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# House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing <br> -Audio Transcription 

January 15, 2024

## Phillip Callais, et al.

VS.
Nancy Landry

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Members, if you could please find your seats. Good morning, everyone. Today is January 15th, 2024. Welcome to the committee on House and Governmental Affairs. Welcome, members. Welcome, public. This is the -- from what I can understand, the first gavel of the new legislative leaders here at -- at the capital. So welcome, everyone.

A couple of things. If you have a cell phone, please silence it. If -- if you forgot to turn off your gumbo or you need to remind somebody to stir your gumbo back home, we ask you to step out and take all calls outside. We have some cards up here for witnesses although we won't be hearing bills today. And just reminding everybody, this is -- this is a preparatory committee meeting. The special session doesn't start until this -- this afternoon.

So what we're going to be doing here is educating members, educating the public, refreshing everyone on redistricting and redistricting principles, and then also hearing from our attorney general. So we won't be debating bills. If -- if everyone could, you know, keep questions and comments strictly to the -- the subject matter that -- we're going to be here from an education standpoint. And if you have questions as it
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | relates to certain bills, we ask you to hold those until | 1 | committee has done over the last several years as it |
| 2 | we -- until we have -- have those bills. But, Ms. | 2 | relates to redistricting. On our website, if you go to |
| 3 | Baker, if you wouldn't mind, please call role. | 3 | the legislator's main page and you click on House page, |
| 4 | MS. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chairman | 4 | and then there's a -- a button that says, "Additional |
| 5 | Beaullieu? | 5 | Sites." Under that "Additional Sites" button is a |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Here. | 6 | Louisiana redistricting site where we have all the work |
| 7 | MS. BAKER: Present. Vice-chair Lyons? | 7 | that this committee has done over the last couple of |
| 8 | VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Present. | 8 | years. We don't want to have to -- to -- we want -- we |
| 9 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Billings? | 9 | don't want to forget that hard work. And if anybody |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Present. | 10 | needs a resource, there's a lot of resources there. |
| 11 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Boyd? | 11 | But with that said -- so we're going to start |
| 12 | Representative Carlson? | 12 | off this morning with Ms. -- Ms. Lowery from here in the |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. | 13 | House and Governmental staff. She's going to update us |
| 14 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter? | 14 | on some principles with redistricting and -- and kind of |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Present. | 15 | get everybody up to speed. So, Ms. Lowrey. |
| 16 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carver? | 16 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you so much, Mr. |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here. Present. | 17 | Chairman. Hi, members. My name is Patricia |
| 18 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnum? | 18 | Lowrey-Dufour. I am the senior legislative analyst for |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Here. | 19 | House and Governmental Affairs. I have staffed this |
| 20 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Gadberry? | 20 | committee in some capacity since 1988. And the chairman |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Here. | 21 | has asked me to give y'all a brief redistricting 101 |
| 22 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Johnson? | 22 | this morning, and it's going to be abbreviated. |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Here. | 23 | And again, as the chairman said, there are a |
| 24 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative | 24 | plethora of resources available on the redistricting |
| 25 | Larvadain? | 25 | website of the legislature, including links to the |
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| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Here. | 1 | videos of the hearings, the roadshow hearings, all |
| 2 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Marcelle? | 2 | public comments and documents that were received there. |
| 3 | Representative Newell? Representative Schamerhorn? | 3 | So again, you are encouraged to go look there. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Here. | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Anyone watching |
| 5 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Thomas? | 5 | online, we're working on the technology. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here. | 6 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you, Anthony. Thank |
| 7 | MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Wright? | 7 | you. Okay. Briefly, we'll be giving an overview of |
| 8 | Representative Wyble? | 8 | redistricting terms concepts and law, redistricting |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Here. | 9 | criteria, the 2020 census population and population |
| 10 | MS. BAKER: Present. We have 13, and a | 10 | trends, malapportionment statistics and illustrative |
| 11 | quorum. | 11 | maps on Congress and the Supreme Court since those are |
| 12 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you. | 12 | items included in the call for this special session, and |
| 13 | Members, a couple of things. One, in your folders | 13 | the act for Congress that was adopted in the 2022 First |
| 14 | you're going to have a copy of the -- the rules for the | 14 | Extraordinary Session as well as the timeline related to |
| 15 | House and Governmental Affairs Committee. These are the | 15 | the adoption of that act. |
| 16 | rules that have been adopted by this committee. If you | 16 | Okay. Briefly, Louisiana's resident |
| 17 | would review them at -- at your leisure, we're not going | 17 | population is $4,657,757$. This is the number that we use |
| 18 | to be discussing them today. But if you have questions | 18 | to determine the ideal district. Now, why is this |
| 19 | regarding these rules or you would like to amend these | 19 | important to you? One of the main criteria for |
| 20 | rules or -- or make some changes, we're going to address | 20 | redistricting is to achieve population equality, so -- |
| 21 | that in the -- in the regular session. But I just | 21 | among the district. So the ideal district population is |
| 22 | wanted to point that out that we have those in -- in the | 22 | very important. |
| 23 | folder for all of you. | 23 | Just so you know, for congressional |
| 24 | Also, members, and -- and the viewing public, |  | apportionment there is a different number that is used. |
| 25 | we don't want to forget all of the work that this | 25 | It's called the apportionment population. And Louisiana |
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25 this committee in the late eighties, we had eight
congressmen allocated to the state. So in the 1980 to '90, we had eight. Following the 1990 census, we were dropped to seven. And then we maintained seven from 2000 to 2010 and again from -- then we dropped another congressman.

So what you see is a pattern is emerging that every other decade, even though the state is growing, because we're lagging behind the nation we are losing our -- our number allocated to us for Congress.

So specifically with the 2020 census, you will see there is growth in this state along, really, the $\mathrm{I}-10 / 12$ corridor. There is loss in north Louisiana generally, although there are a few spots of growth and, you know, there are areas of our coast that are clearly suffering population losses. So why is this important? Obviously, when the districts were drawn in 2010, the population, you know, was substantially equal -- or equal to the extent practicable in all of the districts. Over the decade, you can see, because of the shifts in population it necessitated a change in the district boundaries.

Now, our census population demographic change. In 2010, you can see there we had 62.56 percent of people who identified as single race White, 32.8 percent of people who identified as Black, and we had 1.8
percent of people who identified as Asian, 1.3 percent that identified as American Indian, and 1.83 as Other. And one thing I want to point out about this chart is Hispanic is an ethnicity. So when you look at these numbers across the board, they will not total to 100 because you can be any of these races and also Hispanic. Okay?

So Hispanic is separately reported as a number, and we have $4-$ we had 4.25 percent Hispanic in 2010. That number has increased to 6.92 in 2020. The White population is 57.06; the Black population, 33.13; Asian, 2.30; American Indian, 1.87. And again, the Other -- you'll see the most significant growth in the Other category. The sum of the race is interesting because it's not -- these are people who chose to respond to the census as being not White, not Black, not Asian, not American Indian. Okay. So it's just an interesting jump to see this increase.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. Ms. Lowrey, also just to kind of point out, if -- if members look at the -- the decrease in the White population and look at the increase in the Other population, they're pretty close to the same from a number standpoint. Just if -I don't know if it's more people. I -- we had talked about this in committee over the last couple of years,
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | number that you see on this report indicates White | 1 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay. So they could be a |
| 2 | alone. So this is not going to be any person that | 2 | combination of up to the six. |
| 3 | reported that they were White and any other race. | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Oh, gotcha. |
| 4 | The Black category reflects all people who | 4 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay? |
| 5 | reported Black alone, plus any other race and Black, | 5 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, |
| 6 | okay? Asian is Asian alone and any other race other | 6 | Representative Carter. And members, also just to -- to |
| 7 | than Black, okay? And total American Indian, the same, | 7 | let you all know, I know some of this -- this room -- |
| 8 | American Indian alone and any other race other than | 8 | this technology is new to some of y'all. The buttons on |
| 9 | Asian or Black. And the Other is that category that we | 9 | your -- your desk, the one to the left is -- is -- is |
| 10 | talked about, the people who reported that they were any | 10 | dead. There's nothing on it. So if you want to be |
| 11 | other, and it also includes the Pacific Islanders that | 11 | recognized, please hit the button towards your right, |
| 12 | the population in Louisiana was not significant. So | 12 | and you'll see your microphone light up when -- when |
| 13 | that is included in the Other category. | 13 | it's your turn. Representative Gadberry for a question. |
| 14 | And the category that's labeled VAP total, | 14 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: A pleasure, Mr. |
| 15 | that means voting-age population. And that's going to | 15 | Chair. |
| 16 | be key, as you will hear, I'm sure, from our attorney | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Give me a second. |
| 17 | general. Okay. Moving on. Any questions about that? | 17 | It's giving me a little trouble here. All right. |
| 18 | All right. Yes, sir. | 18 | You're on. |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: So (inaudible 0:13:18) | 19 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Pleasure, Mr. Chair. |
| 20 | -- | 20 | So when we proportion a district, we go by voting-age |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Hold on, let me -- | 21 | population and not total population? |
| 22 | let -- is it Carter? | 22 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: No, sir. So the |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: If -- if you reported | 23 | population of the district that is keyed into the ideal |
| 24 | -- | 24 | district population is the total population of the |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Representative | 25 | district. |
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| 1 | Carter, you're on. | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. So what's the |
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you. Thank you, | 2 | significance of voting-age population then if we -- |
| 3 | Mr. Chairman. If you reported White and -- and you -- | 3 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: That is the population |
| 4 | you -- is any other -- only White -- is counted all the | 4 | that is 18 or over, and it is significant when you're |
| 5 | (inaudible 0:13:36) -- | 5 | analyzing voting rights issues because, obviously, the |
| 6 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: The White population | 6 | people who are 18 and over are of voting age. |
| 7 | category on your report is people who responded to the | 7 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Right. So the -- I |
| 8 | census as being White alone. | 8 | guess the question is -- is -- that I've always come up |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: White alone? | 9 | with is -- and I'm just taking the -- say, District 1 |
| 10 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Not combination with any | 10 | here, it shows 69 percent is White on total population |
| 11 | other race. | 11 | and $100-$ I'm sorry, 71 percent on voting-age |
| 12 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay. | 12 | population. So -- so when we proportion or when we come |
| 13 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay? | 13 | up with a district, do we go by the percentage based on |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: So, basically, the | 14 | total population or voting-age population? |
| 15 | same way with the -- the Black population as -- | 15 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: To achieve the population |
| 16 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: No, sir. | 16 | equality required on the districts, you go by |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay. So go back | 17 | population. To achieve other goals, you look at the |
| 18 | through that because -- | 18 | totality of the circumstances including voting-age |
| 19 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: On the report -- and | 19 | population, okay? |
| 20 | again, this population allocation document is on the | 20 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you. |
| 21 | website and it was adopted by the committee when we | 21 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: You're welcome. Okay. |
| 22 | started the process. So the Black population category | 22 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: You did that well, |
| 23 | is people who reported to the census that they were | 23 | Ms. Lowrey. |
| 24 | Black and any other race. | 24 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay. | 25 | What is redistricting? I will tell you the terms |
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1 apportionment and districting are sometimes used interchangeably, and in fact, in our state constitution, the term reapportionment is used. However, they are different concepts. Apportionment is the process of allocating seats in a legislature while districting is the process of drawing lines to create geographical territories from which officials are elected.

So, again, we talked about the apportionment of numbers of members of Congress to each state. That is allocating seats to the state in Congress, whereas what -- the charge before you under the call for this special session is to draw lines for the geographic territories from which those officials will be elected.

Why do you redistrict? Well, there are many, many, many legal requirements involving redistricting, as we briefly touched on with Representative Gadberry just a moment ago. One includes Article III, Section 6 of our constitution that includes deadlines and duties regarding legislative redistricting. There are also various statutes for your local governing bodies and school boards to conduct redistrictings and as well as deadlines. And then there are some general legal requirements, including the Equal Protection Clause and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
25 So given that, who do you -- who are you
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responsible for redistricting? Congress, the courts, the House and the Senate, the Public Service Commission and the State Board Of Elementary and Secondary Education. All those have been enacted by the state legislature as laws, so it takes a bill.

The issue's dealing with federal law, right, so equal population. You know, you hear often the term, "One man, one vote," you know. So how do you measure it? Again, you measure it by looking at the ideal population. And again, how do we come up with that ideal population? We take the total resident population of the state or the geographic area where the districts are to be confected, and you divide that total population by the number of districts, and you come up with an ideal district population.

So I'm going to refer you now to the planned statistic document that's in your folder. It's numbered 8. And again, this is all relevant to Act 5 of the 2022 First Extraordinary Session.

So this report -- and again, I encourage you to become familiar with the structure of it and what it is telling you. So this will tell you there are six districts in a congressional plan, they are single 24 member districts, the actual population within the 25 district, the ideal population that you are basing the
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MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay. Everybody clear on population equality and deviations? Okay. And as the chairman alluded to, the standards are different between Congress and other representative districts that we draw. They are based on different legal provisions.

Congress, the nearly as equal in population as practicable is based on jurisprudence. Wesberry v. Sanders is the seminal case there, based on Article 1, Section 2 in the 14th Amendment, "Representatives shall be apportioned," among the states, "according to their respective numbers." And you must make a good faith effort to avoid deviation and to be able to provide a legally acceptable, nondiscriminatory justification for any deviation.

Whereas for other representative districts that you will draw, you are allowed to have a slightly larger deviation field. It is substantial equality of population among various districts. That derives from the case of Reynolds v. Sims. Again, the 1960s created a lot of cases dealing with population equality as well as requirements for single member districts.

Again, based on the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, there's a generally accepted 10 percent standard that a legislative plan with an overall range of less than 10 percent would not be enough to

|  | Page 18 |  | Page 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | make a prima facie case of invidious discrimination | 1 | Voting Rights Act. They are size and geographical |
| 2 | under the 14th Amendment. However, so asterisk, it is | 2 | compactness of the group. It requires that the |
| 3 | not necessarily a state harbor -- a safe harbor. I'm | 3 | population be sufficiently large and geographically |
| 4 | sorry. | 4 | compact; a constitutional majority in a single member |
| 5 | In Larios v. Cox, you -- any substantial | 5 | district; that the minority population is politically |
| 6 | deviation must have a legitimate state interest behind | 6 | cohesive; and that in the absence of special |
| 7 | it. Okay. In Louisiana, in order to accomplish this | 7 | circumstances, block voting by the majority defeats the |
| 8 | overall 10 percent range, we have adopted a criteria of | 8 | minority's preferred candidates. |
| 9 | plus or minus five from the ideal to stay as close to | 9 | Once courts have established those |
| 10 | that ideal population among the districts as you can | 10 | preconditions, there are other objective factors that it |
| 11 | get. | 11 | looks to to determine the totality of the circumstances. |
| 12 | Okay. Again, and I know this seems like it's | 12 | And I'm not going to go into those at this moment, but |
| 13 | very repetitive. It's important. Equality of | 13 | if you would like to talk later, we'll be happy to do |
| 14 | population must be the overriding objective of | 14 | that. |
| 15 | districting, and deviations from the -- the principle | 15 | Now, the other side of that is racial |
| 16 | are permissible only if incident to the effectuation of | 16 | gerrymandering. So again, the Equal Protection Clause |
| 17 | a rational state policy which would include allowing | 17 | of the 14th Amendment found that -- you know, there have |
| 18 | representation to political subdivisions, compactness, | 18 | been a series of cases, Reno v. Shaw in Louisiana, Hays |
| 19 | preserving cores of prior districts, and avoiding | 19 | -- the Hays lines of cases where the courts have found |
| 20 | contest between incumbents. And again, that is based on | 20 | that if race was found to be the predominant overriding |
| 21 | Reynolds v. Sims. | 21 | factor, that strict scrutiny on the state's plan would |
| 22 | Okay. Judicial districts, which, again, will | 22 | apply. And in order to survive that strict scrutiny, |
| 23 | be the subject of this special session. In a Louisiana | 23 | the plan must have been narrowly tailored to serve a |
| 24 | case, Wells v. Edwards which was decided in the Middle | 24 | compelling state interest. |
| 25 | District of Louisiana, the court decided that the one | 25 | So what would be a compelling state interest? |
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| 1 | person, one vote standard does not apply to judicial | 1 | Remedying past discrimination, avoiding retrogression, |
| 2 | districts as judges serve the people. They do not | 2 | avoiding violations of Section 2 of the Voting Rights |
| 3 | represent the people. | 3 | Act. And key here is those interests must be strongly |
| 4 | Now, we're going to talk about other issues of | 4 | supported in the evidence when the policymakers are |
| 5 | federal law: discrimination against minorities, the | 5 | making their decisions on the plan. And this would |
| 6 | Voting Rights Act of 1965. And again, principles of | 6 | apply not only to plans that distinguish citizens |
| 7 | this are contained within the 14th and 15th Amendment, | 7 | because of race, but also to plans that may be race |
| 8 | but basically, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act | 8 | neutral but on their face are inexplicable except on |
| 9 | prohibits the state or any political subdivision from | 9 | grounds other than race. |
| 10 | imposing a voting qualification, standard, practice, or | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowrey, we have |
| 11 | procedure that results in the denial or abridgment of | 11 | a question. Representative Marcelle. |
| 12 | any citizen's right to vote on account of race, color, | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Can you |
| 13 | status as a member of a language minority group. | 13 | go back over what you just said about the -- the strict |
| 14 | So there have been a lot of litigation on this | 14 | scrutiny and how -- how that's overridden? Why would |
| 15 | issue. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act was amended | 15 | that be overridden? So I -- I know you -- you -- you |
| 16 | in 1982 to clarify that a violation of Section 2 is | 16 | talked about the -- |
| 17 | established if, based on the totality of circumstances, | 17 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: No, I-- |
| 18 | it is shown that election processes are not equally open | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- idea of |
| 19 | to participation by members of a protected class in that | 19 | population, and I'm just -- |
| 20 | its members have less opportunity than other members of | 20 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- think it's satisfied. |
| 21 | the electorate to participate in the political process | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So it has to be |
| 22 | and elect representative of their choice. | 22 | satisfied? |
| 23 | So there was a case, Thornburg v. Gingles, | 23 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: That if you can prove that |
| 24 | 1986, that established certain preconditions that courts | 24 | it -- that the plan was narrowly tailored to further |
| 25 | will look to to make determinations on violations of the | 25 | your compelling governmental interest. |
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The lighter orange is still below the ideal. The light yellow colors are population that is above. But obviously, District 6 was the most above the ideal district.

So to remedy the population inequality among the districts, the legislature passed a bill. That bill was introduced on February 1st. It was reported favorably by your predecessor committee on February 4th, 2022. It passed the House, 70 votes to 33 nays, on the 10th. It was received in the Senate on the 14th. The Senate and Governmental Affairs Committee reported it on the 15 th. Senate passed it 27 to 10 on the 18 th. The House concurred in amendments, 62 yeas to 27 nays, on the 18th.

Then it was sent to the governor on March the 10th. The governor vetoed the bill on May the 30th. The House overrode the veto, 72 yeas to 31 nays. On March 30th, the Senate also overrode the veto, 27 yeas to 11 nays. And on March 31st, the bill became Act number 5 of the 2022 First Extraordinary Session. This bill, Act 5, is -- this map represents the districts that were drawn pursuant to Act 5. And this is the map that, again, is in litigation currently.

This is the population, again, statistics, the deviations. You've looked at the report. I don't need
to repeat that to you, but you can see that they are as nearly equal in population, and certainly much more equal in population than where we started.

Malapportionment of the Supreme Court, and we're talking about this again because it is in the special session call. These are the current districts for the seven Supreme Court districts. These districts, while not subject to equal population requirements due to that case that we mentioned earlier -- when these districts were last drawn in 1997 using the 1990 census -- okay. So they were drawn in 1997 using 1990 census figures.

The legislature did draw them with substantially equal populations, and in fact, the mean deviation was less than 2 percent among the districts. The ideal district population at that time was 602,853.

This, members, shows you this current state of the deviations among each of the Supreme Court districts. District 1, well, the -- I'm just going to say the -- the population of the districts vary considerably from a low of 476,554 in District number 7 which is a Orleans and Jefferson-based district, to a high of 838,610 in District 5 which is the Baton Rouge metropolitan-based district, a difference among the districts of more than 362,000 people.
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REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowrey, just -the original districts, they were -- they were built in the '20s; is that -- is that correct? And only changed once if -- if my memory --

MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Changed once. I believe,
'21, they were -- Supreme Court districts were established.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Let me -- since
we're in the twenties again, like, we're talking the 1920s?

MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.
Yes. Back before, I believe, anyone in this room had yet made an appearance.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. Representative Thompson may have been in the legislature, but that's -- that's it.
(Laughter.)
MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: He certainly has more
seniority than anyone in the legislature. Whether or not he was actually here in the '20s, we'd have to ask. But, yes. So again, and here's that heat map showing the population deviations. Dark red, dark orange, furthest below the ideal, and then dark green representing population the furthest above the ideal.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowrey, we have
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | a question. Representative Wyble. | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: From the federal |
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. | 2 | government? |
| 3 | Ms. Lowrey, thank you for all of this information. It's | 3 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes, sir. |
| 4 | very helpful. I'm still trying to wrap my head around | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Has that guidance been |
| 5 | how the census is counting population, what we talked | 5 | -- I -- I don't know if this is a fair question or not. |
| 6 | about earlier. So if a respondent checked White and | 6 | Was that similar guidance in 2020 -- |
| 7 | Asian, that respondent would be counted as -- | 7 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yeah. |
| 8 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay. The census reported | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: -- compared to 2010? |
| 9 | all of those population figures to the state, okay? | 9 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes. |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Right. | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Has it always been that |
| 11 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: So if you really want to | 11 | way? |
| 12 | know who reported -- not who, but numbers who reported | 12 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: It's similar guidance. |
| 13 | themselves as White and Asian, we can certainly provide | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: All right. Thank you. |
| 14 | that to you. However, and I - I just want to say | 14 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: No. You're very welcome. |
| 15 | there's a limited number -- there's a limited space on | 15 | Okay. Well, that -- |
| 16 | -- on reports. And in order for you to be able to | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: I think |
| 17 | analyze voting-rights issues -- and we have a document | 17 | Representative -- |
| 18 | on our website, and it was a kind of guidance from the | 18 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- concludes my |
| 19 | justice department -- the United States Justice | 19 | presentation, unless there's any other questions. |
| 20 | Department about analyzing Section 2 guidance for that | 20 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. |
| 21 | where you really look at one -- the population of | 21 | Lowrey. Representative Gadberry does have a question. |
| 22 | "alone," so who reported single race. | 22 | Representative Gadberry. |
| 23 | And then you would allocate to the protected | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you, Mr. |
| 24 | class minority groups the White plus the minority group | 24 | Chair. Just to make this clear, what was the ruling |
| 25 | as well as any other reporting. So you would look at it | 25 | from the judge against the maps that were submitted? I |
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| 1 | like that. So for simplicity and -- and to basically | 1 | -- I assume we submitted a -- |
| 2 | allow y'all to look at, you know, categories of | 2 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Representative Gadberry, |
| 3 | population, this is how the reports are confected. But | 3 | we do have the attorney general here today -- |
| 4 | the census reports hundreds of categories of racial | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. |
| 5 | populations, you know, and they'll tell you. I mean, | 5 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- to address those issues |
| 6 | it's, like, White alone, White plus Black, White plus | 6 | regarding the litigation, and I think it would be much |
| 7 | Asian, White plus Black plus Asian plus other. I mean, | 7 | more appropriate coming from the chief legal officer of |
| 8 | all those things will be reported by the census. | 8 | the state. |
| 9 | But for simplicity, I mean, there's no way for | 9 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: I figured that would |
| 10 | y'all to look at -- | 10 | be your answer. We submitted Act 5 though, right? This |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Sure. | 11 | one? |
| 12 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- the report -- | 12 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Act 5 -- |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Sure. | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Is what we submitted |
| 14 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- because it would be | 14 | -- |
| 15 | hundreds of columns of data. | 15 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- was adopted by the |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: But -- but that | 16 | legislature. |
| 17 | criteria is regarded equally regardless of what they | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's what we |
| 18 | check off, I guess is what I'm trying to find out. If | 18 | submitted to the judge? |
| 19 | -- if they were White -- White only, they're counted as | 19 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Well, the judge was |
| 20 | White. But if they're White and another, then they're | 20 | looking at it -- |
| 21 | counted as Other. But if they check off Black and | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Yeah. |
| 22 | others, then we count them a part of our Black | 22 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- as part of the |
| 23 | population; is that correct? | 23 | litigation. |
| 24 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Right. And that's based | 24 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Right. |
| 25 | on that guidance. | 25 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's the one that | 1 | The last time redistricting, in the 1990s, it -- it was |
| 2 | she looked at though, that she rejected? | 2 | -- when the second majority/minority map was drawn, we |
| 3 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Well, I mean -- and -- and | 3 | ended up in litigation for a decade. So there is no |
| 4 | also there have been other plans -- | 4 | guarantee that when you do this again, we won't still be |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. | 5 | in litigation. But we are in litigation now. |
| 6 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- that have been | 6 | The District Court judge has conducted a |
| 7 | submitted by plaintiffs to the court. | 7 | fact-finding mission - that's what will -- what always |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And -- and would you | 8 | happens - and made fact findings regarding the map. She |
| 9 | say that Act 5 did not meet the redistricting criteria? | 9 | issued an injunction. That injunction is not currently |
| 10 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Representative Gadberry -- | 10 | in effect for reasons that I can explain to you, but I |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: I know. You're not | 11 | think the bottom line is it is not currently in effect |
| 12 | (inaudible 0:43:45) -- | 12 | because the deadlines for the election that it enjoined |
| 13 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: That is a -- that is a | 13 | are -- are over. |
| 14 | legal matter that is currently the subject of litigation | 14 | The courts, nevertheless, have told us to draw |
| 15 | in the Middle District, and again, much more | 15 | a new map, and they have indicated that we have a |
| 16 | appropriately addressed by our chief legal officer. | 16 | deadline to do that or Judge Dick will draw the map for |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. We can let | 17 | us. So you have an opportunity now to go back and draw |
| 18 | our attorney general handle that one. | 18 | the map again. And -- and I think that it is not an |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. Thank you. | 19 | easy task because the United States Supreme Court has |
| 20 | MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you. | 20 | not made it an easy task. They've given you some |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. | 21 | directives that seem to be -- to not give you a lot of |
| 22 | Lowrey. Members, as -- as you all were just -- got a -- | 22 | clear lines for doing your job. I -- I apologize on |
| 23 | got a teaser from Representative Gadberry, we have our | 23 | their behalf for -- but, you know, we tried. |
| 24 | attorney general here with us, Ms. -- Ms. Liz Murrill. | 24 | I mean, I am defending that map, and so you |
| 25 | She's going to join us and give us an update on the | 25 | won't hear me say that I believe that that map violated |
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| 1 | litigation. And I see Ms. Murrill has a familiar face | 1 | the redistricting criteria. I'm defending that map, but |
| 2 | with her, so l'd like to welcome back to the House of | 2 | I will defend your new map if you draw a new map. So, |
| 3 | Representatives former colleague Representative Larry | 3 | you know, it's an act of the legislature. My job is to |
| 4 | Frieman. Welcome, welcome, Mr. Frieman. | 4 | defend the work of the legislature, and I will do that |
| 5 | MR. FRIEMAN: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, | 5 | to the very best of my ability. |
| 6 | members. It's -- I'm glad to be back. And sitting on | 6 | I think that the difficulty is that in the |
| 7 | this side of the table is a familiar place -- | 7 | Merrill v. Milligan case, which was the Alabama |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. | 8 | litigation that preceded ours, the Supreme Court issued |
| 9 | MR. FRIEMAN: -- for myself as well. So thank | 9 | an opinion. And it says that in a Section 2 disparate |
| 10 | you for having me. | 10 | impact claim, which is different really from the work |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: If you wouldn't | 11 | that you did -- you did your work. You did it in good |
| 12 | mind, everyone, and introduce yourself for the | 12 | faith. But they can -- they -- the plaintiffs will go |
| 13 | committee, and then it's all yours. | 13 | to court, and they will make a disparate impact claim, |
| 14 | MS. MURRILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and | 14 | and that's what gets litigated. |
| 15 | members of the committee. It's great to be with you | 15 | That has nothing to do with whether your |
| 16 | today as your new attorney general. I'm Liz Murrill. I | 16 | intent was nefarious or not. Everyone can have had the |
| 17 | also have with me Tom Jones who is the new director of | 17 | right intent and followed the rules as they believed |
| 18 | the civil division and has been involved in the | 18 | they were given to them, and go to court. And the court |
| 19 | litigation. And now, chief deputy -- almost chief | 19 | can still say, "Under Section 2, there's a disparate |
| 20 | deputy, assuming you confirm him, is Larry Frieman. So | 20 | impact. And because there's a disparate impact, you |
| 21 | that'll be before you soon, too. | 21 | have to go back and do it again, or I will do it for |
| 22 | I -- I -- I want to tell you that | 22 | you." |
| 23 | redistricting is hard. I'm not going to tell you this | 23 | And that is -- that is the short version of |
| 24 | is easy. I -- I think that you did a -- you did the | 24 | what Judge Dick has held and what has not been |
| 25 | best job you could before. We've been in litigation. | 25 | overturned by any court that we have brought it before, |
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1 since then. There's no definitive ruling on that case. It is still in litigation. If you pass a new act of the legislature, that will become the new law. So I'm happy to take some more questions. I think that what -- what Merrill v. Milligan did, which is, I think, one question, is that it said, "You can't do this job once there's been some litigation over disparate impact. You can't really do the job without taking race into account."

And so that's not illegal or improper to -- to think about race when you're doing this. You can't really do it otherwise. I mean, that's the whole -- the litigation is because someone has made a claim about the disparate impact. And so there's no way to not give some thought to what you're doing in that context, especially when it's preceded by some litigation and some fact finding. But what the United States Supreme Court has said is that race can't predominate in the way that you draw your lines.

So there have to be other reasons that would justify the map. And those are some -- I thought Ms. Lowery did an excellent job of -- of giving you what the broad parameters are. They aren't -- you know, they're not going to be real -- it's not going to be easy 25 because the Supreme Court hasn't made it real clear in
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terms of how you can meet strict scrutiny,
Representative Marcelle. I mean, it's -- it is -- it is a difficult task.

And I think that some of the other directives that the court has given, like trying to keep geographical compactness, doing the best you can in terms of meeting all the other requirements, I mean, those are things -- those are justifications that still apply. Maintaining communities of interest still apply. Balancing geographical -- I mean, population still applies. So all of those things are, you know -- and then the totality of the circumstances is ultimately what the test is going to be that the courts apply.

And so, you know, I -- I think that if that makes things even more confusing to you, I blame the courts. I mean, we -- we have tried to get them to explain and give you more clear directions. It is ultimately your job. The constitution makes this the job of the legislature to draw the maps, and then when we end up in litigation, it perverts that process.

Because the -- the -- the way that the -- the precedent is built, there's fact finding that occurs from a judge that can override the very fact finding that you've made and your legislative record. And -and that's just a product of precedent and how these
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we have a couple of questions. Representative Thomas.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Good morning. I think I heard you say that race is the predominant --

MS. MURRILL: No. No. Race cannot be the predominant factor in what you would draw. That would violate the Equal Protection Clause. So what you have to do is think about how to best draw the maps, given the criteria that the Supreme Court has established, without allowing race to be the predominant factor that drives the drawing of your lines. That's where the actual Equal Protection Clause violation will come in. So, you know, you need to stay south of that.

And then I -- I think that, you know, you're going to have a lot of other things that you have to think about when you draw these maps. Communities of interest is one of the -- the -- the most important ones. I think that's always been a driving feature of the maps -- or of the map drawing exercise.

Core retention is what was discussed very heavily in Merrill v. Milligan, and I think core retention has now become -- and -- and I'm just going to tell you my personal opinion in trying to decipher
24 Merrill v. Milligan. It was not easy. There are a lot
25 of -- it's a very fractured opinion. But I -- I think

1 that core retention is the part that the court has given the least amount of attention to in this process now, that once you are trying to redraw the map, I think that core retention takes -- is -- becomes a less important factor under Merrill v. Milligan.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Thomas. Representative Marcelle.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Let me start by congratulating you. I don't know if I should say congratulations or condolences. I'm not really
sure. Congratulations.
MS. MURRILL: Well, I asked for the job, so thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Let -- let me just go over a couple of things that you said, and -and so I can be clear in what you're -- what you're telling us today. Number one, you said you're going to defend the map, Act 5, that they presented because that is your job to do so, correct?

MS. MURRILL: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And so --
MS. MURRILL: I am defending it now.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Correct. Because
that's -- that's what we hired you to do, to defend us,
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right? And if we pass another map, you'll defend that map as well?

MS. MURRILL: That's correct.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: The other thing that
|--|--|-| - |-- | heard you say was this is a
-- the judge has fact-finding matters. Can you kind of elaborate on what that means? Is that -- that's based upon the testimony that was presented by the plaintiffs; is that accurate? And -- and the -- and the defense, obviously, she took both -- both matters into consideration when she was doing her fact finding.

MS. MURRILL: She did. That doesn't mean I
agree with them.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. So --
MS. MURRILL: And I -- and I think that it's also a product of -- this is part of what's frustrating,
I think, for the legislature when it goes into litigation because people can -- like, experts, for example, that are hired by the plaintiffs, no matter who they are -- this could happen on the new map. Right? Those experts can come and testify in court, and the judge can control that testimony. In our case, it happened in a very, very short, short turnaround in a preliminary injunction hearing which is different from a trial on the merits. We've never had a trial on the
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REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- a fact, right? Is -- is it also a fact that a third of that -- the population is African American?

MS. MURRILL: Approximately, based on the data. I would also point out that 50 percent are women. I mean, there are other -- there are other population, you know, and gender and differences -- like, that's why Section 2 has never been -- I mean, it is expressly stated in Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act that this is not an act of proportionate dividing. That is not permitted under Section 2. And so we can't just take that number and say that's -- that's how we do this, because it's not that simple and that's actually not permitted under the law.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So -- so it's not permitted to say that we have six congressional districts, and of those six congressional districts, we -- we talk about community interests, I think was one of them. So do you believe that all five of the other districts has all the community interests impacted in those, and African American districts only should have one?

MS. MURRILL: Representative Marcelle, the -the -- the -- the job of drawing the districts is yours. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I get it.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. MURRILL: It's not mine. | 1 | additional congressional map. And I think what we're |
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right. | 2 | hearing from Judge Kelly Dick is -- |
| 3 | MS. MURRILL: And I-- I am defending what I | 3 | MS. MURRILL: Shelly Dick. |
| 4 | believe to have been a -- a defensible map. And if you | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- Shelly Dick is |
| 5 | draw a new map, I will defend that map. Judge Dick has | 5 | that the map is not fair for the state of Louisiana. |
| 6 | put us in a -- in a position -- and the Fifth Circuit, | 6 | And -- and what I -- what I agree with her on is that if |
| 7 | the panel that reviewed that decision, and the whole | 7 | we cannot -- and we had an opportunity to draw this map |
| 8 | court, when I asked them to go en banc, by declining to | 8 | ourselves and we did not do it as it supports Section 2, |
| 9 | go en banc, have put us in a position of where we are | 9 | in my opinion. I know you gave yours, but this is my |
| 10 | today, where we -- we need to draw a map. So I'm here | 10 | opinion. So then we will allow her to draw that map if |
| 11 | to tell -- I'm not here to tell you don't draw a map. I | 11 | we can't do that. We can't draw a map right now, right? |
| 12 | mean, I think we do have to draw a map -- | 12 | Is that accurate? |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And -- and -- | 13 | MS. MURRILL: So what will happen if you do |
| 14 | MS. MURRILL: -- and I will defend that map. | 14 | not draw a map is that she has set a trial date. It's |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: And -- and my final | 15 | very, very quick, and we will still be operating under |
| 16 | question. I heard Representative Beaullieu talk about | 16 | the old map. So we will move forward then with a trial |
| 17 | two-thirds of the legislature approving this map and -- | 17 | on the -- under the old map. There'll be a trial on the |
| 18 | and -- and voting for it. Beaullieu. I'm sorry. | 18 | merits, the same record I think that was presented, and |
| 19 | (Simultaneous speaking.) | 19 | Tom can affirm or -- or correct me if I'm wrong, but the |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Beaullieu? | 20 | -- the record from the preliminary injunction hearing |
| 21 | (Simultaneous speaking.) | 21 | will all go into the -- into the -- into the court |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I just call you | 22 | record, and we will look at whether we want to have |
| 23 | Beau, so I'm -- I'm trying to get your real name because | 23 | additional testimony. And that trial will move forward. |
| 24 | -- | 24 | I -- I don't expect Judge Dick to change her |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: We'll -- we'll -- | 25 | position. I think she will draw a map, and -- and so |
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| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- I been calling | 1 | you are getting the first opportunity to do that. |
| 2 | you Beau. | 2 | mean, we could have -- in theory, we could have had a |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- we'll work on | 3 | trial on the merits, and she could have said, "I don't |
| 4 | you -- | 4 | --" you know, again, "I don't like the old map," and -- |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Yes. | 5 | or, "I don't like the map that you drew and I'm going to |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- Representative | 6 | redraw your map." But as a matter of law, you get the |
| 7 | Marcelle. | 7 | first shot at doing that, so. |
| 8 | (Laughter.) | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No. We get the |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So Beaullieu -- I | 9 | second shot at doing it. Thank you very much, though. |
| 10 | always call him Beau. But Beaullieu, I-- I-- I-- I | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you. |
| 11 | heard him say that two-thirds of the legislature voted | 11 | Representative Marcelle. Representative Farnum. |
| 12 | for this map. And he's absolutely accurate because the | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. |
| 13 | majority of the legislature would support this map | 13 | Chairman. So a couple of things. So the -- the |
| 14 | because it benefits them. We talked about, you know, | 14 | parallel that the argument has been based on is the -- |
| 15 | our districts and our interests. What I did not hear | 15 | the case in Alabama; was that the one? |
| 16 | him say is -- because I sat at that table on the other | 16 | MS. MURRILL: Yeah. The Alabama case was |
| 17 | side and presented a map, and none of the maps that we | 17 | litigated just, you know, a few months ahead of ours, |
| 18 | presented got out of this committee. | 18 | and so it went up to the Supreme Court before ours did. |
| 19 | So it's, you know, it's unfair to say, "Okay, | 19 | And so we've basically been held -- our case was held in |
| 20 | we passed it with the majority of the people," because a | 20 | abeyance pending the outcome of that case. |
| 21 | majority of the people would support us not having an -- | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- and that was a |
| 22 | an additional African American representation in another | 22 | seven-member district, right? |
| 23 | district. I get that. But it's not fair to say that | 23 | MS. MURRILL: I believe so. |
| 24 | those arguments weren't made to -- to support that. I | 24 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- so they were |
| 25 | was one of those that made the argument to support an | 25 | trying to reach a second district in a seven-member |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | state. So would you say, just in your opinion, is it | 1 | MR. JONES: I'm sorry. My name is Tom Jones. |
| 2 | harder to -- to draw two of six than it is two of seven, | 2 | I'm the director of the civil division in the attorney |
| 3 | just based on the compactness of the population of that | 3 | general's office. |
| 4 | state? Because wouldn't you say that every state has a | 4 | The judge has principally based her ruling on |
| 5 | different compactness, there's no two states that are | 5 | Black voting-age population. That's what she's used as |
| 6 | identical, and maybe it's easier in one state, that | 6 | the primary criteria. Then the experts take that Black |
| 7 | maybe the compactness is -- is much more centrally | 7 | voting-age population, and they're very clever people, |
| 8 | located to reach that conclusion. Wouldn't -- would you | 8 | and they do very clever things with those numbers. They |
| 9 | agree with that? | 9 | can persuade you on one side that the Black voting-age |
| 10 | MS. MURRILL: I -- I would agree with you that | 10 | population should be analyzed this way, and the other |
| 11 | every state is different and that -- that our population | 11 | experts can convince you of just the opposite the next |
| 12 | -- how our population is spread out is -- is different | 12 | day. But Black voting-age population has been the |
| 13 | from every other state. | 13 | primary criteria for this judge's rulings. |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Would -- would you -- | 14 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Because you did say |
| 15 | MS. MURRILL: So our population is -- our | 15 | something earlier, that -- that race cannot be a |
| 16 | population, I think, is relatively close to theirs. I | 16 | determining factor of -- of why you draw maps. |
| 17 | -- they'd probably have a little more population because | 17 | MS. MURRILL: It can't be the predominant |
| 18 | they still have seven districts. You know, we -- this | 18 | factor. |
| 19 | isn't going to be easy. I -- I didn't -- that's why I | 19 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Isn't that the only |
| 20 | started out by saying, "I'm not here to tell you this is | 20 | reason we're here right now? |
| 21 | an easy job." You have a hard job. Our state is | 21 | MS. MURRILL: You know, we're here because of |
| 22 | different. Every state is different from each other, | 22 |  |
| 23 | and -- and you have to do this based on the facts in our | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: But isn't that the |
| 24 | state. | 24 | predominant reason? |
| 25 | We have argued in our case that our state is | 25 | MS. MURRILL: -- the court's telling us we |
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| 1 | different from Alabama with regard to -- so that they -- | 1 | have to be here. I mean, I -- I think that's part of |
| 2 | the fact findings aren't -- can't be the same. We're | 2 | it. You know, the -- I mean, I'm defending the map. |
| 3 | not the same. Our history isn't the same. Our history | 3 | I'm going to defend the new map. I -- I want you to |
| 4 | of redistricting and redistricting litigation is not the | 4 | know, I mean, if you draw a new map, I'm defending that |
| 5 | same. And we -- we brought those issues up, and here we | 5 | map, so. |
| 6 | are still, so. | 6 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I agree. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I -- I know. I | 7 | MS. MURRILL: I'm not going to say that, you |
| 8 | spent the better part of three years going over this. I | 8 | know, I mean, I think -- I don't -- I have complaints |
| 9 | was on the committee last time and sat through numerous, | 9 | about how this case was managed, I mean, not by our |
| 10 | numerous meetings on -- on this across a period of the | 10 | litigators, not -- you know, I just think that we need |
| 11 | three years. Help -- help me understand how the -- the | 11 | -- we should have a trial on the merits. I've always -- |
| 12 | voting-age population factors in when the voting -- the | 12 | I have argued that in court. I have signed off on those |
| 13 | Black voting-age population is lower than the total | 13 | pleadings. I still believe that that's true. The |
| 14 | population in the state. How does that factor in? | 14 | courts have told us to do this by a certain date or it's |
| 15 | MS. MURRILL: You want to take that one? | 15 | going to be done for us. |
| 16 | MR. JONES: Yeah. The -- the judge -- | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I think the |
| 17 | MS. MURRILL: Introduce yourself just quickly | 17 | circular fashion of -- of the 14th, the 15th Amendment, |
| 18 | again. | 18 | and this Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is a circle. |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: You're on. You're | 19 | So it -- it -- it sends you in this race to chase your |
| 20 | on. | 20 | tail to try and accomplish what you're trying to |
| 21 | MR. JONES: The judge here in the Middle | 21 | accomplish. And -- and each one contradicts the other |
| 22 | District has based her rulings on the Black -- | 22 | one in the circle. So you end up in this never ending |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: If you don't mind, | 23 | loop of -- of how do you accomplish what we're tasked to |
| 24 | could you kind of speak into the mic a little bit? Or | 24 | do here. |
| 25 | you can pull the mic to you, I believe, as well. | 25 | We did look at a lot of maps and -- and, you |
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| 1 | know, I -- I personally think that the one we passed was | 1 | But the law is pretty much the -- it's the |
| 2 | -- was a very legal, legitimate map. And -- and -- and | 2 | same. So based on that law, that judge says, "Well, |
| 3 | we'll do the best we can with what we have. So, | 3 | y'all either going to do a map, or l'm going to do a |
| 4 | appreciate your time today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. | 4 | map." So -- so he gave us another -- a third time to do |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, | 5 | the map. Now, if you look at the analysis of the -- of |
| 6 | Representative Farnum. Representative Carter. | 6 | what we done the last time, there was about eight maps |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you, Mr. | 7 | that were presented to this House and Government Affairs |
| 8 | Chairman. I-- because this committee meeting is being | 8 | Committee, but there's only one map, the speaker map, |
| 9 | viewed by people throughout the state, I think it's | 9 | House Bill 1, that was even considered, seriously |
| 10 | important that we be honest and -- and -- and -- and put | 10 | considered. |
| 11 | the whole picture, why we here, how we got here. It | 11 | I mean, there was some people came to the -- |
| 12 | seemed to be an impression that the old Judge Dick's | 12 | to the table and -- and talked about these other maps, |
| 13 | begging us, trying to make us do something even though | 13 | but -- but -- but it was asked by the speaker then -- |
| 14 | we've done the right thing. | 14 | the then speaker who was carrying the House Bill 1, "Did |
| 15 | Is it not true that the judge's job, her task, | 15 | you look at Section 2 of the Voters Right Act? And did |
| 16 | is to look at the law, first the law, the -- the | 16 | you try to comply this map with Section 2?" And the |
| 17 | jurisprudence of reapportionment, and look at the -- the | 17 | speaker said no. |
| 18 | -- the -- the statute that's been passed, | 18 | "Well, did you look at the disparity that this |
| 19 | reapportionment and other criteria that Congress and -- | 19 | map represents? It's just common sense. If you got a |
| 20 | has given us, to see if we went about this the right | 20 | third of the population that is African American and -- |
| 21 | way. She just didn't come up the side to say, "I'm | 21 | and -- and 33 -- over 33 percent, did you look at those |
| 22 | going to make them have another Black district." That | 22 | -- those figures? You don't have to be the primary |
| 23 | is not her job. And -- and -- and she did anything | 23 | criteria, but you got to first look at whether or not |
| 24 | contrary to that, she certainly would have been reversed | 24 | it's a -- it's appears to be a fair map and complying |
| 25 | quite quickly. | 25 | with the 14th Amendment, Section 2 and other -- other of |
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| 1 | But -- but -- but what she did, she looked at | 1 | Supreme Court jurisprudence?" He said no. |
| 2 | the law, and there was -- there was -- there was a | 2 | He said that he -- he -- he -- he -- this is |
| 3 | request made by motion to -- to -- as to whether or not | 3 | his map that he's presenting, and he didn't -- let the |
| 4 | the plaintiff would succeed on this problem with | 4 | lawyers worry about all this other stuff. This is his |
| 5 | disparity and what have you if they went to trial. And | 5 | map. So the -- the -- the record -- the record of the |
| 6 | she pretty much said, after studying the law and | 6 | -- and I tried to tell him this because I was asking |
| 7 | studying the facts and what actually took place in this | 7 | questions to this -- to -- on House Bill 1, like |
| 8 | legislature, she decided it would probably succeed. So | 8 | everybody else, "Why this map have a problem?" And so |
| 9 | she asked the legislature to go back and try to do this | 9 | -- so -- so the legislature knew the map had a problem, |
| 10 | over again the right way. And the legislature has that | 10 | but they wouldn't listen to anybody else. |
| 11 | opportunity. We could get nothing done, okay? | 11 | So while I agree that the -- your |
| 12 | So now the judge -- it will stay -- the | 12 | representation that race is not the -- the sole factor, |
| 13 | attorney general office -- she -- she expressed that she | 13 | the -- the fact is you got to have six divided equally, |
| 14 | wanted another map and she -- a better map, she thought, | 14 | okay? And -- and if it -- but -- but -- but Section 2 |
| 15 | that's more legal. And so she -- she asked the | 15 | says if you've got a group that is compact, that is |
| 16 | legislature to -- there was a state made by the attorney | 16 | compact and that vote certain voting patterns, that you |
| 17 | general's office, and that was granted by the Fifth | 17 | should try to create a map that allow that group to |
| 18 | Circuit. | 18 | represent a person of their choice. That's all it says. |
| 19 | And because of the Alabama case -- and Alabama | 19 | So I asked the speaker, "Did you look at Section 2 and |
| 20 | is different from -- first of all, Alabama has 26 | 20 | try to come up with a map that does that?" He said, |
| 21 | percent population of African Americans. Louisiana, 33 | 21 | "No, I didn't." |
| 22 | percent. Alabama has a larger overall population than | 22 | So it's the speaker's and -- and -- and the |
| 23 | Louisiana as well. That's why they have seven | 23 | legislators' testimony in the record that caused them |
| 24 | congressman. But -- but you can't compare Alabama to | 24 | the problem they had when it went to the judge. Had |
| 25 | Louisiana. | 25 | they said, "We looked at Section 2, we tried to comply |
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| 1 | with Section 2 but we couldn't because the Black | 1 | -- what the Supreme Courts over the years have told us |
| 2 | population is so dispersed in the state. We could not | 2 | to do? |
| 3 | get another district that was compact," they didn't say | 3 | I happened to be on the legislature in '84 to |
| 4 | that, didn't even try. So that's why the state is in | 4 | ' 92 when we wrote a lot of the reapportion maps. Okay. |
| 5 | the position it's in, not because somebody is out there | 5 | So this problem been around a long time. So we -- and |
| 6 | -- some federal judge is out there trying to make | 6 | -- and so we had -- oftentimes, federal judges had to |
| 7 | Louisiana have another -- another minority district now. | 7 | put us on the right track, say, "Okay. Y'all doing |
| 8 | However, I do agree that we need to have this | 8 | good. Y'all working in the right direction, but y'all |
| 9 | opportunity, and it's wonderful to have this opportunity | 9 | got to go back and do this over again." And that's what |
| 10 | to try to create a map that will comply. Now -- now -- | 10 | she did. |
| 11 | and I think that I applaud the governor because I think | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Judge |
| 12 | the governor wants to do the right thing. The new | 12 | Carter. Vice-chairman Lyons. |
| 13 | governor wants to do the right thing. He wants to have | 13 | VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 14 | a map to -- so we can do our own map and not a federal | 14 | Is it Ms. Murrill? |
| 15 | judge. And I support that. And so -- but I don't want | 15 | MS. MURRILL: Murrill. |
| 16 | to give the impression that federal judge is just a bad, | 16 | VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Murrill. I'm sorry, |
| 17 | bad monster, is trying to make us do something we | 17 | sorry. I -- I -- I have a question for you, but before |
| 18 | shouldn't do. She has to comply with the law. | 18 | I get into my question, I just wanted to note that as we |
| 19 | Now, the Supreme Court has reviewed what the | 19 | talk about the Voting Rights Act and -- and the premise |
| 20 | -- the -- the -- the attorney general's office presented | 20 | of a lot of things that we've done, today is actually |
| 21 | there on confection of the state, and it's really -- | 21 | the holiday of Martin Luther King Day, today, which his |
| 22 | they -- they denied that. It's the United States | 22 | actual birthday is tomorrow. This is -- the observance |
| 23 | Supreme Court saying you got to go back and do this map, | 23 | of it is today. So a lot of us question, you know, as |
| 24 | not just Judge Dick, okay? So -- so we need to accept | 24 | the federal holiday (inaudible 1:14:43) was -- was |
| 25 | the fact that the map we had, based on the record, based | 25 | empty, what have you, is why we're here today. |
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| 1 | on the testimony presented here in the legislature, | 1 | So I just want to just remind everyone that |
| 2 | based on the debate in the legislature, based on the | 2 | one of the things that Martin Luther King did say was |
| 3 | law, that it was not in compliance. | 3 | there's never a wrong time to do the right thing. So |
| 4 | Now, you can differ. People can differ | 4 | we're here today and we would not have any other, I |
| 5 | because they -- they don't like what the law says, | 5 | guess, issue -- he wouldn't. Now we're doing something |
| 6 | maybe, or they want to twist the law. But the fact of | 6 | that we'll be doing to correct where we at and -- and so |
| 7 | the matter is it's not a sustainable map. This map is | 7 | forth. But my question to you, ma'am, is you alluded to |
| 8 | not sustainable that we have now. And so we have a | 8 | earlier that you want to have a -- preference to have a |
| 9 | chance to do that and not offend too many political | 9 | trial on the merits, that you were requesting -- asking |
| 10 | notions at the same time. | 10 | for. |
| 11 | And so I just -- I just want to make that -- | 11 | So as a body here, as we're going to be going |
| 12 | put that in the record that -- that this is a effort on | 12 | through this process, can you outline to us in any form |
| 13 | the part of people of different political interests to | 13 | necessary that -- to get it across, what were some of |
| 14 | try to resolve the issue that had been defined by -- by | 14 | those merits? Because I'm assuming when you say the |
| 15 | Supreme Court decision and by federal statute, and -- | 15 | trial on the merits, you mean that the merits of -- of |
| 16 | and try to come up with a district that is acceptable. | 16 | the decision that you may have had difference with, you |
| 17 | That's what we're trying to do, you know. And | 17 | had other merits that you wanted to talk about or maybe |
| 18 | it doesn't mean that you're a bad person or you -- or | 18 | defend in the -- in the fact-finding portion that was |
| 19 | you got a problem because you supported that last map. | 19 | not revealed. |
| 20 | It's just that the record did not support -- we didn't | 20 | MS. MURRILL: So, Representative Lyons, when |
| 21 | get enough input from other people that had concerns | 21 | we went into this litigation right after the legislature |
| 22 | about it. We didn't allow people to have -- have -- put | 22 | completed the map drawing process, we went into a very, |
| 23 | their input in. Had we putting three or four maps on | 23 | very compressed hearing on a motion for a preliminary |
| 24 | the floor and explain why we putting on the floor, that | 24 | injunction. That is a different standard. It was very |
| 25 | might have been different. Have we tried to do what the | 25 | compressed. We did not have the -- the length of time |
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| 1 | that we would ordinarily have for a full trial. |  | you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 2 | I believe that -- I mean, this is -- you can | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, |
| 3 | blame it on the litigator in me, which is fine, but I | 3 | Representative Lyons. Representative Gadberry. |
| 4 | believe that it -- that -- that the state and -- and I | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you, Mr. |
| 5 | believe this under the new map that you pass, that we | 5 | Chair. Ms. Murrill, if we draw a new map and Judge Dick |
| 6 | should be entitled to have a trial on the merits -- | 6 | decides she don't like that one, do we start all over |
| 7 | merits before we are forced to go in and change an act |  | again, or will she immediately draw a map? I don't |
| 8 | of the legislature. That is just a fundamental premise | 8 | think she's capable of drawing a map, number one. I |
| 9 | that I have about acts of the legislature and us being | 9 | just don't think she could do it. But -- |
| 10 | required by the courts to redo them. That -- that -- as | 10 | MS. MURRILL: She -- I mean, no federal judge |
| 11 | a practical matter, we did not have a lot of time, but I | 11 | does this without a demographer helping. I mean, |
| 12 | have lost -- we lost on that issue. | 12 | they're -- she'll appoint -- she will ask for experts. |
| 13 | I mean, we -- we did. Not just me, but the | 13 | She will ask for the maps to be submitted to her with |
| 14 | entire litigation team, including the lawyers who | 14 | expert testimony, and then she will -- typically, she's |
| 15 | represented the legislature or the -- the -- the speaker | 15 | probably going to decide which map to take, but she can |
| 16 | and the -- the president of the Senate at the time and | 16 | tweak those lines. She can decide how to draw the map, |
| 17 | the secretary of state. We asked to have a trial on the | 17 | how she wants to draw this map based on the input of the |
| 18 | merits set before you were required to go into session, | 18 | experts from both sides. She could appoint her own |
| 19 | and we offered to do it quickly. So just to be clear, | 19 | expert and have that expert assist her in the |
| 20 | we were not trying to delay. We offered to do it in | 20 | map-drawing exercise. |
| 21 | November. There was another trial set. I mean, we | 21 | And remember, you've been through this before. |
| 22 | tried to do this quickly so that we could have a | 22 | A large part of this exercise is done through computer |
| 23 | complete record upon which whatever the decision was. | 23 | generated maps. So, you know, you put the numbers in, |
| 24 | And we did not believe that Judge Dick would | 24 | you start changing -- you change the inputs, it spits |
| 25 | change her decision, but we still believe that the case | 25 | out a new map. She's going to have to go through that |
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| 1 | should be before the courts on a complete record. It is | 1 | same process that you did, and then -- and then we |
| 2 | not, because we weren't -- we never had a trial on the | 2 | continue. So I-- I mean, I can't tell you that the |
| 3 | merits. The courts have told you to go back and draw a | 3 | plaintiffs will accept the map that you draw. She has |
| 4 | map. And they said, "We can have a trial on the merits, | 4 | established a timeline for the plaintiffs to amend their |
| 5 | but we can do that after you draw a map." | 5 | petition and challenge that map, and then we will -- we |
| 6 | So as a -- I mean, just fundamentally as a | 6 | will go through the process again to determine whether |
| 7 | lawyer who represents the -- you and defends the laws | 7 | or not that map is acceptable. |
| 8 | that you pass, your laws -- if you have a law that you | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And for four years |
| 9 | pass, that you feel very strongly about, and the entire | 9 | on this committee previously, I spent hours upon hours |
| 10 | legislature has voted for it even though some people may | 10 | looking at this map, all the maps. And I looked at the |
| 11 | disagree with it, then I will defend your law. And I -- | 11 | plaintiff's map, so to speak, that they presented before |
| 12 | I think that -- that you are entitled and the | 12 | this group, and I didn't feel like any of those met the |
| 13 | legislature is entitled to that defense. So that's the | 13 | criteria. The -- the -- the overriding factor, I guess, |
| 14 | point that I was making. I -- I don't think any of | 14 | was they had gerrymander lines, which is against the |
| 15 | these cases should be tried and decided at the | 15 | Voting Rights Act. So l'm hearing that you said that |
| 16 | preliminary injunction stage. I think we are entitled | 16 | the map -- that the current map that's been rejected, I |
| 17 | to a trial on the merits. | 17 | guess, by the judge, has it been to the US Supreme |
| 18 | And -- but at this point, the courts have told | 18 | Court? Because that's the next step. |
| 19 | you -- the federal courts have told me and they have | 19 | MS. MURRILL: It has not. It -- the -- the -- |
| 20 | told you that we don't get that right now. You -- you | 20 | the US Supreme Court can decide whether to take a case |
| 21 | get to have this session right now, or Judge Dick is | 21 | or not take a case. |
| 22 | going to draw the map for you. So, you know, I'm not | 22 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Right. |
| 23 | here to say, "Don't draw the map." I'm here to tell | 23 | MS. MURRILL: They have not taken our case. |
| 24 | you, "Draw the map." | 24 | They took our -- they -- they stayed our case last |
| 25 | VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay. Thank -- thank | 25 | summer while the Alabama case went forward and was |
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| 1 | litigated. They said, "You just wait." They thought we | 1 | MS. MURRILL: If they do not accept that map |
| 2 | had made a good case for a stay and so they paused our | 2 | for whatever reason, then if they don't like it, I mean, |
| 3 | case while they decided that one. But they did | 3 | they may -- it may be a perfectly acceptable map for |
| 4 | something and these -- this is kind of a term of art, | 4 | some people. It may be a second majority/minority map |
| 5 | but I mean, they granted cert in advance of judgment. | 5 | that -- that some people like or that some people don't. |
| 6 | That means they actually took our case, and then after | 6 | So there's no guarantee that someone won't, that they |
| 7 | they decided the Merrill case, the Alabama case, they | 7 | -- that the plaintiffs will like the map. But if they |
| 8 | just vacated their own grant and sent it back to us. | 8 | -- they can -- so they could continue to challenge it, |
| 9 | So in a way, they took our case, and then they | 9 | and now they will have to go and amend their pleadings |
| 10 | vacated their own decision to take our case and they | 10 | and we, basically, will start over because it is a new |
| 11 | sent it back down to the Fifth Circuit and to judge | 11 | act of the legislature. |
| 12 | Dick. And so it's -- it's back in the hands of the | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: It's going to |
| 13 | District Court judge who is supervised by the Fifth | 13 | replace the existing map -- |
| 14 | Circuit Court of Appeals. And so there has been some | 14 | MS. MURRILL: It will replace the existing |
| 15 | litigation between August and, really, through the | 15 | map. |
| 16 | summer since the Merrill case came out all the way | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- Representative |
| 17 | through the time that the opinion was issued in | 17 | Gadberry. |
| 18 | November, I think, from the Fifth Circuit where a panel | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Well, I mean, along |
| 19 | of the Fifth Circuit said, "You need to go draw a map by | 19 | what Representative Farnum -- Farnum was saying earlier, |
| 20 | February 15th." | 20 | you chase your tail on this thing. |
| 21 | So they actually suggested we should have done | 21 | MS. MURRILL: Well, that's why I said it's not |
| 22 | this before -- before we legally, really -- or -- or -- | 22 | easy. |
| 23 | or I think it was practically possible to even get it | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: You comply with one |
| 24 | done. But, you know, here you are. I think the | 24 | part, and you check another part and it doesn't meet the |
| 25 | governor heeded that call that -- that -- that demand. | 25 | criteria. So you go back and rework your population or |
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| 1 | I mean, we've had it reviewed by a number of judges. | 1 | your districts, and that doesn't meet. So you're -- |
| 2 | They have had nothing to say about our arguments. It's | 2 | you're constantly going in a circle. |
| 3 | been radio silence. And so the only decision that | 3 | MS. MURRILL: Look, I believe that the United |
| 4 | remains in front of us right now is Judge Dick's. | 4 | States Supreme Court should give you better |
| 5 | And -- and so Judge Dick has set a timeline | 5 | instructions. I -- I do. I think that -- that -- that |
| 6 | for us to have a trial. They did say we get to have a | 6 | is the argument that we made last summer. And, you |
| 7 | trial, but we don't get to have that trial until after | 7 | know, if -- if you pass a map and somebody else |
| 8 | you go through this exercise. And, you know, she will | 8 | challenges that map, it -- I will make that argument |
| 9 | do it for you. | 9 | again. I mean, I think that they -- the courts have |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And once we have | 10 | made this a difficult task for you and -- and so you are |
| 11 | that trial, we have the opportunity, if she still | 11 | doing the best that you can now within the constraints |
| 12 | rejects the map, to appeal that? | 12 | of the rulings of the federal court. |
| 13 | MS. MURRILL: If she -- if she rejects the new | 13 | So, you know, it's -- it's not an easy task |
| 14 | map? | 14 | that you have and I believe that the jurisprudence has |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Or the existing one | 15 | made it confusing and that the Supreme Court would be |
| 16 | again. | 16 | well -- I mean, you know, in my opinion, that the |
| 17 | MS. MURRILL: Well, I mean, if she -- if you | 17 | Supreme Court ought to make its own jurisprudence |
| 18 | don't draw a map, then we will be back in front of her | 18 | clearer to those of you who have the job of drawing the |
| 19 | for the trial on the merits in very short order and that | 19 | maps. I think that's fair. |
| 20 | -- that case will continue. If you do draw a map, then | 20 | The constitution makes it clear that it is |
| 21 | the plaintiffs will have to decide whether they wish to | 21 | your job to draw the maps. I believe that it is not |
| 22 | challenge that map, whether they accept that map. And | 22 | correct in terms of the balance of power between the |
| 23 | if they accept that map, then -- then the whole case | 23 | state and federal government, between the constitution, |
| 24 | should be over. | 24 | you know, purview of how this should be happening, for |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. | 25 | the courts to create precedent that makes it impossible |
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| 1 | for you to follow. So It think they should give you | 1 | session that the United States had after the expiration |
| 2 | better guidance. And you are -- you know, you are here | 2 | of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act which required all |
| 3 | to do the best job that you can to try and draw the map. | 3 | of our maps and every law that we made -- and I'm saying |
| 4 | And I will defend the map, and then we will see what | 4 | we, states that have had a history of discrimination. |
| 5 | happens. | 5 | Laws that we put in place before had to be reviewed by |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. Members, | 6 | the United States attorney general's office or by United |
| 7 | look. We're not going to be able to litigate the | 7 | States District Courts if they were challenged in court. |
| 8 | litigation here in committee. | 8 | This is why this has been such a foreign task, |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Well, you know, my | 9 | I guess, this second part. Because we are taking on all |
| 10 | -- my problem is we had a year to draw this map, at | 10 | of the onus, creating the maps and then going back and |
| 11 | least a year. Now we've got eight days. | 11 | reviewing and redrawing and rewriting the maps, because |
| 12 | MS. MURRILL: That's right. | 12 | this is the first time we've had to. Before, we would |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: That's nothing. | 13 | just throw something together and the United States |
| 14 | MS. MURRILL: That's because the judge gave | 14 | would take -- take over it. We don't have that luxury |
| 15 | you deadlines. | 15 | anymore. We don't have that opportunity of having |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's probably not | 16 | someone else to say, "All right. You messed this up. |
| 17 | going to work then. Thank you, Mr. Chair. | 17 | We've got to do it." Thank God for Judge Dick. |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, | 18 | Just as it was stated that she doesn't have |
| 19 | Representative Gadberry. Representative Newell. | 19 | the knowledge or the know-how to write a map -- Judge, I |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much, | 20 | didn't say it. It -- clearly, we don't have it either. |
| 21 | Mr. Chairman. I don't have very many questions because | 21 | And we've given -- been given every opportunity to |
| 22 | I just don't have very many questions. To add what | 22 | learn, every opportunity to educate ourselves, but some |
| 23 | Judge Carter said, as far as ensuring that people are | 23 | of us take that information and -- sir, what's your name |
| 24 | educated about this process, most of us who are | 24 | again? I -- I apologize. |
| 25 | attorneys or have some information or some kind of | 25 | MR. JONES: Tom Jones. |
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| 1 | experience with a court system in process, we know that | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: (inaudible 1:30:56). |
| 2 | sometimes you do need a preliminary injunction when | 2 | Just as Mr. Jones said in his opening statement, you |
| 3 | things need to happen quickly, particularly when there | 3 | have -- or you determine -- okay. Thank you. Just as |
| 4 | is going to be irreparable harm, irreparable harm to the | 4 | Mr. Jones said in his opening statement, you got one |
| 5 | applicants. | 5 | side that it's their job to confuse you and make you |
| 6 | And in this case, the applicants were the | 6 | think this. The other job is -- the other side, it's |
| 7 | minorities of this state who would have not been given | 7 | their job to confuse you and make you think that. We |
| 8 | the opportunity to vote for a candidate of choice in the | 8 | are not here to confuse anybody. We should not try to |
| 9 | elections that were quickly coming upon us at the end of | 9 | confuse ourselves with trying not to do right. |
| 10 | the session, the first redistricting session. So those | 10 | If we as a body task ourselves with |
| 11 | citizens, once again, did not have the opportunity to | 11 | representing the interests of all the citizens that we |
| 12 | have a candidate of choice because this legislature | 12 | represent, whether they voted for us or not, whether we |
| 13 | could not come to an agreement. The process is not | 13 | want them in our district or not, if we set ourselves to |
| 14 | difficult. The rules, the guidelines, are not difficult | 14 | representing all, this is not going to be a difficult |
| 15 | if you want to understand the rules and guidelines that | 15 | task. And the more we argue amongst ourselves and the |
| 16 | have been put before you. | 16 | more we try to go and appease a national agenda that |
| 17 | What comes to -- what -- what makes it | 17 | does not care for the state of Louisiana, the longer |
| 18 | difficult is when we are choosing not to do what is | 18 | we're going to continue to have these fights and the |
| 19 | right, not to do what is fair for all of the citizens | 19 | more divided the state will be. I've never seen this |
| 20 | that we represent. I have a lot of folks in my district | 20 | state as divided as it is now. |
| 21 | that did not vote for me, but you know what I do? I | 21 | We used to have the divisions on just basic |
| 22 | still represent them in this body. Some of us do not | 22 | moral value things, but we always, as Louisiana, looked |
| 23 | take -- take upon that task. | 23 | at family, looked at community, and tried to do what was |
| 24 | This is the first redistricting session that | 24 | right by our neighbors. I don't see that anymore, and |
|  | we have had -- well, '21 was the first redistricting | 25 | that is what's making this process difficult. Judge |
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unconstitutional based on existing precedent, then my job is to defend the map. I mean, not just that map, any act of the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Thank you, ma'am.
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you
Representative Schamerhorn. Attorney General, that clears the board. Thank you for your time this morning. Mr. Frieman, Mr. Jones, thank y'all for being here with us today, look forward to working with y'all in the future. And again, congratulations on -- on your election.

MS. MURRILL: Thank you very much. Thank you for having me, and good luck

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you
MR. FRIEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Members, we have a
-- a couple of witness card that -- that would like to speak. Again, I want to remind the witnesses as well. We don't -- we're not debating any bills today. We want to hear your voices. So we have an information -- call for information only card, but would like to speak. Mr. Scott -- Edward Scott Galmon, if you want to please come on up. Do you mind introducing yourself?

MR. GALMON: Yes. I'm Edward Scott Galmon
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from St. Helena Parish, Greensburg, Louisiana. And just (inaudible 1:39:31), I'm -- I'm a plaintiff on the map.
My name is Galmon. If you look at the -- at the original lawsuit, it bears my name. And you guys have a -- a tremendous job ahead of you. And I just want to thank y'all in advance, number one, because I -- I think that this time that you -- you guys are going to produce a map that both the plaintiff and the courts can agree with.

I think the last map that we produced, it went away from some of the -- of the -- the challenges that set before. Because, number one, this would be a lot easier if we pulled all the -- the congressmen off the map and just looked at geography and the people. It'd be very easy to do a map. The challenge comes in is that the geography and the people that are already elected, if you leave them on the map, you have another caveat that you have to overcome.

So once again, you guys have a challenge. I just thought I'd come this morning just to look at y'all face and thank y'all. I thank y'all in advance because I think we -- this time we going to achieve where we trying to go. And for me, 33 percent is one-third. Six divided by three is two. Pretty simple for me, not so simple for you guys. But once again, I want to thank
y'all in advance, and I know that at the end of this process, we going to have something that we all can live with. Thank y'all.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, sir. We have two witness cards. They're red cards. I'm -- I'm not sure what we are -- this is just an educational meeting this morning. But if you -- you're welcome to come to the table, Ms. -- Ms. Labry, or if you wanted to save it for the bills that are presented -- or I mean, you're welcome to come to the table. Come on up. You're welcome.

MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: This is just -- can -- can we come up together?

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Sure. Is -- is this Mr. Harmon?

MR. HARMON: Yes, sir.
MS. LABRY: I wanted him to speak.
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Okay. Go ahead and y'all have a seat and introduce yourselves.

MS. LABRY: Okay. You want to do you? And then I'll do me.

MR. HARMON: You want me to go first?
MS. LABRY: Yes. You need to.
MR. HARMON: All right. JC Harmon from -- I'm
speaking for myself, but I'm on the benefit of working
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with a bunch of groups that are interested in the process. What I did is I actually submitted to the -to the committee a -- a --

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. We --
MR. HARMON: -- a -- a PowerPoint --
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. We --
MR. HARMON: -- if you got to look at that.
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- we -- we
received -- the -- the committee -- we're going to hear it when -- we're not in the special session yet, so the committee is going to receive it and it's going to be part of tomorrow's testimony.

MR. HARMON: Okay. So you want me to hold it till then, or?

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah, that might be
-- that might be best. If it's having to do with maps,
I -- I would suggest that.
MR. HARMON: I can do a brief overview right
now if -- if --
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: We -- we're not debating maps at all today.

MR. HARMON: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: So if -- if there
was, like, an educational thing that you had for the committee real quick, we'll be happy to take it. But if
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | it's on a map, we would like to hold that. | 1 | MS. LABRY: Yes. I'm Susie Labry, and I'm |
| 2 | MR. HARMON: Well, it's kind of a -- just a -- | 2 | representing myself. I'm -- I'm an appropriate |
| 3 | just let me give a brief overview. I won't go over the | 3 | individualist, not as a part of a collective class of |
| 4 | report. Basically, what I did is I took a map of the -- | 4 | color, of skin, height, genealogy, gender, physical |
| 5 | of Louisiana, and I color-coded it based on the | 5 | descriptions. As for districting, I tried to find a way |
| 6 | breakdown of Black, White, Republican, Democrat, and | 6 | to create an additional minority district. After |
| 7 | looked at the state from an overview standpoint. And I | 7 | studying up myself and with JC Harmon here, I still |
| 8 | had some people asking me to do that. And what I did is | 8 | cannot come up with an additional majority district |
| 9 | when I did that, you could see that the northern part of | 9 | without gerrymandering, which I consider as illegal if I |
| 10 | the state only had what -- I based it on senatorial | 10 | wanted to or not. But I did try. Gerrymandering, you |
| 11 | districts. So if you look at the northern part of the | 11 | know, is illegal. I also see it, myself, as reverse |
| 12 | state, you have three senatorial districts that would | 12 | discrimination. |
| 13 | fit the criteria that you were looking for. | 13 | Those I see, in my opinion, as other |
| 14 | The issue there is if you take the 39 | 14 | ethnicities such as the Vietnamese, Spanish, et cetera, |
| 15 | senatorial district divided by 6 , which is the number of | 15 | farmers, rural communities and interests, small business |
| 16 | representatives you get, you have -- you get 6 and a | 16 | -- so proprietors, main street USA where I have seen |
| 17 | half. So you need 6 and a half district -- senatorial | 17 | that liberals poorly represent by unfair overtaxation in |
| 18 | districts to make a US representative. So if you -- if | 18 | the working people and agriculture, farmers, and |
| 19 | -- so from a breakdown standpoint, it gives you a good | 19 | businesses. |
| 20 | breakdown to start -- or a preference to start what | 20 | Three, it would pose more central power, |
| 21 | you're looking to do. So that -- but when you do that, | 21 | lessening individual power. Individual constituents |
| 22 | you immediately see that you take the northern part of | 22 | would fall between the cracks and get less attention by |
| 23 | the state off because it doesn't work. So then you can | 23 | congressmen or be hurt or heeded-to less in a |
| 24 | -- so now you're down at the southern part of the state. | 24 | one-size-fit-all class approach which is -- l've seen |
| 25 | So what I was trying to do is make it -- I | 25 | happen to me. When you represent a collective class as |
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| 1 | know you have a big job and it's not easy to do what | 1 | a one-size-fit-all, too many of us individuals fall |
| 2 | you're trying to do, but if you can break down the state | 2 | between the cracks as -- especially special needs, self |
| 3 | into geographical sections and take certain sections | 3 | identity, talents, ethnicities, nativities, et cetera. |
| 4 | off, that makes you focus on the other part of the state | 4 | Four, it would cause us one vote short for |
| 5 | to where you need to do what you're looking to do. So | 5 | conservatives in the United States House of |
| 6 | -- and I'll hold the rest of it till later. But | 6 | Representatives and remove and keep Louisiana in a |
| 7 | hopefully, if you take a look at what I did, I think | 7 | less-empowered position in the United States. Five, the |
| 8 | you'll see. | 8 | only way I could see myself to add a minority district |
| 9 | And -- and I did it to try and help the | 9 | is to draw it as a $Z, \mathrm{~S}$, coil, or snake which all have |
| 10 | process because I agree that what you want to do is you | 10 | been rejected over the decades -- which all have been |
| 11 | want to look at what you can do to unite the state. | 11 | rejected over -- if we have to do so, I'm suggesting we |
| 12 | Because I would agree with -- I think it was | 12 | pop up a minority district as a set of archipelago |
| 13 | Representative Newell that said, you know, we're divided | 13 | island -- looking like different-size polka dots as the |
| 14 | now. And I think, if anything, because we're not | 14 | archipelago islands were scattered between a water. |
| 15 | working to unite the state, that we -- I-- I did a | 15 | A majority districts are districts -- majority |
| 16 | breakdown and if you look at the parishes and you break | 16 | district's a district. Or we can make a district as a |
| 17 | it down, I actually came up where the parishes actually | 17 | coil, like a slinky toy and -- and draw that around the |
| 18 | split out into perfect six representatives. | 18 | minorities. And after studying up with myself and JC, I |
| 19 | And I didn't know what the number was as far | 19 | find it mathematically impossible. So I would say, |
| 20 | as the plus/minus number. I was just looking at | 20 | please -- and he'd adapt to -- his maps, we presenting |
| 21 | population. So it gives you a good starting point. So | 21 | later. He is -- JC here is a genius in research, |
| 22 | Representative Beaullieu, I'll -- I'll leave it there. | 22 | numbers, statistics, and science. Being an actor myself |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. | 23 | and also a great devil's advocate, and also trying as a |
| 24 | Harmon. Ms. Labry, you have something you'd like to | 24 | fair approach, I have tried justifying both sides. And |
| 25 | add? | 25 | I'm just going to ask you, please do not add another |
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| 36:11 | called | 49:19,20 | 2:1 16:19 | 3:20 |
| boundaries | 5:25 9:14 | 50:25 53:9 | 19:24 | changing |
| 7:21 24:17 | calling | 55:19 | 53:14 | 64:24 |
| Boyd | 47:1 | 62:25 | 57:16 83:3 | charge |
| 2:11 | calls | 65:20,21 | certainly | 14:11 |
| break | 1:12 | 65:23, 24 | 28:2 29:18 | chart |
| 83:2,16 | candidate | $65: 2566: 2$ | 30:13 | 8:3 |
| breakdown | 71:8,12 | $66: 3,6,7,7$ | 54:24 | chase |
| 82:6,19,20 | 74:9 | 66:9,10,16 | CERTIFICATE | 53:19 68:20 |
| 83:16 | candidates | 67:20,23 | 87:1 | check |
| brief | 20:8 | 71: 6 | certify | 31:18, 21 |
| 4:21 81:18 | capable | cases | 87:3,10 | 68:24 |
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| checked | 20:16 24:7 | 27:2 | 41:16 | 59:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30:6 | 41:7,12 | columns | 84:15 | onclude |
| chief | clear | 31:15 | community | 6 |
| 33:7 34:16 | 17:1 32:24 | combination | 45:18,20 | oncludes |
| 35:19,19 | 36:22 | 9:7 11:10 | 73:23 | 32:18 |
| choice | 38:25 | 12:2 | compact | conclusion |
| 19:22 57:18 | 39:17 | come | 20:4 57:15 | 50:8 |
| 71:8,12 | 42:17 | 13:8,12 | 57:16 58:3 | concurred |
| 74:9 | 62:19 | 15:10,14 | compactness | 27:13 |
| choose | 69:20 | 41:12 | 18:18 20:2 | condolences |
| 74:16 | 77:18 86:3 | 43:21 | 39:6 50:3 | 42:11 |
| choosing | clearer | 54:21 | 50:5,7 | conduct |
| 71:18 77:25 | 69:18 | 57:20 | company's | 14:21 |
| chose | clearly | 59:16 | 87:8 | conducted |
| 8:15 | 6:17 7:14 | 71:13 74:5 | compare | 36:6 |
| circle | 16:15 | 74:10 | 55:24 | confected |
| 53:18,22 | 72:20 | 78:23 | compared | 15:13 31:3 |
| 69:2 | 77:25 | 79:20 80:8 | 32:8 | confection |
| Circuit | clears | 80:10,10 | compelling | 58:21 |
| 46:6 55:18 | 78: | 80:13 84:8 | 20:24,25 | confirm |
| 66:11,14 | clever | com | 21:25 | 35:20 |
| 66:18,19 | 52:7 | 71:17 79: | complaints | confuse |
| 77:5 | click | coming | 53:8 | 73:5,7,8,9 |
| circular | 4:3 | 33:7 71:9 | complete | confusing |
| $53: 17$ circumst. | close | comma | 62:23 63:1 | 39:15 69:15 |
| circumst.. $13: 18 \quad 19: 17$ | 8:23 16:23 | 24 | completed | congratu. |
| $13: 1819: 17$ $20: 7,11$ | 18:9 26:21 | comments | 61:22 | 42:10 |
| $20: 7,11$ $25: 13$ | 40:13 | 1:23 5:2 | compliance | congratu. |
| $25: 13$ $39: 12$ | 50:16 86:7 | Commission | 24:6 59:3 | 42:11,12 |
| 39:12 citizen's | coast | 15 | complicated | 78:10 |
| citizen's 19:12 | $7: 14$ coastal | committee | 77:9 | Congress |
| 19:12 citizens | coastal | $\begin{array}{rrr}1: 3,16 & 3: 15 \\ 3: 16 & 4: 1,7\end{array}$ | comply | 5:11,13 6:3 |
| citizens $6: 121: 6$ | 6:20 | 3:16 4:1,7 | 56:16 57:25 | 7:9 14:9 |
| $6: 121: 6$ $71: 11,19$ | cohesive | 4:20 6:25 | 58:10,18 | 14:10 15:1 |
| $71: 11,19$ $73: 11$ | 20:6 | 8:25 9:22 | 68:23 | 16:9,13 |
| $73: 11$ $74: 23 \quad 75: 3$ | coil | 9:23 11:21 | complying | 17:4, 6 |
| 74:23 75:3 civil | 85:9,17 | 22:9 27:8 | 56:24 | 25:5,22 |
| civil 35:18 52:2 | colleague | 27:11 | composed | 54:19 |
| $35: 18$ claim | 35:3 | 35:13,15 | 24:10 | congress. |
| claim $37: 10,13$ | colleagues | $40: 4$ $51: 97: 18$ 54 | compressed | 5:23 9:13 |
| $37: 10,13$ $38: 13$ | 23:1 | $51: 9$ $56: 8$ 54: 70 | 44:6 61:23 | 15:23 |
| $38: 13$ clarify | collective | $56: 8$ $70: 8$ $74: 5$ | 61:25 | 16:17 26:9 |
| clarify 19:16 | 84:3,25 |  | computer | 26:12,19 |
| 19:16 class | color | 74:10 81:3 | 64:22 87:4 | 26:19,20 |
| class 19:19 30:24 | 19:12 26:24 | 81:9,11,25 common | computers | 44:23 |
| $19: 19$ $84: 3,24,24$ | 84:4 | common | 86:8 | 45:16,17 |
| 84:3,24,25 Clause | color-coded |  | concepts | 48:1 74:7 |
| Clause 14:23 17:22 | 82:5 | communities $24: 19 \quad 39: 9$ | 5:8 14:4 | congressman |
| 14:23 17:22 | colors | 24:19 39:9 | concerns | 7:5 55:24 |
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| congressmen | 53:21 | 38:18,25 | 56:23 | 59:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:4 7:1 | contrary | 39:5 40:19 | 65:13 | debating |
| 79:13 | 54:24 | 41:9 42:1 | 68:25 | 1:22 78:20 |
| 84:23 | control | 43:21 44:2 | 82:13 | 81:21 |
| conserva | 40:14 43:22 | 46:8 48:21 | criterias | decade |
| 85:5 | 44:4 | 49:18 | 22:11 | 6:16 7:7,19 |
| consider | convince | 53:12 57:1 | current | 36:3 |
| 25:12 84:9 | 52:11 | 58:19,23 | 28:6,17 | decades |
| consider | COO | 59:15 | 65:16 | 6:24 25:8 |
| 28:21 | 87:2,16 | 65:18, 20 | currently | 85:10 |
| consider | copies | 66:13,14 | 27:23 34:14 | decide |
| 24:4 25:20 | 24:2 | 69:4,12,15 | 36:9,11 | 64:15,16 |
| 43:11 | copy | 69:17 71:1 | cycle | 65:20 |
| 74:23 | 3:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 7 \text { 77:6 } \\ & \text { court's } \end{aligned}$ | 26:12 | 67:21 |
| considered | core | $\begin{aligned} & \text { court's } \\ & 52: 25 \end{aligned}$ | D | decided |
| 26:6 56:9 | 41:20,21 | 52 | D | 18:24,25 |
| 56:10 | 42:1,4 | courts | dark | 55:8 63:15 |
| considering | cores | 15:1 16:15 | 26:24 29:22 | 66:3,7 |
| 75:2 | 18:19 | 19:24 20:9 | 29:22,23 | decides |
| constantly | correct | 20:19 | data | 64:6 |
| 69:2 | 29:3 31:23 | 23 | 6:7 24:21 | decipher |
| constit | 40:16 | 36:14 | 24:21,22 | 41:23 |
| 84:21 | 42:20,24 | 39:13,16 | 24:23 26:4 | decision |
| constitu. | 43:3 48:19 | 44:11,17 | 26:6,7 | 46:7 59:15 |
| 14:2,18 | 61:6 69:22 | 53:14 60:1 | 31:15 45:5 | 61:16 |
| 39:18 | 87:9 | 62:10 63:1 | 86:15 | 62:23,25 |
| 69:20,23 | corridor | 63:3,18,19 | date | 66:10 67:3 |
| 75:23 76:4 | 7:12 | 69:9,25 | 48:14 53:14 | decisions |
| constitu.. | count | 72:7 77:17 | Dated | 21:5 22:7 |
| 20:4 77:22 | 31:22 |  | 87:14 | declared |
| constraints | counted | Cox | day | 77:12 |
| 69:11 | 11:4 30:7 | 18:5 | 25:10,10 | declining |
| contain | 31:19,21 | 84:22 85:2 | 40:23 | 46:8 |
| 24:12 25:17 | counting | create | 52:12 | decrease |
| 25:18, 22 | 30:5 |  | 60:21 74 7 | 8:21 |
| contained | couple | $58: 10$ | $74: 11$ days | defeats |
| 19:7 | 1:9 3:13 | 69:25 84:6 | days | 20:7 |
| contest | 4:78:25 | created ${ }^{\text {crea }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {creat }}$ | 70:11 | defend |
| 18:20 | 41:1 42:16 | 17:19 | dead | 37:2,4 |
| context | 49:13 | creating | 12:10 | 42:19,25 |
| 38:15 | 78:18 | $72: 10$ | deadline | 43:1 46:5 |
| contiguous | court | criteria | 36:16 44:14 | 46:14 53:3 |
| 24:10 | 5:11 18:25 | criteria $5: 9,19$ 18:8 | deadlines | 61:18 |
| continue | 23:12 25:5 | 5:9,19 18:8 | 14:18,22 | 63:11 70:4 |
| 65:2 67:20 | 28:4,7,18 |  | 36:12 | 76:21 78:2 |
| 68:8 73:18 | 29:6 34:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 1 \\ & 34: 9 \\ & 34: \end{aligned}$ | 70:15 | defending |
| 76:14,21 | 36:6,19 | 34:9 $41:$ | dealing | 36:24 37:1 |
| 77:20 | 37:8,13,18 | $52: 13$ | 15:6 17:20 | 42:23 46:3 |
| contradicts | 37:18,25 | $54: 19$ | debate | 53:2,4 |
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| defends | 17:12,14 | difficult | 26:16,19 | 82:11,12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63:7 | 17:17 18:6 | 25:11 39:3 | 26:20 27:3 | 82:18 |
| defense | 26:17 | 40:20, 24 | 27:4 28:16 | 85:15,15 |
| 43:9 63:13 | 28:15 | 69:10 | 28:19,21 | divide |
| defensible | 40:13 | 71:14,14 | 28:22,23 | 15:13 |
| 46:4 | deviations | 71:18 | 28:24 | divided |
| defined | 16:19 17:2 | 73:14,25 | 34:15 36:6 | 57:13 73:19 |
| 59:14 | 18:15 | 74:17 | 47:23 | 73:20 |
| definitive | 26:25 | difficulty | 49:22,25 | 79:24 |
| 38:1 | 27:25 | 37:6 | 51:22 | 82:15 |
| delay | 28:18 | direction | 54:22 58:3 | 83:13 |
| 62:20 | 29:22 | 60:8 | 58:7 59:16 | dividing |
| delimited | devil's | directions | 66:13 | 45:10 |
| 25:1 | 85:23 | 39:17 | 71:20 72:7 | division |
| demand | Dick | directives | 73:13 | 35:18 52:2 |
| 66:25 | 36:16 37:24 | 36:21 39:4 | 82:15,17 | divisions |
| Democrat | 46:5 48:2 | director | 84:6,8 | 24:14 73:21 |
| 82:6 | 48:3, 4, 24 | 35:17 52:2 |  | documen |
| demographer | $58: 24$ $62: 24$ | disagree | distric | 9:24 11:20 |
| 64:11 | 63:21 61 | 63:11 | distric | 15:17 |
| demographic | 63:21 64:5 | discrimi | 85:16 | 30:17 |
| 7:22 | 72:17 | 18:1 19:5 | 14:1,5 | documents |
| denial | $72: 17$ $74: 21$ | 21:1 22:4 | $14: 1,5$ 18:15 $84: 5$ | 5:2 |
| 19:11 | 74 | 72:4 84:12 | districts | doing |
| denied | Dick's | discusse | 7:16,18 | 1:18 36:22 |
| 58:22 |  | 41:20 | 7:16,18 | 38:11,15 |
| department | differ | discussing | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 16 \\ & 15: 12,14 \end{aligned}$ | 39:6 43:11 |
| 30:19, 20 | $59: 4,4$ | 3:18 74:13 | 15:23,24 | 49:7,9 |
| deputy $35: 19,20$ | 59:4,4 <br> difference | disparate | 15:23,24 | 60:7 61:5 |
| 35:19, 20 derives | 26:18 28:24 | 37:9,13,19 | 17:4,15,18 | 61:6 69:11 |
| derives | $61: 16$ | 37:20 38:7 | 17:21 | dots <br> 85:13 |
| 17:18 descript | differences |  | 18:10,19 | draw |
| descript $84: 5$ | 6:16 45:7 | disparity $55: 5 \quad 56: 18$ | 18:22 19:2 | 14:12 17:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 84: 5 \\ & \text { desk } \end{aligned}$ | different | dispersed | 22:18 $23: 9$ | 17:16 25:9 |
| desk | 5:24 14:4 | 58:2 | - | 28:13 |
| determin. | , 5 | distinguish | 2 | 36:14,16 |
| 19:25 |  | 21:6 | 26:21,23 | $36: 17$ 37:2 |
| determine | 50:11,12 | district | 27:6,21 | 38:19 |
| 5:18 16:1 | 50:11,12 | 5:18,21,21 | 28:6,7,7 | 39:19 |
| 20:11 65:6 | 51:1 55:20 | 7:20 12:20 | 28:10,15 | 40:15,16 |
| 73:3 | 59:13,25 | 12:23,24 | 28:19,20 | $44: 13 \quad 46: 5$ |
| determining | 61:24 | 12:25 13:9 | 28:25 29:2 | 46:10,11 |
| 52:16 | 75:18 | 13:13 | 29:6 44:23 | 46:12 48:7 |
| deviate | 76:25 | 15:15,25 | 45:17,17 | 48:10,11 |
| 26:16 | differen. | $18: 25$ $24: 19$ | 45:20,21 | 48:14, 25 |
| deviation | 85:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 19 \\ & 25: 10,14 \end{aligned}$ | $45: 24$ | 50:2 52:16 |
| 16:1,2,3,5 | differen. | 25:21, 23 | $47: 15$ $50: 18$ | 53:4 63:3 |
| 16:10,12 | 26:5 | 25:21,23 | 50:18 69:1 | 63:5,22,23 |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

| 63:24 64:5 | 36:20 | elections | 16:16 17:2 | experts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64:7,16,17 | 38:24 | 71:9 | 17:17,20 | 43:18,21 |
| 65:3 66:19 | 41:24 | electorate | 18:13 | 52:6,11 |
| 67:18,20 | 50:19,21 | 19:21 | equally | 64:12,18 |
| 69:21 70:3 | 68:22 | electron. | 19:18 31:17 | expiration |
| 70:10 74:6 | 69:13 | 24:25 | 57:13 | 2:1 |
| 75:19 76:7 | 79:15 83:1 | Elementary | equivalency | explain |
| 76:12 85:9 | educate | 15:3 | 25:1 86:14 | 36:10 39:17 |
| 85:17 | 72:22 | emerging | 86:14 | 59:24 |
| drawing | educated | 7:6 | especially | expressed |
| 14:6 25:9 | 70:24 | employed | 38:16 85:2 | 55:13 |
| 25:10 40:6 | educating | 26:4 | essence | expressly |
| 41:11,19 | 1:19,19 | empty | 22:8,10 | 45:8 |
| 45:24 | education | 60:25 | establish | extent |
| 61:22 64:8 | 1:25 15:4 | en | 24:17 | 7:18 24:13 |
| 69:18 | educational | 46:8,9 | established | 24:20 |
| drawn | 80:6 81:24 | enacted | 16:16 19:17 | 25:21 |
| 7:16 23:20 | 86:4 | 15:4 | 19:24 20:9 | Extraord |
| 27:22 | Edward | encourage | 22:6 29:7 | 5:14 15:19 |
| 28:10,11 | 78:23,25 | 15:20 | 41:9 65:4 | 27:20 |
| draws | Edwards | encouraged |  | F |
| 75:24 76:23 | 18: | 5:3 | ethnicities | face |
| 77:1,1 | 36:10,11 | $36: 3$ | 84:14 85:3 | 21:8 35 |
| drew | effects |  | ethnicity | 79:21 |
| 16:8 49:5 | 6:20 | enjoined $36: 12$ | 8:4 | facie |
| $76: 13$ | effectua | enormous | everybody | 18:1 |
| drives | 18:16 | 44:3 | 1:15 4:15 | fact |
| 41:11 | effort | ensurin | 17:1 57:8 | 14:2 28:14 |
| driving | 17:12 59:12 | 70:23 | evidence | 36:8 38:17 |
| 41:18 | eight | entire | 21:4 40:18 | 39:22,23 |
| dropped | 6:25 7:2 | 62:14 63:9 | exact | 40:18,19 |
| 7:3,4 | 56:6 70:11 | entitled | 77:10 | 40:24 |
| due | eighties | 44:10 62:6 | example | 43:11 44:8 |
| 25:20 28:8 | 6:25 | $63: 12,13$ | 22:2 43:19 | 44:23 45:1 |
| duties | either | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 12,13 \\ & 63: 16 \end{aligned}$ | excellent | $45: 2$ 51:2 |
| 14:18 76:5 | 56:3 72:20 | environment | 38:22 | 57:13 |
| duty | elaborate | environment | exercise | 58:25 59:6 |
| 76:20,21 | 43:7 | equal ${ }^{\text {23:22 }}$ | 41:19 64:20 | 74:1 |
| E | elect | 6:3 7:17,18 | 64:22 67:8 | $36: 743: 6$ |
| earlier | 19 | 14:23 15:7 | existing | 61:18 |
| 28:9 30:6 | el | 17:6,22 | 67:15 68:13 | factor |
| 52:15 61:8 | $22: 18$ | 25:18,23 | 68:14 expect | 20:21 41:6 |
| 68:19 | 22:18 $79: 17$ | $25: 18,23$ $26: 21,28$ | expect | 41:10 42:5 |
| easier | election | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 21 \quad 28: 2 \\ & 28: 3,8,14 \end{aligned}$ | experience | 51:14 |
| 50:6 79:13 | $19: 18 \quad 24: 13$ | 28:3,8,14 <br> 41:7,12 | experience 71:1 | 52:16,18 |
| easy | $36: 12$ | equality | expert | 57:12 |
| 35:24 36:19 | $78: 11$ | $5: 20 \quad 13: 16$ | $64: 14,19,19$ | 65:13 |
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| factors | 59:15 60:6 | 49:7 54:16 | 48:16,23 | 34:5, 8, 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20:10 23:23 | 60:24 | 55:20 | 65:25 | 34:11,19 |
| 51:12 | 63:19 | 56:23 | 77:21 78:9 | 34:23 64:3 |
| facts | 64:10 | 71:10,24 | 86:16 | 64:4 65:8 |
| 50:23 55:7 | 69:12,23 | 71:25 | found | 65:22 |
| fair | feel | 72:12 | 20:17,19,20 | 67:10,15 |
| 32:5 47:23 | 63:9 65:12 | 77:19 | four | 68:17,18 |
| 48:5 56:24 | field | 80:22 | 40:5 59:23 | 68:23 70:9 |
| 69:19 | 17:17 | fit | 65:8 85:4 | 70:16,19 |
| 71:19 | Fifth | 82:13 | fractured | Galmon |
| 74:22 | 46:6 55:17 | five | 41:25 | 78:23,25,25 |
| 85:24 | 66:11,13 | 18:9 45:19 | Frieman | 79:3 |
| faith | 66:18,19 | 85:7 | 35:4,4,5,9 | gavel |
| 17:11 37:12 | 77:5 | flip | 35:20 | 1:6 |
| fall | fights | 9:14 | 40:17 78:8 | gender |
| 84:22 85:1 | 73:18 | floor | 78:15 | 45:7 84:4 |
| familiar | figure | 59:24,24 | front | genealogy |
| 9:17,18 | 9:21 | focus | 67:4,18 | 84:4 |
| 15:21 35:1 | figured | 83:4 | 74:21 | general |
| 35:7 86:9 | 33:9 | folder | frustrating | 1:21 10:17 |
| family | figures | 3:23 15:17 | 43:16 | 14:22 33:3 |
| 73:23 | 28:12 30:9 | folders | full | 34:18, 24 |
| far | 56:22 | 3:13 | 62:1 87:8 | 35:16 |
| 70:23 83:19 | file | folks | fun | 55:13 75:7 |
| farmers | 24:21 25:1 | 71:20 | 86:17 | 78:6 |
| 84:15,18 | files | follow | fundamental | general's |
| Farnum | 86:14 | 70:1 | 62:8 | 52:3 55:17 |
| 2:18,19 | final | followed | fundamen. | 58:20 72:6 |
| 49:11,12 | 46:15 | 37:17 | 63:6 | 75:10 |
| 49:21, 24 | find | following | further | generally |
| 50:14 51:7 | 1:2 23:11 | 7:2 26:10 | 21:24 87:10 | 7:13 17:23 |
| 52:14,19 | 31:18 84:5 | 26:13 | furthest | generated |
| 52:23 53:6 | 85:19 | force | 26:25 29:23 | 64:23 |
| 53:16 54:6 | finding | 76:4 | 29:24 | genius |
| 68:19,19 | 38:17 39:22 | forced | future | 85:21 |
| fashion | 39:23 | 62:7 | 78:10 | geographic |
| 53:17 | 40:24 | foreign |  | 14:12 15:12 |
| favorably | 43:11 44:8 | 72:8 | G | geograph. |
| 27:8 | findings | forget | Gadberry | 14:6 20:1 |
| feature | 36:8 40:18 | 3:25 4:9 | 2:20,21 | 39:6,10 |
| 41:18 | 40:19 51:2 | forgot | 12:13,14 | 83:3 |
| February | fine | 1:10 | 12:19 13:1 | geograph.. |
| 27:7,8 | 62:3 | form | 13:7,20 | 20:3 |
| 66:20 | firmly | 61:12 | 14:16 | geography |
| federal | 22:6 | former | 32:21,22 | 24:11 25:6 |
| 15:6 19:5 | first | 35:3 | 32:23 33:2 | 79:14,16 |
| 24:9 32:1 | 1:6 5:13 | forth | 33:4,9,13 | gerrymander |
| 40:14,20 | 6:24 15:19 | 61:7 76:21 | 33:17,21 | 65:14 |
| 58:6,14,16 | 27:20 49:1 | forward | 33:24 34:1 | gerryman... |
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| 20:16 84:9 | 73:16 76:4 | gotcha | guess | 80:24,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84:10 | 79:23 | 12:3 | 13:8 31:18 | 81:5,7,13 |
| getting | 80:18, 22 | governing | 61:5 65:13 | 81:18,22 |
| 49:1 | 82:3 | 14:20 | 65:17 72:9 | 82:2 83:24 |
| Gingles | goals | government | guidance | 84:7 |
| 19:23 | 13:17 | 32:2 56:7 | 30:18, 20 | Hays |
| give | God | 69:23 | 31:25 32:4 | 20:18,19 |
| 4:21 12:16 | 72:17 | governme | 32:6,12 | head |
| 25:20 | goes | 1:4 3:15 | 70:2 | 30:4 |
| 34:25 | 43:17 76:10 | 4:13,19 | guidelines | headway |
| 36:21 | going | 21:25 | 71:14,15 | 74:18 |
| 38:14 | 1:18,24 | 27:11 | gumbo | hear |
| 39:17 | 3:14,17,20 | governor | 1:11,11 | 10:16 15:7 |
| 58:16 69:4 | 4:11,13,22 | 27:15,16 | guys | 36:25 |
| 70:1 74:8 | 10:2,15 | 58:11,12 | 79:4,7,19 | 47:15 |
| 82:3 | 15:16 16:8 | 58:13 | 79:25 | 78:21 81:9 |
| given | 19:4 20:12 | 66:25 |  | heard |
| 14:25 36:20 | 25:3 28:19 | grades | H | 40:12 41:3 |
| 37:18 39:5 | 34:25 | 77:5,6 | half | 43:5 46:16 |
| 41:8 42:1 | 35:23 | grant | 16:10,12 | 47:11 |
| 44:14,17 | 38:24,24 | 66:8 | 82:17,17 | hearing |
| 54:20 71:7 | 39:13 | granted | handle | 1:14,21 |
| 72:21,21 | 41:15,22 | 55:17 66:5 | 34:18 | 9:18 43:24 |
| gives | 42:18 49:5 | great | hands | 48:2,20 |
| 82:19 83:21 | 50:19 51:8 | 35:15 74:23 | 66:12 | 61:23 |
| giving | 53:3,7,15 | 85:23 | happen | 65:15 |
| 5:7 12:17 | 54:22 56:3 | green | 43:20 48:13 | hearings |
| 38:22 | 56:3 61:11 | 29:23 | 71:3 84:25 | 5:1,1 |
| glad | 61:11 | Greensburg | happened | heat |
| 35:6 | 63:22 | 79:1 | 43:23 60:3 | 26:23 29:21 |
| go | 64:15,25 | grew | happening | heavily |
| 4:2 5:3 | 68:12 69:2 | 6:7,12,23 | 69:24 | 41:21 |
| 11:17 | 70:7,17 | grounds | happens | heeded |
| 12:20 | $71: 472: 10$ $73: 14,18$ | 21:9 | 36:8 70:5 | 66:25 |
| $13: 13,16$ $20: 12$ | $73: 14,18$ $75: 799: 7$ | group | happy | heeded-to |
| $20: 12$ $21: 13$ | $75: 7$ $79: 22-80: 2$ | 19:13 20:2 | 20:13 38:3 | 84:23 |
| $21: 13$ $36: 17$ | 81:9,11,11 | 30:24 | 81:25 | height |
| 37:12,18 | 85:25 86:4 | 57:15,17 | harbor | 84:4 |
| 37:21 | 86:6 | 65:12 | 18:3,3 | ld |
| 42:16 | gold | groups <br> 30:24 81:1 | hard | $\begin{gathered} 37: 24 \quad 49: 19 \\ 49: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| 44:13,17 | 26:7 | 30:24 81:1 growing | 4:9 35: | Helena |
| 44:21 46:8 | good | growing $7: 7$ | 50:21 | 79:1 |
| 46:9 48:21 | 1:2 17:11 | growth | harder | help |
| 55:9 58:23 | $37: 11$ 41:3 | 6:8,9,10,18 | 50:2 | 51:11,11 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}60: 9 & 62: 7 \\ 62: 18 & 63: 3\end{array}$ | 60:8 66:2 | 6:8,9,10,18 $7: 11,13$ |  | $83: 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}62: 18 & 63: 3 \\ 64: 25 & 65: 6\end{array}$ | 75:13,14 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 11,13 \\ & 8: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $71: 4,4$ | helpful |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64: 25 \\ & 66: 19\end{aligned} 67: 6$ | 78:13 | 8:13 |  | $30: 4$ |
| $66: 19$ $68: 97$ 67 | 82:19 | guarantee $36: 468: 6$ | Harmon $80: 15,16,22$ | helping |
| 68:9,25 | 83:21 | 36:4 68:6 | 80:15,16,22 | helping |
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| 64:11 | I | 41:17 42:4 | individuals | 76:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HG | I-10/12 | 54:10 | 85:1 | introduce |
| 87:3 | $7: 12$ | imposing | inequality | 35:12 51:17 |
| Hi | idea | 19:10 | 27:5 | 80:19 |
| 4:17 | 21:18 | impossible | inexplic | introduced |
| high | ideal | 69:25 85:19 | 21:8 | 27:7 |
| 28:23 | 5 | impression | information | introducing |
| hired | 12:23 15:9 | 54:12 58:16 | 30:3 70:25 | 78:24 |
| 42:25 43:19 | 15:11,15 | improper | 72:23 | invidious |
| Hispanic | 15:25 18:9 | 38:10 | 78:21,22 | 18:1 |
| 8:4,6,8,9 | 18:10 | inaudible | 86:12 | involved |
| historical | 25:20,23 | 10:19 11:5 | injunction | 35:18 87:12 |
| 6:14 | 26:8,16,25 | 34:12 | 36:9,9 | involving |
| history | 27:1,3 | 60:24 73:1 | 43:24 | 14:15 |
| 51:3,3 72:4 | 28:16 | 79:2 | 48:20 | irreparable |
| 77:14,15 | 29:23,24 | incident | 61:24 | 71:4,4 |
| hit | identical | 18:16 | 63:16 71:2 | island |
| 12:11 | 50:6 | include | 76:16,19 | 85:13 |
| hold | identified | 18:17 86:13 | 76:22 | Islanders |
| 2:1 10:21 | 7:24,25 8:1 | included | input | 10:11 |
| 81:13 82:1 | 8:2 | 5:12 9:12 | 40:15 59:21 | islands |
| 83:6 | identifying | 9:12 10:13 | 59:23 | 85:14 |
| holiday | 9:1 | includes | 64:17 | issue |
| 60:21,24 | identity | 10:11 14:17 | inputs | 19:15 59:14 |
| home | 85:3 | 14:18 | 64:24 | $61: 562: 12$ |
| 1:12 74:24 | III | including | instruct. | 76:18,18 |
| honest | 14:17 | 4:25 13:18 | 69:5 | 77:24 |
| 54:10 | illegal | 14:23 | intent | 82:14 |
| hopefully | 38:10 84:9 | 62:14 | 37:16,17 | issue's |
| 83:7 | 84:11 | increase | intercha | 15:6 |
| hours | illus | 8:18,22 | 14:2 | issued |
| 65:9,9 | 5:10 | increased | interest | 36:9 37:8 |
| 74:11 | immediately | 8:10 26:9 | 18:6 20:24 | 66:17 |
| House | 64:7 82:22 | incumbents | 20:25 | issues |
| 1:4 3:15 | impact | 18:20 | 21:25 | 13:5 19:4 |
| 4:3,13,19 | 37:10,13, 20 | Indian | 24:19 39:9 | 30:17 33:5 |
| 15:2 25:4 | $37: 20$ 38:7 | 8:2,12,17 | 41:17 | 51:5 |
| 25:16 27:9 | 38:14 | 10:7,8 | interested | It'd |
| 27:13,17 | impacted | indicated | 81:1 87:13 | 79:14 |
| 35:2 56:7 | 45:20 | 36:15 | interesting | It'll |
| 56:9,14 | import | indicates | 8:14,18 | 86:17 |
| 57:7 85:5 | 25:2 | 10:1 | interests | items |
| hundreds | important | individual | 21:3 45:18 | 5:12 |
| 31:4,15 | 5:19,22 | 26:15 84:21 | 45:20 |  |
| hurricanes | 6:23 7:15 | 84:21 | 47:15 | $J$ |
| 6:20 | 18:13 | individu | 59:13 | January |
| hurt | 22:21, 25 | 84:3 | 73:11 | 1:3 |
| 84:23 | 23:5,8 | individu. | 84:15 | JC |
|  | $24: 3 \quad 26: 11$ | 22:22 | intervene | 80:24 84:7 |
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| 85:18, 21 | $64: 10$ | 12:23 | $76: 2477: 1$ | $72: 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jefferso | 65:17 | kind | 77:8,13,23 | laws |
| 28:22 | 66:11,13 | 4:14 8:20 | 80:1 83:1 | 15:5 23:10 |
| job | 67:4,5 | 9:2 30:18 | 83:13,19 | 63:7,8 |
| 35:25 36:22 | 70:14,23 | 40:4 43:6 | 84:11 | 72:5 |
| $37: 3$ 38:6 | 72:17,19 | $51: 24 \quad 66: 4$ | know-how | lawsuit |
| 38:8,22 | 73:25 | $70: 25$ 75:9 | 72:19 | 79:4 |
| 39:18,19 | 74:20 | $76: 6$ 82:2 | knowledge | lawyer |
| 42:13,20 | 75:18 | King | 72:19 | 63:7 |
| 45:24 | judge 's | 60:21 61:2 |  | lawyers |
| 50:21, 21 | 52:13 54:15 | knew | L | 57:4 62 |
| 54:15,23 | judges | 57:9 | labeled | leaders |
| 69:18,21 | 19:2 6 | know | 10:14 | 1:7 |
| $70: 373: 5$ | 67:1 | 1:23 5:23 | Labry | learn |
| $73: 6,7$ | judgment | 6:17,18 | 80:8,17,20 | 72:22 |
| 77:8,18 | 66:5 | 7:14,17 | 80:23 | leave |
| $78: 279: 5$ | judicial | 8:24 9:8 | 83:24 84:1 | 79:17 83:22 |
| 83:1 | 18:22 19 | 12:7,7 | 84:1 86:3 | left |
| Johnson | 40:20 | 15:7,8 | lagging | 12:9 |
| 2:22,23 | jump | 18:12 | 6:11 7:8 | legal |
| join | 8:18 | 20:17 | laid | 14:15, 22 |
| 34:25 | jurispru... | 21:15 22:9 | 22:13,13 | 17:5 33:7 |
| Joint | 17:7 22:16 | 22:16,17 | language | $34: 14,16$ |
| 9:23 2 | $54: 17 \quad 57: 1$ | 22:22 23:4 | 19:13 | 54:2 55:15 |
| 24:1 | 69:14,17 | 23:7,21 | large | legally |
| Jones | justice | $30: 12$ 31:2 | 20:3 64:22 | 17:13 66:22 |
| 35:17 51:16 | 30:19,19 | $31: 532: 5$ | larger | legislation |
| $51: 21 \quad 52: 1$ | justific | $34: 11$ | 17:17 55:22 | $23: 5$ |
| $52: 1 \quad 72: 25$ | 17:13 | $36: 23$ 37:3 | Larios | legislative |
| $72: 2573: 2$ | justific. | $38: 23$ | 18:5 | $1: 64: 18$ |
| 73:4 78:8 | 39:8 | 39:11,14 | Larry | $14: 19$ |
| judge | justify | $40: 4,21$ | 35:3,20 | $16: 11$ |
| 32:25 33:18 | 38:21 | 4.13,14 | Larvadain | 17:24 |
| $33: 19$ 36:6 | justifying | $42: 1044: 2$ | 2:25 3:1 | $39: 24$ |
| $36: 16$ | $85: 24$ | $44: 14,16$ | late | legislat |
| 37:24 |  | 45:7 47:14 | 6:25 | 4:3 |
| $39: 23$ | K | 47:19 48:9 | Laughter | legislators |
| 40:14 43:6 | Katrina | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 4,17 \\ & 50 \cdot 1851 \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ | 29:17 47:8 | 75:22 |
| $43: 22 \quad 44: 3$ | $6: 20$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 50: 18 & 51: 7 \\ 52: 21 & 53: 2 \end{array}$ | law | legislat. . |
| 44:3 46:5 | keep | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 21 \quad 53: 2 \\ & 53 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | $5: 8 \quad 15: 6$ | $57: 23$ |
| 48:2,24 | 1:23 6:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 4,8,10 \\ & 54: 1 \quad 59: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $19: 5 \quad 22: 14$ | legislature |
| $51: 16,21$ | $39: 5 \quad 75: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 1 \quad 59: 17 \\ & 60: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $22: 17 \quad 24: 9$ | legislature $4: 25 \quad 14: 5$ |
| 52:4 54:12 | $85: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 23 \\ & 63: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $38: 3 \quad 45: 14$ | $15: 5 \quad 23: 25$ |
| $55: 12 \quad 56: 2$ | Kelly | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 22 \\ & 64: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $49: 654: 16$ | $24: 4 \quad 26: 22$ |
| $57: 2458: 6$ | Kelıy $48: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 23 \\ & 66: 24 \quad 67: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 6 \quad 54: 16 \\ & 54: 16 \quad 55: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 24: 4 & 26: 22 \\ 27: 6 & 28: 13 \end{array}$ |
| 58:15,16 | key | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 24 \quad 67: 8 \\ & 69: 7,13,16 \end{aligned}$ | $55: 6 \quad 56: 1$ | $29: 16,19$ |
| $58: 24$ | 6:9 10:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 7,13,16 \\ & 69: 2470: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $56: 2 \quad 58: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 16,19 \\ & 33: 16 \quad 37: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 60: 11 \\ & 62: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 21:3 | $70: 9 \quad 71: 1$ | $59: 3,5,6$ | $37: 4$ 38:3 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}62: 24 & \\ 63: 21 & 64: 5\end{array}$ | keyed | $71: 21$ | 63:8,11 | 39:19 40:7 |
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| 43:17 | listen | 19:25 | Louisiana | 32:14,18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:17 | 57:10 | 30:21,25 | 4:6 5:25 | 33:2,5,12 |
| 47:11,13 | listening | 31:2,10 | 6:2,6,15 | 33:15,19 |
| 55:8,9,10 | 74:11 | 48:22 | 7:12 10:12 | 33:22,25 |
| 55:16 57:9 | litigate | 53:25 | 18:7,23,25 | 34:3,6,10 |
| 59:1,2 | 44:18 70:7 | 54:16,17 | 20:18 | 34:13,20 |
| 60:3 61:21 | 76:15 | 56:5,15,18 | 22:19,20 | 80:12 |
| 62:8,9,15 | litigated | 56:21,23 | 40:10 | luck |
| 63:10,13 | 37:14 40:1 | 57:19 69:3 | 44:24 48:5 | 78:13 |
| 68:11 | 44:6 49:17 | 70:7 75:1 | 55:21,23 | Luther |
| 71:12 76:8 | 66:1 76:20 | 75:6 78:9 | 55:25 58:7 | 60:21 61:2 |
| 76:9 78:3 | litigation | 79:3,20 | 73:17,22 | luxury |
| legitimate | 19:14 27:23 | 81:7 82:11 | 75:2 79:1 | 72:14 |
| 18:6 54:2 | 33:6,23 | 83:7,11,16 | 82:5 85:6 | Lyons |
| leisure | 34:14 35:1 | 86:16 | Louisiana's | 2:7,8 60:12 |
| 3:17 | 35:19,25 | looked | 5:16 | 60:13,16 |
| length | 36:3,5,5 | 27:25 34:2 | low | 61:20 |
| 61:25 | $37: 8$ 38:2 | 55:1 57:25 | 28:21 | $63: 2564: 3$ |
| less-emp. | 38:7,13,16 | $65: 10$ $73: 22,23$ | lower | M |
| 85:7 lessening | 39:20 | $73: 22,23$ $79: 14$ $82: 7$ | 51:13 | $\frac{\mathrm{M}}{\text { ma'am }}$ |
| lessening $84: 21$ | 43:18 51:4 | 79:14 82:7 | Lowery | ma'am |
| 84:21 | 61:21 | looking | 4:12 38:22 | 23:13 61:7 |
| let's | 62:14 | 15:9 33:20 | lowest | 78:4 |
| 25:25 75:5 | 66:15 70:8 | 65:10 | 6:12 | main |
| 75:6 | 77:11,20 | 82:13,21 | Lowrey | 4:3 5:19 |
| letter | litigator | 83:5,20 | 4:15 8:19 | 84:16 |
| 22:16 | 62:3 | 85:13 | 13:23 16:6 | maintained |
| liberals | litigators | looks | 21:10 29:1 | 7:3 |
| 84:17 | 53:10 | 20:11 | 29:25 30:3 | Maintaining |
| light | little | loop | 32:21 | 39:9 |
| 12:12 27:1 | 9:16 12:17 | 53:23 | 34:22 | maintenance |
| lighter | 50:17 | losing | Lowrey-D. . | 24:18 |
| 27:1 | 51:24 76:7 | 7:8 | 4:16,18 5:6 | majority |
| limitation | 77:9 | loss | 9:3 11:6 | 20:4,7 |
| 24:14 | live | 7:12 | 11:10,13 | 47:13,20 |
| limited | 80:2 | losses | 11:16,19 | 47:21 84:8 |
| 30:15,15 | Liz | 7:15 | 12:1,4,22 | 85:15,15 |
| line | 34:24 35:16 | lost | 13:3,15,21 | majority. |
| 36:11 | local | 62:12,12 | 13:24 | 36:2 68:4 |
| lines | 14:20 | lot | 16:15,24 | 77:12 |
| 14:6,12 | located | 4:10 17:20 | 17:1 21:17 | makeup |
| 20:19 | 50:8 | 19:14 | 21:20,23 | 74:12 |
| 36:22 | long | 36:21 | 22:3,15,25 | making |
| 38:19 | 40:5 60:5 | 41:15,24 | 23:13,15 | 21:5 22:7 |
| 41:11 | longer | $44: 17$ 53.25 | 23:18 29:5 | 22:20 |
| 64:16 | 73:17 | $53: 25,60:$ $60: 20,23$ | 29:11,18 $30: 8,11$ | $44: 15$ $63: 14$ |
| 65:14 links |  | 60:20,23 62:11 | 31:12,14 | 63:14 $73: 25$ |
| links $4: 25$ | $5: 38: 4,20$ $8: 21 \quad 13: 17$ | 71:20 | $31: 24 \quad 32: 3$ | malappor... |
| 4.25 | 8.21 13.17 | 79:12 | 32:7,9,12 |  |
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| 5:10 26:14 | 65:3,5,7 | 86:13 | 64:11 65:2 | 53:11 61:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28:4 | 65:10,11 | Marcelle | 66:5 67:1 | 61:14,15 |
| man | 65:16,16 | 3:2 21:11 | $67: 17 \quad 68: 2$ | 61:15,17 |
| 15:8 | 66:19 | 21:12,18 | 68:18 69:9 | 62: 6, 7, 18 |
| managed | 67:12,14 | 21:21 22:1 | 69:16 | $63: 3,4,17$ |
| 53:9 | 67:18, 20 | 22:8,24 | $77: 2578: 2$ | 67:19 |
| map | 67:22,22 | 23: 6, 14, | 80:9 | 76:15 |
| 6:14 26:11 | $67: 23$ 68:1 | 39:2 42:8 | means | Merrill |
| 26:23 | 68:3,4,7 | 42:9,15,22 | 10:15 43:7 | 37:7 38:5 |
| 27:21, 22 | 68:13,15 | 42:24 43:4 | 66:6 87:5 | 41:21,24 |
| 29:21 36:2 | 69:7,8 | 43:14 | measure | 42:5 66:7 |
| $36: 8,15,16$ | 70:3,4,10 | 44:19,22 | 15:8,9 | 66:16 |
| 36:18, 24 | 72:19 | 45:1,15,23 | meet | messed |
| $36: 25$ 37:1 | 74:12 | $45: 2546: 2$ | 23:11 34:9 | 72:16 |
| 37:2,2 | 75:18,19 | 46:13, 20 | 39:1 68:24 | met |
| $38: 21$ 40:6 | 75:23, 24 | 46:22 47:1 | 69:1 | 22:11 65:12 |
| 40:16 | 76:1,7,8, | 47:5,7,9 | meeting | method |
| 41:19 42:3 | 76:12,13 | 48:4 49:8 | 1:16 39:7 | 6:3 |
| 42:19 43:1 | 76:14,19 | 49:11 74:3 | 54:8 80:7 | metric |
| 43:2,20 | 76:23,24 | March | 86:4,21 | 26:5 |
| 44:7,13,16 | 77:1,1,2 | 27:15,18,19 | Meeting.mp4 | metro |
| 46:4,5,5 | 77:10,10 | 87:14 | 87:4 | 6:21 |
| 46:10,11 | 77:12 78 | Martin | meetings | metropol |
| 46:12,14 | $78: 279: 2$ | 60:21 | 51:10 | $28: 24$ |
| 46:17 | 79:8,10,14 | mathemat | member | mic |
| 47:12,13 | 79:15,17 | 85:19 | 15:24 17:21 | 51:24, 25 |
| 47:17 48:1 | 82:1,4 | matter | 19:13 $20: 4$ | microphone |
| 48:5,7,10 | map-drawing | 1:24 34:14 | 24:24 | $12: 12$ |
| 48:11,14 | 64:20 | 43:19 49:6 | 25:17, 22 | Middle |
| 48:16,17 | maps | 59:7 62:11 | members | $18: 24 \quad 34: 15$ |
| 48:25 49:4 | 5:11 16:8 | 74:24 | 1:1,4,19 | $51: 21$ |
| 49:5,6 | $16: 11$ | matters | 3:13, 24 | Milligan |
| $53: 2,3,4,5$ | 32:25 | 40:14 43:6 | $4: 1780$ | $37: 738:$ |
| $54: 2$ 55:14 | 39:19 41:8 | 43:10 | 12:6 14:9 | $41: 21,24$ |
| 55:14 56:3 | 41:16,19 | mean | 19:19,20 | $42: 5$ |
| $56: 4,5,8,8$ | 47:17 | 16:5 26:14 | 19:20 $24: 2$ | mind |
| $56: 16,19$ | 52:16 | 28:14 31:5 | $25: 2 \quad 28: 17$ | 2:3 6:12 |
| $56: 2457: 3$ | $53: 25 \quad 56: 6$ | $31: 7,9$ | $34: 22 \quad 35: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 36: 12 \\ & 16: 735: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 57:5,8,9 | $56: 12$ | $34: 3$ 36:24 | $35: 15$ 70:6 | $51: 23$ |
| 57:17,20 | $59: 23 \quad 60: 4$ | 38:12 39:2 | 78:16,17 | $78: 24$ |
| 58:10,14 | 64:13, 23 | $39: 7,10,16$ | 86:3,16 |  |
| 58:14,23 | 65:10 | $43: 12 \quad 45: 6$ | memory | mine $46: 1$ |
| $58: 25$ 59:7 | 69:19, 21 | 45:8 $46: 12$ | 29:4 | $46: 1$ <br> minorities |
| 59:7,19 | 72:3,10,11 | 49:2 53:1 | mentioned | minorities $19: 5 \quad 71: 7$ |
| $61: 22,62: 5$ | 74:1,4,4 | $53: 2,4,8,9$ | $28: 9 \quad 87: 6$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 19: 5 & 71: 7 \\ 74: 8 & 85: 18 \end{array}$ |
| 63:4,5,22 | 74:19,20 | 56:11 | merits | $74: 8 \quad 85: 18$ |
| 63:23,24 | 74:21,22 | 59:18 | merits | minority |
| 64:5,7,8 | 75:8 81:16 | 61:15 62:2 |  | 19:13 20:5 |
| 64:15,16 | 81:21 | $62: 13,21$ |  | 30:24,24 |
| 64:17,25 | 85:20 | 63:6 64:10 | 48:18 49:3 | 58:7 84:6 |
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| 85:8,12 | 48:3,13 | 7:20 | 70:20 73:1 | 60:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86:1 | 49:16,23 | need | 83:13 | obviously |
| minority's | 50:10,15 | 1:11 9:18 | nondisc | 7:16 13:5 |
| 20:8 | 51:15,17 | 23:10 | 16:21 17:13 | 27:3 43:10 |
| minority. | 52:17,21 | 27:25 | north | occurs |
| 74:7 | 52:25 53:7 | 41:13 | 7:12 | 39:22 |
| minus | 60:14,15 | 46:10 | northern | offend |
| 18:9 25:19 | 60:15,16 | 53:10 58:8 | 82:9,11,22 | 59:9 |
| mission | 61:20 64:5 | 58:24 | note | offered |
| 36:7 | 64:10 | 66:19 71:2 | 60:18 | 62:19,20 |
| mixed | 65:19,23 | $71: 375: 1$ | notions | office |
| 9:1 | 67:13,17 | 77:17 | 59:10 | 52:3 55:13 |
| moment | 68:1,14,21 | 80:23 | November | 55:17 |
| 14:17 20:12 | 69:3 70:12 | 82:17 83:5 | 62:21 66:18 | 58:20 72:6 |
| monster | 70:14 | needs | number | officer |
| 58:17 | 75:14,16 | 4:10 85:2 | 5:17,24 6:4 | 33:7 34:16 |
| month | $75: 20 \quad 76$ | nefarious | 7:9 8:9,10 | officials |
| 4:11 | $76: 6,12$ | 37:16 | 8:23 10:1 | 14:7,13 |
| months |  | negative | 15:14 | oftentimes |
| 49:17 | N | 16:3 | 24:14 | 60:6 |
| moral | name | neighbors | 26:15,19 | Oh |
| 73:22 | 4:17 46:23 | 73:24 | 26:20 | 12:3 |
| morning | $4.1746: 23$ $52: 12: 23$ | neither | 27:20 | okay |
| 1:2 4:12,22 | 79:3,4 | 87:10 | 28:21 | 5:7,16 6:6 |
| 41:3 75:13 | narrowly | neutral | 30:15 | 8:7,17 9:9 |
| 75:14 78:7 | 20:23 21:24 | 21:8 | 42:18 | 10:6,7,17 |
| 79:20 80:7 | Nathan | never | 45:12 64:8 | 11:12,13 |
| 86:4,5 | $87: 2,16$ | 43:25 45:8 | 67:1 76:25 | 11:17,25 |
| motion | nation | 53:22 61:3 | 79:6,12 | 12:1,4 |
| 55:3 61:23 | 6:8,11,12 | 63:2 73:19 | 82:15 | 13:1,19,21 |
| move | 6:8,11,12 7:8 | 77:13 | 83:19,20 | 16:19 17:1 |
| 48:16,23 | national | neverthe | numbered | 17:2 18:7 |
| 77:20 | national $73: 16$ | 36:14 | 9:15 15:1 | 18:12,22 |
| 86:18 | nativities | new | numbers | 22:15 |
| moved |  | 1:6 12:8 | 8:5 14:9 | 24:12 |
| 86:20 |  | 22:9 26:4 | 17:11 | 25:25 |
| Moving | nauseam | 35:16,17 | 30:12 52:8 | 28:11 30:8 |
| 10:17 | 74:15 | 36:15 37:2 | 64:23 | 30:9 32:15 |
| municipa | nays | 37:2 38:2 | 85:22 | 33:4,25 |
| 24:17 | 27:9,13,17 | 38:3 43:20 | numerous | 34:5,19 |
| Murrill | 27:19 | 44:15 46:5 | 51:9,10 | 40:25 |
| 34:24 35:1 | nearly | 53:3,4 |  | 42:15 |
| 35:14,16 | 17:6 25:23 | 58:12 62:5 | 0 | 43:14 |
| 41:5 42:13 | 28:2 | 64:5,25 | objection | 44:19 |
| 42:21,23 | necessarily | 67:13 | 44:9 | 47:19 |
| 43:3,12,15 | 18:3 22:16 | 68:10 | objective | 55:11 |
| 44:20,25 | necessary | 76:18 | 16:18 18:14 | 57:14 |
| 45:4,23 | 61:13 | Newell | 20:10 | 58:24 60:4 |
| 46:1,3,14 | necessit. | 3:3 70:19 | observance | 60:7 63:25 |
|  |  |  |  | 73:3 75:21 |
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| 76:11 | orange | 37:25 | 63:9 69:7 | 83:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80:18, 20 | 26:24 27:1 | overview | passed | perfectly |
| 81:13,22 | 29:22 | 5:7 81:1 | 27:6,9,12 | 68:3 |
| old | order | 82:3,7 | 44:7 47:20 | period |
| 48:16,17 | 9:11, 21 |  | 54:1,18 | 51:10 |
| 49:4 54:12 | 18:7 20:22 | P | Patricia | ermanent |
| 76:9 | 30:16 | Pacific | 4:17 | 76:19 |
| once | 67:19 | 10:11 | pattern | permissible |
| 20:9 29:4,5 | ordinarily | packet | 7:6 | 18:16 |
| 38:6 42:3 | 62:1 | 9:15 | patterns | permitted |
| 67:10 | original | packets | 57:16 | 45:11,14,16 |
| 71:11 | 29:2 79:4 | 24:2 | paused | person |
| 79:19,25 | Orleans | page | 66:2 | 9:6 10:2 |
| one-size | 6:21 | 4:3,3 9:1 | pending | 19:1 57:18 |
| 84:24 85:1 | ought | 9:15 | 49:20 | 59:18 |
| one-third | $69: 17$ | panel | people | personal |
| 79:23 | outcome | 46:7 | 7:24,25 8:1 | 41:23 87:11 |
| ones | 49:20 | papers | 8:15,24 | personally |
| 41:18 | outcomes | 77:5,7 | 9:1 10:4 | 54:1 |
| online | 76:2 | paralle | 10:10 11:7 | persuade |
| 5:5 | outline | 49:14 | 11:23 13:6 | 52:9 |
| onus | 61:12 | parameters | 16:4 19:2 | perverts |
| 72:10 | outside | 38:23 | 19:3 28:25 | 39:20 |
| open | 1:13 86:12 | parish | 43:18 | petition |
| 19:18 | overall | 24:17 | 47:20,21 | 65:5 |
| opening | 16:3,5 | parishes | $52: 7$ 54:9 | phone |
| 73:2,4 | 17:24 1 | 83:16,17 | $56: 11 \quad 59: 4$ | 1:9 |
| operating | 26:16 | part | 59:13, 21 | physical |
| 48:15 | 55:22 | 31:22 33:22 | 59:22 | 84:4 |
| opinion | overcome | 42:1 43:16 | $63: 10 \quad 68: 4$ | picking |
| 37:9 41:23 | 79:18 | 51:8 53:1 | 68:5,5 | 77:24 |
| $41: 25$ 48:9 | overridden | 59:13 | 70:23 | picture |
| $48: 10 \quad 50: 1$ | 21:14,15 | 64:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 14,16 \\ & 82: 8 \quad 84: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 54:11 |
| $66: 17$ | override | 68:24,24 | 82:8 84:18 percent | Pikover |
| 69:16 | 39:23 40:8 | 72:9 81:12 | percent | 87:2,16 |
| 84:13 | overriding | 82:9,11,22 | 6:7 7:23,24 | PL |
| opportunity | 16:17,20 | 82:24 83:4 | 8:1,1,9 | 24:21 |
| 19:20 36:17 | 18:14 | 84:3 | 16:10,11 | place |
| $48: 7 \quad 49: 1$ | 20:20 | participate | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 10,12 \\ & 16: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $35: 7 \quad 55: 7$ |
| 55:11 58:9 | 65:13 | 19:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 13 \\ & 17: 24.25 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 5$ |
| 58:9 67:11 | overrode | particip... | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 24,25 \\ & 18: 8 \quad 25: 19 \end{aligned}$ | plaintiff |
| 71:8,11 | 27:17,18 | $19: 19$ | $\begin{array}{lr} 18: 8 & 25: 19 \\ 28: 15 & 45: 5 \end{array}$ | $55: 4 \quad 79: 2,8$ |
| 72:15,21 | overseas | particul. | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 15 \quad 45: 5 \\ & 55: 21,22 \end{aligned}$ | plaintiff's |
| $72: 22 \quad 74: 3$ | $6: 1$ | $71: 3$ | $55: 21,22$ $56: 21$ | $65: 11$ |
| 74:9 77:3 | overtaxa | parties | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 21 \\ & 79: 23 \end{aligned}$ | plaintiffs |
| opposite | 84:17 | 87:12 | $79: 23$ percentage | $34: 7 \quad 37: 12$ |
| 52:11 | overturn | pass | percentage $13: 13$ | $43: 8,19$ |
| options | $40: 20,24$ | 38:2 43:1 | perfect | $65: 3,4$ |
| 74:6,6 | overturned | 62:5 63:8 | perfect $25: 10,14$ | $67: 2168: 7$ |
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| 76:14 | 18:18 19:9 | 45:6 50:3 | 37:8 38:16 | 48:18 56:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| plan | 19:21 | 50:11,12 | precedent | 58:20 59:1 |
| 15:23 17:24 | 23:22 59:9 | 50:15,16 | 39:22,25 | 65:11 80:9 |
| 20:21, 23 | 59:13 | 50:17 | 40:22 | presenting |
| 21:5,24 | politically | 51:12,13 | 69:25 78:1 | 22:21 57:3 |
| 22:7 24:25 | 20:5 | 51:14 52:5 | precinct | 85:20 |
| 25:4,6,15 | polka | 52:7,10,12 | 24:15 | preserving |
| 25:16 | 85:13 | 55:21,22 | precincts | 18:19 |
| 26:16 | poorly | 56:20 58:2 | 24:13 | president |
| planned | 84:17 | 68:25 | precondi | 62:16 |
| 15:16 | pop | 74:13,14 | 19:24 20:10 | presumed |
| plans | 85:12 | 83:21 | predecessor | 77:22 |
| 21:6,7 | population | populations | 27:8 | pretty |
| 23:20 24:5 | 5:9,9,17,20 | 28:14 31:5 | predeces. | 8:22 55:6 |
| 24:10,16 | 5:21,25 | portion | 9:22 | 56:1 79:24 |
| 34:4 | 6:2,10,15 | 61:18 | predominant | previously |
| pleadings | 6:17 7:15 | pose | 20:20 41:4 | 65:9 |
| 53:13 68:9 | 7:17,20,22 | 84:20 | 41:6,10 | prima |
| please | 8:11,11,21 | position | 52:17,24 | 18:1 |
| 1:2,10 2:3 | 8:22 9:5 | 46:6,9 | predominate | primary |
| 12:11 | 9:15,20,23 | 48:25 58:5 | 38:18 | 52: 6,13 |
| 78:23 | 9:25 10:12 | 77:14 85:7 | preference | 56:22 |
| 85:20,25 | 10:15 11:6 | positive | 61:8 82:20 | principally |
| 86:9 | 11:15,20 | 16:3 | preferred | 52:4 |
| pleasure | 11:22 | possible | 20:8 | principle |
| 12:14,19 | 12:21,21 | 26:22 66:23 | preliminary | 18:15 |
| plethora | 12:23,24 | 86:10,16 | 43:24 48:20 | principles |
| 4:24 | 12:24 13:2 | potential | 61:23 | 1:20 4:14 |
| plus | 13:3,10,12 | 76:25 | 63:16 71:2 | 19:6 |
| 10:5 18:9 | 13:14,14 | potentially | 76:16 | prior |
| $25: 19$ $30: 24$ 31.6 | $13: 15,17$ $13: 1915: 7$ | 77:6 | premise | 18:19 26:11 |
| 30:24 31:6 | 13:19 15:7 | power | 60:19 62:8 | 76:9 77:9 |
| $31: 6,7,7,7$ plus/minus | 15:10,11 | 69:22 84:20 | preparatory | 77:10 |
| plus/minus | 15:11,14 | 84:21 | 1:15 | privacy |
| 83:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 15,24 \\ & 15 \cdot 25 \end{aligned}$ | PowerPoint | present | 26:4,5 |
| point $3: 228: 3,20$ | $15: 25$ $16: 16$ $17: 2$ | 81:5 | 2:7,8,9,10 | probably |
| $3: 22,8: 3,20$ $9: 2,4$ | $16: 1617: 2$ $17: 6,18,20$ | practicable | 2:11,13,14 | 50:17 55:8 |
| $9: 2,4$ $44: 12$ $4^{5: 5}$ | $17: 6,18,20$ $18: 10,14$ | 7:18 17:7 | 2:15,16,17 | 64:15 |
| $44: 12,45: 5$ $63: 14,18$ | $18: 10,14$ $20: 3,5$ | 24:14,20 | $2: 18,20,22$ | 70:16 |
| $63: 14,18$ $83: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 3,5 \\ & 21: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 25:21,24 | 2:24 3:2,5 | 76:17 |
| 83:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 19 \\ & 25: 18,24 \end{aligned}$ | practical | 3:7,10 | problem |
| pointed | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 18,24 \\ & 26: 8,21 \end{aligned}$ | 62:11 | 22:23 23:4 | 55:4 57:8,9 |
| $74: 1$ policy | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 8,21 \\ & 27: 2,5,24 \end{aligned}$ | practically | 23:8 75:18 | 57:24 |
| policy 18 17 22:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 2,5,24 \\ & 28: 2,3,8 \end{aligned}$ | 66:23 | presenta | 59:19 60:5 |
| $\begin{array}{rl}18: 17 \\ 23: 4 & 22: 20 \\ \text { 23 }\end{array}$ | 28:16,20 | practice | 32:19 | 70:10 |
| $23: 4$ policyma... | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 16,20 \\ & 29: 22,24 \end{aligned}$ | 19:10 | presented | procedure |
| policyma... 21:4 $22: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 22,24 \\ & 30: 5,9,21 \end{aligned}$ | pre-cleared | 40:19 42:19 | 19:11 |
| 21:4 22:19 political | 31:3,23 | 77:11 | 43:8 47:17 | process |
| political | 39:10 45:3 | preceded | 47:18 | 11:22 14:4 |
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| 14:6 19:21 | provisions | 75:9 86:6 | 38:24,25 | 5:20 9:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:20 42:2 | 17:5 | quick | 46:23 | 13:25 |
| 61:12,22 | PSC | 48:15 81:25 | 81:25 | 14:15,19 |
| 65:1,6 | 25:5,17 | quickly | really | 15:1 23:20 |
| 70:24 71:1 | public | 51:17 54:25 | 7:11 30:11 | 23:24 24:5 |
| 71:13 | 1:5,19 3:24 | 62:19, 22 | 30:21 | 24:10,16 |
| 73:25 | 5:2 15:2 | 71:3,9 | 37:10 38:8 | 24:21 25:4 |
| 74:17 | 24:24 | quite | 38:12 | 25:16 26:7 |
| 76:22 80:2 | pull | 54:25 | 42:11 | 26:12 $34: 9$ |
| 81:2 83:10 | 51:25 | quorum | 58:21 | 35:23 36:1 |
| processes | pulled | 3:11 | 66:15,22 | 37:1 51:4 |
| 19:18 | 79:13 |  | reapportion | 51:4 71:10 |
| produce | purpose | R | 60:4 | 71:24,25 |
| 25:3 79:7 | 25:1 | race | reapport. | 77:15 |
| produced | pursuant | 7:24 8:14 | 14:3 54:17 | redistri |
| 79:10 | 27:22 | 9:7 10:3,5 | 54:19 | 14:21 |
| product | purview | 10:6,8 | reason | redo |
| 39:25 43:16 | 69:24 | 11:11,24 | 16:20 52:20 | 62:10 |
| program | put | 19:12 | 52:24 68:2 | redraw |
| 24:23 | 23:23 40:12 | 20:20 21:7 | reasons | 26:23 42:3 |
| prohibits | 46:6,9 | 21:7,9 | 23:2 36:10 | 49:6 |
| 19:9 | 54:10 | 30:22 38:8 | 38:20 | redrawing |
| Promised | 59:12,22 | 38:11,18 | receive | 72:11 |
| 75:20 | 60:764:23 | 41:3,5,10 | 81:11 | refer |
| properly | 71:16 72:5 | 52:15 | received | 15:16 |
| 77:19 | 74:18 | 53:19 | 5:2 27:10 | reflects |
| proportion | putting | 57:12 | 81:9 | 10:4 |
| 12:20 13:12 | 59:23,24 | races | recognized | refreshing |
| proporti. |  | racial | 12:11 | 1:19 |
| 45:10 | Q | racial | record | regard |
| proportions | qualific | 20:15 31: | 22:7 39:24 | 51:1 |
| 6:4 | 19:10 | radio | 48:18,20 | regarded |
| proposed | question | 67:3 | 48:22 57:5 | 31:17 |
| 22:11 | 12:13 13:8 | raised | 57:5,23 | regarding |
| proprietors | 16:7 21:11 | 44:9 | 58:25 | 3:19 14:19 |
| 84:16 | 24:11 30:1 | range | 59:12,20 | 33:6 36:8 |
| protected | 32:5,21 | 16:5,12 | 62:23 63:1 | regardless |
| 19:19 30:23 | 38:6 46:16 | 17:25 18:8 | 74:19 | 31:17 |
| 75:23 | 60:17,18 | ranges | 76:16 | region |
| Protection | 60:23 61:7 | 16:2 | red | 6:9 |
| 14:23 17:22 | 75:4,17 | rate | 29:22 80:5 | regular |
| 20:16 24:7 | 77:4 | 6:8, 9, 12 | reddish | 3:21 23:25 |
| 41:7,12 | questions | rational | 26:24 | rejected |
| prove | 1:23,25 | 16:21 18:17 | redistrict | 34:2 65:16 |
| 21:23 | $3: 18$ 10:17 | reach | 14:14 | 85:10,11 |
| provide | $32: 19$ 38:4 | 49:25 50:8 | redistri | rejects |
| 17:12 30:13 | 41:1 57:7 | read | 1:20,20 4:2 | 67:12,13 |
| provided | 70:21, 22 | 86:8 | 4:6,14,21 | related |
| 16:20 | 74:15 75:6 | real | 4:24 5:8,8 | 5:14 |
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| relates | 26:1 27:7 | 23:17 29:1 | 68:12,16 | 20:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:1 4:2 | 27:11 30:8 | 29:8,14,15 | 68:16,18 | research |
| relative | 30:12,12 | 29:25 30:1 | 68:19,23 | 85:21 |
| 16:4 | 30:22 31:8 | 30:2,10 | 70:6,9,13 | resident |
| relatively | reporting | 31:11,13 | 70:16,18 | 5:16 15:11 |
| 50:16 | 26:3 30:25 | $31: 16$ 32:1 | 70:19,19 | resolve |
| released | reports | 32:4,8,10 | 70:20 73:1 | 59:14 |
| 24:22 | 9:5,12,13 | 32:13,16 | 75:5,10,12 | resource |
| relevant | 9:19 25:3 | 32:17,20 | 75:15,17 | 4:10 |
| 15:18 | 30:16 31:3 | 32:21,22 | $75: 21$ 76:3 | resources |
| remain | 31:4 | 32:23 33:2 | 76:11 78:4 | 4:10,24 |
| 76:13 | represent | 33: 4, 9, 13 | 78:5,6,14 | respect |
| remains | 19:3 22:18 | 33:17,21 | 78:17 80:4 | 24:16 75:10 |
| 67:4 | 57:18 | $33: 24,34: 1$ $34: 5,8,10$ | $80: 14,18$ $81: 4,6,8$ | respective |
| remedy | $71: 20,22$ | 34:5,8,10 | $81: 4,6,8$ | 17:11 |
| 27:5 | 12 | $34: 11,17$ $34: 19,21$ | 81:23 | respond |
| Remedying |  | 34:23 35:3 | 82:18 | 8:16 9:6,8 |
| $21: 1 \quad 22: 3$ | represen... 18:18 $47: 22$ | 35:8,11 | 83:13, 22 | 9:10 |
| remember <br> 64:21 86:11 | 57:12 | 39:2 40:3 | 83:23 86:2 | responded |
| remind | represen... | 40:10,25 | 86:19,20 | respondent |
| 1:11 61:1 | 1:1 2:6,9 | 41 | repres | 30:6,7 |
| 78:19 | 2:10,11,12 | $42: 9,15,22$ | $76: 5 \quad 82: 16$ | responsi |
| reminder | 2:13,14,15 | 42:24 43:4 | 83:18 85:6 | 75:22 |
| 26:20 | 2:19,20,21 | 43:14 | represented | responsible |
| reminding | 2:22,23,24 | 44:19, 22 | 62:15 | 15:1 |
| 1:15 | 3:1,2,3,3 | 45:1,15,23 | represen. | rest |
| remove | 3:4,5,6,7 | 45:25 46:2 | 29:24 73:11 | 44:20 83:6 |
| 85:6 | 3:8,9,12 | 46:13,15 | 73:14 84:2 | results |
| Reno | 5:4 8:19 | 46:16,20 | represents | 19:11 |
| 20:18 | 10:19,21 | 46:22,25 | 27:21 56:19 | retention |
| Rep | 10:23,25 | 47:1,3,5,6 | 63:7 | 41:20,22 |
| 74:2 | 10:25 11:2 | 47:6,9 | Republican | 42:1,4 |
| repeat | 11:9,12,14 | 48:4 49:8 | 82:6 | retrogre. |
| 28:1 | 11:17,25 | 49:10,11 | request | 21:1 22:4 |
| repetitive | 12:3,5,6 | 49:11,12 | 55:3 | revealed |
| 18:13 | 12:13,14 | 49:21,24 | requesting | 61:19 |
| replace | 12:16,19 | 50:14 51:7 | 61:9 | reverse |
| 68:13,14 | 13:1,7,20 | 51:19,23 | require | 84:11 |
| report | 13:22 | 52: 14,19 | 25:13 | reversed |
| 9:20 10:1 | 14:16 16:6 | $52: 23$ $53: 16$ $54: 5$ | required | 54:24 |
| 11:7,19 | 16:22,25 | 53:16 54:5 | 13:16 62:10 | review |
| 15:20 | 17:4,15 | 54: 6, 6,7 | 62:18 72:2 | 3:17 40:23 |
| 27:25 | 19:22 | 60:11 | requirem. . | reviewed |
| 31:12 82:4 | 21:10,11 | 61:20 64:2 | 14:15,23 | 46:7 58:19 |
| reported | 21:12,18 | 64:3,3,4 | $17: 15128$ 17: 28 | 67:1 72:5 |
| 8:8 10:3,5 | 21:21 22:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 8,22 \\ & 67: 10.15 \end{aligned}$ | 39:7 | 87:7 |
| 10:10,23 | 22:8,24 | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 10,15 \\ & 67: 25 \end{aligned}$ | requires | reviewing |
| 11:3,23 | 23:6,14,16 | 67.25 |  | 72:11 |
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| rework | 5:1 | 3:3,4 75:11 | 28:1 35:1 | 15:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68:25 | role | 75:12,15 | 54:20 70:4 | 18:23 |
| rewriting | 2:3 | 75:17,21 | $73: 2482: 9$ | 23:25 |
| 72:11 | room | 76:3,11 | 82:22 83:8 | 27:20 28:6 |
| Reynolds | 12:7 16:14 | 78:4,6 | 84:11,13 | 62:18 |
| 17:19 18:21 | 29:12 | school | 85:8 | 63:21 |
| right | Rouge | 14:21 | seeing | 71:10,10 |
| 9:3 10:18 | 28:23 | science | 25:4 | $71: 24$ 72:1 |
| 12:11,17 | rule | 85:22 | seen | 81:10 |
| 13:7 15:6 | 24:1,1,2 | Scott | 73:19 84:16 | set |
| 19:12 | rules | 78:23,23,25 | 84:24 | 23:10 48:14 |
| 22:23, 23 | 3:14,16,19 | scrutiny | self | 62:18, 21 |
| 22:24 | $3: 20 \quad 37: 17$ | 20:21,22 | 85:2 | $67: 5 \quad 73: 13$ |
| 23:24 | 71:14,15 | 21:14 39:1 | seminal | 79:12 |
| 30:10 | ruling | 77:5 | 17:8 | 85:12 |
| 31:24 | 32:24 38:1 | seat | Senate | seven |
| 32:13 | 52:4 76:18 | 80:19 | 9:23 15:2 | $7: 3,328: 7$ |
| 33:10,24 | rulings | seats | 25:5,16 | 50:2,18 |
| $37: 17 \quad 43: 1$ | 51:22 52:13 | 1:2 14:5,10 | 27:10,11 | 55:23 |
| 43:20 44:7 | 69:12 | second | 27:12,18 | seven-me. |
| 45:1 46:2 | rural | 12:16 36 | 62:16 | 49:22,25 |
| 48:11,11 | 84:15 | 49:9 | senatorial | shapefiles |
| 49:22 |  | 68:4 72:9 | 82:10,12,15 | 86:13 |
| 52:20 | S | 74:7 77:3 | 82:17 | Shaw |
| 54:14, 20 | S | Secondary | sends | 20:18 |
| 55:10 | 85:9 | 15:3 | 53:19 | she'll |
| 56:15 | safe | secretary | senior | 64:12 |
| 58:12,13 | 18:3 44:17 | 62:17 | 4:18 | Shelly |
| 60:7,8 | Sanders | Section | seniority | 48:3,4 |
| 61:3,21 | 17:8 | 14:17 17:9 | 29:19 | shifts |
| 63:20,21 | sat | 19:8,15,16 | sense | 7:19 |
| 65:22 67:4 | 40:4 47:16 | $21: 2$ 22:5 | 56:19 | short |
| 70:12 | 51:9 74:10 | 24:8 30:20 | sent | 37:23 43:23 |
| 71:19 | satisfied | 37:9,19 | 27:15 66:8 | 43:23 |
| $72: 16$ 73:9 | 21:20,22 | $45: 8,9,11$ | 66:11 | 67:19 85:4 |
| 73:24 | save | 48:8 53:18 | separately | shot |
| 80.24 | 80:9 | 56:15,16 | 8:8 | 49:7,9 |
| 80:24 | saying | 56:25 | series | showed |
| 81:18 | 22:12 50:20 | 57:14,19 | 20:18 | 6:7 |
| rights | $58: 23$ | $57: 25$ 58:1 | seriously | showing |
| 13:5 14:24 | 68:19 72:3 | 72:2 | 26:3 56:9 | 6:10 29:21 |
| 19:6,8,15 | says | sections | serve | shown |
| 20:1 21:2 | 4:4 22:14 | 83:3,3 | 19:2 | 19:18 |
| 22:5 24:8 | $4: 4$ <br> $37: 9$ | see | Service | shows |
| $45: 953: 18$ | $37: 956: 2$ $57: 15,18$ |  | Service |  |
| 60:19 | $57: 15,18$ $59.576 \cdot 5$ | $6: 16,19$ $7: 11,19,23$ | 15:2 | 6:14 13 |
| 65:15 72:2 | 59:5 76:5 | 7:11,19,23 | session | 26:24 |
| Rita | scattered | 8 | 1:16 3:21 | 28:17 |
| 6:20 | 85:14 | 10:1 12:12 | 5:12,14 | side |
| roadshow | Schamerhorn | 16:2 26:17 | 14:12 | 20:15 35:7 |
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| 47:17 52:9 | 50:2 57:13 | 46:19,21 | 28:3 50:20 | 15:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:21 73:5 | 74:11 | 80:25 | starting | statistics |
| 73:6 77:20 | 79:23 | special | 83:21 | 5:10 27:24 |
| sides | 83:18 | 1:16 5:12 | state | 85:22 |
| 64:18 85:24 | size | 14:12 | 6:5,11,15 | status |
| signed | 20:1 | 18:23 20:6 | 6:23 7:1,7 | 19:13 |
| 53:12 | skin | 28:6 81:10 | 7:11 9:5,6 | statute |
| signific. | 84:4 | 85:2 | 14:2,9,10 | 54:18 59:15 |
| 13:2 | slightly | specific. | 15:3,4,12 | statutes |
| significant | 17:16 | 7:10 | 16:20 18:3 | 14:20 |
| 6:17 8:13 | slinky | speed | 18:6,17 | stay |
| 10:12 13:4 | 85:17 | 4:15 22:10 | 19:9 20:24 | 18:9 41:13 |
| silence | small | spent | 20:25 | 55:12 66:2 |
| 1:10 67:3 | 84:15 | 40:5 51:8 | 22:18,20 | 86:7 |
| similar | snake | 65:9 | 24:9 25:7 | stayed |
| 32:6,12 | 85:9 | spits | 26:2 28:17 | 65:24 |
| simple | sole | 64:24 | 30:9 33:8 | step |
| 45:13 79:24 | 57:12 | split | 40:10 48:5 | 1:12 65:18 |
| 79:25 | somebody | 24:15 83:18 | 50:1, 4, 4, 6 | stick |
| simplicity | 1:11 58:5 | spots | 50:11, 13 | 75:9 |
| 31:1,9 | 69:7 | 7:13 | 50:21, 22 | stir |
| Sims | soon | spread | 50:24,25 | 1:11 |
| 17:19 18:21 | 35:21 86:10 | 50:12 | 51:14 54:9 | street |
| Simultan. | 86:16 | St | 55:16 58:2 | 84:16 |
| 46:19,21 | sorry | 79:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 4,21 \\ & 62: 4.17 \end{aligned}$ | strict |
| single | 13:11 18:4 | staff | 62:4, 23 71:7 | 16:16 20:21 |
| 7:24 9:6 | 29:11 | 4:13 86:10 | 73:17,19 | 20:22 |
| 15:23 | 46:18 52:1 | 86:15 | 73:20 74:8 | 21:13 39:1 |
| 17:21 20:4 | 60:16,17 | staffed | 74:23 75:2 | strictly |
| 25:10,17 | south | 4:19 | 82:7,10,12 | 1:23 |
| 25:22 | 41:13 | stage | 82:23,24 | strongly |
| 30:22 | southern | 63:16 | 83:2,4,11 | 21:3 63:9 |
| sir | 6:8 82:24 | standard | 83:15 | structure |
| 10:18 11:16 | space | 17:24 19:1 | state's | 15:21 |
| 12:22 | 30:15 | 19:10 26:7 | 20:21 | studying |
| 16:24 32:3 | Spanish | 61:24 | stated | 55:6,7 84:7 |
| 72:23 80:4 | 84:14 | standards | 45:9 72:18 | 85:18 |
| 80:16 | speak | 17:3 24:3 | statement | stuff |
| site | 51:24 65:11 | standpoint | 73:2,4 | 57:4 |
| 4:6 | 78:19,22 | 1:25 8:23 | states | subdivision |
| Sites | 80:17 | 82:7,19 | 16:19 17:10 | 19:9 |
| 4:5,5 | speaker | start | 26:4 30:19 | subdivis |
| sitting | 56:8,13,14 | 1:16 4:11 | 36:19 | 18:18 |
| 35:6 | 56:17 | 42:10 64:6 | 38:17 50:5 | subject |
| six | 57:19 | 64:24 | 58:22 69:4 | 1:24 18:23 |
| 9:7,9,22 | 62:15 | 68:10 | 72:1,4,6,7 | 28:8 34:14 |
| 12:2 15:22 | speaker's | 82:20,20 | 72:13 77:6 | submit |
| 16:4 44:23 | 57:22 | started | 85:5,7 | 24:24,25 |
| 45:16,17 | speaking | 6:24 11:22 | statistic | 25:14,14 |
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| submitted | 28:4,7,18 | takes | 52:25 | 78:4,5,7,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32:25 33:1 | 29:6 36:19 | 15:5 42:4 | term | 78:12,12 |
| 33:10,13 | 37:8 38:17 | talents | 14:3 15:7 | 78:14,15 |
| $33: 18$ 34:7 | $38: 25$ 41:9 | 85:3 | 24:12,13 | 78:15 79:6 |
| 64:13 81:2 | 49:18 57:1 | talk | 66:4 | 79:21,21 |
| submitting | 58:19,23 | 9:16 19:4 | terms | 79:25 80:3 |
| 86:12,12 | 59:15 60:1 | 20:13 23:8 | 5:8 13:25 | 80:4 83:23 |
| subordinate | 65:17,20 | 25:25 | 39:1,7 | 86:1,2,17 |
| 24:18 | 69:4,15,17 | 40:21, 22 | 40:22,23 | theirs |
| substantial | 77: 6 | 45:18 | 69:22 | 50:16 |
| 17:17 18:5 | sure | 46:16 | territories | theory |
| 26:17 | 10:16 31:11 | 60:19 | 14:7,13 | 49:2 |
| substant. | 31:13 | 61:17 75:8 | test | thereof |
| 7:17 25:18 | 42:12 75:1 | talked | 39:13 | 87:13 |
| 28:14 | 80:6,14 | 8:24 10:10 | testify | they'd |
| succeed | survive | 14:8 21:16 | 43:21 | 50:17 |
| 55:4,8 | 20:22 77:4 | 30:5 47:14 | testimony | thing |
| suffering | Susie | 56:12 | 40:12 43:8 | 8:3 23:18 |
| 7:15 | 84:1 | 74:15 | 43:22 44:4 | 43:4 54:14 |
| sufficie | sustainable | talking | 48:23 | 58:12,13 |
| 20:3 | 59:7,8 | 16:9 24:6 | 57:23 59:1 | 61:3 68:20 |
| suggest | system | 28:5 29:9 | 64:14 | 81:24 |
| 81:17 | 25:2 40:21 | task | 76:17 | things |
| suggested | 71:1 | 36:19,20 | 81:12 | 1:9 3:13 |
| 66:21 | T | 39:3 54:15 | thank | 22:6 31:8 |
| suggesting | table | 69:10,13 | 2:4 3:12 | 39:8,11,15 |
| 85:11 | 35:7 47:16 | 73:10,15 | $4: 165: 6$, $11: 2,2$ | $41: 15$ $42: 16$ |
|  | 56:12 80:8 | tasked | 12:5 13:20 | 49:13 52:8 |
| summer | 80:10 | 53:23 | 13:24 | 60:20 61:2 |
| 65:25 66:16 | tail | team | 16:25 | 71:3 73:22 |
| 69:6 | 53:20 68:20 | 62:14 87:5 | 21:12 | think |
| supersede | tailored | 87:11 | 23:14,15 | 21:20 22:17 |
| 76:9 | 20:23 21:24 | teaser | 23:16 30:2 | 22:21,25 |
| supervised | take | 34:23 | 30:3 32:13 | 23:3 32:16 |
| 66:13 | 1:12 15:11 | technology | 32:20,23 | 33:6 35:24 |
| suppleme | 23:9 38:4 | 5:5 12:8 | 34:19,20 | 36:11,18 |
| 76:17 | 45:11 | tell | 34:21 35:5 | 37:6 38:4 |
| support | $51: 15$ 52:6 | 6:22 9:4 | 35:5,9,14 | 38:5,11 |
| 47:13,21,24 | 64:15 | 13:25 | 41:2 42:6 | 39:4,14 |
| 47:25 | 65:20,21 | 15:22 25:8 | 42:7,9,14 | 41:3,8,14 |
| 58:15 | 66:10 | 25:9 31:5 | 49:9,10,12 | 41:16,18 |
| 59:20 | 71:23,23 | 35:22,23 | 54: 4,5,7 | 41:21,25 |
| supported | 72:14,14 | 41:23 | 60:11,13 | 42:3 43:15 |
| 21:4 59:19 | 72:23 | 46:11,11 | 63:25,25 | 43:17 |
| supports | 81:25 | 50:20 57:6 | 64:1,2,4 | 44:10 |
| 48:8 | 82:14,22 | 63:23 65:2 | 70:17,18 | 45:18 |
| Supreme | 83:3,7 | telling | 70:20 | 46:12 48:1 |
| 5:11 25:5 | taken 65:23 77:14 | 15:22 42:18 | 75:3,12,16 | 50:16 53:1 |
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| 53: 8, 10,16 | 66:17 | 25:20 | 75:6,9 | unfair |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:1, 9 | 72:12 75:3 | transcribed | 83:9 84:10 | 47:19 74:24 |
| 58:11,11 | 75:7,10 | 87:4,7 | trying | 84:17 |
| 63:12,14 | $77: 19 \quad 78: 7$ | Transcri | 30:4 31:18 | uniform |
| $63: 1664: 8$ | 79:7,22 | 87:2,5,7,11 | 39:5 41:23 | 6:1 |
| $64: 966: 18$ | timeline | 87:16 | 42:3 46:23 | unique |
| 66:23,24 | 5:14 65:4 | transcript | 49:25 | 26:2 |
| 69:5,9,19 | 67:5 | 87:6 | 53:20 | unite |
| $70: 173: 6$ | today | transcri | 54:13 58:6 | 83:11,15 |
| $73: 7 \quad 74: 2$ | 1:3,14 3:18 | 87:1,5,9,11 | 58:17 | United |
| 77:8,25 | $33: 3$ 35:16 | tremendous | 59:17 | 30:19 36:19 |
| 79:6,10,22 | 42:18 | 79:5 | 62:20 73:9 | 38:17 |
| 83:7,12,14 | $46: 1054: 4$ | trends | $79: 23$ | 58:22 69:3 |
| third | 60:20,21 | 5:10 6:15 | 82:25 83:2 | 72:1,6,6 |
| 45:2 56:4 | 60:23,25 | 6:18 | 85:23 | $72: 13$ 77:6 |
| 56:20 | 61:4 78:9 | trial | turn | 85:5,7 |
| Thomas | 78:20 | 43:25 | 1:10 12:13 | unjust |
| 3:5,6 41:1 | 81:21 | 44:8,10 | turnaround | 74:24 |
| 41:2 42:6 | told | 48:14,16 | 43:23 | untangle |
| 42:8 86:20 | 36:14 44:13 | 48:17, 23 | tweak | 76:7 |
| Thompson | 53:14 60:1 | $49: 3$ 53:11 | 64:16 | update |
| 29:15 | 63:3,18,19 | 55:5 61:9 | twenties | 4:13 $34: 25$ |
| Thornburg | 63:20 | 61:15 62:1 | 29:9 | upheld |
| 19:23 | Tom | 62: 6, 17, 21 | twist | 40:7 |
| thought | 35:17 48:19 | $63: 2,4,17$ | 59:6 | uploaded |
| 38:15,21 | 52:1 72:25 | 67:6,7,7 | two | 86:8 |
| 40:9,9 | tomorrow | 67:11,19 | 50:2,2,5 | USA |
| 55:14 66:1 | 9:17 60:22 | 76:15 | 79:24 80:5 | 84:16 |
| 79:20 | tomorrow's | tried | two-thirds |  |
| threatened | 81:12 | 36:23 39:16 | 40:7, 9 | 5:17 24:20 |
| 75:19,20 | total | 57:6,25 | 46:17 | 26:7 |
| three | 8:5 9:15,20 | 59:25 | 47:11 | uses |
| 51:8,11 | 10:7,14 | 62:22 | typically | 6:3 |
| 59:23 | 12:21,24 | 63:15 | 64:14 | utilizing |
| 79:24 | 13:10,14 | 73:23 84:5 |  | 87:4 |
| 82:12 | 15:11,13 | 85:24 | U | 87.4 |
| 84:20 | 51:13 | trouble | ultimatel | V |
| throw | totality | 12:17 | 39:12,18 | v |
| 72:13 | 13:18 19:17 | true | 40:6 | 17:7,19 |
| till | 20:11 | 53:13 54:15 | unconsti | 18:5,21,24 |
| 81:14 83:6 | 25:12 | 87:9 | 77:13 78:1 | 19:23 |
| time | 39:12 | try | undermine | 20:18 37:7 |
| 28:16 36:1 | touched | 53:20 55:9 | 24:18 | $38: 5 \quad 41: 21$ |
| 40:5 44:5 | 14:16 | 56:16 | understand | 41:24 42:5 |
| 44:16 51:9 | toy | 57:17,20 | 1:6 23:1,7 | vacated |
| $54: 456: 4$ | 85:17 | 58: 4, 10 | 23:21 | 66:8,10 |
| 56:6 59:10 | track | 59:14,16 | 51:11 | vacuum |
| $60: 561: 3$ | 60:7 | $70: 3$ 73:8 | 71:15 | $23: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 61: 25 \\ & 62: 11,16 \end{aligned}$ | traditional | $73: 1675: 5$ | $74: 14$ | validated |
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| 24:22 | 74:9,19,20 | 48:22 | 53:23 | $7: 24 \quad 8: 11$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| value | 85:4 | $51: 15$ 53:3 | 59:17 | 8:16, 21 |
| 73:22 | voted | $58: 15$ 59:6 | 60:25 61:4 | 9:8,21,25 |
| VAP | 47:11 63:10 | 59:11 61:1 | 61:5,11 | 10:1,3 |
| 10:14 | 73:12 | 61:8 71:15 | $70: 7 \quad 73: 18$ | $11: 3,4,6,8$ |
| various | Voters | $73: 13 \quad 74: 2$ | $78: 2081: 9$ | 11:9 13:10 |
| 14:20 17:18 | 56:15 | 74:18 | 81:10,20 | 30:6,13,24 |
| vary | votes | 78:19,20 | 83:13,14 | $31: 6,6,6,7$ |
| 28:20 | 27:9 | $78: 23$ 79:5 | 86:6 | 31:19,19 |
| verifica. | voting | 79:25 | we ' ve | 31:20,20 |
| 24:23 | 13:5,6 | 80:20, 22 | 9:12 25:25 | 82:6 |
| version | 14:24 19:6 | 81:13 | 35:25 | wiggle |
| 37:23 | 19:8,10,15 | 83:10,11 | 40:11,12 | 16:14 |
| veto | 20:1,7 | wanted | 43:25 | wish |
| 27:17,18 | 21:2 22:5 | 3:22 55:14 | 49:19 | 67:21 |
| 40:8 | 24:8 45:9 | 60:18 | 54:14 | wishes |
| vetoed | 46:18 | 61:17 80:8 | $60: 20 \quad 67: 1$ | 24:24 |
| 27:16 | 51:12 | 80:17 | 70:11 | witness |
| Vice-chair | 53:18 | 84:10 | 72:12,17 | 78:18 80:5 |
| 2:7 | $57: 16$ | wants | 72:21 | witnesses |
| Vice-cha | 60:19 | 58:12,13,13 | website | 1:13 78:19 |
| 2:8 60:12 | 65:15 72:2 | 64:17 | 4:2,25 9:25 | women |
| 60:13,16 | 74:13 | watching | 11:21 | 45:5 |
| 63:25 | voting-age | 5:4 | 30:18 | wonderful |
| videos | 10:15 12:20 | water | we | 58:9 |
| 5:1 | 13:2,11,14 | 85:14 | 40:16 | work |
| Vietnamese | 13:18 | way | 86:17 | $3: 25$ 4:6,9 |
| 84:14 | 51:12,13 | 9:10 11:15 | welcom | 37:4,10,11 |
| viewed | 52:5,7,9 | $31: 9$ 32:11 | 1:3,4,5,7 | 40:11 47:3 |
| 54:9 | 52:12 | 38:14,18 | 13:21 | $70: 17 \quad 77: 4$ |
| viewing | 74:13 | 39:21 | 32:14 35:2 | 77:4 82:23 |
| 3:24 | voting-r | 52:10 | 35:4,4 | working |
| violate | 30:17 | 54:21 | 75:15 80:7 | 5:5 6:24 |
| 41:7 | vs | 55:10 66:9 | 80:10,11 | 40:5 60:8 |
| violate | 74:13 | 66:16 84:5 | Wells | 78:9 80:25 |
| violat | VTDs | 85:8 87:12 | 18:24 | 83:15 |
| violation | 24:12 | we'll | went | 84:18 |
|  |  | 5:7 2 | 40:8 49:18 | worry |
|  | W | 46:25,25 | $54: 20$ 55:5 | 57:4 |
| 5 | wait | 47:3 54:3 | 57:24 | wouldn't |
| 19:25 | 66:1 | 61:6 81:25 | 61:21, 22 | 2:3 35:11 |
| 2:5 | want | we're | $65: 25 \quad 74: 8$ | 50: 4, 8 |
| voices | 3:25 4:8,8 | 1:18,24 | 79:10 | 57:10 61:5 |
| 78:21 | 4:9 6:22 | $3: 17,20$ | weren't | wrap |
| vote | 8:3 9:4,16 | $4: 115: 5$ | 47:24 63:2 | 30:4 |
| 15:8 19:1 | 12:10 | 7:8 16:8,8 | Wesberry |  |
| 19:12 23:2 | 16:22 | 19:4 28:5 | 17:7 | $3: 7$ |
| $23: 3$ 40:7 | 23:19,23 | 29:9,9 | whatnot | write |
| 57:16 71:8 | 30:11,14 | 48:1 51:2 | 40:8 | $72: 19$ |
| 71:21 74:4 | $35: 22$ | 52:20,21 | White | 72:19 |
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| wrong | 27:2 | 105 | 1st | 55:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48:19 61:3 | Z | 25:11 | 27:7 | 27 |
| wrote | Z | 10th |  | 27:12,13,18 |
| 60:4 | Z | 27:10,16 | 2 | 291001-A. |
| Wyble | 85:9 | 11 | 2 | 87:3 |
| 3:8,9 30:1 | zero | 27:19 | 16:12 17:9 |  |
| 30:2,10 | 16:23 40:13 | 12th | 19:8,15,16 | 3 |
| 31:11,13 | 0 | 87:14 | 21:2 22:5 | 3,711 |
| $31: 16$ 32:1 | 0 | 13 | 24:8 28:15 | 6:1 |
| 32:4,8,10 | 0.00 | 3:10 | 30:20 37:9 | 30 th |
| 32:13 | 16:5 | 14th | 37:19 45:8 | 27:16,18 |
| 46:15 | 0.01 | 17:9,23 | 45:9,11 | 31 |
|  | 16:5 | 18:2 19:7 | 48:8 53:18 | 27:17 |
| X | 0:13:18 | 20:17 24:7 | 56:15,16 | 31st |
|  | $10: 19$ $0.13 \cdot 36$ | 27:10 | 56:25 | 27:19 |
| Y | 0:13:36 | 53:17 | 57:14,19 | 32.8 |
| y'all | 11:5 | 56:25 | 57:25 58:1 | 7:24 |
| 4:21 9:11 | 0:43:45 | 15th | 2.30 | 33 |
| 9:14,17 | 34:12 | 1:3 19:7 | 8:12 | 27:9 55:21 |
| 12:8 22:17 |  | 24:8 27:12 | 2.74 | 56:21,21 |
| 22:19 | 1 | 53:17 | 6:7 | $79: 23$ |
| 23:22 31:2 | 1 | 66:20 | 20,000 | 33.13 |
| 31:10 56:3 | 13:9 16:10 | 18 | 26:10 | 8:11 |
| 60:7,8,8 $78: 8,9$ | 16:12 17:8 | 13:4,6 | 2000 | 362,000 |
| $78: 8,9$ $79: 6,20,21$ | 28:19 56:9 | 18th | 6:18 7:4 | 28:25 |
| $79: 6,20,21$ $79: 2180: 1$ | 56:14 57:7 | 27:12,14 | 2000s | 39. |
| $79: 2180: 1$ $80: 3,19$ | 1.3 | 1920s | 6:19 | 25:11 82:14 |
| $80: 3,19$ yeah | 8:1 | 29:10 | 2010 | 25.11 82.14 |
| yeah | 1.8 | 1940 | 6:19 7:4,16 | 4 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}8: 19 & 29: 14 \\ 32: 7 & 33: 21\end{array}$ | 7:25 | 6:13 | 7:23 8:10 | 4 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}32: 7 & 33: 21 \\ 34: 17 & 35: 8\end{array}$ | 1.83 | 1960s | 26:8 32:8 | 8:9 26:19 |
| $34: 17$ $40: 17$ | 8:2 | 17:19 | 2020 | 4,657,757 |
| $40: 17$ $49: 16$ $51: 16$ | 1.87 | 1965 | 5:9 6:6 | 5:17 |
| $49: 16$ $51: 16$ $67: 25 \quad 70: 6$ | 8:12 | 14:24 19:6 | 7:10 8:10 | 4.25 |
| $51: 16$ $67: 25 \quad 70: 6$ $75: 5 \quad 81: 4$ | 1:14:43 | 1980 | 26:1,10,13 | 8:9 |
| $75: 581: 4$ $81: 6,15$ | 60:24 | 7:1 | 32:6 | 41 |
| 81:6,15 $86: 19$ | 1:30:56 | 1982 | 2022 | 16:3 |
| 86:19 | 73:1 | 19:16 | 5:13 15:18 | 476,554 |
| year $26: 2 \quad 70: 10$ | 1:39:31 | 1986 | 27:9,20 | 28:21 |
| $26: 270: 10$ $70: 11$ | 79:2 | 19:24 | 2024 $1 \cdot 3$ 87:14 | 4 th |
| $70: 11$ years | 10 | 1988 | $20 \mathrm{~s}$ | 27:8 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { years } & \\ 4: 1,8 & 8: 25\end{array}$ | $17: 23,25$ $18: 827: 12$ | 4:20 | 29:3,20 | 5 |
| $\begin{array}{rrr}4: 1,8 & 8: 25 \\ 40: 5 & 51: 8\end{array}$ | $18: 8$ 10.22 | 1990 | $21$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}40: 5 & 51: 8 \\ 51: 11 & 60: 1\end{array}$ | 10.22 $6: 9$ | 6:18 7:2 | 23:25 24:1 | 5 $15: 18 \quad 25: 19$ |
| 51:11 $60: 1$ $65: 8$ | $6: 9$ 100 | 28:10,11 1990s | $29: 671: 25$ | $\begin{gathered} 15: 1825: 19 \\ 27: 20,21 \end{gathered}$ |
| 65: 8 yeas | 8:5 13:11 | 1990s | 24 | $27: 22$ |
| yeas $27: 13,17,18$ | 101 | 36:1 | 16:3 | 28:23 |
| yellow | 4:21 | 28:10,11 | 26 | 33:10,12 |
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In Re: Louisiana Senate Committee Video

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Bill by Senator Womack, Senate Bill 8. Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack provides for redistricting of the Louisiana congressional districts.
(Pause.)
SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the committee, I have an amendment, if I could pass out, please. If I could, I'll -- I'll begin with my opening.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Senator Womack, you are recognized, and you may proceed, sir.

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you. As you know, Louisiana congressional districts must be drawn given the Federal Voting Rights Act litigation that is still ongoing in the US District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana. The map is the bill that I'm introducing, which, as the product of a long, detailed process, achieves several goals. First, as you know -- all are aware, Congresswoman Letlow, Julia Letlow, is my representative in Washington, DC.

The boundaries in this bill I'm proposing ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unimpaired with any other incumbents and in a congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade. I have great

1 pride in the work Congresswoman Letlow has accomplished and this map will ensure that Louisianans will continue to benefit from her presence in the halls of Congress for a long -- for as long as she decides to continue to serve our great state.

Second, of Louisiana's six congressional districts, the map and the proposed bill ensures that four of our safe Republican seats, Louisiana Republican presence in the United States Congress has contributed tremendously to the national discourse. And I'm very proud of both Speaker of the US House of Representatives Mike Johnson and US House Majority Leader Steve Scalise are both from our great state. This map ensures that the two of them will have solidly Republican districts at home so that they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC

The map proposed in this bill ensures that the conservative principles retained by the majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend past our boundaries to our nation's capital. Finally, the maps in the proposed bill respond appropriately to the ongoing Federal Voting Rights Act case in the Middle District of Louisiana. For those of you who are unaware, the congressional maps that we enacted in March 2022 have been the subject of litigation since the day

Page 3
the 2022 congressional redistricting bill went into effect and even before we enacted it.

After a substantial amount of prolonged
litigation, the federal district court has (inaudible $0: 03: 35$ ) to its view that the federal law requires that the state have two congressional districts with a majority of Black voters. Our secretary of state, attorney general, and our prior legislative leadership appealed but have yet to succeed. And we are here now because of the federal court's order that we must -that we have a first opportunity to act.

The district court's order that we must have two majority Black voting age population districts, combined with the political imperatives I just described, having largely driven the boundaries of District 2 and District 6, both of which are over 50 percent Black voting age population -- given the state's current demographics, there is not a high enough Black population in the southeast portion of Louisiana to create two majority Black districts and to also comply with the US Constitution one person, one vote requirement.

That is the reason why District 2 is drawn around New Orleans Parish, while District 6 includes the 25 Black population of East Baton Rouge Parish and travels
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Senate Bill 4. Senate Bill 4 split only 11 parishes, as I appreciate it, and it created two majority-minority districts. What was the predominant reason for you to create the 6th District the way it looks now vs. just going with Senator Price's bill, which created a more compact district?

SENATOR WOMACK: It -- it was strictly -politics drove this map because of the -- the -- Speaker Johnson, Majority Leader Scalise, and my congresswoman, Julia Letlow, predominantly drove this map that I was a part of.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. So is it safe to say that your convection of District 6, race is not the predominant factor?

SENATOR WOMACK: No. It's not the predominant factor. It -- it -- it has a secondary consideration in that because that was the district that we were trying to -- trying to encompass, but it wasn't the primary.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: So I guess it's kind of difficult when you got a speaker of the house. We're very fortunate in Louisiana. But when you got two members of your Congress that are the two top-ranking members of the US House of Representatives, being a speaker and a majority leader, you know, how much did that weigh in on your decision in drawing this map?

SENATOR WOMACK: Well, it -- it -- it had a lot to weigh in on. Not only that, but you have Congresswoman Letlow that sits on Ag and Appropriation, which is a big part of my district. So when you put them all together, that's -- that's a lot of -- a lot of I call it muscle that we -- we were able to look at and put in for the State of Louisiana, for all of Louisiana.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. So your -- your
minority population in District 2 is -- is -- voter registration is 52.6, and your population is 53.1. And in the 6th District it's 54.3 in registration and 56.1 in population. And this was the -- the -- you know, looking at all of the issues you were dealing with, this was the best you could come up with?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, sir. They perform well. When you look at the performance base, when you look at the District 6, the performance of it appears to be positive for the minority district.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Are there any things that bring these communities together in District 6 ? I guess that would be considered the Red River District.

SENATOR WOMACK: Well, you -- you got the Red
River, but you also got I-49 that -- that -- that goes through this district from Shreveport down to Lafayette,
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follows the (inaudible 0:09:30) of the Red River through there.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. All right. Questions from members of the committee? No questions. You have some amendments you had, Senator?

SENATOR WOMACK: I do. Did -- did you -y'all have the amendments?

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: I'm sorry. Senator Carter for --

SENATOR CARTER: I don't have a -CHAIRMAN FIELDS: -- a question. SENATOR CARTER: -- copy to (inaudible 0:09:50). Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry, Senator. I did have a -- a -- a question before we move to the amendment. You said that both districts -- you said that the district performed. You were asked a question from the Chairman a minute ago about District 6 and whether or not it performs as an African American district. Do you remember that question a second ago?

## SENATOR WOMACK: I do.

SENATOR CARTER: Same question for District 2. From looking at the District 2 in your map, we have a total African American population of 53.121 percent, and we have the registered African American -- registered African American vote for District 2 at 52.659 percent;
did I read that correctly?
MALE SPEAKER 1: (inaudible 0:10:56)?
SENATOR WOMACK: Yes
SENATOR CARTER: Did -- was any performance
test conducted -- I'm sorry. I'm (inaudible 0:11:02).
Did -- were any performance tests or analyses conducted
to see how District 2 performs as an African American
majority district or not? SENATOR WOMACK: The Democratic incumbent wins over 60 percent of the time in that race. SENATOR CARTER: (inaudible 0:11:43) 60 percent of the time? SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. I'm sorry. 60 percent of the vote.

SENATOR CARTER: Yeah, I think my microphone -- can you repeat it? I'm sorry. SENATOR WOMACK: The Democratic -SENATOR CARTER: So my question -- well, let me ask this. So my question was: how does District 2 perform? And you just gave me a figure. What was it? SENATOR WOMACK: 60 percent of the vote on the Democratic nominee. SENATOR CARTER: We heard earlier when we were considering Senator Price's bill that the -- the legal
defense fund had conducted an analysis of the
performance of that district. They conducted multiple different elections based upon that district, and it had a 100 percent performance race that's coming in as an African American seat. And I guess I'm curious to know what would be the comparable number in terms of the performance of the District 2 of this particular map, the District 2 on your map that's being proposed here. You -- am I asking the question in a way you get what I'm asking?

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: I think -- yeah. I think what the Senator is -- is requesting -- have you done any kind of performance tests for either District 6 or District 2? Any performance analysis?

SENATOR WOMACK: I have not.
SENATOR CARTER: Okay.
SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I -- I have a report here printed off on a congressional map, and in District 2, a Democratic candidate could win 100 percent of the time.

SENATOR CARTER: A democratic candidate, but not necessarily an African American Democratic -- an African American candidate regardless of party. So you said "a Democratic candidate." So I'm asking about an African American candidate. You said that a Democrat candidate performs in that district, but my question is

1 whether or not it performs as a -- for an -- as an

## African American district?

SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. Our analysis is on -is -- is on party, not race. So -- so I can't answer that.

SENATOR CARTER: There was -- there was no analysis done to determine whether or not District 2 for this map -- of your map performs as an African American district?

SENATOR WOMACK: No.
SENATOR CARTER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Carter
The board is clear. Do you have an amendment, Senator?
SENATOR WOMACK: I do. It's Amendment 34.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Senate Womack
brings up Amendment Number 34. Senator Womack on his amendment.

SENATOR WOMACK: You want -- you want -- you
want to pull that up and --
MALE SPEAKER 2: Yes, Senator.
SENATOR WOMACK: It's okay for him to pull
that up?
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Yes, sir.
SENATOR WOMACK: Sorry.
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(Pause.)
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. You may proceed,
Senator. This is the amended -- the amended --
SENATOR WOMACK: This is the amendment. What we did on that in Avoyelles Parish, we -- we took out -split Avoyelles Parish, put those into Rapides, around Alexandria, Rapides Parish. And then we moved into -that's Rapides there where we moved it to. And then we moved into Ouachita Parish and took Ouachita, West Monroe, Monroe, and Calhoun into that.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay.
SENATOR WOMACK: Any other -- that's it.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. So how many
parishes, with the -- with that amendment would the bill overall split?

SENATOR WOMACK: Could you -- it'd -- it goes from 15 to 16.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. So it splits one
additional one there.
SENATOR WOMACK: One -- one extra parish.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: And that would be Avoyelles Parish?

SENATOR WOMACK: That would be Avoyelles
Parish. Okay.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Questions from
members of the -- and the percentages pretty much stay the same in the 2nd District?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: And the 6th District?
SENATOR WOMACK: And 6th, yeah. The -- the numbers are the same.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Are there questions from members of the committee? All right. I do have a card - you don't need to fill out no card - from Senator Heather Cloud. If you wish to be recognized, you -please come and take --

SENATOR CLOUD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to make a simple statement. As a Republican woman, I want to stand here -- or sit here, rather, and offer my support for the amendment to the map, which I believe further protects Congresswoman Julia Letlow. She is the only woman in the Louisiana's congressional district.
She is a member of the Appropriations Committee in the
US House, as Senator Womack stated, and also a member of the Agricultural Committee in the US House. It's -it's important to me and all of the other residents of our area that -- to have these two representatives from our crucial region in our state.

I think that politically, this map does a great job protecting Speaker Johnson and Congresswoman
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Julia Letlow as well as Majority Leader Scalise. It
keeps CD5 in the northern Louisiana area and allows
Congresswoman Letlow to keep doing the great job that
she's been doing. So I just sit here and offer my
support of the amendment. Thank you, members.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you. And -- and so we can be clear, Senator, just to be, like they say, on what is it? - A Few Good Men, crystal clear, so this map, with this amendment, there are other ways we could perfect a second minority-majority district --majority-minority district that's more compact, 11 parishes split. This one splits 16 parishes, and the reason you're offering this amendment is for protecting -- I hate to say for -- but to protect incumbents, members of Congress. But race is not your predominant reason for drawing and perfecting this map?

SENATOR CLOUD: Mr. Chair, I have both Congresswoman Julia Letlow and Congressman Mike Johnson in my Senate -- in my district. I work well with both of them, and I want them to continue to be able to do the great job that they do on behalf of all of the constituency in my district.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. So basically, you are trying to -- attempting to comply with the federal court, but yet protect members of the US Congress, be it
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a female and be it two of the most powerful members of the US Congress?

SENATOR CLOUD: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Senator Reese for a question.

SENATOR REESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For
Senator Womack. First of all, you know, as we -- as we continue to contemplate these alternative maps, l've got to say that I -- I continue to move forward cautiously as I have been concerned that -- that we may indeed be taking some action that the courts may not have necessarily directed us to take yet. You know, we do know that there was an alternative to -- to ultimately end up with a hearing on the merits.

But I'm also conflicted in that because I know that the person charged with the responsibility of representing the decisions we make in this legislature is our attorney general, and our attorney general has -has certainly declared that she thought it was the best action for us to -- to take at this time to -- to contemplate a different map structure. The reason we've not done that in the past is because of the difficulty, I believe, in managing what the Voting Rights Act would ask us to do and avoiding other pitfalls in the Voting Rights Act like gerrymandering to ultimately come up
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with the districts. And so I -- I appreciate what you're charged with trying to present here.

Would you say that -- that predominantly, in the remaining districts that are not majority-minority districts, that you've tried to really adhere to the continuity of representation in those districts? And it appears perhaps that you're really trying to -- to not bust up the -- kind of the communities of interest, crack or split or divide those communities of interest. SENATOR WOMACK: Yes.

SENATOR REESE: So in -- in -- in the 4th District, for instance, I noticed that you've kept together, like, our major military installations in that 4th District that has -- that kind of speaks to communities of interest that it looks like you're -you're attempting to preserve with this map while you still attempt to -- to comply with -- with the objective of the courts in terms of creating another majority-minority opportunity district there.

SENATOR WOMACK: That's exactly right.
SENATOR REESE: The numbers -- and -- and we're talking -- we're on your amendment now, right, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Yes.
SENATOR REESE: We've not adopted the
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amendment yet?
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: No, we have not
(Pause.)
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: What -- just -- yes. And
because if you need to be -- want to --
MALE SPEAKER 3: It's okay. Yeah. Just in opposition.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. Yeah. Your -- your
opposition will be noted for the record. There are no
other cards that I see. Senator Reese has moved that
the amendments be adopted. Are there any objections to the adoption of the amendments? Hearing no objections, those amendments are adopted.

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, committee members and Mr. Chairman. Close on my bill.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Yes. Before you do, I have
-- I wanted to just show you an amendment that I'm not
-- I wanted -- Bill, can you pull up -- initially, when
I -- when I saw the -- you know, I tried to -- you know,
I'm a stickler to keeping parishes together, try to make districts as compact as possible. And I had tried to put something together, and I just want to get some comments from you about it. As soon as Bill pulls it up, I want to know if this amendment would impact any of the considerations you have -- you have made in
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All right. I tried to keep as many parishes
whole as possible in both the -- you know, in the whole state, but I particularly want to concentrate on the 2nd District and the 6th District. Would -- would -- would
-- would that satisfy your -- if I -- if -- if -- if we
were to adopt that amendment, would that interfere with your concerns about helping some of the members of Congress?
(Pause.)
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Do we have the amendment prepared? Okay. Let me offer up the amendment. I want to offer up an amendment. I'm -- I'm going to offer it up.
(Pause.)
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Give you a quick second to look at this amendment. This amendments -- amendment splits only 15 parishes. Would you have a problem with adopting this amendment?

SENATOR WOMACK: Well, I -- Mr. Chairman, all due respect, if we could get a few minutes to look at it. If you could get a --

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Yes, sir
SENATOR WOMACK: Go -- maybe a 10- or
15 -minute recess to look at it and -- and kind of see.



CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator. Senator Jenkins.

SENATOR JENKINS: Well, I'm just trying to be sure here. I mean, I fundamentally don't have an issue. I'm just trying to see what's happened here in -- in north Louisiana.

SENATOR CARTER: It shouldn't affect northern Louisiana at all. It's just a swap between 6 -- sorry, I'm -- I'm not on. It -- it should not affect northern Louisiana. This is just a swap between District 2 and District 6. At the very bottom, if you're looking at Iberville and West Baton Rouge parishes right there towards the bottom, it has no bearing or no effect on northern Louisiana.

SENATOR JENKINS: Well, I'm looking at the configuration. I mean --

SENATOR CARTER: Well, I think the difference is we're looking at the configuration from the previous amendment from Senator Womack. That should be incorporated into the amendment that I'm offering.

SENATOR JENKINS: Okay. So --
SENATOR CARTER: So that's a technical thing that they're fixing. It -- it doesn't have anything to do with the swap that I am. So there was the previous amendment that was offered by Senator Womack with
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Senator Cloud testifying at the table that got adopted. SENATOR JENKINS: Okay.
SENATOR CARTER: This amendment doesn't --
SENATOR JENKINS: It doesn't -- doesn't
(inaudible 0:40:09).
SENATOR CARTER: -- doesn't undo that, doesn't
touch it whatsoever. This is just a very slight swap between District 2 and District 6.

SENATOR JENKINS: I see that. Okay. Got it.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. Senator Jenkins. All right. Are there any other members who wish to be heard on the amendment?

SENATOR CARTER: At this time I would like to move -- provide -- we don't have the amendment. Can we do it in concept or no?

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Senator Carter, why don't we -- why don't we move the bill out the way it is now. The -- your amendment is not ready. And you're talking about 3,000 people. You know, I -- I -- I -- (inaudible 0:41:02) -

SENATOR CARTER: I know we had the conversation earlier about doing the hard work in the committee and making certain we have amendments that we need here. I -- I did not realize that it didn't
contemplate the previous amendment that got on. It was my --

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Yeah. Yeah.
SENATOR CARTER: -- understanding it was supposed to, and I just heard about the issue --

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Right.
SENATOR CARTER: -- about the contiguousness of it.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: I -- I hate to oppose one of my distinguished colleagues in committee.

SENATOR CARTER: Well, I hope you don't.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: But I do think we have an obligation to -- to make sure that anything we do and pass is not for -- race is not the predominant reason. Can you give us the reason for splitting two parishes other than race?

SENATOR CARTER: Well, I think -- one, I think hearing the testimony of my previous colleague, Senator Womack and Senator Cloud, this makes -- this increases the odds of District 2 performing as an African American district. And given the importance that our congressperson has performed in District 2, I think it's very important that that district remains strengthened where it can perform as an African American district. That is a factor. It is not the predominant factor.
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It's also consistent with the principles outlined with the federal judge, and it's also consistent with communities of interest and all the other factors that we previously considered.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: So lastly, what's the predominant factor you're using to split the two parishes, that -- the 3,000 people?

SENATOR CARTER: It's very important, and we talked about very -- earlier when this hearing started, we talked about many of the storms and hurricanes that we've had. It's very important. You look at what happened in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, making certain we had congressional representation to deliver for the City of New Orleans, for not just the City of New Orleans, but for that whole area, the whole 2nd Congressional District. Similarly, during hurricane -not hurricane, with the pandemic with COVID, making certain we have congressional representation that can continue to deliver for our district.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Okay. Members, you've heard the discussion by Senator Carter. The amendment can't be adopted because it's not ready. We do have other bills we have to hear. I would plead to the gentleman to let us pass the bill, and if we can perfect your amendment on the floor, we can do just that.

SENATOR CARTER: Well, my only concern with doing it on the floor is it opens it up to -- you know, it's -- it's -- it's important that we do the hard work in committee, I thought.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right.
SENATOR CARTER: So if we can perhaps give staff --

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: How much more time --
SENATOR CARTER: -- an opportunity to -- to finalize the amendment so we can get that hopefully considered by the committee.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Well, we're going to pass over -- Senator, if you -- if we could pass over your bill for now and get to the rest of these bills because --

SENATOR CARTER: It shouldn't take long. It's
-- it's a very small -- it's -- I believe it's less than 3,000 voters, so it should be easy and quick to fix.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: All right. Let's pass over Senator -- Senator Womack, do you -- do you wish for us to pass over your bill for now?

SENATOR WOMACK: That's good.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Bill, you have it?
SENATOR CARTER: I think we have it, but.
MALE SPEAKER 4: (inaudible 0:44:47) not quite
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the same. You can't have that one.
SENATOR CARTER: I believe we have the revised
amendment, so don't -- don't go too far, Senator.
MALE SPEAKER 4: (inaudible 0:45:02).
SENATOR CARTER: Yes.
(Pause.)
SENATOR CARTER: Does this contemplate the previous amendment from that -- that got on from Senator Womack and Senator Cloud?

MALE SPEAKER 4: (inaudible 0:45:30)?
SENATOR CARTER: The one that's already passed, yes, yes.

MALE SPEAKER 4: (inaudible 0:45:34).
SENATOR CARTER: Without -- it doesn't undo
any of the previous amendments. It maintains the revisions that was --

MALE SPEAKER 4: It maintains all of that (inaudible 0:45:41).

SENATOR CARTER: Okay. Good. Yes. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is now -- it's being finalized, that solves both of those issues where it doesn't undo the previous -- where it doesn't undo the previous amendment that was offered by Senator Womack and Senator Cloud. It wasn't intended to do that. And it fixed the one part of the amendment that
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { certainly } \\ 14: 19 \end{gathered}$ | change 24: 4 25:21 | $18: 23$ <br> company's | 28:22 | copy 7:12 <br> correct 24:5 |
| CERTIFICATE | changes | 33:9 | 1:19, 22 | 33:10 |
| 33:1 | 23:10 | comparable | 2:1 4:11 | correctly |
| certify 33:3 | charged | 9:5 | 5:9 6:3 | 8:1 |
| 33:11 | 14:16 15:2 | comparisons | 12:16,25 | council |
| chair 12:12 | chopped | 18:10 | 13:3,18 | 24:19 |
| 13:17 | 24:20 | completely | conserva | count 4:20 |
| 19:24 | City 29:14 | 23:13 | 2:18 | country 4: 6 |
| 22:13 32:7 | 29:14 | comply 3:20 | consider | couple 4:18 |
| Chairman 1:1 | clarific. | 13:24 | 22:23 | 20:24 |
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| course 22:13 | Democrat | 6:20,22,25 | due 17:21 | 6:19 7:3,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| court 1:15 | 9:24 | 7:16,17,19 | 24:16 | 7:11 9:10 |
| 3:4 4:15 | democratic | 7:21,22,25 |  | 10:13,16 |
| 13:25 | 8:9,17,22 | 8:7,8,19 | E | 10:24 11:2 |
| court's 3:10 | 9:18,20,21 | 9:1,2,6,7 | earlier 8:23 | 11:11,13 |
| 3:12 | 9:23 20:6 | 9:12,13,17 | 27:23 29:9 | 11:18,21 |
| courts 14:11 | demograp | 9:25 10:2 | East 3:25 | 11:25 12:4 |
| 15:18 | 3:18 | 10:7,9 | easy 30:18 | 12:7 13:6 |
| COVID 29:17 | described | 12:2,4,17 | effect 3:2 | 13:23 14:4 |
| crack 15:9 | 3:15 | 13:10,11 | 26:13 | 15:24 16:2 |
| create 3:20 | detailed | 13:19,22 | either 9:12 | 16:4,8,16 |
| 5:4 18:22 | 1:17 | 15:12,14 | elect 1:24 | 17:11,16 |
| created 5:2 | determine | 15:19 17:5 | elections | 17:23 18:3 |
| 5:5 | 10:7 | 17:5 18:13 | 9:2 | 18:18 19:3 |
| creating | difference | 18:22 20:1 | enacted 2:24 | 19:9,13,17 |
| 15:18 | 26:17 | 20:2,2,6,9 | 3:2 | 19:19 |
| cross 18:16 | differences | 20:11,13 | encompass | 20:16,25 |
| crucial | 18:14 | 20:13,20 | 5:18 | 21:3 22:1 |
| 12:23 | different | 20:23 21:9 | ensure 1:22 | 22:10,14 |
| crystal 13:8 | 4:2,8 9:2 | 21:14,15 | 2:2 | 22:21 23:4 |
| curious 9:4 | 14:21 | 21:18,24 | ensures 2:7 | 24:2,11,14 |
| current 3:18 | difficult | 23:14 | 2:13,17 | 25:1 26:1 |
| 18:10 | 5:20 | 24:19 25:9 | ensuring | 27:11,17 |
| currently | difficulty | 25:11,12 | 4:13 | 28:3,6,9 |
| 20:20 | 14:22 | 26:10,11 | entire 18:16 | 28:12 29:5 |
| cutting | digging | 27:8,8 | exactly | 29:20 30:5 |
| 24:22 | 18:15 | 28:20,21 | 15:20 | 30:8,12,19 |
|  | directed | 28:22,23 | example 18:3 | $30: 23$ 32:2 |
| D | 14:12 | 28:24 | extend 2:19 | 32:5,12,21 |
| Dated 33:15 | discourse | 29:16,19 | extra 11:20 | figure 8:20 |
| day $2: 25$ | 2:10 | districts |  | fill 12:9 |
| DC 1:20 2:16 | discuss 22:7 | 1:4,13 2:7 | F | finalize |
| deal 22:24 | discussing | 2:14 3:6 | factor 5:14 | 30:10 |
| dealing 6:13 | 18:21 | 3:13,20 | 5:16 28:25 | finalized |
| decade 1:25 | discussion | 4:12,14 | 28:25 29:6 | 31:21 |
| decides 2:4 | 29:21 | 5:3 7:15 | factors 29:3 | Finally 2:20 |
| decision | discussions | 15:1,4,5,6 | far 24:21 | fine 18:25 |
| 5:25 | 19:5 32:8 | 16:21 | 31:3 | firmly 4:9 |
| decisions | 32:9,14 | 20:13,15 | favor 24:17 | first 1:18 |
| 14:17 | distingu | divide 15:9 | favorable | 3:11 14:7 |
| declared | 28:10 | doing 13:3,4 | 32:15,18 | fix 30:18 |
| 14:19 | district | 19:7 27:23 | federal 1:14 | fixed 31:25 |
| decrease | 1:15,15,24 | 30:2 | 2:22 3:4,5 | fixing 26:23 |
| 21:20 | 2:23 3:4 | draw 4:6 | 3:10 4:14 | floor 22:11 |
| defense 8:25 | 3:12,16,16 | drawing 5:25 | 13:24 29:2 | 29:25 30:2 |
| defer 32:7 | 3:23,24 | 13:16 | female 14:1 | 32:8,10 |
| definitely | 4:5,15,20 | drawn 1:13 | FIELDS 1:1 | focus 2:15 |
| 24:22 | 5:4,6,13 | 3:23 | 1:10 4:17 | follows 7:1 |
| deliver | 5:17 6:4,9 | driven 3:15 | 4:24 5:12 | fortunate |
| 29:13,19 | 6:11,17,18 | drove 5:8,10 | 5:19 6:8 | 5:21 |
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| forward 14:9 | 24:18 | 21:13 | initially | 17:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| four 2: 8 | guess 5:19 | 24:18,23 | 16:18 | keeping |
| 4:13 19:25 | 6:21 9:4 | 26:12 | inserted | 16:20 |
| full 33:9 |  | impact 16:24 | 22:19 | keeps 13:2 |
| fund 8:25 | H | imperatives | installa | 18:3,4 |
| fundamen. | halls 2:3 | 3:14 | 15:13 | kept 15:12 |
| 26:4 | handle 22:12 | implicat. | instance | kind 5:19 |
| further | happened | 20:10 | 15:12 | 9:12 15:8 |
| 12:16 19:5 | 26:5 29:12 | importance | intended | 15:14 |
| 19:13 | happy 4:15 | 28:21 | 31:24 | 17:25 |
| 32:14 | hard 27:23 | important | interest | Kleinpeter |
| 33:11 | 30:3 | 4:5 12:21 | 15:8,9,15 | 24:14,15 |
|  | hate 13:14 | 21:17 | 29:3 | knew 22:3 |
| G | 28:9 | 28:23 29:8 | interested | know 1: 12,18 |
| general 3:8 | hear 29:23 | 29:11 30:3 | 33:14 | 4:19 5:24 |
| 14:18,18 | heard 4:25 | inaudible | interfere | 6:12 9:4 |
| gentleman | 8:23 22:4 | 3:4 7:1,12 | 17:7 | 14:7,12,13 |
| 29:23 32:6 | 22:5 27:12 | 8:2,5,11 | introducing | 14:15 |
| 32:6,12 | 28:5 29:20 | 19:15 | 1:16 | 16:19,19 |
| gerryman. | hearing | 21:11 | involve | 16:24 17:3 |
| 14:25 | 14:14 | 23:17,19 | 20:11 | 18:14,24 |
| give 17:16 | 16:12 | 23:22 27:5 | involved | 22:2 27:20 |
| 18:9,11 | 28:18 29:9 | 27:20 | 33:13 | 27:22 30:2 |
| 19:12,21 | 32:17 | 30:25 31:4 | issue 22:25 |  |
| 28:15 30:6 | Heather | 31:10,13 | 26:4 28:5 | L |
| given 1:13 | 12:10 | 31:18 32:4 | issues 6:13 | Lafayette |
| 3:17 28:21 | help 25:18 | include 4:1 | 18:1 31:21 | 6:25 |
| go 17:24 | helping 17:8 | includes | it'd11:16 | largely 3:15 |
| 24:23 31:3 | high 3:18 | 3:24 |  | lastly 29:5 |
| goals 1:18 | home 2:15 | incorpor | J | law 3:5 |
| 4:5,11 | hometown | 26:20 | Jenkins 21:3 | leader 2:12 |
| goes 6:24 | 24:17 | increase | 21:4,20 | 4:13 5:9 |
| 11:16 | hope 28:11 | 20:8,8 | 26:2,3,15 | 5:24 13:1 |
| going 5:5 | hopefully | 25:19 | 26:21 27:2 | leadership |
| 17:13 19:3 | 30:10 | increases | 27:4,9,11 | 2:16 3:8 |
| 19:10 | house 2:11 | 20:5,23 | job 12:25 | lean 32:5 |
| 23:11 | 2:12 5:20 | 21:17 | 13:3,21 | legal 8:24 |
| 24:22 | 5:23 12:19 | 28:19 | Johnson 2:12 | legislative |
| 30:12 32:5 | 12:20 | increasing | 4:12 5:9 | 3:8 |
| good 13:8 | hurricane | 20:7 | 12:25 | legislature |
| 30:22 | 29:12,16 | incumbent | 13:18 | 14:17 |
| 31:19 | 29:17 | 8:9 | judge 29:2 | let's 24:2,2 |
| 32:11 | hurricanes | incumbents | Julia 1:19 | 30:19 |
| Governme. | 29:10 | 1:23 13:14 | 5:10 12:16 | 32:22 |
| 33:4 |  | individuals | 13:1,18 | Letlow 1:19 |
| great 1:25 | I | 25:20 |  | 1:19,22 |
| 2:5,13 | I-49 4:1 | information | K | 2:1 5:10 |
| 12:25 13:3 | 6:24 | 18:9 25:15 | Katrina | 6:3 12:16 |
| 13:21 | Iberville | inherently | 29:12 | 13:1,3,18 |
| growing | 20:21 | 21:6,6 | keep 13:3 | Letlow's |
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| 4:11 | majority.. | microphone | need 2:16 | okay 6:8 7:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| level $24: 21$ | 5:2 13:11 | 8:15 | 12:9 16:5 | 8:13 9:15 |
| listed 20:1 | 15:4,19 | Middle 1:15 | 27:25 | 10:3,11,22 |
| litigation | making 27:24 | 2:22 4:15 | neither | 11:2,11,18 |
| 1:14 2:25 | 29:12,17 | Miguez 18: 6 | 33:11 | 11:24 |
| 3:4 4:3 | MALE 8:2 | 18:7 23:4 | new 3:24 | 13:23 16:6 |
| little 18:8 | 10:21 16:6 | 23:5,18,20 | 20:11 23:9 | 16:8 17:12 |
| long 1:17 | 30:25 31:4 | 23:25 24:3 | 23:13 | 19:3 20:16 |
| 2:4,4 | 31:10,13 | 24:7,13 | 24:24 | 22:1 23:4 |
| 30:16 | 31:17 32:4 | Mike 2:12 | 29:12,14 | 24:7 25:14 |
| look 6:6,16 | managing | 13:18 | 29:15 | 25:25 |
| 6:16 17:17 | 14:23 | military | nominee 8:22 | 26:21 27:2 |
| 17:21,25 | map 1:16 2:2 | 15:13 | north 18:2 | 27:9,11 |
| 21:10,11 | 2:7,13,17 | Miller 25:1 | 26:6 | 29:20 |
| 29:11 | 4:2,4,8 | 25:2,7,14 | northern | 31:19 32:2 |
| looking 6:13 | 5:8,10,25 | 25:22,25 | 13:2 26:7 | old 24:19 |
| 7:22 19:22 | 7:22 9:6,7 | mind 18:8 | 26:9,14 | ongoing 1:15 |
| 23:11,12 | 9:17 10:8 | minor 20:22 | notable | 2:22 |
| 26:11,15 | 10:8 12:15 | 21:16 | 18:14 | opening 1:9 |
| 26:18 | 12:24 13:9 | minority 6:9 | noted 16:9 | opens 30:2 |
| looks 5:4 | 13:16 | 6:18 | noticed | opinion |
| 15:15 | 14:21 | minority. | 15:12 | 24:24 |
| lot 6:2,5,5 | 15:16 | 13:10 | number 4:7 | opportunity |
| Louisiana | 18:14 | minute 7:17 | 9:5 10:17 | 3:11 15:19 |
| 1:3,13,16 | 20:15 | minutes | 20:7 | 30:9 |
| 2:8,19,23 | 21:10,11 | 17:21 22:9 | numbers 12:6 | oppose 28:9 |
| 3:19 4:6 | 24:24 | Monroe 11:10 | 15:21 | opposition |
| 4:15 5:21 | maps 2:20,24 | 11:10 | 18:12 | 16:7,9 |
| 6:7,7 13:2 | 14:8 | move 7:14 | 19:22 | options 4:8 |
| 26:6,8,10 | March 2:24 | 14:9 21:14 |  | order 3:10 |
| 26:14 | 33:15 | 27:15,18 | 0 | 3:12 |
| Louisiana's | math 25:5 | moved 11:7,8 | objections | original |
| 2:6 12:17 | mean 26:4,16 | 11:9 16:10 | 16:11,12 | 24:10 |
| Louisianans | means 33:5 | 32:15 | 32:16,18 | Orleans 3:24 |
| 2:2 | member 12:18 | moves 20:2 | objective | 29:12,14 |
| M | members 1:7 | multiple 9:1 | obligation | Ouachita |
| maintain | 5:22,23 | 18:16 | 28:13 | 11:9,9 |
| 21:23 | 7:4 12:1,8 | muscle 6:6 | odds 28:20 | outcome |
| maintaining | 13:5,15,25 |  | offer 12:14 | 33:14 |
| 4:12 | 14:1 16:14 | N | 13:4 17:12 | outlined |
| maintains | 17:8 18:23 | Nathan 33:2 | 17:13,13 | 29:1 |
| 31:15,17 | 19:25 | 33:17 | offered | overall |
| major 15:13 | 27:12 | nation's | 26:25 | 11:15 |
| majority | 29:20 | 2:20 | 31:23 |  |
| 2:12,18 | 32:20 | national | offering | P |
| 3:7,13,20 | Men 13:8 | 2:10,15 | 13:13 | pandemic |
| 4:13 5:9 | mentioned | nature 23:1 | 26:20 | 29:17 |
| 5:24 8:8 | 22:25 33:7 | necessarily | oh 19:5 | papers 18:16 |
| 13:1 | merits 14:14 | 9:21 14:12 | 23:14 25:9 | parish 3:24 |
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| 3:25 11:5 | 8:10,12,13 | 12:24 | 8:24 | questions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:6,7,9 | 8:21 9:3 | politics 5:8 | pride 2:1 | 4:16,18 |
| 11:20,22 | 9:18 20:7 | population | primary 5:18 | 7:3,4 |
| 11:24 | 25:11,13 | 3:13,17,19 | principles | 11:25 12:7 |
| 20:19,20 | percentage | 3:25 4:1 | 2:18 29:1 | 25:3 |
| 20:21 | 21:23 | 6:9,10,12 | printed 9:17 | quick 17:16 |
| 21:13 | percentages | 7:23 18:12 | prior 3:8 | 25:3 30:18 |
| 23:10,13 | 12:1 | 20:23 25:4 | problem | quickly $22: 9$ |
| parishes | perfect | 25:7,9,10 | 17:18 21:7 | quite 30:25 |
| 4:19,21 | 13:10 | 25:12 | 22:6 |  |
| 5:1 11:14 | 29:24 | portion 3:19 | proceed 1:11 | R |
| 13:12,12 | perfecting | positive | 11:2 | race 5:13 |
| 16:20 17:2 | 13:16 17:1 | 6:18 | process 1:17 | 8:10 9:3 |
| 17:18 | perform 6:15 | possible | product 1:17 | 10:4 13:15 |
| 20:17,22 | 8:20 25:16 | 16:21 17:3 | prolonged | 28:14,16 |
| 21:1 22:15 | 25:18 | powerful | 3:3 | Rapides 11: 6 |
| 24:18 | 28:24 | 14:1 | proposed 2:7 | 11:7,8 |
| 26:12 | performance | precincts | 2:17,21 | read 8:1 |
| 28:15 29:7 | 6:16,17 | 20:1 21:12 | 4:3 9:7 | readily 18:9 |
| part 5:11 | 8:4,6 9:1 | 21:14,15 | 20:15 | ready 24:7 |
| 6:4 24:19 | 9:3, 6, 12 | predominant | 21:10,12 | 27:19 |
| 31:25 | 9:13 25:23 | 5:3,14,15 | proposing | 29:22 32:3 |
| particular | performed | 13:15 | 1:21 | realize |
| 9:6 | 7:16 28:22 | 28:14,25 | protect | 27:25 |
| particul | performing | 29:6 | 13:14,25 | really 15:5 |
| 17:4 | 28:20 | predomin. | 18:23 | 15:7 18:14 |
| parties | performs | 5:10 15:3 | protecting | 24:8 |
| 33:13 | 7:18 8:7 | prefer 22:12 | 4:11 12:25 | reason 3:23 |
| party 9:22 | 9:25 10:1 | prepared | 13:13 | 5:3 13:13 |
| 10:4 | 10:8 | 17:12 | protects | 13:16 |
| pass 1:8 | person 3:21 | presence 2:3 | 12:16 | 14:21 |
| 28:14 | 14:16 | 2:9 | proud 2:11 | 28:14,15 |
| 29:24 | personal | present 15:2 | provide | recess 17:25 |
| 30:12,13 | 33:12 | presented | 27:15 | 22:8 |
| 30:19, 21 | picked 21:5 | 24:25 | provides 1:2 | recognized |
| 32:7 | Pikover 33:2 | preserve | pull 10:20 | 1:11 12:10 |
| passed 17:1 | 33:17 | 15:16 | 10:22 | 19:20 |
| 22:24 | pitfalls | pretty 12:1 | 16:18 | record 16:9 |
| 23:24 | 14:24 | previous | pulls 16:23 | 24:23 |
| 31:12 | plaintiffs | 22:18,19 | put 4:20 6:4 | Red 6:21,23 |
| Pause 1: 5 | 4:3 | 23:23 | 6:7 11:6 | 7:1 |
| 11:1 16:3 | plead 29:23 | 26:18,24 | 16:22 | redistri |
| 17:10,15 | please 1:8 | 28:1,18 |  | 1:3 3:1 |
| 19:16,18 | 12:11 | 31:8,15,22 | Q | Reese 14:4,6 |
| 19:23 | point 19:1 | 31:23 | question | 15:11,21 |
| 21:25 31:6 | 24:8 | previously | 7:11,14,16 | 15:25 |
| people 27:20 | pointed 22:7 | 29:4 | 7:19,21 | 16:10 |
| 29:7 | political | Price 4:25 | 8:18,19 | 32:14 |
| percent 3:17 | 3:14 4:4 | 24:21 | 9:8,25 | regarding |
| 7:23,25 | politically | Price's 5:5 | 14:5 25:14 | 22:25 |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

| regardless | 24:16 | Scalise 2:12 | 15:10,11 | 32:14,19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9:22 | respond 2:21 | 4:13 5:9 | 15:20,21 | senator's |
| region 12:23 | responsi | 13:1 | 15:25 | 18:19 |
| registered | 14:16 | seat 4:11 | 16:10,14 | serve 2:5 |
| 7:24,24 | rest 30:14 | 9:4 | 17:20,24 | show 16:17 |
| 20:5 21:23 | retained | seats 2:8 | 18:5,7 | 18:21 |
| registra | 2:18 | second 2:6 | 19:1,5,7 | shows 18:19 |
| 6:10,11 | review 24 : 8 | 7:19 13:10 | 19:12,15 | 18:20 |
| relates | reviewed 4:4 | 17:16 | 19:17,19 | Shreveport |
| 18:12 | 33:8 | 19:12,21 | 19:21,24 | 4:2 6:25 |
| remainder | revised 31:2 | secondary | 20:16,18 | significant |
| 1:25 | revisions | 5:16 | $21: 2,3,4,9$ | 21:17 |
| remaining | 22:23 | secretary | 21:12,20 | 25:21 |
| 15:4 | 31:16 | 3:7 | 21:22 22:4 | Similarly |
| remains 1:22 | rework 23:1 | see 8:7 | 22:12,15 | 29:16 |
| 28:23 | 23:25 | 16:10 | 22:16, 20 | simple 12:13 |
| remember | right 1:10 | 17:25 18: | 22:22,24 | sir 1:11 |
| 7:19 | 4:17,23,24 | 21:4 24:8 | 23:4,5,8 | 6:15 10:24 |
| repeat $8: 16$ | 5:12 6:19 | 26:5 27:9 | 23:16,18 | 14:3 17:23 |
| report 9:16 | 7:3 10:16 | Senate 1:2, 2 | 23:19,20 | sit 12:14 |
| reported | 11:13,25 | 4:21 5:1,1 | 23:21,25 | 13:4 |
| 32:15,16 | 12:8 14:4 | 10:16 | 24:3,5,7 | sits 6:3 |
| 32:18 | 15:20,22 | 13:19 | 24:11,12 | six 2: 6 |
| reporting | 17:2 19:3 | 32:15,17 | 24:13,14 | slight 20:8 |
| 32:17 | 19:8,19 | Senator 1:1 | 24:15,16 | 27:7 |
| represen | 20:8 22:14 | 1:2,6,10 | 24:20 25:1 | slightly |
| 15:6 29:13 | 22:21 | 1:12 4:18 | 25:2,6,7,8 | 20:5,21 |
| 29:18 | 23:15 | 4:23, 25 | 25:14,17 | 21:2 |
| represen | 26:12 | 5:5,7,15 | 25:22,24 | small $21: 16$ |
| 1:20 | 27:12 28:6 | 6:1,15,23 | 25:25 26:1 | 21:16 |
| represen... | 30:5,19 | $7: 5,6,8,10$ | 26:1,3,7 | 25:20,20 |
| 2:11 5:23 | 32:13,21 | $7: 12,13,20$ | 26:15,17 | 30:17 |
| 12:22 | Rights 1:14 | 7:21 8:3,4 | 26:19,21 | solidly 2:14 |
| represented | 2:22 14:23 | 8:9,11,13 | 26:22,25 | solves 31:21 |
| 4:10 | 14:25 | 8:15,17,18 | 27:1,2,3,4 | soon 16:23 |
| represen. | River 6:21 | 8:21,23,24 | 27:6,9,11 | sorry 7: 8,13 |
| 14:17 | 6:24 7:1 | 9:11,14,15 | 27:14,17 | 8:5,13,16 |
| Republican | Rouge 3:25 | 9:16,20 | $27: 22$ 28:4 | 10:25 18:5 |
| 1:24 2:8,8 | 20:19,20 | 10:3,6,10 | 28:7,11,17 | 26:8 |
| $2: 14$ 4:13 | 21:13 | 10:11,13 | 28:18,19 | Sounds 32:11 |
| 12:13 | 24:18, 22 | 10:14,15 | 29:8,21 | southeast |
| requesting | 26:12 | 10:17,19 | $30: 1,6,9$ | 3:19 |
| 9:11 | run 25:22 | 10:21,22 | 30:13,16 | speaker 2:11 |
| requirement |  | 10:25 11:3 | 30:20,20 | 4:12 5:8 |
| $3: 22$ | S | 11:4,12,16 | 30:22, 24 | 5:20,24 |
| requires 3:5 | safe $2: 8$ | 11:20,23 | $31: 2,3,5,7$ | 8:2 10:21 |
| residents | 5:12 | 12:3,5,9 | 31:8, 9, 11 | 12:25 16:6 |
| 12:21 | satisfy 17:6 | 12:12,19 | $31: 14,19$ | $30: 25$ 31:4 |
| respect | save 18:8 | 13:7,17 | 31:23,24 | 31:10,13 |
| 17:21 | saw 16:19 | 14:3,4,6,7 | 32:11,13 | $31: 17$ 32:4 |
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| speaks 15:14 | 22:18 23:1 | 33:14 | two 2:14 3:6 | 14:23,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| split 4:21 | 23:2 28:5 | thing 26:22 | 3:13,20 | 18:12 25:3 |
| 4:23 5:1 | sure 26:4 | things 6:20 | 5:2,21,22 | 25:6,7,8 |
| 11:6,15 | 28:13 | 23:2 | 12:22 14:1 | 25:10,12 |
| 13:12 15:9 | swap 21:18 | think 8:15 | 19:25 | vs 5:4 |
| 18:10,19 | 26:8,10,24 | 9:10,10 | 20:21,25 |  |
| 20:17,19 | 27:7 | 12:24 | 22:15 | W |
| 20:25 29:6 | swaps 19:25 | 26:17 | 24:17 25:2 | want 10:19 |
| splits 11:18 |  | 28:12,17 | 25:2 28:15 | 10:19, 20 |
| 13:12 | T | 28:17, 22 | 29:6 | 12:13,14 |
| 17:18 18:5 | table 27:1 | 30:24 |  | 13:20 16:5 |
| 18:20 | take 4:16 | thought | U | 16:22,24 |
| 20:25 25:4 | 12:11 | 14:19 30:4 | ultimately | 17:4,12 |
| splitting | 14:12,20 | thousand | 14:13,25 | 18:24 |
| 22:15 | 22:18 23:1 | 20:9,24 | unaware 2:24 | wanted 16:17 |
| 28:15 | 23:2 30:16 | three 19:25 | understa | 16:18 |
| staff 20:12 | talked 29:9 | 20:22 | 20:12 | 24:23 |
| 22:5,5 | 29:10 | time 8:10,12 | 22:17 | Washington |
| $30: 7$ 32:2 | talking | 9:19 14:20 | 23:16 | 1:20 2:16 |
| 32:3,3 | 15:22 | 18:8 19:10 | 25:17 28:4 | wasn't5:18 |
| stand 12:14 | 27:19 | 27:14 30:8 | undo 27: 6 | 31:24 32:1 |
| started 29:9 | team 33:6,12 | 32:6 | 31:14,22 | way 5:4 9:8 |
| state 2:5,13 | technical | top-ranking | 31:22 | 19:10 |
| 3:6,7 6:7 | 22:22 | 5:22 | unimpaired | 27:18 |
| 12:23 17:4 | 26:22 | total 7:23 | 1:22 | 33:13 |
| 24:21 | terms 9:5 | touch 27:7 | United 2:9 | ways 13:9 |
| state's 3:17 | 15:18 | transcribed | utilizing | we're 5:20 |
| stated 12:19 | 21:16 | 33:4,8 | 33:5 | 15:22,22 |
| statement $12: 13$ | test 8:5 | Transcri. | V | 18:21 |
| States 2:9 | 23:8 | 33:12,17 | VAP 25:10 | 24:20,21 |
| stay 12:1 | testifying | transcript | version | 26:18 |
| Steve 2:12 | 27:1 | 33:7 | 18:11 24:9 | 30:12 |
| stickler | testimony | transcri | 24:10 | we've 14:21 |
| 16:20 | 4:25 28:18 | 33:1,6,10 | view 3:5 | 15:25 |
| storms 29:10 | tests 8: 6 | 33:12 | voice 24:24 | 29:11 |
| strength | 9:12 25:23 | travels 3:25 | vote 3:21 | weigh 5:25 |
| 28:23 | Thank 1:6,12 | tremendo | 7:25 8:14 | 6:2 |
| strictly 5:7 | 4:17 7:13 | 2:10 | 8:21 19:10 | went 3:1 |
| strong 4:12 | 10:11,13 | tried 4:19 | 20:6 21:18 | West 11:9 |
| structure | 12:12 13:5 | 15:5 16:19 | voter 6:9 | 20:19,19 |
| 14:21 | 13:6 14:6 | 16:21 17:2 | voters 3:7 | 21:13 |
| subject 2:25 | 16:14 18:7 | true 33:10 | 20:4 25:19 | 24:18, 22 |
| submit 4:9 | 19:24 23:5 | try 16:20 | 30:18 | 26:12 |
| substantial | 23:5 24:15 | trying 5:17 | votes 20:9 | whatsoever |
| 3:3 | 25:2,25 | 5:18 13:24 | 20:24 21:5 | 27:7 |
| succeed 3:9 | 26:1 27:10 | 15:2,7 | 21:8 | win 9:18 |
| support | 32:12,13 | 18:16,21 | voting 1:14 | wins 8:9 |
| 12:15 13:5 | 32:19,21 | 18:23 21:4 | 2:22 3:13 | wish 12:10 |
| supposed | thereof | 26:3,5 | 3:17 4:9 | 27:12 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 20 \\ & \text { withdraw } \\ & 19: 4 \\ & \text { Womack 1:1,2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 14 \quad 28: 3 \\ & 28: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | 53. 1217 :23 <br> $53.61225: 13$ <br> 54.18921:24 <br> 54.3 6:11 <br> 56.16:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 |  |
|  |  | 23:16,23 |  |
|  |  | 6:97:21 |  |
|  | Z | 7:22,25 |  |
| 1:6,10,12 | 0 | 8:7,19 9:6 |  |
| $4: 23$ $5: 15$ $5: 15$ $6: 1$ | $\frac{0}{0: 03: 353: 5}$ | 9:7,13,18 | -6 |
| $5: 15$ 6:1 $6: 15,23$ | 0:09:35 7: 0 | 10:7,21 | 63:16, |
| 7:6,20 8:3 | 0:09:507:13 | 18:13 20:1 | 5:13 6:17 |
| 8:9,13,17 | 0:10:568:2 | 20:13, 20 | 6:21 7:17 |
| 8:21 9:14 | 0:11:028:5 | 20:24 21:5 | 9:12 18:13 |
| 9:16 10:3 | 0:11:438:11 | 21:14,18 | 20:2,11,14 |
| 10:10,15 | 0:29:27 | 21:19,24 | 21:9,13,15 |
| 10:16,17 | $19: 15$ $0: 33: 36$ | 25:4,9,11 | 21:19,21 |
| 10:19, 22 | 0:33:36 | 26:10 27:8 | 21:22,22 |
| 10:25 11:4 | $21: 11$ $0.36: 41$ | 28:20,22 | 22:1 23:14 |
| 11:12,16 | 0:36:41 | 2021:15 | 25:4,12 |
| 11:20,23 | 23:17 $0: 36: 43$ | 2022 2:25 | 26:8,11 |
| 12:3,5,19 | $0: 36: 43$ $23: 19$ | 3:1 | 27:8 |
| $14: 715: 10$ $15: 20$ | 23:19 $0: 36: 49$ | $202433: 15$ | 608:10,11 |
| 15:20 | $0: 36: 49$ $23: 23$ | 22 21:15 | $8: 13,21$ $6 \operatorname{th} 5: 46: 11$ |
| $16: 14$ $17: 20,24$ | 0:40:0927:5 | 2621:15 | 6th $5: 4 \mathrm{6}$ 6:11 $12: 4,5$ |
| 19:1 21:12 | 0:41:02 | 290872-A. 33:3 | 17:5 |
| 22:20,24 | $27: 21$ 0.44 .47 | 2nd 12:2 | 7 |
| $26: 25$ $28: 19$ | 0:45:0231:4 | 3 | 8 |
| 30:20,22 | 0:45:30 | $316: 6$ | 81:2,2 4:22 |
| 31:9, 24 | 31:10 | 3,000 20:3,4 | 21:13 |
| 32:19 | 0:45:34 | 27:20 29:7 | 32:15,17 |
| woman 12:13 | 31:13 | 30:18 | 8th 33:15 |
| $12: 17$ work 2.1 | $0: 45: 41$ $31: 18$ | 3410:15,17 | 9 |
| work $2: 1$ | $31: 18$ $0: 46: 1332: 4$ | 4 |  |
| 27:23 30:3 |  | 45:1,1 |  |
| working 17:1 | 1 | 30:25 31:4 |  |
| 24:6 | 18:2 | 31:10,13 |  |
| wrong 23:12 | 10-17:24 | 31:17 |  |
| X | $1009: 3,18$ $115: 13: 11$ | 4th 15:11,14 |  |
|  | $154: 21$ | 5 |  |
| Y | 11:17 | 532:4 |  |
| y'all 7:7 | 17:18 | $503: 16$ |  |
| 25:22,22 | 15-minute | 51.132 25:11 |  |
| yeah 8:15 | 17:25 | 52.66:10 |  |
| 9:10 12:5 | 1611:17 | 52.6597:25 |  |
| 16:6,8 | 13:12 | 52.823 20:7 |  |
| 18:18 | 1B21:12 | 21:24 |  |
| 19:15 | 1C 21:12 | 53.16:10 |  |
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MALE SPEAKER: Senate will come to order. Sector, open machines. Members, vote your machines. OCHA, machines. Senator McMath is here. Senator Pressly. Senator Morris. Senator Talbot. Senator Talbot is here. Senator Connick is here. 36 members are present for a quorum. Senate will rise. Senator Mizell will -- will open the senate in prayer and also lead us in the -- for the Pledge of Allegiance.

MS. MIZELL: Thank you, Mr. President.
Members, before we pray, $I$ just want to say, we are all here for a time such as this. I -- I haven't heard one member say this is easy, and I -- I just -- I think it would be appropriate if we join together in the Lord's Prayer of unifying our body and reaching out to God. If you'd join me. Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.

And lead us not to temptation, deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen. Thank you. Join me in the pledge, please.
(Pledge of Allegiance.)
MALE SPEAKER: Reading of the journal.

MS. MIZELL: Official Journal of the Senate of the state of Louisiana, Second day's proceedings, Tuesday, January 16th, 2024

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Hodges moves to dispense the reading of the journal without objection.

MS. MIZELL: Petitions, memorials, and communications, I am in receipt of a letter from the president appointing the parliamentarians, Senator Gregory Miller. Messages from the house, the house is finally passed and asked for concurrence in the following house bills and joint resolutions. House Bill 16. House Bill 8 , respectfully submit headed. Michelle Fontenot, Clerk of the House. Introduction of House bills. Senator Talbot now moves for suspension of the rules for the purpose of reading the house bills the first and second time and referring them to Committee.

House Bill 8 by Representative Mike Johnson is an act to Entitled 13 relative to the Supreme Court to provide relative to redistricting Supreme Court Justice districts. It is referred to senate and governmental affairs. House Bill 16 by Representative McFarland is an act to appropriate funds and to make certain reductions from certain sources to be allocated to the designated agencies and purposes in specific amounts for making of supplemental appropriations. Refer to

Page 3
finance.
MALE SPEAKER: Oh, Senator O'Connor for an introduction.

MALE SPEAKER 2: (inaudible 0:04:15).
MALE SPEAKER: Oh, okay.
MALE SPEAKER 2: It's okay.
MALE SPEAKER: Never mind. It's -- that zip sound? Senate bills on third reading and final passage.

MS. MIZELL: First bill? Senator Womack now moves for a suspension of the rules for the purpose of calling out of order, Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack. It's an act to amend Title 18 relative to congressional districts to provide for the redistricting of Louisiana's congressional

FEMALE SPEAKER: To provide with respect to positions and offices other than congressional, which are based on congressional districts.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack, on your bill.
SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I bring Senate Bill Number 8 before you this evening. As you know, Louisiana congressional districts must be drawn, given the Federal Voting Rights Act litigation that is still ongoing in the US District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana. This map in the bill that I'm introducing, which is the product of a
long, detailed process, achieves several goals.
First, as you know and you're aware of,
Congresswoman Julia Letlow is my representative in
Washington, DC. The boundaries in the bill I'm proposing ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in a congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade. I have great pride in the work of Congresswoman Letlow and -- that she's accomplished, and this map will ensure that Louisianans will continue to benefit from her presence in the halls of the Congress for as long as she decides to continue to serve this great state

Second. Louisiana has six congressional districts. The map that's proposed bill ensures that four are safe Republican seats. Louisiana Republican presence in the United States' countours has contributed tremendously to the national discourse, and I'm very proud that both Speaker of the US House of Representatives, Mike Johnson, and US House Majority Leader Steve Scalise are both from our great state. This map ensures that two of them will have solidly Republican districts at home, so they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC. The map that's proposed in this bill ensures conservative
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principle is retained by the majority of those in Louisiana and will continue to extend past our boundaries to the nation's capital.

Third. The corridor that you see on the map that -- that you have on your -- your table, if you'll notice the map runs up Red River, which is barge traffic, commerce. It also has I-49, which is a -which is -- goes from Lafayette to Shreveport, which is also a corridor for our state that is very important to our commerce. We have a college. We have education along that corridor. We have a presence with ag with our row crop, as well as our cattle industry all up along Red River in those parishes

A lot of people from that area, the Natchitoches Parish, as well as Alexandria, use Alexandria for -- for -- for their healthcare, their hospitals, and so forth in that area. So finally, the amounts in the proposed bill responds appropriate to the ongoing Federal Voting Rights Act in the Middle District of Louisiana. For those who are unaware, the congressional amounts that we enacted in 2022 of March have been the subject of litigation, roughly since the day -- the 2022 Congressional Redistricting Bill went into effect. Even before we enacted it

After a substantial amount of prolonged

|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | litigation, the Federal District Court has adhered to | 1 | common with one another within the district? |
| 2 | its view that the federal law requires that the state | 2 | SENATOR WOMACK: No, I didn't because it was |
| 3 | have two congressional districts with a majority of | 3 | -- it was -- we had to draw two districts, and that's |
| 4 | Black voters. Our secretary of state, attorney general, | 4 | the only way we could get two districts. One of the |
| 5 | and our prior legislative leadership appealed that, but | 5 | ways we could get two districts, and still protect our |
| 6 | have yet to succeed. And we are now here because of the | 6 | political interest. |
| 7 | federal court order, that we have to have first | 7 | SENATOR MORRIS: Well, one of the things you |
| 8 | opportunity to act. The district court order that we | 8 | said earlier was that -- that we had in common the |
| 9 | must have two majority voting-age population districts, | 9 | agriculture. You mentioned that. That's a community of |
| 10 | combined with the political impurities I just described, | 10 | interest. So you did consider agriculture as being |
| 11 | have largely -- largely driven the boundaries of | 11 | something that everybody had in common with this |
| 12 | District Two and District Six on your map, both of which | 12 | district, or? |
| 13 | are over 50 percent voting -- Black voting age | 13 | SENATOR WOMACK: My comment was -- was the |
| 14 | population. | 14 | fact that it was along that corridor. Ag was along that |
| 15 | Given the state's current demographics, there | 15 | corridor some -- some -- not so much in that community |
| 16 | is not enough high Black population in the southeast | 16 | interest. Just maintaining -- bringing out the fact |
| 17 | portion of Louisiana to create two majority Black | 17 | that l-49 does go through there, and it does encompass |
| 18 | districts, and to also comply with the US Constitution | 18 | your -- your timberland, your ag, your hospitals. Just |
| 19 | one person, one vote requirement. That is the reason | 19 | trying to bring to light some of the positives going up |
| 20 | why District Two is drawn around Orleans Parish, while | 20 | that corridor. |
| 21 | District Six includes the Black population of East Baton | 21 | SENATOR MORRIS: So would you -- would you say |
| 22 | Rouge Parish and travels up the I-49 quarter to include | 22 | that the heart of this district is Northeast Louisiana |
| 23 | Black population in Shreveport. While this is a | 23 | and North Central Louisiana? |
| 24 | different map than the Plaintiffs' litigation have | 24 | SENATOR WOMACK: I wouldn't say the heart of |
| 25 | proposed, this is the only map I reviewed that | 25 | the district is that way, but the way the district -- to |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 9 |
| 1 | accomplishes the political goals I believe that are | 1 | pick up the -- the -- and honor the courts, it had to be |
| 2 | important for my district, for Louisiana, and for the | 2 | drawn like it had to be drawn to pick that up. |
| 3 | country. | 3 | SENATOR MORRIS: So the -- is there a heart of |
| 4 | While I did not draw these boundaries myself, | 4 | the district? |
| 5 | I carefully considered the number of different map | 5 | SENATOR WOMACK: If it is, it'll be a small |
| 6 | options. I firmly submit that the congressional voting | 6 | majority of the heart. I don't think it's a -- it's a |
| 7 | boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the | 7 | -- it -- it has a heart of the district, but it had to |
| 8 | goals of protecting Congresswoman Letlow's seat, | 8 | start somewhere. |
| 9 | maintaining a strong district for Speaker Johnson, as | 9 | SENATOR MORRIS: Do you know what the most |
| 10 | well as Majority Leader Steve Scalise, ensuring four | 10 | populated parish is of Congressional District Five at |
| 11 | Republican districts, and adhering to the command of the | 11 | the current moment? |
| 12 | Federal Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. And | 12 | SENATOR WOMACK: I do not. I hadn't looked at |
| 13 | I ask for favorable passage. | 13 | that to -- to prove that myself. I (inaudible 0:08:54) |
| 14 | MALE SPEAKER: We have -- we have one question | 14 | -- could be Ouachita Parish. |
| 15 | by Senator Morris for -- | 15 | SENATOR MORRIS: Right. So Ouachita Parish, |
| 16 | SENATOR MORRIS: Senator Womack, among the | 16 | which is the most populated parish in Congressional |
| 17 | factors that you considered was the community of | 17 | District Five, which you seek to protect for |
| 18 | interest of the district. Something that was considered | 18 | Congresswoman Letlow. Your map cuts Ouachita Parish |
| 19 | in coming up with this version of the map that we have | 19 | into various pieces, does it not? And puts a lot of |
| 20 | before us. | 20 | that in Congressman Johnson's District Four, correct? |
| 21 | SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, this map was | 21 | SENATOR WOMACK: That's true. The way the map |
| 22 | strictly drawn from the political aspect of our | 22 | is drawn. That's in my bill. That is the way it's |
| 23 | congressman in -- in office is how it was drawn. | 23 | drawn. |
| 24 | SENATOR MORRIS: Did -- you didn't consider | 24 | SENATOR MORRIS: And like you, your -- I-- I |
| 25 | the community of interest of people having something in | 25 | think you indicated that Congresswoman Letlow is your |
|  |  |  | 3 (Pages 6 to 9) |
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congressperson, and -- and it's important to you for her to remain to be your Congresswoman; is that correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: Very important.
SENATOR MORRIS: Well, under your map, I would
be Congressman Johnson's -- in his district, and so
would Senator Cathey, and so would Representative
Echols; is that correct?
SENATOR WOMACK: That would be correct. I
don't -- I know -- I've been to your house, but I hadn't
been in any of the others, but I think you're correct.
SENATOR MORRIS: So that would be important to
me; did you know? But -- but this district as it's drawn now, would move Lincoln Parish and Louisiana Tech into Congressman Johnson's district; would it not?

SENATOR WOMACK: That's a possibility.
SENATOR MORRIS: Well, your map does -- map
does put Lincoln Parish -- all of Lincoln Parish into
Congressman Johnson's district; does it not?
SENATOR WOMACK: It does do that, yes.
SENATOR MORRIS: So -- but the district does
reach down into Baton Rouge; does it not?
SENATOR WOMACK: It does.
SENATOR MORRIS: And the district includes
Tiger Stadium in the district and also Joe Aillet
Stadium at -- in Louisiana Tech in Ruston.
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SENATOR WOMACK: In the minority district, in
district -- in District Two -- or District Six.
SENATOR MORRIS: Isn't it true that Tiger
Stadium in your -- on your map is located in
Congresswoman Letlow's district?
SENATOR WOMACK: Yes.
SENATOR MORRIS: And so is Joe Aillet Stadium at Louisiana Tech.

SENATOR WOMACK: Not -- not in -- not in that
district. She don't go into -- under my map, she doesn't go into Ruston.

SENATOR MORRIS: Under your map, all of Lincoln Parish is in Congresswoman -- that's Lincoln on the map right there. That's where Ruston is.

SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
SENATOR MORRIS: And so that is Congresswoman
-- that would be -- it's currently Congresswoman
Letlow's, but now it's going to be Congressman
Johnson's.
SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
SENATOR MORRIS: Okay. Right.
SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah.
SENATOR MORRIS: So they will be in different
districts. Tiger Stadium will be in Congresswoman -- I mean, yeah, Congresswoman Letlow's district, but
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yesterday, the bill as filed -- but now, under the current version of the bill, I am in Congressman Johnson's district.

SENATOR WOMACK: Okay.
SENATOR MORRIS: Don't you think we should have moved -- included Louisiana Tech and Ouachita Parish in the Northeast Louisiana Congressional District?

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, it's -- it's a lot of could have, and -- and -- and I regret that it's not, but we also have to look at the other members of Congress, and what we can live with concerning that.

SENATOR MORRIS: If your bill gets out of -off the floor today and goes over to the House, would you be amenable to amendments that would allow this district, as long as all the other requisites are -- are there for -- to comply with the judge's order, and to comply with, you know, the -- the community of interest and all the other redistricting principles that we have to abide by?

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, I have no problem in that, as long as it -- it -- it -- it -- it meets the requirements of the bill.

SENATOR MORRIS: Thank you, Senator. I appreciate your efforts, and I'm hopeful that we can --

|  | Page 14 |  | Page 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | as if -- assuming the bill does move, that we can | 1 | Despite those concerns, I stand in support of |
| 2 | perhaps find a resolution that can make everybody, if |  | this legislation. It still needs work, it must be |
| 3 | not absolutely happy, a little happier. Thank you. |  | amended, but I stand in support of it today, and I speak |
| 4 | SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Senator Morris. |  | only for today. I would like to read to you all a |
| 5 | MALE SPEAKER: Senator Stine for the floor. |  | statement from Congressman Carter, who currently |
|  | (Pause.) |  | represents the Second Congressional District. Many of |
| 7 | SENATOR STINE: Thank you, Mr. President. |  | us served with him either when we were in the House, or |
| 8 | Members of this esteemed chamber, today we stand at a |  | those of us who served with him in the Senate. Here's a |
| 9 | crossroads, burdened with a decision that weighs heavily |  | sta |
| 10 | on each of us. The congressional map before us, a | 10 | "My dear friends and colleagues, as I said on |
| 11 | construct far from our ideal, now demands our reluctant | 11 | the steps of the capital, I will work with anyone who |
| 12 | endorsement. It pains me, as it does many of you, to | 12 | wants to create two majority-minority districts. I am |
| 13 | navigate these troubled waters not of our own making, | 13 | not married to any one map. I have worked tirelessly to |
| 14 | but of a heavy-handed, Obama-appointed federal judge, | 14 | help create two majority-minority districts that |
| 15 | who has regrettably left us little room to maneuver. | 15 | perform. That's how I know that there may be better |
| 16 | This map, imperfect as itis, stands as a bulwark | 16 | ways to create -- to craft both of these districts. |
| 17 | protecting not just lines on a map, but the very pillars | 17 | There are multiple maps that haven't been reviewed at |
| 18 | of our representation in Congress. | 18 | all. However, the Womack map creates two |
| 19 | It safeguards the positions of pivotal | 19 | majority-minority districts, and therefore I am |
| 20 | figures, the United States Speaker of the House, the | 20 | supportive of it. And I urge my former colleagues and |
| 21 | majority leader, and notably, the sole female member of | 21 | friends to vote for it while trying to make both |
| 22 | our congressional delegation. Her role is not merely | 22 | districts stronger with appropriate amendment." |
| 23 | symbolic. She is a lynchpin in the appropriations, | 23 | "We do not want to jeopardize this rare |
| 24 | education, and workforce committees which are vital to | 24 | opportunity to give African American voters the equal |
| 25 | the prosperity and well-being of our state. We are the | 25 | representation they rightly deserve." And that's the |
|  | Page 15 |  | Page 17 |
| 1 | guardians of Louisiana's voice on the national stage | 1 | statement from Congressman Troy Carter. I expressed my |
| 2 | Our decision today, while constrained, is crucial. | 2 | concerss. They're serious concerns. It is my |
| 3 | It's about more than lines on a map. It's | 3 | expectation and my hope that this bill continue to be |
| 4 | about ensuring our state's continued influence in the | 4 | worked on, that amendments continue to happen, but today |
| 5 | halls of power where decisions are made that affect | 5 | I stand in support. Thank you. |
| 6 | every citizen we represent. So with a heavy heart, but | 6 | MALE SPEAKER: Senator Jackson for the floor. |
| 7 | a clear understanding of the stakes, unfortunately, we | T | (Pause.) |
| 8 | must pass this map before us instead of giving the pen | 8 | SENATOR JACKSON: He tried to cut off my mic. |
| 9 | to a heavy-handed, Obama-appointed federal judge who | 9 | (Pause.) |
| 10 | seeks to enforce her will on the legislature. Into an | 10 | MALE SPEAKER: Members, you have to talk |
| 11 | untenable situation, rather than acting as a co-equal | 11 | directly into the mic, unlike in previous times, where |
| 12 | branch of government as laid out in our constitution. | 12 | you could kind of talk around the mic. You have to |
| 13 | MALE SPEAKER: Senator Carter for the floor. | 13 | literally talk directly into the mic for it to work. |
| 14 | SENATOR CARTER: Thank you, Mr. President, | 14 | We're going to adjust that for the next -- |
| 15 | members. This proposed map by Senator Womack --well, | 15 | SENATOR JACKson: Hello. Okay. Good. |
| 16 | let me start with the current district, District Two. | 16 | (inaudible $0: 23: 11$ ) was going to have a fit if I wasn't |
| 17 | The current African American voting age population in | 17 | able to speak. I stand in support of this map. If first |
| 18 | District Two is currently 58 percent. This map proposed | 18 | want to thank Senator Womack, who had the fortitude, |
| 19 | by Senator Womack reduces it to barely 51 percent, and, | 19 | regardless of how we got here, but to stand up and do |
| 20 | Committe, the bill's author testified that no sort of | 20 | what the last body couldn't do, and that's to come |
| 21 | performance analysis had been conducted to determine | 21 | together. But I do stand to say this because I said it |
| 22 | whether or not District Two continues to consistently | 22 | in Committee. I reluctantly came to the floor to |
| 23 | perform as an African American district. There are | 23 | support this map because my constituents and a lot of |
| 24 | serious concerns about this map. There are serious | 24 | our constituents in North Louisiana right now are still |
| 25 | concerns about this proposal. |  | experiencing an ice state. That's what I call it |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | because we didn't get snow. | 1 | spirit of fairness that they asked me to carry in the |
| 2 | And so a lot of them don't even know that | 2 | last redistricting session. And I want to thank Senator |
| 3 | we're down here right now passing maps. And so this is | 3 | Womack because the mark of a true leader is a leader |
| 4 | the first time in a long time I'm probably going to vote | 4 | that not only does what he wants to do, but what's |
| 5 | for something that I haven't vetted through my | 5 | necessary to bring resolve and wholeness to a body that |
| 6 | constituency because tonight, myself, Representative | 6 | has to work together on a number of issues. Thank you. |
| 7 | Fisher and Representative Morrell will have a Zoom | 7 | MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Jackson. |
| 8 | community meeting to catch them up on what they have | 8 | Senator Duplessis for the floor. |
| 9 | lost while they were at home, because my legislative | 9 | SENATOR DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. President. |
| 10 | assistant was finally able to get to the office and at | 10 | Thank you, Chairman Womack. I just want to make a few |
| 11 | least send something out to our constituency. | 11 | brief comments based on some comments that have been |
| 12 | However, at some point, what they did tell me | 12 | made earlier today. I was not necessarily planning to |
| 13 | over and over again for the last year, year and a half | 13 | speak, but I think it's important that I just share a |
| 14 | that we've been going through this process, that they | 14 | thought or two. It was said that this is much more than |
| 15 | were supportive of fair and equitable maps, and that | 15 | just lines on a map, and I agree. It is much more than |
| 16 | they knew a fair and equitable -- equitable map would be | 16 | just lines on a map. We've heard a lot from Chairman |
| 17 | something that created fair representation for all | 17 | Womack and my colleague, Senator Stine about the |
| 18 | people in the State of Louisiana. I will end with this. | 18 | importance of protecting certain elected officials, but |
| 19 | I don't think we're in a -- in the hands of a | 19 | it's about more than lines on a map. It's about the |
| 20 | heavy-handed judge, but we're in the hands of | 20 | people of this state. It's about one-third of this |
| 21 | consequences that the last legislature created in our | 21 | state going underrepresented for too long. |
| 22 | failure to act. And I say that with a heart of hope | 22 | It's about a federal law called the Voting |
| 23 | that we act today on what is right, on what is just, and | 23 | Rights Act that has not been interpreted just by one |
| 24 | what is fair. | 24 | judge in the Middle District of Louisiana who was |
| 25 | I don't believe, and I said this before, any | 25 | appointed by former president Barack Obama, but also a |
|  | Page 19 |  | Page 21 |
| 1 | of my colleagues in this chamber would have it to be | 1 | US Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals that's made up of |
| 2 | that a certain group of people in the State of Louisiana | 2 | judges that were appointed by predominantly Republican |
| 3 | would not be properly represented. I am an American who | 3 | presidents, and a United States Supreme Court that has |
| 4 | stands every time the flag is presented. I proudly say | 4 | already made rulings. That has been made up of justices |
| 5 | one nation under God. And I hope today that in this | 5 | that were appointed by a majority of Republican |
| 6 | senate we will stand as one Louisiana under God, because | 6 | presidents, primarily former president Trump. This is |
| 7 | God is for what's just and what's equitable and what | 7 | not about one judge that was appointed by former |
| 8 | helps all people. | 8 | president Barack Obama. This is about the people of |
| 9 | There is nothing that says that a second | 9 | this state, and one-third of that state, 33 percent, to |
| 10 | African American serving in Congress in Louisiana will | 10 | be exact, being underrepresented. |
| 11 | not help the masses. Well, if we think that, then we | 11 | So I think it's important that we keep the |
| 12 | think that we're less or better than a person based on | 12 | focus on why we're here today. None of us want to be |
| 13 | race. If anyone in this chamber could articulate a | 13 | here today. We've been at this for well over two years, |
| 14 | reason why they believe that any African American that | 14 | and all of us have a level of reluctancy with the maps |
| 15 | sits before you today wouldn't go to Congress with the | 15 | that are before us. Just like Senator Carter, I'm not |
| 16 | same zeal and vigor and heart for the people, then maybe | 16 | thrilled about what's happening to send it to |
| 17 | we can say that there's not an African American in this | 17 | Congressional District Two, and the way that it's |
| 18 | state that's going to stand in Congress and represent | 18 | lowering the numbers. |
| 19 | us. | 19 | Senator Price and I, we coauthored a bill that |
| 20 | But l literally do not believe that there's a | 20 | we felt performed better, but we too are going to |
| 21 | colleague in here that looks across this chamber at any | 21 | support this map because not only have we been ordered |
| 22 | member of the Black caucus and does not believe that we | 22 | to do it by, yes, a judge who was appointed by President |
| 23 | wouldn't go to Congress and represent Louisiana. And so | 23 | Obama, but if we felt like the -- the -- the -- the |
| 24 | I stand in support, with reluctancy of having to talk to | 24 | appellate judges would overrule her, then we'd be right |
| 25 | my constituents after this vote, but with carrying the |  | back in court. We're at the end of the road, and Itoo |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | will support this -- this map. Not because I think it's | 1 | MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Pressly. |
| 2 | perfect, not because I think it's the best thing that we | 2 | The board is clear. Senator Womack, to close on your |
| 3 | could do, but because it's time to give people of this | 3 | bill. |
| 4 | state fair representation. Thank you. | 4 | SENATOR WOMACK: Colleagues, appreciate the |
| 5 | MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Duplessis. | 5 | questions and the comments, and I just ask that we move |
| 6 | Senator Pressly for the floor. | 6 | this bill favorable. |
| 7 | SENATOR PRESSLY: Thank you, Mr. President, | 7 | MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack has moved |
| 8 | and members. Senators, I rise today in opposition of | 8 | favorable passage of Senate Bill 8. When the machines |
| 9 | this bill, and I rise in opposition because I represent | 9 | are open, all those in favor, aye. Those opposed, vote |
| 10 | a community that's unique and wonderful in many ways, | 10 | nay. Open the machines. Madam Secretary, open the |
| 11 | very diverse, and clearly a passionate part of my life | 11 | machines. Go to a machine, members. Senator -- Senator |
| 12 | in Northwest Louisiana. I believe that Shreveport and | 12 | Miguez. There we go. Secretary, close the machines. |
| 13 | Bossier City and the surrounding parishes of De Soto and | 13 | 27 ayes, 11 nays. The -- the -- the bill is passed. |
| 14 | Red River and Webster are unique from the rest of our | 14 | Senator Womack moves of reconsideration. The -- the |
| 15 | state, and I believe that commonalities of -- of | 15 | vote by which the bill was passed. I lay the motion on |
| 16 | interest are important. | 16 | the table without objection. So ordered. |
| 17 | I agree with -- with Senator Jackson. I would | 17 |  |
| 18 | have no issue whatsoever of having any member of this | 18 |  |
| 19 | body, and many others from throughout our state of any | 19 |  |
| 20 | background, of any creed, of any race represent our | 20 |  |
| 21 | great, wonderful, diverse state in Washington, DC. But | 21 |  |
| 22 | I cannot support a map that puts Caddo Parish and | 22 |  |
| 23 | portions of my district, which is over 220 miles from | 23 |  |
| 24 | here, in a district that will be represented by someone | 24 |  |
| 25 | in East Baton Rouge that may or may not have ever even | 25 |  |
|  | Page 23 |  | Page 25 |
| 1 | been to Northwest Louisiana, and certainly doesn't | 1 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION |
| 2 | understand the rich culture, rich, important uniqueness | 2 | I, Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc., |
| 3 | of our area of the state. | 3 | do hereby certify that |
| 4 | When we look at -- at Louisiana, we often talk | 4 | 290872-Audio-011724SCHAMB-Edited-Appended.json was |
| 5 | about north and south, and that division is true. It's | 5 | transcribed utilizing computer aided means and the |
| 6 | real. I think all of us acknowledge that. The I-10 | 6 | TranscribeMe transcription team. |
| 7 | corridor has unique needs. When you look at -- at the | 7 | The transcript of the audio mentioned above, |
| 8 | challenges that you face with storms, often you think of | 8 | having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, |
| 9 | hurricanes. In North Louisiana, we think of tornados | 9 | Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full, |
| 10 | and ice storms. When you look at the -- the important | 10 | true, and correct transcription. |
| 11 | region of our states and the -- the diverse industries | 11 | I further certify that neither I, nor the |
| 12 | that we have in Northwest Louisiana, Barksdale is | 12 | TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal |
| 13 | vitally important. Certainly, having Barksdale and Fort | 13 | association with the parties involved or are in any way |
| 14 | Johnson now, previously Fort Polk, together in one | 14 | interested in the outcome thereof. |
| 15 | district is the one positive thing that I see in this | 15 | Dated this 8th of March, 2024. |
| 16 | map, and I think that is something that we must keep in | 16 |  |
| 17 | mind as we continue through this process. | 17 | Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc. |
| 18 | But I am concerned with the important part of | 18 |  |
| 19 | -- of this state, Northwest Louisiana, not having the | 19 |  |
| 20 | same member of Congress. With having a -- two members | 20 |  |
| 21 | of Congress, that has the potential to split our | 21 |  |
| 22 | community even further along a -- a -- a -- a -- a -- | 22 |  |
| 23 | line that's based purely on race, and I'm concerned | 23 |  |
| 24 | about that. Therefore, I'm voting no, and I urge you to | 24 |  |
| 25 | do the same. | 25 |  |
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| 4:20 | 14:13 | ongoing 3:23 | passionate | 6:9,14,16 |
| mile 12:2 | nay 24:10 | 5:19 | 22:11 | 6:21,23 |
| miles 12:2 | nays 24:13 | open 1:2,7 | Pause 14:6 | 15:17 |
| 22:23 | necessarily | 24:9,10,10 | 17:7,9 | portion 6:17 |
| Miller 2: 9 | 20:12 | opportunity | pen 15:8 | portions |
| mind 3:7 | necessary | 6:8 16:24 | people 5:14 | 22:23 |
| 23:17 | 20:5 | opposed 24:9 | 7:25 18:18 | positions |
| minority | need 4:24 | opposition | 19:2,8,16 | 3:16 14:19 |
| 11:1 12:5 | needs 16:2 | 22:8,9 | 20:20 21:8 | positive |
| Mizell 1:7,9 | 23:7 | options 7: 6 | 22:3 | 23:15 |
| 2:1,6 3:9 | neither | order 1:1 | percent 6:13 | positives |
| moment 9:11 | 25:11 | 3:11 6:7,8 | 15:18,19 | 8:19 |
| Morrell 18:7 | Never 3:7 | 13:17 | 21:9 | possibility |
| Morris 1:4 | north 8:23 | ordered | perfect 22:2 | 10:15 |
| 7:15,16,21 | 17:24 23:5 | 21:21 | perform | potential |
| 7:24 8:7 | 23:9 | 24:16 | 15:23 | 23:21 |
| 8:21 9:3,9 | Northeast | Orleans 6:20 | 16:15 | power 1:21 |
| 9:15,24 | 8:22 13:7 | Ouachita | performance | 15:5 |
| 10:4,11,16 | Northwest | 9:14,15,18 | 15:21 | pray 1:10 |
| 10:20,23 | 22:12 23:1 | 12:19 13:6 | performed | prayer 1:7 |
| 11:3,7,12 | 23:12,19 | outcome | 21:20 | 1:14 |
| 11:16,21 | notably | 25:14 | person 6:19 | predomin. |
| 11:23 | 14:21 | overrule | 19:12 | 21:2 |
| 12:10,14 | notice 5: 6 | 21:24 | personal | presence |
| 12:17,24 | number 3:20 |  | 25:12 | 4:12,17 |
| 13:5,9,13 | 7:5 20:6 | P | Petitions | 5:11 |
| 13:21,24 | numbers 12: 6 | pains 14:12 | 2:6 | present 1: 6 |
| 14:4 | 21:18 | parish 5:15 | pick 9:1,2 | presented |
| motion $24: 15$ move 10:13 | 0 | $6: 20,22$ $9: 10,14,15$ | pieces 9:19 | 19:4 |
| move 10:13 14:1 $24: 5$ | $\frac{0}{0 ' C o n n o r ~ 3: 2}$ | 9:10,14,15 $9: 16,18$ | Pikover 25:2 25:17 | president |
| moved 12:22 | Obama 20:25 | 10:13,17 | pillars | 3:19 14:7 |
| 13:6 24:7 | 21:8,23 | 10:17 | 14:17 | 15:14 20:9 |
| moves 2: 4, 14 | Obama-ap... | 11:13 | pivotal | 20:25 21:6 |
| 3:10 24:14 | 14:14 15:9 | 12:19 13:7 | 14:19 | 21:8,22 |
| multiple | objection | 22:22 | Plaintiffs' | 22:7 |
| 16:17 | 2:5 24:16 | parishes | 6:24 | presidents |
|  | OCHA 1:3 | 5:13 22:13 | planning | 21:3,6 |
| N | office 7:23 | parliame | 20:12 | Pressly 1: 4 |
| name 1:16 | 18:10 | 2:8 | please 1:23 | 22:6,7 |
| Natchito. | offices 3:16 | part 22:11 | pledge 1: 8 | 24:1 |
| 5:15 | Official 2:1 | 23:18 | 1:23,24 | previous |
| Nathan $25: 2$ $25: 17$ | officials | parties | point 18:12 | 17:11 |
| 25:17 | 20:18 | $25: 13$ | political | previously |
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| Price 21:19 | puts 9:19 | 2:18,19 | 2:12 | secretary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pride 4:9 | :22 | 3:12 | responds | 6:4 24:10 |
| primarily |  | reluctancy | 5:18 | 24:12 |
| 21:6 | Q | 19:24 | rest 22:14 | Sector 1:2 |
| principle | quarter 6:22 | 21:14 | retained 5:1 | see 5:4 |
| 5:1 | question | reluctant | reviewed | 23:15 |
| principles | 7:14 | 14:11 | 6:25 16:17 | seek 9:17 |
| 13:19 | questions | reluctantly | 25:8 | seeks 15:10 |
| prior 6:5 | 24:5 | 17:22 | rich $23: 2,2$ | senate 1:1, 6 |
| probably | quorum $1: 6$ | remain 10:2 | right 9:15 | 1:7 2:1,20 |
| 18:4 |  | remaind | 11:14,15 | 3:8,11,20 |
| problem | R | 4:8 | 11:20,21 | 16:8 19:6 |
| 13:22 | race 19:13 | remains 4:5 | 17:24 18:3 | 24:8 |
| proceedings | 22:20 | represent | 18:23 | Senator 1:3 |
| 2:2 | 23:23 | 15:6 19:18 | 21:24 | 1:3,4,4,4 |
| process 4:1 | rare 16:23 | 19:23 22:9 | rightly | 1:5,6 2:4 |
| 18:14 | reach 10:21 | 22:20 | 16:25 | 2:8,14 3:2 |
| 23:17 | reaching | represen. | Rights 3:22 | 3:9,11,18 |
| product 3:25 | 1:14 | 14:18 | 5:19 20:23 | 3:19 7:15 |
| prolonged | read 16:4 | 16:25 | rise 1: 6 | 7:16,16,21 |
| 5:25 | reading 1:25 | 18:17 22:4 | 22:8,9 | 7:21,24 |
| properly | 2:5,15 3:8 | represen. | River 5: 6, 13 | 8:2,7,13 |
| 19:3 | real 23:6 | 2:17,21 | 22:14 | 8:21,24 |
| proposal | reason 6:19 | 4:3 10:6 | road 21:25 | 9:3,5,9,12 |
| 15:25 | 19:14 | 18:6,7 | role 14:22 | 9:15,21,24 |
| proposed | receipt 2:7 | Represen. | room 14:15 | 10:3,4,6,8 |
| 4:15,25 | reconsid. | 4:20 | Rouge 6:22 | 10:11,15 |
| 5:18 6:25 | 24:14 | represented | 10:21 | 10:16,19 |
| 15:15,18 | Red 5: 6,13 | 7:7 19:3 | 22:25 | 10:20,22 |
| proposing | $22: 14$ | 22:24 | roughly 5:22 | 10:23 11:1 |
| 4:5 | redistri. | represents | row 5:12 | 11:3, 6, 7, 9 |
| prosperity | 2:19 3:13 | 16:6 | rules 2:15 | 11:12,15 |
| 14:25 | 5:23 12:7 | Republican | 3:10 | 11:16,20 |
| protect 8:5 | 13:19 20:2 | 4:8,16,16 | rulings 21:4 | 11:21,22 |
| 9:17 | reduces | 4:23 7:11 | runs 5:6 | 11:23 12:4 |
| protecting | 15:19 | 21:2,5 | Ruston 10:25 | 12:10,11 |
| 7:8 14:17 | reductions | requirement | 11:11,14 | 12:14,14 |
| 20:18 | 2:23 | 6:19 |  | 12:17,21 |
| proud 4:19 | Refer 2:25 | requirem | S | 12:24 13:4 |
| proudly 19:4 | referred | 13:23 | safe 4:16 | 13:5,9,9 |
| prove 9:13 | 2:20 | requires 6:2 | safeguards | 13:13,21 |
| provide 2:19 | referring | requisites | 14:19 | 13:21, 24 |
| 3:13,15 | 2:16 | 13:16 | says 19:9 | 13:24 14:4 |
| purely 23:23 | regardless | resolution | Scalise 4:21 | 14:4,5,7 |
| purpose 2:15 | 17:19 | 14:2 | 7:10 | 15:13,14 |
| 3:10 | region 23:11 | resolutions | seat 7: 8 | 15:15,19 |
| purposes | regret 13:10 | 2:11 | seats $4: 16$ | 17:6,8,15 |
| 2:24 | regrettably | resolve 20:5 | second $2: 2$ | 17:18 20:2 |
| put 10:17 | 14:15 | respect 3:15 | 2:16 4:14 | 20:7,8,9 |
| 12:12,15 | relative | respectf. . . | 16:6 19:9 | 20:17 |
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| 21:15,19 | 15:13 17:6 | 7:22 | 14:3,4,7 | tonight 18:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22:5,6,7 | 17:10 20:7 | strong 7:9 | 15:14 17:5 | tornados |
| 22:17 24:1 | 22:5 24:1 | stronger | 17:18 20:2 | 23:9 |
| 24:2,4,7 | 24:7 | 16:22 | 20:6,7,9 | totally 12:5 |
| 24:11,11 | specific | subject 5:22 | 20:10 22:4 | traffic 5:7 |
| 24:14 | 2:24 | submit 2:12 | 22:5,7 | transcribed |
| Senators | spirit 20:1 | 7:6 | 24:1 | 25:5,8 |
| 22:8 | split 23:21 | substantial | thereof | Transcri |
| send 18:11 | Stadium | 5:25 | 25:14 | 25:2,6,8 |
| 21:16 | 10:24, 25 | succeed 6:6 | thine 1:21 | 25:12,17 |
| serious | 11:4,7,24 | suppleme... | thing 22:2 | transcript |
| 15:24,24 | stage 15:1 | 2:25 | 23:15 | 25:7 |
| 17:2 | stakes 15:7 | support 16:1 | things 8:7 | transcri |
| serve 4:13 | stand 14:8 | 16:3 17:5 | think 1:12 | 25:1,6,10 |
| served 16:7 | 16:1,3 | 17:17,23 | 9:6,25 | 25:12 |
| 16:8 | 17:5,17,19 | 19:24 | 10:10 13:5 | travels 6:22 |
| serving | 17:21 19:6 | 21:21 22:1 | 18:19 | tremendo |
| 19:10 | 19:18,24 | 22:22 | 19:11,12 | 4:18 |
| session 20:2 | stands 14:16 | supportive | 20:13 | trespass |
| share 20:13 | 19:4 | 16:20 | 21:11 22:1 | 1:19 |
| Shreveport | start 9:8 | 18:15 | 22:2 23:6 | trespasses |
| 5:8 6:23 | 15:16 | Supreme 2:18 | 23:8,9,16 | 1:18 |
| 22:12 | state 2:2 | 2:19 21:3 | third 3:8 | tried 17:8 |
| sits 19:15 | 4:13,21 | surrounding | 5:4 | troubled |
| situation | 5:9 6:2,4 | 22:13 | thought | 14:13 |
| 15:11 | 14:25 | suspension | 20:14 | Troy 17:1 |
| six 4:14 | 17:25 | 2:14 3:10 | thrilled | true 9:21 |
| 6:12,21 | 18:18 19:2 | symbolic | 21:16 | 11:3 20:3 |
| 11:2 | 19:18 | 14:23 | Thy 1:16,16 | 23:5 25:10 |
| small 9:5 | 20:20,21 | T | 1:16 | Trump 21: 6 |
| snow 18:1 | 21:9,9 | T | Tiger 10:24 | trying 8:19 |
| sole 14:21 | 22:4,15,19 | table 5:5 | 11:3,24 | 16:21 |
| solidly 4:22 | 22:21 23:3 | 24:16 | timberland | Tuesday 2:3 |
| sort 15:20 | 23:19 | Talbot 1:4,5 | 8:18 | two 4:22 6:3 |
| Soto 22:13 | state's 6:15 | 2:14 | time 1:11 | 6:9,12,17 |
| sound 3:8 | 15:4 | talk 17:10 | 2:16 18:4 | 6:20 8:3,4 |
| sources 2:23 | statement | 17:12,13 | 18:4 19:4 | 8:5 11:2 |
| south 23:5 | 16:5,9 | 19:24 23:4 | 22:3 | 12:5 15:16 |
| southeast | 17:1 | team 25:6,12 | times 17:11 | 15:18,22 |
| 6:16 | states 14:20 | Tech 10:13 | tirelessly | 16:12,14 |
| speak 16:3 | 21:3 23:11 | 10:25 11:8 | 16:13 | 16:18 |
| 17:17 | States' 4:17 | 12:1,2 | Title 3:12 | 20:14 |
| 20:13 | steps 16:11 | 13:6 | today 13:14 | 21:13,17 |
| Speaker 1:1 | Steve 4:21 | tell 18:12 | 14:8 15:2 | 23:20 |
| 1:25 2:4 | 7:10 | temptation | 16:3,4 |  |
| 3:2,4,5,6 | Stine 14:5,7 | 1:20 | 17:4 18:23 | U |
| 3:7,15,18 | 20:17 | testified | 19:5,15 | unaware 5:20 |
| 4:19 7:9 | storms 23:8 | 15:20 | 20:12 | underrep |
| 7:14 14:5 | 23:10 | thank 1: 9, 22 | 21:12,13 | 20:21 |
| 14:20 | strictly | 3:19 13:24 | 22:8 | 21:10 |
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# House Governmental Affairs - Audio Transcription 

January 18, 2024

## Phillip Callais, et al.

vs.
Nancy Landry

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Good morning. Today is Thursday, January 18th, 2024. You're in the Committee of House and Governmental Affairs. We ask everyone to please silence your cell phones. If you need to take a call, please step out. There's witness cards that are maintained in committee records. Red is in -- in -opposed. Green is in favor. If you plan on testifying, please fill out one of those cards. Ms. Baker, would you please call the roll?

MS. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Beaullieu.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Billings.
REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Boyd.
REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Present.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson.
REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter.
Representative Carver.
REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnum. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Johnson.


|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | decides and continues to serve our great state. As you | 1 | Constitution one person, one vote requirement. That is |
| 2 | know, Congresswoman Letlow sits on appropriations. She | 2 | the reason why District 2 is drawn around the Orleans |
| 3 | sits on ag, which is a big part of my district. | 3 | Parish and why District 6 includes the Black population |
| 4 | Second, the Louisiana 6th Congressional | 4 | of East Baton Rouge Parish and travels up l-49 corridor |
| 5 | District. The map and the proposed bill ensures that | 5 | to include Black population in Shreveport. |
| 6 | four are safe Republican seats. Louisiana's Republican | 6 | While this is a different map than the |
| 7 | present in the United States Congress has contributed | 7 | plaintiffs' litigation have proposed, this is the only |
| 8 | tremendously to the national discourse, and I'm very | 8 | map I reviewed that accomplishes the political goals I |
| 9 | proud that both Speaker of the US House of | 9 | believe are important for my district, for Louisiana, |
| 10 | Representatives, Mike Johnson, and US House Majority | 10 | and for the country. |
| 11 | Leader Steve Scalise are both from our great state. | 11 | While I did not draw these boundaries myself, |
| 12 | This map ensures that the two of them will | 12 | I carefully considered a number of different map |
| 13 | have solidly Republican districts at home, so they can | 13 | options, and I firmly submit the congressional voting |
| 14 | focus on the national leadership that we need in | 14 | boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the |
| 15 | Washington, DC. The map proposed in this bill ensures | 15 | goals for protecting Congressman Letlow's seat, |
| 16 | that the Conservative principles retained by the | 16 | maintaining strong districts for Speaker Johnson and |
| 17 | majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend | 17 | Majority Leader Scalise, ensuring four Republican |
| 18 | past our boundaries to our nation's capital. | 18 | districts, and adhering to the command of the Federal |
| 19 | Third, the map that l've presented is -- goes | 19 | Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. I'd be happy |
| 20 | along the Red River. It's the I-49 corridor. We have | 20 | to answer any questions. |
| 21 | commerce through there. We have a college through | 21 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Senator |
| 22 | there. We have a lot of ag cattlemen as well as farm | 22 | Womack. Representative Marcelle for a question. |
| 23 | row crop, and a lot of people up through that corridor | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Senator |
| 24 | comes back to Alexandria using that corridor for their | 24 | Womack, for presenting this bill. Were -- did you have |
| 25 | healthcare. Finally, these maps in the proposed bill | 25 | the opportunity to view the map that I filed? |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 9 |
| 1 | respond appropriate to the ongoing Federal Voting Rights | 1 | SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I reviewed several maps, |
| 2 | Act case in the Middle District of Louisiana. | 2 | Representative Marcelle. |
| 3 | For those who are unaware, the congressional | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: HB5. |
| 4 | maps that we enacted in March 2022 have been the subject | 4 | SENATOR WOMACK: HB5. I didn't -- I didn't |
| 5 | of litigation, roughly since the day the 2022 | 5 | look at the HB5 -- |
| 6 | Congressional Redistricting Bill went into effect and | 6 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Did not. |
| 7 | even before we enacted it. After a substantial amount | 7 | SENATOR WOMACK: -- per se. I looked at |
| 8 | of prolonged litigation, the Federal District Court has | 8 | several maps. One of them could have been that. |
| 9 | adhered to its view that the federal law requires that | 9 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Because I |
| 10 | the state have two congressional districts with a | 10 | heard you say that you thought that your map was the |
| 11 | majority of Black voters. | 11 | best possible route. A pathway to get to what we needed |
| 12 | Our secretary of state, attorney general, and | 12 | to, first of all, make sure that we get out of the |
| 13 | our prior legislative leadership appealed, but have yet | 13 | litigation, apply with Section 2, and go about the |
| 14 | to succeed, and we are now here because of the Federal | 14 | deviations and the compactness and all of those |
| 15 | Court's order that we have a first opportunity to act. | 15 | different things that we needed to do in order to create |
| 16 | The District Court's order that we must have two | 16 | a second Black seat -- congressional seat. Is that what |
| 17 | majority Black voting age population districts, combined | 17 | I heard you say? |
| 18 | with the political imperative I just described, have | 18 | SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am. |
| 19 | largely driven the boundaries for District 2 and | 19 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Well, l-- I |
| 20 | District 6, both of which are over 50 percent Black | 20 | certainly want to thank you, and I know -- I spoke to |
| 21 | voting age population. | 21 | you yesterday about putting an amendment on your bill to |
| 22 | Given the state's current demographics, there | 22 | make sure that we could reduce the parish splits and |
| 23 | is not enough high -- high enough Black population in | 23 | that we had some conversations, and it's a short period |
| 24 | the southeast portion of this -- Louisiana to create two | 24 | of time. Certainly, I don't know when the amendments |
| 25 | majority Black districts, and to also comply with the US | 25 | are going to be offered up, but I certainly want to go |
|  |  |  | 3 (Pages 6 to 9) |
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REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Senator Womack, thank you for the time that you've spent because I know myself, we've been in this redistricting process for almost three years now, so I -- I knew the time it took for me just to try to redraw my house district because of the growth in Orleans Parish. So I do understand when you're looking at congressional districts. So again, I want to thank you for the time that you dedicated to -- to doing -- to -- to redrawing this map and submitting this bill, but I must say that I am along the lines of my two colleagues that just spoke.

That although this is a good map, this isn't the best map that has come before us. It does meet the -- it does meet the Court requirements. It does meet -meet the statute and the -- the -- the jurisprudence that is before us that guides us as to what needs to be to satisfy congressional districts. I did look at your numbers, the BVAP in 2 and 6, as well as the total population for the -- these two minority-majority districts.

However, there were two that were -- two other maps that were presented that were stronger for those two minority-majority districts and didn't do as many splits. That's House Bill 5 and Senate Bill 4.

## Page 15

However, the politics of those two individuals that submitted those two maps, I guess, have led us to having to work with yours. And -- and -- and it's -- it's disheartening that we do have so much politics that are guiding our maps instead of the policy, and the people helping us to guide our maps and our decisions.

Because your map gives us what we're -- what we're wanting, I am going to support your map. And again, I'm going to say it's not because it's the best map, but it is because it -- it -- it looks that -- it 11 looks as though it's giving what we -- what we need. It 12 does not reflect what the African Americans that we've 13 heard from across the state during the road shows in 142021 asked for. It does not reflect all of what the 15 Black Caucus and the Democratic Caucus has asked for 16 these past three years.
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probably press my button again.
SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative
Newell. Representative Marcelle would like to just make a clarification for the Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Senator Womack, we keep using the term BVAP, and we know that there are many people in the audience who may not understand that terminology. So do you want to tell them what BVAP means, or you want me to do it?

SENATOR WOMACK: Go ahead. You got the mic.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I got -- okay, sir.
I didn't want to take over your bill. It's the Black
voting age population for those that are -- that are looking online, and maybe across the state. We -because we keep using those terms, and I want to make sure that everybody understands what BVAP means. Thank you, Senator Womack.

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you. When she -- when she asked that question, I started running through my mind. It's got to be voting age population. And -- and I hadn't heard the term BVAP. It's voting age population, which does meet the -- I don't know exactly, but it's in a high percentage, 50 percentile on that -on voting age population.
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CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Senator
Womack. And look, for the -- again, the viewing
audience, those numbers are all on the bill. They're
part of the bill that's been filed. So if you -- if
you're listening online and you want to scroll through and -- and look at different statistics on the maps and on the amendments, they're all there for you. Vice Chairman Lyons.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank -- thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator Womack, for -- for -- for bringing this like that, even though we're looking at this piece, and I'm studying it as -- as it is there. And you mentioned in your opening statement about the -the plaintiffs and -- and the cause of -- of why you're doing this, but my question is: did you do any -- any comparisons to the -- the plaintiffs' map or the first map that was -- that was issued, drawn on this piece with your map?

SENATOR WOMACK: Representative Lyons, I've looked at so many maps in the last three days till -till -- to say I did or didn't would be -- be -- I couldn't answer that. I'm sorry, but -- but l've looked at so many maps from what -- even through our roadshow. But in the last two or three days to -- to say that -25 that my map and how it compares to another map, I'm kind

1 of where I'm at right now, and I -- I can -- I know what my map looks like now.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Well, the reason why I asked that question was I wanted to know if you did any type of analysis to see how it would perform. I mean, it looks, in particular, according to certain criteria, that it is a -- a -- a workable map of some sort, but how does it perform in comparison to the plaintiffs' map that was out there, that existing map? I -- I would 10 think that you would compare it to that one because that 11 was the map of -- not of choice, but that was the map in 12 litigation. How would your map perform along with that 13 one?

SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I didn't look at a map.
I looked at a performance chart --
VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Performance. Yes.
SENATOR WOMACK: -- and it -- it -- right.
That was printed. It's online. That -- that we --
VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay.
SENATOR WOMACK: -- pull, and it does -- it does perform very well. It does in the election. It -it performs.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay. And --
SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I don't have that map in front of me, I'm sorry. I thought -- I'm looking for
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it. But I thought it was here, but it's not. But I did have -- I did have that with me.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay.
SENATOR WOMACK: But it's not with me, but I
-- I do remember us looking at that.
VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay. Okay. I want --
I just wanted to know if you did analysis and it was
done and how it compared. I know it could perform.
Basically, as I'm looking at it now, I would think it does. And I don't think it would perform better -better than the original map of -- of the plaintiff, but it does perform. I kind of want to see if something at least close to that performance measures there, but this is a performing map. Thank you for answering my questions.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Vice Chairman Lyons. Representative Farnum for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
Speaker. If it's the proper time, I'd like to offer an amendment.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Do we have any other questions before we go into the amendments? Because we do have -- we have two amendments. No other button's pushed. So give me two seconds, and we'll -- we'll come right back to you. Give me -- we've got one more
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lot of my students in my district attend those, so
that's the community of interest; would you agree?
SENATOR WOMACK: I agree.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: When you look at
Natchitoches, there's a community of interest with
Natchitoches and Caddo. You've got a lot of -- you've got lumber companies in the Natchitoches area. A lot of people work. RoyOMartin has a big -- big plant in Natchitoches --

SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: -- and a lot of
folks in my area work there. RoyOMartin from
Alexandria. And a lot of folks work in DeSoto where you have a lot of timber. And would you agree with that?

SENATOR WOMACK: I agree.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: You look at Saint
Landry. Saint Landry has -- Opelousas has a nice-sized, medium-sized hospital. So those folks in Pointe Coupee,
they will go to Saint Landry to get their medical care and so forth in the Opelousas area. Would you agree with that?

SENATOR WOMACK: I agree.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: And you look at
West Baton Rouge-East Baton Rouge Parish. Is East Baton
Rouge Parish cut in one district or two districts in
your map? Because I'm having problems seeing it. Is it
two?

SENATOR WOMACK: I would have to look at the

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Two. Okay. I've seen maps to infinitum. So I think East Baton Rouge is divided into two.

SENATOR WOMACK: It's --
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Is that two? It's yellow, and I guess a white piece.

SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah. Right. Two.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. And it goes
all the way to the great city of Shreveport.
SENATOR WOMACK: Right. Where our LSU hospital is.

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: And the hospital is vital because in Alexandria, we had a HOEPA loan. You're familiar with that. And Jindal shut my HOEPA loan. So my folks --

SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: -- in Rapides have to go to LSU. So that's a community of interest. Now, with your hospital, with your district, it goes from East Baton Rouge all the way to Caddo, which is probably about a two-hour ride, give or take, because I take that
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ride a lot going up to Meyer in Alexandria. There was a -- a different map that was heard in the Senate, but it was a much cleaner map. That map didn't get out of the Senate, and it didn't get out of this area. The map I'm talking about is Ed Price's. I think Ed Price had a map.

FEMALE SPEAKER 1: It was Price and Marcelle.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Price-Marcelle map.
I'm sorry. Did you get a chance to look at that map?
That map was heard on the Senate side.
SENATOR WOMACK: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Those districts
were a lot closer, a lot compact, but you're presenting this district. When you look at District 4, that's -that is the district for the Speaker, Mr. Johnson; is that correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Does he have a
problem with his district being cut in -- in half like
that? If you look at Winnfield, if he's in Winnfield
and he goes to Sabine, he has to go through
Natchitoches, which is not (inaudible 0:26:54) district.
Yet you think he has a problem with that?
SENATOR WOMACK: No. It looks like the shortest route would be through Natchitoches.

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: But his prior map
was just one continuous area. Now he has to leave one district and go to another area, which is -- which he'll be representing; is that correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah, that.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. Have you had a chance to talk to -- to Congressman Johnson about this map?

SENATOR WOMACK: Not directly to him.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. Is he
content with this map?
SENATOR WOMACK: He's content.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Even though it
slashes right through the middle of his district.
SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah. It -- it --
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Now, Ed Price and
Denise Marcelle. Let's go to District 5. Let's go the District 5 area. Their map, they were looking at District 5, which is the eastern part of Louisiana. And their map, they had that as the minority --majority-minority district, I think, but you kept that map so you can help your friend, Congressman Letlow; is that correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes. Yes, sir. REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: So this is more of
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a political map.
SENATOR WOMACK: Exactly.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: So our objective is to get two majority-minority districts, but you have presented us a political map; isn't that correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: The influence is political. I created -- we created two minority Black districts.

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: But you also said earlier that you were trying to do your best to protect Congressman Scalise.

SENATOR WOMACK: That was -- that -- that --
Scalise, as well as Johnson, Letlow, which is my representative, and Higgins.

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: You were trying to protect your Republican team.

SENATOR WOMACK: That was a primary driver.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: So this is a
political matter. But the judge wanted you to make sure that you presented two --

SENATOR WOMACK: Two Black.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: --
majority-minority districts.
SENATOR WOMACK: And I've done that.
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: I don't know if you've done -- you've -- you've made a effort at it, but
there was another map. There's a lot cleaner map because the map that I see goes from Shreveport to Baton Rouge, which you're just zigzagging. And you picked up Alexandria, you picked up Natchitoches, you picked up DeSoto, but it's more of a political map. The map that the Democrats pursued, it was a map that we agreed on two majority-minority districts, and this is more of a political map.

SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah, I know. REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. Thank you. SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Senator Womack, why are
we here today? What -- what brought us all to this special session as it -- as it relates to, you know, what we're discussing here today?

SENATOR WOMACK: The middle courts of the district courts brought us here from the Middle District, and said, "Draw a map, or l'll draw a map." CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. SENATOR WOMACK: So that's what we've done. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And -- and were you -does -- does this map achieve that middle court's orders? SENATOR WOMACK: It does. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. When you were
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drawing the maps, you also took into consideration
incumbency, correct?
SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. To protect not
just our state, but our national interest as well.
SENATOR WOMACK: Our national.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Is that correct? SENATOR WOMACK: Right. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: This is -- this is bigger than just us.

SENATOR WOMACK: It's bigger than just us, and Louisiana has never been sitting in the poor position that they are today.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: What -- what position
does Congressman Mike Johnson have in the United States
House of Representatives?
SENATOR WOMACK: He's a speaker of the house. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. And what about
Congressman Steve Scalise? SENATOR WOMACK: Majority leader of the house. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. So if we've been able to accomplish what the judge has ordered through your map, and also been able to protect the political interest, that is kosher, correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: That's exactly.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. That's what -that's what I was thinking. That's what I've learned through the process, and I just wanted to make sure that your map achieved that. Yeah.

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: All right. Senator, the board's cleared. We're going to go ahead, if you don't mind, and -- and take up the amendments right now. Bear with me for two seconds. Senator Marcelle, and -- and -- excuse me. Sorry about that promotion,
Representative Marcelle.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's okay.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And -- and Representative
Farnum both have amendments.
FEMALE SPEAKER 2: Here. This card's in Marcelle's name.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Hold that -- hold that for me. Bear with me. So the first amendment is how -- is Amendment 68. That is Amendment 60. Give me a second while it's loading. What amendment is 68 ?

MS. LOWERY: That is the one offered by Representative Farnum.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Farnum, we're going to take up your amendment first.
Representative Farnum, on your amendment.

Page 29
REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr.
Speaker. So l offer -- does -- do we need to read it
in?
MS. LOWERY: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowery, please read-in the amendment.

MS. LOWERY: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Representative Farnum is offering up HCASBA-36268. And on page 1, it's going to delete lines 13 through 17, and delete pages 2 through 6 , and we'll be inserting a new district configuration for the congressional districts for the State of Louisiana. This amendment is available
online and is available in your packets, members, and contains maps and statistics relevant to the plan.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Lowery. Representative Farnum, on your amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. So in the -- in the beginning of this process, me and my colleagues from Southwest Louisiana set out to accomplish making Calcasieu whole. In the history of -- of our -- our great parish, we've always had one congressman that represented us. And -- and -and with the current map as presented from Senator Womack, it -- it split Calcasieu Parish basically in 25 half in population. And -- and with the community of
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | interest in our industrial sector down there, we thought | 1 | accomplished that, but it -- it actually increases the |
| 2 | that was not just for our area. | 2 | -- the viability of the two minority districts. |
| 3 | We -- we have -- we're -- we're probably one | 3 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. And what about |
| 4 | of the top two or three economic engines for the State | 4 | incumbency, are the -- the current members protected? |
| 5 | of Louisiana with our oil and gas industries and our LNG | 5 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Protects all the |
| 6 | industry that's going on in -- in our region. So we | 6 | current incumbencies. I think it -- it -- it meets all |
| 7 | thought it would be -- be great to make an effort to get | 7 | the -- all the checkboxes. |
| 8 | back to one congressman. | 8 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Thank you. |
| 9 | We have issues with -- with all sorts of | 9 | Representative Marcelle. Again, give me a second, |
| 10 | natural disasters in our area, and we have a hard enough | 10 | Representative Marcelle, because l'm going to get |
| 11 | time getting -- getting the -- the adequate supplies and | 11 | Representative Farnum added back on. Bear with me. |
| 12 | -- and resources to our region in those situations with | 12 | (Pause.) |
| 13 | one congressman, and I-- I can imagine it might be a | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You ready? Thank |
| 14 | little more difficult with two. So in that effort, we | 14 | you. Representative Farnum. |
| 15 | set out to make -- make ourselves whole. And in the | 15 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes, ma'am. |
| 16 | process, a lot of folks in -- in other areas wanted to | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You said that some |
| 17 | come along and -- and get -- be a part of this to -- to | 17 | senators and some representatives met last night, but |
| 18 | correct little -- little tweaks in their area. | 18 | you weren't able to be there. Is that -- is that what |
| 19 | So last night a group of senators and | 19 | you said? |
| 20 | representatives got together. I wasn't able to attend | 20 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. |
| 21 | that meeting. So this is the product of that meeting. | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So whose map is |
| 22 | At the end of the day, we -- we accomplished a few | 22 | this? |
| 23 | things. We -- we kept the, the basic intent of what | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: This is Senator |
| 24 | Senator Womack's bill is in place, and with a -- a -- | 24 | Womack's map. |
| 25 | kind of a counterclockwise shift that would -- but the | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No, no, no, no. The |
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| 1 | process has to happen that way to increase some areas in | 1 | amendment. |
| 2 | -- in Northeast Louisiana to help that district to make | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: The amendment. I'm |
| 3 | Congressman Johnson come down some. | 3 | the author because -- |
| 4 | That inherently makes Congressman Higgins have | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Because if senator |
| 5 | to shift to the east, and so on and so forth. In the | 5 | -- I don't mean -- |
| 6 | process, we increase the -- the -- both the Black | 6 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: -- it has -- it has to |
| 7 | population and the voting population of both of the | 7 | have an author from this committee, and -- and I'm -- |
| 8 | minority districts by almost a percent each in most | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. It has to |
| 9 | cases. | 9 | have an author from this committee, so that's why. Who |
| 10 | So it helps -- it helps the -- the workability | 10 | asked you to carry it is my question. |
| 11 | of the two new districts and -- and what they're trying | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I started it myself |
| 12 | to accomplish, and it accomplished the -- the -- making | 12 | without anybody asking me. Now, I -- I allowed input |
| 13 | more -- more parishes whole. I think we -- we only -- | 13 | from other members of this body to -- to better my |
| 14 | we're down to 15 split parishes with this map, and so I | 14 | amendment because it -- mine was -- mine was from my |
| 15 | think we've accomplished several things in the process. | 15 | region's perspective. |
| 16 | And -- and with that, we can answer questions or ask for | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: It's Calcasieu. |
| 17 | your passage. | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Calcasieu's |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Farnum, | 18 | perspective. |
| 19 | does your -- does your amendment meet the judge's order? | 19 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And so let me -- let |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Absolutely. | 20 | me see -- let -- let me walk down this really quick. In |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. And so we have two | 21 | Calcasieu, you said that you wanted to make your parish |
| 22 | majority-minority districts, or two Black districts that | 22 | whole. Did I understand that correctly? |
| 23 | have a voting -- a majority voting age population over | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Correct. |
| 24 | 50 percent? | 24 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So instead of having |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I think it | 25 | two congressional representatives, you wanted to make |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | sure you were whole, and you just wanted one; is that | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. |
| 2 | accurate? | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- and she picked up |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Correct. That's | 3 | some more, right? |
| 4 | correct. | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. But over in | 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: His map -- Womack's |
| 6 | East Baton Rouge, if I'm reading it correctly, we now | 6 | map didn't do that. So you added back Lincoln, Jackson, |
| 7 | have three congressional districts; is that accurate? | 7 | and you made her whole in Ouachita. |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's accurate. | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Ouachita. |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's accurate. | 9 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Ouachita. Ouachita. |
| 10 | Okay. Good. So on the one hand, you want to make | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Ouachita whole. |
| 11 | yourself whole, and you want to split us three ways in | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Ouachita, right? |
| 12 | East Baton Rouge Parish. | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Correct. |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's the net result. | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Is that right? |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's the net | 14 | Okay. |
| 15 | result. Okay. Got it. So are you aware of the | 15 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. |
| 16 | population shift in Louisiana? You know, we had these | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I -- I want to make |
| 17 | hearings a year and a half ago, two, whatever. It was | 17 | sure I -- I got that straight. So it -- are you aware |
| 18 | two years ago. Whenever it was. Are you aware -- | 18 | that this map that you're proposing has less compact |
| 19 | because I think you were on this committee. | 19 | overall than Womack's map or the enacting map? Are you |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes, ma'am. | 20 | aware of that? It has less compactness. |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. So are you | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: No. |
| 22 | aware of the growth, the largest growth in the state? | 22 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I know you didn't |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes. | 23 | have a whole lot of time to study it because it was last |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Where was that? | 24 | minute. |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Northshore. | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yeah. I don't know if |
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| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Where? Northshore. | 1 | I agree with that. |
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Northshore. | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You don't know if |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And where was Baton | 3 | you agree with it. |
| 4 | Rouge in that? | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: No. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: It's probably middle | 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Well, it |
| 6 | of the road. | 6 | does. In fact, it's the lowest compactness of all of |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Middle of the road. | 7 | the maps. That's A. The district level in Congressional |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yeah. | 8 | District 6 is less compact than Womack's map, and the |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Would you say that | 9 | Congressional District 2 is half as compact as Womack's |
| 10 | Baton Rouge had more growth than Calcasieu? | 10 | map. Are you aware of that? |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I don't know if that's | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So what I do know is |
| 12 | accurate. I -- I couldn't speak to that. | 12 | that the -- the BVAP increased. |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: They did. My -- my | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I'm not asking about |
| 14 | point to you is that there was growth in -- in Baton | 14 | the BVAP. |
| 15 | Rouge. They lost population in North Louisiana. Is | 15 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: The population |
| 16 | that accurate? | 16 | increased, and it helps those -- the electability of |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. | 17 | those minority candidates in those areas. |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: They did lose | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I -- I guess that's |
| 19 | population, and I'm just trying to -- | 19 | your opinion, but what I'm asking you for right now is |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. | 20 | facts in -- in -- in -- in terms of the compactness of |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- refresh my | 21 | the districts. So let me go to another one. Are you |
| 22 | memory. In North Louisiana, so, but you wanted to make | 22 | aware that it splits more municipalities than Womack's |
| 23 | sure that North Louisiana -- because it looks like -- | 23 | and almost twice as many as the -- the bill that I |
| 24 | I'm looking at his map and your map, and it looks like | 24 | brought? |
| 25 | you shift Letlow back over -- | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I'm not familiar -- |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Are you aware of | 1 | That would mean that Clay Higgins would |
| 2 | that? | 2 | represent the people on Lakeshore Drive in Baton Rouge. |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I'm not familiar with | 3 | That's what that would mean. |
| 4 | your bill. | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- so in -- in my |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Was HB5 up? | 5 | area, Clay Higgins represents my house, and if I drive |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: We didn't -- we didn't | 6 | 10 houses down the road, Congressman Johnson represents |
| 7 | have a chance to hear that. | 7 | those people -- |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I presented it in | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I guess -- |
| 9 | here. You were -- you were here. | 9 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: -- 10 houses away from |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: You -- you voluntarily | 10 | my house. |
| 11 | withdrew it. | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I imagine because |
| 12 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Pardon me? | 12 | you're on the line. But what I'm saying is that's a far |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: You voluntarily | 13 | distance from where his district starts, to bring him |
| 14 | withdrew it. | 14 | down to Baton Rouge, and I'm just trying to -- it's |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: But I presented it. | 15 | unclear to me what the motivation of offering this |
| 16 | But you had an opportunity to get it on your laptop and | 16 | amendment is, other than political reasons. It -- it -- |
| 17 | see it like we get all bills, right, because you're on | 17 | it certainly doesn't help us in Baton Rouge. |
| 18 | this committee. | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Well, all -- all I can |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes. | 19 | say is my constituents at home expressed a strong desire |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. So this map, | 20 | to remain whole. Now, whether we were in District 3 -- |
| 21 | the -- well, not map, the amendments. If these | 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So do mine. |
| 22 | amendments get on this bill, it will split more | 22 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: -- or District 4 -- I |
| 23 | municipalities than Womack's. The deviation on these | 23 | -- I can appreciate that. I really can appreciate that, |
| 24 | amendments that go to this map is a 129 , which is both | 24 | and that's why we all get a vote here. And so it's -- |
| 25 | higher than Womack's bill, which is almost twice as much | 25 | this is -- this is my attempt to -- to help my citizens |
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| 1 | as the enacted map at 65. \| -- | think what I'm saying | 1 | in my area. |
| 2 | is there were more than one goal to meet when we were | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I get that. |
| 3 | told to draw these maps. | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: And in the process, I |
| 4 | It was more than one thing that we had to | 4 | included -- a lot of other people from a lot of other |
| 5 | consider: compactness, communities of interest, not | 5 | regions were included in the conversation. I can't |
| 6 | splitting municipalities. And it appears that this map | 6 | speak to who all was included that night because I |
| 7 | -- or these amendments, if we were to vote on this, does | 7 | wasn't able to attend that. So it -- it was people from |
| 8 | far more harm than good. | 8 | New Orleans. I think Senator Womack was in the room |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- so it's my | 9 | when -- when it was discussed, and -- and feel free to |
| 10 | opinion that -- that we -- we addressed all of the | 10 | jump in any time. |
| 11 | issues that we were set out to do. We've accomplished | 11 | SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. I -- I was in that |
| 12 | all the goals that we were mandated by the Court to do. | 12 | meeting, and -- and the -- back to the BVAP. And in the |
| 13 | We have the -- the two minority districts were very, | 13 | districts, District 2 and District 6 went up -- up as |
| 14 | very lightly touched, and -- and mostly White population | 14 | far as Black voter age population. Senator Gary Carter |
| 15 | was pulled out of those districts. | 15 | was in the room with us looking at this and -- and |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, let -- let me | 16 | working on this to -- to try to come up with the best |
| 17 | just say this, Representative Farnum, with all due | 17 | outcome. We did -- |
| 18 | respect. If you were just trying to make Calcasieu | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That would be -- |
| 19 | whole and that was your parish and you were trying to do | 19 | SENATOR WOMACK: -- include -- |
| 20 | that, I might have a little bit more respect for this | 20 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I'm sorry. That -- |
| 21 | amendment. But since you are trying to make yourself | 21 | you said Senator Carter. |
| 22 | whole, and East Baton Rouge Parish split between three | 22 | SENATOR WOMACK: Carter. Gary Carter. |
| 23 | congressional districts, that would mean that for the | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And that we be |
| 24 | public that's watching -- because you can't see the map, | 24 | Congressional District 2, right? |
| 25 | or you may not be able to understand it. | 25 | SENATOR WOMACK: He was in the room. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. | 1 | SENATOR WOMACK: I'm sorry. |
| 2 | SENATOR WOMACK: He was in the room, and -- | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: It's not your |
| 3 | and -- and looking at these districts with us. This | 3 | amendment. |
| 4 | wasn't -- this wasn't -- this was several senators | 4 | SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah. I'm sorry. |
| 5 | trying to work to -- to try to accomplish, I guess, a | 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I'm just making a |
| 6 | lot of maybe concerns from different ones, but I know | 6 | statement. |
| 7 | Red River Parish was put in. | 7 | SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am. |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, the -- the | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And I'm not voting |
| 9 | only one that could have been concerned about | 9 | for any map that has Baton Rouge split three ways |
| 10 | Congressional District 2 would be Congressman Troy | 10 | because that's insane. It's insane. And so for |
| 11 | Carter; is that accurate? Who -- did he have a concern | 11 | whatever motive that they had, I believe that they threw |
| 12 | about your map? | 12 | a monkey wrench in a bill that I think would have gotten |
| 13 | SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I would think that | 13 | out of here without any opposition, which is your bill. |
| 14 | Congressman -- Senator Carter would -- would be speaking | 14 | So I don't -- I don't know if you realize it -- |
| 15 | in -- in that capacity, as to watching the -- the -- the | 15 | SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah. Yeah. |
| 16 | VAP, the -- the -- the -- the voting age population. He | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- but, I mean, I |
| 17 | was watching that. He was working with us to try to | 17 | don't think what they have done has helped your bill. |
| 18 | best fit everything that we -- that -- that people was | 18 | And if Farnum wanted to protect Calcasieu, that's |
| 19 | wanting and -- and -- and concerns from each side that | 19 | Calcasieu. It ain't got nothing to do with Baton Rouge. |
| 20 | we're asking for and -- and to still maintain the -- the | 20 | So he should have put amendment on this bill that |
| 21 | fact that -- that we -- we got a map to draw. And we | 21 | protects Calcasieu, not Baton Rouge. Not change |
| 22 | had to draw this map to get -- | 22 | anything in Baton Rouge. And that's just my honest |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So let me -- let me | 23 | opinion. So I -- I -- I could not -- so I would object. |
| 24 | ask you, Senator. Was somebody from Baton Rouge asking | 24 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I -- I -- I could |
| 25 | to be split three ways in that room? Because I want to | 25 | not -- so I would object to this amendment being added. |
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| 1 | know who that was. | 1 | And I want everybody in Baton Rouge who's listening to |
| 2 | SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I -- I don't know where | 2 | please call your senators and the people that represent |
| 3 | these people -- all the people live. | 3 | you and tell them we do not want to be split in three |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Don't know where the | 4 | ways in Baton Rouge. Thank you. |
| 5 | -- | 5 | SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you. Just for |
| 6 | SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I think Carter lives | 6 | correction, Senator Fields was in the room with us. So |
| 7 | back toward New Orleans. | 7 | that -- that -- I appreciate Senator Kathy reminding me |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Yeah. That's what I | 8 | of that. He was in the room as well. |
| 9 | said. | 9 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. Ms. -- |
| 10 | SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. All right. | 10 | Representative Marcelle. Representative Johnson. |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right. That's what | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. |
| 12 | I said. And this is -- | 12 | Chairman. Senator Womack, you represent Senate District |
| 13 | SENATOR WOMACK: And -- and -- and that's -- | 13 | -- what's the number? |
| 14 | and I can't say he's been on the phone, but he was in | 14 | SENATOR WOMACK: 32. |
| 15 | the room and worked with us on this. | 15 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: 32. You're my |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Let -- let -- let me | 16 | senator, and we share a lot of people, a lot of |
| 17 | say this, and I'll -- l'll leave it alone at this. I -- | 17 | population. You have spent a lot of time on this map; |
| 18 | I respect you, Senator Womack. That's why when I | 18 | haven't you? |
| 19 | proposed a cleanup amendment to your bill, I came over | 19 | SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, sir. |
| 20 | to talk to you about exactly what I was going to propose | 20 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: And you've tried to |
| 21 | on your bill. I think it's disingenuous that we sit | 21 | do it as best you can and to make it legal and to make |
| 22 | here, and we drop maps that changes Baton Rouge because | 22 | it -- to adjust the population shift that has occurred |
| 23 | some senators got in a room and decided to change my | 23 | in our state; is that right? |
| 24 | district. This is what I represent. I -- I-- I don't | 24 | SENATOR WOMACK: That's right. |
| 25 | mean -- I'm -- and you -- | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: And it -- you're not |
|  |  |  | 12 (Pages 42 to 45) |
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doing it in a vacuum. It's affecting people that are in your district.

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, sir. That's exactly right.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: And you are catching a lot of heat because of that; aren't you?

SENATOR WOMACK: That's right.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: You take your responsibility seriously; don't you?

SENATOR WOMACK: I do.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Even when it hurts you politically?

SENATOR WOMACK: I do.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: It hurts me politically.

SENATOR WOMACK: It does. And I've apologized.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: I know you to be a good and honest man who tries to do the right thing. Does this map, as amended by -- by Representative Farnum, my good friend from Southwest Louisiana -- well, let me back up. You believe that you have presented a map that achieves all the necessary requirements and provides us with the best instrument that you could come up with?
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SENATOR WOMACK: I do.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Do you believe that
Representative Farnum's amendment makes your bill better?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: And would you support your bill and your map and all of your time and all your political pain that you and I are feeling if he presents that amendment?

SENATOR WOMACK: I do. I would.
REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative
Johnson. Representative Newell.
REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And Representative Farnum, I appreciate your attempt at drawing this map. But what I don't appreciate -- and I do understand that this is a compressed session. And let me pause right quick and say thank you to our staff because our staff is truly overworked and underpaid. So I -- I-- I-- I understand how swiftly they work to try to get bills prepared, amendments prepared so that we can have them in order to get to committee.

But I -- with all of that, we also need to
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being in the room. Rep Farnum's name is on this map, and he wasn't in the room. You mentioned a lot of senators in the room talking about something that representatives are now sitting here trying to pour over, talk about, discuss, and understand in a shorter period of time.

Most of us can't really pay attention to the discussions because we're looking and trying to understand these 15 pages that we've just been given. And I just needed to put that out there, Mr. Pro Tem, that we should need to give each other more consideration in our futures, that we give each other more time to digest things that are this sensitive of a issue and of a topic. And I'm still not satisfied with this map. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Newell. Representative Mark Wright.

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Pro
Tem. I didn't expect to get called on so soon I thought
there'd be a line. I -- I don't know. I'm going to upset somebody with this statement, but I'm just going to say it. I don't understand the idea of wanting just one rep for a parish.

I think if you got two, you got two people to go to. I don't think congressmen sit there and say,
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | idea of what Congressman Carter wanted in District -- | 1 | That's what I was being told. |
| 2 | District 2? | 2 | That's A. And B, we do have another senator in |
|  | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I have no idea. | 3 | Baton Rouge. Her name is Senator Regina Barrow. She is |
|  | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. And let me | 4 | the Pro Tem. So I'm wondering why she wasn't in the |
| 5 | make sure in -- in District 6 , the new district, the VAP | 5 | room. We're a metropolitan area. So I want to clear |
| 6 | -- the VAP map is 54.342; is that correct? I'm looking | 6 | that up. I guess she wasn't invited to the party. I -- |
| 7 | at it. | 7 | I don't know. |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I'll take your word | 8 | But l -- I do want to ask our chairman if the |
| 9 | for it. It -- they went up. | 9 | Legal Defense Fund can come up and help to clear up some |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Yeah. BVAP. Okay. | 10 | of the questions that we may have about these map and |
| 11 | And we know that that district will perform at that | 11 | the performance because we have the public who's |
| 12 | capacity? | 12 | listening, and they should know what's going on. I |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: We feel like it'll | 13 | believe that these are the people who could perhaps |
| 14 | perform better because the population -- the -- the BVAP | 14 | answer some of the questions that we have. |
| 15 | has increased. | 15 | And I certainly have some questions for them |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: And what about the | 16 | myself, since I can't get a clear answer on performance |
| 17 | BVAP for District 2 at 51.7? Will that increase? | 17 | or compactness. All of these issues that we're talking |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: It -- it increased as | 18 | about: the deviation, how many splits it is. I have an |
| 19 | well. | 19 | attorney right here by me, Mr. Larvadain. And he's -- |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: So your -- your map | 20 | because we were given this information a few minutes |
| 21 | will produce two majority-minority districts; is that | 21 | ago, as legislators, many of us can't decipher through |
| 22 | correct? | 22 |  |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That's correct. | 23 | So I would ask that LDF, the Legal Defense |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: But you've got | 24 | Fund, would be able to come up to the table to answer |
| 25 | several districts in District 6 where you have my | 25 | some questions as it relates to these amendments, if you |
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| 1 | district, Rapides, is split three ways, and also East | 1 | don't mind. Mr. Beaullieu -- Chairman Beaullieu. Thank |
| 2 | Baton Rouge Parish is split three ways. | 2 | you. |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I - l think in order | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Someone here present |
| 4 | to accomplish the shift in population, Ithink some of | 4 | from the Legal Defense Fund like to come to the table? |
| 5 | the white population was extracted from -- from that | 5 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowery on a |
| 6 | minority district in order to increase their -- their | 6 | clarification. |
| 7 | BVAP. | 7 | MS. LOWERY: I just wanted to correct. Hey, |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. That's it. | 8 | Members - I'm sorry - in the audience, I want to correct |
| 9 | Thank you. | 9 | something I said earlier. Senator Womack's Bill |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you. | 10 | presently has 16 split parishes as well as |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative | 11 | Representative Farnum's amendment at 16 split parishes. |
| 12 | Larvadain. Representative Marcelle. | 12 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. Ms. Lowery, |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Let -- | 13 | Rep Marcelle. And we have -- if y'all wouldn't mind, |
| 14 | let -- let me start out by saying I'm not personally | 14 | please introduce yourselves. And y'all filled out |
| 15 | attacking any senator, particularly Gary Carter, who I | 15 | cards? |
| 16 | like and have served with. I believe that you said that | 16 | MS. WENGER: We did not, but we can. |
| 17 | Senator Carter was in the room. And I believe that you | 17 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Please do. Thank you. |
| 18 | said that he probably was protecting the interest or | 18 | MS. WENGER: My name is Victoria Wenger. I'm |
| 19 | speaking on behalf of Senator -- I mean, Congressman | 19 | an attorney with the Legal Defense Fund. |
| 20 | Carter. | 20 | MR. EVANS: Jared Evans, attorney with the |
| 21 | So l-- I asked a question was anybody in | 21 | Legal Defense Fund. |
| 22 | there from Baton Rouge? What I'm being told by my | 22 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you all for |
| 23 | senator or one of my senators, which is Cleo Fields, | 23 | coming to the table, and thank you for your work on this |
| 24 | that he was handed the finished product - he did not | 24 | matter. Can you please -- first of all, let me -- let |
| 25 | work on the product - after the product was finished. |  | me ask you a question because perhaps you all got this |
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1 map a lot sooner than us. You all have been working for how many years on getting this done?

MS. WENGER: We filed our litigation,
Robinson, now, v. Landry - at the time it was Robinson
v. Ardoin - the day that the legislature overrode the governor's veto. I believe it was March 30th, 2022.

MR. EVANS: But the work started around the first roadshow in October 2021 -- September 2021.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. So can you all please tell me, in your opinion, what adding -- if this amendment get on, what does it do to Womack's bill? Does it make it better? Does it make it worse? Is it more compactness? Is it more split parishes? Does it make sense?

Help me and help walk us through it because the public really needs to know what's going on. And I know they can't know because we just got hit with it today.

MS. WENGER: Representative Marcelle, we're in a similar posture to you. The map that we advocated for was presented here in the legislature as SB4 which died in committee, and HB5, sponsored by you. That exact map has been in public discourse since the roadshow, as my colleague mentioned, at least a similar version. Our attempt was to create a new Black-majority district in
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District 5, uniting north Baton Rouge with the Delta parishes.

We have also seen in the public domain other versions of maps, like HB12 in 2022, that run along the Red River and the l-49 corridor. But we, for a variety of different reasons, had really coalesced around another -- another option here, and that's because it has been held up to court scrutiny for years now.

It has made its way before the District Court, but also before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. We've had to show that it's possible to reduce parish splits in line with Joint Rule 21, which was passed by this legislature in 2021.

So I guess our journey started earlier than we represented. We've been following redistricting since, perhaps, the census and since you all made the rules. So --

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So -- so I guess my question is: does this amendment make more splits than -- because I think it has 16 in it.

MS. WENGER: So you'll put us on the spot. So let me pull out my notebook and -- and talk a little bit about the other maps we've seen in this process.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Well, I'm just trying to get a little clarity for myself and other
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shared here about parish splits. But that's coming not only directly from doctrine around redistricting, but also Joint Rule 21. We have been abiding by the rules that this legislature put in place for yourselves.

So that is the rubric that we are guided by, that the courts are referring to, that our map drawer is accountable to. So that's why parish splits are emphasized.

There's also a logic to it. There's a lot of governing that's done at the parish level here. There's election administration, school boards, other elements of civic life that have been recognized in your politics, in your policy, in Joint Rule 21, and by the federal courts. So that's why that principle is so important. I think there's many other things.

And, again, I -- I don't even have a copy of the amendment in front of me here, but we have had to comply with principles like deviation, trying to get that as close to zero as possible, certainly trying to keep important places.

We've heard really compelling testimony about the importance of keeping military bases whole or the communities that serve those areas, whether it's, you know, housing or other communities of interest. We have tried to comply with that over the course of the -- the
process. Even SB4 and HB5, we have alternative options that we could pursue to keep some of the military districts that have been -- or military bases that have been mentioned whole.

We'd be happy to work on that with you all. We would be happy to end this litigation with a map that complies with Section 2 and also can achieve other political ends. We understand for any type of politics that our bill was not successful here.

We do, however, know based off of the amendment that Representative Marcelle has presented here, based off of record from prior bills filed in this process or presented by the civil rights community that follow the Red River and I-49, that there could be ways to clean up this amendment to otherwise perfect it that, maybe, maybe, could get us further towards resolution in this litigation but none that could do that as efficiently and cost-effectively for years and years of expensive litigation with folks far above my -- my bracket to get it over with and to finally just be resolved.

There is a path forward there. It is in grasp. We would love -- and on behalf of our clients, we would love to see that resolution.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, thank you. I
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-- I just was wondering, Rapides and East Baton Rouge
are heavily populated by minorities, right?
MS. WENGER: That's correct.
MR. EVANS: That's correct.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Would you agree with that?

MR. EVANS: That's correct.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And I'm just wondering how would the Court view that, that we split it three ways, both of them?

MS. WENGER: I think the Court would have a lot of questions about what are the politics guiding this. And I think my question is: why, for three years or more, are we not listening to Black people who came here? We had young people who drove here overnight in the snow and back roads from my colleague's alma mater up north at Grambling University just to have their voices heard in the process.

We had people who were here when the whole state was closed down, were here on Martin Luther King Day when the nation is closed down. And they came to advocate for SB4. And they still, after years, have never gotten a floor debate.

They've never been able to see this conversation happen or to have their grievances met with
any genuine effort to resolve this Section 2 violation or just honor a principle of fairness.

So there might be a path forward here. We tried to give a much easier one to get this litigation over with. I cannot speak to whether this is that path forward. I can speak to ways to do this better by redistricting criteria and, hopefully, give people some fairness and give you all some reprieve from federal court litigation.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Thank you. I'm -- I'm just wondering if there's a risk that the judge would say that this is -- she would go ahead and draw it herself because instead of reducing it, we increased it, and so -- the splits. And I -- and I -I'm just curious.

And -- and we keep talking about the political motivations. And I heard and I respect Senator Womack who talked about he wanted to -- to make Scalise -- he checked with Scalise. He checked with Letlow. I heard every person's name except Gary Graves, and that's one of my congressmen. I was wondering if y'all had a conversation with him as well. But --

MR. EVANS: Hope you're not asking us that.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Pardon me?
MR. EVANS: I was talking -- yeah. You
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weren't asking that to me, right?
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No, no, no, no, no

MR. EVANS: Yeah.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- no, no, no. I was just making a statement because I'm -- I'm -- I'm about to be quiet.

But I -- I just want to make sure that everybody understand when you start talking about -- and I said this the other day when I was at the table. If we could remove all of the people who represent the districts away from it and give it to somebody and allow them to draw it fairly, then we would get the best product because it's not impossible to draw two Black congressional districts.

But if everybody -- nobody wants to give up any portion of anything, you're going to have the same problem over and over again. And -- and I do respect that Senator Womack says he's -- you know, his district is -- is getting hit as well. But everybody has to give up something to do what is right. And nobody wants to do that.

Some people want to make sure that they have, you know, a certain number of a certain population to win. And it's just not right. It is not right. It is
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | far too long that Louisiana has done things wrong. And | 1 | the time, and we represent groups that are trying to get |
| 2 | it's about time that we do something that's right and | 2 | folks engaged in this process, excited, and knowing that |
| 3 | get us out of the courts. | 3 | their vote's going to matter. So it's perhaps a way to |
| 4 | And I want to thank you guys for your work. I | 4 | reduce some confusion or to have, again, the lines line |
| 5 | don't know if anybody else has any questions for you, | 5 | up. |
| 6 | but I-- I see this as strictly politics, last minute, | 6 | But, again, I think the legislature and the |
| 7 | let's throw in something and confuse the whole issue. | 7 | folks behind Joint Rule 21, many of y'all, colleagues, |
| 8 | But I will not vote for this bill with that amendment on | 8 | or folks that, you know, have moved along to the Senate |
| 9 | it. Thank you. | 9 | but were part of that process, can speak best to why |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Also -- have -- have -- | 10 | that matters specifically to them. |
| 11 | have y'all filled out cards. If not, would you please | 11 | But it is something that's been dignified in |
| 12 | do it? | 12 | the courts, that's been recognized both at a very |
| 13 | MR. EVANS: We going to fill them out. | 13 | Louisiana-specific level. Most other places, we're |
| 14 | MS. WENGER: We will. Thank you. | 14 | calling them counties instead of parishes. So it means |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. | 15 | something here. It really matters. |
| 16 | Representative Wyble. | 16 | So I think that's why, perhaps, it was |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Yes. Thank you. If | 17 | involved in Joint Rule 21. Perhaps it's mattered to the |
| 18 | you could remain just for a minute, please. Sorry. I'm | 18 | courts. But parish splits is -- is something you can |
| 19 | sorry. I didn't catch your name. | 19 | quantify. You can look at how many times the parishes |
| 20 | MS. WENGER: Sorry. I'm Victoria Wenger. | 20 | are split overall. There's this other quantitative |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Oh, thank you both for | 21 | metric we talk about called fracking, which is, like, |
| 22 | being here. I appreciate it. You mentioned in -- in | 22 | where multiple districts or different non-contiguous |
| 23 | your remarks, you connected splitting parishes with | 23 | parts of a district are coming into a parish. |
| 24 | local politics and, like, school board elections. So | 24 | We're just really looking at what are those |
| 25 | just connect for me, where's the voter confusion if a | 25 | metrics where it's fair to put one map side by side and |
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| 1 | parish is split with a school board election? Make that | 1 | make some observations about how they compare, where you |
| 2 | connection for me, because you mentioned school board | 2 | can take politics or you can take other subjective |
| 3 | particularly -- | 3 | measures out of the equation for a moment just to do |
| 4 | MS. WENGER: So -- | 4 | that side by side. So I was mentioning that as one of |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: -- specifically. | 5 | those quantitative measures that's codified for this |
| 6 | MS. WENGER: Yeah, this could vary based off | 6 | legislature in Joint Rule 21. |
| 7 | -- parish to parish, based off where -- what types of | 7 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: I -- I was just curious |
| 8 | elections are happening, whether they're a district, at | 8 | where the correlation was because, I'm not sure if |
| 9 | large, whether -- you know, how many folks are on a | 9 | you're aware, but we actually have parishes in Louisiana |
| 10 | school board, if there's someone elected at large and | 10 | that have multiple public school districts. |
| 11 | another position. It can happen a lot of different | 11 | MS. WENGER: Absolutely. |
| 12 | ways. | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: So in some of those |
| 13 | Again, what -- what I was speaking to, again, | 13 | parishes, they're already voting for different school |
| 14 | is Joint Rule 21, which signified the fact that this | 14 | board members and -- and there are splits, if you want |
| 15 | legislature and the prior legislature that enacted it, | 15 | to call it that. And I just -- you -- you -- you caught |
| 16 | wanted to keep in consideration how current lines, | 16 | my attention when you mentioned school boards. And I |
| 17 | political lines, like parishes -- that's probably the | 17 | was trying to figure out the correlation to that and |
| 18 | most significant one you could think of here. | 18 | splitting a parish in a congressional district. |
| 19 | But another thing that our map drawer | 19 | MS. WENGER: Yeah. And it really depends |
| 20 | considered and that Joint Rule 21 is considering is | 20 | parish by parish, and those are -- those are the types |
| 21 | municipalities or unincorporated areas. And so you're | 21 | of lines. Or, like, you could halve the districts, |
| 22 | thinking about how are ballots drawn around that. How | 22 | those school districts. That's one of the things that |
| 23 | are people conceptualizing? | 23 | map drawers can actually have on the screen and can use |
| 24 | And, you know, we -- we don't just work on | 24 | as a measure of how to look at that. |
| 25 | redistricting or litigating. We do civic education all | 25 | So you can also look at what's called landmark |
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| 1 | or COI landmark. So thinking of school districts or | 1 | to create two majority-Black districts. And performance |
| 2 | hospitals, airports, everything else when you're looking | 2 | of those maps that we saw earlier, some that didn't make |
| 3 | at that metric, all I can speak to -- I can't speak to | 3 | it through, some that were here, including yours, |
| 4 | this amendment. I just saw it. But in terms of | 4 | Senator Womack, some of them perform. Some perform |
| 5 | landmark place splits, the map that we had proposed had | 5 | better than others. |
| 6 | the exact same amount as the enacted map. | 6 | But we have to look at the -- the -- the |
| 7 | So that was another metric that, in our | 7 | center of this piece, and that is to create those |
| 8 | process, we were able to hold ourselves accountable to, | 8 | districts that perform. And some of that's going to be |
| 9 | to making sure our map was as good as or, in most of the | 9 | for debate and some that's going to be for the -- the |
| 10 | instances, better than the enacted map. | 10 | clearing pieces to happen as we go forward. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So, Representative Wyble, | 11 | But l just want to put on the record, you |
| 12 | what we can do -- I know you're a big school board guy. | 12 | know, that I know the senators worked hard on this |
| 13 | Why don't we get you with them afterwards, and y'all can | 13 | piece. And that goal is what was in mind, to create |
| 14 | talk in some details on that? | 14 | these two majority-Black districts and to do it with as |
| 15 | MS. WENGER: We've got slide decks on this. | 15 | much of the criteria as possible to be done to -- to |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Right. No. They have -- | 16 | make sure that it -- it -- it is conforming. |
| 17 | they have -- they have tons of information. | 17 | And -- and with that being said, I wanted to |
| 18 | MS. WENGER: I'd be happy to provide it for us | 18 | get that clear of what that message is and what we're |
| 19 | anytime. | 19 | doing here, which you remember before we -- we go with |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Thank -- thank you so | 20 | this piece. And I wanted to say that, Mr. Chairman, as |
| 21 | much. | 21 | we go forward in this opportunity. Thank you. |
| 22 | MS. WENGER: Thank you. | 22 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Vice Chairman |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative | 23 | Lyons. Members, back on the motion, we have a -- a |
| 24 | Wyble. Members, that clears the board. Representative | 24 | motion by Representative Foreman to adopt -- Farnum to |
| 25 | Farnum has a motion on the table to adopt Amendment Set | 25 | adopt Amendment Set 68. Is there any objections to the |
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| 1 | 68. And objection -- what's that? | 1 | adoption of that amendment set? Hearing no -- no |
| 2 | VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: (inaudible 1:22:44). | 2 | objection, Amendment Set 68 is -- is hereby adopted. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Oh, oh. One second, | 3 | On to the next amendment. We have Amendment |
| 4 | Members. Vice Chairman Lyons. | 4 | Set 70, I believe, Representative Marcelle. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. | 5 | Representative Marcelle, on -- on your amendment. |
| 6 | And I was going to address this -- this to | 6 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's amendment |
| 7 | Representative Farnum on -- on your amendment. And | 7 | (inaudible 1:25:52). |
| 8 | after the table was just -- was clear with that | 8 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Or Ms. Lowery, would you |
| 9 | information, now, I--1 just want to say that the past | 9 | mind reading that in? |
| 10 | two years, I've been through every roadshow throughout | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I just missed my |
| 11 | this state. | 11 | objection -- amendment. |
| 12 | I was in Calcasieu, and I heard the testimony | 12 | MS. LOWERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 13 | there. And I - I sympathize in it with the individual | 13 | Representative Marcelle brings Amendment Set HCASB-8362, |
| 14 | residents there as they talked about being whole as | 14 | number 70. This is available, Members, in front of you, |
| 15 | other communities of interest throughout the state. | 15 | and also for members of the public, it's available |
| 16 | That was the most impacting testimony that we received | 16 | online. |
| 17 | throughout this process. And it went on for not only | 17 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle, |
| 18 | from our community to your community, everywhere else. | 18 | on your amendment. |
| 19 | And the question remains always - and we don't | 19 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. |
| 20 | have an answer for - is: can we draw the perfect map? I | 20 | Amendment Number 3 adds River -- the Red River Parish to |
| 21 | don't think we ever can draw the perfect map. I don't | 21 | Congressional District 6, better preserving the Red |
| 22 | think that there's ever going to be a situation where | 22 | River community of interest and the community of |
| 23 | everybody's going to be happy or even whole. | 23 | interest formed by Red River, Natchitoches, and DeSoto |
| 24 | But I'm looking at the mission that we have | 24 | Parishes. It also makes Ouachita Parish whole in |
| 25 | here. And the mission that we have here is that we have | 25 | Congressional District 5. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: No. | 1 | -- so the bill now is the amendment. So as -- as the -- |
| 2 | MS. BAKER: No. Representative Wright? | 2 | the red cards come up, if they have a clarification to |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: No. | 3 | where they -- this is -- they're not in opposition |
| 4 | MS. BAKER: No. Representative Wyble? | 4 | anymore, they can waive and -- or -- or -- or correct |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: No. | 5 | it. And we can -- we can waive these red cards if -- if |
| 6 | MS. BAKER: No. There are 5 yeas and 11 nays. | 6 | they are in favor of this amendment. So they could -- |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Members, Amendment Set 70 | 7 | we give the liberty of those who turned in the red card |
| 8 | has failed to pass. So we're back on the bill, which is | 8 | to be able to clarify that. I don't want to speak for |
| 9 | the Amendment Set of 68, which we have just adopted. | 9 | them. |
| 10 | We're going to go ahead and -- and -- and read in some | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Okay. So we listening |
| 11 | cards present in support and not wishing to speak. | 11 | to these red cards before we do the final vote on |
| 12 | We have Ms. Brianna Robillard (phonetic), | 12 | passing -- |
| 13 | present in support and not wishing to speak; Deborah | 13 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes, ma'am. |
| 14 | Hebert (phonetic); Gary Hebert as well; Elise Blade | 14 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: -- the bill as |
| 15 | (phonetic), present, in support, not wishing to speak. | 15 | amended. |
| 16 | All of these are present in support, not | 16 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes, ma'am. |
| 17 | wishing to speak. Ashley Duly (phonetic), Heather Trice | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Okay. Thank you for |
| 18 | (phonetic), Catherine Mays (phonetic), Gail Baralt | 18 | that clarification, Mr. Chair. |
| 19 | (phonetic), Julia Harris, Joyce LaCour, Lucille Harris | 19 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: No. I'm -- thank you for |
| 20 | (phonetic), Kristy Robinson (phonetic), Kathleen -- | 20 | asking. Mr. Alexander. |
| 21 | maybe, Matharms. | 21 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Representative |
| 22 | MS. FARMS: Farms. | 22 | Beaullieu. Thank you, members of the committee. My |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Form? | 23 | name is Chris Alexander. I'm here simply on behalf of |
| 24 | MS. FARMS: F-A-R-M-S. | 24 | the Louisiana Citizen Advocacy Group. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Oh, Farms. Okay, yeah. | 25 | As each of you know, conservatives in the US |
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| 1 | Thank you. Farms, Tisha -- and Tisha Lathan. | 1 | House of Representatives now have a two-vote majority, |
| 2 | We have a couple of red cards present and not | 2 | razor-thin Republican majority. This is a |
| 3 | wishing to speak, in opposition. Christine Robinson, | 3 | super-majority Republican legislature. And it's that |
| 4 | Gail Paralt. And then we have some red cards present | 4 | for a reason because 70 percent of the citizens of |
| 5 | and would like to speak. We'll start with Chris | 5 | Louisiana are conservative. And, actually, in the US |
| 6 | Alexander. So if you'll give the floor, please, | 6 | House of Representatives, at this second, there's -- |
| 7 | Senator. | 7 | there's a one-vote majority -- Republican majority |
| 8 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. | 8 | because Representative Scalise is on medical leave now. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Mr. Alexander, if you | 9 | So we're one vote away in our country right |
| 10 | would please introduce yourself for the committee? | 10 | now, in the US Congress, from having the Biden-Schumer |
| 11 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. My name is Chris. | 11 | agenda essentially unleashed on the country. Some |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Give me -- give me one | 12 | people may say it's already been. But there is some |
| 13 | second, Mr. Alexander. | 13 | protection in the US Congress right now because of that |
| 14 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. | 14 | razor-thin majority. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Newell, do | 15 | By voting for this bill, creating an |
| 16 | you have a question? | 16 | additional minority district in Louisiana, it's our view |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Newell. | 17 | that you are giving that majority away. And you're |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Newell. | 18 | putting the very delicate balance of power in the US |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: We're back -- | 19 | Congress in very grave jeopardy on matters of profound |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: I get it right most of | 20 | consequence to citizens of Louisiana and citizens across |
| 21 | the time. | 21 | the country. Everything is at risk here. |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Sometimes you do | 22 | Now, the argument that we've heard from a lot |
| 23 | (inaudible 1:33:36). These red cards are on the | 23 | of Republican members here is that if you don't pass a |
| 24 | amendment that we just voted on or back on the bill? | 24 | new plan creating an additional minority district in |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So they can -- so that's | 25 | Louisiana, then the Federal Court judge will make that |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | decision. | 1 | And if six months or a year from now, the |
| 2 | Well, her actual order says that the | 2 | United States Congress is controlled by Democrats, it |
| 3 | plaintiffs, when they went into Court for a preliminary | 3 | started in this house, it started and ended in this |
| 4 | injunction, never tried on the merits, just a summary | 4 | capital, and that's what will have made it possible. |
| 5 | proceeding, said that they had carried their burden of | 5 | And the citizens of Louisiana, I can tell you, will have |
| 6 | showing that the current map violates Section 2 of the | 6 | a very, very good memory if that occurs. I would |
| 7 | Voting Rights Act and that the plaintiffs had a | 7 | respectfully submit that your responsibility is to |
| 8 | substantial likelihood of making their claim successful, | 8 | represent the interests of the substantial majority of |
| 9 | which is that we'll have a second minority district in | 9 | Louisiana citizens and not to cave to political |
| 10 | Louisiana. | 10 | pressure. And we're asking you to defeat this |
| 11 | But there was no trial on the merits. But the | 11 | legislation. Thank you. |
| 12 | judge essentially said, if we have a trial on the | 12 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. Alexander. |
| 13 | merits, I'm going to rule in favor of the plaintiffs, | 13 | And look just to -- to -- and -- and you got a couple |
| 14 | and I'm going to create a second majority-minority | 14 | of questions. But just from -- from my standpoint, I |
| 15 | district in Louisiana. That's exactly what this bill is | 15 | sat on the committee when we drew the other maps that we |
| 16 | doing right now. | 16 | all believe were fair, and we believe is representative |
| 17 | And if our current map goes -- if you do | 17 | of the state of Louisiana. The Fifth Circuit sent it |
| 18 | nothing and our current map goes back before Judge Dick, | 18 | back to the federal judge and basically held us hostage |
| 19 | she's going to probably end up doing the same thing. | 19 | that if -- if we don't do it, she's going to do it. And |
| 20 | But at least we have a chance to fight for the current | 20 | so none of us like the position we're in. |
| 21 | map in our state. And no matter how she rules, we have | 21 | But -- you know, and -- and a little bit to |
| 22 | the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal, and we have the US | 22 | your point, we were elected to serve, and we feel that |
| 23 | Supreme Court. | 23 | -- that we would prefer to have the lines drawn in this |
| 24 | And, again, everything is at stake, and it | 24 | committee than have some Obama-appointed judge drawing |
| 25 | seems like we're simply giving it all away right now. | 25 | the lines for us. And so we don't like it. It's |
|  | Page 87 |  | Page 89 |
| 1 | We believe that this is worth fighting for. We believe | 1 | painful to do. And sol feel your sentiment, and -- and |
| 2 | that that balance of power is worth fighting for. | 2 | I don't -- I'm not disagreeing with most of what you |
| 3 | And I would remind the members of this panel | 3 | said. I mean, it's -- it's -- it's -- it's what goes on |
| 4 | that I know, some of whom we helped get elected, along | 4 | in a lot of our minds. So l-- I appreciate your |
| 5 | with Governor Landry whom we worked very hard for and | 5 | comments. Thank you. And you do have -- you do have a |
| 6 | who we respect and think he's going to be a great | 6 | question. Representative Newell. |
| 7 | governor, that the citizens of Louisiana worked very | 7 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much, |
| 8 | tirelessly to get you elected to come here, not to cave | 8 | Mr. Chairman. I'm troubled by your statements because |
| 9 | in to political pressure, which is it appears to | 9 | this is not a process by which one party is losing |
| 10 | hundreds and hundreds of citizens across the state that | 10 | power, caving into another party. This is a process by |
| 11 | that's what you're doing. You're caving in to political | 11 | which the other 30 percent of the people in this state |
| 12 | pressure, and you're giving in without a fight. | 12 | are trying to get the representation that their |
| 13 | Speaker Mike Johnson has weighed in on this. | 13 | population and numbers deserve in Congress. This isn't |
| 14 | We heard some testimony earlier that Congressman Johnson | 14 | a caving in or power grab or giving away of power or |
| 15 | apparently was okay with this proposed legislation. | 15 | losing of power of the Republican Party. |
| 16 | That's not our legislation. That's not our | 16 | It's an opportunity for this body to represent |
| 17 | understanding at all. In fact, Congressman Johnson | 17 | all of the people that they supposed to represent in |
| 18 | specifically said that our current map from 2022 needs a | 18 | their district, listening to them and giving them the |
| 19 | full trial on the merits, with appellate review all the | 19 | opportunity to vote for someone of their choice, whether |
| 20 | way to the Supreme Court, if necessary, because the | 20 | that person of their choice is a Black Republican or |
| 21 | issue is so profoundly important to the future of this | 21 | White Democrat. It's an opportunity for Black people, |
| 22 | republic. I will -- I want to reiterate before I close, | 22 | as some of my colleagues would prefer to be said, but a |
| 23 | as I said, people all over the state are watching this | 23 | minority-majority district to have the opportunity to |
| 24 | right now, many of whom voted for you to come here, some | 24 | vote for their candidate of choice. And l'm troubled by |
| 25 | of you who were just elected very recently. | 25 | the way you said your statement. You're very |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | respectful, but I listen to the words. | 1 | forever. And we're just -- l just want to see African |
| 2 | This is not supposed to be a process that is | 2 | Americans across the state have the same privileges |
| 3 | this contentious and this divisive, but it is a very | 3 | you've had all your life, and that is voting in someone |
| 4 | difficult process. And we have been fighting this for | 4 | that they know or believe will have their best interest |
| 5 | three years now, and l've been on this committee since | 5 | at heart, whether it's in this building or whether it's |
| 6 | the very start. Went to Utah with the rest of the | 6 | in our United States Capitol. |
| 7 | people from across this country that had the same job | 7 | It's not a caving-in. Because if it was a |
| 8 | that we all have here to learn what we're doing. | 8 | caving-in, this process would have been over a long time |
| 9 | Traveled this state from north to south, east to west, | 9 | ago. And I just needed to say, I don't have any |
| 10 | to listen to what all of the people in this state | 10 | questions for you, but your statement kind of disturbed |
| 11 | wanted. The White citizens in this state, their issue | 11 | me a little bit -- |
| 12 | was keeping their -- their communities together. | 12 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. |
| 13 | You know what Black people wanted? Just an | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: -- because I don't |
| 14 | opportunity to have a voice in a room. And that is what | 14 | want you to think that it's a caving-in of any party. |
| 15 | we're trying to do. It is not to -- it's not a power | 15 | MR. ALEXANDER: Well, I respect you, |
| 16 | grab. It's not to say that Republicans rule or that if | 16 | Representative Newell, and I respect your right to |
| 17 | that -- if there's another chance where Democrats are | 17 | speak. |
| 18 | ruling, that that's a problem. We should not see one | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Newell. |
| 19 | party as a problem. We should not see another person | 19 | MR. ALEXANDER: And I would always -- Newell. |
| 20 | that has a different letter behind the name as the | 20 | And I would always protect your right to speak, but we |
| 21 | enemy. I like him. He's not the enemy because he's a | 21 | do live in a democracy here. And when a majority with a |
| 22 | Republican. We just have a different way of looking at | 22 | particular ideology is in power and control, policy |
| 23 | things, and that's how we should see it. We both | 23 | should reflect that ideology. Our position here is very |
| 24 | observing the same problem. | 24 | simple, that Congressman Mike Johnson, the Speaker of |
| 25 | We just have different ways as -- different | 25 | the House, represents a conservative ideology. Many |
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| 1 | ways as how we gets to the solution. And we cannot | 1 | citizens across Louisiana are very proud and happy that |
| 2 | continue to have this rhetoric on -- out in the -- in | 2 | he's there, and this legislation threatens the authority |
| 3 | the world like it's a problem to be of another party, or | 3 | that conservatives have in the United States Congress. |
| 4 | it's a problem for another party to be in -- in | 4 | He has said very clearly that our current map |
| 5 | leadership. We're not giving away power. The | 5 | is constitutional and that we should fight for it in |
| 6 | Republicans are not caving in because they're helping | 6 | federal court in order to reflect the interests of a |
| 7 | African Americans have an opportunity to vote for a | 7 | majority of Louisiana citizens. And democracy and a |
| 8 | candidate of their choice. | 8 | republic means something. But I would always fight, by |
| 9 | That is what we're doing here because -- and | 9 | the way, for your right to speak, and I-- I value it |
| 10 | we're going through this fight because, as I've said | 10 | greatly, as much as I value mine. |
| 11 | many times before, this is the first time that this | 11 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you for giving |
| 12 | country has gone through redistricting where -- after | 12 | me my right for letting me know I have a right to speak. |
| 13 | the expiration of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. | 13 | $I$ also have a right to vote. And I also have had a |
| 14 | Section 5 required all states that had a history of | 14 | right all my life, coming from Orleans Parish as having |
| 15 | racism that any bills -- any laws that were passed that | 15 | an opportunity to vote for a representative of my |
| 16 | would affect people's access and rights to voting had to | 16 | choosing that I believe represented my interests. And |
| 17 | be overseen and approved by the Department of Justice. | 17 | this democracy, we need to make sure that it enables |
| 18 | This is our first time doing this where we no longer | 18 | other people across this state to also have a voice and |
| 19 | have that supervision. | 19 | a right to vote for a candidate of choice that could |
| 20 | And God knows, I wish we still had that | 20 | also be their voices in rooms that they're not able to |
| 21 | supervision because, clearly, we can't do this on our | 21 | be in. That is what this process is, sir. |
| 22 | own, because, clearly, somewhere along the lines, the | 22 | So I appreciate you reminding me of my right |
| 23 | message is getting construed that this is a giving up of | 23 | to speak because I'm going to do it anyway. |
| 24 | power. Instead, this is an opportunity to let other | 24 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, ma'am. |
| 25 | people enjoy the benefits that another group has had for | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: But it also is my |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | right to ensure that others have their right to speak | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: And, you know, I |
| 2 | and their right to vote and keep their access to voting | 2 | would rather put this decision in the hands of elected |
| 3 | intact. And while they have that right in that access, | 3 | representatives than in -- in the hands of an unelected |
| 4 | that they also have the ability to vote for a person of | 4 | judge. |
| 5 | their choice. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. | 5 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you for that |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative | 6 | (inaudible 1:48:43). |
| 7 | Newell. We have a handful of representatives that want | 7 | MR. ALEXANDER: And I very much appreciate |
| 8 | to exercise their right to speak. Representative | 8 | that, Representative Carlson. And I would simply argue, |
| 9 | Carlson. | 9 | I'm consistent with Speaker Johnson's position that our |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. | 10 | current map is constitutional, and it's worth fighting |
| 11 | Mr. Alexander, I appreciate your comments. | 11 | for when you consider what is so profoundly at stake. |
| 12 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: I understand, but |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: I really do. I'm -- | 13 | there is no position to fight at this time. It is |
| 14 | MR. ALEXANDER: And congratulations on your | 14 | either Judge Dick draw a map or we create a map. There |
| 15 | election. | 15 | is no continue -- |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Thank you very much. | 16 | MR. ALEXANDER: Right. That's true. |
| 17 | I appreciate that. Look, I'm -- certainly wish that | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: The -- the fight |
| 18 | we're in a different position in the House of | 18 | cannot continue on beyond that until we draw a map or we |
| 19 | Representatives with more than just a one-vote majority | 19 | don't draw a map. |
| 20 | -- | 20 | MR. ALEXANDER: But if you don't draw a map, |
| 21 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. | 21 | you're -- or do draw a map, either way, you end up with |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: -- and that this | 22 | a one -- |
| 23 | wasn't looked at as a "we're going to lose the majority | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: If we don't draw -- |
| 24 | or not" kind of decision. But unfortunately, that's the | 24 | MR. ALEXANDER: -- majority-minority increase. |
| 25 | position that we find ourselves in. I can assure you | 25 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: If we don't draw a |
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| 1 | this: that we are not -- that we're not here today | 1 | map, we end up with the map that Judge Dick draws, which |
| 2 | because we're caving to any kind of political pressure. | 2 | will be a map with two majority Black districts. But if |
| 3 | The fact of the matter is, like it or not, Judge Dick | 3 | you say worse than that is -- |
| 4 | has said, "Either you do your job and draw the map, or | 4 | MR. ALEXANDER: Exactly what we're going to |
| 5 | l'll draw the map for you," period. We've argued this | 5 | have as a result of this legislation. |
| 6 | case before the Fifth Circuit twice. | 6 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: But it will not be as |
| 7 | We've asked the Supreme Court to hear it. | 7 | good as the senator's map. |
| 8 | They've said, "You need to go and do your job first," | 8 | MR. ALEXANDER: Well, in the net effect, I |
| 9 | which our job is to draw these maps. | 9 | would respectfully submit, would be the same. |
| 10 | MR. ALEXANDER: Sure. | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: It -- it certainly |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: I don't like this | 11 | is. And, look, I-- I-- I think there is a legal basis |
| 12 | position. I wish we were not in this position. I like | 12 | for it. Look, I'm glad that we are having this |
| 13 | the maps that the legislature a few years ago voted on | 13 | conversation. In -- in all fairness and all honesty, I |
| 14 | and approved, but here we are. And so we -- if I-- as | 14 | think all of these maps look crazy because -- |
| 15 | I look at it today, I can -- I'm a -- I'm a realist, | 15 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. |
| 16 | right? I don't -- I -- I could say I wish things were | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: -- the truth is that |
| 17 | different. But today, what is presented in front of me | 17 | every -- the overarching argument that l've heard from |
| 18 | is either Judge Dick draw the map or we draw the maps. | 18 | nearly everyone over the last four days has been race |
| 19 | I feel like this legislative body is going to draw a | 19 | first. I wish it weren't that. This is the first |
| 20 | better map than Judge Dick will, period. | 20 | argument today that said, "I'm basing a -- a map on |
| 21 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. | 21 | political reasons, not on race." And I-- I think it's |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: And that's why we're | 22 | a shame that we are having a conversation where race |
| 23 | here. That's why we're going to vote on the map that we | 23 | seems to be, at least based on the conversations, the |
| 24 | think is the best. | 24 | driving force, when we do not live in a -- a -- a -- a |
| 25 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. | 25 | segregated society or nearly as segregated as it once |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | was 40,50 years ago. | 1 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle. |
| 2 | And so the reason why this is so difficult is | 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Mr. |
| 3 | because we are moving in the right direction. We don't | 3 | Alexander, I guess it's disheartening for me to sit here |
| 4 | have concentrated populations of -- of certain | 4 | in 2024 and hear that we certainly need to keep the |
| 5 | minorities or populations of White folks in certain | 5 | power. And if you all do what's right in Louisiana, |
| 6 | areas. It is spread out throughout the state. Compared | 6 | we're going to lose our thin majority. If we would have |
| 7 | to Alabama, Alabama has 17 counties that are | 7 | done what was right long time ago, you probably wouldn't |
| 8 | minority-majority, and they're all contiguous. | 8 | be in a majority. If Alabama passes what they need to |
| 9 | Louisiana has seven parishes that are minority-majority | 9 | pass and we pass what we need to pass, then, perhaps, we |
| 10 | and only three are contiguous. That's why this process | 10 | will have a fair and balanced Congress. |
| 11 | is so difficult, but here we are without any other | 11 | MR. ALEXANDER: And you'll be in the majority. |
| 12 | options to move forward. | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well -- and -- and |
| 13 | And so I-- I hear what you're saying. I | 13 | what's the problem with that, sir? |
| 14 | respectfully disagree with the characterization that | 14 | MR. ALEXANDER: Well, there's millions of |
| 15 | it's bending to political pressure. | 15 | Americans who have a problem with that. |
| 16 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And guess what, it's |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: l-- l-- you know | 17 | millions of people who have not had an opportunity to |
| 18 | me, and you know that I wouldn't do that. But I don't | 18 | have a seat at the table. We have a problem with voter |
| 19 | see any other path forward. This is the best of two bad | 19 | suppression. We have a problem with people thinking |
| 20 | options, and I'm going to always do my job -- | 20 | that we can't make decisions. And let me say this: on |
| 21 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. | 21 | the other side of the aisle -- on the other side of the |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: -- that's before me. | 22 | chamber in the Senate, I have colleagues that have some |
| 23 | MR. ALEXANDER: And I understand that. | 23 | of the same beliefs that some of you have, right? And |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. | 24 | they believe in pro-life. They are African Americans. |
| 25 | MR. ALEXANDER: Is there -- is -- is there -- | 25 | I believe in pro-choice. So to say that everybody's |
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| 1 | do you think there's anything that would be -- an option | 1 | ideology because they are Black is one way, is certainly |
| 2 | would be to allow our attorney general to argue the | 2 | crazy, number one. |
| 3 | constitutionality of our current map in Federal Court, | 3 | And number two, I really agree with you with |
| 4 | Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal, and Supreme Court? | 4 | something, and that is, send it back to the courts and |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Already been done | 5 | let Judge Shelly Dick draw the maps. We could then |
| 6 | twice in the Fifth Circuit and asked of the Supreme | 6 | remove -- |
| 7 | Court, and they've refused to do that. And here we lie | 7 | MR. ALEXANDER: But you -- you agree with me. |
| 8 | today. | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I -- I do agree with |
| 9 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. | 9 | that because then we could remove all of these different |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: There's never even been a | 10 | people and these moving parts that everybody -- these |
| 11 | trial on the merits, Representative Carlson, on this map | 11 | political interests because we do deserve two Black |
| 12 | -- | 12 | congressional seats because where I went to school - it |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: That's not our | 13 | was a Black school, though, Capitol High School - when |
| 14 | decision. | 14 | you divide six into a third, a third into sixth, you get |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: -- even in district | 15 | two. And so we deserve two seats, and that's what we |
| 16 | court. | 16 | deserve. We didn't -- we're not begging for something |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: That -- that is the | 17 | that we don't deserve. That's what we deserve. |
| 18 | judge's decision, unfortunately. | 18 | And -- and God forbid, maybe somebody will get |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And if you don't do | 19 | elected that feels like you, have the same ideologies as |
| 20 | anything, they'll have one. | 20 | you, but perhaps they won't. People need an opportunity |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: And if we don't do | 21 | to have their voices heard. |
| 22 | anything, we'll have a worse map. Thank you, Mr. Chair. | 22 | MR. ALEXANDER: I respect that. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. | 23 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And when I send |
| 24 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, sir. I appreciate | 24 | somebody to Congress that feels like you that represents |
| 25 | the interchange. | 25 | my district, then you do not represent what I believe. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And that's called community -- | 1 | end up. But if we continue along this path, I feel this |
| 2 | MR. ALEXANDER: But what about representing | 2 | -- the state as a whole will suffer. The reality of it |
| 3 | majority of the people in your district? | 3 | is, is that Mike Johnson is the Speaker of the House. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: What -- what? | 4 | They still have four Republicans representing |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Look, let's let -- | 5 | Louisiana. We're here trying to stop just one |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I'm -- I'm just -- | 6 | additional African American seat. What does that say |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: The questions come from | 7 | for us? We have my chairman referring to the judge as |
| 8 | this way to you. | 8 | an Obama-judge. We cannot continue to divide the city |
| 9 | MR. ALEXANDER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. | 9 | -- the state and expect to survive. It won't happen. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So we don't go the other | 10 | We have to learn to coexist, appreciate our differences, |
| 11 | way. | 11 | appreciate the culture and differences. There are |
| 12 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank -- thank you. I | 12 | things that you cannot possibly understand in African |
| 13 | appreciate that. | 13 | American life because you're not one. We cannot |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: All l'm saying to | 14 | continue to throw out and spew divisive words and think |
| 15 | you is -- is -- | 15 | that we can survive as a state. It won't happen. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And we keep this | 16 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. |
| 17 | timeline. | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you. |
| 18 | MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. Absolutely. | 18 | MR. ALEXANDER: Representative Boyd, in what |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I think it's -- it's | 19 | you're saying, it just -- it makes me think of what |
| 20 | -- it's disingenuous to sit here and say -- and look at | 20 | Thomas Jefferson said as one of the founders of our |
| 21 | us in 2024 and say, "Black people in Louisiana, you | 21 | country. He said, "In matters of taste and culture, |
| 22 | might be a third. You could be 40 percent, but we do | 22 | swim like a fish. In matters of principle, stand like a |
| 23 | not want you at the table making decisions as it relates | 23 | rock." And that's what I'm asking this committee to do, |
| 24 | to what you want or your constituents want." And that's | 24 | is stand like a rock and allow our country to not argue |
| 25 | what I'm hearing. And it's really, really sad. | 25 | the constitutionality. |
|  | Page 103 |  | Page 105 |
| 1 | MR. ALEXANDER: Representative Marcelle, I | 1 | REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: I repeat, that makes no |
| 2 | hear you. | 2 | sense. So you're looking to further divide the state. |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: It's really -- it's | 3 | MR. ALEXANDER: I'm not here to divide anyone. |
| 4 | about -- it's about control. It's about power. And it | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: That's exactly what |
| 5 | is really fundamentally wrong. And I-I said this | 5 | you're doing. Thank you. |
| 6 | last year, and I -- I was hoping not to get upset, but | 6 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. |
| 7 | we -- we meet afterwards. We barbeque. We go across | 7 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. Mr. |
| 8 | the street. We hang out. We cool. I love you. You | 8 | Alexander, that clears the board. |
| 9 | love me. We go up to the bible study and we pray | 9 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. Appreciate your |
| 10 | together, but we do not feel like we are equal, and that | 10 | time. |
| 11 | is wrong. | 11 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative | 12 | FEMALE SPEAKER 4: Mr. Chairman, it's possible |
| 13 | Marcelle. Representative Boyd. | 13 | to have a -- |
| 14 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Representative | 14 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: We -- we have three |
| 15 | Marcelle. I appreciate that. | 15 | witnesses left. Let's -- let's hold tight on that. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. | 16 | Let's try and get through these three -- three |
| 17 | Sitting here today, thinking about the fact that we are | 17 | witnesses. If y'all could just be respectful of -- |
| 18 | literally fighting for an opportunity. It's not given | 18 | everyone be respectful of time. Ms. -- Ms. Suzie |
| 19 | because people still have to vote. An opportunity to | 19 | Labrie. What's that? |
| 20 | have two Black representation of African Americans in | 20 | MS. LABRIE: Labrie. |
| 21 | DC. The opportunity, nothing is guaranteed. We're here | 21 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Suzie Labrie, would |
| 22 | fighting for the last three years just for the | 22 | you -- |
| 23 | opportunity. And with voter apathy, we really don't | 23 | MS. LABRIE: Yes, (inaudible 1:58:09). |
| 24 | know where that's going to end up. The closed | 24 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: -- would like to speak in |
| 25 | primaries, we really don't know where that's going to | 25 | opposition. |
|  |  |  | 27 (Pages 102 to 105) |
| PohlmanUSA Court Reporting (877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com |  |  |  |


|  | Page 106 |  | Page 108 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. LABRIE: Let me pull it up. | 1 | circumstances. I want to thank you and to keep up the |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Labrie, you're ready | 2 | good work and thank you for rejecting the rest of the |
| 3 | to go. | 3 | bills calling for minority districts. It's been a |
|  | MS. LABRIE: Okay. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chair, | 4 | pleasure coming to you -- before you. |
| 5 | and all the state representatives and US | 5 | Representatives, please keep up the good work |
| 6 | representatives, I'm Suzie Labrie, appropriate | 6 | and God bless you, God bless Louisiana, God bless the |
| 7 | situational individuals who takes one issue at a time | 7 | USA, and God bless our great Speaker Mike Johnson and |
| 8 | and represent -- represent myself against this bill | 8 | Congressman Steve Scalise. Thank you. |
| 9 | because I'm in support of J. Hill Harmon's for | 9 | MR. ALEXANDER: Thank -- thank you, Ms. |
| 10 | proposals, really the Speaker of the House, Mike | 10 | Labrie. |
| 11 | Johnson, and Congressman Steve Scalise and the power, | 11 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: I have a Bert Callais |
| 12 | where they sit in Congress. First, gerrymandering is | 12 | (phonetic), and that also says you're with Chris |
| 13 | illegal. Number two, I'm for integration, not | 13 | Alexander. Is there something additional that you |
| 14 | segregation. Number three, individualism is better in a | 14 | wanted to add to -- to Chris's comments? |
| 15 | collective class approach. One-size-fit-all fails by | 15 | MR. CALLAIS: I don't know if it's so much in |
| 16 | hiding different individuals within a large class fall | 16 | addition right now. What -- what was going on is |
| 17 | between the cracks. | 17 | Christopher had a conflict of meeting. He had to make |
| 18 | This causes -- number four, this causes | 18 | another meeting with Congressman Higgins. So he |
| 19 | interdivision, which we're seeing now within the | 19 | couldn't be here at the time, but the recess -- or at |
| 20 | political, ethnic, and cultural areas causing conflict | 20 | least the at ease went long enough to where he had a |
| 21 | and confusion, chopping up and pulverizing once | 21 | chance to make it and speak for himself. So I'm here on |
| 22 | contented and happy integrated districts when more | 22 | my own behalf. |
| 23 | important deeper issues than just color. Small | 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. |
| 24 | businesses of both colors, working people of both races, | 24 | MR. CALLAIS: My name is Bert Callais. I'm |
| 25 | disabled of both races, economics and taxation streaks | 25 | West Baton Rouge Parish, RPAC chairman, and I'm speaking |
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| 1 | introductory to all races, schools, et cetera. I'm | 1 | for basically my constituency. And they had some |
| 2 | going to skip number five. Well, it -- I want to leave | 2 | concerns, and I wanted to convey that to you all. |
| 3 | room for other maps to be proposed by J.C. Harmon, | 3 | They're wondering where they're -- the courage is to |
| 4 | which we had emailed to you last night. And I hope that | 4 | stand up to a federal judge. Basically, this federal |
| 5 | y'all have seen. It's called Harmon 2. | 5 | judge, they feel is ignoring the Constitution. The |
| 6 | Number six, Louisiana is in a better and | 6 | Constitution supersedes any act of Congress, such as the |
| 7 | higher position of power nationally due to Speaker Mike | 7 | Voting Rights Act. And the Constitution places |
| 8 | Johnson and Majority Leader Steve Scalise and the | 8 | determining congressional districts solely on the state |
| 9 | different chairs and seniority we enjoy. If we have | 9 | legislatures. And we feel that it's an overreach of the |
| 10 | minority districts, we will -- if we have two majority | 10 | federal government. |
| 11 | districts -- no. If we have two minority districts, we | 11 | And this is what we're having enough of being |
| 12 | will be short two votes in the US House of | 12 | dictated to by the federal government on state and local |
| 13 | Representative. Most of the state is conservative, as | 13 | issues, especially our own personal sovereignty. The |
| 14 | you see here, and we don't want the House going back to | 14 | past two, three years, you know, is -- is -- it really |
| 15 | the left. With the present map or with J.C. Harmon's | 15 | -- it really brought all that to light how far the |
| 16 | map, we would beat the cost of time, effort, and money | 16 | federal government will go to trample on individual |
| 17 | in the courts and other activities. | 17 | rights. So somewhere we got to stop and draw the line. |
| 18 | Number seven, I'm either for the present map | 18 | So, again -- and I--I -- I grew up -- I was young when |
| 19 | or J.C. Harmon's maps, which we had emailed to you last | 19 | -- when -- and naive, whatever you might want to call |
| 20 | night. Eight, most everyone I have heard from in | 20 | it, but I was a person who supported desegregation when |
| 21 | Louisiana are against two or any minority districts. | 21 | my grandparents and my parents didn't exactly do so, |
| 22 | Number nine, opening it would be other cans worms, | 22 | given the time of the '60s, early '70s. |
| 23 | opening Pandora's box of suits, and other descriptions. | 23 | I don't understand why we seem to be wanting |
| 24 | I love Senator Womack, who is doing well and his best to | 24 | to segregate ourselves again, because all I hear -- and |
| 25 | serve his constituents in his district under restrictive | 25 | from what I understand, gerrymandering is illegal when |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | it comes to prioritizing race. And they said, "Well, | 1 | MR. HURD: All right. We good? |
| 2 | then it's not a priority." But that's all I hear and as | 2 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes, sir. |
| 3 | far as the argument. And I understand having a seat at | 3 | MR. HURD: All right. I apologize. Here's |
| 4 | the table. Trust me, I do. I served in the military | 4 | where we are with Section 2 voting -- voting rights |
| 5 | and swore to defend the Constitution. I sit on the | 5 | claims. It is not unconstitutional to use race to draw |
| 6 | board of election supervisors. We've had these same | 6 | districts. It is presumptively unconstitutional, okay? |
| 7 | kind of arguments and disagreements. | 7 | What does that mean? How can I use race to draw a |
| 8 | But when I brought up the fact that if we | 8 | district? I can use race provided that there is a |
| 9 | refer to the law and follow the law, no one can really | 9 | compelling governmental interest, compliance with |
| 10 | be upset with us, unless they're ready to change the | 10 | Section 2. There's a compelling governmental interest. |
| 11 | law. And -- and that is to go ahead and draw the -- the | 11 | Judge Dick has more or less signaled she's that far down |
| 12 | -- the balls, right, with the numbers on it so that | 12 | the process, okay? The second step -- and this is where |
| 13 | there's no picking and choosing in favoritism. It's -- | 13 | you're missing the opportunity of a proud vote of your |
| 14 | it's a blank slate. So if we follow the Constitution, | 14 | life. |
| 15 | the basics of the Constitution, the -- the -- the core | 15 | And that is this: the second requirement of |
| 16 | of it, we really don't have this issue, other than we're | 16 | Section 2 is whatever remedy there is going to be, it |
| 17 | having to fight a judge that is trying to dictate what | 17 | must be racially narrow-tailored. What that means is |
| 18 | we must do. | 18 | you take a traditional districting plan before you start |
| 19 | So, again, if -- if -- as one of them stated, | 19 | fixing a Section 2 remedy. And what makes it |
| 20 | "If Martin Luther King or Nelson Mandela had been as -- | 20 | constitutional is when you have an opportunity to draw a |
| 21 | not as strong-willed and -- and cowed to it," I'm not | 21 | majority-minority district based upon communities of |
| 22 | going to -- I don't like the word cowardly in this case. | 22 | interest, whole parishes, whole cities. The points |
| 23 | As our current leadership, then apartheid and Jim Crow | 23 | being made today are excellent, but what I'm going to |
| 24 | would still be in place. A country is not lost in an | 24 | tell you is you've made the full point that what you're |
| 25 | invasion. It's lost to the cowardice on the part of its | 25 | considering is a racial gerrymander. This slash -- and |
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| 1 | leadership. So that's why we're not in favor of this. | 1 | it's even worse than that. |
|  | Thank you very much. | 2 | If you don't -- I -- I don't -- I -- I don't |
|  | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. Callais. | 3 | know who was here in the '90s, but Ms. -- Ms. -- Ms. |
| 4 | Mr. -- Mr. Hurd, the floor is yours. Would you please | 4 | Lowery and I were. And what -- two things happened. |
| 5 | introduce yourself? Pick one. | 5 | The Zorro district was set aside. It went all the way |
| 6 | MR. HURD: My name's Paul -- Paul Hurd. I am | 6 | from Caddo -- does this ring a bell? Caddo, all the way |
| 7 | an attorney. I was lead counsel when we set this | 7 | down to Baton Rouge, all the way over to Lafayette, all |
| 8 | foolishness aside 30 years ago. The district -- and -- | 8 | the way a little bit east. And it was held to be a |
| 9 | and what I'm going to do is this: I have never | 9 | gross racial gerrymander, unconstitutional, under |
| 10 | represented anyone but voters. I believe in compact | 10 | Section 2. Why? The reason it was held as |
| 11 | contiguous districts for White, Black, Asian voters that | 11 | unconstitutional is because the use of race that is |
| 12 | live together, work together, go to school together. We | 12 | apparent in that district and apparent in the -- this |
| 13 | have successfully defended that right in Louisiana. | 13 | district was not narrowly tailored to meet the |
| 14 | We've -- we've done it -- I've done it in Texas. I've | 14 | requirements of -- of Section 2. |
| 15 | done it in Virginia. The point is this, you're being | 15 | Race was overused to the subordination of |
| 16 | misled, and you politicians don't get misled. It's the | 16 | other districting principles, or as Justice O'Connor |
| 17 | cover. Here's where we are with the Section 2 claim. | 17 | said, "When race predominates, it's unconstitutional." |
| 18 | It is not -- | 18 | If you can -- why can we draw a compact minority |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: I think you might have | 19 | district out of Orleans up the river? The reason why is |
| 20 | pushed your own button there. You're trying to tell us | 20 | it's otherwise lots of community interests. It doesn't |
| 21 | something? | 21 | violate commonalities of interest. |
| 22 | MR. HURD: Even my wife can't mute me, so. | 22 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Mr. Hurd, would you -- |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Like, leave your -- you | 23 | would you entertain a question? I think something may |
| 24 | -- you leave the button alone. We'll control it for | 24 | have just come back, sparked a question. Would you |
| 25 | you; how's that? | 25 | entertain a question? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. HURD: Yeah. If I can just get -- | 1 | Representative Carlson for a question. Representative |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. | 2 | Carlson. |
| 3 | MR. HURD: Wait. Once I-- I've spent all day | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 4 | and I'll spend all night. I'll be glad to help anyone. | 4 | Mr. Hurd, after the Zorro district was eliminated and |
| 5 | But what you have done now, after we voided the -- the | 5 | the -- "the slash" district, as you represented, was -- |
| 6 | Zorro district, the $Z$ district, they enacted what was | 6 | was enacted, who created that district? |
| 7 | called by the federal judge "the slash." This district | 7 | MR. HURD: The legislature. |
| 8 | that you're considering is 90 percent of "the slash." | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: And who did away with |
| 9 | If you will look at Hays v. Louisiana, 839 F. Supp. | 9 | that district, or who said that that was |
| 10 | 1188, and then that's the Zorro district, Judge Jacques | 10 | unconstitutional or -- or -- or not -- could not stand? |
| 11 | Wiener, who is still on the Fifth Circuit, went through | 11 | MR. HURD: Judge Jacques Wiener wrote the |
| 12 | racial gerrymandering community by community and said | 12 | opinion. |
| 13 | why it was excessive. | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Okay. And then we |
| 14 | He asked the question to start the opinion, | 14 | went back to the districts that we had up until |
| 15 | "Can we use race in districting?" And he said the | 15 | recently, right, that we were -- |
| 16 | answer is yes, "We -- we can use it to comply with a | 16 | MR. HURD: That's correct. |
| 17 | compelling governmental interest." He said that this | 17 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: So as I hear that -- |
| 18 | body -- two things, and I'll be glad to go anywhere that | 18 | I see one major difference between then and now. I know |
| 19 | a member would like to ask. He said two things. One, | 19 | you stated that the district that we're looking at |
| 20 | this was excessive. He said the same thing about "the | 20 | creating through the senator's -- the senator's bill |
| 21 | slash" that did exactly what you all are about to do | 21 | looks very similar. You said about 90 percent the same |
| 22 | that went up to East Baton Rouge goes to Avoyelles, then | 22 | as -- as that "slash" district. |
| 23 | goes up the river taking minority districts. | 23 | MR. HURD: I will reserve because y'all have |
| 24 | He said they're both racial gerrymanders | 24 | done (inaudible 2:15:30) since you've made unavailable |
| 25 | because they subordinate all interest. This district | 25 | to the public, okay? |
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| 1 | will hand -- I got good news for the plaintiffs. This | 1 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Like, the -- the -- the |
| 2 | district, if enacted, will hand them and Judge Dick | 2 | -- |
| 3 | unrestrained power to redraw your district because you | 3 | MR. HURD: But the district isn't -- |
| 4 | just did it again. And it -- it started -- it ends in | 4 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: The minutes are public, |
| 5 | -- | 5 | and they -- they are online and public, (inaudible |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: All right. Mr. Hurd, | 6 | 2:15:38). |
| 7 | let's -- let's get to the question. Just -- | 7 | MR. HURD: You put them online ten minutes |
| 8 | MR. HURD: The last point -- the last point is | 8 | before we started the meeting six hours late. That's |
| 9 | what Judge Wiener said, and this is what's equally | 9 | not available for the public. |
| 10 | important for you. He said, "The federal government --" | 10 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Mr. Hurd, I |
| 11 | this point was Section 5. "The -- the federal | 11 | appreciate that, and I understand. I wish we had more |
| 12 | government, one, has no authority to impose on a state | 12 | time to -- to review those. That's when those were made |
| 13 | the violation of the Fourteenth Amendment." So the idea | 13 | available, but they are there for the public. I think |
| 14 | that we're afraid of Judge Dick may be more demanding of | 14 | there's one difference. We are being mandated by the |
| 15 | the district, just like the DOJ was under pre-Clarence. | 15 | judge to create a second Black district, period. In |
| 16 | It is of no concern. That's why our system gives us the | 16 | your example, it's complete opposite. |
| 17 | Fifth Circuit in the supremes. | 17 | MR. HURD: No, it's not. |
| 18 | This court -- I mean, this body should | 18 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: The legislature tried |
| 19 | consider either giving Judge Dick an opportunity to | 19 | to create a district that followed this similar route, |
| 20 | judge it, then submit a remedy plan if you lose, or | 20 | and it was ruled unconstitutional. We're being told by |
| 21 | enact a remedy. Now, l've handed in material -- | 21 | the judge, by Shelly Dick, that we must do this, period. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: We've -- we've gotten all | 22 | It's complete opposite. We must do it or she will. |
| 23 | that. | 23 | It's a complete opposite scenario than it was 20 years |
| 24 | MR. HURD: I -- | 24 | ago. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So l'm going to | 25 | MR. HURD: Can I -- can I respond? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Absolutely. And | 1 | applies on why this is a -- a -- a ineffective remedy, |
| 2 | thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm done. | 2 | and I hope -- I hope your good judgment finds another |
| 3 | MR. HURD: It's absolutely the same. What | 3 | solution. |
| 4 | they held was in the '90s, the federal agency that was | 4 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. |
| 5 | telling you, "You had to do it," was the DOJ under | 5 | Representative Phelps, you failed to call, but you |
|  | Section 5 , which itself was later held unconstitutional. | 6 | didn't say you wanted to speak. Are you trying to speak |
| 7 | The answer is they were wrong. They were | 7 | now? |
| 8 | unconstitutionally demanding racial districting beyond | 8 | REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Yes, (inaudible |
| 9 | what the federal courts now recognize as the permissible | 9 | 2:19:39). |
| 10 | range of remedy. We may be -- we don't -- I-- I -- | 10 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: I know you're not on the |
| 11 | look, I'll give Judge Dick an opportunity. It's not | 11 | committee, but you want -- all right. Come on. Let's |
| 12 | that she's hailed Section 2 applies. | 12 | -- all right. All right. So let's fill this out that |
| 13 | The question is whether or not Section 2 has a | 13 | says she does want to speak. She's providing |
| 14 | constitutional remedy, i.e., I believe that my | 14 | information only, not a green card or a red card. So |
| 15 | districting plan that I've handed in and I did it for an | 15 | Representative Phelps? |
| 16 | -- an example is as close as you can get to a | 16 | REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Thank you for the |
| 17 | non-racially gerrymandered district and get to two | 17 | opportunity to speak. I -- I just wanted to mention to |
| 18 | majority-minority districts, and it does. The | 18 | maybe some of our new colleagues here when we talk about |
| 19 | plaintiff's remedy, Senate Bill 4 and 5, they're both | 19 | why we're here. This started from an increase of the |
| 20 | racial gerrymanders and will not stand up to the Fifth | 20 | population from our census. So I-- and I think that's |
| 21 | Circuit. There are abilities to draw a compact | 21 | not -- we haven't heard a lot of that with the audience |
| 22 | contiguous majority-minority district, second one, in | 22 | on the outside. It just was not a mandate to draw a |
| 23 | Louisiana. What you're going to do, you're going to | 23 | map. So this does go with the 2020, the Census results |
| 24 | enact this. | 24 | that resulted in a population increase of African |
| 25 | If I was Judge Dick, I'd look at it and go, | 25 | Americans across the state. |
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| 1 | "I'm sorry. I've got -- already got the judge that | 1 | Secondly, I hope that there is some passion |
| 2 | wrote the opinion on the Fifth Circuit that says what | 2 | here about if there were a different population, a White |
| 3 | y'all are about to do is a constitutional gerrymander. | 3 | population, and there was so much pushback about |
| 4 | Therefore, I can disregard it." Disregard it. It is | 4 | creating a district so that everyone would be |
| 5 | null and void. And she's going to draw the plan if you | 5 | represented, how that may feel. Just a thought. |
| 6 | want to remedy an actual remedy. That's why it's | 6 | Thirdly, when I heard Judge Dick's name reference to |
| 7 | exactly the same. You read the opinion, and you'll see | 7 | Obama's judge, I don't know if l've ever heard someone |
| 8 | they said, "The federal power does not override or force | 8 | say Trump's judge or Carter's judge or Reagan's judge or |
| 9 | you to violate the Constitution." Stand up for the | 9 | whomever. I don't know if we're going to start |
| 10 | Constitution. | 10 | referencing judges that way, but I hope that we do not |
| 11 | Stand up if you want a compact district. Draw | 11 | do that in this body. |
| 12 | the one that makes sense with our traditional | 12 | I think we should give all of our elected |
| 13 | districting principles because you can do it. The -- | 13 | officials a little bit more respect in that, regardless |
| 14 | the -- the -- the -- the answer is, this is an | 14 | of what president they were appointed to or from. Thank |
| 15 | unconstitutional alternative. | 15 | you for your time. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Thank you, Mr. | 16 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative |
| 17 | Hurd. You -- you -- I think you've been very, very | 17 | Phelps. The board is clear. Senator Womack, would you |
| 18 | clear on it. The board is clear. We have no more | 18 | come up and close on your bill? |
| 19 | witnesses. Senator Womack, we're going to go ahead and | 19 | SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 20 | -- and call you back up to -- to close. | 20 | Members of the committee, we all know why we're here. |
| 21 | MR. HURD: Your Honor, if -- I mean, Your | 21 | We were ordered to -- to draw a new Black district, and |
| 22 | Honor. I apologize. I'd like to -- I've got a copy of | 22 | that's what I've done. At the same time, I tried to |
| 23 | that opinion that outlines all the reasons that what | 23 | protect Speaker Johnson, Minority Leader Scalise, and my |
| 24 | you've got is a racial gerrymander. I had an outline of | 24 | representative, Congresswoman Letlow. I'm agreeable to |
| 25 | what it -- of -- of the -- each criteria that the judge | 25 | the amendment, and we complied with everything the judge |
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|  | Page 122 |  | Page 124 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | has asked. And I just ask for favorable passage. | 1 | matters before this committee. Representative Thomas |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Senator -- | 2 | had made a motion that we adjourn. Look, and -- as we |
| 3 | Senator Womack. Representative Farnum has made a motion | 3 | adjourn, thank you everyone for your patience. Thank |
| 4 | that we adopt Senate Bill 8 as amended. Is there any | 4 | you everyone for your time. It's been a -- a great |
| 5 | objection? Representative Marcell objects. Ms. Baker | 5 | debate and -- and we appreciate you. Meeting adjourned. |
| 6 | -- listen, do we have anybody in an anteroom needs to | 6 | Thank you all. |
| 7 | come in real quick? We have everyone here? Looks like | 7 | (Meeting adjourned.) |
| 8 | everyone's here. Okay. Ms. Baker, would you please | 8 |  |
| 9 | call the role? So let me clarify the vote. A vote of | 9 |  |
| 10 | yes moves Senator Womack's bill as amended by | 10 |  |
| 11 | Representative Farnum forward. A vote of no leaves it | 11 |  |
| 12 | here in the committee. Ms. Baker? | 12 |  |
| 13 | MS. BAKER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. | 13 |  |
| 14 | Chairman Beaullieu? | 14 |  |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes. | 15 |  |
| 16 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Billings? | 16 |  |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Yes. | 17 |  |
| 18 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Boyd? | 18 |  |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Yes. | 19 |  |
| 20 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Carlson? | 20 |  |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Yes. | 21 |  |
| 22 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Carter? | 22 |  |
| 23 | Representative Carver? | 23 |  |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Yes. | 24 |  |
| 25 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Farnum? | 25 |  |
|  | Page 123 |  | Page 125 |
| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes. | 1 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION |
| 2 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Gadberry? | 2 | I, Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc., |
| 3 | Yes. Representative Johnson? Representative Larvadain? | 3 | do hereby certify that |
| 4 | Yes. Representative Lyons? | 4 | 291001-Audio-COMBINE-1-18-24_HG_p1-p2.MP3 |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Yes. | 5 | was transcribed utilizing computer aided means and the |
| 6 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Marcelle? | 6 | TranscribeMe transcription team. |
| 7 | Representative Newell? | 7 | The transcript of the audio mentioned above, |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Not as amended. No, | 8 | having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, |
| 9 | as amended. | 9 | Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full, |
| 10 | MS. BAKER: No for Representative Marcelle. | 10 | true, and correct transcription. |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No. | 11 | I further certify that neither I, nor the |
| 12 | MS. BAKER: Representative Newell? | 12 | TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal |
| 13 | REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Yes. | 13 | association with the parties involved or are in any way |
| 14 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Schamerhorn? | 14 | interested in the outcome thereof. |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Yes. | 15 | Dated this 12th of March, 2024. |
| 16 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Thomas? | 16 |  |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Yes. | 17 | Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc. |
| 18 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Wright? | 18 |  |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Yes. | 19 |  |
| 20 | MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Wybel? | 20 |  |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE WYBEL: Yes. | 21 |  |
| 22 | MS. BAKER: Yes. There are 14 yeas and 1 nay. | 22 |  |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Members -- members have a | 23 |  |
| 24 | vote of 14 yeas, 1 nay. Senate Bill 8 is hereby adopted | 24 |  |
| 25 | as amended. Reported as amended. There are no other | 25 |  |
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| Caucus | 15:25 | 77:12,17 | 90:17 | 108:1 |
| 15:15,15 | 51:12 | 78 | 108:21 | cities |
| caught | 81:16 | 79:11,12 | change | 112:22 |
| 73:15 | 84:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 4,14, \\ & 80 \cdot 22,23 \end{aligned}$ | 43:23 44:21 | Citizen |
| cause | 94:10 | 81:18 82:7 | 78:11 | 84:24 |
| 17:14 | 99:22 | $82: 23,25$ | $110: 10$ changes | citizens |
| causes | 103:14 | 83:9,12,15 | changes | 40:25 85:4 |
| 106:18,18 | 116:3 | 83:18,20 | charact | 85:20,20 |
| causing | 118:2 | 83:25 | Ch | 87:7,10 |
| 106:20 cave | chairman | 84:13,16 | Charles | 88:5,9 |
| cave 87:8 88:9 | 1:1,10,10 | 84:19 | 56:10 | $93: 7$ |
| caving | 1:12 2:2 | $88: 12$ $94: 5,6$ | chart | city |
| 87:11 89:10 | 2:17 3:6 | 96:5, 98. | 18:15 | 22:13 56:5 |
| 89:14 91:6 | $3: 11,12$ $4: 5,18$, | 99:10,15 | checkboxes | 104:8 |
| 95:2 | 5 | 99:19,23 | 32:7 | civic |
| caving-in | 10:13, | 100:1 | checked | 65:12 71:25 |
| 92:7,8,14 | $10: 13,23$ $12: 313: 24$ | 102:5,7,10 | 68:19,19 | civil |
| cell | $\begin{array}{ll}14: 2 & 16: 3\end{array}$ | 102:16 | chime | 55:15 66:13 |
| 1:4 | 17:1,8,9 | 103:12 | 10:14 | claim |
| census | 17:10 18:3 | 104:7 | choice | 86:8 111:17 |
| 63:16 | 18:16,19 | 105:7,11 | 18:11 89:19 | claims |
| 120:20,23 | 18:23 19:3 | 105:12,14 | 89:20,24 | 112:5 |
| center | 19:6,16,16 | 105:21,24 | 91:8 93:19 | clarific |
| 76:7 | 19:21 | 106:2 | 94:5 | 16:5 61:6 |
| certain | 26:12,19 | 108:11,23 | choosing | $78: 15 \quad 79: 4$ |
| 18:6 69:24 | 26:21,25 | 108:25 | 93:16 | 84:2,18 |
| 69:24 98:4 | 27:4,7,9 | 111:3,19 | 110:13 | clarify |
| 98:5 | 27:14,18 | 111:23 | chopping | 79:14,16 |
| certainly | 27:21 28:1 | 112:2 | 106:21 | 84:8 122:9 |
| 9:20,24,25 | 28:5, 6, 13 | 113:22 | Chris | clarity |
| 10:6 11:11 | 28:17,23 | 114:2 | 83:5,11 | 63:25 |
| 29:4 40:17 | 29:5,7,15 | 115:6,22 | 84:23 | class |
| 60:15 | 29:18 | 115:25 | 108:12 | 106:15,16 |
| 64:24 | 31:18,21 | 117:1,4 | Chris's | Clay |
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| 40:1, 5 | colleague | 108:14 | 119:11 | concerned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51:22 | 62:24 | commerce | compactness | 42:9 |
| clean | colleague's | 6:21 | 9:14 36:20 | concerns |
| 66:15 | 67:16 | committee | 37:6,20 | 42:6,19 |
| cleaner | colleagues | 1:2,6 3:9 | $39: 560: 17$ | 109:2 |
| 23:3 26:1 | 14:11 15:20 | 5:7 16:5 | 62:13 78:6 | configur |
| cleanup | 29:19 72:7 | 33:7,9 | companies | 29:11 |
| 10:3 43:19 | 89:22 | 34:19 | 21:7 | conflict |
| 78:10,12 | 100:22 | 38:18 | company's | 106:20 |
| clear | 120:18 | 47:24 | 125:9 | 108:17 |
| 15:21 60:5 | collective | 62:22 | compare | conforming |
| 60:9,16 | 106:15 | 83:10 | 18:10 73:1 | 76:16 |
| 75:8 76:18 | college | 84:22 | compared | confuse |
| 119:18,18 | 6:21 | 88:15, 24 | 19:8 98:6 | 70:7 |
| 121:17 | color | 90:5 | compares | confused |
| cleared | 106:23 | 104:23 | 17:25 | 51:14 |
| 13:21 28:7 | colors | 120:11 | comparison | confusion |
| clearing | 106:24 | 121:20 | 18:8 | 70:25 72:4 |
| 76:10 | combined | 122:12 | comparisons | 106:21 |
| clearly | 7:17 | 2 | 17:16 | congratu |
| 91:21,22 | come | commonal | compelling | 94:14 |
| 93:4 | 3:3 5:8 | 113:21 | 65:21 112:9 | Congress |
| clears | 10:20 13:9 | communic. | 112:10 | 5:20,25 6:7 |
| 74:24 105:8 | $14: 14$ | 13:7 | 114:17 | 11:16 |
| Cleo | 19:24 | communities | complete | 85:10,13 |
| 59:23 | 30:17 31:3 | 13:15 39: | 117:16, 22 | 85:19 88:2 |
| clients | 41:16 | 48:21 | 117:23 | 89:13 93:3 |
| 66:23 | $46: 2455: 5$ | 65:23,24 | compliance | 100:10 |
| close | 60:9, 24 | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 15 \\ & 90: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 112:9 | 101:24 |
| 19:13 65:19 | 61:4 79:14 | 90:12 | complied | 106:12 |
| 87:22 | $84: 287: 8$ |  | 121:25 | 109:6 |
| 118:16 | 87:24 | community | complies | congress.. |
| 119:20 | 102:7 | 10:8 13:7 | $66: 7$ | 4:25 5:1,2 |
| 121:18 | 113:24 |  | comply | 5:9,19 6:4 |
| closed | 120:11 | $20: 20,23$ $21: 2,5$ | 7:25 20:4 | $7: 3,6,10$ |
| 67:20,21 | 121:18 | 21:2,5 | 51:13 | 8:13 9:16 |
| 103:24 | 122:7 |  | 65:18, 25 | 10:7 11:20 |
| closer | comes |  | 114:16 | 13:17 14:8 |
| 23:13 64:24 | 6:24 50:24 | $75: 18,18$ | compressed | 14:18 |
| closest | 110:1 | 75:18,18 | $47: 19$ | 29:11 |
| 15:17,18 | coming |  | computer | $33: 25 \quad 34: 7$ |
| coalesced | 61:23 6 |  | 125:5 | 37:7,9 |
| 63:6 | 72:23 | $113: 20$ $114: 12,12$ | concentr. | 39:23 |
| codified | 93:14 | compact | 98:4 | 41:24 |
| 73:5 | 108:4 | compact $23: 13$ $36: 18$ | conceptu. . | 42:10 |
| coexist | command | $37: 8,9$ | 71:23 | 69:15 |
| 104:10 | 8:18 | $111: 10$ | concern | 73:18 |
| COI | comments | 113:18 | 42:11 | 77:21,25 |
| 74:1 | 89:5 94:11 | 118:21 | 115:16 | 78.4 |
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| 101:12 | 71:16 | continues | 61:7,8 | 63:9,10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109:8 | 80:15 | 6:1 | 67:3,4,7 | 67:9,11 |
| congressman | considered | continuous | 84:4 | 68:9 85:25 |
| 8:15 12:11 | 8:12 11:2 | 24:2 | 116:16 | 86:3, 22, 23 |
| 13:20 24:7 | 71:20 | contributed | 125:10 | 87:20 93:6 |
| 24:22 | considering | 6:7 | correction | 95:7 99:3 |
| 25:10 | 71:20 | control | 45:6 | 99:4,4,7 |
| 27:15,19 | 112:25 | 56:9 92:22 | correctly | 99:16 |
| 29:22 30:8 | 114:8 | 103:4 | 33:22 34: | 115:18 |
| $30: 13$ 31:3 | consistent | 111:24 | correlation | court's |
| $31: 4$ 40:6 | 96:9 | controlled | 73:8,17 | 7:15,16 |
| 42:10,14 | consti | 88 | corridor | 26:22 |
| 54:14,17 | 109:1 | conversa | 6:20,23,24 | courts |
| $55: 7,10,12$ | constitu | 13:20 41:5 | 8:4 63:5 | 26:16,17 |
| 55:20 | 40:19 55:18 | 50:19 | cost | $64: 17$ 65:6 |
| 56:12,12 | 102:24 | 55:15 | 107:16 | 65:14 70:3 |
| $56: 1657: 2$ | 107:25 | 67:25 | cost-eff | 72:12,18 |
| 57:11,17 | Constitu | 68:22 | 66:18 | 101:4 |
| 58:1 59:19 | 8:1 109:5,6 | 97:13, 22 | counsel | 107:17 |
| 87:14,17 | 109:7 | conversa. | 111:7 | 118:9 |
| 92:24 | 110:5,14 | 9:23 97:23 | count | cover |
| 106:11 | 110:15 | convey | 53:5 | 111:17 |
| 108:8,18 | 119:9,10 | 109:2 | counted | covered |
| congressmen | constitu | COO | 53:1 64:1 | 11:14 |
| $49: 25 \quad 50: 4$ | 93:5 96:10 | 125:2,17 | counterc. | cowardice |
| 55:4 68:21 | 112:20 | cool | 30:25 56:24 | 110:25 |
| Congress . . . | 118:14 | 103:8 | counties | cowardly |
| 5:15,18, 23 | 119:3 | copy | 72:14 98:7 | 110:22 |
| 6:2 121:24 | constit | 20:5 65:16 | counting | cowed |
| connect | 99:3 104:25 | $20: 565: 16$ $119: 22$ | counting $53: 21$ | 110:21 |
| 70:25 | construed | core | 5 | cracks |
| connected | 91:23 | 110 | 8:10 85 | 106:17 |
| 70:23 | contains | correc | 8.10 | crazy |
| connection | 29: | 20:9 23:1 | 90:7 91:12 | 7:14 101:2 |
| 71:2 | content | 24:4,23 | 104:21,24 | create |
| consequence | 24:11, | 25:5 27: | 110:24 | 7:24 9:15 |
| 85:20 | contented | 27:7,24 | Coupee | 11:4,16 |
| conserva | 106:22 | 30:18 | 20:7 21:18 | 13:15 |
| 6:16 85:5 | contentious | 32:20 | couple | $62: 2576: 1$ |
| 92:25 | 90:3 | $33: 23$ 34:3 | 83:2 88:13 | 76:7,13 |
| 107:13 | contiguous | $34: 4$ 35:17 | courage | 86:14 |
| conserva | 98:8,10 | 35:20 36:1 | 109:3 | 96:14 |
| 84:25 93:3 | 111:11 | $36: 4,12,15$ |  | 117:15,19 |
| consider | 118:22 | 51:15,18 | 65:25 | created |
| 39:5 48:1 | continue | $51: 24,25$ | court | 25:7,7 |
| 96:11 | 5:20,24 | 52:2,3,5 |  | 116:6 |
| 115:19 | 6:17 91:2 | 53:3,12,15 | $8: 1911: 19$ | creating |
| consider | 96:15,18 | 53:17 57:5 | $14: 15$ | 85:15,24 |
| 27:1 49:12 | 104:1,8,14 | 58: 6, 22, 23 | 39:12 63:8 | 116:20 |
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| 121:4 | 5:16 6:15 | 92:21 93:7 | 95:18, 20 | directly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Creole | 103:21 | 93:17 | 96:14 97:1 | 24:9 48:5 |
| 20:24 | debate | Democrat | 101:5 | 65:2 |
| criteria | 67:23 76:9 | 89:21 | 112:11 | disabled |
| 18:6 68:7 | 124:5 | Democratic | 115:2,14 | 106:25 |
| 76:15 | Deborah | 15:15 | 115:19 | disagree |
| 119:25 | 82:13 | Democrats | 117:21 | 98:14 |
| critical | decade | 15:23 26:6 | 118:11,25 | disagreed |
| 48:1 | 5:21 | 88:2 90:17 | Dick's | 55:15 56:7 |
| crop | decided | demograp | 121 | disagreeing |
| 6:23 | 43:23 | 7:22 | dictate | 89:2 |
| Crow | decides | Denise | 110:17 | disagree. |
| 110:23 | 6:1 | 24:17 | dictated | 110:7 |
| cultural | decipher | Department | 109:12 | disappoi |
| 106:20 | 60:21 | 91:17 | died | 55:16 |
| culture | decision | depends | 62:21 | disasters |
| 104:11,21 | 86:1 94:24 | 73:19 | difference | 30:10 |
| curious | 96:2 99:14 | described | 116:18 | discourse |
| 68:15 73:7 | 99:18 | 7:18 | 117:14 | 6:8 62:23 |
| current | decisions | descript | differences | discuss |
| 7:22 29:23 | 15:6 100:20 | 107:23 | 104:10,11 | 49:5 |
| 32:4,6 | 102:23 | desegreg | different | discussed |
| 52:15 | decks | 109:20 | 8:6,12 9:15 | 41:9 51:7 |
| 71:16 86:6 | 74:15 | deserve | 10:15 17:6 | discussing |
| 86:17,18 | dedicated | 89:13 | 23:2 42:6 | 26:15 |
| 86:20 | 14:9 | 101:11,15 | 63:6 64:25 | discussions |
| 87:18 93:4 | deeper | 101:16,17 | 71:11 | 49:8 |
| 96:10 99:3 | 106:23 | 101:17 | 72:22 | disheart. |
| 110:23 | defeat | desire | 73:13 | 15:4 100:3 |
| currently | 88:10 | 40:19 | 90:20, 22 | disingen. |
| 64:15 78:21 cut | defend | desires | $90: 25,25$ $94: 18$ | 43:21 |
| cut 20:21 $21: 25$ | 110:5 | 57:21 | 94:18 | 102:20 |
| 20:21 $21: 25$ $23: 19$ | defended | DeSoto | $95: 17$ $101: 9$ | disregard |
| 23:19 | 111:13 | 20:8 21:13 | $101: 9$ $106: 16$ | 119:4,4 |
| D |  | detailed | 107:9 | distance |
| Dated $125: 15$ | $61: 4,19,21$ | $5: 13$ | $121: 2$ difficult | district |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:15 } \\ & \text { Davis } \end{aligned}$ | delayed | details | 30:14 90:4 | 4:25 5:11 |
| 80:7 | 2:20 | 74:14 | 98:2,11 | 5:11,19 |
| day | de | determining | digest | 6:3,5 7:2 |
| 7:5 30:22 |  | deviation | 48:7 49:13 | $7: 8,16,19$ $7: 208: 2,3$ |
| 62:5 67:21 | $85: 18$ | $11: 2 \quad 38: 23$ | 50:25 64:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 20 \quad 8: 2,3 \\ & 8: 9,19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 69:10 | Delta | 60:18 | dignified | 10:7 11:17 |
| 114:3 | 63:1 78:1 | 65:18 78:3 | 72:11 | 14:6 20:11 |
| days | demanding | deviations | dipping | 20:13,21 |
| 17:20,24 | 115:14 | 9:14 | 52:18 | 20:22,22 |
| DC ${ }_{\text {97:18 }}$ | 118:8 | Dick | direction | 21:1,25 |
| DC | democracy | 86:18 95:3 | 98:3 | 22:23 |
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| 23:14,14 | 117:3,15 | 101:14 | 120:22 | 8:4 20:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:15,19 | 117:19 | 104:8 | 121:21 | 21:24 22:6 |
| 23:22 24:3 | 118:17,22 | 105:2,3 | drawer | 22:24 31:5 |
| 24:14,17 | 119:11 | divided | 65:6 71:19 | 34:6,12 |
| 24:18,19 | 121:4,21 | 22:7 51:15 | drawers | 39:22 |
| 24:21 | districting | 52:5,8 | 73:23 | 51:21 |
| 26:17,18 | 112:18 | diving | drawing | 54:20 59:1 |
| 29:11 31:2 | 113:16 | 52:18 | 27:1 47:17 | 67:1 90:9 |
| 37:7,8,9 | 114:15 | divisive | 88:24 | 113:8 |
| 40:13,20 | 118:8,15 | 90:3 104:14 | drawn | 114:22 |
| 40:22 | 119:13 | doctrine | 8:2 11:15 | eastern |
| 41:13,13 | districts | 65:2 | 17:17 | 24:19 |
| 41:24 | 5:2,9 6:13 | documents | 71:22 | economic |
| 42:10 | $7: 10,17,25$ | 48:2 | 88:23 | 30:4 |
| 43:24 | $8: 16,18$ | doing | draws | economics |
| 45:12 46:2 | 11:4,17,17 | 14:9 17:15 | 97:1 | 106:25 |
| 51:23,23 | 14:8,18,21 | 46:1 76:19 | drew | Ed |
| 52:8,23 | 14:24 | 86:16,19 | 88:15 | 23:5,5 |
| 54:15,15 | 21:25 | 87:11 90:8 | drive | 24:16 |
| 55:1,1,8 | 23:12 25:4 | 91:9,18 | 40:2,5 | education |
| 55:12 57:4 | 25:7,22 | 105:5 | driven | 71:25 |
| $57: 12,18$ | $26: 7$ 29:11 | 107:24 | 7:19 | effect |
| $57: 22 \quad 58: 1$ | $31: 8,11,22$ | DOJ | driver | 7:6 97:8 |
| 58:2,5,5 | $31: 22 \quad 32: 2$ | 115:15 | 25:16 | efficiently |
| $58: 11,17$ $58 \cdot 2559.1$ | $34: 7$ 37:21 | 118:5 | driving | 66:18 |
| 58:25 59:1 | 39:13,15 | domain | 97:24 | effort |
| , 9 | $41: 13$ 42:3 | 63:3 | drop | 20:4 25:25 |
| 63:1,9 $69: 1971: 8$ | 41:13 42:3 | drafted | 43:22 | 30:7,14 |
| 72:23 |  | 78:16,16 | drove | 51:12 68:1 |
| 73:18 | 66:3 69:12 | draw | 67:15 | 107:16 |
| 77:21, 25 | 69:15 | 8:11 26:1 | due | Eight |
| $78: 4,6$ | 72:22 | 26:18 39:3 | 39:17 107:7 | 107:20 |
| 85:16,24 | 73:10,21 | 42:21,22 | Duly | either |
| 86:9,15 | $73: 22 \quad 74: 1$ | 68:13 | 82:17 | , 1 |
| 89:18, 23 | $76: 1,8,14$ | 69:13,14 | E | 96:14,21 |
| 99:15 | 97:2 | 75:20,21 | E | 107:18 |
| 101:25 | 106:22 | 95:4,5,9 | earlier | 115:19 |
| 102:3 | 107:10,11 | 95:18,18 | 25:9 61:9 | elect |
| 107:25 | 107:11,21 | 95:19 | 63:14 76:2 | 5:20 |
| 111:8 | 108:3 | 96:14,18 | 87:14 | electabi |
| 112:8,21 | 109:8 | 96:19,20 | early | 37:16 |
| 113:5,12 | 111:11 | 96:21,23 | 109:22 | elected |
| 113:13,19 | 112:6 | 96:25 | ease | 71:10 87: |
| 114:6,6,7 | 114:23 | 101:5 | 2:22 3:1 | 87: 8, 25 |
| 114:10,25 | 116:14 | 109:17 | 48:8 | 88:22 96:2 |
| 115:2,3,15 | 118:18 | 110:11 | 108:20 | 101:19 |
| 116:4,5,6 | disturbed | 112:5,7,20 | easier | 121:12 |
| 116:9,19 | 92:10 | 113:18 | 68:4 | election |
| 116:22 | divide | $\begin{aligned} & 118: 21 \\ & 119: 5,11 \end{aligned}$ | east | 18:21 65:11 |
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| 71:1 94:15 | entertain | 112:23 | 69:13 | 40:9,18,22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110:6 | 113:23,25 | excessive | fairness | 41:3 44:18 |
| elections | equal | 114:13,20 | 68:2,8 | 46:21 |
| 70:24 71:8 | 103:10 | excited | 97:13 | 47:16 |
| elements | equally | $72: 2$ | fall | 51:12,16 |
| 65:11 | 115:9 | excuse | 106:16 | 51:25 52:3 |
| eliminated | equation | 28:10 52:6 | familiar | 52: 6,11,14 |
| 116:4 | 73:3 | exercise | 22:18 37:25 | 52:21,24 |
| Elise | especially | 94:8 | 38:3 | 53:5,9,13 |
| 82:14 | 109:13 | existing | far | 53:16,21 |
| emailed | essentially | 18:9 | 15:18 39:8 | 53:25 54:2 |
| 107:4,19 | 85:11 86:12 | expect | 40:12 | 54:5,8,11 |
| emphasized | et | 49:19 104:9 | 41:14 | $54: 16,21$ $54: 23,55.3$ |
| 65:8 | 107:1 | expecting | 66:19 70:1 | 54:23 55:3 |
| enables | ethnic | 50:20 | 109:15 | 55:9,13,24 |
| 93:17 | 106:20 | expensive | 110:3 | 56:2,6,11 |
| enact | Evans | 66:19 | 112:11 | 56:18, 20 |
| 11:11 | 61:20,20 | expiration | farm | 56:23 57:6 |
| 115:21 | 62:7 67:4 | 91:13 | 6:22 | $57: 9,13,19$ $58: 3,8,13$ |
| 118:24 | 67:7 68:23 | expressed | Farms | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 3,8,13 \\ & 58: 18,23 \end{aligned}$ |
| enacted | 68:25 69:4 | 40:19 55:25 | 82:22, 22, 24 | 59:3,10 |
| 7:4,7 39:1 | 70:13 80:8 | extend | 82:25 83:1 | 74:25 75:7 |
| 64:14 | evening | 6:17 | Farnum | 76:24 |
| $71: 15$ 74:6 | 5:7 | extracted | $1: 22$ $3.23: 22$ | 78:21 79:1 |
| 74:10 | everybody | 59:5 | 3:23 19:17 | 80:13,15 |
| 114:6 | 16:17 45:1 |  | 19:18 | 81:8,9 |
| 115:2 | 69:9,16,20 | F | $28: 14,22$ $28: 23,25$ | 122:3,11 |
| 116:6 | 101:10 | F | 28:23,25 | 122:25 |
| enacting $36: 19$ | everybody's | 114:9 | $29: 1,8,16$ $29: 17$ | 123:1 |
| $36: 19$ ended | 75:23 | F-A-R-M-S | 29:17, | Farnum's |
| ended | 100:25 | 82:24 | 31:18,20 $31: 25$ 32:5 | 47:3 49:1 |
| $88: 3$ ends | everyone's | fact | 32:11,14 | 61:11 |
| 66:8 115: | 122:8 | 37:6 42:21 | 32:15, 20 | 78:23 |
| enemy | 62:22 7 | $50: 15$ $57: 20$ | $32: 23$ 33:2 | 80:17,19 |
| 90:21,21 | exactly | 71:14 | 33:6,11,17 | 78:17 |
| engaged | 16:23 25:2 | 87:17 95:3 | 33:23 34:3 | favor |
| 72:2 | 27:25 | 103:17 | 34:8,13,20 | 1:7 80:6,9 |
| engines | 43:20 46:3 | 110:8 | $34: 23,25$ $35: 2,5,8$ | 84:6 86:13 |
| 30:4 | 51:4 64:1 | facts | 35:11,17 | 111:1 |
| enjoy | 86:15 97:4 | 37:20 | 35:20 36:1 | favorable |
| 91:25 107:9 | 105:4 | failed | 36:4,8,10 | 78:10,13 |
| ensure | 109:21 | 82:8 120:5 | $36: 12,15$ | 122:1 |
| 5:17,24 | 114:21 | fails | 36:21,25 | favoritism |
| 94:1 | 119:7 | 106:15 | 37:4,11,15 | 110:13 |
| ensures | example | fair | $37: 25$ 38:3 | federal |
| 6:5,12,15 | 117 | 72:25 88:16 | 38:6,10,13 | 5:10 7:1,8 |
| ensuring | xcell | 100:10 | 38:19 39:9 | 7:9,14 |
| 8:17 | excellent | fairly | 39:17 40:4 | 8:18 20:4 |
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| 65:14 68:8 | 110:17 | 111:4 | 115:13 | general |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85:25 | fighting | focus | fracking | 7:12 99:2 |
| 88:18 93:6 | 87:1,2 90:4 | 6:14 | 72:21 | genuine |
| 99:3 109:4 | 96:10 | folks | free | 68:1 |
| 109:4,10 | 103:18,22 | 21:12,13,18 | 41:9 | gerrymander |
| 109:12,16 | figure | 22:19 | friend | 112:25 |
| 114:7 | 64:1 73:17 | 30:16 | 24:22 46:21 | 113:9 |
| 115:10,11 | filed | 66:19 71:9 | front | 119:3,24 |
| 118: 4,9 | 8:25 17:4 | 72:2,7,8 | 18:25 20:5 | gerryman. |
| 119:8 | 62:3 66:12 | 98:5 | 53:22 | 118:17 |
| feel | fill | follow | 65:17 | gerryman |
| 41:9 48:20 | 1:8 70:13 | 66:14 11 | 77:14 | 106:12 |
| 48:22 | 120:12 | 110:14 | 95:17 | 109:25 |
| 58:13 | filled | followed | frustration | 114:12 |
| 88:22 89:1 | 61:14 70:11 | 117:19 | 50:24 | gerryman. |
| 95:19 | final | following | full | $114: 24$ |
| 103:10 | 84:11 | 50:13 63:15 | 87:19 | 118:20 |
| 104:1 | finally | foolishness | 112:24 | getting |
| 109:5,9 | 6:25 66:20 | 111:8 | 125:9 | 30:11,11 |
|  | find | forbid | Fund | 62:2 69:20 |
| feeling | 94:25 | 101:18 | 60:9,24 | 91:23 |
|  | finds | force | 61:4,19,21 | give |
| feels | 120:2 | 97:24 119:8 | fundamen. | 2:24 3:10 |
| 101:19,24 | fine | Foreman | 103:5 | 19:24,25 |
| felt | 12:7 56:12 | 76:24 | further | 22:25 |
| 11:9 | finished | forever | 66:16 105:2 | 28:19 32:9 |
| FEMALE | 59:24,25 | 92:1 | 125:11 | 49:11,12 |
| 23:7 28:15 | firmly | Form | future | 50:2 68:4 |
| 54:18 | 8:13 | 82:23 | 87:21 | 68:7,8 |
| 105:1 | first | formed | futures | 69:12,16 |
| fewer | 5:15 7:15 | 77:23 | 49:12 | 69:20 79:6 |
| Fiel | 9:12 17:16 | Fort |  | 83: 6, 12,12 |
| Fiel | 28:18,24 | 57:4 | $\frac{G}{}$ | 4:7 |
| 45:6 5 | 48:19 | forth | Gadberry | 18:11 |
| 50:18 | 61:24 62:8 | 21:20 31:5 | 1:23,24 | 121:12 |
| 59:23 | 91:11,18 | forward | $3: 24,25$ | given |
| 79:14,19 | 95:8 97:19 | 66:22 68:3 | 81:10,11 | 5:9 7:22 |
| Fifth | 97:19 | $68: 676: 10$ | 123:2 | 48:25 49:9 |
| 63:10 86:22 | 106:12 | $76: 21$ | Gail | 60:20 |
| 88:17 95:6 | fish | 98:12,19 | 82:18 83:4 | 103:18 |
| 99:4,6 | 104:22 | 122:11 | gained | 109:22 |
| 114:11 | fit | founder | 57:21 | gives |
| 115:17 | 42:18 | 104:20 | Gary | 15:7 78:12 |
| 118:20 | five | four | 41:14, 22 | 115:16 |
| 119:2 | 107:2 | 6:6 8:17 | 59:15 | giving |
| fight | fixing | 97:18 | $68: 20$ | 15:11 85:17 |
| 86:20 87:12 | 112:19 | 104:4 | $82: 14$ | $86: 25$ |
| 91:10 93:5 | floor | $106: 18$ | gas | 87:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 8 \quad 96: 13 \\ & 96: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 67:23 83:6 | Fourteenth | 30:5 | 89:14,18 |
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| 91:5,23 | 114:22,23 | 112:1 | 109:18 | handed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93:11 | going | 115:1 | grievances | 59:24 |
| 115:19 | 2:20,21 3:1 | 120:2 | 67:25 | 115:21 |
| glad | 9:25 15:8 | gotten | gross | 118:15 |
| 97:12 114:4 | 15:9,19 | 10:10 15:17 | 113:9 | handful |
| 114:18 | 20:11 23:1 | 44:12 | group | 10:19 94:7 |
| go | 28:7,24 | 67:23 | 30:19 84:24 | hands |
| 3:1 9:13,25 | 29:9 30:6 | 115:22 | 91:25 | 96:2,3 |
| 10:4,9 | 32:10 | governing | groups | hang |
| 16:11 | 43:20 | 65:10 | 13:8,11 | 103:8 |
| 19:22 | 49:20,21 | government | 72:1 | happen |
| 21:19 | $50: 2$ 52:19 | 109:10,12 | growth | 31:1 67:25 |
| 22:22 | 55:21 | 109:16 | 14:6 34:22 | 71:11 |
| 23:21 24:3 | 60:12 | 115:10,12 | $34: 22$ | 76:10 |
| 24:17,17 | 62:16 | governme | 35:10,14 | 104:9,15 |
| 28:7 37:21 | 69:17 | 1:3 3:8 | guaranteed | happened |
| 38:24 | $70: 13 \quad 72: 3$ | 112:9,10 | 103:21 | 113:4 |
| 49:25 | 75: 6, 22, 23 | 114:17 | guess | happening |
| 68:12 | 76:8, 9 | governor | 15:2 22:10 | 71:8 |
| 76:10,19 | 79:18, 21 | 87:5,7 | $37: 18 \quad 40: 8$ | happy |
| 76:21 | 82:10 | governor's | $42: 560: 6$ | 8:19 57:19 |
| 79:12,21 | 86:13,14 | 62:6 | 63:14,18 | 66:5,6 |
| 82:10 95:8 | $86: 1987: 6$ | grab | 100:3,16 | 74:18 |
| 102:10 | 88:19 | 89:14 90:16 | guide | $75: 23$ 93:1 |
| 103:7,9 | 91:10 | Grambling | 15:6 | 106:22 |
| 106:3 | 93:23 | $67: 17$ | guide | hard |
| 109:16 | 94:23 | grandpar | 65:5 | 13:14 30:10 |
| 110:11 | 95:19,23 | 109:21 | guides | $76: 12 \quad 87: 5$ |
| 111:12 | 97:4 98:20 | 109:21 | 14:17 | harm |
| 114:18 | 100:6 | grasp | 14:17 | harm $39: 8$ |
| 118:25 | 103:24, |  | guidin |  |
| 119:19 | 107:2,14 | gra | 15: | Harmon |
| 120:23 | 108:16 | 85:1 | guy | 107:3,5 |
| goal | 110:22 | Graves | 74:1 | Harmon's |
| 39:2 76:13 | 111:9 | 54:15 | gu | 106:9 |
| goals | 112:16,23 | 68:20 | 70:4 | 107:15,19 |
| 5:14 8:8,15 | 115:25 | great |  | arr |
| 13:16 | 118:23,23 | 5:22 6:1,11 |  | 82:19,19 |
| 39:12 | 119:5,19 | 2:13 | hailed | Hays |
| God | 121:9 | 9:21 | 118:12 | 114:9 |
| 91:20 | good | 51:14,18 | half | HB12 |
| 101:18 | 1:1 3:6 5:7 | 87:6 108:7 | 23:19 29:25 | 63:4 |
| 108:6,6,6 | 10:23 12:5 | 124:4 | 34:17 37:9 | HB5 |
| 108:7 | 14:13 | greatly | halls | 9:3,4,5 |
| goes | $34: 10$ 39:8 | 93:10 | 5 : | 38:5 62:22 |
| 6:19 20:6 | 46:19,21 | green | halve | 66:1 |
| 22:12,23 | 55:14 | 1:7 51:1 | 73:2 | HCASB-8362 |
| $23: 2126: 2$ | $57: 25 \quad 74: 9$ | 80:5,9 | hand | 77:13 |
| 86:17,18 | 88:6 97:7 | 120:14 | 34:10 115:1 | HCASBA-3. |
| 89:3 | 108:2,5 | grew | 115:2 | 29:8 |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

Case 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS Document 181-4 Filed 04/10/24 Page 46 of 67 PageID \#: 3208

Page 138

| he'll | help | 97:13 | 111:22 | 87:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:3 | 24:22 31:2 | honor | 112:1,3 | 106:23 |
| healthcare | 40:17, 25 | 68:2 119:21 | 113:22 | 115:10 |
| 6:25 | 53:17,18 | 119:22 | 114:1,3 | impose |
| hear | $60: 962: 15$ | hope | 115:6,8,24 | 115:12 |
| 2:21,25 | 62:15 | 68:23 107:4 | 116:4,7,11 | impossible |
| 38:7 95:7 | 114:4 | 120:2,2 | 116:16,23 | 69:14 |
| 98:13 | helped | 121:1,10 | 117:3,7,10 | improves |
| 100:4 | 44:17 87:4 | hopefully | 117:17,25 | 78:5 |
| 103:2 | helping | 12:13 68:7 | 118:3 | inaudible |
| 109:24 | 15:6 91:6 | hoping | 119:17,21 | 23:22 51:3 |
| 110:2 | helps | 3:3 11:13 | hurts | $75: 277: 7$ |
| 116:17 | 31:10,10 | 103:6 | 46:11,14 | 83:23 96:6 |
| heard | 37:16 | hospital | I | 105:23 |
| 9:10,17 | Hey | 21:18 22:15 | I | 116:24 |
| 15:13 | 61:7 | 22:16,23 | I-49 | 117:5 |
| 16:22 23:2 | hiding | hospitals | 6:20 8:4 | 120:8 |
| 23:10 | 106:16 | 74:2 | 63:5 66:14 | include |
| 48:23 50:6 | Higgins | hostage | i.e | 8:5 41:19 |
| $64: 665: 21$ | 25:13 31:4 | 88:18 | 118:14 | included |
| 67:18 | 40:1,5 | hour | idea | 41:4,5,6 |
| 68:17,19 | 51:22 | 48:10 | 49:22 50:19 | includes |
| 75:12 | 55:10,12 | hours | 54:16, 23 | 8:3 |
| 85:22 | 55:21 | 117:8 | 55:14 58:1 | including |
| 87:14 | 56:12,16 | house | 58:3 | 76:3 |
| 97:17 | 108:18 | 1:3 3:8 6:9 | 115:13 | increase |
| 101:21 | high | 6:10 14:6 | ideal | 31:1, 6 |
| 107:20 | 7:23,23 | 14:25 | 55:22 | 54:11 |
| 120:21 | 16:24 | 27:16,17 | ideologies | 58:17 59:6 |
| 121:6,7 | 101:13 | $27: 20 \quad 40: 5$ | 101:19 | 96:24 |
| hearing | higher | 40:10 85:1 | ideology | 120:19,24 |
| 50:6 77:1 | 38:25 107:7 | 85:6 88:3 | 92:22,23,25 | increased |
| 102:25 | Hill | 92:25 | 101:1 | 37:12,16 |
| hearings | 106:9 | 94:18 | ignoring | 58:15,18 |
| 34:17 | history | 104:3 | 109:5 | 68:14 |
| heart | 29:21 91:14 | 106:10 | illegal | increases |
| 92:5 | hit | 107:12,14 | 106:13 | 32:1 |
| heat | 62:17 69:20 | houses | 109:25 | incumben. |
| 46:6 | HOEPA | 40:6,9 | imagine | 32:6 |
| Heather | 22:17,18 | housing | 30:13 40:11 | incumbency |
| 82:17 | hold | 65:24 | impacting | 27:2 32:4 |
| heavily | 10:18 28:17 | how's | 75:16 | incumbents |
| 67:2 | 28:17 74:8 | 111:25 | imperative | 5:19 |
| Hebert | 105:15 | Huh | 7:18 | individual |
| 82:14,14 | home | 55:9 | importance | 75:13 |
| held | 6:13 40:19 | hundreds | 65:22 | 109:16 |
| 63:8 88:18 | honest | 87:10,10 | important | individu. |
| 113:8,10 | 44:22 46:19 | Hurd | 8:9 65:15 | 106:14 |
| 118:4,6 | honesty | 111: 4, 6, 6 | 65:20 | individuals |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

Case 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS Document 181-4 Filed 04/10/24 Page 47 of 67 PageID \#: 3209

Page 139

| 15:1 106:7 | interest | 109:13 | 87:17 | Julia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 106:16 | 13:13,15 | it'll | 92:24 | 5:16 82:19 |
| industrial | 20:20,23 | 51:22 58:13 | 104:3 | jump |
| 30:1 | 21:2,5 | item | 106:11 | 41:10 |
| industries | 22:22 27:5 | 2:18 4:19 | 107:8 | jumped |
| 30:5 | 27:24 30:1 |  | 108:7 | 48:19 |
| industry | 39:5 48:22 | J | 121:23 | jurispru. |
| 30:6 | 51:1 59:18 | J | 123:3 | 14:16 |
| ineffective | 65:24 | 106:9 | Johnson's | Justice |
| 120:1 | 75:15 | J.C | 96:9 | 91:17 |
| infinitum | 77:22,23 | 107:3,15,19 | Joint | 113:16 |
| 22:6 | 92:4 112:9 | Jackson | 63:12 65:3 |  |
| influence | 112:10,22 | 36:6 | 65:13 | K |
| 25:6 | 113:21 | Jacques | 71:14,20 | Kathleen |
| influences | 114:17,25 | 114:10 | 72:7,17 | 82:20 |
| 13:8 | interested | 116:11 | 73:6 | Kathy |
| information | 125:14 | January | journey | 45:7 |
| 48:2 60:20 | interests | 1:2 3:9 | 63:14 | keep |
| 64:7 74:17 | 88:8 93:6 | Jared | Joyce | 16:7,16 |
| 75:9 | 93:16 | 61:20 80:8 | 82:19 | 65:20 66:2 |
| 120:14 | 101:11 | Jefferson | judge | 68:16 |
| inherently | 113:20 | 104:20 | 20:4 25:18 | 71:16 94:2 |
| 31:4 | introduce | jeopardy | 27:22 | 100:4 |
| injunction | 61:14 83:10 | 85:19 | 68:12 | 102:16 |
| 86:4 | 111:5 | Jim | 85:25 | 108:1,5 |
| input | introducing | 110:23 | 86:12,18 | keeping |
| 33:12 | 5:13 | Jindal | 88:18,24 | 65:22 90:12 |
| insane | rodu | 22:18 | 95:3,18, | keeps |
| 44:10,10 | 107:1 | job | 96:4,14 | 78:1,3 |
| inserting | invasio | 90:7 95:4,8 | 10 | 80:18 |
| 29:10 | 110:25 | 95:9 98:20 | 104:7 | kept |
| instances | invited | Johnson |  | 24:21 30:23 |
| 74:10 | 60:6 involved | 1:25 4:1 | 110:17 | kind |
| instrument | involved | 6:10 8:16 | 112:11 | 2:23 3:3 |
| 46:24 | $72: 17$ $125: 13$ | 23:15 24:7 | 114:7,10 | 17:25 |
| intact | 125:13 issue | 25:12 | 115:19,20 | 19:12 |
| 94:3 | issue 48:14 49:14 | 27:15 31:3 | 116:11 | 30:25 |
| integrated | $\begin{array}{rrr}48: 14 & 49: 14 \\ 51: 5 & 55: 24\end{array}$ | 40:6 45:10 | 117:15,21 | 48:19 |
| 106:22 | $\begin{array}{ll}51: 5 & 55: 24 \\ 70: 7 & 87: 21\end{array}$ | $45: 11,15$ $45: 20,25$ | 118:11, 25 | 92:10 94 |
| integration | $70: 787: 21$ $90: 11$ | $45: 20,25$ $46: 5,8,11$ | 119:1,25 | $94: 24$ $110: 7$ |
| 106:13 | 106:7 | $46: 5,8,11$ $46: 14,18$ | 121:6,7,8 | King |
| intent | 110:16 | $46: 14,18$ $47: 2,6,11$ | 121:8,8,25 | King $67: 20$ |
| $30: 23$ intentio.. | issued | 47:14, 471 | judge's | 110:20 |
| intentio. . $50: 24$ | 17:17 | 51:20 55:7 | 31:19 51:13 | knew |
| 50:24 | issues | 56:13 57:2 | 99:18 | 14:5 |
| interchange $99: 25$ | 30:9 39:11 | 57:4 61:3 | judges | know |
| interdiv... | 60:17 | 81:12,13 |  | 5:8 6:2 |
| 106:19 | 106:23 | 87:13,14 | judgment $120: 2$ | 9:20,24 |
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| 10:15 | 91:20 | 24:13,16 | 90:8 104:10 | 35:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:18, 22 | kosher | 24:25 25:3 | learned | 57:17 |
| 12:25 13:4 | 27:24 | 25:8,14,17 | 28:2 | 68:19 |
| 14:3 16:7 | Kristy | 25:21,24 | leave | 121:24 |
| $16: 2318: 1$ | 82:20 | 26:10 | 24:2 43:17 | Letlow's |
| 18:4 19:7 |  | 51:10,11 | 50:8 85:8 | 8:15 |
| 19:8 20:22 | L | 51:17 52:1 | 107:2 | letter |
| 25:24 26:9 | Labrie | 52: 4, 7, 10 | 111:23,24 | 90:20 |
| 26:14 | 105:19,20 | 52:13,16 | leaves | letting |
| 34:16 | 105:20,21 | 52:22 53:2 | 122:11 | 5:7 93:12 |
| 35:11 | 105:23 | 53:11,14 | led | level |
| 36:22,25 | 106:1,2,4 | 53:19 54:4 | 15:2 | 37:7 65:10 |
| $37: 2,11$ | 106:6 | 54:13,19 | left | 72:13 |
| 42:6 43:1 | 108:10 | 54:22,25 | 105:15 | liberty |
| 43:2,4 | LaCour | 55: 6, 11, 20 | 107:15 | 84:7 |
| 44:14 | 82:19 | 56:1,4, 8 | legal | lie |
| 46:18 | Lafayette | 56:15,19 | 45:21 60:9 | 99:7 |
| 49:20 50:1 | 113:7 | $56: 22$ 57:1 | 60:23 61:4 | life |
| $50: 5$ 51:5 | Lake | $57: 7,10,16$ | 61:19,21 | 65:12 92:3 |
| $51: 6$ 52:20 | 56:10 | $57: 25$ 58:4 | 97:11 | 93:14 |
| 53:6 55:2 | Lakeshore | 58:10,16 | legislation | 104:13 |
| 55:3, 4, 17 | 40:2 | 58:20,24 | 87:15,16 | 112:14 |
| 56:9 57:1 | landmark | 59:8,12 | 88:11 93:2 | light |
| 58:11 60 | 73:25 74:1 | 81.14,15 | 97:5 | 109:15 |
| 60.12 | 74:5 | 81:14,15 | legislative | lightly |
| $62: 1764: 2$ | Landry |  | 7:13 95:19 | 39:14 |
| 64:23, 25 | 20:7 21:17 | 1ate | legislators | likelihood |
| 65:24 | 21:17,19 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 . \\ & \mathrm{La} \end{aligned}$ | 60:21 | 86:8 |
| 66:10 | 62:4 87: | - 83 | legislature | Lincoln |
| 69:19,24 | laptop | law | 62:5,21 | 36:6 |
| $70: 571: 9$ | 38:16 |  | 63:13 65:4 | line |
| $71: 24 \quad 72: 8$ | large |  | 71:15,15 | 40:12 49:20 |
| $74: 12$ | 71:9,10 | la | $72: 673: 6$ | 63:12 72:4 |
| 76:12,12 | 106:16 | 1 | 85:3 95:13 | 109:17 |
| 84:25 87:4 | largely |  | 116:7 | lines |
| 88:21 | 7:19 |  | 117:18 | 10:1 14:11 |
| 90:13 92:4 | largest |  | legislat | 29:9 71:16 |
| 93:12 96:1 | 34:22 |  | 109:9 | $71: 17 \quad 72: 4$ |
| 98:17,18 | Larvadain | 1 | let's | 73:21 |
| 103:24,25 | 2:1 4:2,3 |  | 24:17,17 | 88:23,25 |
| 108:15 | 20:1,2,13 | 6:11 8 | $70: 7102: 5$ | 91:22 |
| 109:14 | 20:15,17 | 27:20 | 105:15,15 | listen |
| 113:3 | 20:19 21:4 | 107:8 | 105:16 | 90:1,10 |
| 116:18 | 21:11,16 |  | 115:7,7 | 122:6 |
| 120:10 | 21:23 22:5 | leadership | 120:11,12 | listened |
| 121:7,9,20 | 22:9,12,16 | 6:14 7:13 | Letlow | 48:22 |
| knowing | 22:21 23:8 |  | 5:16,18, 23 | listening |
| 72:2 | 23:12,18 | $\begin{aligned} & 110: 23 \\ & 111: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 6:2 24:22 | 3:2 17:5 |
| knows | 24:1,6,10 | learn | 25:12 | 45:1 55:18 |
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| 60:12 | look | 115:20 | 114:9 | 12:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67:14 | 9:5 12:18 | losing | 118:23 | 32:15 |
| 84:10 | 14:18 17:2 | 89:9,15 | Louisiana's | $34: 20$ 44:7 |
| 89:18 | 17:6 18:14 | lost | 4:24 6:6 | 84:13,16 |
| literally | 20:5,20 | 35:15 | Louisian. | 93:24 |
| 103:18 | 21:4,16,23 | 110:24,25 | 72:13 | main |
| litigating | 22:3 23:9 | lot | Louisianans | 51:5 |
| 71:25 | 23:14,20 | 6:22, 23 | 5:24 | maintain |
| litigation | 51:19 | 21:1,6,7 | love | 42:20 |
| 5:10 7:5,8 | 72:19 | 21:11,13 | 66:23,24 | maintained |
| 8:7 9:13 | 73:24,25 | 21:14 23:1 | 103:8,9 | 1:6 |
| 18:12 62:3 | $76: 680: 16$ | 23:13,13 | 107:24 | maintaining |
| $64: 1666: 6$ | 88:13 | $26: 1$ 30:16 | lower | 8:16 |
| 66:17,19 | 94:17 | $36: 23$ 41:4 | 78:7 | major |
| 68:4,9 | 95:15 | 41:4 42:6 | Lowery | 116:18 |
| little | 97:11,12 | 45:16,16 | 4:20,22 | majority |
| 30:14,18,18 | 97:14 | $45: 17$ 46:6 | 28:21 29:4 | 6:10,17 |
| 39:20 | 102:5,20 | 49:2 62:1 | 29:5,7,15 | 7:11,17,25 |
| 63:22,25 | 114:9 | 65:9 67:12 | 53:18, 20 | 8:17 27:20 |
| 88:21 | 118:11,25 | 71:11 | 54:1, 7, 9 | $31: 23$ 85:1 |
| 92:11 | 124:2 | 78:11 | 61:5,7,12 | 85:2,7,7 |
| 113:8 | looked | 85:22 89:4 | 77:8,12 | 85:14,17 |
| 121:13 | 9:7 17:20 | 120:21 | 113:4 | 88:8 92:21 |
| live | 17:22 | lots | lowest | 93:7 94:19 |
| 43:3 54:15 | 18:15 | 113:20 | 37:6 | 94:23 97:2 |
| 55:4 92:21 | 94:23 | Louisiana | LSU | $100: 6,8,11$ |
| 97:24 | looking | 5:9,12 6:4 | 22:14, 22 | 102:3 |
| 111:12 | 14:7 16:15 | $6: 17 \quad 7: 2$ | Lucille | 107:8,10 |
| lives | 17:11 | $7: 248: 9$ | 82:19 | majority.. |
| 43:6 48:18 | 18:25 19: | 8:19 24:19 | lumber | 76:1,14 |
| 54:17,24 | 19:9 20:9 | 27:12 | 21:7 | majority. |
| LNG | 24:18 | 29:12,19 | Luther | 24:21 25:4 |
| 30:5 | 35:24 | 30:5 31:2 | 67:20 | 25:22 26:7 |
| loading | 41:15 42:3 | 34:16 | 110:20 | 31:22 |
| 28:20 | $\begin{array}{ll}48: 5 & 49: 8 \\ 58: 6 & 72 \cdot 24\end{array}$ | 35:15, 22 | Lyons | 58:21 |
| loan | 58:6 72:24 | $35: 23$ | 2:1,2 4:4,5 | 86:14 |
| 22:17,19 | $74: 2$ $90: 22$ | 46:21 70:1 | 17:8,9,19 | 96:24 |
| local | 90:22 | 73:9 84:24 | 18:3,16,19 | 112:21 |
| 70:24 | 116:19 | 85:5,16,20 | 18:23 19:3 | 118:18,22 |
| 109:12 | 116:19 | 85:25 | 19:6,17 | making |
| logic | looks | $86: 10,15$ | 75:2,4,5 | 29:20 31:12 |
| 65:9 | 15:10,11 | 87:7 88:5 | 76:23 | $44: 5 \quad 51: 12$ |
| long | 18:2,6 | 88:9,17 | 81:17,18 | 69:6 74:9 |
| 5:13,25 | $23: 24$ $35 \cdot 23,24$ | 93:1,7 | 123:4,5 | 86:8 |
| 64:3 70:1 | 35:23,24 | 98:9 100:5 |  | 102:23 |
| 92:8 100:7 |  | 102:21 | M | MALE |
| 108:20 |  |  | ma'am | 51:3 52:9 |
| longer | $\begin{aligned} & \text { los } \\ & 35 . \end{aligned}$ | 107:6,21 | 9:18 11:22 | man |
| 91:18 | $100: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 6 \\ & 111: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 11:24 | 46:19 |
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| meetings | metric | 86:9 | moved | natural |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13:10 | 72:21 74:3 | 107:10,11 | 72:8 | 30:10 |
| meets | 74:7 | 107:21 | moves | nay |
| 32:6 | metrics | 108:3 | 122:10 | 123:22,24 |
| member | 72:25 | 113:18 | moving | nays |
| 55:17 | metropol | 114:23 | 98:3 101:10 | 82:6 |
| 114:19 | 60:5 | 121:23 | multiple | nearby |
| members | Meyer | minority | 72:22 73:10 | 2:23 |
| 2:15,18 3:2 | 23:1 | 14:20,24 | municipa... | nearly |
| 3:6 4:19 | mic | 89:23 98:8 | $37: 22$ 38:23 | 97:18,25 |
| 4:23 5:7 | 16:11 79:13 | 98:9 | 39:6 71:21 | necessary |
| 10:15 | middle | minute | mute | 46:23 87:20 |
| 11:16, 21 | 5:11 7:2 | 36:24 70:6 | 111:22 | need |
| 29:13 32:4 | 8:19 24:14 | 70:18 |  | 1:4 6:14 |
| 33:13 | 26:16,17 | minutes | N | 15:11 29:2 |
| 48:20 | 26:22 35:5 | 60:20 117:4 | naive | 47:25 |
| 53:20 61:8 | 35:7 51:22 | 117:7 | 109:19 | 49:11 |
| 64:1 73:14 | Mike | misled | name | 93:17 95:8 |
| $74: 24 \quad 75: 4$ | 6:10 27:15 | 111:16,16 | 28:16 49:1 | 100:4,8,9 |
| 76:23 | $51: 20$ 55:7 | missed | $60: 361: 18$ | 101:20 |
| 77:14,15 | 57:2 87:13 | 77:10 | 68:20 | needed |
| 78:15 | 92:24 | missing | 70:19 | 9:11,15 |
| 80:11 82:7 | 104:3 | 112:13 | 83:11 | 48:13 |
| 84:22 | 106:10 | mission | 84:23 | 49:10 92:9 |
| 85:23 87:3 | 107:7 | 75:24,25 | 90:20 | needs |
| 121:20 | 108:7 | moment | 108:24 | 14:17 62:16 |
| 123:23,23 | military | 73:3 | 121:6 | 87:18 |
| memory | 65:22 66:2 | money | name's | 122:6 |
| 35:22 88:6 | 66:3 110:4 | 107:16 | 111: 6 | neither |
| mention | millions | monkey | narrow-t | 125:11 |
| 10:25 | 100:14,17 | 44:12 | 112:17 | Nelson |
| 120:17 | mind | months | narrowly | 110:20 |
| mentioned | 16:21 28:8 | 88:1 | 113:13 | net |
| 12:20 17:13 | 61:1,13 | morning | Natchito | 34:13,14 |
| 49:2 62:24 | 76:13 77:9 | 1:1 2:20 | 20:8,24 | 97:8 |
| 66:4 70:22 | minds | 3:4 | $21: 5,6,7,9$ | never |
| :27 | 89:4 | motion | 23:22,25 | 27:12 67:23 |
| mentioning | mine | $74: 25 \quad 76: 23$ | 26:4 77:23 | $67: 2486: 4$ |
| mentioning | 33:14,14 | 76:24 | Nathan | 99:10 |
| 73:4 | 40:21 | 122:3 | 125:2,1 | 111:9 |
| merits | 93:10 | 124:2 | nation | new |
| 86:4,11,13 | minorities | motivation | 20:25 67:21 | 29:10 31:11 |
| $87: 19$ | 67:2 98:5 | 40:15 | nation's | 41:8 43:7 |
| 99:11 | minority | motivations | 6:18 | 58:5 62:25 |
| message | 11:17 24:20 | 68:17 | national | 85:24 |
| 76:18 91:23 | 25:7 31:8 | motive | 6:8,14 27:5 | 120:18 |
| met | $32: 237: 17$ | 44:11 | 27:6 | 121:21 |
| 13:8 32:17 | $39: 13$ 59:6 | move | nationally | Newell |
| 67:25 | 85:16, 24 | 98:12 | 107:7 | $2: 5,64: 7,8$ |
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| 13:25 14:1 | null | 45:22 | 55:6, 6, 11 | 62:10 64:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:4 47:14 | 119:5 | occurs | 55:14 56:1 | 114:14 |
| 47:15 | number | 88:6 | $56: 2258: 4$ | 116:12 |
| 49:17 | 4:23 8:12 | October | 58:10 59:8 | 119:2,7,23 |
| 50:13 | 45:13 | 62:8 | $62: 963: 24$ | opinions |
| 81:21, 22 | 53:21 | offer | $64: 11$ | 64:25 |
| 83:15,17 | 69:24 | 19:19 29:2 | 68:10 79:5 | opportunity |
| 83:17,18 | 77:14,20 | offered | 82:25 | 7:15 8:25 |
| 83:19,22 | 101:2,3 | 9:25 28:21 | 84:10,17 | 38:16 |
| 84:10,14 | 106:13,14 | 80:11 | $87: 15$ | 76:21 |
| 84:17 89:6 | 106:18 | offering | 106:4 | 89:16,19 |
| 89:7 92:13 | 107:2,6,18 | 29:8 40:15 | 112:6,12 | 89:21,23 |
| 92:16,18 | 107:22 | offices | 114:2 | 90:14 91:7 |
| 92:18,19 | numbers | 5:1 | 116:13,25 | 91:24 |
| 93:11,25 | 14:19 17:3 | officials | 119:16 | 93:15 |
| 94:7 123:7 | 89:13 | 121:13 | 122:8 | 100:17 |
| 123:12,13 | 110:12 | oh | once | 101:20 |
| news |  | 50:1 70:21 | 12:15,15 | 103:18,19 |
| 115:1 | 0 | 50:1 70:21 | 52:17 | 103:21,23 |
| nice-sized | - 'clock | 82:25 | 97:25 | 112:13,20 |
| 21:17 | 48:9 | oil | 106:21 | 115:19 |
| night | O'Connor | 30.5 | 114:3 | 118:11 |
| 30:19 32:17 | 113:16 |  | One-size | 120:17 |
| 41:6 107:4 | Obama's | $9: 9,19$ | 106:15 | opposed |
| 107:20 | 121:7 | $10: 21,23$ | one-vote | 1:7 |
| 114:4 | Obama-ap | 11:25 | 85:7 94:19 | opposite |
| nine | 88:24 | 12:17 13:6 | ones | 117:16, 22 |
| 107:22 | Obama-judge | 13:19,23 | 15:22 42:6 | 117:23 |
| non-cont | 104:8 | 16:12 | ongoing | opposition |
| 72:22 | object | 18:19,23 | 5:11 7:1 | 44:13 83:3 |
| non-raci | 44:23,25 | 19:3,6,6 | online | 84:3 |
| 118:17 | objected | 20:19 22:5 | $3: 2,310: 15$ | 105:25 |
| north | 80:15 | 22:12 24:6 | 10:17 | option |
| 35:15,22,23 | objection | 24:10 | 16:15 17:5 | 63:7 99:1 |
| $63: 167: 17$ | 75:1 77:2 | 26:10,19 | 18:18 | options |
| 90:9 | 77:11 | $26: 25$ 27:4 | 29:13 | 8:13 66:1 |
| Northeast | 80:13 | 27:18, 21 | $77: 16$ | 98:12,20 |
| 31:2 | 122:5 | 28:1,12,17 | 117:5, | order |
| northern | objections | $31: 21$ 32:3 | Opelousas | 7:15,16 |
| 57:21 | 76:25 | $32: 833: 8$ | 21:17,20 | 9:15 31:19 |
| Northshore | objective | 34:5,10,15 | open | $47: 2459: 3$ |
| 34:25 35:1 | 25:3 | 34:21 | 12:13 | 59:6 86:2 |
| 35:2 | objects | 36:14 37:5 | opening | 93:6 |
| Northwes | 122:5 | 38:5,20 | 11:14 17:13 | ordered |
| 20:25 | observat | 41:11 42:1 | 107:22,23 | 27:22 |
| notebook | 73:1 | 43:10 | opinion | 121:21 |
| 63:22 | observing | 47:11 52:1 | 11:18 12:9 | orders |
| noticing | 90:24 | 52:16 | 37:19 | 26:23 |
| 48:17 | occurred | 53:11,25 | 39:10 | original |
|  |  | 54:2,11,14 | 44:23 |  |
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| 19:11 | 50:21,21 | 70:23 | 9:11 11:10 | percentile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52:25 53:3 | pain | 71:17 | patience | 16:24 |
| 53:17 54:7 | 47:8 | 72:14,19 | 3:7 124:3 | perfect |
| 54:8 | painful | 73:9,13 | Paul | 66:15 75:20 |
| Orleans | 89:1 | 77:24 78:1 | 111:6,6 | 75:21 |
| 8:2 14:7 | Pandora's | 98:9 | pause | perfectly |
| 41:8 43:7 | 107:23 | 112:22 | 3:5 32:12 | 56:12 |
| 93:14 | panel | part | 47:19 | perform |
| 113:19 | 87:3 | 6:3 17:4 | 79:10 | 18:5, 8, 12 |
| Ouachita | papers | 24:19 | pay | 18:21 19:8 |
| 36:7,8,9,9 | 48:11 | 30:17 55:1 | 49:7 | 19:10,12 |
| 36:10,11 | Paralt | 56:3 72:9 | people | 58:11,14 |
| 57:20 | 83:4 | 110:25 | 6:23 15:5 | 76:4,4,8 |
| 77:24 | Pardon | particular | 16:8 21:8 | performance |
| outcome | 38:12 68:24 | 18:6 92:22 | 40:2,7 | 18:15,16 |
| 41:17 | parents | particul | 41: 4, 7 | 19:13 |
| 125:14 | 109:21 | 59:15 71:3 | 42:18 43:3 | 60:11,16 |
| outline | parish | parties | 43:3 45:2 | 76:1 |
| 119:24 | 8:3,4 9:22 | 125:13 | 45:16 46:1 | performing |
| outlines | 10:7 11:6 | parts | 49:24 51:1 | 19:14 |
| 119:23 | 11:8 12:21 | 72:23 | 57:22,24 | performs |
| outside | 12:21 14:7 | 101:10 | 60:13 | 18:22 78:6 |
| 120:22 | 21:24,25 | party | 67:14,15 | period |
| overall | 29:21,24 | 60:6 89:9 | 67:19 68:7 | 9:23 13:11 |
| 36:19 72:20 | 33:21 | 89:10,15 | 69:11,23 | 49:6 95:5 |
| overarching | 34:12 | 90:19 91:3 | 71:23 | 95:20 |
| 97:17 | 39:19,22 | 91:4 92:14 | 85:12 | 117:15,21 |
| overnight | 42:7 49:23 | pass | 87:23 | permissible |
| 67:15 | 50:4 51:14 | 79:1 82:8 | 89:11,17 | 118:9 |
| overreach | 51:20 52:2 | 85:23 | 89:21 90:7 | person |
| 109:9 | 52:5,7 | 100:9, 9, 9 | 90:10,13 | 8:1 89:20 |
| override | 53:22,23 | passage | 91:25 | 90:19 94:4 |
| 119:8 | 54:20 | 31:17 78:13 | 93:18 | 109:20 |
| overrode | 55:22 57:2 | 122:1 | 100:17,19 | person's |
| 62:5 | 59:2 63:11 | passed | 101:10,20 | 68:20 |
| overseen | 64:8,15,19 | 63:12 79:2 | $102: 3,21$ $103: 19$ | personal |
| 91:17 | 65:1,7,10 | $91: 15$ passes | 103:19 | 109:13 |
| overused | 71:1,7,7 | passes | people's | 125:12 |
| 113:15 | 72:18,23 | 78:10 100:8 | people's $91: 16$ | personally |
| overworked | $73: 18,20$ 73.20 | passing | percent | 59:14 |
| 47:21 | $73: 20$ $77: 20,24$ | 84:12 | percent $7: 20 \quad 31: 8$ | perspective |
| P | 78:2 93:14 | passion | 31:24 50:1 | 33:15,18 |
| packets | 108:25 | path | 50:2 85:4 | Phelps $78.5120: 5$ |
| 29:13 | parishes | 10:2 66:22 | 89:11 | 120:8,15 |
| page | 31:13,14 | 68:3,5 | 4: | 120:16 |
| 29:9 | 52:22,25 | 98:19 |  | 121:17 |
| pages | $53: 1,10,24$ $61: 10,11$ | 104:1 | 116:21 <br> percentage | phone |
| 29:10 49:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 10,11 \\ & 62: 1363: 2 \end{aligned}$ | pathway | $16: 24$ | 43:14 |
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| 1:4 | 78:25 | 106:20 | 96:9,13 | 1:17,18,19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| phonetic | 79:14,15 | politically | 107:7 | 1:22,25 |
| 80:7,8 | 85:24 | 11:15 46:12 | positions | 2:2,3,5,7 |
| 82:12,14 | 112:18 | 46:15 | 5:1 | 2:10,12,15 |
| 82:15,17 | 115:20 | politicians | possible | 3:13,15,16 |
| 82:18,18 | 118:15 | 111:16 | 9:11 50:3 | 3:17,18,19 |
| 82:19,20 | 119:5 | politics | 56:3,21,25 | 3:22,24 |
| 82:20 | plant | 11:20 15:1 | 63:11 | 4:1,4,5,6 |
| 108:12 | 21:8 | 15:4 65:13 | 65:19 | 4:9,12,14 |
| pick | please | 66:8 67:12 | 76:15 88:4 | 4:17 5:8 |
| 48:11 111:5 | 1:4,5,8,9 | 70:6,24 | 105:12 | 6:7 12:24 |
| picked | 3:10 4:21 | 73:2 | possibly | 61:3 80:6 |
| 26:3,4,4 | 29:5 45:2 | poor | 15:19 | 82:11,13 |
| 36:2 | 61:14,17 | 27:12 | 104:12 | 82:15,16 |
| picking | 61:24 | populated | posture | 83:2,4 |
| 110:13 | 62:10 | 67:2 | 62:20 | 107:15,18 |
| piece | 70:11,18 | population | pour | presented |
| 17:12,17 | 80:16 83:6 | 7:17,21,23 | 49:4 | 6:19 14:23 |
| 22:10 76:7 | 83:10 | 8:3,5 11:2 | power | 25:5,19 |
| 76:13,20 | 108:5 | 11:5 14:20 | 85:18 87:2 | 29:23 38:8 |
| pieces | 111: 4 | 16:14,21 | 89:10,14 | 38:15 |
| 76:10 | 122:8 | 16:23,25 | 89:14,15 | 46:22 |
| Pikover | pleasure | 29:25 31:7 | 90:15 91:5 | 50:14 51:2 |
| 125:2,17 | 108:4 | 31:7,23 | 91:24 | 62:21 |
| pink | point | 34:16 | 92:22 | 66:11,13 |
| 51:18 | 35:14 88:22 | 35:15,19 | 100:5 | 95:17 |
| place | 111:15 | 37:15 | 103:4 | presenting |
| 30:24 64:15 | 112:24 | 39:14 | 106:11 | 8:24 23:13 |
| 65:4 74:5 | 115:8,8,11 | 41:14 | 107:7 | presently |
| 110:24 | Pointe | 42:16 | 115:3 | 61:10 |
| places | 20:7 21:18 | 45:17,22 | 119:8 | presents |
| 65:20 72:13 | points | 57:21 | pray | 47:8 |
| 109:7 | 112:22 | 58:14 59:4 | 103:9 | preserving |
| plaintiff | policy | 59:5 69:24 | pre-Clar | 10:7 77:21 |
| 19:11 | 15:5 65:13 | 78:8 89:13 | 115:15 | president |
| plaintiff's | 92:22 | 120:20,24 | precinct | 121:14 |
| 118:19 | political | 121:2,3 | 78:18 | press |
| plaintiffs | 7:18 8:8 | populations | predomin | 16:1 |
| 17:14 86:3 | 10:11 | 48:21 98:4 | 113:17 | pressure |
| 86:7,13 | 13:17 25:1 | 98:5 | prefer | 87:9,12 |
| 115:1 | 25:5,6,18 | portion | 88:23 89:22 | 88:10 95:2 |
| plaintiffs' | 26:5,8 | 7:24 51:23 | preliminary | 98:15 |
| 8:7 17:16 | 27:23 | 69:17 | 86:3 | presumpt. |
| 18:8 | 40:16 47:8 | position | prepared | 112:6 |
| plan | 66:8 68:16 | 27:12,14 | 47:23,23 | Price |
| 1:7 12:12 | 71:17 87:9 | 71:11 | presence | 23:5,7 |
| 29:14 54:1 | 87:11 88:9 | 88:20 | 5:25 | 24:16 |
| 78:17,19 | 95:2 $97: 21$ $98: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 23 \\ & 94: 18,25 \end{aligned}$ | present | Price's |
| 78:21,23 | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 15 \\ & 101: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 18,25 \\ & 95: 12,12 \end{aligned}$ | 1:13,15,16 | 23:5 |
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| Price-Ma. | 69:18 | $6: 5,15,25$ | 106:1 | 116:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:8 | 90:18,19 | 8:7 10:16 | pulled | 118:13 |
| pride | 90:24 91:3 | 43:19 | 39:15 | questions |
| 5:22 | 91: 4 | 52:17 | pulverizing | 8:20 10:19 |
| primaries | 100:13,15 | 64:16 74:5 | 106:21 | 11:1 19:15 |
| 103:25 | 100:18,19 | 87:15 | pursue | 19:22 |
| primary | problems | 107:3 | 66:2 | 31:16 |
| 25:16 80:20 | 22:1 | proposing | pursued | 60:10,14 |
| principle | proceeding | 5:17 36:18 | 26:6 | 60:15,25 |
| 65:14 68:2 | 86:5 | 78:22 | push | $67: 12 \quad 70: 5$ |
| 104:22 | process | protect | 55:16,16 | 79:4,5 |
| principles | 5:14 14:4 | 11:15 25:9 | pushback | 80:10 |
| 6:16 65:18 | 28:3 29:19 | 25:15 27:4 | 121:3 | 88:14 |
| 113:16 | $30: 1631: 1$ | 27:23 | pushed | 92:10 |
| 119:13 | 31:6,15 | 44:18 | 19:24 | 102:7 |
| printed | 41:3 63:23 | 92:20 | 111:20 | quick |
| 18:18 | 66:1,13 | 121:23 | put | 33:20 47:19 |
| prior | $67: 18 \quad 72: 2$ | protected | 42:7 44:20 | 122:7 |
| 7:13 24:1 | $72: 974: 8$ | 32:4 | 49:10 | quickly |
| 66:12 | 75:17 89:9 | protecting | $63: 2165: 4$ | 64:8 |
| 71:15 | 89:10 90:2 | 8:15 59:18 | $72: 25$ | quiet |
| prioriti | 90:4 92:8 | protection | $76: 11$ | 69:7 |
| 110:1 | 93:21 | 85:13 | 79:24 96:2 | quorum |
| priority | 98:10 | protects | 117:7 | 2:16 4:17 |
| 110:2 | p | 11:20 32:5 | putting | R |
| privileges |  | 44:21 | 9:21 64:2 | R |
| 92:2 |  | prou | 85:18 | race |
| privy | produc | 6:9 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 18,21,22 \\ & 110 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:19 |  | 12 | 2 | 110:1 ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ - |
| Pro | produc | provide | quantify | 113:11.15 |
| 49:10,18 | 5:13 30:21 | 4:24,25 5:2 | 72:19 | 13:11,1 |
| 50:12 60:4 | 59:24, 25 | 74:18 | quantita... | 113:17 |
| pro-choice | 59:25 | provide | 72:20 73:5 | 114:15 |
| 100:25 |  | 112 | question | races |
| pro-life | profoun | provides | 8:22 16:20 | 106:24, 25 |
| 100:24 |  | 46:24 | 17:15 18:4 |  |
| probably | profoundly | providing | 19:17 20:1 | rac |
| 16:1 22:24 | 87:21 96:11 | 120:13 | 33:10 | 12:25 |
| 30:3 35:5 | prolonged | public | 57:15 | 113:9 |
| 48:16 | 7:8 | 10:18 39:24 | 59:21 | 114:12,24 |
| 59:18 | promotion | 60:11 | 61:25 | 0 |
| 71:17 | 28:10 | 62:16, 23 | 63:19 | 119:24 |
| 86:19 | proper | 63:3 73:10 | 67:13 | racially |
| 100:7 | 19:19 | 77:15 | 75:19 | 112:17 |
| problem | proposals | 116:25 | 83:16 89:6 | racism |
| 23:19,23 | 106:10 | 117:4,5,9 | 113:23,24 | 91:15 |
| 50:12 | propose | 117:13 | 113:25 | ran |
| 55:21 | 43:20 | pull | 114:14 | 79:19 |
| 57:11,17 | proposed | 18:20 63:22 | 115:7 | range |
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| 118:10 | 10:11 40:16 | 68:13 | remedy | 1:25 2:1,3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rapides | 63:6 97:21 | refer | 112:16,19 | $2: 4,5,6,7$ |
| 20:8,20,23 | 119:23 | 110:9 | 115:20,21 | 2:9,10,11 |
| 22:21 | received | reference | 118:10,14 | $2: 12,13,14$ |
| 51:14,19 | 75:16 | 121:6 | 118:19 | 3:13,14,15 |
| $51: 2159: 1$ | recess | referencing | 119:6,6 | $3: 16,17,18$ |
| 67:1 | 108:19 | 121:10 | 120:1 | $3: 19,20,21$ |
| razor-thin | recognize | referring | remember | $3: 22,23,24$ |
| 85:2,14 | 118:9 | 65:6 104:7 | 19:5 76:19 | 3:25 4:1,2 |
| read | recognized | reflect | remind | 4:3, 6, 7, 8 |
| 29:2 82:10 | 65:12 72:12 | 15:12,14 | 87:3 | 4:9,11,12 |
| 119:7 | record | 92:23 93:6 | reminding | 4:13,14,15 |
| read-in | 10:5,9 | refresh | 45:7 93:22 | 4:16 5:16 |
| 4:21 29:6 | 66:12 | 35:21 | remove | 8:22, 23 |
| reading | 76:11 | refused | 69:11 101:6 | 9:2,3,6,9 |
| 34:6 77:9 | 79:24 | 99:7 | 101:9 | 9:19 10:13 |
| ready | records | regardless | rep | 10:20, 22 |
| 3:8 32:13 | 1:6 | 121:13 | 12:8 48:17 | 10:24 11:6 |
| 106:2 | red | Regina | 49:1,23 | 11:9,12,18 |
| 110:10 | 1:6 6:20 | 60:3 | 50:13,16 | 11:23,25 |
| Reagan's | 10:6,8 | region | 51:12 | $12: 3,4,5,8$ |
| 121: 8 | 42:7 63:5 | 30:6,12 | 61:13 | 12:17,20 |
| real | 66:14 | region's | repeat | $13: 6,12,19$ |
| 51:20 122:7 | $77: 20,21$ | 33:15 | 105:1 | $13: 24,25$ |
| realist | $77: 23$ 83:2 | regions | replace | 14:1 16:3 |
| 95:15 | $83: 4,23$ | 41:5 55:5 | 79:1 | $16: 4,6,12$ |
| reality | 84:2,5,7 | reiterate | replaces | $17: 19$ |
| 104:2 | 84:11 | 87:22 | 80:17 | 19:17,18 |
| realize | 120:14 | rejecting | report | 20:1,2,13 |
| 44:14 | redistri | 108:2 | 53:23,23 | 20:15,17 |
| really | 4:24 7:6 | related | Reported | 20:19 21:4 |
| 33:20 40:23 | 14:4 63:15 | 5:2 | 123:25 | 21:11,16 |
| $49: 762: 16$ | 65:2 68:7 | relates | represent | 21:23 22:5 |
| $63: 6$ 65:21 | 71:25 | 26:14 60:25 | 40:2 43:24 | 22:9,12,16 |
| 72:15,24 | 91:12 | 102:23 | 45:2,12 | 22:21 23:8 |
| 73:19 | redraw | relative | 56:10 | 23:12,18 |
| 94:13 | 14:6 115:3 | 4:24 | 69:11 72:1 | $24: 1,6,10$ |
| 101:3 | redrawing | relevant | 88:8 89:16 | 24:13,16 |
| 102:25,25 | 14:10 | 29:14 | 89:17 | $24: 25$ 25:3 |
| 103:3,5,23 | redrawn | remain | 101:25 | 25:8,13,14 |
| 103:25 | 5:9 | $40: 20 \quad 70: 18$ | 106:8,8 | 25:17,21 |
| 106:10 | reduce | remainder | represen. | 25:24 |
| 109:14,15 | 9:22 63:11 |  | 89:12 | 26:10 |
| 110:9,16 | 72:4 | 5:21 <br> remains | 103:20 | 28:11,12 |
| reason | reduced |  | represen. . | 28:13,22 |
| 8:2 18:3 | 54:2 |  | 1:13,14,15 | 28:23,25 |
| 85:4 98:2 | reduces | remar | 1:16,17,18 | 29:1,8,16 |
| 113:10,19 | 78:2,3 | remedial | 1:19,20,21 | 29:17 |
| reasons | reducing | $64: 15$ | 1:22,23,24 | 31:18, 20 |
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| $31: 25$ 32:5 | 47:3,6,11 | 64:22 | 98:17,22 | 57:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32:9,10,11 | 47:13,14 | 66:11,25 | 99:5,11,13 | 63:15 |
| 32:13,14 | 47:15,16 | 67:5,8 | 99:17,21 | 93:16 |
| 32:15,16 | 49:16,17 | 68:10,24 | 100:1,2,12 | 111:10 |
| 32:20, 21 | 49:18 | 69:2,5 | 100:16 | 116:5 |
| 32:23,25 | 50:10,10 | $70: 16,17$ | 101:8,23 | 121:5 |
| $33: 2,4,6,8$ | 50:11 51:4 | 70:21 71:5 | 102:4,6,14 | represen. |
| 33:11,16 | 51:9,10,11 | 73:7,12 | 102:19 | 24:4 102:2 |
| 33:17,19 | 51:16,17 | 74:11, 20 | 103:1,3,12 | 104:4 |
| 33:23,24 | $51: 25$ 52:1 | 74:23,24 | 103:13,14 | represents |
| $34: 3,5,8,9$ | $52: 3,4,6,7$ | $75: 7$ 76:24 | 103:16 | 40:5,6 |
| 34:13,14 | 52:10,11 | 77:4,5,6 | 104:17,18 | 92:25 |
| 34:20,21 | 52:13,14 | 77:10,13 | 105:1,4 | 101:24 |
| 34:23,24 | 52:16, 21 | 77:17,19 | 107:13 | reprieve |
| $34: 25$ 35:1 | 52:22,24 | 78:5,14,21 | 116:1,1,3 | 68:8 |
| $35: 2,3,5,7$ | 53:2,5,9 | 78:22,23 | 116:8,13 | republic |
| 35:8,9,11 | 53:11,13 | 79:1,17,25 | 116:17 | 87:22 93:8 |
| 35:13,17 | 53:14,16 | 80:3, 4, 10 | 117:10,18 | Republican |
| 35:18, 20 | 53:19, 21 | 80:11,13 | 118:1 | 5:20 6:6,6 |
| $35: 2136: 1$ | 53:25 54:2 | 80:15,17 | 120:5,8,15 | 6:13 8:17 |
| $36: 2,4,5,8$ | 54: 4, 5, 8 | 80:18,19 | 120:16 | 15:20 |
| $36: 9,10,11$ | 54:10,11 | 80:24,25 | 121:16,24 | 25:15 85:2 |
| 36:12,13 | 54:13,16 | 81:1,2,3,4 | 122:3,5,11 | 85:3,7,23 |
| 36:15,16 | 54:19,21 | 81:5,6,7,8 | 122:16,17 | 89:15,20 |
| 36:21, 22 | 54:22, 23 | 81:9,10,11 | 122:18,19 | 90:22 |
| $36: 2537: 2$ | 54:25 55:3 | 81:12,13 | 122:20, 21 | Republicans |
| 37:4,5,11 | 55: 6, 9, 11 | 81:14,15 | 122:22, 23 | 90:16 91:6 |
| 37:13,15 | 55:13, 20 | 81:16,19 | 122:24,25 | 104:4 |
| $37: 18,25$ | 55:24 56:1 | 81:20,21 | 123:1,2,3 | required |
| $38: 1,3,5,6$ | $56: 2,4,6,8$ | 81:22,23 | 123:3, 4, 6 | $91: 14$ |
| $38: 8,10,12$ | 56:11,15 | 81:24,25 | 123:7,8,10 | requirement |
| 38:13,15 | 56:16,18 | 82:1,2,3,4 | 123:11,12 | $8: 1 \quad 112: 15$ |
| 38:19,20 | 56:19,20 | 82:5 83:15 | 123:13,14 | requirem |
| 39:9,16,17 | 56:22,23 | 83:17,19 | 123:15,16 | $14: 15 \quad 46: 23$ |
| 40:4,8,9 | $57: 1,6,7,9$ | 83:22 | 123:17,18 | $113: 14$ |
| 40:11,18 | 57:10,13 | 84:10,14 | 123:19,20 |  |
| 40:21, 22 | 57:16,19 | 84:17,21 | 123:21 | requires $7: 9$ |
| 41:2,3,18 | $57: 25 \quad 58: 3$ | 85:8 88:16 | 124:1 | 7:9 |
| 41:20,23 | $58: 4,8,10$ | 89:6,7 | represen... | reserve |
| 42:1,8,23 | 58:13,16 | 92:13,16 | 6:10 27:16 | 116:23 |
| 43:4,8,11 | 58:18, 20 | 92:18 | 30:20 | residents |
| 43:16 44:2 | 58:23,24 | 93:11,15 | 32:17 | 75:14 |
| 44:5,8,16 | 59:3,8,10 | 93:25 94:6 | $33: 2549: 4$ | resolution |
| 44:24 | 59:11,12 | 94:8,10,13 | 85:1, 6 | 66:16,24 |
| 45:10,10 | 59:13 61:3 | 94:16,22 | 94:7,19 | resolve |
| 45:11,15 | 61:11, 22 | 95:11, 22 | 96:3 106:5 | 68:1 |
| 45:20,25 | 62:9,19 | 96:1,8,12 | 106:6 | resolved |
| 46:5,8,11 | 63:18,24 | 96:17,23 | 108:5 | 66:21 |
| 46:14,18 | 64:10,12 | 96:25 97:6 | represented | resources |
| $46: 2047: 2$ | 64:18,20 | 97:10,16 | 8:14 29:22 | 30:12 |
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| respect | 19:25 20:9 | ring | 22:6,24 | 63:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:25 39:18 | 20:10,16 | 113:6 | 26:3 34:6 | running |
| 39:20 | 20:18 | risk | 34:12 35:4 | 16:20 |
| 43:18 | 21:10 | 68:11 85:21 | 35:10,15 | rush |
| 68:17 | 22:11,14 | river | 39:22 40:2 | 48:14 |
| 69:18 87:6 | 22:20 | 6:20 10:7,8 | 40:14,17 |  |
| 92:15,16 | 23:17 | 42:7 63:5 | 42:24 | S |
| 101:22 | 24:14 27:3 | 66:14 | 43:22 44:9 | Sabine |
| 121:13 | 27:8 28:6 | 77:20, 20 | 44:19,21 | 23:21 |
| respectful | 28:8 36:3 | 77:22,23 | 44:22 45:1 | sad |
| 90:1 105:17 | 36:11,13 | 113:19 | 45:4 48:18 | 102:25 |
| 105:18 | 37:19 | 114:23 | 54:18,20 | safe |
| respectf | 38:17 | road | 55:22 59:2 | 6:6 |
| 88:7 97:9 | 41:24 | 15:13 35:6 | 59:22 60:3 | Saint |
| 98:14 | 43:10,11 | 35:7 40:6 | 63:1 67:1 | 20:7 21:16 |
| respond | 45:23,24 | roads | 79:16,20 | 21:17,19 |
| 7:1 117:25 | $46: 4,7,19$ $47: 19$ | 67:16 | 108:25 | sat |
| responsi.. | $47: 19$ <br> $48: 581: 3$ | roadshow | 113:7 | 48:10 88:15 |
| 46:9 88:7 | $\begin{array}{ll}48: 5 & 51: 19 \\ 53: 1 & 54: 6\end{array}$ | 17:23 62:8 | $114: 22$ Rouge-East | satisfied |
| rest | $53: 154: 6$ $60: 19$ $67: 2$ | 62:23 | Rouge-East | 49:14 |
| $90: 6108: 2$ restrictive | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 1967: 2 \\ & 69: 1,21,25 \end{aligned}$ | 75:10 | $21: 24$ | satisfies |
| restrictive 107:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 1,21,25 \\ & 69: 2570: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Robillard | roughly | 11:19 |
| 107:25 result | $\begin{array}{ll} 69: 25 & 70: 2 \\ 74: 16 & \end{array}$ | 82:12 | 7:5 | satisfy |
| result $34: 13,15$ | 83:20 85:9 | Robinson | route 9:11 $23: 25$ | 14:18 |
| $34: 13,15$ $97: 5$ | 85:13 | 62: 4,4 | 9:11 $23: 25$ $117: 19$ | saw |
| 97:5 cesulted | 86:16,25 | 82:20 83:3 | row | 48:11,17 |
| resulted 120:24 | 87:24 | rock | 6:23 | 74:4 76:2 |
| 120:24 results | 92:16,20 | 104:23,24 | RoyOMartin | saying |
| results 120:23 | 93:9,12,12 | role | 21:8,12 | 10:5,9 39:1 |
| 120:23 resume | 93:13,14 | 122:9 | RPAC | 40:12 |
| resume $3: 8$ | 93:19,22 | roll |  | 59:14 |
| 3:8 retain | 94:1,1,2,3 | 1:9 3:10 | rubric | 98:13 |
| retain ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( 57.23 | 94:8 95:16 | room | $65: 5$ | 102:14 |
| 56:3 57:23 retained | 96:16 98:3 | 41:8,15,25 | 65:5 | 104:19 |
| retained $6: 16$ | 100:5,7,23 | 42:2,25 | rule | says |
| $6: 16$ review | 108:16 | 43:15,23 | 63:12 65:3 | 69:19 86:2 |
| review | 110:12 | 45: 6, 8 | 65:13 | 108:12 |
| $87: 19$ $117: 12$ | 111:13 | 49:1,2,3 | 71:14,20 | 119:2 |
| 117:12 reviewed | 112:1,3 | 50:17,18 | 72:7,17 | 120:13 |
| reviewed | 115:6 | 51:6 59:17 | 73:6 86:13 | SB4 |
| 8:8 9:1 | 116:15 | 60:5 90:14 | 90 | 62:21 66:1 |
| 125:8 | 120:11,12 | 107:3 | ruled | 67:22 |
| rhetoric | 120:12 | rooms | 117:20 | Scalise |
| 91:2 | rights | 93:20 | rules | 6:11 8:17 |
| ride | 5:10 7:1 | rotation | 63:16 | 25:10,12 |
| 22:25 23:1 | 66:13 86:7 | 56:21,24 | 86:21 | 27:19 |
| right | 91:13,16 | Rouge | ruling | 57:11 |
| 13:4 18:1 | 109:7,17 | 8:4 20:6,6 | 90:18 | 68:18,19 |
| 18:17 | 112:4 | 21:24,25 | run | 85:8 |
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| 106:11 | 118:22 | 106:14 | 30:24 | sense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107:8 | Secondly | Senate | $32: 23$ 33:4 | 51:8 62:14 |
| 108:8 | 121:1 | 2:19 4:20 | 41:8,11,14 | 105:2 |
| 121:23 | seconds | 4:23 14:25 | 41:19,21 | 119:12 |
| scenario | 19:24 28:9 | 23:2,4,10 | 41:22,25 | sensitive |
| 117:23 | secretary | 45:12 72:8 | 42:2,13,14 | 48:14,14 |
| Schamerhorn | 7:12 | 78:7 | 42:24 43:2 | 49:13 |
| 2:8,9 4:10 | Section | 100:22 | 43:6,10,13 | sent |
| 4:11 81:23 | 9:13 66:7 | 118:19 | 43:18 44:1 | 88:17 |
| 81:24 | 68:1 86:6 | 122:4 | $44: 4,7,15$ | sentiment |
| 123:14,15 | 91:13,14 | 123:24 | $45: 5,6,7$ | 89:1 |
| school | 111:17 | senator | 45:12,14 | separate |
| 65:11 70:24 | 112:4,10 | 2:19,19,21 | 45:16,19 | 78:25 |
| 71:1,2,10 | 112:16,19 | $2: 25$ 4:20 | 45:24 46:3 | September |
| 73:10,13 | 113:10,14 | $4: 235: 6$ | 46:7,10,13 | 62:8 |
| 73:16, 22 | 115:11 | 8:21, 23 | $46: 16$ 47:1 | seriously |
| 74:1,12 | 118:6,12 | $9: 1,4,7,18$ | 47:5,10,12 | 46:9 |
| 101:12,13 | 118:13 | 11:3,8,12 | $48: 4 \quad 50: 16$ | serve |
| 101:13 | sector | 11:22,24 | 50:17,18 | 6:1 65:23 |
| 111:12 | 30:1 | 12:2,5,7 | 53:15 | 88:22 |
| schools | see | 12:15,18 | 59:15,17 | 107:25 |
| 107:1 | 12:16 18:5 | 12:23 13:2 | 59:19,23 | served |
| screen | 19:12 26:2 | 13:5,10,14 | $61 \cdot 964$ | 59:16 110:4 |
| 73:23 | 33:20 | 13:23 14:2 | $61: 964$ | session |
| scroll | 38:17 | 16:2,6,11 | $68: 17$ | 26:14 47:19 |
| 17:5 | 39:24 | 17:1,10,19 | $69: 19 \quad 76: 4$ | set |
| scrutiny | 50:20 | 17:1,10,19 |  | 29:20 30:15 |
| 63:8 | 51:17 | 18 | 79:13,14 | 39:11 |
| se | $66: 24$ | $18: 20,24$ $19: 4 \quad 20: 2$ | 79:19,23 | 48:15 |
| 9:7 | 67:24 70: | $19: 4 ~ 20: 2$ $20: 11,14$ | 80:2 83:7 | $74: 25$ |
| seat | 90:18, 19 | 11,1 | 107:24 | $76: 25$ 77:1 |
| 8:15 9:16 | 90:23 92:1 | $: 16,18$ $: 3,10,15$ | $119: 19$ | 77:2,4,13 |
| 9:16 | 98:19 | $21: 3,10,15$ $21: 22-22: 3$ | 121:17,19 | $78: 20,24$ |
| 100:18 | 107:14 | $21: 22$ $22: 8,11,14$ | 122:2,3,10 | $79: 8$ 80:7 |
| 104:6 | 116:18 | $22: 8,11,14$ | senator's | 80:12 82:7 |
| 110:3 | 119:7 |  |  | 82:9 111:7 |
| seats | seeing | 5 | 1 | 113:5 |
| 6:6 101:12 | 22:1 51:19 | 23:24 24:5 | 116:20 | seven |
| 101:15 | 106:19 | $24: 9,12,15$ $24 \cdot 2425.2$ |  | 98:9 107:18 |
| second | seen | 24:24 25:2 | $3$ | shame |
| 6:4 9:16 | 12:10 15:23 | $25: 6,11,16$ $25: 20,23$ | $42: 4 \quad 43: 23$ | 97:22 |
| 10:14 | $22: 6$ 63:3 | $26: 9,11,12$ | $59: 23$ | share |
| 28:20 32:9 | 63:23 | $26: 16,20$ | $76: 12$ | 45:16 |
| $75: 3 \quad 79: 6$ | 107:5 | $26: 24 \quad 27: 3$ | send | shared |
| 79:8 83:13 | segregate | $27: 6,8,11$ | $101: 4,23$ | 65:1 |
| 85:6 86:9 | $109: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 0,8,11 \\ & 27: 17,20 \end{aligned}$ | Senior | Shelly |
| 86:14 | segregated | $27: 25 \quad 28: 5$ | $5: 4$ | 101:5 |
| 112:12,15 | $97: 25,25$ | $28: 6,9$ | seniority | 117:21 |
| 117:15 | segregation | $29: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seniority } \\ & \text { 107:9 } \end{aligned}$ | Shelton |
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| 80:8 | 52:2 55:17 | slighted | 68:6 72:9 | $42: 25 \quad 44: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| shift | sir | 48:20 | 74:3, 3 | 45:3 52:14 |
| 30:25 31:5 | 15:24 16:12 | Small | 80:6 82:11 | 52:19,22 |
| 34:16 | 24:24 28:5 | 106:23 | 82:13,15 | $52: 25$ 53:1 |
| 35:25 | $45: 19 \quad 46: 3$ | snow | 82:17 83:3 | 53:10,15 |
| 45:22 59:4 | 79:25 | 67:16 | 83:5 84:8 | 53:23,23 |
| short | 93:21 | society | 92:17,20 | 53:24 |
| 9:23 107:12 | 99:24 | 97:25 | 93:9,12,23 | 55:14 59:1 |
| shorter | 100:13 | solely | 94:1,8 | 59:2 61:10 |
| 49:5 | 112:2 | 109:8 | 105:24 | 61:11 |
| shortest | sit | solidly | 108:21 | 62:13 67:9 |
| 23:25 | 43:21 48:11 | 6:13 | 120:6,6,13 | 71:1 72:20 |
| show | 49:25 | solution | 120:17 | splits |
| 63:11 | 100:3 | 91:1 120:3 | speaker | 9:22 11:7,8 |
| showing | 102:20 | somebody | 6:9 8:16 | 12:21, 21 |
| 86:6 | 106:12 | 42:24 49:21 | 19:19 23:7 | 14:25 |
| shows | 110:5 | $69: 12$ | 23:15 | 37:22 |
| 15:13 | sits | 101:18,24 | 27:17 | 48:16 |
| Shreveport | 6:2,3 | soon | 28:15 29:2 | 60:18 |
| 8:5 22:13 | sitting | 49: | 50:11 51:3 | 63:12,19 |
| 26:2 78:4 | 27:12 48:3 | sooner | $52: 954: 18$ | 64:9,15,19 |
| shuffling | 49:4 | 62:1 | 87:13 | 65:1,7 |
| 48:12 50:21 | 103:1 |  | $2: 24$ 96:9 | 68:14 |
| shut | situation |  | 104:3 | 72:18 |
| 22:18 | 75:22 | 18:25 23:9 | 105:12 | 73:14 74:5 |
| side | situational | $18: 25-13: 9$ $28: 10$ | 106:4,10 | 78:2,12 |
| 23:10 42:19 | 106:7 | 41:20 44: | 08.7 | litting |
| 51:21 | situations | $44: 4 \quad 48: 4$ |  | 39:6 70:23 |
| 72:25,25 | 30:12 | 61:8 70:18 |  | 73:18 |
| 73:4,4 | six | 70:19,20 | g | 79:15,20 |
| 100:21,21 | 88:1 101:14 | 102:9,9 | 9:19 | spoke |
| signaled | 107:6 | 119:1 | 71:13 | 9:20 10:5 |
| 112:11 | 117:8 | sort | 108:25 | 14:12 |
| significant | sixth | 18:7 | special | 57:14,14 |
| 71:18 | 101:14 | sorts | 26:14 | sponsored |
| signified | skip | 30:9 |  | 62:22 |
| 71:14 | 107:2 | south | 71:5 72:10 | spot |
| silence | slash | 90: |  | 63:21 |
| 1:4 | 112:25 | southeast | spend | spots |
| similar | $114: 7,8,21$ | 7:24 | 114:4 | 20:21 |
| 62:20,24 | 116:5,22 | Southwest | spent | spread |
| 116:21 | slashes | 29:19 46:21 | 14:3 45:17 | 98:6 |
| 117:19 | 24:14 | sovereignty | 114:3 | St |
| simple | slate | 109:13 | spew | 50:1 |
| 92:24 | 110:14 | sparked | Spl | staff |
| simply | slide | 113:24 | split | 47:20,20 |
| 84:23 86:25 | 74:15 | speak | 29:24 31:14 | 57:15 |
| 96:8 | slight | 35:12 41:6 |  | stake |
| single | 48:6 | 51:1 68:5 | 38:22 | 6:24 |
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| stand | 120:25 | students | supplies | swore |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:22 3:1 | state's | 21:1 | 30:11 | 110:5 |
| 104:22,24 | 7:22 | study | support | sympathize |
| 109:4 | stated | 36:23 103:9 | 10:3 12:11 | 75:13 |
| 116:10 | 110:19 | studying | 13:22 15:8 | system |
| 118:20 | 116:19 | 17:12 | 15:19 47:6 | 115:16 |
| 119:9,11 | statement | subject | 82:11,13 |  |
| standpoint | 11:14 17:13 | 7:4 | 82:15,16 | T |
| 13:18 88:14 | 44:6 49:21 | subjective | 106:9 | table |
| stands | 69:6 89:25 | 73:2 | supported | 60:24 61:4 |
| 11:16 | 92:10 | submit | 109:20 | 61:23 |
| start | statements | 8:13 88:7 | supporting | 69:10 |
| 59:14 69:9 | 89:8 | 97:9 | 12:12 | $74: 25$ 75:8 |
| $79: 983: 5$ | states | 115:20 | supposed | 100:18 |
| 90:6 | 6:7 27:15 | submitted | 89:17 90:2 | 102:23 |
| 112:18 | 88:2 91:14 | 15:2, 22, 2 | suppression | 110:4 |
| 114:14 | 92:6 93:3 | submitting | 100:19 | tailored |
| 121:9 | statistics | 14:10 | Supreme | 113:13 |
| started | 17:6 29:14 | subordinate | 86:23 87:20 | take |
| 16:20 33:11 | statute | 114:25 | 95:7 99:4 | 1:4 16:13 |
| $62: 763: 14$ | 14:16 | subordin | 99:6 | 22:25,25 |
| 88:3, 3 | stay | 113:15 | supremes | 28:8,24 |
| 115:4 | 2:23 | substantial | 115:17 | 46:8 58:8 |
| 117:8 | step | 7:7 86:8 | sure | 73:2,2 |
| 120:19 | 1:511 | 88:8 | 9:12, 22 | 112:18 |
| starts | Steve | substant | 10:4 16:17 | takes |
| 40:13 | 6:11 27:19 | 78:5 | 25:18 28:3 | 106:7 |
| state | 106:11 | succeed | $34: 1$ 35:23 | talk |
| 6:1,11 7:10 | 107:8 | 7:14 | 36:17 | 24:7 43:20 |
| 7:12 15:13 | 108:8 | successful | $48: 1957: 3$ | 49:5 55:7 |
| 16:15 | stop | 66:9 86:8 | $57: 3$ 58:5 | $63: 22$ |
| 20:25 27:5 | 104:5 | successf | $64: 6$ 69:8 | 72:21 |
| 29:12 30:4 | 109:17 | 111:13 | $69: 23 \quad 73: 8$ | 74:14 |
| 34:22 | straight | 111:13 | $74: 976: 16$ | 120:18 |
| 45:23 | 36:17 | suffer | 79:3 83:11 | talked |
| 67:20 | straig | sui | 83:14 | 55:10 68:18 |
| 75:11,15 | 13:21 |  | 92:12 | 75:14 |
| 86:21 | streaks | 107:23 summary | 93:17 | talking |
| 87:10,23 | 106:25 | summary | 94:12, 21 | 23:5 49:3 |
| 88:17 | $106: 25$ street | 86:4 | 95:10 | 60:17 |
| 89:11 90:9 | street | super-ma... | survive | 68:16,25 |
| 90:10,11 |  | 85: | 104:9,15 | 69:9 |
| 92:2 93:18 | strict | supersedes | Suzie | Tammany |
| 98:6 104:2 | 70:6 | $109: 6$ | 105:18, 21 | 50:1 |
| 104:9,15 | strong | supervision | $106: 6$ | taste |
| 105:2 | $8: 16 \quad 40: 19$ | 91:19,21 | swiftly | 104:21 |
| 106:5 | strong | supervisors | 47:22 | taxation |
| 107:13 | 110:21 | 110:6 |  | $106: 25$ |
| 109:8,12 | stronger | Supp | 104:22 | team |
| 115:12 | 14:23 | 114:9 | 104:22 | team |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

Case 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS Document 181-4 Filed 04/10/24 Page 62 of 67 PageID \#: 3224

Page 154

| 25:15 | 45:11 | 124:3,3,6 | 64:22 | 34:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125:6,12 | 47:11,13 | thereof | 65:15 | 39:22 |
| tell | 47:15,20 | 125:14 | 67:11,13 | 42:25 44:9 |
| 16:9 45:3 | 49:15,16 | thin | 71:18 72:6 | 45:3 50:3 |
| 62:10 88:5 | 49:18 50:9 | 100:6 | 72:16 | 50:3 51:15 |
| 111:20 | 50:11 51:8 | thing | 75:21,22 | 51:16,17 |
| 112:24 | 51:9,11,12 | 39:4 46:19 | 87:6 92:14 | 51:24 59:1 |
| telling | 59:9,10,11 | 71:19 | 95:24 | 59:2 67:10 |
| 118:5 | 59:13 61:1 | 86:19 | 97:11,14 | 67:13 |
| Tem | 61:12,17 | 114:20 | 97:21 99:1 | 79:20 90:5 |
| 49:10,19 | 61:22,23 | things | 102:19 | 98:10 |
| 50:12 60:4 | 66:25 | 9:15 10:5,8 | 104:14,19 | 103:22 |
| ten | 68:10 70:4 | 11:19 | 111:19 | 105:14,16 |
| 117:7 | 70:9,14,15 | 13:21 | 113:23 | 105:16 |
| term | 70:17,21 | 30:23 | 117:13 | 106:14 |
| 16:7,22 | 74:20,20 | 31:15 | 119:17 | 109:14 |
| terminology | 74:22,23 | 49:13 | 120:20 | threw |
| 16:9 | 75:5 76:21 | 65:15 70:1 | 121:12 | 44:11 |
| terms | 76:22 | 73:22 | thinking | throw |
| 16:16 37:20 | 77:12,19 | 90:23 | 28:2 71:22 | 70:7 104:14 |
| 74:4 | 78:14 | 95:16 | 74:1 | thrown |
| testifying | 79:18,25 | 104:12 | 100:19 | 48:15 |
| 1:7 | 83:1,8 | 113:4 | 103:17 | Thursday |
| testimony | $83: 1,8$ $84: 17$, | 114:18,19 | third | 1:2 3:9 |
| 65:21 75:12 | $84: 17,19$ $84: 21,22$ | think | 6:19 101:14 | tight |
| 75:16 | $84: 21,22$ $88: 11,12$ | 10:11 11:4 | 101:14 | 105:15 |
| 87:14 | 89:5,7 | 12:23 | 2:22 | till |
| Texas | 93:11 94:5 | 18:10 19 | Thirdly | 17:20,21 |
| 111:14 | 94:6,10,16 | 19:10 | 121 | timber |
| thank | 96:5 98:24 | 20:24 22:6 | Thomas | 21:14 |
| 1:10 2:17 | 99:22,23 | 23:5,23 | 2:10,11 | time |
| 3:4,7 4:18 | 99:24 | $24: 21$ $31: 13,15$ | $4: 12,13$ $81 \cdot 2582.1$ | 2:24 3:4 |
| 4:22 5:6,7 | 100:2 | $31: 13,15$ $31: 25 \quad 32: 6$ | $81: 25 ~ 82: 1$ $104: 20$ | 9:24 12:24 |
| 8:21, 23 | 102:12,12 | $\begin{array}{lll}31: 25 & 32: 6 \\ 34: 19 & 39: 1\end{array}$ | 104:20 | 13:11 14:2 |
| 9:20 11:25 | 103:12,14 | $\begin{array}{ll}34: 19 & 39: 1 \\ 41: 8 & 42: 13\end{array}$ | $123: 16,17$ $124: 1$ | 14:5,9 |
| 12:1,2,3,7 | 103:16 | $41: 842: 13$ $43: 6,21$ | 124:1 | 19:19 |
| 13:23,24 | 104:17 | $43: 6,21$ $44: 12,17$ | thought $9: 10 \quad 10: 2$ | 30:11 |
| 14:1,2,8 | 105:5,6,7 | $44: 12,17$ $49: 24,25$ | $9: 10 \quad 10: 2$ $18: 25 \quad 19.1$ | 36:23 |
| 15:24 16:2 | 105:9,11 | 49:24,25 | $18: 25 ~ 19: 1$ $30: 1,7$ | 41:10 |
| 16:3, 6, 17 | 108:1,2,8 | $50: 2,3,7$ $50: 12,23$ | $30: 1,7$ $49: 19$ | 45:17 47:7 |
| 16:19 17:1 | 108:9,9,23 | $50: 12,23$ $51: 2,4$ | $49: 19$ $55: 13$ | 48:3,7,9 |
| 17:9,9,10 | 111:2,3 | $51: 2,4$ $52: 4,17$ | $55: 13$ $64: 21$ | 48:24 49:6 |
| 19:14,16 | 116:3 | 52: 4, 17 | 64:21 | 49:13 50:2 |
| 19:18 20:2 | 118:2 | 53:7,17,19 | 121:5 | 50:6 62:4 |
| 20:3 26:10 | 119:16 | 53:20 54:5 | threatens | 64:3 70:2 |
| 26:11 29:1 | 120:4,16 | 54:18,19 | 93:2 | 72:1 79:5 |
| 29:7,15,17 | 121:14,16 | 54:20 | three | 79:19 |
| 32:8,13 | 121:19 | 57:13,19 | 14:4 15:16 | 83:21 |
| 45:4,5,9 | 122:2,13 | 59:3,4 | 17:20,24 | 91:11,18 |
| -1,5,9 | 122:2,13 | 63:20 64:6 | 30:4 34:7 | 92:8 96:13 |
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| V | 113:21 | 107:12 | 119:6,11 | 113:5,6,7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 119:9 | voting | 120:11,13 | 113:8 |
| 62:4,5 | violates | 5:10 7:1,17 | wanted | 121:10 |
| 114:9 | 86:6 | 7:21 8:13 | 10:24 15:20 | 125:13 |
| vacuum | violation | 16:14,21 | 18:4 19:7 | ways |
| 46:1 | 68:1 115:13 | 16:22,25 | 25:18 28:3 | 34:11 42:25 |
| value | Virginia | 31:7,23,23 | 30:16 | 44:9 45:4 |
| 93:9,10 | 111:15 | 42:16 44:8 | 33:21,25 | 51:15 59:1 |
| VAP | vital | 73:13 | $34: 1 \quad 35: 22$ | 59:2 66:14 |
| 42:16 58:5 | 22:17 | 85:15 86:7 | 44:18 57:2 | 67:10 68:6 |
| $58: 6$ | voice | 91:13,16 | 57:3,23 | 71:12 |
| variety | 90:14 93:18 | 92:3 94:2 | 58:1 61:7 | 79:20 |
| $63: 5$ | voices | 109:7 | 68:18 | 90:25 91:1 |
| vary | 67:18 93:20 | 112:4,4 | 71:16 | we'll |
| 71:6 | 101:21 | voting-age | 76:17,20 | 2:24 10:20 |
| version | void | 78:8 | 79:23, 24 | 12:18 |
| 62:24 | 119:5 | W | 90:11,13 | 19:24,24 |
| versions | vo | Wait | 108: | 29:10 83:5 |
| 63:4 | volunt | 114:3 | 120:6,17 | 111:24 |
| veto | voluntarily | waive | wanting | we're |
| 62: 6 | 38:10,13 vote | 84:4,5 | 15:8 42:19 | 2:20,21 3:1 |
| vetted | vote $8: 1$ 39:7 | walk | 49:22 | 12:23 15:7 |
| 64:16 | $8: 1$ $40: 24948: 4$ | 33:20 62:15 | 109:23 | 15:8,18 |
| viability | 40:24 $70: 8$ $70: 4$ $80: 18$ | want | wants | 17:11 20:9 |
| $32: 2$ Vice | 70:80:17,18 | 9:20,25 | 56:9 69:16 | 26:15 28:7 |
|  | 84:11 85:9 | 10:4,8 | 69:21 | 28:24 30:3 |
| 2:1,2 4:4,5 | 84:11 $89.19,24$ | 11:13 14:8 | Washington | 30:3 31:14 |
| $17: 7,9$ $18: 3,16,19$ | $89: 19,24$ $91: 793: 13$ | 16:9,10,13 | 5:16 6:15 | 42:20 |
| 18:3,16,19 | 93:15,19 | 16:16 17:5 | wasn't | 48:17 49:8 |
| 18:23 19:3 | $93: 15,19$ $94: 2,4$ | 19:6,12 | 30:20 41:7 | 50:20 60:5 |
| 19:6,16 | 95:23 | 20:3 34:10 | 42: 4, 4 | 60:17 |
| $75: 2,4,5$ $76: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 23 \\ & 103: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 34:11 | 49:2 55:24 | 62:19 64:7 |
| $76: 22$ $81: 16,18$ | 112:13 | 36:16 | 60:4,6 | 72:13,24 |
| $81: 16,18$ $123: 5$ | 122:9,9,11 | 42:25 45:1 | 94:23 | 76:18 |
| 123:5 Victoria | 122:9,9,11 | 45:3 56:13 | watching | 78:18 82:8 |
| Victoria | vote's | 60:5,8 | 3:2 39:24 | 82:10 |
| $\begin{array}{rl}61: 18 & 70: 20 \\ 80: 9 & \end{array}$ | 72:3 | 61:8 69:8 | 42:15,17 | 83:19 85:9 |
| 80:9 | voted | 69:23 70:4 | 87:23 | 86:25 |
| view |  | 73:14 75:9 | way | 88:10,20 |
| 7:9 8:25 | 83:24 | 76:11 79:3 | 22:13,24 | 90:8,15 |
| 67:9 85:16 | 95:13 | 79:13,16 | 31:1 55:21 | 91:5,9,10 |
| viewed |  | 84:8 87:22 | 63:9 72:3 | 92:1 94:18 |
| 11:10 | $\begin{gathered} 41: 14 \quad 70: 25 \\ 100: 18 \end{gathered}$ | 92:1,14 | 78:15 | 94:23 95:1 |
| viewer | 100:18 | 94:7 | 87:20 | 95:2,22,23 |
| 3:2 | 103: | 102:23,24 | 89:25 | 97:4 100:6 |
| viewing | voters | 102:24 | 90:22 93:9 | 101:16 |
| 3:7 10:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 11 \cdot 78: 7 \\ & 111.10: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 107:2,14 | 96:21 | 103:21 |
| 10:18 17:2 | votes | 108:1 | 101:1 | 104:5 |
| violate | votes | 109:19 | 102:8,11 | 106:19 |

PohlmanUSA Court Reporting
(877) 421-0099 PohlmanUSA.com

Case 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS Document 181-4 Filed 04/10/24 Page 65 of 67 PageID \#: 3227

Page 157

| 109:11 | 108:20 | 8:22, 24 | 107:24 | 99:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110:16 | 113:5 | 9:1,4,7,18 | 119:19 | 113:1 |
| 111:1 | 114:11,22 | 11:3,8,12 | 121:17,19 | worth |
| 115:14 | 116:14 | 11:22,24 | 122:3 | 87:1, 2 |
| 116:19 | weren't | 12:2,7,15 | Womack's | 96:10 |
| 117:20 | 32:18 51:7 | 12:18,23 | 30:24 32:24 | wouldn't |
| 119:19 | 69:1 97:19 | 13:2,5,10 | 36:5,19 | 61:13 98:18 |
| 120:19 | west | 13:14,23 | 37:8, 9, 22 | 100:7 |
| 121:9,20 | 20:6 21:24 | 14:2 16:2 | 38:23,25 | wrench |
| we 've | 90:9 | 16:7,11,18 | 53:15 61:9 | 44:12 |
| 14:3 15:12 | 108:25 | 16:19 17:2 | 62:11 64:4 | Wright |
| 15:17,23 | white | 17:10,19 | 78:11 | 2:12 4:14 |
| 19:25 | 22:10 39:14 | 18:14,17 | 122:10 | 49:17,18 |
| 26:20 | 59:5 89:21 | 18:20,24 | wondering | 50:10 82:2 |
| 27:21 | 90:11 98:5 | 19:4 20:3 | 60:4 67:1,9 | 82:3 |
| 29:21 | 111:11 | 20:11,14 | 68:11, 21 | 123:18,19 |
| $31: 15$ | 121:2 | 20:16,18 | 109:3 | wrong |
| 39:11 49:9 | Wiener | 21:3,10,15 | word | 53:7 70:1 |
| 51:15 | 114:11 | 21:22 22:3 | 58:8 110:22 | 103:5,11 |
| 63:11,15 | 115:9 | 22:8,11,14 | words | 118:7 |
| 63:23 | 116:11 | 22:20 | 90:1 104:14 | wrote |
| 65:21 | wife | 23:11,17 | work | 116:11 |
| 74:15 | 111:22 | 23:24 24:5 | 5:22 12:1 | 119:2 |
| 85:22 95:5 | win | 24:9,12,15 | 15:3 21:8 | Wybel |
| 95:7 110:6 | 69:25 | 24:24 25:2 | 21:12,13 | 123:20,21 |
| 111:14,14 | Winnfield | 25: 6, 11, 16 | $42: 547: 22$ | Wyble |
| 115:22,22 | 23:20,20 | 25:20,23 | 59:25 | 2:13,14 |
| week | wish | 26:9,11,12 | $61: 23$ 62:7 | 2:15,16 |
| 50:6 | 80: | 26:16,20 | 66:5 70:4 | 70:16,17 |
| weighed | 94:17 | 26:24 27:3 | 71:24 | $70: 2171: 5$ |
| 87:13 | 95:12,16 | 27:6,8,11 | 108:2,5 | $73: 7,12$ |
| Wenger | 97:19 | $27: 17,20$ | 111:12 | 74:11,20 |
| 61:16,18,18 | 117:11 |  | workability | $74: 24$ 82:4 |
| 62:3,19 | wishes | $29: 24 \text { 41:8 }$ | 31:10 | 82:5 |
| $63: 21$ 64:6 | 51:13 | $41: 11,19$ | workable |  |
| 64:11,14 | wishing | 42.2,13 | 18 | X |
| 64:19,22 | 82:11, 13,15 | 42:2,13 | worked |  |
| 67:3,11 | 82:17 83:3 | 43:2,6,10 | 43:15 76:12 | Y |
| 70:14,20 | withdrew | 43:13,18 | $87: 5,7$ | $y^{\prime}$ all |
| $70: 20 \quad 71: 4$ | withdrew | $44: 1,4,7$ | working | $48: 11 \quad 61: 13$ |
| $71: 673: 11$ | $38: 11,14$ witness | 44:15 45:5 | 41:16 42:17 | 61:14 |
| 73:19 | witness $1: 5$ | 45:12, 14 | 50: 50:1 | 68:21 |
| 74:15,18 | 1:5 | 45:19,24 | 106:24 | $70: 11 \quad 72: 7$ |
| 74:22 80:9 | witnesses | 46:3,7,10 | world | $74: 13$ |
| went |  | 46:13,16 | 91:3 | 105:17 |
| 7:6 41:13 | W | 47:1,5,10 | 91 | 107:5 |
| 48:8 58:9 | Womack | 68:17 |  | 116:23 |
| 75:17 86:3 | 2:19,19, 21 | 69:19 76:4 | WO | 119:3 |
| 90:6 | 2:25 4:2 | 79:11,13 | worse $62: 1297$ | yeah |
| 101:12 | 4:23 5:4,6 | 79:23 80:2 | 62:12 97: | 19:18 20:13 |
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| 22:11 24:5 | 114:6 | 13 | 2021 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:15 26:9 | zero | 4:17 29:9 | 15:14 62:8 | 14:25 20:14 |
| 28:4 35:8 | 65:19 | 14 | 62:8 63:13 | 24:17,18 |
| 36:25 43:8 | zigzagging | 123:22,24 | 2022 | 24:19 |
| 44:4,15,15 | 26:3 | 15 | 7:4,5 62:6 | 51:23 52:8 |
| 53:14 | Zorro | 31:14 49:9 | 63:4 87:18 | 52:9,10,13 |
| 54:13 56:8 | 113:5 114:6 | 52:25 54:4 | 2024 | 54:15 55:1 |
| 56:19 | 114:10 | 54:7, 8 | 1:2 3:9 | 63:1 77:25 |
| 58:10 | 116:4 | 64:15 | 100:4 | 82:6 91:13 |
| 64:10,20 |  | 16 | 102:21 | 91:14 |
| 68:25 69:4 | 0 | 12:23 53:3 | 125:15 | 115:11 |
| 71:6 73:19 | 0:26:54 | 53:8,15,19 | 21 | 118:6,19 |
| 79:12 | 23:22 | 53:24 54:9 | 63:12 65:3 | 50 |
| 82:25 | 0:57:16 | 61:10,11 | 65:13 | 7:20 16:24 |
| 95:21,25 | 51:3 | 63:20 64:8 | 71:14, 20 | 31:24 50:1 |
| 97:15 |  | 17 | 72:7,17 | 98:1 |
| 98:16,21 | 1 | 29:9 98:7 | 73:6 | 51.7 |
| 99:9 | 1 | 18th | 22 | 58:17 |
| 102:18 | 23:7 29:9 | 1:2 3:9 | 78:3 | 54.342 |
| 104:16 | 51:3 52:9 |  | 25 | 58:6 |
| 114:1 | 123:22,24 | 2 | 50:2 |  |
| year | 1:22:44 | 2 | 291001-A. | 6 |
| 34:17 88:1 | 75:2 | 7:19 8:2 | 125:4 | 6 |
| 103:6 | 1:25:52 | 9:13 13:1 |  | 7:20 8:3 |
| years | 77:7 | 13:3 14:19 | 3 | 10:7 13:1 |
| 14:4 15:16 | 1:33:36 | 20:12,13 | 3 | 13:3 14:19 |
| 34:18 62:2 | 83:23 | 20:14 | 40:20 54:18 | 20:14,15 |
| 63:8 66:18 | 1:48:43 | 28:15 | 77:20 | 20:17,22 |
| 66:18 | 96:6 | 29:10 37:9 | 30 | 29:10 37:8 |
| 67:13,22 | 1:58:09 | 41:13, 24 | 89:11 111:8 | 41:13 |
| 75:10 90:5 | 105:23 | 42:10 58:2 | 30th | 51:23 |
| 95:13 98:1 | 10 | 58:17 66:7 | 62:6 | 52:13,23 |
| 103:22 | 40:6,9 48:9 | 68:1 86:6 | 32 | 54:15 58:5 |
| $109: 14$ $111: 8$ | 52:9 | 107:5 | 45:14,15 | 58:25 |
| 111:8 | 10:15 | 111:17 | 53:1,13,17 | 77:21 78:4 |
| 117:23 | 48:9 | 112:4,10 | 36 | 78:6 |
| yeas 82:6 123:22 | 10:20 | 112:16,19 | 53:4 | 60 |
| $82: 6123: 22$ $123: 24$ | 48:9 | 113:10,14 |  | 28:19 |
| 123:24 yellow | 11 | 118:12,13 | 4 | 60s |
| yellow $22: 10 \quad 51: 18$ | 64:18,19 | 2:15:30 | 4 | 109:22 |
| 22:10 $51: 18$ $51: 21$ | 64:18,19 $78: 282: 6$ | 116:24 | 14:25 20:22 | 65 |
| 51:21 | $1188$ | 2:15:38 | 23:14 | 39:1 |
| yesterday $9: 21$ | 114:10 | 117:6 | 40:22 52:8 | 68 |
| 9:21 young | 12 | 2:19:39 | 105:12 | 28:19,20 |
| young | 2:15 | 120:9 | 118:19 | 75:1 76:25 |
| 67:15 109:18 | $\begin{gathered} 2: 1 \\ 129 \end{gathered}$ | 20 | 40 | 77:2 82:9 |
| 109:18 | 129:24 | 117:23 | 98:1 102:22 | 6th |
| Z | 12th | 2020 |  | 6:4 |
| Z | 125:15 | 120:23 | 5 | 7 |
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# House Floor Audio Transcription 

January 18, 2024

## Phillip Callais, et al.

vs.
Nancy Landry

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: The House will come to order. The clerk will open the machine. Members, vote your machines. Members, vote your machines. Are you through voting? Representative Newell? Members, vote your machines. Are you through voting? The clerk will close the machine. We have 102 yeas, 102 members present and a quorum. The House will be opened in prayer by Representative Illg.

REPRESENTATIVE ILLG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always a great honor to be able to come up here and start the day or late evening with a prayer. I've met some of my best friends in -- in -- in -- in this room. I've served with you for a little over four years, and for our newer members, the -- your colleagues that you have in this room, you're blessed to serve with.

Because we're leaders for our districts and for the state and we take up important issues, and sometimes it does drag out and it -- we need patience to be able to do this job properly. And I'm proud to serve with each and every one of you because $I$ know it's been a long day and it's been a tough beginning for a number of our members. And will you please join me and bow your heads in prayer.

Lord, as we continue our special session dealing with important and transformative issues facing


| A | 3:1,3,17,23 | D | future | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ability } \\ & 5: 9 \\ & \text { able } \end{aligned}$ |  | Dated$5: 15$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { job } \\ & 1: 19 \\ & \text { join } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | blessed 1:15 |  | G |  |
|  | bow | $\begin{aligned} & \text { day } \\ & 1: 11,21 \quad 4: 3 \end{aligned}$ | generations |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1: 10,19 \\ & \text { actions } \end{aligned}$ | bow 1:22 |  |  | 1:22 |
|  | $1: 22$ bureau | dealing | Gerald | Jordan |
| actions | bureau | 1:25 | Gerald | 2:9,11 |
| adjourn | $3: 18,22,22$ $3: 234: 3$ | decisions | 3:2 good | journal |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4: 13 \\ & \text { adjourned } \end{aligned}$ | C | 2:4 | 2:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 16,20,21 \\ & 2: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | DEVILLIER |  |  |
| adopt | called | $\begin{array}{rr}1: 1 & 2: 9,15 \\ 2: 19 & 3.10\end{array}$ | 2:25 | K |
| 2:21 4:6 | 2:18 | 3:15 4:5 | great | know |
| advance | caring | 4:10,14 | 1:10 | 1:20 |
| 3:13 | CERTIFICATE | dispense | guidance | knowing |
| Affairs | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 1 \\ & \text { certify } \end{aligned}$ | $2: 20$ |  | 2:4 |
| $2: 25$ aided |  | $2: 2$ | H | L |
| 5:5 | certify |  | heads$1: 23$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { late } \\ \text { 1:11 } \end{array}$ |
| allegiance | Chair$3: 3,25$ | districts |  |  |
| 2:11,14 |  | $3: 8$ | heal | lead |
| Amen | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 3,25 \\ & \text { clerk } \end{aligned}$ | Dodie | $\begin{gathered} 2: 8 \\ \text { help } \end{gathered}$ | 2:10leader |
| 2:8 | clerk $1: 2,5 \quad 2: 16$ |  |  |  |
| amendments | $\begin{array}{ll} 2: 24 & 3: 16 \\ 3: 20 & \end{array}$ | drag | $\begin{gathered} 2: 3,6 \\ \text { honor } \end{gathered}$ | 1:16 2:2 |
| 3:2,24 4:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { close } \\ & 1: 6 \\ & \text { colleagues } \end{aligned}$ | 1:18 | $1: 10$ | learn |
| America |  | E | Horton$3: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 6 \\ & \text { Legislative } \end{aligned}$ |
| $2: 12$ <br> Appropri... |  | enact |  | $3: 17,22$ |
| 3:14 | colleagues $1: 14$ | 3:4 | hour | little |
| association | come | evening | 2:15,23 | 1:13 |
| 5:13 | 1:1,10 2:5 | 1:11 | House | long |
| audio | committee | example | $1: 1,7{ }^{2: 16}$ | 1:21 |
| 5:7 | $2: 23 \text { 3:1,14 }$ <br> committees | 2:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 17 \\ & 3: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Lord $1: 24 \quad 2: 5$ |
| B |  | F |  | Louisiana |
| Bacala | company's 5:9 | facing $1: 25$ | Illg | $2: 3$ <br> Louisiana's |
| $2: 19$ based | computer | $1: 25$ flag | 1:8,9 | Louisiana's $3: 5$ |
| 3:7 | 5:5 | 2:12 | important | loving |
| Beau | congress... | following | 1:17,25 inaudible | 2:7 |
| $3: 2$ Beaullieu | $\begin{array}{\|l} 3: 4,6,7,8 \\ \text { considering } \end{array}$ | $3: 1,22$ four | $4: 2$ | M |
| Beaullieu | $4: 2$ | 1:13 | interested | machine |
| beginning | continue | friends | 5:14 | 1:2,6 |
| $1: 21$ | 1:24 | 1:12 | involved | machines |
| best | COO | full | 5 | 1:3,3,5 |
| 1:12 5:9 | 5:2,17 | 5:9 | 1:17, | making |
| bill | correct | further | 1:17,25 | 2:3 |
|  | 5:10 | 5:11 |  | March |
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| 5:15 | 4:5,8,14 | provide | rules | 1:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McFarland | offices | 3:5 | 3:13,17 4:2 | team |
| 3:10,12 | 3:7 | provides |  | 5:6,12 |
| means | Official | 3:6 | S | Thank |
| 5:5 | 2:16 | purpose | SB8 | 1:9 3:12 |
| Meeting | open | 4:2 | 3:14 | thereof |
| 4:15 | 1:2 |  | senate | 5:14 |
| members | opened | Q | 3:1,3,17,23 | third |
| 1:2,3,4,6 | 1:7 | quorum | Senator | 4:7 |
| 1:14,22 | order | 1:7 | 3:3 | Thompson |
| 2:22,25 | 1:2 2:18 |  | send | 4:10,12 |
| 3:16, 20 | ordered | R | 3:14 | till |
| 4:13 | 2:22 4:8 | reading | serve | 4:13 |
| mentioned | outcome | 2:20 4:7 | 1:15,19 | Title |
| 5:7 | 5:14 | receipt | served | 3:4 |
| met |  | 2:23 3:21 | 1:13 | today |
| 1:11 | P | received | session | 2:4 |
| mistakes | p.m | 4:4 | 1:24 | tough |
| 2:6 | 2:18 | redistri | shape | 1:21 |
| morning | parties | 3:5 | 2:4 | transcribed |
| 2:15,23 | 5:13 | referred | Signed | 5:4,8 |
| 4:13 | pass | 3:17 | 3:2 | Transcri |
| motion | 4:7 | relative | solid | 5:2,5,8,12 |
| 3:11 4:11 | patience | 3:4 | 2:3 | 5:17 |
| move | 1:18 | report | Speaker | transcript |
| 3:13 4:13 | Pause | 2:23 3:1,21 | 1:1,9 2:9 | 5:7 |
| moves | 3:9,19 4:9 | 3:23 4:3 | 2:15,19,25 | transcri |
| 2:20,21 4:1 | personal | reported | 3:10,13,15 | $5: 1,6,10,12$ |
| 4:6,7 | 5:12 | 3:2,23 | 3:16, 20 | transfor. . . |
| mp4 | Pikover | Reports | 4:5,10,12 | 1:25 |
| 5:4 | 5:2,17 | 2:24 | 4:14 | true |
| N | please | Represen... | special | 5:10 |
| Nathan | 1:22 2:6 pledge | $1: 4,8,92: 9$ $2: 11,19$ | 1:24 start | U |
| 5:2,17 | 2:10,11,14 | 3:10,12 | 1:11 | United |
| need | positions | 4:1,6,10 | state | 2:12 |
| 1:18 | 3:7 | 4:12 | 1:17 2:1,3 | utilizing |
| neither | pray | represen.. | 2:8 | 5:5 |
| 5:11 | 2:1 | 2:2,17,17 | States |  |
| Newell | prayer | republic | 2:12 | V |
| 1:4 | 1:8,11,23 | 2:13 | submits | vote |
| newer | present | respect | 3:1,22 | 1:2,3,4 |
| 1:14 | 1:7 | 3:6 | submitted | voting |
| number $1: 21 \quad 2: 15$ | privileged | Respectf... $3: 24$ | $3: 24$ <br> suspend | 1:4,5 |
| 1:21 2:15 | $3: 21$ | reviewed | $3 \cdot 13 \quad 4$ | W |
| 0 | properly | 5:8 |  | waiting |
| objection | proud | room | T | 2:22 |
| 2:22 3:15 | 1:19 | 1:12,15 | take | way |
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## Phillip Callais, et al.

vs.
Nancy Landry

THE CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, Representative Beaullieu moves to advance to Regular Order No. 6, Senate Bills on Third Reading and Final Passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.
THE CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, first instrument in this order -- only instrument in this order is Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack: to enact Title 18 relative to congressional districts; provide relative to redistricting Louisiana's congressional district; provide with respect to offices, positions, other than congressional, which are based on congressional districts.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu on the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Members, also, thank you. Thank you for your patience this week. I know we have been charged with a tall task, and your patience, your fortitude, your strong desires to represent your district, it's impressive. It's -- it's nice to see, especially -- especially with some of the new members. You've been awesome this week, and you've -- you've stood strong. And to say it's impressive is -- is -- is a -- is just the bit of it.

Members, I'm bringing you this congressional redistricting map that Senator Womack presented. You've -- you've heard it debated a couple of times. You heard it in -- in committee as well. Yesterday, we added an amendment in committee to Senator Womack's bill. And so my first order of business, even before I make my opening remarks, is going to get this bill in a proper posture. I'd like to offer up an amendment to delete the amendments that we added in committee yesterday. So if you'll check your monitors, it's going to -- or Madam Clerk, would you mind reading in the amendment?

THE CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members,
Representative Beaullieu, as he's just discussed, is offering up a one-page set of amendments. That set is online. It's set number 83 .

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: So, members, after hearing from a lot of you, it's my thought that this instrument was in its best posture when it came over here from the Senate. And so I am offering an amendment to put it back in that posture, and I'd ask for your support.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no questions on the amendment. Representative Marcelle for the floor on the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Mr.

Page 3
Speaker and Chairman. And thank you, members. On yesterday, we had a pretty, I would say, heated debate in H\&G about these amendments, and so I rise in support of removing those amendments. And I had a lot of questions after I got home about why didn't I object to the amendments, but l'd stepped out of the room and so that's the reason for me not objecting to the amendments. I did object to the bill because the amendments had been added.

I know this is the process. I think that the bill was in its best posture when it came over with Representative -- I mean, with Senator Womack, Senate Bill 8. However, I tried to put that bill in a better posture. That matter failed. I know the process. I appreciate the process. And I appreciate the chairman taking that amendment off that I think does us no good to get to a better place where we can get the second congressional district. And I'd ask that you all would support the chairman in removing the amendment that was placed on there on yesterday. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any objections to the adoption of the amendment? Representative Farnum, objection. Would you like to speak on your objection?

24 Representative Beaullieu, would you like to close on 25 your amendment?
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REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Members, I just ask you to support the removal of the amendment that we added in -- in House and Governmental. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu has offered up an amendment which Representative Farnum objects. All those in favor, vote yea. All those opposed, vote nay. The clerk will open the machine.

THE CLERK: (inaudible 0:04:34).
MR. SPEAKER: Wright, yea.
THE CLERK: Emerson, yea.
MR. SPEAKER: Emerson, yea. Are you through voting, members? The clerk will close the machine. We have 84 yeas and 16 nays, and amendment passes. Representative Beaullieu on the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, members, for supporting me on that amendment. You'll bear with me for a second. So, members, I -- I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to be with you here today. Two years ago, I sat on the committee that -- that passed the original congressional map after redistricting, and we spent a lot of time going around the state listening to folks from all over our state. And this House, by two -- over two-thirds vote, supported a map that we thought was fair, that we thought was representative of the state of Louisiana.

## Page 5

As Senator Stine said earlier in this week,
"It's with a heavy heart that I present to you this other map," but we have to. It's that clear. A federal judge has ordered us to draw an additional minority seat in the state of Louisiana. We have the -- the federal Voting Rights Act litigation is still going on in the US District Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. The map in this bill that I'm presenting is one of a product of long, detailed process with several goals.

First, and as a lot of you are aware,
Congresswoman Julia Letlow represents north Louisiana in our nation's capital and serves on both the appropriations and agricultural committees. The boundaries in the bill that I'm presenting ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unimpaired with any other incumbents, and in a congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican Congress for the remainder of this decade.

I have great pride in the work Congresswoman Letlow has accomplished, and this map will ensure that Louisianians will continue to benefit from her presence in the halls of Congress for as long as she decides to continue serving our great state of Louisiana.

Second, of Louisiana's six congressional
districts, the map and the proposed bill ensures that

|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | four are safe from -- or safe Republican seats. | 1 | -- the reason why District 2 is growing around Orleans |
| 2 | Louisiana's Republican presence in the United States | 2 | Parish, while District 6 includes the Black population |
| 3 | Congress has contributed tremendously to the national | 3 | of east Baton Rouge Parish and travels up the I-49 |
| 4 | discourse, and I'm very proud, and it's remarkable, that | 4 | corridor and the Red River to include Black population |
| 5 | both the speaker of the United States House of | 5 | in Shreveport. |
| 6 | Representatives, Mike Johnson, and the US House majority | 6 | While this is a different map than the |
| 7 | leader, Steve Scalise, are both from our great state. | 7 | plaintiffs in the litigation have proposed, this is the |
| 8 | This map ensures that the two men -- the two | 8 | only map I reviewed that accomplishes the political |
| 9 | of them will have solidly Republican districts at home | 9 | goals I believe are important for my district, for |
| 10 | so they can focus on the national leadership that we | 10 | Louisiana, and for our country. |
| 11 | need in Washington, DC. The map proposed in this bill | 11 | While I did not draw these boundaries myself, |
| 12 | ensures that the conservative principles retained by the | 12 | and I'm bringing the bill to the floor for the -- |
| 13 | majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend | 13 | Senator Womack carried through the Senate and through |
| 14 | past our boundaries to our nation's capital. | 14 | committee yesterday in this House, I firmly submit that |
| 15 | Finally, the maps in the proposed bill respond | 15 | the congressional voting boundaries represented in this |
| 16 | appropriately to the ongoing federal litigation, the | 16 | bill best achieve the goals of protecting Congresswoman |
| 17 | ongoing federal Voting Rights Act case in the Middle | 17 | Letlow's seat, maintaining strong districts for Speaker |
| 18 | District of Louisiana. For those who are unaware of the | 18 | Johnson and Majority Leader Scalise, ensuring four |
| 19 | background, the congressional maps that we enacted, that | 19 | Republican districts, and adhering to the command of the |
| 20 | I mentioned a second ago, in March of -- in March of | 20 | federal court in the Middle District of Louisiana. |
| 21 | 2022, have been the subject of litigation roughly since | 21 | I submit to you this map, and I'll be happy to |
| 22 | the day the 2022 congressional redistricting bill went | 22 | take any questions. |
| 23 | into effect, and even before we enacted it. So the suit | 23 | MR. SPEAKER: Representative Taylor on a |
| 24 | was filed before we actually enacted the bill. | 24 | question. |
| 25 | After a substantial amount of prolonged | 25 | THE CLERK: She waives. |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 9 |
| 1 | litigation, two trips to the Fifth Circuit asking it to | 1 | MR. SPEAKER: She waives. Representative |
| 2 | reverse it, and a trip to the US Supreme Court, the | 2 | Amedee on a question. |
| 3 | federal District Court has adhered to its view that the | 3 | REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you, Mr. |
| 4 | federal law requires that the state have two | 4 | Speaker. Rep. Beaullieu, thanks for carrying the bill |
| 5 | congressional districts with a majority of Black voters. | 5 | over here. Is this bill intended to create another |
| 6 | It's that simple. Our secretary of state, our attorney | 6 | Black district? |
| 7 | general, and our prior legislative leadership appealed | 7 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yes, ma'am, and to |
| 8 | but have yet to succeed. We are now here because the | 8 | comply with the judge's order. |
| 9 | federal courts order that we have a first opportunity to | 9 | REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you. |
| 10 | act. | 10 | MR. SPEAKER: Seeing no further questions, |
| 11 | If we don't act, it is very clear that the | 11 | Representative Bayham for the floor. |
| 12 | federal court will impose the plaintiff's proposed map | 12 | (Pause.) |
| 13 | on our state, and we don't want that. The District | 13 | REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: When I ran for the |
| 14 | Court's order that we must have two majority-Black | 14 | legislature, I had one goal, and that is to give my |
| 15 | voting-age population districts, combined with the | 15 | community a voice. I've studied some of the plans that |
| 16 | political imperatives I just described, have largely | 16 | were submitted by my colleagues here. Representative |
| 17 | driven the boundaries for District 2 and District 6, | 17 | Wilford Carter had a plan, I believe, that kept St. |
| 18 | both of which are over 50 percent Black voting-age | 18 | Bernard Parish intact, and I appreciate that, |
| 19 | population, or BVAP as you've heard discussed a lot in | 19 | Representative Carter. I am here to stand up for my |
| 20 | committees and may hear with folks discussing today. | 20 | community. St. Bernard has never been split into two |
| 21 | Given the state's current demographics, | 21 | congressional districts. We've already been split into |
| 22 | there's not a high enough Black -- Black population in | 22 | two Senate districts. And to be brutally honest, |
| 23 | the southeast portion of Louisiana to create two | 23 | looking at the way these precincts are -- and I know |
| 24 | majority-Black districts and to also comply with the US | 24 | every precinct. I've campaigned in every precinct in |
| 25 | Constitution's one vote, one person requirement. That a | 25 | St. Bernard. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | We have two precincts, for example, that are | 1 | -- on Senate Bill Number 8. I want to correct from |
| 2 | in the 2nd Congressional District. One, Precinct 24, | 2 | absent to nay. |
| 3 | gave President Trump 75 percent of the vote. Precinct | 3 | MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. |
| 4 | 25 gave President Trump 69 percent of the vote. Those | 4 | REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Thank you, Mr. -- |
| 5 | are in the 2nd District. In the 1st District is | 5 | MALE SPEAKER: Representative Taylor moves for |
| 6 | Precinct 44, which gave President Biden 83 percent of | 6 | a motion to correct her vote. |
| 7 | the vote. Precinct 45 gave President Biden 85 percent | 7 | REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good afternoon. I |
| 8 | of the vote. It seems like these precincts were just | 8 | would also like to vote from absent to yea on the |
| 9 | thrown together like a mechanical claw machine, just | 9 | amendment. |
| 10 | grabbing people and dropping them off. | 10 | MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. |
| 11 | Now, I participated in the hearings on the | 11 | Representative Jackson moves to correct his vote. |
| 12 | congressional reapportionment where they toured the | 12 | REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Yes. I want to |
| 13 | state, and I appreciated the leadership of the House and | 13 | change my vote from nay to yea. |
| 14 | the Senate, the committees in doing this. I took | 14 | MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. |
| 15 | advantage of it. I testified. We are being told that | 15 | REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you. |
| 16 | we have to redraw all of this in a period of less than | 16 |  |
| 17 | eight days. That is not how you make sausage. That's | 17 |  |
| 18 | how you make a mess. I cannot in good conscience vote | 18 |  |
| 19 | for this bill that divides my community, and I will | 19 |  |
| 20 | stand by that for my community. Thank you. | 20 |  |
| 21 | MR. SPEAKER: There's no questions. | 21 |  |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: Thank you. | 22 |  |
| 23 | MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu to | 23 |  |
| 24 | close on the bill. | 24 |  |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: As a colleague | 25 |  |
|  | Page 11 |  | Page 13 |
| 1 | mentioned earlier - sorry, Representative Cox, if I have | 1 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION |
| 2 | to poach you - "Everybody likes to eat sausage, but | 2 | I, Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc., |
| 3 | nobody likes to see how it's made." And it's -- it has | 3 | do hereby certify that 291001-Audio-1-19-24_1es_day5 - |
| 4 | been painful, and it has been painful for all of us. | 4 | Cut-Appended was transcribed utilizing computer aided |
| 5 | But it's simple. We're under a federal judge's mandate, | 5 | means and the TranscribeMe transcription team. |
| 6 | and this bill is our best attempt to comply with her | 6 | The transcript of the audio mentioned above, |
| 7 | decision. So, members, I ask you to support me in | 7 | having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, |
| 8 | voting for this map. Thank you. | 8 | Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full, |
| 9 | MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu moves | 9 | true, and correct transcription. |
| 10 | for final passage of the bill. Those in favor, vote | 10 | I further certify that neither I, nor the |
| 11 | yea. Those opposed, vote nay. The clerk will open the | 11 | TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal |
| 12 | machine. Vote your machine, members. Members, are you | 12 | association with the parties involved or are in any way |
| 13 | through voting? The clerk will close the machine. We | 13 | interested in the outcome thereof. |
| 14 | have 86 yeas, 16 nays, and the bill is finally passed. | 14 | Dated this 11th of March, 2024. |
| 15 | Representative Beaullieu moves to adopt the title, and | 15 |  |
| 16 | moves to reconsider the vote for which the bill finally | 16 | Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc. |
| 17 | passed and lay that motion on the table without | 17 |  |
| 18 | objection. | 18 |  |
| 19 | MR. SPEAKER: Open the machine for co-authors. | 19 |  |
| 20 | (Pause.) | 20 |  |
| 21 | MR. SPEAKER: The clerk will close the | 21 |  |
| 22 | machine. We have ten co-authors. | 22 |  |
| 23 | MALE SPEAKER: Representative Bagley for a | 23 |  |
| 24 | motion to move to correct his vote. | 24 |  |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: I want to correct on | 25 |  |
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| A | 2:9,14 3:3 | 2:13,16 | 2:6 | 10:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ability | 3:4,6,8,9 | 3:24 4:1,4 | BVAP | colleagues |
| 13:8 | amount | 4:14,15 | 7:19 | 9:16 |
| absent | 6:25 | 9:4,7 |  | combine |
| 12:2,8 | appealed | 10:23, 25 | C |  |
| accompli | 7:7 | 11:9,15 | campaigned | command |
| 5:20 | appreciate | lieve | 9:24 | 8:19 |
| accompli | 3:15,15 | 8:9 9:17 | capital | committe |
| 8:8 | 4:18 9:18 | benefit | 5:12 6: | 2:4,5,9 |
| achieve | appreciated | 5:21 | carried | 4:19 8:14 |
| 8:16 | 10:13 | Bernar | 8:13 | committees |
| act | appropri | 9:18,20,25 | carrying | 5:13 7:20 |
| 5:6 6:17 | 6:16 | best | 9:4 | 10:14 |
| 7:10,11 | appropri | 2:18 3:11 | Carter | community |
| added | 5:13 asking | 8:16 $13: 8$ | $\begin{gathered} 9: 17 \\ \text { case } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 15,20 \\ & 10: 19,20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $2: 4,93: 9$ $4: 3$ | 7:1 | better | 6:17 | company's |
| additional | association | 3:13,17 | CERTIFICATE | 13:8 |
| 5:4 | 13:12 | Biden | 13:1 | comply |
| adhered | attempt | 10:6,7 | certify | 7:24 9:8 |
| 7:3 | 11:6 | bi | 13:3,10 | 11: 6 |
| adhering | attorney | :8,15 2:5 | chairman | computer |
| 8:19 | 7:6 | 2:7 3:8,11 | 3:1,15,19 | 13:4 |
| adopt | audio | 4.14 | change | Congress |
| 11:15 | 13:6 | $5: 14,25$ | 12:13 | 5:17,22 6:3 |
| adoption | aware $5: 10$ | 6:11,15,22 | Charged $1: 19$ | congress. |
| 3:22 <br> advance | awesome | 6:24 8:12 | check | 1:12 2:1 |
| 1:2 | 1:23 | 8:16 9 | 2:10 | 3:18 4:20 |
| advantage | B | 11:6,10,14 | Circuit | 5:16,24 |
| 10:15 | back | 11:16 12:1 | 7:1 | 6:19,22 |
| afternoon | back 2:20 | Bills | claw | $\begin{array}{ll} 7: 5 & 8: 15 \\ 9: 21 & 10: 2 \end{array}$ |
| 12:7 | background | 1:3 | clear | $10: 12$ |
|  | $6: 19$ | bit | 5:3 7:11 | Congress. |
| $4: 19 \quad 6: 20$ agricult. | Bagley | 1:25 | clerk | 5:11,15,19 |
| agricult $5: 13$ | 11:23,25 | Black | 1:1,6,17 | 8:16 |
| aided | 12:4 | $7: 5,18,22$ $7: 22 \quad 8: 2$ | 2:11,12 | conscience |
| 13:4 | based | 9:6 | 4:7,8,10 | 10:18 |
| Amedee | 1:12 Baton | boundaries | 4:12 8:25 | conserv |
| 9:2,3,9 | 8aton | 5:14 6:14 | $11: 11,13$ $11: 21$ | Constitu |
| amendment | Bayham | 7:17 8:11 | close | 7:25 |
| 2:5,8,11,19 | $9: 11,13$ | 8:15 | 3:24 4:12 | continue |
| 2:23,24 | $9: 11,13$ $10: 22$ | bringing | 10:24 | 5:17,21,23 |
| $3: 16,19,22$ | bear | 2:1 8:12 | 11:13,21 | 6:13 |
| $3: 25,4: 2,5$ $4: 13,16$ | 4:17 | brutally | co-authors | contributed |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4: 13,16 \\ & 12: 9 \end{aligned}$ | Beaullieu | 9:22 | 11:19,22 | 6:3 |
| amendments | 1:2,14,16 | business | colleague | COO |
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| 13:2,16 | 7:21 | eight | 8:14 | H\&G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| correct | described | 10:17 | first | 3:3 |
| 11:24,25 | 7:16 | elect | 1:6 2:6 | halls |
| 12:1,6,11 | desires | 5:17 | 5:10 7:9 | 5:22 |
| 13:9 | 1:20 | Emerson | floor | happy |
| corridor | detailed | 4:10,11 | 2:23 8:12 | 8:21 |
| 8:4 | 5:9 | enact | 9:11 | hear |
| country | different | 1:8 | focus | 7:20 |
| 8:10 | 8:6 | enacted | 6:10 | heard |
| couple | discourse | 6:19,23,24 | folks | 2:3,3 7:19 |
| 2:3 | 6:4 | ensure | 4:22 7:20 | hearing |
| court | discussed | 5:14,20 | fortitude | 2:17 |
| 5:7 7:2,3 | 2:13 7:19 | ensures | 1:20 | hearings |
| 7:12 8:20 | discussing | 5:25 6:8,12 | four | 10:11 |
| Court's | 7:20 | ensuring | 6:1 8:18 | heart |
| 7:14 | district | 8:18 | full | 5:2 |
| courts | 1:10,21 | especially | 13:8 | heated |
| 7:9 | 3:18 5:7,7 | 1:22,22 | further | 3:2 |
| Cox | 5:16 6:18 | Everybody | 9:10 13:10 | heavy |
| 11:1 | 7:3,13,17 | 11:2 | G | 5:2 |
| create | 7:17 8:1,2 | example | G | high |
| 7:23 9:5 | 8:9,20 9:6 | 10:1 | general | 7:22 |
| current | 10:2,5,5 | extend | 7:7 | home |
| 7:21 | districts | 6:13 | give | 3:5 6:9 |
| Cut-Appe. | 1:9,13 5:25 |  | 9:14 | honest |
| 13:4 | 6:9 7:5,15 | F | Given | 9:22 |
|  | 7:24 8:17 | failed | 7:21 | House |
| D | 8:19 9:21 | 3:14 | giving | 4:3,23 6:5 |
| Dated | 9:22 | fair | 4:18 | 6:68:14 |
| 13:14 | divides | 4:24 | goal | 10:13 |
| day | 10:19 | Farnum | 9:14 |  |
| 6:22 | doing | 3:22 4:5 | goals | I |
| days | 10:14 | favor | 5:9 8:9,16 | I-49 |
| 10:17 | draw | 4:6 11:10 | going | 8:3 |
| DC | 5:4 8:11 | federal | 2:7,10 4:21 | imperatives |
| 6:11 | driven | 5:3,5 6:16 | 5:6 | 7:16 |
| debate | 7:17 | 6:17 7:3,4 | good | important |
| 3:2 | dropping | 7:9,12 | 3:16 10:18 | 8:9 |
| debated | 10:10 | 8:20 11:5 | 12:7 | impose |
| 2:3 | E | Fifth | Governme | 7:12 |
| decade | E | 7:1 | 4:3 | impressive |
| 5:18 | earlier | filed | grabbing | 1:21,24 |
| decides | 5:1 11:1 | 6:24 | 10:10 | inaudible |
| 5:22 | east | final | great | 4:8 |
| decision | 8:3 | 1:3 11:10 | 5:19,23 6:7 | include |
| 11:7 | eat | finally | growing | 8:4 |
| delete | 11:2 | 6:15 11:14 | 8:1 | includes |
| 2:8 demograp. | effect $6: 23$ | 11:16 firmly | H | 8:2 |
| demograp. |  | firmly | $\longrightarrow$ | incumbents |
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| 5:16 | Letlow's | mandate | 11:17,24 | offer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| instrument | 8:17 | 11:5 | 12:6 | 2:8 |
| 1:7,7 2:18 | likes | map | move | offered |
| intact | 11:2,3 | 2:2 4:20,24 | 11:24 | 4:5 |
| 9:18 | listening | 5:3,8,20 | moves | offering |
| intended | 4:22 | 5:25 6:8 | 1:2 11:9,15 | 2:14,19 |
| 9:5 | litigation | 6:11 7:12 | 11:16 12:5 | offices |
| interested | 5:6 6:16,21 | 8:6,8,21 | 12:11 | 1:11 |
| 13:13 | 7:1 8:7 | 11:8 | N | Okay |
| involved | long | maps | $\frac{N}{\text { Nathan }}$ | 4:15 |
| 13:12 | 5:9,22 | $6: 15,19$ Marcelle | Nathan $13: 2,16$ | one-page |
| J | looking $9: 23$ | 2:23,25 | nation's | ongoing |
| Jackson | lot | March | 5:12 6:14 | 6:16,17 |
| 12:11,12,15 | 2:17 3:4 | 6:20,20 | national | online |
| Johnson | 4:21 5:10 | 13:14 | 6:3,10 | 2:15 |
| 6:6 8:18 | 7:19 | matter | nay | open |
| judge | Louisiana | 3:14 | 4:7 11:11 | 4:7 11:11 |
| 5:4 | 4:25 5:5,7 | mean | 12:2,13 | 11:19 |
| judge's | 5:11,23 | 3:12 | nays | opening |
| 9:8 11:5 | 6:13,18 | means | 4:13 11:14 | 2:7 |
| Julia | 7:23 8:10 | 13:5 | need | opportunity |
| 5:11 | $8: 20$ | mechanical | $6: 11$ | 4:18 7:9 |
| K | 1:10 5:24 | members | neither 13:10 | opposed $4: 711$ |
| kept | 6:2 | 1:1,6,17,22 | never | order |
| 9:17 | Louisian | 2:1,12,16 | 9:20 | 1:3,7,8 2:6 |
| know | 5:21 | 3:1 4:1,12 | new | 7:9,14 9:8 |
| $\begin{array}{cc}1: 18 & 3: 10 \\ 3: 14 & 9: 23\end{array}$ | M | 4:16,17 | 1:22 | ordered |
| 3:14 9:23 | M | 11:7,12,12 | nice | 5:4 |
| L | ma'am | men | 1:21 | original |
| largely | machine | mentioned | north | 4:20 |
| 7:16 | 4:7,12 10:9 | 6:20 11:1 | number | Orlear $8: 1$ |
| law | 11:12,12 | 13:6 | 2:15 12:1 | outcome |
| 7:4 | 11:13,19 | mess |  | 13:13 |
| lay | 11:22 | 10:18 | 0 |  |
| 11:17 | Madam | Middle | object | P |
| leader | 1:17 2:10 | 5:7 6:17 | 3:5,8 | painful |
| 6:7 8:18 | maintaining | 8:20 | objecting | 11:4,4 |
| leadership | 8:17 | Mike | 3:7 | Parish |
| 6:10 7:7 | majority | 6:6 | objection | 8:2,3 9:18 |
| 10:13 | 6:6,13 7:5 | mind | 1:5 3:23,23 | particip.. |
| legislative | 8:18 | 2:11 | 11:18 12:3 | 10:11 |
| 7:7 | majority... | minority | 12:10,14 | parties |
| legislature | 7:14,24 | 5:4 | objections | 13:12 |
| 9:14 | MALE | monitors | 3:21 | passage |
| Letlow | 11:23 12:3 | 2:10 | objects | 1:4 11:10 |
| 5:11,15,20 | 12:5,10,14 | motion | 4:6 | passed |
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| 4:20 11:14 | 10:2,3,6,7 | 10:21 | 9:13,16,19 | 10:17 11:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:17 | precincts |  | 10:22,23 | Scalise |
| passes | 9:23 10:1,8 | R | 10:25 11:1 | 6:78:18 |
| 4:13 | presence | ran | 11:9,15,23 | seat |
| patience | 5:21 6:2 | 9:13 | 11:25 12:4 | 5:4 8:17 |
| 1:18,19 | present | reading | 12:5,7,11 | seats |
| Pause | 5:2 | 1:3 2:11 | 12:12,15 | 6:1 |
| 9:12 11:20 | presented | reapport | Represen... | second |
| people | 2:2 | 10:12 | 6:6 | 3:17 4:17 |
| 10:10 | presenting | reason | represented | 5:24 6:20 |
| percent | 5:8,14 | 3:7 8:1 | 8:15 | secretary |
| 7:18 10:3,4 | President | reconsider | represents | 7:6 |
| 10:6,7 | 10:3,4,6,7 | 11:16 | 5:11 | see |
| period | pretty | Red | Republican | 1:21 2:22 |
| 10:16 | 3:2 | 8:4 | 5:17 6:1,2 | 11:3 |
| person | pride | redistri | 6:9 8:19 | Seeing |
| 7:25 | 5:19 | 1:10 2:2 | requirement | 9:10 |
| personal | principles | 4:21 6:22 | 7:25 | Senate |
| 13:11 | 6:12 | redraw | requires | 1:3,8 2:19 |
| Pikover | prior | 10:16 | 7:4 | 3:12 8:13 |
| 13:2,16 | 7:7 | Regular | respect | 9:22 10:14 |
| place | process | 1:2 | 1:11 | 12:1 |
| 3:17 | 3:10,14,15 | relative | respond | Senator |
| placed | 5:9 | 1:9,9 | 6:15 | 1:8 2:2,5 |
| 3:20 | product | remainder | retained | 3:12 5:1 |
| plaintiff's | 5:8 | 5:18 | 6:12 | 8:13 |
| 7:12 | prolonged | remains | reverse | serves |
| plaintiffs | 6:25 | 5:15 | 7:2 | 5:12 |
| 8:7 | proper | remarkable | reviewed | serving |
| plan | 2:7 | 6:4 | 8:8 13:7 | 5:23 |
| 9:17 | proposed | remarks | Rights | set |
| plans | 5:25 6:11 | 2:7 | 5:6 6:17 | 2:14,14,15 |
| 9:15 | 6:15 7:12 | removal | rise | Shreveport |
| poach | 8:7 | 4:2 | 3:3 | 8:5 |
| 11:2 | protecting | removing | River | simple |
| political | 8:16 | 3:4,19 | 8:4 | 7:6 11:5 |
| 7:16 8:8 | proud | Rep | room | six |
| population | 6:4 | 9:4 | 3:6 | 5:24 |
| 7:15,19,22 | provide | represent | Rouge | solidly |
| 8:2,4 | 1:9,11 | 1:20 | 8:3 | 6:9 |
| portion | put | represen... | roughly | sorry |
| 7:23 | 2:20 3:13 | 1:2,14,16 | 6:21 | 11:1 |
| positions |  | 2:13,16,23 | S | southeast |
| 1:11 | Q | 2:25 3:12 | S | 7:23 |
| posture | question | 3:22,24 | safe | speak |
| 2:8,18,20 | 8:24 9:2 | 4:1, 4, 5, 14 | 6:1,1 | 3:23 |
| 3:11,14 | questions | 4:15,25 | sat | speaker |
| precinct | 2:22 3:5 | 8:23 9:1,3 | 4:19 | 1:1,5,6,14 |
| 9:24,24 | 8:22 9:10 | 9:7,9,11 | sausage | 1:17 2:12 |
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| 2:22 3:1 | 7:8 | thrown | unimpaired | 9:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:21 4:4,9 | suit | 10:9 | 5:15 | Womack |
| 4:11,15 | 6:23 | time | United | 1:8 2:2 |
| 6:5 8:17 | support | 4:21 | 6:2,5 | 3:12 8:13 |
| 8:23 9:1,4 | 2:21 3:3,19 | times | utilizing | Womack's |
| 9:10 10:21 | 4:2 11:7 | 2:3 | 13:4 | 2:5 |
| 10:23 11:9 | supported | title |  | work |
| 11:19,21 | 4:24 | 1:8 11:15 | V | 5:19 |
| 11:23 12:3 | supporting | today | view | Wright |
| 12:5,10,14 | 4:16 | 4:19 7:20 | 7:3 | 4:9 |
| spent | Supreme | told | voice |  |
| 4:21 | $7: 2$ | 10: | 9:15 | X |
| split $9: 20,21$ |  | toured | vote |  |
| 9:20,21 | T | 10:12 | 4:6,7,23 | Y |
| St | table | transcribed | 7:25 10:3 | yea |
| 9:17,20,25 | 11:17 | 13:4,7 | 10:4,7,8 | 4:6,9,10,11 |
| stand | take | Transcri | 10:18 | 11:11 12:8 |
| 9:19 10:20 | 8:22 | 13:2,5,7,11 | 11:10,11 | 12:13 |
| state | tall | 13:16 | 11:12,16 | years |
| 4:22,22,25 | 1:19 | transcript | 11:24 12:6 | 4:19 |
| 5:5,23 6:7 | task | 13:6 | 12:8,11,13 | yeas |
| 7:4,6,13 | 1:19 | transcri. | voters | 4:13 11:14 |
| 10:13 | Taylor | 13:1,5,9,11 | 7:5 | yesterday |
| state's | 8:23 12:5,7 | travels | voting | 2:4,9 3:2 |
| 7:21 | team | 8:3 | 4:12 5:6 | 3:20 8:14 |
| States | 13:5,11 | tremendo | 6:17 8:15 | Z |
| 6:2,5 stepped | ten | 6:3 | $11: 8,13$ |  |
| stepped $3: 6$ | 11:22 | tried | voting-age $7: 15,18$ | 0 |
| Steve | testi | 3:13 | 7. | 0:04:34 |
| 6:7 | thank |  | W | 4:8 |
| Stine | 1:16,17,17 | trips | waives | 1 |
| 5:1 | 1:18 2:25 | 7:1 | 8:25 9:1 | 11th |
| stood $1: 24$ | 3:1,20 4:3 | true | want 7.13 .25 | 13:14 |
| 1:24 strong | 4:16 9:3,9 | 13:9 | $12: 1,12$ |  |
| strong $1: 20,24$ | $10: 20,22$ $11: 8 \quad 12: 4$ | Trump | Washington | 4:13 11:14 |
| 8:17 | 12:15 | 10: | 6:11 | 18 |
| studied | thanks | $4: 19,23 \quad 6: 8$ | way | 1:9 |
| 9:15 | 9:4 | $6: 8 \quad 7: 1,4$ | 9:23 13:12 | 1st |
| subject | thereof | $7: 14,23$ | We're | 10:5 |
| $6: 21$ submit | 13:13 | 9:20,22 | 11:5 | 2 |
| submit | think | 10:1 | We ve |  |
| $8: 14,21$ submitted | 3:10,16 | two-thirds | 9:21 | 7:17 8: |
| submitted | Third | $4: 23$ | week | 2022 |
| 9:16 substantial | 1:3 |  | $1: 18,23 \quad 5: 1$ | 6:21,22 |
| substantial 6:25 | thought | U | went | 2024 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 25 \\ & \text { succeed } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2: 174: 24 \\ 4: 25 \end{gathered}$ | unaware $6: 18$ | 6:22 | 13:14 |
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MALE SPEAKER: Secretary will open the machines. Vote at the machines, members. Vote at the machines. Are we finished voting? 36 members in a quorum. Next order of business.

THE CLERK: Messages. Messages from the House. The -- I'm directed to inform you that the House of Representatives has finally passed the following Senate bills and joint resolutions. Senate Bill 8 reported with amendments respectfully submitted. Michelle Fontana, clerk of the house. Senate bills returned from the House with amendments. Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack is an act to amend Title 18, relative to congressional districts, to provide for the redistricting of Louisiana's congressional districts to provide with respect to positions and offices other than congressional, which are based upon congressional districts. The bill comes from the House with a set of House Committee amendments and House Floor amendments.

Senator Womack now moves for suspension of the rules to take up the bill at this time.

MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. Without objection. Senator Womack, on your bill.

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. President.
Members, Senate Bill 8, which provides for redistricting of congressional districts, appears to be before you now
in the exact posture that it left the Senate. The House is removed. HGA Committee amendment I move to concur with on Senate Bill Number 8.
(Pause.)
MALE SPEAKER: Gotcha. Members, the summaries are being passed out right now, so we're just going to slow down a little bit. I want to give everybody the chance to see what we're voting on.

## (Pause.)

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack, would you mind going over the -- I know we've all seen the amendment once. We -- we know what the bill looks like, but if you could just go over some high points on it while they're passing this out. Members, if you have a -members, if you want to speak, hit your Floor button if anybody would like to come to the Floor to discuss the bill. I know some members -- make sure that you do that.
(Pause.)
SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. They're passing out the amendments. The -- the way they did lay up the House -- I mean, lay up the Senate, it was one district change on that amendment. That took in part of Avoyelles Parish. That was the only change, to my knowledge, that was in the -- that was in the new map.
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MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Senate Morris for -- for -- Senator Morris for a question on the bill, and you also have your Floor button, so which -- you want to question. Let's do question first, please, and then we can do the Floor. Thank you.

SENATOR MORRIS: Senator Womack, you said the only change was -- was taking some of Avoyelles Parish and putting it in Miss Letlow's district, correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: Correct.
SENATOR MORRIS: However, it actually took my personal home out of Miss Letlow's district, as well as Senator Cathey's home precinct, as well as State Rep Echols' home precinct, and put that in Representative Johnson's district; did it not?

SENATOR WOMACK: It did.
SENATOR MORRIS: So the only thing being done was not just Avoyelles Parish, correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: I stand to be corrected.
You're correct.
SENATOR MORRIS: Why did we do that for Avoyelles Parish?

SENATOR WOMACK: That was -- that was brought before the -- the -- I'll have to look back. I -- I was
24 -- I was thinking that was a -- a -- a Senate Committee
25 amendment on that, and that's the way it came out of

Committee.
SENATOR MORRIS: Yes, sir. I think you altered the amendment.

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, l'll have to -- l'll have to look back and -- and put that together for you. Any other questions?

SENATOR MORRIS: So you don't know why we put Avoyelles in Miss Letlow's district?

SENATOR WOMACK: As I stated earlier, we were -- we were trying to put what we could to -- to give senator -- Representative Letlow as much North Louisiana as we could. So that was what we -- that was what we done on -- on that amendment.

SENATOR MORRIS: By -- by trading Avoyelles for Monroe, we gave her more North Louisiana.

SENATOR WOMACK: As I understand it, in that bill, I didn't think that -- that your home or Senator Cathey or Echols was in the original bill to start with. My recollection.

SENATOR MORRIS: It wasn't in Miss Letlow's district.

SENATOR WOMACK: Right.
SENATOR MORRIS: Would you be shocked if that was not the case, and that we were all in Miss Letlow's district?
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SENATOR WOMACK: Probably so. But that -- at the -- at the time I put that amendment on, I don't remember the original map having that -- y'all's address in her district.

SENATOR MORRIS: But you did know that the amendment took some more of Ouachita Parish out of Letlow's, and put it into Johnson's district; you did know that, right?

SENATOR WOMACK: I knew it had to come from somewhere.

SENATOR MORRIS: Yes, sir. Thank you.
MALE SPEAKER: Senator Morris, you have the Floor now for the -- for Senate (inaudible 0:08:19).

SENATOR MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. President. We
came here to redistrict because there's a chance. It's not absolute, but there's a chance that the judge will rule that our districts that we -- that we completed in the last couple of years will not be declared unconstitutional. That case never went to a final judgment. It hasn't even gone to a full trial on the merits, but yet here we are. So what do we do? We're supposed to redistrict with a lot of principles in mind. Among those include compactness and contiguity.

This bill does neither. It's neither
contiguous nor compact. We're all supposed to do it and

$\square$

Rapides Parish. And now this map, yet again, has Rapides Parish divided in half. I guess that's better than six, but I guess we would have to have every congressperson from the -- from the state to have six. It's important that we do these maps, and we do them correctly, where we establish another minority majority district. And for that reason, I'm going to support and I'm going to vote for this map, but like my colleagues before me, I have to admit we should do better.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Luneau. Senator Carter for the floor.

SENATOR CARTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, we have an historic opportunity before us today, and it's an exciting day for the great State of Louisiana. If we concur and accept Senate Bill 8, we get to create two performing African American districts right here in the State of Louisiana. That is historic. That is to be celebrated. I really want to say thank you to everyone in this room. I can't thank you all enough. I appreciate the sincere effort. I appreciate the -- the -- the working late into the evenings that -I want to thank the staff of the SGA committee and the tireless hours that they have. This is -- this is historic.

I know that it's hard to do anything that's
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perfect, and I know redistricting is the hardest thing that we do of all. This is my second redistricting session, and they're very tough, but we came together in a effort to comply with a federal judge's order that Louisiana provide equal representation to the African Americans in the State of Louisiana, and we have an opportunity to do that. Let's celebrate. Let's be happy. Let's be glad this state has an opportunity to provide equal representation in our congressional leadership right here in the State of Louisiana. Thank you all so much.

And I also want to thank -- I'll be remiss if I didn't thank the -- the president, all the members of SGA committee, the -- the governor who called this session. We began with the governor addressing us on Dr. King's Day, and here we are celebrating at the end of that week. And it just didn't start at the beginning of this week with Dr. King's Day. It started way back when Dr. King was alive, in a push for a voters' rights act. There's so many hurdles along the way and so many battles. There's so many -- so many -- so much effort. So much energy.

And when we were in Committee, we heard from many people. From the LDF people to the plaintiffs to all the -- the community people that came to testify
because they did it last year. And some of them said,
"We are tired. We're tired of keep doing this." But
let me tell my friends and my colleagues, to everyone,
we shall not tire. We shall continue to fight for
what's right. It is -- this is how we make progress.
It is not easy, it is challenging, but this is how we make progress, and we make progress. We celebrate it. We acknowledge it. So thank you to my colleagues. Thank you to all of us who engaged in this process. Thank you, Mr. President.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Carter. Senator Womack to close.

SENATOR WOMACK: Members, we all -- we all know what we went through and worked through and tirelessly. Late nights. Many hours. Many hours spent in the drafting room, of trying to help Senator Morris and Senator Cathey in trying to alleviate some of the problems they had. We worked on that. However, congressional, it wasn't working for everybody. So we're here where we're at, and here your bill's before you. I ask that you concur with Senate Bill 8. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Womack. Senator Womack moves to concur in Senate amendments proposed to House -- to Senate Bill 8. When the
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machines are open, all those in favor to concur in the
Senate amendments will vote aye. All opposed will vote nay. Madam Secretary may open the machines.

SENATOR HENRY: Go to machine, members. Go to machines. Go to machines, members. Close machine, please.

27 yeas, 11 nays, and the motion carries.
Senator Talbot for a motion.
SENATOR TALBOT: Thank you, Mr. President. I make a motion that we adjourn sine die.

SENATOR HENRY: Without objection. Members, if you could have your seat just for a second. Sit down just.


| A | articulate | Carter 10:11 | compact 5:25 | couple 5:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ability 14:9 | 6:13 | 0:12 | compactness | create 10:16 |
| absolute | on |  | 5:23 7:17 | cut 7:5,8 |
| 5:16 | 14:13 | case 4 | company's 14:9 | D |
| accept 10:15 | aud | 5 | 14:9 completed | Dated 1 |
| account 6:2 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Avoyelles } \\ 2: 243: 7 \end{array}$ | Cathey $4:$ $7: 22,24$ | comple | $\text { day } 10: 14$ |
| 12:8 | $3: 17,21$ | 9:7 12:1 | comply 11: 4 | 11:16,18 |
| act 1:12 | 4:8,14 | Cathey's | computer | days 8:6 |
| 11:20 | aye 13:2 | 3:12 | 14:5 | declared |
| ddress 5:3 | B | celebrate | concur 2: | 5:18 degree |
| addressing $11: 15$ | back 3:23 | celebrate | 12:21,24 | delegation |
|  | 4:5 11:18 | 10:18 | 13:1 | 6:9 8:10 |
| 13 | based 1:16 | celebrating | Congress | die 13:10 |
| admire 6:21 | battles | 1:16 | 7:10,13 | different |
| admit 10:9 | 21 | centers 9:23 | congress | 6:5 9:14 |
| African | began 11:15 | certain 7:18 | 1:13,14,16 | 9:15,18 |
| 10:16 11:5 | beginning | CERTIFICATE | 1:16,25 | directed 1: |
| agree 8:2 | 1 | 14:1 | 6:5,9 8: | disappoi |
| Agriculture | believe 6:25 | certify 14:3 | 9:3 11:9 | 6:20 |
| 6:11 | 7:18 | 14:11 | 12:19 | discuss 2:16 |
| aided 14:5 | best 14 | challenging | Congressman | disenfra |
| alive 11:19 |  | 12:6 | 6:20 |  |
| alleviate | 10:2,9 | chance 2:8 | congress | disservic |
| 12:17 | bill 1:8,11 | 5:15,16 | 10:4 | 8:8 9:5 |
| altered 4:3 | 1:17,20,22 | change 2:23 | congress | district |
| amend 1:12 | 1:24 2:3 | 2:24 3:7 | 6:13 8:1 | 2:22 3:8 |
| amendment | 2:12,17 | Charles 6:4 | 8:15,23 | 3:11,14 |
| 2:2,11,23 | :2 4 | 9:5 | consider 6:1 | 4:8,21,25 |
| $3: 25403$ | 4:18 5:24 | clerk 1:5,10 | considered | $5: 4,7 \quad 6: 3$ |
| 4:13 5:2,6 | 6:15,16,17 | close 9:6 | 7:2,3 | 6:11,21 |
| amendments | 7:4,20,22 | 12:12 13:5 | contiguity | 7:7 8:15 |
| 1:9,11,18 | 10:15 | colleagues | 5:23 | 8:23 9:4 |
| 1:18 2:21 | 12:21,25 | 10:8 12:3 | contiguous | 9:17 10:7 |
| 12:24 13:2 | bill's 12:20 | 12:8 | 5:25 | districts |
| American | bills 1:8,10 | come 2:16 | continue | 1:13,14,17 |
| 10:16 | bit 2:7 | 5:9 9:25 | 12:4 | 1:25 5:17 |
| Americans | body 8:3 | comes 1:17 | controls | 6:6 7:8,15 |
| 11:6 | bright 6:12 | coming 9:24 | 8:11 | 9:17 10:16 |
| anybody 2 : 16 | brought 3:22 | committee | COO14:2,17 | divided 10:2 |
| apart 6:6 | building | 1:18 2:2 | corner 6:19 | oing 8: |
| appears 1:25 | :16,17 | 3:24 4:1 | correct 3:8 | 12 |
| applaud 6:14 | business 1:4 | 6:7,11 | 3:9,17,19 | dollars 8:12 |
| appreciate | button 2:15 | 8:11 10:22 | 14:10 | Dr 11:16,18 |
| 10:20,20 |  | 14 | cted |  |
| appropri | C | $6:$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { draftin } \\ 12: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
| area 7:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { called 11:14 } \\ & \text { carries } 13: 7 \end{aligned}$ | community <br> 11:25 | $\begin{gathered} 10: 6 \\ \text { count 8: } \end{gathered}$ | E |
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| earlier 4:9 | friends 6:23 | 7:5,8 9:1 | know 2:11,12 | love 8:2,3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| easy 12: 6 | 12:3 | 9:1,17 | 2:17 4:7 | Luneau 9:8 |
| Echols 4:18 | full 5:20 | horribly | 5:5,8 7:25 | 9:10 10:10 |
| Echols' 3:13 | 14:9 | 6:20 | 8:2,14,18 |  |
| effective | further | hours 10:23 | 8:20 9:22 | M |
| 6:13 | 14:11 | 12:15,15 | 10:25 11:1 | machine 13: 4 |
| effectively |  | house 1: 6, 6 | 12:14 | 13:5 |
| 7:17 | G | 1:10,11,17 | knowledge | machines 1:2 |
| effort 10:20 | give 2:7 | 1:18,18 | 2:25 | 1:2,3 13:1 |
| 11:4,21 | 4:10 | 2:1,22 | knows 6:23 | 13:3,5,5 |
| eight 7:14 | glad11:8 | 6:22 8:11 |  | Madam 13:3 |
| energy 11:22 | go 2:13 7:6 | 12:25 | L | majority |
| engaged 12:9 | 8:18,22 | hurdles | lack 7:16 | 10: 6 |
| equal 11:5,9 | 13:4,4,5 | 11:20 | Lake 6:4 9:5 | MALE 1:1,21 |
| establish | goal 6:14 | hurt 9:25 | late 10:21 | 2:5,10 3:1 |
| 10:6 | going 2: 6, 11 |  | 12:15 | 5:12 7:21 |
| evenings | 7:13,17 | I | lay 2:21,22 | 9:7 10:10 |
| 10:21 | 8:4,5,18 | immensely | LDF 11:24 | 12:11,23 |
| everybody | 9:22 10:7 | 6:21 | leadership | $\operatorname{map} 2: 25$ 5:3 |
| 2:7 9:20 | 10:8 | important | 11:10 | 8:8,13 |
| 12:19 | Gotcha 2:5 | 10:5 | left 2:1 | 10:1,8 |
| everyone's | governor | inaudible | Let's 3:4 | maps 10:5 |
| 6:2 | 11:14,15 | 5:13 | 11:7,7,8 | March 14:15 |
| exact 2:1 | Grambling | include 5:23 | Letlow 4:11 | McNeese 9:4 |
| excited 8:4 | 6:4 | inform 1:6 | 6:8 8:14 | mean 2:22 |
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| 10:14 | 9:23 10:14 | 7:3,12 | 3:11 4:8 | member 6:10 |
|  | guess 8:23 | interested | 4:20,24 | 8:3,10 |
| F | 10:2,3 | 14:14 | 5:7 8:15 | members 1:2 |
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| favor 13:1 | H | 14:13 | 9:2,3 | 2:14,15,17 |
| federal 8:12 | half 7:6 |  | little 2:7 | 7:4,25 |
| 11:4 | 10:2 | $J$ | live 6:2 | 9:11 10:13 |
| fight 12:4 | handful 7: 4 | Johnson's | long 8:20 | 11:13 |
| filed 7:5 | happen 9:24 | 3:14 5:7 | look 3:23 | 12:13 13:4 |
| final 5:19 | happy 11: 8 | 6:20 | 4:5 8:17 | 13:5,11 |
| finally 1:7 | hard 10:25 | joint 1:8 | 8:19 | mentioned |
| finished 1:3 | hardest11:1 | judge 5:16 | looks 2:12 | 14:7 |
| first 3:4 | heard 11:23 | judge's 11:4 | 7:2 | merits 5:21 |
| floor 1:18 | help 12: 16 | judgment | lost 9:19 | Messages 1:5 |
| 2:15,16 | HENRY 13:4 | 5:20 | lot5:22 7:7 | 1:5 |
| 3:3,5 5:13 | 13:11 | Julia 6:8 | 9:13 | Michelle |
| 7:22 9:8 | HGA 2:2 |  | Louisiana | 1:10 |
| 10:11 | high 2:13 | K | 4:11,15 | miles 6:6 |
| Florida 6:18 | historic | keep 12:2 | 6:3,4,5 | 8:16,16 |
| following | 10:13,17 | kind 8:25 | 8:7,13 | 9:2,2 |
| 1:7 | 10:24 | King 11:19 | 10:15,17 | mind 2:10 |
| Fontana 1:10 | hit 2:15 | King's 11:16 | 11:5,6,10 | 5:22 |
| Fort 9:4 | home 3:11, 12 | 11:18 | Louisiana's | minority |
| fought 9:19 | 3:13 4:17 | knew 5: 9 | 1:14 | 10: 6 |
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## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: The house will come to order. The clerk will open the machines for rollcall. Members vote your machines. Are you through voting, Jordan? Fisher? Jordan? Fisher? Members are you through voting? Emerson?

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

The clerk will close the machine. We have 104 members present in quorum.
[00:05:01]
The house will be opened in prayer by Representative Amedee. Please rise.
REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Heavenly Father, we come before you today. We thank you, first of all, for your precious Son. We thank you, Lord, that you could have placed us anywhere in time, and anywhere on this globe. And you saw fit to place each one of us here and now. And you also saw fit to place each legislator in their seat for such a time as this. Lord, I ask that you would help us to never take that lightly. I ask that you would guide us with the serious matters that come before us. And in this opening of this class of the legislature for the next four years, also ask that each day when we come here, we would never lose the awe of this building and all that it stands for. And we would never forget the people who sent us here to represent them. May we always legislate with Louisiana in mind. May we always make decisions that align with your vision for our state. May we take steps to bring Louisiana to the place where she leads as you planned, in Jesus name.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Representative Amedee. Representative Knox will lead us in Pledge of Allegiance.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Morning hour number five.
FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker, and members, the house is in receipt of a proclamation by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Louisiana Constitution, I, Jeff Landry, Governor in the State of Louisiana do hereby call and convene the legislature of Louisiana into extraordinary session to convene State Capital, City of Baton Rouge during eight calendar days, beginning 4:00 PM on the 15th day of January and ending no later than 6:00 PM on the 23rd day of January. The call includes 14 items and is signed by Jeff Landry, governor of the State of Louisiana.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]
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Members, the speaker appoints the following committee to notify the governor that the house is convened and is ready to conduct business. Those members are Representatives Bayham, Emerson, LaFleur, Moore and Owen. Again, Representative Bayham, Emerson LaFleur, Moore, Owen, please meet Stephen Lewis near the rear of the chamber. Please raise your hand. And Emerson, I think I may have forgotten you. Committee to notify the senate, Representative Billings, Representative Echols, Representative Larvadain, Representative Ventrella, Representative Willard, please meet Mr. Francoise near the middle rear of the chamber to notify the senate, Representatives Billings, Echols, Larvadain, Ventrella and Willard.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

## [00:10:00]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Newell for a personal privilege.
REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. First, I want to just say thank you to my colleagues who called, who sent cards, who attended. Most of you all know that my mom passed on the last day of the last special session that we had. And these past few months have been filled with a lot of firsts for me. My first birthday without the woman that gave birth to me. My first Thanksgiving without the woman that taught me how to cook. My first Christmas without the woman who made sure that Santa had all the gifts on my list. Today would have been my mama's 71st birthday. And this past Monday when we got sworn in, my biggest cheerleader was not here with me. I had intended -fix your face. I could see you, Schlegel. Don't make me cry. I thought I would be spending today with my dad and with my mom's sisters, but that is not the case. Members, we are here in these rails for one term representing the people of our districts, and I am curious and hopeful about what we will uncover on Louisiana over the next four years. Today, please not let it be lost on us that we start this term and most of you are starting your very first term as legislators. Some are second, some are third with the most important redistricting session on a most fitting and significant day. Starting this redistricting session on Martin Luther King Day has been a controversial and a sensitive issue to some and it seems to be disrespectful to the legacy of Dr. King and his fight for civil rights and voting rights. Some of our constituents, neighbors and supportive, had touted that the beginning of a redistricting session on King Holiday is a fitting tribute to Dr. King's legacy as it is an opportunity to ensure that the electoral districts reflect the diversity and needs of the communities that we all serve. Starting this session on King Holiday is not intended to be disrespectful or divisive, but rather an effort to fulfill a constitutional and legal duty and to meet a tight deadline imposed on us by the courts and the federal government. We have drastically different opinions on how this redistricting session is being started on Martin Luther King's holiday and those opinions have been heavily contested and it's a controversial task of redistricting. But we must remember that this is a matter that will have a significant impact on the representation and power of different groups of voters, which, if not done with consideration of context and circumstances of each district, can undermine the principle of one person, one vote and the democratic rights of the people that we serve. Dr. King's cause went beyond white and black. He also dealt with concerns of poverty, privilege and access, particularly at the voting polls. Ultimately, holding a redistricting session today on King's
holiday is a matter of debate and perspective. Therefore, any redistricting session should be guided by the values of justice, dignity and democracy that Dr. King embodied and advocated for. Thus, in the spirit of democracy, I want to remind all of our citizens and constituents that all of our sessions is open and accessible to the public. Anyone can attend and we, your legislative body, should be committed to following the principles of fairness and equality in the redistricting process. I do not believe any of us in this chamber is committed to forgetting an unerasable history and repeating or perpetuating the suppressive practices and ideologies of those such as Thurman and Wallace. We have come a long way considering the history of the south and with this governor's commitment to keeping Louisianans in Louisiana.
[00:15:02]
This is our opportunity to show all citizens that we are not only working to create opportunities of education and employment for Louisiana citizens, but also giving them fair elections and the opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. I am hopeful about the outcome of this session. And again, considering the dedication of Governor Landry and our Speaker DeVillier of ensuring this body will create that second minority majority district. On Martin Luther King's holiday, let us remember his contribution and sacrifice to voting rights and remember his words, "The time is always right to do what is right." Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Representative Newell.
FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker and members, Representative Brown requests five days leave for his seatmate, Representative LaCombe.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Without objection.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker and members, the Senate committee has appeared and is prepared to provide a report.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Senator Seabaugh.
SENATOR SEABAUGH: Members, we are here to advise that the Senate has convened and we are ready to do business. And I look forward to working with you all from over there.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Senator.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker and members, the committee sent to notify the governor has returned and is prepared to give a report.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Emerson.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, we have notified the governor that the House is ready to do business.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Representative Emerson.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker, the committee sent to notify the Senate has return with a report.
REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Mr. Speaker, we have reported to the Senate.
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: I'm sorry, Representative Billings.

## [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: I'll say it again. Mr. Speaker, we have reported to the Senate that we are open and ready for business.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Representative. Representative Larvadain for a personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, can I get your attention, please? Members.
[00:20:00]
Today is my grandson, Brandon Jackson's birthday. I want to wish him a happy three-year-old. I love him and I appreciate him. I want to wish Brandon a happy birthday and also Jordan. I love him and may God continue to bless him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you. Representative Larvadain. Morning hour number six.
FEMALE 1: Introduction of resolutions, the house concurrent resolution by Representative Willard to create a task force to study reforms to Louisiana's process of redistricting and methods of elections, promote efficiency, and ensure eligible Louisiana voters can effectively participate in the process. That resolution becomes HR-1.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Mike Johnson moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of referring this committee. Is there any objection? To House and governmental affairs? Without objection. So order.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[00:25:00]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Cruz for a personal privilege.
REPRESENTATIVE CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, if you've been looking at your chamber laptop, there was a reminder sent out. If you want your per diem payments non taxed, you need to sign that form today and get it to house accounting so per diem payment can be tax free if you sign that form and submit it today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, Representative Cruz. Morning hour number seven.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Wilford Carter constitutional amendment proposing to amend Article 5 of the Constitution of Louisiana and provides relative to conversation to Supreme Court.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Mike Johnson moves for a suspension of the rules for the purpose of referring all pre filed House Bills to the committee at this time without objection so order, House and Governmental.

FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Wilford Carter to enact Title 18 governmental districts redistricting positions offices based on congressional districts.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Wilford Carter Title 13 Supreme Court redistricting Supreme Court districts billing of vacancies additional judgeships becomes House Bill 3.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Marcelle Title 18 campaign finance provide for assessment of penalties becomes House Bill 4.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Marcelle Title 18 congressional districts redistricting of congressional districts positions offices based on congressional districts becomes House Bill 5.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Mandie Landry Title 18 elections nature of judicial elections exempt certain candidates from additional fees becomes House Bill 6.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
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FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Melerine Title 13 Supreme Court redistricting Supreme Court justice districts into nine districts filling of vacancies to eliminate certain additional judgeships becomes House Bill 7.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Mike Johnson Title 13 Supreme Court redistricting Supreme Court districts provide for the filling of vacancies additional judgeship becomes House Bill 8.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Mandie Landry Title 18 voting by mail distribution of vote by mail ballots application for vote by mail ballot becomes House Bill 9.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Jackson Title 18 financial disclosure statements filing of financial disclosure statements after qualifying for office becomes House Bill 10.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.

FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative by Jackson Title 18 campaign contribution limits provide relative to application of campaign contribution limits for calendar year becomes House Bill 11.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Wright Title 18 party primary elections nature of primary elections mandate legislature provide for party primary elections for certain offices becomes House Bill 12.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Melerine joint resolution to amend the Constitution relative to Supreme Court number of justices of the Supreme Court number of justices required to concur in order to render a judgment becomes House Bill 13.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Echols Title 18 congressional districts redistricting Louisiana's congressional districts positions offices based on those congressional districts becomes House Bill 14.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.

FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative Wilford Carter Supreme Court red istricting Supreme Court justice district filling of vacancies to eliminate statutory provisions regarding additional judgeship becomes House Bill 15.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.
FEMALE 1: House Bill by Representative McFarland to appropriate funds, make certain reductions from certain sources be allocated to designated agencies purposes for the purpose of making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2023 through ' 24 becomes House Bill 16.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Appropriations.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Members we're going to stand at ease and we're pinning a joint session.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[00:30:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[00:35:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Members, if you can head towards your seats so we can begin. Members, if you could take your seat, we'd appreciate it.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Members, we have one message that needs to be read. Members, please take your seats. Morning hour number five.

FEMALE 1: Petitions Memorials Communications, the House and receipt of a message from the Senate to the Honorable speaker, members of the House of Representatives. I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate has adopted and asks concurrence in the following SCRs. SCR1 respectfully submitted, Yolanda Dixon, Secretary of the Senate. SCR1 by Sarah Barrow to invite the Honorable Jeff Landry, Governor of Louisiana to address a joint session of the Legislature. Representative Marcelle moves to spin the rules for the purpose of concurring in this resolution at this time.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Without objection.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: The Joint Session will come to order. President Barrow moves to dispense of the calling of role of the Senate without objection so ordered. President pro tempore Mike Johnson moves to dispense with the calling of the role of the House without objection so ordered.
[00:40:00]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: The President appoints, on part of the Senate, the following members to escort the Governor: Senators Harris, Pressly, Jenkins, Talbot and Owens. Harris, Pressly, Jenkins, Talbot and Owens. The speaker appoints on the part of the House the following members to escort the Governor: Bayham, Moore, Emerson, Owen and LaFleur. Go to the back door. That committee will assemble and discharge their duties. Those members need to go get the Governor. The ones I just read out, like get up and walk back there and then he walks in. Go ahead. Harris, Pressly, Jenkins. I know you all are here. They're all back there. Well, come on down, gentlemen. Come on. The members come out first. The members come out first, then the Governor. There we go.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Members, Governor Jeff Landry.
[APPLAUSE]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Right there. I think if you could sit in. There we go. Thank you, buddy. All right. Members, we'd like to recognize Lieutenant Governor Billy Nungesser.
[APPLAUSE]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Secretary of State Nancy Landry.
[APPLAUSE]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Attorney General Liz Murrill.
[APPLAUSE]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Treasurer John Fleming.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Agriculture Commissioner Mike Strain.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: And Commissioner of Insurance Tim Temple.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: We also have members of the Supreme Court here. Justice Weimer.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Justice Crain, Justice Genovese, Justice McCallum, Justice Hughes and Justice Griffin. Thank you all for being here.

## [APPLAUSE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Jason Hughes will lead us in the prayer and please remain standing afterwards for the pledge.

REPRESENTATIVE JASON HUGHES: All things work together for good, to those who are called before the Lord and are called according to His purpose. Members, let's go before the Lord in prayer. Father God, we thank You for this day that You have made. And with all going on in the world, Father, we are going to rejoice and be glad in it. Father, the Bible tells us to humble ourselves before You, and good will come from it. So, Father, we come before You as humbly as we know how first and foremost to say thank You, Father. Thank You for this extraordinary opportunity, Father. Father, I thank You on behalf of every person in this body, for our Governor Jeff Landry and his wife Sharon. Father, please guide his stewardship of this great State of Louisiana as he oversees 4.6 million people, Father God. Father, we thank You for all of the statewide elected officials assembled before us, may You guide them as well. Father, we thank You for our Senate President, our Speaker of the House, our respective pro tems, clerk, secretary, sergeant-at-arms, and all of the staff that keeps these noble bodies running each and every day, Father.

## [00:45:11]

Father, we can't do this work without them and we are so thankful. Father, we thank You for the members of our Judiciary, our Supreme Court that are gathered here today. Father, may You continue to stand in their bodies, think with their minds and speak with their voices as they do the work of the Judiciary, Father. Father, out of 4.6 million people, You have selected, ordained, appointed, anointed only 144 people to lead the legislative branch of government. What an awesome responsibility and task that is. Father, may You remind us every day that we are all created by You. May we not see political party. May we not see race. May we not see gender. May we just see people and do the work that You have called us to do. Now, Father, let Your sweet, sweet spirit fill this place. Father, bless everyone under the sound of my voice, from this podium to the door, from the balcony to the floor, from the crowns of our heads to the soles of our feet, oh, Lord, our strength and our redeemer. And Lord, in everything, let us be so very
careful to give You all the praise, all the glory and all the honor. Now, let us go forth conquer and do the work that You have called us to do. In Jesus' name, we pray. Let all of the people of God join me in saying. Amen!

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Amen!
[APPLAUSE]
SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Please remain standing for the pledge. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Ladies and gentlemen, the Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Jeff Landry.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: Mr. President, I would tell you and the representatives and senators that escorted me that we'll do this at least one more time before the regular session and so, we'll have it perfected for the rest of the term. Please sit. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, thank you for your cordial welcome. May I begin by recognizing on this day Dr. Martin Luther King, whose moral fortitude and spiritual inspiration allowed millions to live the American dream. And I would like to begin with one of my favorite quotes of his many, that the ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in the moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy. Our stage DNA is directly connected to the diverse and varied relationships that we all share with one another. Diverse relationships between our friends, our acquaintance, our neighbors, our old classmates, our co-workers, our caregivers, our colleagues, our family and each other right here in this room. For our culture is built upon relationships. And we are here today because we have inherited the issues that others have laid at our feet. So let us accept that task. Let us do the work that is incumbent upon us so that we can move towards solving much larger problems for the people of this great State.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: Now I am well aware that Huey Long was shot over redistricting matters. And I am hopeful and I am confident that we can dispose of this matter without you all disposing of me. Is that fair? Because for various reasons, both known and unknown, spoken and unspoken, closure of this redistricting problem has evaded us. It is time to stop averting the issue and confront it head-on. We are here today because the federal courts have ordered us to perform our job. Our job which is not finished, our job that our own laws direct us to complete, and our job that our individual oaths promise we would perform.
[00:50:01]
GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: To that end, I ask you to join me in adopting the redistricting maps that are proposed. These maps will satisfy the court and ensure that the congressional
districts of our State are made right here in this Legislature and not by some heavy handed federal judge.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: We do not need a federal judge to do for us what the people of Louisiana have elected you to do for them. You are the voice of the people, and it is time that you use that voice. The people have sent us here to solve problems, not to exacerbate them, to heal divisions, not to widen them. To be fair and to be reasonable, the people of this State expect us to operate government efficiently and to act within the compliance of the laws of our nation and of our courts, even when we disagree with both of them and let me say this. I know that many of you in this Legislature have worked hard and endured and tried your very best to get this right. As Attorney General, I did everything I could to dispose off this litigation. I defended the redistricting plan adopted by this body as the will of the people. We sought a stay in the Fifth Circuit. We successfully stayed the case at the United States Supreme Court for more than a year, allowing the 2022 elections to proceed. Last October, we filed for writ mandamus, which was granted in the Fifth Circuit, which would again allow us one more chance to take care of our business. However, when the Fifth Circuit panel ruled against us later in the fall, we filed for an en banc hearing, which they denied. We have exhausted all legal remedies and we have labored with this issue for far too long. I recognize the difficulty of getting 144 people to agree on anything. My wife and I don't agree on everything. She's kept me for 21 years. But I sincerely commend you for the work you have done so far. But now, once and for all, I think it's time that we put this to bed. Let us make the necessary adjustments to heed the instructions of the court. Take the pen out of the hand of a non-elected judge and place it in your hands. In the hands of the people. It's really that simple.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: I would beg you, help me make this a reality in this special session, for this special purpose, on this special day. The redistricting challenge goes further than just our congressional maps. While one federal judge has the pen in her hand, another is eager to pick it up from his desk and redraw our Supreme Court. In 2021, in a regular session, the Senate passed a resolution, Resolution 248, asking the State Supreme Court to provide this Legislature with the recommendations for redistricting their court. A wide majority of the court, over twothirds, has responded. Justice McCallum, Justice Genovese, Justice Crane, Justice Hughes, and Justice Griffin, have conscientiously and unselfishly and courageously stepped forward and presented us with a map that redraws the Supreme Court districts in a manner that will comply with the Voting Rights Act and alleviate the costly litigation to the State. You can fulfill your responsibility and honorably meet your obligation to redistrict our high court so that the people of Louisiana will have a fair, democratic, and equally represented judiciary. The litigation involving our Supreme Court districts has been pending for quite some time. In fact, there are cases in all three federal districts in the State.

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: Again, as Attorney General, we worked to defend the State and to have those cases dismissed. I know, firsthand, how indefensible these cases are. Our Supreme Court districts have been redistrict by this Legislature only one time in 103 years. The result is that districts are grossly unbalanced with two districts twice as large as another one. Last year, I negotiated a scheduling order with the plaintiffs in one of those cases, allowing the Legislature, allowing you all a chance to willingly handle our own affairs rather than unwillingly have it done by another nonelected federal judge. I want to publicly commend the justices for their willingness to set aside any regard for their own careers or the power that they hold. They epitomize statesmanship, honor, integrity, and the very embodiment of fairness. They are a reflection of our people's goodness, decency and justness. Every single person in this great State can look up to them with pride and reverence and a reborn confidence that the judicial system in this State is great and filled with men and women who will absolutely do the right thing.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: Just as we would respect and honor and comply with any decision reached by such a majority of this court. I ask you to respect that and adopt the court's redistricting map and allow the first seat to be filled this fall. Now, every voting age citizen in Louisiana may or may not join a political party of his or her choosing. It is a choice. It is their freedom. But if you choose to join a political party, it certainly is only fair and right that you have the ability to select your party's candidate for office without the interference of another party or without the distraction and the interference of a convoluted, complicated and extended ballot to wade through and to decipher.

## [APPLAUSE]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: As I travel the State, I have listened carefully to those who seek a more focused, electoral process where they may participate in the nomination of their party's chosen candidate. And I believe it is an issue that our Legislature should consider and we have included a proposal for a closed party primary system for your consideration for that very reason. Because it's about fairness, it's about simplicity, it's about clarity and we have tested this system before in this State, and it works. The United States House Majority Leader Steve Scalise is in his seat as a result of being elected to Congress under a party primary system. Our State Treasurer was elected to Congress under a tried and tested system. I was elected to Congress under a party primary system. President Joe Biden was elected in Louisiana's presidential primary, as was President Trump, and other presidential nominees that were put forward by this State were chosen in a party primary system which allows the major parties to pick their candidates. It is fair and it is common sense. And as for our independent or no party voters, who by their own choice, decide not to join a party, their voice is heard and their votes are counted. Counted on a simpler, shorter, clearer November election ballot containing generally one Democrat, one Republican, and ballot qualifying independent candidates. Some things make Louisiana unique. Our food, our music, and our culture. These are sources of our pride. However, our jungle primary system is the only one of its kind in this country. It is a relic of the past, which I believe has left us dead last.

## [APPLAUSE]

## [01:00:07]

GOVERNOR JEFF LANDRY: All of our fellow southern states are succeeding, they have a closed primary system, a process which results in stronger, more unified elected leaders. It is time to rewrite our story and to move to a similar system. We have already tried, we have already tested and still use in presidential primaries and will use in February of this year. As we work on other electoral reforms with these redistricting maps. Now is the time to also deal, I believe, with this commonsense change. Today, we honor Dr. Martin Luther King. And I do not believe that it is mere irony that finds us here today on this great day, on this consecrated day, where we seek to amplify the voice of few, where we seek to broaden the opportunity for participation in the government and governance of our people. The courage and the wisdom and the relentless pursuit of fairness in our electoral process was exactly what Dr. King spoke for. And so, it should be profoundly moving that we do this on this day. In fact, his words in 1968, I believe, are wholly appropriate 56 years later at this very hour where he said, "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice." You see, for Dr. King's, his was an uphill journey into the headwinds of hate. His was a march into a battle, while ours is a mere walk in the park. His was a persecution for speaking his truth, while ours is just a comfortable dialogue. His was a mighty shove, while yours is simply a mere push of the button. Ladies and gentlemen, let us take these affairs and the things that have divided us in this state off the table so we can begin the work that the people have sent us here. God bless you. God bless each and every one of you. God bless the people of Louisiana, and God bless the people we represent. Thank you so very much.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Thank you, governor. Senator McMath moves that the senate retire to its chambers without objection.
[01:05:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

Members, we're waiting on additional bills to be filed, so please don't leave. Members, we're waiting on additional bills to be filed, so please do not leave.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[01:15:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Morning hour number seven.

FEMALE 1: Mr. Speaker and members, the House Bill by Representative Emerson to amend and reenact Title 18 relative to elections party primary system of elections for certain office as provides relative to nominations, recognized political parties voting and that bill becomes House Bill 17.

## [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Representative Mike Johnson moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of referring the pre-filed House Bills to committee at this time. House and Governmental.

FEMALE 1: A House Bill by Representative Wright joint resolution to amend the constitution, to amend Title V provides relative to Supreme Court election, statewide election of Supreme Court justices, elimination of Supreme Court District submission of proposed amendment to the electors. That bill becomes House Bill 18.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: House and Governmental.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Okay, members, we're going to stand at ease until we get committee notices.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[01:20:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[01:25:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

[01:30:00]

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Announcements.

FEMALE 1: Announcements Mr. Speaker and members, Committee on Appropriations meets tomorrow morning, Tuesday, January 16 at 8:30 a.m., Committee Room 6 and Chair McFarland may suspend the rules for the purpose of hearing House Bill 16 at that meeting.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Without objection.

FEMALE 1: Committee on House and Governmental Affairs will meet 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, Committee Room 5 and Representative Vallee moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of adding House Bill 6, 8, 9 and 17 to that agenda.

## [01:35:05]

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: Without objection. Representative Thompson for a Motion.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, members, I move that we adjourned to 3:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

SPEAKER DEVILLIER: The House is adjourned.
[BACKGROUND NOISE]
[01:40:00]
[BACKGROUND NOISE]
[01:45:00]
[BACKGROUND NOISE]
[01:45:34]

FEMALE 1: And Senator Womack.
SENATOR WOMACK: Present.
FEMALE 1: We have nine members.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Nine members present on a quorum. First, let me thank the members of the public who are here. We had to delay it because of the weather. We wanted to give people more of an opportunity to get here. And I know today is probably one of the coldest days in Baton Rouge, and if you don't like today, tomorrow is going to be even colder, I understand. But thank you all so much for coming. We're here pursuing to Proposition No. 1. Special session called by the governor as a result of a map that was passed by this legislature and challenged in court. And both the district and the appeals court have said we need to do something before the next congressional elections. And there are other things in the call, but we're going to first take congressional redistricting. Let me advise the public. We're only going to take before we break two congressional maps. In fact, Senator Carter. And then we're going to do Senator Price bill. The Womack bill will be delayed until after we recess. So Senator Carter would like to be recognized on a matter of personal privilege first, Senator Carter. But before I do, I want to welcome all of the members to this committee, and I think it'd be appropriate, Senator Carter, if you would just yield just for a second to let each member kind of introduce themselves to the public. And we'll start with Senator Miller.

SENATOR GREG MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Greg Miller, Senate District 19. That's all of St. Charles Parish parts of the east bank of St. John the Baptist Parish, parts of Jefferson, Kenner, and then North Lafourche. And I'm coming over here after serving three terms in the House, where I also served, I think, eight years on House and Governmental Affairs and one year as chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Miller. You're going to be a great addition to this committee. Let's now go to Senator Womack.

SENATOR WOMACK: Good morning, Senator Womack from District 32. Senate District 32 go from Avoyelles, West Feliciana, Concordia, LaSalle, Catahoula, Rapides, Caldwell, Franklin, Richland, and Ouachita, ten parishes. This is my second term. I served on Senate and Governmental Affairs last term and glad to be back on the team. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Womack, and welcome back. Let's now go to Senator Kleinpeter.

SENATOR KLEINPETER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Kleinpeter, District 17. I as well represent ten parishes, St. Helena, East Feliciana, West Fel., part of East Baton Rouge, and I jump across Pointe Coupee, West Baton Rouge, Iberville, and jump across the other river and go into upper St. Martin, part of Lafayette and St. Landry. I was on SGA last year, ran in a special election, and look forward to working with everybody on this panel.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Welcome back, Senator Kleinpeter. And now we're going to go to another freshman member who by way of the House of Representative, Senator Miguez.

SENATOR BLAKE MIGUEZ: How are you doing? Happy to be here this morning. My name is Blake Miguez. I'll be representing Senate District 22, which is Iberia, St. Martin and a portion of Lafayette Parish. I had the honor to serve nine years in the House of Representatives. I look forward to serving here on the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. I appreciate the president giving me this opportunity and I look forward to serving with you, Mr. Chairman. And I hope to provide a great balance and help you work towards solving the problems for our state.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Miguez. And Senator Miguez is also the vice chair of the committee. Now we go to Senator Fesi.

SENATOR FESI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I represent Senate District 20, which is Terrebonne, main portions of Terrebonne and Lafourche.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Fesi, and welcome back to the committee. And now we go into another house member who moved from the house and now in the senate, Senator Sam Jenkins.

SENATOR SAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. It's good to see everybody out today. Glad to have you here. I'm glad to be here. Eight years in the House of Representatives on House and Governmental affairs. Now I'm here on Senate and Governmental Affairs. So the learning curve has been somewhat steep coming from the House to the Senate.
[00:05:00]
But a few days in, I see a whole lot of familiar faces here that used to be in House and Governmental Affairs, often to testify. I represent Senate District 39, and that's parts of Shreveport and Blanchard.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: I welcome Senator Jenkins. And now we're going to go to a returning member of the committee, Senator Reese.

SENATOR MICHAEL REESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Michael Reese, Senate District 30, which is Western Calcasieu Parish, all of Beauregard Parish, all of Vernon Parish, and most of Western Rapides Parish. Had the privilege of serving on the committee during our last term in redistricting and through that process. So I want to say I'm thankful to be back, I guess. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Reese. And last but certainly not least, we go to a returning member of the Senate, Senator Carter, who's going to be recognized to introduce himself and also on a matter of personal privilege. Senator Carter.

SENATOR GARY CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members, I'm State Senator Gary Carter. I represent District 7, which is the west bank of Arlene's and Jefferson Parishes, and also the east bank of Plaquemines Parish. It's really good to be on this committee given the important work that we have in front of us, and I'm ready to get started. I do have a matter of personal privilege that I want to take. Congressman Carter was hoping to be here today, but with the weather and traveling to DC for votes, he was unable to make it. But he asked that I enter into a record a letter that all of us have from his office that I'd like to take time just to read very briefly, and it's addressed to us directly to the chairman. And this is from Congressman Troy Carter, representing the Second Congressional District in Louisiana. Dear Senator Fields, I regret that I cannot be here today due to the weather conditions on the roads. I pray that all throughout the state are remaining safe and warm as they wait for this winter storm to pass. As a member of Congress, I stand ready to help anyone affected in any way that I can. Watching a storm roll in brings back the memories of other storms that have rolled through the state, Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, great flood of 2016, Ida, and so many more have altered life for everyone. During the immediate aftermath of natural disasters, this state shows the compassion and resilience that others envy. However, as we learn from natural disasters, recovery is different in every community. The disparate needs of communities give concrete examples of why representation matters. As a former member of this beloved body, I know your hearts because I have the opportunity to see them up close and personal. While we have not always agreed on policy, we have always agreed on the love of our country, community, and the great people of Louisiana. Dr. Martin Luther King said, "The time is always ripe to do what is right." Today, Louisiana stands ready to enact constitutional congressional maps that reflect that map is map. One third of six is two. I am willing to work with anyone to produce a constitutional map creating two majority minority districts that give black candidates a meaningful opportunity to win. Louisiana stands ready to show that all of its citizens deserve equal opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. Louisiana stands ready to do the right thing. I trust that my former colleagues and distinguished members of this committee will not wait. I pray you will do the right thing. And it's signed by Congressman Troy Carter. And I asked that a copy of it be entered into the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Without objections, so ordered a copy of the congressman letter will be entered into the record. Members would take up our first bill for today. We'll take Senate Bill 4 by Senator Price, which provides for the redistricting of Louisiana Congressional Districts. Senator Price, if you can come forward and you can bring whomever you so desire to the table. Welcome Senator Price. Why don't we have everyone at the table to introduce themselves, and then we get started. All right. This is a new little gizmo for me. I got you. I think I can do this. Let's see. I'm going to put all three on at the same time.

SENATOR ED PRICE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman ad member of the committee, Senate and Governmental Affairs.
[00:10:00]
I'm State Senator Ed Price, and I represent the River Parishes, St. James, St. John, Ascension, Iberville, West Baton Rouge, Assumption and Lafourche.

SENATOR ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Good morning Chairman and senate colleagues, my name is Royce Duplessis, and I represent senate District 5, Orleans Parish, and a portion of both east and west Bank of Jefferson Parish.

JARED EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members, I'm Jared Evans. I am a Senior Policy Counsel with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, and I'm also counsel for the plaintiffs in Robinson v. Landry.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Let me say you before you get started Senator Price. Mr. Evans, you've been before this committee quite some time. I want to thank you for all your hard work, and you're the reason why we're here today. Senator Price, you're recognized.

SENATOR ED PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, I come before you today to present Senate Bill 4. We all know that we've been ordered by the court that we draw congressional district with two minority districts. This map will comply with the order of both the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal and the district court. They have said that the legislature must pass a map that has two majority black districts. In this map, those districts are District 2 and District 5. I will walk through the cohesion of the black population in both of the districts. Okay. And so, what we're going to talk about today is getting there, but I do want to say, before I turn it over to our attorney with the LDL on the roadshow, and I was on Senate and Government Affairs at the time, and I attended every roadshow that we had. And one of the things that was talked about at all this roadshow was that we should have fair maps. Fair maps in a second congressional district. We all know that one third of six is two, and that was pushed very hard during these roadshows by a lot of speakers that came forward. So, when designing this map, we made sure that it was very compact, we didn't split a lot of Parishes, and we think that this is a fair map that can meet the muster of the courts. At this time, I want Senator Duplessis to give his statement, and then we'll turn it over to Jared.

SENATOR ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Senator Price. I want to begin -- there we are. I'd like to just begin by thanking Senator Price for his leadership and filing this map. While he was on Senate and Governmental Affairs, I served on House and Governmental Affairs as Vice Chair, so had the opportunity to be intimately involved in this process. And as we sit here today, it brings me back to more than two years ago, as Senator Price just mentioned, where we began this process going to every corner of this state on the roadshow, northeast, northwest, southeast, southwest, Central Louisiana, all throughout this state that we began. I want to say in the fall of 2021, and here we are now in 2024 trying to resolve this matter at the direction of the court. So, I would just like to read just a few comments for purposes of Senate Bill 4, which we believe is the best path forward given the order of the court, and provides some motivating factors in the creation of this map. In drawing this map that complies with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, we considered equal population, contiguity, compactness, parish splits, and communities of interest. Consideration of the legislature's Joint Rule 21 was paramount in this process, but the overall strategy was to balance all of the relevant districting principles without allowing any single factor to predominate. Unlike many of the maps for the legislature and other bodies, the ideal population deviation of each district is zero, as close to zero deviation as possible. So, our
goal is to have 776,292 people in each district. We balance this with keeping as many parishes whole as possible. The few parishes that are split in this map are done so to keep each district with as close to the same number of people as possible.

## [00:15:02]

I want to briefly walk through this map, district by district, to talk about the communities of interest that we consider. We certainly know, starting out that Louisiana has a great agriculture heritage that can be respected in this map by maintaining primarily the rural compositions in Districts 4 and 5. Starting with District 4, the northwest corner of the state is kept intact, with Shreveport being the major anchor of the district and the surrounding parishes that have common rural and agricultural interests. Moving to District 5, which is a newly minority district in this map is similar and that it contains large agricultural communities that are united with four of the state's larger population centers being Monroe, Alexandria, Opelousas and Baton Rouge. Moving to District 3, this map preserves the connectivity of Louisiana's Acadiana region, an important theme from the roadshow. Major cities and the surrounding communities are preserved and connected to the maximum extent possible in this map by keeping Lake Charles and nearly all of Lafayette in District 3. We keep District 1 as a coastal district. District 1 also includes the southern half of St. Tammany, the northern half of Orleans, and the majority of Jefferson. These communities are greatly important to the New Orleans region. Thousands of parents work and send their children to school in New Orleans, and it was important for us to keep these communities connected to the greater New Orleans region. District 1 also includes the largest maritime community in the country. These parishes are the first line of defense when hurricanes hit the southeast corner of the state, such as Katrina did in 2005, and with respect to the representative of that district, it allows them to work closely with our federal agencies on issues like flood insurance, flood protection, coastal restoration, et cetera. Terrebonne and Lafourche and are also fully united in the map, which we also heard a lot about during the roadshow. Moving to District 6, this map unites the northwest Florida Parishes with South Baton Rouge, north Ascension, all of Livingston, and the vast majority of Tangipahoa Parish, which is the fastest growing region in the state, and this map unites those communities in the 6th District. We know thousands of residence work in and send their children to school in and worship in Baton Rouge, and it's important that we keep these communities of interest connected. Finally, instead of packing black voters in New Orleans and Baton Rouge into one district, District 2 goes west and includes communities in the River Parishes and the Bayou region. It was very important for us that New Orleans remained the heart and population center of the second congressional district. So, this map unites New Orleans with St. Martin, St. James, St. John, St. Charles, South Ascension, and Assumption. These parishes again, have many industries in common, such as fishing and energy, and also share some of the same concerns and challenges as flood protection and insurance. And I may have failed to mention the connection of sugar cane along these parishes. These communities in District 2 are also united by a large petrochemical industry. Members, as you can see, we really wanted to keep as many of these communities of interest intact as possible while maintaining close to equal population among the districts as possible. And for those reasons that I've given, and you will hear additional reasons, we believe this is the best map for us to adopt. Thank you.

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton \& Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you, senator.
JARED EVANS: Thank you, senator. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members. As I said, I'm Jared Evans, and I'm an attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. I'm joined by my colleague, Victoria Wenger. For almost two years now, Victoria and I have had the privilege of serving as counsel for the NAACP Louisiana State Conference and the Power Coalition for Equity and Justice, and nine individual voters and their challenge to the current congressional map. Several of them are sitting behind me in the room today, and it has truly been an honor to represent them throughout this process. This special session was convened as a direct result of that litigation, Robinson v. Landry. The map we present here mirrors the map submitted by plaintiffs in multiple phases of our case. It has been vetted by the federal courts and now provides you with the clearest path to remedy the state's violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This map builds off of previous versions that were presented in this committee two years ago during the roadshow. The first redistricting session. The second special redistricting session and amendments that were filed again throughout this process.

## [00:20:05]

The common links between those maps and disks are multifold, including the fact that it unpacks the populations packed into a single majority black district running from New Orleans to Baton Rouge, and instead provides for a new configuration of District 5 connecting Baton Rouge with the Delta parishes. Creating new opportunities for fair representation and a second majority black congressional district. Also, like previous versions, this map is notable in that it outperforms the others that have been offered throughout this process. As the federal courts have acknowledged the map offered by the Robinson plaintiffs, the map before you today, performs equal to or better than the states enacted maps from both 2022 and 2011 in adhering to traditional and state redistricting criteria, including those embodied in the Legislature's Joint Rule 21. This map has been updated from the plaintiff's map to utilize the most up-to-date precinct lines. Unlike its prior versions, this map once again surpasses its competitors. It has fewer pair splits than the enacted map, with only 11 compared to 15 . As courts have held, there is no more fundamental unit of societal organization in the history of Louisiana than the parish. This map does not split any precincts. This map splits fewer municipalities than the enacted map. It achieves better scores on three quantitative measures of compactness, most accepted by the courts, Reock, Convex Hull, Polsby-Popper. And it has less instances of fracking where two or more noncontiguous pieces of a parish are within the same district than the enacted map and alternatives here. In other words, members, this map is a better map when graded on the rubric that this legislature wrote for itself in Joint Rule 21 and the redistricting criteria accepted for decades by the federal courts. As Governor Landry acknowledged yesterday, we are not here to debate the merits of our case or whether black voters should have a map of two majority black districts. The court has already decided that and ruled in our favor. We are here to talk about what that map will actually look like. I want to thank Senators Price and Duplessis for their leadership in carrying this map and their commitment to a fair process and true representation for black residents in this state. They have stood with us and with our clients from the beginning of this process. I will now turn over to Senator Price to explain the map further.

SENATOR ED PRICE: Thank you. As you can see, at this time, we're going to want to bring the map up. Okay.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Duplessis, Senator, why don't you just grab that chair and let sergeant [INDISCERNIBLE 00:23:15]? We have a sergeant so sue can sit right next to you. Thank you. You may proceed, senator.

SENATOR ED PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you can see on this map, Senate District 2, which is the present minority district runs from Orleans Parish through St. Charles, St. John, St. James, Ascension Assumption, Iberville, and portions which is new of St. Martin. The other district, District 5, actually runs from the bottom of the boot here from St. Helena, take a little bit of Tangipahoa, East Feliciana, East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, Pointe Coupee, St. Landry, West Feliciana, Avoyelles, Concordia, Catahoula, Tensas, Franklin, Madison, Richland, East Carroll, West Carroll, Morehouse and that's basically how the present district runs down from North Louisiana all the way into the Florida Parishes presently. But a big difference there, is it picks up portion of East Baton Rouge and West Baton Rouge. District 4, of course, remains basically the same. It represents Northwest Louisiana and District 3, the southern portion from Rapides to the Cameron of Amelia and Iberia area.

## [00:25:00]

One is the Orleans, the coast area and goes into St. Bernard and Orleans also. The maps at this time, population we've talked about making sure that we stay within the deviation. District 1 has 507,988 whites with 144,750 blacks. District $2 ; 776,287$ with 275,643 white and 415,880 , which is $53.73 \%$ black. District 3; 776,249 with 555,655 white, 154,675 at $71 \%$ white, $19.9 \%$ black. District 4 is 776,310 with 455,308 white, $58 \% 262,042$ with $33.75 \%$ black. District $5 ; 776,309$ with 310,229 white or $39.9 \%, 424,358,54.664 \%$ black, and District $6 ; 776,286$ with 552,819 $71 \%$ white, 141,414 and that's $18.2 \%$ black. So those are basically the numbers for the district.

## [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

SENATOR ED PRICE: Okay, the next is voter registration. In District 1, we have a percentage, $75 \%$ white and $15 \%$ black. District 2 is $39 \%$ white and $52.9 \%$ black. District $3,75 \%$ total registered voters with $79 \%$ black and $16.3 \%$ black. District 4 is $65 \%$ white and $30 \%$ black. District 5 is $43 \%$ white and 53.479 black. And District 6 is $80 \%$ white, $14 \%$ black. And the others to make up the $100 \%$, is other voters. At this time, I think we can start to take some question, because we can go over all these numbers if you want, but we'll start to take the question.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Why don't you have your guest to your right to introduce herself and we'll start taking questions. Unless she would like to make some opening comments.

SENATOR ED PRICE: No, hit it back. You turn it off.

VICTORIA WENGER: All right, I think its officially afternoon, so, good afternoon, Chairman Fields and members of the committee. My name is Victoria Wenger and I'm an attorney with the Legal Defense Fund and a very proud representative of the Robinson plaintiffs, many of whom are here today.

CHAIRMAN FIELDS: Thank you very much. I have just a few questions, Senator Price, I'm familiar with this map because it's similar to the one that we had in the last redistricting session. In terms of splits, this map splits 11 parishes, is that correct?

VICTORIA WENGER: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: And the present congressional plan that we have that members are running under today splits 15 parishes.

VICTORIA WENGER: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: So, this map splits less parishes than the present map?
VICTORIA WENGER: Correct.
CHAIRMAN FIELDS: The deviation, which is another important factor. Your deviations are in line, I think your highest deviation. Your highest deviation in this plan is minus 43, is that correct?
[00:30:05]
ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: I believe the statistic I have for the deviation is 67. So essentially 67 people between the lowest populated district and the highest populated district. Just for a point of context, the bill that originated, or the version of the map that was put in comparison in our record in the case compared to the enacted map at the time had 61 for the deviation. The difference here, the slight adjustments that have been made between the map that's been in the record before the courts and that had several versions that have been before this legislature before the prior your predecessors, that map has just been updated to reflect precinct changes in the past year or two or three, wherever we're at now. So this has a deviation of 67. The enacted plan has one of 65 . In its original form, we had a deviation of 61 , but all essentially trying to get as close to that one person, one vote principal.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: All right, so your overall range is 67. And how does that compare to the map that's enacted today?

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: That is just within two people?
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Lastly, in terms of Senate Bill 4, it creates two majority minority districts. One in district two, which is the present minority district, and that voter registration is 52.9 . Voter registration.

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: The map provides us with multiple different statistics. There are voter registration numbers. There's also the black voting age population, essentially the population of Louisianans from one race or another who are above the age of 18 , so qualified to vote whether they're registered or not.

SENATOR FIELDS: So I think it's 52.9 in voter registration.
SENATOR ED PRICE: Yeah. Registered black.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Registered black. And then population is 53.5.
ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: The total population, is that what you're referring to?
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Yes, ma'am.
SENATOR ED PRICE: 53.5. That's correct.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: All right. And now let me go to District 5. You have a voter registration of 53.4 ?

SENATOR ED PRICE: Yeah, 53.479.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: And then you have a population of 54.6. Is that correct?
SENATOR ED PRICE: Yes. That is correct.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: So my only question is, do you think that this complies with any court order that this legislature is under today?

SENATOR ED PRICE: I certainly do think that it complies with the court order, Senator Fields. We've looked at this map and we studied it, and we based on what the court ordered, and that's why we filed it the way it is. We think it meets the court order.

SENATOR FIELDS: All right. Thank you, senator. I have no other questions. I'm now Senator Carter for a question.

SENATOR CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator Duplessis. Thank you, Senator Price. And thank you to the legal defense fund for not just your work on this legislation and especially to the legal defense fund for helping get us to this point of having the court order and having us into session to do this important work. I believe Senator Fields, the chairman, asked most of my questions, but I just want to ask a couple of questions to make sure. The map that you're proposed, it creates two African-American majority districts in the state of Louisiana?

SENATOR ED PRICE: It creates two minority majority districts. Yes, sir.

SENATOR CARTER: And they both perform as two. And you're nodding, but yes.
SENATOR ED PRICE: Yes, that's correct.
SENATOR CARTER: And when I say perform, what does that mean for those who actually run, I'm looking at you, the legal defense fund? When we hear that, does it perform as an African-American district? What does that mean? Is that calculated any sort of way? Is it analyzed any sort of way? You can help us explain how that's done.

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: Absolutely. So we have a very thorough record on this. In the court, we had a PhD, Dr. Lisa Hanley, who has essentially gone, and she's recompiled the results of prior elections and superimposed those on the districts that we have here. So she was able to analyze 15 elections at that primary stage and then nine elections where you're looking at the outcomes when you're putting the candidates of choice here in the elections that she analyzed, black candidates. But truly, we're looking at who is the candidate of choice of the voters, black voters here, who we represent in contest with the candidate of choice of white voters here, white candidates as well.
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So in 15 primary elections and 9 runoffs, she was able to analyze what the results would be on our district lines. In District 2, the current black majority district represented by Congressman Carter. In these elections, in all of the 24 that she analyzed, the candidate of choice of black voters was elected $100 \%$ of the time. So 24 out of 24 elections. If you were using these district lines and looking at the outcome of those elections that have happened. So, many of these are statewide elections looking at secretary of state or governor or other offices where we have votes for each and every precinct within the configuration of the districts as they've been drawn here $100 \%$ of the time.

SENATOR CARTER: And let me pause you. That's $100 \%$ of the time for District 2, which is current congressional.

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: Correct. As we reconfigured here, which, yes, it will bring down the black population. It'll look different than the district that it's drawn as right now. But maintaining that majority, black population, not only as a total population or a registered voter population, which were the metrics presented before, but the black voting age population, which the court is often looking to. That's the primary metric we're using here. Here, we have a black voting age population above $50 \%$, lower than its current percentage, but still $100 \%$ of the time on those elections, black voters were able to see the candidate that they want win.

SENATOR CARTER: And let me ask you, so $100 \%$ of the time performance for District 2 . The other district that's created will be District 5, the third African-American majority seat. Did you run the performance numbers on that one as well?

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: We certainly did. We did for all six districts. But let me talk about District 5, the real one in question here. In the 15 primary elections here, $86.7 \%$ of the time, black voters saw their candidate of choice succeed. Looking to the later elections, between, in two candidate contests, $77.8 \%$ of the time, black voters were seeing their candidate of choice succeed. I'll note that once you get to that runoff scenario, those nine elections in the remaining of the districts, you're very rarely, if ever, seeing black voters have their candidates of choice elected. But in District 5, an opportunity is created here that just has not been recorded in recent history and certainly is not provided under the currently enacted map.

SENATOR CARTER: Thank you. Thank you for your questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR FIELDS: Thank you, senator. Senator Jenkins.
SENATOR JENKINS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me start off also by just expressing my appreciation for all the hard work that has gone into this effort. I said in my opening comments, well, my introduction, that I served in-house and governmental affairs. So I was very much a part of the redistricting process over there, served with Senator Duplessis, who was vice chair of our House and governmental affairs committee, and certainly want to salute you, sir, on your leadership once again. We touched upon it somewhat, but I just want, just for the record, if we could, can you expand a little bit on the motivating factors behind this particular map?

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: Certainly. So I can speak from the perspective of the litigation, and again, where the map was a teeny, tiny bit different because this one has been adjusted for precinct lines and updates since our phases of litigation, when this map was introduced jointly by parties involved. But we had our incredible map drawer Tony Fairfax, who's been credited by courts for decades now testified before the district court about his process of drawing a map. And he spoke to balancing principles, to really looking at joint Rule 21, the rules of the game that the legislature here enacted, but also what courts have sustained for decades now. We really look at the rubric provided by Thornburg v. Gingles, which was upheld in Allen v. Milligan just last year. The Alabama case, very analogous to this one before the Supreme Court and argued by my colleagues at LDF. So he was able to provide in his analysis, and this is all in the public record. I can provide it, or you can find it there. A comparison on eight of the quantitative measures for redistricting that really put in joint Rule 21 into numeric measures so that you can see a side by side of this map compared to the enacted map or any of the other maps that were presented or argued either as bills or amendments during prior redistricting sessions or in the session that we were reconvened for today. So we can first talk about population deviation. At the time that Mr. Fairfax was working on this map, we spoke to this earlier, he was able achieve a deviation of only 61 people HB1 have a deviation of 65 .
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Both maps were able to comply with the principle of geographic contiguity. That's the idea that you don't have one pocket of a district over here and the other pocket over here. Everything is connected by land or waterway. You can get from one point in a district to the other without
needing to go through another district. Both were successful on that, but he was ensuring that he was complying with that principle. Parish splits is a huge one here and my colleague, Jared, spoke to it earlier. Mr. Fairfax was able to get parish splits down to 11 . We've seen very few bills here, or in other phases of the process that we're able to keep so many parishes whole. And in Louisiana, that's a huge deal. If you do anything on elections, voter registration, and I know each one of you all do, because you have to run for office. That's the level at which elections are administered. Ballots are often built at that level. But you also see school boards, administration, all these other elements of civic and public life really codified around that parish level. So keeping parishes whole was a huge guiding principle here, but again, balanced with all of these other dynamics. In comparison, again, HB-1 split 15 parishes. VTD splits, that's a fancy census way of saying precinct splits. This legislature is very committed to making sure that number is zero, both maps achieved that. Census place split. So that's another fancy term for municipal splits, but also accounting for unincorporated areas. It's really what's your hometown and is it encompassed in one district or cut up into multiple. Mr. Fairfax was able to get it down to 27 splits in comparison to HB-1, the enacted maps 32. Landmark splits. So this is where we're talking about airports, cemeteries, parks, schools, churches. How many times are they sliced and diced into multiple different districts? Mr. Fairfax had it at 58. Same number for HB-1. Now let's get into compactness. The layman's way of analyzing compactness is something very scientific called the Eyeball Test. How does it look? Do the district lines look silly? Do they look like they have a bunch of tendrils going in one direction or another? Just illogical if you're taking any kind of rivers or other things that may also wind and bent out of the equation. What's that eyeball test? You can run the eyeball test for yourself. If I was offering my opinion here, I would say that our map looks much more compact than the enacted map that voters are participating on to this day and represented under right now. But we also have some math to back that up. And specifically, Mr. Fairfax was looking at three tests, which again, my colleague mentioned earlier, the Reock Test which calculates the ratio of district area to the smallest circle containing the district. So draw the district and try to have a circle encompass it, you can run some numbers to see what that ratio is. You have the Convex-Hull Test, which determines the ratio of the area of the district to the convex-hull area of the district. And then finally, the Polsby-Popper Test, which calculates the ratio of the same area of the district to the area of a circle with the same perimeter. So here your goal is to get as close to one as possible. And I'll give you the numbers for Mr. Fairfax's map and then the enacted one. He was able to get to a compactness score of point $0.4,0.2$ and 0.7 compared to HB-1's $0.37,0.14$ and 0.62 . In easiest terms, this map that we're presenting here today beats the enacted map and many of the others that it was up against throughout the multi fold processes we've been before the legislature during it outperforms on every measure. So compactness is another check in favor of this bill. And then finally, Fracking, which I know can mean different things in different contexts. But here fracking is whether or not discontiguous parts of a district are or of a parish are populating the district. So essentially, how are things being sliced and diced. Here, Mr. Fairfax was able to get the number down to 12 . Again, lower the better versus the inactive plan at 17 . So that is 8 quantitative measures where at worst this map is exactly the same as the enacted map and at best it is well outperforming it. But on one measure which is listed towards the top, if not at the top of Joint Rule 21, and a guiding principle for how redistricting comes into play is compliance with Federal and State Law. And one of those Federal Laws is the Voting Rights Act of 1965, including Section 2, including the promise that black voters where there's an opportunity to create a second black majority district
or any additional majority districts that give black voters an opportunity to elect their candidate of choice where it is possible, we're number one, and this is the Jingles Test.
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It's possible to draw a map because that population lives geographically compactly enough to be able to draw the district. So again, this is not about just some ratio, it's not because black voters are $1 / 3$ of the state that they inherently get another black majority district, it's because of where they live, it's because we've seen multiple maps presented here in these chambers and in front of the courts that showed it's possible, it's easy, and in fact, you can do a better and comply with all of these other measures, better wills doing that, then passing the map that you all have enacted here and that voters are operating under today. So number one, is it possible. Number two, is it necessary. The Voting Rights Act looks to voting behaviors. It's asking in the second part of that Jingles test, if the black voters are voting cohesively, if they really have a voting block and shared interests and community and needs based off of legacies of discrimination, but also contemporary realities. And then two, are white voters, the majority population voting in the opposite direction. So unless you create a geographic majority, black voters or whatever the minority population is are just not going to see their candidates of choice elected. Those conditions exist here. This record is replete with examples, including ones filed finally from across the aisle here that show it's possible to create another black majority district. And we know from Dr. Lisa Hanley's analysis and other record evidence before the courts that it is necessary because of patterns of racially polarized voting in this state. If those elements weren't here, we wouldn't be in this place. There's a future where maybe those elements subside where the state is more integrated, where the politics are less divided by race. We are not there yet. So we're in this situation. And so what we have here is a map that complies with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 , that has withstood that test of jingles, which has now been in play wills, we had to see that test sustained through Allen V. Milligan and the Supreme Court of the United States. All of these factors bring us to today and bring us to this map which is well vetted by the courts and which a lot of folks in this room have been really excited about for many years now. So I'll leave it at that. But the point is, this map complies with the Voting Rights Act, and we hope that you can get on board with it.

SENATOR JENKINS: Great answer. And much needed. Thank you so much for that information.

ATTY. VICTORIA WENGER: Thank you.
SENATOR JENKINS: Senator Price, you mentioned about the roadshows that took place. You went to a larger roadshow.

SENATOR PRICE: Yes, went to all of them.
SENATOR JENKINS: All right. and I went to a majority of them myself. And would you agree with me that there was a broad cross section of the community at most of those roadshows talking about redistricting?

SENATOR PRICE: Yes.
SENATOR JENKINS: All right. Do you feel like this particular map represents the voices of the people that we heard, regardless of race, color, creed at those roadshows?

SENATOR PRICE: It absolutely does.
SENATOR JENKINS: And Senator Duplessis, you know when we are drawing these maps, we're not just drawing them, just drawing two minority districts, am I right?

SENATOR DUPLESSIS: Correct.

SENATOR JENKINS: What we have to do is present a map that contains all of the geography of Louisiana.

SENATOR DUPLESSIS: That's correct.
SENATOR JENKINS: And do you feel like this map adequately represents all the geography of Louisiana, and the community of interest, the very community interests that take place in different parts of the state?

SENATOR DUPLESSIS: I do. Yes, sir.
SENATOR JENKINS: All right. Thank you for your answers and for the information. I think it was something we needed to discuss and make sure that it's in a record. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Jenkins. Now we'll go to Senator Reese. Before we do, let me say that there is an overflow room, Room E, that the sergeant at arms have opened up, so those individuals who are in Room E now, when we get to the testimony, we'll call you and if you hear your name, you can come. Senator Reese.

SENATOR REESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Price, thank you for the work that you put into this. Certainly respect your time and effort in it. I would like to take a moment though to point out my reservation about this map and it's not one that I've pointed out in similar drawn maps before. For me, it's difficult to abandon one set of standards for the Voting Rights Act to accept others. And district three, we split in Vernon Parish, the state's largest single federally owned asset in the state of Louisiana, which is a military installation. So that that is now fully consumed in District Four. So not only do we abandon our continuity representation, and a welldefined community of interest from a federal standard.
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We personally believe in congress' primary responsibility as the national defense of our country. That is a strong, very strong community of interest. They're occupying about half of the land mass of Vernon Parish and currently encapsulated within one congressional district in one area of responsibility. In addition to that, when the map is drawn in the fashion in which it is, the housing for the military installations captured in District 3 while training lands are captured in District 4 . And so, you have a population there of nearly 8,000 to 10,000 people that would be counted in the population but who do not typically register to vote in the State of Louisiana. And so, it's for those two reasons and I've articulated this before. I had really good discussion with the chairman as a matter of fact during our last round of redistricting about this topic. I'll continue to listen to the debate and again appreciate the work put into but I just want to voice serious reservation about the split of that strong federal community of interest in the way that we manage Vernon Parish in this version of the redistricting map. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you. And thank you for your concern. I think when we look at it, we had to have some split for population reason and that's why that area right there does constitutes a split. But we have less split than we have right now in enacted map and I know probably an enacted map stayed whole. But because of the population and the deviation and trying to make sure we have the minimum amount of deviation, that's the way we had to do it.

SENATOR REESE: There's no perfect way to define the areas that you have to make those divides. I just have to express what I believe is serious consideration for that community of interest, continue the representation in that large federal asset in that area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Senator Reese. The Board is clear. I want to thank each of you for your testimony. We're going to announce or taken some testimony from the public. I do have a state representative here. We'd take her. Do you wish to be heard? Yes, we're going to hear the state rep. You want to be heard now? First, let's hear from Senator Jackson and then Senator Marcelle, if you would come to the table as well. And then, we'll start taking public testimony. First, Senator Jackson wish to be heard. So, Senator Jackson, you recognize and then we'll hear from Representative Denise Marcelle. Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON: Thank you, Senator Fields and members of the committee. Mr.
Chairman, I want to first thank you for your work not just today but throughout this entire process even from last term and what you've done to try to create a fair and equitable districts and this committee. We're under a duty, I understand, of the court but I must come express my concern that while North Louisiana is ice stun, our legislative assistance cannot even get to our offices to our constituent databases. Some of our constituents do not know that we're here today and in the process of redistricting, I want to express my strong opposition that this body continues to meet while North Louisiana, specifically for me, Northeast Louisiana constituents cannot come and give their testimony nor can we communicate with them as we normally would through our office process to give them the maps that we received on yesterday. I know that this legislature has attempted not to act in a clandestine way and we're up against a clock of a court order, as well as this ice storm that Northeast Louisiana and I think Northwest is experiencing. However, in redistricting, the constituents input is paramount to understand the communities of interest for me and how our constituents feel. My constituents, Northeast Louisiana constituents,
cannot be here now. And worse than that is that our mechanisms and our databases for communicating with them are in offices that our staff cannot reach. And for that reason, Mr. Chairman, in a very respectful way for all of the work that you and other committee members have done. It is my hope that at some point the resolve would be for this legislature to at least ask for an extension of time based on this ice storm that we cannot effectuate the goals of the order because I agree with the court order. Let me say that. I firmly agree with it. That fairness must prevail. However, in fairness, how fair is it for my constituents not to be able to look at maps that I have to vote on.
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Because if I can't hear from them, how do I take a vote that's in their best interest. And so, I know this is not idea, right? And I know that no one could have planned what is happening in the North Louisiana, in Northwest Louisiana, Northeast Louisiana but our constituents have not seen these maps. And usually, I have a database of 4,000 or 5,000 constituents and you noticed about me, Mr. Chairman, you worked with me long enough that I would've sent out and said, "These are the maps that's introduced." You at home, "The data is great. Please look at them. Communicate with us. Let's get on Zoom and talk about them." But as I come today, a couple of my more learned constituents about the process have called and expressed concern that if they wanted to there was no way for them to get in their car and drive here and express concerns they have with some of the maps that's been introduced. And for that reason, I believe and I may stand alone in this belief that those attorneys who represent us and the state and others who support the legal defense on point should have at least asked for an extension so our constituents could take part in this process. I do not believe maps should be passed in a way where our constituents can't get here. What I don't want to happen is, and I think every senator and representative from my area should feel the same way or any area this iced in, is that maps are passed and we go home and our constituents gain knowledge of it are their path and the time to speak to the senators who are elected to represent them is over because the maps are sitting in the house and that's the place I found myself in today and I have to speak up for those constituents who can't be here and don't know what's going on. And that's with all due respect to all of your hard work because I greatly appreciate it Mr. Chairman and I agree with the court's ruling. I just think that we're up against a clock that may be ticking to a point where our constituents cannot participate in the process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Senator. Comment will be noted for the record. I mean, as all of us know when the governor made this call, no one knew, at least I didn't know and I don't think any member of this committee knew, that we would be in the conditions that we're in now but we are against a mandate from the courts and you can take that up with the president.

SENATOR JACKSON: I've expressed my concern to the president. That's why great deference to the committee chairman and its members, that at some point both parties in this lawsuit should consider that and I wanted that to go on the record. That no one could have known this ice storm was coming but our goal is to effectuate the goals of the people and the wishes of the people and represent them. And if our people can't be here, then I think it's only
incumbent upon those in leadership to ask for that extension until such time as half of the state can come because right now half of the state is iced in and can't be here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, madam. I mean, Senator Jackson. Now, we hear from Representative Denise Marcelle who wants to be a senator. I'm just teasing.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Is that right?
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: I'm just teasing. Please, proceed Representative.
REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you for the promotion. I appreciate it, Chairman, and thank you Senator Price and Senator Royce Duplessis for putting on this SB4. I certainly appreciate it. I thought it was important that I come over because I have the same identical map on the house side. I don't believe in duplicating things, so I'm going to park my map on my bill until I see if this bill moves forward. I do want to go on the record with my testimony though that I believe that this map represents communities of interest. I believe that District 5, the new district that's being created unites the Baton Rouge with the Delta, Monroe, Alexandra, and St. Landry and I think that's important. You know, when we attempted to address redistricting a few sessions ago, we found that Baton Rouge had growth. To me, it made perfect sense that Baton Rouge would have its own congressional district. We added population. Others lost population. So, I thought it was a great thing to create the district where Baton Rouge would have representation and that's important because there are some goals that we had to achieve with a fair map given African-Americans an additional seat. There is a need to unpack Black voters. And in my opinion, the current configuration is a map where we have compact voters. Black voters particularly.
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And so that leaves us with the one district. One of the things that I thought about as I came up here that there is a history of voter suppression in Louisiana. I started thinking back about why did we actually have to do this and I started thinking about before, we used to have a preclearance method that we had to take up, but that was removed by the decision of Shelby. That was the protection because it appears that this is not the first time that we could not do what was right in Louisiana. I listened very intently in H\&G today as we talked about the courts and I know we're on the congressional map, but it's the same thing. We have not fixed the map of the Supreme Court in over 100 years. Think about that just for a moment. 100 years we have not done it. Hence is the reason we used to have the protection when we were doing redistricting, but that has been again removed. As we go through this process for the third time, for the third time, I just want you all to remember that a third of six is two. If the shoe were on the other foot, would you want a second congressional district? Know, the district are not going to be idea of what everybody wants. Somebody is going to lose something. This is not about a person. It is about the entire Louisiana. And until we can see it that way, everybody has to have a seat at the table and have proper representation, and until we do what's right in Louisiana, we always going to be in the back. I don't want to see us do that. My ideas may be different from your ideologies, but I should have a seat at the table or I should be able to go to Congress and fight for the people
in my district. I shouldn't be outnumbered unfairly. I should be able to do what Section II provides. And so that's why I came to give my testimony in support of this map. We have failed to do what's right. That's why the courts have ordered us to do it. And some of us are still saying we don't want to do it. We want to defy what the court's opinion is. We don't want to look at facts. We want to look at what we believe should happen so we can have the control. It's not about one party having the control over the other. It's about what the constitution says and it provides, and the Voting Rights Act was clear. Of course, we had to fight for that as well so that we could have a seat at the table and represent our people. I think we need to do what's right. I think we need to pass this map. It is the best representation that I've seen of fair maps for the congressional district. Let's do what's right. Let's not let Judge Dick have to do what our job is, which is to create a second minority-majority district. I beg of you to do the right thing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much. Members of the public, please keep your opinions to yourself. But thank you very much, Ms. Marcelle, for your testimony. Now we're going to now go to public testimony. I know I saw Press Robinson, are there any other plaintiffs? I take you off first and then we'll take -- will all the plaintiffs just come? I know Press Robinson, you first up on my list, and just identify yourself for the record and you all may proceed. I'm sorry, Devante. Commissioner Davante Lewis I forgot. Identify yourselves for the record and you may proceed however you so desire.

ASHLEY SHELTON: Good afternoon. My name is Ashley Shelton and I'm the Founder, President and CEO of the Power Coalition for Equity and Justice.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Identify yourself and you may proceed.
ASHLEY SHELTON: I'm sorry, thought we were going to all go. I'll introduce myself. You know, I kind of changed my talking points up today because as I sit before you, I'm a little tired.
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We have been moving this process, working with community, educating community for over two years. And actually, for us, we've been doing this since the census. We've been working with communities across the State of Louisiana and I think it is unfortunate that fairness is a concept that evades us here in the legislature. And so as we sit here today with one more chance to do what's right, I hope that we find a pathway there. Because what is true is that for many of the plaintiffs, what I'm clear is that if we can't get our map through this session, then Judge Dick is going to give us a second minority-majority district. And what I do know too, is I've traveled the state. We have worked on this process starting with the roadshows. Hundreds of folks participated in the roadshow stops across the state. We trained, talked to, worked with communities. We also had unprecedented citizen participation within the redistricting process. We know that at least on one day there were over 300 green cards, which you know are affidavits. So these are Louisiana citizens and other folks from our legal team, from outside the state as well who said that they support this map. And they think that today we have some community with us. Certainly the weather put us in a position to not have as many people be able
to join us, but what we know is that the theme that has been clear is that across those roadshows and throughout all of the redistricting sessions, the veto session and the sessions that would follow and court that at the end of the day, people want a fair map. And the people have said it time and time again and here's what I think is important around what is important to understand around African-American voters. When we were in that first session around redistricting, African-American voters from all over this state, folks that would not even benefit and would not even live in the two or three potential districts that could be created, understood that they wanted to have one more voice in Congress that reflected their experiences, their values, and fighting for the things that matter to them. For example, the infrastructure bill that was basically our entire delegation with the exception of Congressman Charles Carter was voted down, was not voted for by our delegation. And so in the second poorest state in the country, I am always confused around why we are voting around political lines that are voting for the needs and the interests of our people. I also want to talk about the cohesion of this map. I support this map because it does something that I think is very true for all of the parishes that are included in the new district. All of the areas that are included in the new district, it is composed of all of the communities that are overlooked in the current districts where they exist, whether it's North Baton Rouge, the Flora parishes, or the delta. We find that all of those communities are not centered in the districts that they are in. And so this would be an opportunity for these communities to actually have a voice. And we also know that these communities have rich culture and history, but also have some of our lowest life indicators, whether it's life expectancy, maternal mortality and other issues. And so these are things that we can fix not only at this legislative level, but certainly at the federal level and they need that attention. So for me, this is really just an opportunity to, again, affirm what I have said now for the last two years, which is you know, fairness isn't complicated, and I think Representative Marcelle said it best. We're not going to all get what we want, but two districts should -- I think we've shown both through the original session that there were eight different maps that showed that it could be done eight different ways. And here we are again, looking at a number of maps, including ours, and proving yet again that it can be done. And so with that, I will conclude my testimony and certainly allow my other plaintiffs to speak.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much, Ms. Shelton and for brazen this cold weather and coming here. Mr. Robinson, please identify yourself for the record, please.

PRESS ROBINSON: My name is Press Robinson. I'm one of the plaintiffs in the Robinson v. Landry litigation related to the redistricting of its congressional boundaries. Pursuant to of course the 2020 census, by law, the Louisiana Legislature is responsible for redistricting a number of districts for the state, but none more important than those for the US House of Representatives.
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I hope that the legislature will not repeat the mistake of the past by denying Black citizens of the state their rightful opportunities to elect representatives of their choice. Now, according to the 2020 census, Blacks represent approximately a third of the state's population, and they live close enough together to easily create two majority Black districts. Easily to create two majority Black districts. You know, it's really unfortunate that here we are today, amidst the celebration of Martin Luther King's birthday, fighting for rights that we thought had been earned in 1965 with
a passing of the Voting Rights Act by the US Congress. That's almost as old as I am, and yet here we are still fighting today for those same rights. But because you are the elected officials with the responsibility of joining the congressional districts, I strongly, very strongly urge you to live up to your charge by adopting a lawful map and thus avoid a court imposed remedial one. The map represented by SB 4 is plaintiff's offering, and it balances traditional redistricting principles, including those articulated by the legislature here in the State of Louisiana as the top priorities for this redistricting session, as well as uniting communities with common interests. But perhaps just as important, the passes of SB 4 is the clearest route, the clearest route to ending the Robinson litigation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. Commissioner, thank you. Please identify yourself for the record.

DAVANTE LEWIS: Yes, sir. Good afternoon Committee, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Davante Lewis. I proudly serve on the Louisiana Public Service Commission, representing the third district which includes 10 parishes here in the State of Louisiana, primarily East Baton Rouge Parish and Orleans Parish. And as you can imagine, I was up late last night ensuring that most of my constituents did not lose power. Their power was restored. But when my grandmother called me this morning to check on me and we had a talk, she reminded me of an old hymn that she would sing in church about how I feel this morning. And she told me to wake up this morning with my mind state on freedom. And so that is why I'm here. That is why I am a plaintiff in this case, because we have been asking to be free for too long. Senate Bill 4 presents a plan that complies with the Voting Rights Act, keeps community of interest in the State of Louisiana together, and allows us, as Louisiana finally an opportunity to join as one and do something right for our people. I'm often reminded by what St. Augustine said, which is, we love the truth when it enlightens us, but we hate it when it convicts us. And the truth is, the map that we passed into law showcased that we did not put the best interest of Louisiana first. This map in Senate Bill 4 gives us the opportunity to do what is right, to do what is just, and to give every Louisiana the opportunity to be heard and their voices be recognized in these elections. I appreciate what Senator Jackson said, as we would have had more people here had the bad weather not been, but I would be remiss not to remind the Committee that the judge gave us until January 30 th to pass a new map, not until January 23 rd. There are still seven more days that we can do it. But we all know, I'll admit we wanted to go to Washington Mardi Gras, but I think if we can't get this done in the next few days, instead of leaving our responsibility, we should not travel to DC, we should not go to balls, we should not go to the events, we should stay here and do the work of the Louisiana people.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Members of the public, please do not show any expressions.
[01:15:03]
If we do it again, I may have to have the sergeant at arms, so please work with me. You may proceed.

DAVANTE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will say in conclusion, my fellow plaintiffs and I have worked tirelessly and we appreciate the work that we know you have done. Looking at models and districts, looking at how we can do this, and we strongly believe this is the best path, the clearest path, the legal path to getting it done, and I'll end with the reason why I put my name on this lawsuit was not for anything of personal self-gratification, but because I'm reminded of what my grandmother always taught me which is, when you get to judgment day, you will not be judged by what you personally accomplished in your life, but you will be judged by where you stood in relationship with those in despair. And there are people in our state who felt they are in despair because their voices haven't been heard and I would not do my job on this Earth if I did not stand with them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Commissioner. Appreciate your testimony. And the last plaintiff, please identify yourself, ma'am.

DR. DOROTHY NAIRNE: Hey. My name is Dr. Dorothy Nairne, and I'm a plaintiff in the case and I am here on the shoulders of my ancestors who are from this region, from Assumption Parish, so I saw Senator Price. That's my elected official. And for me, on a cold day, when we couldn't go outside and somebody was misbehaving, it was like we had to wait until everybody was behaving well and then we could go outside. So I look at that here in Louisiana, where if we, as African-Americans are a third of the population, then when we rise, everyone rises. So when I see this map as a plaintiff, I sign up, because this map represents everyone, and together we rise. So elected officials watch us all rise as we celebrate the saints, as we stand on the sidelines for Mardi Gras and catch beads. Let's all rise together, just like it's Mardi Gras every day, so that our least thought of members of our community in places like Napoleonville have some opportunities. The despair that I see around me every day in Assumption Parish, it's weathering and I just moved back here. So just to give a little background, I lived in South Africa for 20 years and moved back here to Louisiana in 2016, and it's been really difficult where I don't see the opportunities for my people. I don't see how we can elect ourselves. I don't see the answers for my people where I live. But one step in having answers and solutions which we have ourselves would be in the passing of this map. So instead of putting more energy into maps, we can put our energy, once we pass the map, that makes good sense to the majority of people. We can put our energy into our economic development. So that's what we're here for and we represent a whole lot of people who together are talking about glimmers of hope, whether they're being snuffed out or whether they're being lifted up. So lift us up, because together we can go outside. Together we can win something. And this map is a step towards our together, Louisiana together. Together, we thrive together.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much, ma'am, for your testimony. Let me thank all the plaintiffs. We appreciate you all coming here in this tough weather. We only have now nine other individuals who wish to be heard on the bill and we have one person who wished to be heard in opposition, and I'm going to put everybody cards in the record. Let me first take -is this Jacqueline [PH 01:19:12] Germany? If you're here and you still wish to testify, you may come forward. And Carlos Pollard, Jr. with Power Coalition. If you're still here and you wish to testify, please come forward. And Morgan Walker, if you are still here, you may come forward and you may testify. Please identify yourself for the record and you may proceed.

JACQUELINE GERMANY: Okay, first, good afternoon, Chairman Fields and other members of the Senate Committee. My name is Jacqueline Germany, and I'm a member of East Veterans Parish and Senate District 14. Your district Senator Fields.

## [01:20:00]

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Welcome to the committee. And this is the most important witness I want every member to pay attention to. Please proceed.

JACQUELINE GERMANY: I have lived and worked in Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge Parish for 74 years and I'm very proud of that and I'm a very active member. Today, I come before you do with members of the community and other groups and coalitions at Lord. I also come to speak for those who are afraid to speak. I come to speak for the voiceless, the ones who feel like their voices cannot be heard. Today, I urge you to keep my community together, to give us fair representation. Since the beginning of the redistrict process beginning with the roadshows which I attended, and I testified, and I've come before senate committees and testified and given you my opinion as to how I feel. We need fair representation. I need to feel like my voice is heard, that I have a part of the process, that I have a right to have. For far too long, justice had been denied and I have something that I use to say and sometime I back up from saying it but I'm sick and tired of feeling like I'm not a part and we are not a part of the process. My community deserves fair representation. We deserve to be heard, to be a part of everything. Not to sit back and look over and feel like I'm not a part of that. I work in the community trying to encourage people to vote and it's hard because they feel like they don't have a voice, that their voices are not being heard, that they're not a part of the process. You all have an opportunity to give us a chance, to give us what we deserve and that's fair representation. The time is right to do what is best by giving me, my community and others the right to have a choice. A choice in who we want to serve us and feel like that person understands how I feel, what I need, what my community need and wants. We have values and we have expectations, and we need those things heard and we need those things expressed. Thank you very much for listening to me and please give us fair and equitable maps. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much. Ms. Germany. Please identify yourself.
CARLOS POLLARD, JR.: Yes, sir. Good afternoon. I am Carlos Pollard, Jr. with Power Coalition for Equity and Justice and a 2 L at Southern University Law Center. I am happy to be here, but also tired as Ms. Jacqueline Germany expressed and the plaintiffs because I started off this redistricting process as a redistricting fellow almost three years ago and today, we're still here fighting the same fight and I just came here to express that back in 2022, we mobilized over 300 people to come to the capitol to express their need and their want for fair representation across this state. And yet, in 2024, we still have not received that. And we, again today had planned to mobilize over 200 people. And just in response to Senator Jackson's sentiments earlier, we had planned two busloads of people from North Louisiana to come here today to testify what they want in their state that they live, pay taxes in. So again today, we're in support of Senate Bill 4, and we deserve two majority minority districts in this state.

## [01:25:07]

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much, Mr. Pollard.
MORGAN WALKER: Good afternoon. I'm Morgan Walker, the founder and executive director of Bike N Vote, here with Power Coalition as well. And I just want to reiterate and express some of the things that the community said. Bike N Vote is a Louisiana non-profit organization dedicated to mobilizing millennials in Louisiana to register to vote and get out to vote in an innovative way. I traveled here to express my sentiments to the people Louisiana elected to represent us and vote for us on our behalf. Two years ago, close to this exact date, the first special session was held for the redistricting cycle where over 250 people traveled to our state capitol to urge you all to pass fair maps. To date in 2024, we are urging you to do the same thing we urged in 2022. The numbers have shown as Black people make up one-third of Louisiana population and this session presents an opportunity to create two out of the six congressional districts where Black voters can have their voices heard. Today, I urge you, as a Louisiana constituent, to vote in the favor of the Senate Bill 4. This map illuminates fair representation. Fair representation can lead to real change for Black Louisianans and help improve disparities in education, health care access, environmental safety, infrastructure, and more. Please, on the behalf of your constituents, pass a fair map. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you all so very much for coming to the Committee to testify in this inclement weather. Thank you all. Next, we have John Milton, Devon Trey Newman, and Wilfred Johnson. If you're still here, you can come forward. Please identify yourself for the record and you may proceed.

JOHN W. MILTON: Thank you, sir. I'm John W. Milton. I am a resident of Carencro, Lafayette area, and I am here today in support of the Senate Bill 4. I've been out of law school for over 35 years. I've never come to this body, the legislative body, to ever testify. I remember some years ago when I was in law school, 1987, I think it was, and there were some issues of how do we get African-American on the judiciary, and so, I did some research as part of the Louisiana, Martin society and realized the dynamics that required and the state did take some action to set up an opportunity where there would be subdistricts and African-Americans could enter the judiciary and be a part of the process of governing our people in the State of Louisiana. I remember that time, Senator Fields, if you remember, we had a very gerrymandered second district while we had seven congressional seats available in the State of Louisiana before Katrina. And I remember how awkward that was and how crazy it was. Thank God these maps don't look like that. But I say to you that I think one thing that was most important if I had a couple of minutes to say to you is that where I lived, my neighbor on my right was a very staunch Democrat, I'm sorry, my neighbor on my left. My neighbor on my right was a very staunch Republican, and we were all three friends. But when you ran for governor, there was a Mary Landrieu sign, a Cleo Fields sign and a Mike Foster sign. And I'll be darned, when you entered the election, I'm not sure if all the members are aware what I'm talking about, but most of you, I think would that when Senator Fields entered into the runoff against Governor Mike Foster, my
neighbor on the left took down his Mary Landrieu sign when we all walked out to get our newspaper, The Daily Advertiser.
[01:30:00]
And I saw a Mike Foster sign. I'm thinking all of the issues that were on the table, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:30:09], were like this. And Foster was over here, and he looked at me and said, "John, I know how it looks. It looks bad". And he gave me some reason why he would not, as a Democrat, not vote for Cleo Fields for governor, and why he put up a sign, and all of a sudden, that was a republican sign. I'm saying to you that race is a factor. It is undeniable. And while the day after the King holiday, we talk about the move toward integration and one America, one Louisiana, and how miserably a failure that has been, the reality of it. So, if we're not going to go there as a people, then allow the African-American community to have some type of representation so that we can be a part and continue to participate in self-governance and make sure that we are protected in all of the rights that all American should continue to have. So, I simply rise for that purpose to say that the creation of districts that are majority-minority, while is not desired by me or most people in this room, we shouldn't have to do that. It is only a band aid on a bigger problem of white supremacy and racism in America in this state and until we can get to the root of it, let's go ahead on and take care of this and at least show some empathy to all of the people of this state. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, sir, for your testimony. Please identify yourself and you may proceed.

DEVON TREY NEWMAN: My name is Devon Trey Newman. I am an activist and community person from Lafayette, Louisiana. I travel here on behalf of the Village 337 as the president and director of the organization in partnership with the Power Coalition and many other organizations that are here today. We traveled here with a bus of about 30 people from places from Lafayette to New Iberia, Carencro, Opelousas. And we were scheduled to leave at 6:00 a.m. but we waited it out and waited until we had clearance to leave. And so, we are here today. I'm here to support House Senate Bill 4, and thank you all for your time and allowing us to be here. And I want to say that it is disheartening that we are still here today. I believe it was in the year 2020 when there was an attack on the 1965 -- ‘ 64 , ' 65 Voting Rights Act. And unfortunately, this is, I believe, part of the problem. We see that this is only -- as the bishop said, putting a band aid on the problem. But as we continue to address these issues, we wanted it to be known that people from across the state of Louisiana are aware of what's happening. Part of the problem that we see too often is that things go on in this great building without us ever knowing about it, without people -- and when I say us, I mean people who live in the community for real. I'm not talking about those that wear suits like we all have on most of the time. I'm talking about the ones who struggle to make ends meet. I'm talking about the ones who are going to be affected mostly by how the resolve of this is. We hope today that this can be resolved and that it doesn't have to go back to the courts, because we know that that means that somebody's going to be making a choice for black people once again in Louisiana. And we are sick and tired of other people making choices for us and being pushed in corners like we're being pushed in today, that we have to choose when most of the state or most of the people who want to be here cannot be
here. We actually were supposed to bring two busloads, but unfortunately, due to those conditions, we cannot. And so, again, even in this situation, our people are underrepresented, under supported, and rushed again to make the decisions that will affect not only their lives, but the lives of their families in their future. I pray that this resolve does give us more representation and that we can continue to work towards a more equal Louisiana. But we cannot go without acknowledging the fact that this is deeply rooted in racism and white supremacy. And if we look at the representation here today, I think that especially when you talk about involving and engaging younger voters, and everybody's complaining as to why young, particularly young black voters, don't vote. Well, when you look at what our options are, it's kind of hard for me to make that argument. Especially I'm not talking about individuals, but I'm talking about on what we actually can vote for. Having the idea that we have to engage young people in 2024 about coming to the state capitol to make sure that we can have fair and equitable maps and lines drawn out to represent them is what makes them not want to participate in the process.

## [01:35:15]

So, I hope and pray that going forward, we can continue to engage and we just wanted it to be known that people from across the State of Louisiana are aware, and we do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support in all what you're doing to make this happen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Mr. Trey Newman. And you may identify yourself and proceed.

REV. WILFRED JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and to this committee. I am Reverend Wilfred Johnson. I'm from a little small town called Jeanerette, Louisiana. My senator just walked out. I wish he wouldn't have, but I wanted to look him in the eye when I say what I have to say. I'm also founder of A New Chapter Push, which is a community organization that was founded in 2007 that focus upon assisting those that were formally incarcerated. I myself, as a formerly incarcerated individual, after serving 20 years in Angola, the majority of my life now is focused upon the community affairs. I'm here also representing Power Coalition. We've been here too long. Three years is too long. As I look, as some of the testimonies been going on, some people are not even paying attention. They're looking away. They're doing other things. They're not even hearing what we're saying. It's like it doesn't even matter. I mean, when is this going to stop? When are we going to live out the life that we say we are? I promise you, if I ask every one of you to raise your hand, if you're God fearing, you will. But how can you be God fearing when you can't do the right thing, when you can't see that the numbers, that is, before you make all the sense there is, we shouldn't be going through this. There shouldn't have been a federal judge that has to make a decision when those that we've elected can't make the decision for us. It saddened my heart. I mean, I just got my voting rights back five years ago, and I'm always excited to vote, but the point I'm making is, guys, come on. Look at it for what it is. We got to do the right thing because it's the right thing to do. Anybody know who said that? The Honorable Dr. Martin Luther King. So, we got to understand what it is that we're here for, man, we drove -- we didn't know what we was going to run into icy roads. We came down here, like Devon and Pastor Milton said. I mean, we had to busload of people to come, but unfortunately, that didn't happen. But we're here, and we speak for those that didn't come, that wanted to come. We speak for
those that are not in Louisiana. That is ice out that couldn't get here. We speak for those in New Orleans and all over the State of Louisiana to let you all know, man, we're sick and tired of going through the same thing over and over again. When you have been elected to do a job that you are not doing. Cut it out. Give us what we deserve. We deserve fair mapping. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much, reverend. Both reverends, thank you all for your testimony. Appreciate you being here today. We now have three left, and then we get to the opposition. No, we have two because we've [PH 01:38:36] Bristetta Carter. Did I mispronounce that? And Marja Broussard are the last two witnesses who I have cards for and we put the others in the record. Please identify yourself and you may proceed.

RADISHA CARTER: Good afternoon, Chairman. My name is [PH 01:39:00] Radisha Carter and I am a first-year law student at Southern University Law Center. I am a resident of Shreveport, Louisiana, in Caddo Parish. I have been a resident of this community for 34 years, my entire life. I am here with my community members and larger coalitions. I urge you to vote in favor of Senate Bill 4. My goal for this redistricting process is for our elected officials to pass Senate Bill 4, a fair and equitable map that does not deflate my power in the election process. Our voices cannot go unheard on this matter. Shreveport and Caddo Parish are unique from the rest of the state and so are our traditions and issues that we are facing. According to The Daily Advertiser, in 2022, Caddo Parish had an average weekly average of $\$ 1,109$, ranking next to last among the large Louisiana parishes.

## [01:40:06]

This redistricting cycle has been going on for close to three years now and the numbers have been the same. Fair representation can lead to real change for Black Louisianans. Please, as a person you represent, pass Senate Bill 4 for a fair and equitable map. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much for your testimony.
MARJA BROUSSARD: Good afternoon. My name is Marja. M-A-R-J-A.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: I'm sorry, Ms. Marja.
MARJA BROUSSARD: Marja Broussard. I am the NAACP Louisiana State Conference District D, Vice President, also a member of The Village 337. Vote Imani Temple and many other community organizations. I'm from Lafayette. Have been a longtime community activist in hopes to move our people, people who look like me, forward. It's important for Louisiana to secure a second majority congressional seat for many reasons. Representation, equal opportunity, protecting minority voting rights. As far as representation is concerned, a second majority black congressional seat would ensure better representation for the significant black population in Louisiana. As of now, Louisiana has one majority black seat despite having a substantial African-American population. Having another district with a majority black representation will give a greater voice to the concerns and the interests of this community. As far as equal
opportunity, a second majority black congressional seat would provide an opportunity for fair representation and better political participation. It allows for diverse range of perspectives and experiences to be brought to decision making processes, leading to more equitable policies that addresses the unique needs and challenges faced by the black community, which is different than what faces the white community, or the Hispanic community, or the Asian community, or any other community protecting majority-minority voting rights. The creation of a second congressional black seat can help safeguard minority voting rights. Louisiana, like many other states, has an ugly history, and that history is of gerrymandering and racially discriminatory redistricting practices. By establishing another district with a majority black population, it becomes more difficult to dilute the voting power of the African-American community through redistricting plans that minimize their influences. Overall, securing a second majority black congressional seat in Louisiana is crucial to advancing representation, equal opportunity, protecting voters' rights, and addressing specific community concerns and promoting diverse perspective in policy making. Now, what's most concerning to me is that each person who is sitting on this seat here, each of you know that it is right -- you know that a second congressional seat is needed to represent the African-American community. And every elected official, every elected lawmaker know that this is the right thing. It is disheartening for me to sit before you this afternoon and watch this process, to watch my people beg the lawmakers to do what is right. You are elected to do what is right. We shouldn't need a judge to tell us what to do. We shouldn't need a judge to tell you what to do. You guys represent us, knowing what is the right thing to do. You know it, yet you still fight not to do it. That's scary and as Reverend Johnson said, "Martin Luther King said, the time is always right to do what is right." And we're asking you because I don't want to be -- I'm a proud woman. I don't want to be perceived as a beggar, okay?
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So, I refuse to beg you to do the right thing. I'm a proud black woman, unapologetically black and beautiful, and have five beautiful black daughters and beautiful black grandkids. And I refuse to beg you guys to do what is right. But I will make a request that you do what is right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much for your testimony. Members, I've had -I know people have driven here doing inclement weather, but I picked up three more cards when I closed. But Christopher Toombs, if you must be heard, please come. Jordan, is that Braithwaite? If you must be heard, please come and then lastly, Maya -- I didn't bring my glasses. And those would be the last cards and then we close off. Those would be all of the people who wish to be heard. Please proceed, sir.

CHRISTOPHER TOOMBS: Good morning, committee members, Senator Fields and all people in attendance. I just feel like this is a Bill that we have to make sure that we pay close adherence to. When you look at the makeup of the ivory hue and the ebony hue people in this state, then you kind of see where we're trending towards a point where there has to be equitable representation. I think that when you think about things from a progressive climate standpoint with the rest of the country, we've got to keep up with the norms that are existing and the algorithm that's creating a society that we want to be a part of. And I think that in other major
metropolis and other areas, they're able to get through the minutiae a lot easier because their policies and procedures are much more progressive. This is an opportunity to show that Louisiana, with all of our, I guess, deficiencies that we have to deal with on a day to day basis, that we take these larger, looming issues like this and we give it the proper attention it deserves. Now, here's the deal. If you look at Louisiana from unhistorical perspective, the ebony hue population has been largely underserved. This is an opportunity to show that we're making progress because we want to be progressive. Like right now, a lot of big companies look at our state and they see where we are. And it's almost like if we don't show the progress on a national level, which this can do, then we're saying that we're regressing and not progressing, right? And I just think that this is a great opportunity with a Bill like this that you can make an impact on our national image. Because here's the deal. We're in an international marketplace now. We have to show as a collective that we have the capability that we have the intentionality to get some equity in these spaces. And I'm saying this as a doctoral candidate at LSU in cultural preservation. This is all I deal with all day. I read about the history of this state. I understand the history of this state and this is an opportunity as a collective for ebony hue and ivory hue together, to come together and show that we're the progressive state that we can be, and this is your opportunity to do it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you, Mr. Toombs.
JORDAN BRAITHWAITE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. All the members of the committee. Thank you for taking the opportunity to hear my testimony. My name is Jordan Braithwaite, and I'm currently a proud graduating senior attending Grambling State University. And I come here on behalf of not only Power Coalition, but Louisiana NAACP, as I currently serve as the state president for the Youth and College Conference. And the main reason that I'm here, and I'm advocating and strongly urging for the adoption of the Senate Bill 4, is because it's an opportunity to allow the youth to be heard and know that our voices truly matter. When I have the pleasure in serving in this role and being able to travel across Louisiana and go to underrepresented communities and register youth to vote, black youth to vote specifically and talk and have conversations about voting with them and educating them on that knowledge, it always peaks with the conversation of the picture that's displayed that my vote doesn't matter. It goes unheard. I already know that with gerrymandering and things of that nature, that I don't have a say in our democracy. And so that's why I strongly urge the passing of this Bill, because it allows the opportunity for the youth to see that we do matter, we do have a say so, and that our future isn't in vain.
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And so, that's why I came on here today, and that's mainly why I travel all the way from North Louisiana despite the weather conditions because I just wanted to ensure that the youth's voice is being heard today and that they could see this as an opportunity and understanding that we do matter and that this is happening so that we can know that our future and our democracy. This is the clearest path to that. And so, thank you again, and I appreciate your time today.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you for coming. Thank you for your testimony.

MAYA SANE: Good afternoon, Chairman, and members of the committee. My name is Maya Sane and I'm also a student at Grambling State University. I won't say much and I won't be long, but I do want my presence today to serve as a form of support not only for the underrepresented but African-American youth voters as well. Through my advocacy and hands-on efforts through voter registration through Northern and Southern Louisiana, the SB 4 Bill has shown its effective measures for the inclusion of not only black voters, but voters across the State of Louisiana. So, today, all I am asking is that you hear the concerns of the citizens and the youth and take heed to the major concerns regarding the current one at hand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thanks to each of you, and let me thank all of the individuals who actually showed up today in this very bad weather to testify. There are also 47 cards which I won't read, but they -- I'm going to -- we are going to put them, make them a part of the record. Thank you all so much for coming to testify. And at this time, we start taking - we take the -those in opposition of the Bill and then we move on it right after that. Senator, thank you all. In opposition -- let me first -- I just have a card in who wish to speak. Former State Representative Woody Jenkins, it doesn't say opposition, it simply say that you wish to speak. So, I guess this would be an appropriate time to call up on you, Representative Woody Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE WOODY JENKINS: Thank you, Senator Cleo Fields, my friend. I appreciate you and this chance to speak. My name is Woody Jenkins and I did serve in the House of Representatives for 28 years. I want to especially congratulate Senator Jenkins. It is long overdue that we have a Senator Jenkins in Louisiana. I can tell you that. I want to read a statement from Speaker of the House, Mike Johnson, who wants to weigh into this, a very important message, I think. But before I say that, I want to just say that we've now set for 2 hours and 15 minutes and heard some wonderful testimony from people who are very passionate. They are coming from a Democratic perspective, that the main thing about a person is that person's race, and that when we draw maps, we ought to be looking what the race of people is and drawing maps about that. Over two-thirds of this legislature were elected on a very different philosophy, and that is the people or individuals, and they need to be treated as individuals, and we are not to be looking at their race when we do things like draw maps. In fact, the Supreme Court has said we're not supposed to draw maps based on race, and we're not supposed to gerrymander around as most of these plans do, trying to pick up precincts here and there to make an artificial racial balance. In fact, what the testimony has said not just based on race but to guarantee, if you listen to the testimony, they wanted a guarantee of the outcome and elections based on how the maps are drawn. That's all based on this philosophy that the most important characteristic about a person is their race or their sex or whatever it is. And that's not the philosophy of the people who elected you, and it's not the philosophy of most of the people sitting here. Now, this debate needs to be in the context of what's happening in this country today. We have a Speaker of the House elected from the State of Louisiana who has a two-vote majority. What's he doing up there? He's trying to stop the flow of millions and millions of illegal aliens into this country. He's trying to lead an investigation of the wrongdoing of this administration in power right now. He's trying to protect the security of this country, and he has a two-vote majority, which these Bills would deprive him of if enacted because it's going to take one vote away and take it the other way. It's a two-vote swing. So, this matter is extremely
serious. It's not about our local politics. It's not about deals that have been made. It's not about who might run based on this district or that. It affects the security of this country. Now, here's the message from -- that I would like to read from the Speaker of the House who has made this especially for the members of this committee so that you would know how he feels about it. He said we've just seen, and this was at 10:30 this morning, he said, "We've just seen and are very concerned with the proposed congressional map presented to Louisiana legislature.
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It remains my position that the existing map is constitutional and that the legal challenge to it should be tried on the merits so that the state has adequate opportunity to defend its merits, to defend its merits, which we haven't had in court. Should the state not prevail at trial, there are multiple other map options that are legally compliant and do not require the unnecessary surrender of a Republican seat in Congress." Now, that's the position of the Speaker of the House, which leads me to the next thing. We have had over and over again, we've been told in this committee something that's completely false, and what we've been told is that the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has ordered this legislature to redo the maps and create a second majority black district. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has done nothing of the sort. It hasn't ordered this legislature to do anything, and it certainly hasn't ordered this legislature to create an additional majority black district. Here's what the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and, unfortunately, most people have not read it. It's not that long an opinion. You should read it. But here's the final statement in the Fifth Circuit's comments on this case. It says this, "If the legislature adopts a new redistricting plan and it becomes effective, then that map will be subject to potential new challenges." Now think about that. You top something new. That's not the end of the story. It's going to be challenged. In fact, in the 1990s, our colleague, Senator Fields, is not in Congress today because maps were thrown out by the courts where there was gerrymandering to create a second black district. Those maps were thrown out. Those maps are very similar to the maps you are looking at today. They were thrown out because they require you to look at people's race to draw congressional district maps. Now, go back to what the Fifth Circuit said. They said, "If the legislature adopts new districting plan and it becomes effective, then that map will be subject to any potential new challenge." And then it says, "If no plan is adopted," in other words, you don't pass any of these Bills, "then the District Court is to conduct a trial." The order is that if you take no action, the District Court, Judge Dick, has to have a trial. The Fifth Circuit has ordered her to have a trial.

## CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Excuse me.

## REPRESENTATIVE WOODY JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Representative Jenkins, the gentleman has a point of order. State your point. Oh, let me turn you on first, I'm sorry.

MALE 1: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your testimony. It's my understanding you put in a white card as opposed to a red card, and I just question the point of order of that. It seems as if he's taking a certain position on the legislation as opposed to a neutral position.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Yeah. Is it safe to say you in opposition, too?
REPRESENTATIVE WOODY JENKINS: No. I'm here giving you information about what the court said, which you have not heard here for.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Gentleman may proceed, but I understand your point.
REPRESENTATIVE WOODY JENKINS: It says, "If you take no action on a new plan, then the District Court is to conduct a trial and any other necessary proceedings to decide the validity of the HB1 map." And it says, "At the completion of the trial, there shall be time for appellate review." Now, that's what the court actually said. They didn't say you have to draw any new map, and they didn't say you have to have two majority black districts. It says if you take no action, the district judge has to have a trial on the merits which has never been. Attorney general said she's ready to defend our law. Now, when you look at the Roadshow, the 24 stops that the Roadshow made, and people are talking about the Great Roadshow, they did, but they didn't result in this plan. They resulted in the passage of HB1, which is the current reapportionment plan. That's what the Roadshow did. Now, we got notice anybody in this state yesterday afternoon about 5:45 of these different plans. There has not been adequate notice for the people of this state to come here and weigh in on this plan, which totally changes our existing plan. You've had bad information. No transparency. You have a good plan to defend. One of the things I want to point out as a Baton Rouge and who represented this Parish for 28 years, these bills eliminate a congressional seat for Baton Rouge, for the capital area, which normally we've had a capital-based congressional seat, which that does away with it. So, I want to just conclude by pointing out that congressman, our Speaker of the House, Mike Johnson, is opposed to all of these plans, thinks we need to go ahead and go to trial, hear the evidence and what we have an Obama judge, a Judge Dick, and we have a conservative Fifth Circuit and a Supreme Court that's conservative.

## [02:00:07]

They don't think alike. So let's have a trial and see what happens and see what the judges do.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: All right. Thank you very much, Representative Jenkins, for coming to explain to us what the Fifth Circuit has said. The last person in opposition, well, the only card I have in opposition is [PH 02:00:32] Mary Labrie. Ms. Labrie, if you come forward.

SUSIE LABRIE: I pull it up here.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you for coming here and thank you for coming through this tough weather. Please proceed. Identify yourself, please.

SUSIE LABRIE: Well, I'm very glad to be here. All right, thank you. When I'm here, the reason I'm here is I want to represent JC Harmon and also myself. JC could not be here because of the weather. He's stuck at home in Jefferson Parish. But he did send everybody a packet in the
map that he proposed. And I hope every one of you got to see the map and the presentation, which I thought was superior. And this is my take, a combination of JC in my testimony. I like to support JC's proposal, and the reason I want to suggest JC Harmon's proposal is because, first of all, it's illegal to gerrymander. And he feels like statistically and scientifically, it is not really possible. I am Susie Labrie. I'm representing myself. I see myself as an appropriate situationalist individualist, not as a part of a collective class of color, skin, age, height, genealogy, gender, physical description, et cetera. JC was going to appear, like I told you, he was crowned. So I'm sort of representing him, too, as an individual. As redistricting, I tried to find a way to create and convert into an additional minority district. After studying up myself and with JC, I still cannot come up with any additional minority district without gerrymandering, which is illegal to add. But did try. I see it, as well as JC. That is mathematically and statistically impossible. And he has a solution that he has sent to all of us. In law, I understand that gerrymandering is illegal, like I said, number two, I see its reverse discriminations, those I see, in my opinion, such as Vietnamese, Spanish, disabilities, gender, age, so forth. And also, especially as in my district, I see it as against rural and farmers interests, small business, sole proprietors, main streets, those I had seen the electing liberals represented by unfair overtaxation and other issues on the working people, on the farms and small menaces. Number three, it would pose more central power, lessening individual power. Individual constituents would fall between the cracks and less attention would be heard or heeded to less. When you represent a collective, huge class as a one size fits all, too many fall between the cracks, especially myself. Special needs, self-identity, talents, nativities, et cetera. I've been through that. I want to integrate, not segregate, a district with a one-size fits all, collective class approach. I don't want to do that. I would not feel represented in a homogeneous, segregated community or district which hides individual needs and representation. Number four, it would cause us one vote to two votes shorts for us in the US House of Representative, which would remove Louisiana from its high position, for example, the speaker of the house and the majority leader, Mike Johnson and Steve Scalise, et cetera. Louisiana is enjoying a good position in the house if we stay put. The only way I can see for myself to add a minority district is to draw it as a $\mathrm{Z}, \mathrm{S}$, a zero or coil snake, a tornado, which all have been rejected over the decades. If we had to do this, I'm still suggesting a pop-up. A minority district is a set of archipelago islands looking like different size polka dots. Small one is as small as a voter, a minority voter's house up to the largest size you could get around a district.

## [02:05:03]

And scatter these polka dots all within, all across the state, within a water of majority district or districts, or make the district as a coil, like a slinky toy or tornado, like that. And after studying that myself with JC Harmon, I find it mathematically and scientifically impossible. Number six, it would divide the state and cause disunity. So we need to integrate, not segregate. So please heed and adapt to this proposal and maps that were submitted to you. JC is a genius in research, numbers, geostatistics, engineering and science. And me being an actor myself, I'm also a great devil's advocate and trying to hit a fair approach. I have tried justifying both sides, could not find a solution until JC came around. And I suggest that you receive this. Once again, integrate, don't desegregate -- I mean, integrate don't segregate. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you very much for your testimony. And again, we appreciate you going, coming through all this bad weather to be here to testify.

SUSIE LABRIE: It was mighty. It was a great pleasure and I thank you for having us.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Thank you. Members, you've heard all the testimony. There are seven other cards that do not wish to speak, but in an opposition, that would be a part of the record as well. Senator Price, to close on your bill.

SENATOR ED PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I know we've had a lot of testimony today and we've been here a long time, but this bill is very and extremely important. I know we heard some comments a little while ago about race. Well, the Voting Rights Act never said that it could not be about race. It said it could not be a predominant factor. So sometimes you get information and it's just not what it should be. We've come a long way and we need to move a map forward. This map does what the court has ordered us to do. Regardless of what you heard, we are on a court order and we need to move forward. We would not be here if we were not under a court order to get this done. So I say to you that, look at the map. We have seen it. It works. It performs. It does what it needs to do to make things right. This is a fair map, a map that has been vetted, a map that has shown that it will work. And I implore upon you that we need to move a map forward. And I feel that this map will do what we intend it to do. Don't listen to some things that are just said to be said. We know what we have to do. We know that we have $33 \%$ in this state and one-third of six is two. And that's where we need to go. We have a fair map. I went all over the state of Louisiana doing the redistricting hearing. I heard what the people said. I heard from North Louisiana in Monroe, Shreveport. I heard in Alexandria. I heard in Thibodaux, Louisiana, Baton Rouge, Lake Charles. I was at every hearing and everybody wants a fair map with two minority districts. They were there. So we know what they want from around the state. I heard it all. And I ask that we move this bill favorable, we'll move it to the floor so that we can start to do what we need to do to have a fair map. My colleagues, you want to --

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Senator Duplessis, you want to close?
SENATOR ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Just really briefly, without reiterating or repeating what Senator Price said, all the points have been made. We've been at this well over two years now. And if you compare it to a sporting event, we are past the fourth quarter. We are what I compare to double OT with no time left on the clock. This is it.

## [02:10:00]

And the question I think we have to ask ourselves is how much more time, how many more resources will we expend on a process where we're at the end of the road? We have so much other business that we need to be handling on behalf of this state, and our constituents deserve us to do the right thing and move on. Governor Landry was very clear yesterday in his speech to both chambers that this is our time to get this right, to adopt the maps that have been put before us. And he was very clear in his message, and I think this is our opportunity to do that. So I'm
asking this committee to basically do what's been consistent throughout all of this presentation today and adopt the map before us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: All right. Thank you, Senator Price. You've been at this for a long time, and thank you for your former service on this committee. And thank you, Mr. Duplessis, as well. We've heard the testimony of Senate Bill 4. Members, what's your pleasure? All right, Senator Jenkins moved that we report Senate Bill 4 favorable. Are there any objections, Senator Miguez? Object. Secretary will call the role if you want to. Senator Miguez.

SENATOR BLAKE MIGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to first start off by amending my introduction that I'm also, as you know, I represent Senate District 22, which is Iberia St. Martin in Lafayette Parish. But I'm also the only member on this committee that serves in the capacity and represents the Acadiana region, the Lafayette regional area. And I think it's incumbent upon me to state the reasons for my objection here today. Also want to preface my comments to everyone that supported this particular instrument, that this is not the only instrument in the process. The instrument that's going to be heard today that's active, that creates a second majority minority district. We have SB4, which is currently up, and we also have SB8. But I'm going to talk about this bill in particular, and what's most important is to point out who is going to pay the real price for this legislation if it were to pass. And that's the Acadiana region. Senator Duplessis mentioned connectivity into the Acadiana region, which in the Acadiana region, we're looking at the Lafayette surrounding area and those parishes like Acadia, St. Morton, Vermilion, Iberian, St. Mary, that are known to have a lot of cohesiveness there. And I would disagree that they have connectivity. They're in fact split into many different areas. Senator Duplessis has also mentioned that be his area would be connected with my district, which is St. Martin Parish. And I can tell you that the folks in my district would give me a tough time at the coffee shop next week, and then they would have trouble finding a lot in common with St. Martin in Orleans Parish besides the fact that we're both Louisiana citizens. Senator Price, you mentioned that you had attended every single roadshow, so you likely attended the UL roadshow?

## SENATOR ED PRICE: Yes.

SENATOR BLAKE MIGUEZ: And you got an opportunity to see a different dynamic at the UL roadshow. Not only did you hear a lot of testimony about a second majority minority district, but you got to see people come out from Iberia and St. Martin Parish and talk about the history over 60 years of how, and it was particularly about the Senate district that I currently represent, but how much we had in common. And the folks that testified were local elected officials from my business community. They were folks from my minority community, and they talked about some great testimony. I encourage you to go back and look at it. I also spoke there as well. But the testimony there also applies to this congressional proposal here today, because in this proposal, you are splitting Iberian St. Martin area. And I know you guys are some really great guys. I want to mention that. But I do have one issue with you both. You all both overachievers. I didn't get enough time to spend serving with you in the House because you all moved over to the senate so quickly. And I think it's partly my fault. And I don't think you guys are trying to adversely affect my map. And I want to have an invitation to both Senator Price, Senator

Duplessis. I'm Cajun. We're known for our foods. You guys can come on down to my home district and I'm going to bring you some of the best local food possible. We're going to get in the car, we're going to drive around 30 or 45 minutes, and we're going to pick up some of the best shrimp in [INDISCERNIBLE 02:14:31] in congressional district three. Then we're going to go get some of the best crawfish in Breaux Bridge, just about 30 minutes away in congressional district number two. Then we're going to get some of the best Buddha in north Lafayette in congressional district number five. And then we're going to go to congressional district number one right there in Morgan City and get all the petroleum products to cook. And we're going to have a great cookout. And I want you guys, my point is that our chairman mentioned splits. This map only splits 11 ways, whereas the other map, which I believe is Senator Womack's map, splits 15 ways.

## [02:15:00]

It's a difference of four, but which I'll fail to point out, is that Acadiana area gets split into four different ways. That's something that's very unique to your map. You got four congressional districts that meet between St. Landry, Lafayette, St. Morton and St. Mary Parish. I have a real issue with that, and I encourage any maps that are going through this process to weigh that in and go back. And you made some great testimony about all the people that spoke. You mentioned, I believe, 200 people. I think we had about 150 to 200 people that showed up from St. Morton, Iberia Parish to talk about keeping cohesion is there. Guys, we're just on the west side of the basin there. We got a lot in common, and we talked about our differences with folks way down the bayou in Houma. But just imagine the kind of differences that we have in Orleans Parish. So if this bill were to make it favorably here today, which I hope it doesn't, I've reserved the opportunity to maybe make it a floor amendment, and I'm going to rename it the Divide Acadian in Congress Act, because I want the public to know that's exactly what this bill does. And I want you to know that's the reason for my objection here today. But I appreciate you guys bringing the bill. And, Mr. Chairman, with that, I formally object to the bill.

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: All right, thank you. And you're going to have to operate this because I've lost all control with this computer here. Senator Jenkins moved that we report Senate Bill 4 favorable. Senator Miguez, object. Therefore, when the secretary called a roll, please vote yes if you in favor and no if you're not. All the roll.

FEMALE 1: Senator Miguez?
SENATOR BLAKE MIGUEZ: No.
FEMALE 1: Votes no. Senator Carter?
SENATOR GARY CARTER: Yes.
FEMALE 1: Yay. Senator Fesi.
SENATOR FESI: No.

FEMALE 1: Nay. Senator Jenkins?
SENATOR SAM JENKINS: Yes.
FEMALE 1: Yay. Senator Kleinpeter?
SENATOR KLEINPETER: No.
FEMALE 1: Nay. Senator Miller?
SENATOR MILLER: No.
FEMALE 1: Nay. Senator Reese?
SENATOR MICHAEL REESE: No.

FEMALE 1: Nay. Senator Womack?
SENATOR WOMACK: No.
FEMALE 1: Votes nay.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: And the Chair of votes yes.
FEMALE 1: Yes, sir. Excuse me. Senator Fields?
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Yes.
FEMALE 1: Yay. I have three yays and six nays.
CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: Three yays and six nays. The bill is deferred. All right. Thank you, senators. Members, we've been at it for a minute, and some of us without a restroom break, but why don't we break until 3:00 and --

## [OVERLAY]

CHAIRMAN CLEO FIELDS: That's probably not going to happen. Let's break into 3:00 and if we're a little late later, members of the public, these members have not eaten, so we're going to just say 3:00 and hopefully we'll be back by three. Senator Carter moves that we recess until break until 3:00 p.m. Thanks.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]
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[02:21:47]

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Good morning, members. Good morning viewer in public. Today is Wednesday, January 17, 2024, and you're in the committee on House and Governmental Affairs. We ask everyone to please silence your cell phones. If you need to take a call, we ask you to be courteous and step out to take that call. If any witnesses. We have some cards on the table. White cards of information. Green cards in favor, red cards are in opposition. These are held as evidence in these hearings. We're going to go ahead this morning. Ms. Baker, would you mind calling roll?

MS. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Beaullieu?
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Here.
MS. BAKER: Here. Sorry. Representative Billings?
REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Here.
MS. BAKER: Representative Boyd? Representative Carlson?
REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter?
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Present.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carver?
REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnham?
REPRESENTATIVE FARNHAM: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Gadberry?
REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Johnson? Representative Larvadain?
REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Vice Chair Lyons?
VICE CHAIR LYONS: Present.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Marcel? Representative Noel?

REPRESENTATIVE NOEL: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Shammerhorn?
REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Thomas?
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here.
MS. BAKER: Present, Representative Wright?
REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Present.
MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Wyble?
REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Present. We have 14 in a quorum.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Baker. We're going to go ahead and start this morning with Representative Marcelle's bills, and she has stepped out for a second, but if we'll sit tight for a second, she'll be right with us.

## [BACKGROUND NOISE]

Representative Marcelle. Good morning. We have two bills. We'll start with House Bill 4. Okay, Ms. Smith, you want to read in the bill?

MS. SMITH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, committee members, this is House Bill No. 4 by Representative Marcel. It provides for the assessment of penalties for failure to timely file required reports.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Chairman and members. House Bill 4 is a bill that I've previously filed in another session. I intend to run this bill again. However, due to the time restraints that we're under, I know that the most important thing that we're here to do is to make sure that we have fair maps. So, in the interest of time, I will move to voluntarily defer this bill, and you will see it again in regular session.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle has moved voluntarily to defer the bill. Is there any objection? Hear no objection. We're going to hold that billing committee. Thank you, Representative Marcelle. We're going in the House Bill 5, Ms. Lowrie.

MS. LOWRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 5 by Representative Marcelle provides for the election districts for members of congress and provides with respect to positions and offices other than congressional based upon those districts.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative, Ms. Marcelle.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. Again, I've filed a similar bill to this one in previous sessions, and we're here to this session, a special session, to address this issue. So I'd like to give you some information on this bill, if that's okay.

## CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Good. So, good morning members, this has been vetted by the Federal Courts, House Bill 5 and the map that I'm presenting to you today, and it now provides you with the clearest path to remedy the state's violation of Section II of the Voting Rights Act. This map builds off of my bill that was presented in this committee two years ago. During the roadshow and first redistricting session, as well as bills and amendments that were filed again throughout the multiple sessions when the legislature has been convened with a directive to pass a map that complies with state and federal law. The common links between those maps and this are multifold, including the fact that it performs better than an active map on multiple redistricting criteria like parish splits and compactness, among other metrics, in Joint Rule 21.

## [00:05:13]

And because it unpacks the populations running from New Orleans to Baton Rouge and instead provides a new configuration of District 5 connecting Baton Rouge and the Delta parishes, creating new opportunities for fair representation and a second majority black congressional district. In other words, HB 5 is a better map when graded on the Rubik that this legislature wrote for itself in Joint Rule 21 and the redistricting criteria accepted for decades by the federal courts, including compliance with the Voting Rights Act. In drawing this map that complies with Section II of the Voting Rights Act, we considered equal population, contiguity, compactness, parish splits, communities of interest and fracking. Consideration of the legislature's Joint Rule 21 was paramount in this process. But the overall strategy was to balance all of the relevant districting principles without allowing any single factor to predominate. We balanced population in line with the principles of one person, one vote, with efforts to keep as many parishes whole as possible. The few parishes that are split in this map are done so to keep each district with as close to the same number of people as possible. Finally, I want to talk about the two majority black districts in our map. To comply with the order of both the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals and the District Court, the legislature must pass a map. I'm going to say that again. The legislature must pass a map that has two majority black districts. In this map, those districts are District 2 and 5 . I will walk through the cohesion of the black population in both of the districts. Congressional District 5 is centered around Baton Rouge and the Delta parishes. Congressional District 2 is based in New Orleans and the river parishes. While not the predominant factor to comply with the court's order to create a plan with two majority minority districts, race was a factor in the
creation of this map. The population is compact enough to draw a district that meets all traditional redistricting criteria and unlike some of the cases where distant pockets of minority populations have been found to have desperate interests, the court has accepted that the concentrations of black population grouped together in Council District 5 share cultural, economic and social and educational ties. The cohesion of black population in Congressional District 5 in this map is evidenced by faith-based congregations, Greek lettered organizations, cultural events, activities, and shared entertainment. The black churches, I will start with one of the oldest and most important institutions in the black community, the church. Since AfricanAmericans first arrived in what was then the Louisiana Purchase in 1719, the black church has been the bedrock and foundation of this community, and that continues to be the case in the proposed 5th Congressional District in this map. Black communities regularly fellowship in various denominations of their faith. I will walk through several of those communities and each denomination in turn. The Church of God in Christ, COGIC as is commonly known or referred to, is a Holiness Pentecostal Christian Denomination. That is the oldest Black Pentecostal Denomination in the country. There are many COGIC churches located in Madison, Richland, Tensas, and other parishes that worship together. There are regional conferences, meetings and convocations of the COGIC church in District 5 that are held throughout the year. These events provide for connection with other COGIC members within different parishes in congressional District 5. There are many other protestant denominations represented in Congressional District 5, including Pentecostal, Full Gospel and Southern Baptist churches. There are also two large Black Methodist denominations in congressional District Five.

## [00:10:00]

First, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, which was founded in 1870 in the south as the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America. It is the largest Black Methodist Church in the U.S. and there is a Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in nearly every parish in Congressional District 5. Second, the African-American Methodist Episcopal Church is the first independent protestant denomination to be founded by Black people. The AME faith is very prominent in the southern half of Congressional District 5, including right here in Baton Rouge. What unites all of these denominations is a shared faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ. All of these churches hold events such as conferences and conventions, bible studies, vacation bible schools and general assemblies. If you were to attend a church anniversary, choir anniversary or appraised team anniversary, family and friends day or any other celebration in one of these churches, the guest pastor and choir would likely be from another church within Congressional District 5. For example, the guest pastor and choir at a Praise Team Anniversary is one of the Delta parishes in one of the Delta parishes is often from Alexandria and Monroe. Pastoral and church anniversary in Saint Landry often also feature guest preachers and choirs from other churches within Congressional District 5. In the catholic faith Holy Ghost Catholic Church in Opelousas is the oldest and largest black catholic parish in the state. For many years, it was the only Black Catholic Church in the region. It draws attendees and worshipers from neighboring parishes within Congressional District 5. The same dynamics among the black churches exists in Congressional District 2. The Divine Nine of which I'm a part of, as Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Incorporated member. This is another important institution in the black community, in our Greek lettered organizations, I referred to as the Divine Nine. The Divine Nine refers to the nine black

Greek lettered organizations and five fraternities and four sororities that formed the National Pan-Hellenic Council founded in Howard University in 1930. Their inceptions were a result of African-American students being excluded from Greek organizations at predominantly white institutions. I will list these organizations in order in which they were founded. Alpha Phi Alpha 1906, Alpha Phi Alpha founded in 1906. Louisiana is located in the south western region, and A Pi A has two alumni chapters partially located in Congressional District 5 and two chapters wholly contained in Congressional District 5. AKA 1908, known as AKA that was Alpha Kappa Alpha known as AKA, the oldest black sorority founded in 1908. Louisiana is located in South Central Region. The AKAs have one chapter that is partially contained and three that are wholly contained in Congressional District 5. Kappa Alpha Psi 1911, it was founded on the campus of Indiana University in 1911. Louisiana is located this fraternity southwestern province. Kappa Alpha Psi had six alumni chapters located partially in Congressional District 5 and three chapters wholly contained in Congressional District 5. Omega Psi Phi is the fraternity that has Louisiana chapters located in Congressional District 5 which form United Omegas of Louisiana. There are two alumni chapters in Congressional District 5, one in Alexandria, Louisiana, one in Opelousas, Louisiana, St. Landry Parish. Delta Sigma Theta founded in 1913. It's the largest Black Greek Letter Sorority in the world. The Deltas have eight chapters partially located in Congressional District 5 and six chapters wholly located in Congressional District 5. Phi Beta Sigma 1914, this chapter is partially in Congressional District 5 and one chapter wholly in Congressional District 5. Zeta Phi Beta has several undergraduate and graduate chapters in Louisiana. There is one undergraduate chapter partially located in Congressional District 5 and one undergraduate chapter wholly located in Congressional District 5. Sigma Gamma Rho 1922, has one graduate chapter wholly located in Congressional District 5.

## [00:15:10]

Lota Phi Theta also has several chapters throughout the proposed 5th Congressional District. These Greek organizations not only have alumni chapters throughout Congressional District 5, but are also united through the undergraduate chapters on the campuses of ULM and southern university. These organizations fellowship together throughout the year and serve as a shared binding experience within black culture, these community-oriented organizations have scholarship programs, community service outreach, founder's day programs of which we're about to celebrate on Sunday with the Deltas, regional conventions and other meetings that bring the communities together. For example, Alumni Founders Day Gatherings and Christmas parties are often jointly hosted by chapters in St. Landry and Baton Rouge. The alumni chapters in Alexander Monroe draw memberships from surrounding rural areas and parishes. The Divine Nine organizations unite the black community in Congressional District 5 in this map through a shared sense of brotherhood and sisterhood and commitment to black excellence and achievement. Next, another unifying feature among the black community in Congressional District 5 is Southern University. Looking at our map, it is fair to say that Southern is the anchor of black community southeastern portion of Congressional District 5. Southern is known as a flagship public institution and is the largest HBC in Louisiana of where I graduated from, and the largest HBC system in the country. In the early days after it's founded, the Southern University was the only higher education that would admit and educate black students. Southern University serves as the pivotal training ground for community of black students and attracts the black
community in Congressional District 5. The largest event in the black community within Congressional District 5 is Southern University's Homecoming, which is held every fall. Homecoming is attended by alumni, families and friends and supporters from across Congressional District 5. I also want to mention McKinley High School in Baton Rouge. For many years McKinley was the only high school option for black students in a wide swath of Louisiana. It attracted students from all across to propose Congressional District 5, followed by the Capital High School of where I graduated from that did the same thing in Congressional District 5. In conclusion, Congressional District 5 is rich in black history, cultural, events and experiences. As you can see, senators, the black community in Congressional District 5 in this map is comprised of a cohesive community that includes churches, organizations and universities. It is time that community has an equal voice in our political process. I think it is important that my motivation for filing this map was made clear on the record and that I speak here on behalf of the many folks who have voiced support for a fair map from across the state but who cannot be here today. That said, I attended the committee on senate and governmental affairs meeting yesterday and saw a parallel version of this map completely shutdown. Just like every single other bill, members of the black churches I have presented in this now three sessions since the redistricting process. In fact, I, myself, sat here with a Bill that was very similar to this, and it never made it to the floor. So, my concern is that this bill will probably not make it to the floor as well. It is evident to me that whatever map that this legislator want to pass and who has the majority of votes that is exactly what is going to pass and nothing else is going to get out of these committees, although I don't agree with it. At this time, knowing what the politics are at play, I move to voluntarily defer this bill. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Marcelle. Representative Larvadain, do you still want to come to the table or?

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members. It is time for us to create a second majority minority district. This is the time. We have spent a lot of time and money on this issue, we must put this to bed.

## [00:20:03]

Our citizens demand fair and equitable maps. When you look at the State of Louisiana, there are 4.6 million citizens in Louisiana. $33 \%$ are African Americans that live in our state. When you talk about the Alabama case, let me tell you quickly about that. The Alabama case there are seven congressional seats. In Louisiana we have six. So, Alabama has a larger population. However, Alabama has $28 \%$ African-Americans. They have one seat, but they trying to get another African-American seat. We have to correct the wrong in Alabama and we have to correct the wrong here in Louisiana. Section II of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 prohibits voting practices and procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, and membership of one of the language minority groups. In other words, we cannot intentionally dilute black vote. In the landmark case of Thornburg versus Gingles, it states, it demands that where there's another majority black district can be drawn, it must be drawn. The map that you have in front of you, this map won't proceed forward, but whatever map we have, it has to have compactness, continuity, preservation of counties and parishes, preservation of communities of interest,
preservation of prior districts, and avoiding prior incumbents against each other. We must try to correct this wrong and this is the time to do it. When you look at District 5, you look at a lot of community of interests. You look at East Carroll, Madison, Tensas, Concordia is nothing but poverty in those areas. Good working hard family people. When they get sick all of those folks have rural hospitals. You saw what happened with COVID rural hospitals. These are rural hospitals with 30, 40 beds. You can't do a whole lot with 30,40 beds and no equipment and no staffing. Those folks in the Delta have to come to Alexandria to Rapides or Cabrini. They have to go to Washita to St. Francis to get medical help or West Monroe. Those folks even sometimes have to go to Jackson out of state to get healthcare or Natchez. When you look at the community of interest, health care is vital. Medicaid is the heartbeat of our community. When folks cannot afford Blue Cross or Blue Shield, they have to have access to hospitals. We can't be here if we're sick and we're unhealthy. The hospitals are the pulling force. All these communities are struggling with poverty. You look at the Delta Farmland, wide open farmland, cotton, soybeans. That's the bedrock of those communities. You look at District 5, that's what you have. They have a connectivity. Highway 65 leaves Concordia goes all the way to 20. Those folks know each other. They attend churches, they're families, they're friends. My high school in Alexandria plays Washita, plays Neville. There's a strong connection in that area. Peabody, which is one of the top schools has to go play Neville and then when ASH has to play Washita and West Monroe, it's tough because those are strong powerhouses. So, all of us family and friends. Look at Avos Parish. Avos Parish has connected its community because Avos has a small hospital, 30, 40 beds. When you look at health care and all these folks, these folks have a common interest. They worship together. They visit their family, their friends. The East, West Feliciana, your small hospitals, your rural folks, the churches, the communities, all of them are family, all of them are related. So, when you look at District 5, all is family. In Alexandria, I've got a lot of students that attend school in UL Monroe. They attend school in Baton Rouge. So, when you look at the community of interest in this area, it's there. We want to make sure that we have two districts that are majority-minority. And when you look at the community of interest, these are folks who worship together, their family, their friends, they travel, they visit, they do a lot together. We also want to make sure that we look at District 2. We want to make sure that's our first majority-minority district. We want to make sure we protect that district also, because that's important. If we're going to apply the law according to the constitution because some of you all are constitutional scholars, I'm not, we have to be fair to everybody. We have to be fair to District 2, Congressmen, and we have to be fair to 5 because the courts have asked us to do two majority-minority districts. This map will not proceed but whatever map we have we have to do what's right and what's fair.

## [00:25:03]

If Shelly Dick has asked us to come back and get a district, it's important that we comply with it. You might agree, you might disagree, but at the end of the day, she's the judge. We have to respect her wishes. I go to court all the time. I don't always agree with what the judges say, but I have to comply with it. I'm asking for you all, whatever we do in a good compact district, we have to be fair. The District 5, the District 2, and to all of the folks in those districts. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me an opportunity to present.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So, look, Judge Carter, I see you have your button pushed. She's voluntarily deferred the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Hold on one second. There you go.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: I understand your decision to defer the bill, but I don't necessarily agree that we need to because we don't have the votes in the committee and we know we don't have the votes in the committee, and we're going to do the same thing we've done every session, come up with a bill that's really not the best bill we can come up with. The better bills, this bill and some other maps that have been presented, and none of those maps are going to get into consideration. But sometimes you still got to make a record and take a vote, but your decision is to defer it. But I don't necessarily agree that we need not pursue and develop a bill and develop the benefits of the bill for the record. And you said a lot of things, but it's a lot more can be said why this bill, this particular map is a good map. Why seven other maps they have are very good maps, but because the leadership is going to let one bill out, we know that, and one or two bills out and neither one of them are really good bill, not the best we can do. And it seemed that we feel like we got to do this because they offer two minority districts as shallow as they maybe because they're doing us a favor. They're not doing us no favor. The governor, the administration, nobody, no favors. They're doing themselves a favor. The favor to us will pass one of these decent maps that's compacted, that creates a real second minority district and create a map that is going to be challenged either on constitutional ground by the 14th Amendment or by Section II. Just to say you got two black districts, it's really not the right thing to do. And while it will happen, we know we can still make a record, and the record is important for future court action. Personally, I don't care what the legislature do with these maps, because on February 5 there's going to be a trial. Okay. And what this whole session is about, in my opinion, is to not have the trial on February 5 because they don't want to do the right thing. They won't pass a map with two black districts in it, even though it may not be a good performing district, in order to say they gave us something. The people are not getting nothing from the leadership in this legislature. The court is going to make a decision on this. So, I like to see the court make the decision because I don't trust the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, thank you, Representative Judge.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Not my bill.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate and understand your concern. However, I know that we vetted this same bill on the other side. I know the outcome of it. And so that's why I made the decision to do that. I did want to go on the record to talk about the communities of interest and the things that we share in common throughout the areas that we proposed. And that's why I wanted to go ahead and tell you all about the map. I do believe I have
the best map. I think I had the best map the last time. However, I've been here long enough, this is my 9th year to know what's going to get out and what's not going to get out. And so, I didn't want to just have people vetted again on this side and when I knew what the outcome was going to be and there was an opportunity for everyone to hear this pretty much the same map on the other side. So, I appreciate what you said. I did want to go on the record to talk about the communities of interest, the churches, the schools, the things that we do, the Divine 9 , the things that we have in common and I do agree that we must do what the judge has ordered us to do, and further, that we should not be passing a map that's going to be ruled unconstitutional and have us back in court. I get what you're saying. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So, Rep. Thomas, for a bite.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My question actually is to you Mr. Chair.

## [00:30:00]

I firmly believe that words mean something and that we are using -- I am hearing the phrase majority minority being used as a synonym for majority black, and I would like a clarification on what did Judge Dick order us to do in drawing these maps. Was it majority minority or majority black?

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: It was majority black.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And look Representative Marcelle, just in light of the comments, especially with what Judge Carter said, and he didn't care about what the legislature does. I care about everything that goes on in this committee, and we all need to be caring about what we do in this legislature. And so, if anyone doesn't care about this process, it's a shame because this process is very important. I voted against you, and I'm only saying this because of all the evidence, you laid out your cases really well. You decimate the communities of interest in my area. I voted against it before and was very respective about it. But I understand you had communities of interest and you laid it all out with the fraternities and sororities but in the Bayou Teche area and the KDN area where we're at, they're decimated and so I'll stand firm. I want to have that on record the same way you have everything else on record. And I think if you look around your map, I think what was brought up, and again, we're not re-litigating what we had last year when we heard this maps before but there was a lot of evidence brought up on why that was the case. So just want to in light of the evidence being brought up and understanding, especially with Judge Carter saying about preparing for trial and a lot of this is to get information on record simply for trial, I want to make sure that was clear. Representative Wright for comment.

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Marcelle, I appreciate you. Although I just don't know what's the problem with St. Tammany. You split us up. That's
our community of interest. Not going to be able to vote for it, just so you know but I know you're going park it.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you very much sir. I respect your position and everyone's position. And as I said yesterday in the Senate, when they had the hearing on the similar map, when you decide or when you were told to make two districts, it's going to impact somebody. And if we could remove the people from it and just divide it like it should be divided, then we could come out with something that's best for the State of Louisiana. So if it affects your congressional district, you're a congressman, of course, you're not going to be for it. That's why I really believe that Judge Dick should draw the map and we can stay out of it, and then she can do what's best for the state because of the interest that everybody up here represents somebody and I get it. But I also believe that we deserve two black congressional districts, and that's my belief. So that's why I keep bringing the bill. But thank you so much, Representative Wright. I understand. And I love the people in your parish.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: All right, thank you. Representative Marcelle. She's moved that we voluntary defer House Bill 5. Any objection? Hearing no objection, House Bill 5 is voluntary deferred. Mr. Melerine are you close by? Representative Melerine? Representative Melerine, do you want to start with the -- well, we'll start with House Bill 7 since that's kind of the meat of the maps for your bill. Ms. Smith, would you please read in House Bill 7.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Members, this is House Bill No. 7 by Representative Melerine. It provides for the redistricting of the Supreme Court districts.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Melerine, on your bill.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Good morning, members of the committee and thank you for hearing the bill today. So, House Bill 7 provides for a map with nine Supreme Court justices. I have a constitutional amendment, which was HB 13, I can discuss later, but essentially what this does is the map that ties to my constitutional amendment. In looking across the state and seeing some of the pushback that we've had at the seven person maps, it seems like a lot of the issues arise from geography and separating communities of interest and separating geographical regions.

## [00:35:00]

And some of the feedback I've had is that certain areas of the state don't feel as if their interest would be represented in a seven-person map. Digging into it a little bit easier, I feel a nineperson Supreme Court would geographically represent the members of the state and the citizens of the state. I can tell you now, geography was the thing I looked at most. If you look at the map, it splits only five parishes. It's compact. It has six majority white districts based on voting age population, two majority black districts, and then the third is more of a purple district. And I have the breakdown right here, if you hold on one second. It's actually my home district that we made as the purple district. It's district nine. So if you look the voting age population across the state, the voting age population -- let me start with the district first. So District 9's white voting
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age population is right under $57 \%$. It's $35 \%$ black and then the rest of the Asian, AmericanIndian and other totals about 5 or $6 \%$. When you get into the voting age population across the state it's about $59 \%$ white, $31 \%$ black, and then the remainder is either Asian, American-Indian, or other. So as you can see, the proportion in that purple district of voting age population white is lower than the state average or the state percentage. The voting age population for blacks is higher than the state. And again, the key was to keep it as compact as we could. I know there have been questions about what do other states around us look like, how many Supreme Court justices do those states have. I've done that research. Mississippi has nine Supreme Court justices. Alabama has nine Supreme Court justices. Georgia has the same. Now, when you move to our west, Texas has 18 . Now, that split nine in a criminal supreme court and nine in a civil supreme court. Oklahoma also has 14, with nine being on the civil bench and five being on a criminal bench. So it would not be out of line. We would not be an outlier if we went to nine. And also, another question I've received is, well, what are those populations look like compared to Louisiana. Alabama has more population than us. Georgia has more population than us, but Oklahoma and Mississippi both have smaller populations. So we, again, would not be out of line by having a nine-member Supreme Court. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Melerine. Representative Wright for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Melerine actually answered my question. I've been sympathetic to this idea for a couple of years and just wanted to get a little layout of the other states because I know nine is not an outlier. It's incongruent. It's congruent with a lot of other states. But you answered that before. You answered it after I pressed my button, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Carter.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative, I'm trying to figure out, are you aware that we are in litigation of a 72 map, trying to resolve a 72 map?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yes rep.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: And the Supreme Court has suggested a map that we voted out of here. So that might resolve the litigation, that map that we voted out of here?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yes. And that brings up another one. So the second part or my second bill is a constitutional amendment. So obviously, hypothetically, if my bill passed, both of them, and then we passed a seven-member map, there would have to be some enabling language in mind and also some trigger languages.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: We would have to have a constitutional amendment vote of people, and we would --

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: But it's not going to resolve the litigation because your map create two minority district, the black districts, and the one is. I guess, you would call it an opportunity, I don't know if there was opportunity of district. District 9 has $33 \%$ black race of voters.
[00:40:00]
And it looks like -- but you're still going to have the same issue that you have a third of the population. A third of nine is three, not two. So, you're going to have the same issue we're litigating right now. Your map doesn't resolve a dispute that exists.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: If you look at the percentage, it's actually slightly less than a third and it falls in that number where I understand that it's about 31\% black is the state population?

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Actually, it's 33\%.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I'm looking at the numbers I was given. My understanding is you look at the voting age population, and if you look at the voting age population, it's 31 . So, it's not quite a third. And if you look at it again, it comes as close as you can while keeping geography as the main component. It did factor in race breakdown, the map. Again, it was not the only factor. I believe if you look at the Milligan case, there is no bright line rule as to a percentage. It talks about -- as the supreme court obviously normally does, and you know this, they don't set forth bright line rules. But again, the voting age population of the state is not quite a third, so then you get into the position where you're in here, where with a ninemember map, it doesn't easily -- it goes from either two to three and it falls somewhere in between.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Except Representative Jingles and other cases doesn't talk about voting age population so much as population. You got -- performance would be -- you take considered voting age population for performance factors, but the population of Louisiana is over $33 \%$ black. That's the third, okay? If you base the population, you have still two out of nine. I would rather two out of seven than two out of nine. You see what I'm saying? I agree with you. Race should not be the primary factor. That's what the cases say, but it can be a factor in order to achieve compliance with section two. So, I don't think this map is going to comply with section two at all. We're going to have the same argument we got right now.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: And again -
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:23] the same fight.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: As I've told the people that have asked, representatives that have discussed this with me, this is a starting point. By no means is this what I'm saying has to be passed? Obviously, we would have to go through a constitutional amendment process. If
you look at the HB 13 that I'm bringing, the election wouldn't be until November of this year, which would give us time to come back at a later point if we're unable to reach a Bill -- reach a map. Again, there's a lot of hurdles that it would have to clear even if we do pass the nine amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Judge Carter. Representative Melerine, just on your question, I think you're accurate. Just on the congressional side, Judge Dick has told us to focus on the voting age population. I think that was similar to what Representative Thomas had mentioned as well. I know there is a difference on the court maps versus congressional maps, but you don't have the same one person, one vote rule, but voting age population has been the key focus question for you on the other states. Do you know how many of them elect their supreme court justices statewide by any chance, or is it broken up by district?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Some of them are broken. Some of them are appointed by a commission. For example, Oklahoma's are appointed by a commission. Mississippi, I believe, is elected statewide. And I'm not sure about Georgia and Alabama. I looked and it's slipping my mind right now.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Representative Marcelle, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. I'm going to try to get your name correct. Is it Melen?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Melerine.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Melerine?
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Melerine, please be patient with Representative Marcelle on the name pronunciations.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Name pronunciations.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: She and I have been working on this.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I'm used to it.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: All right, Balu. Thank you. Sir, serious. All seriousness. Your Bill would increase the number of supreme court justices to nine?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Correct. We're currently at seven.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And we're currently at seven. So, you're adding two seats?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Correct.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: How does this fix the litigation that we're currently in?
Do you see this as --
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: The litigation we're currently in is over the seven-person map. Obviously, if you change it and expand it to nine, you would need a new map, depending on what that map is.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You don't see this as being the same issue that we'll be fighting over since we're already saying that -
[00:45:01]
I know you all saying a voting age population, but the argument is going to be that if you're going to increase it, then you need to increase the number of seats.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I understand the argument and what I'm saying is until we see a final map, that issue could be addressed in a final map. I'm not sure what -

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So, your map is not a final map that you want to do.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: No, this was a map that I thought was a good starting point, and if there are amendments to it, we could look at -

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So, it's starting point. Let me ask you something.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Again, geography was the main factor that I looked at was keeping compact districts.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: How would these justices run, subdistricts?
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yes. So, if you look, there are none --
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Not statewide because I know we got a Bill out here to say everybody runs statewide.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: This one does not do that. This one says you elect everybody that lives in District 9 elects the judge from District 9 and so on.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. And how do you -- I was looking at your fiscal note. They cast -- I know, this is your first term, but they come up here every year and they ask
for additional money and they say they don't have enough money. So, adding two more seats would be more money. Is that -

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah. There's a fiscal note that we received last night. I'm sorry?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I was looking at it. What is your fiscal note saying?
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: It looks like in fiscal year 25, it'd be right over a million dollars. by fiscal year 28, 29 --

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Is that taken into consideration, the judges and all of their staff and their offices and everything?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Correct? Yes, ma'am.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And that's for the two additional seats.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: That is because in fiscal year 25, it's only a half year. If you look into fiscal year 26, that's the first full year and it jumps up to, I think, right under 2 million because there is some cost associated, some one-time cost associated with expanding offices, buying furniture, things like that.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right. I think this is probably my first time meeting you, so I would think that you might be a fiscal conservative. So, I'm trying to figure out why we're trying to find additional money to spend on judicial seats when we're trying to fix what we currently have and they don't have enough money. Currently, I sit on appropriation every year. Every single year they come and say they don't have enough money. So, this would be on top of the already not having enough money. I'm just trying to figure out why would we be going this route? What does this do?

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle, can I jump in real quick?
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Just because I want to make sure everybody's clear on this. We are here in House Bill 7, and on the constitutional amendment side, there's a fiscal note on having the constitutional amendment, the election, and then from the number of judges. Sorry. And then there's another one from the secretary of state that's also in your packet as well.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay, yeah. I was trying to figure -
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And that's on the Bill we're on.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I'm looking -- yeah, it is two different notes.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah, it goes with actually, the fiscal note I was just referring to goes with HB 13 and this one that we're talking about now, 7. I'm happy to answer it. We'll talk about 13 in a minute. I'm happy to answer it now or then.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And my final question, I'm going to let somebody else, if somebody else has a question. Talk. Did you speak with the judges concerning this, or is this something? Because when they came in here, they all agreed on the way to fix the matter that we're currently under in court. So, they've met. Have they met with you?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I've talked to several judges.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Are they in agreement with this?
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I can't speak for all the judges, and I don't want to speak for all the judges. I can tell you not all supreme court justices signed off on that map that was presented yesterday by Representative Johnson. I know my supreme court justice from my area did not sign off on it. Again, I don't want to speak for every supreme court justice here and say yes or no. They're in favor of this.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So, when they came to this committee and said that they had come to an agreement, all of them, that wasn't accurate?

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: I'm not sure exactly what they meant by had come to an agreement. They may have come to an agreement to something else, but if you look at the letter that went out with the map, there were only five of seven justices that signed on to that map.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Thank you very much. I would just like -- I mean, for someone else's position and area, we typically try to lean towards what they would like overall. When we're doing this major -- this is a major change. I would consider this a major change. I would think that you would get the support of most of the justices before we will move in this direction.
[00:50:05]
But thank you for your work. I see you coming in working.
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Appreciate it.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Rolling up your sleeves. Representative Carver?
REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Melerine, thank you for your work on this, and I appreciate the intent and the conversations you've had with the
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folks in Northwest Louisiana, and Representative Marcelle actually asked the question that I was planning to ask. I just -- yesterday, we had testimony from Justice Crane, also an Appellate Court Judge Guidry was here. And the governor's comments in the opening of special session just alluded to the fact that there had been some consensus on the court, not all of them, and I wondered if you had had the same feedback, but you answered the question to my satisfaction. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Melerine, that clears the Board. We do have one witness card in opposition not wishing to speak, Ms. A'Niya Robinson with the ACLU of Louisiana. You have an opportunity to close on your Bill, Representative Melerine.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Oh, excuse me. We have a technical amendment for you Bill that we'd like to adopt first.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Smith?
MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Committee Members, this is Amendment Set 52. It is online. This is a technical amendment, just to literally fill in the blank, tying this instrument House Bill 7 to House Bill 13.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Members, we have Amendment Set 52 that I will offer up. Is there any opposition to this technical amendment? Hearing none, Amendment Set 52 is hereby adopted. Back on your closing, Representative Melerine.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Thank you. I just appreciate the opportunity to present the Bill. Thank you for your questions. Look, the reason why I started going down this road is I saw the issues that we were facing with a seven-member map, seven justice map. This is another opportunity or another option in order to alleviate some of those concerns. I know there is a companion essentially Bill running through the Senate that's a little bit ahead of mine. It was discharged from committee yesterday and has been taken off on the floor. So, at this time, I would like to just hold my Bill here, and if we need to come back to it.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Representative Melerine, I'm going to go ahead and offer that we voluntarily defer Representative Melerine's House Bills 13. Is there any opposition to that? Hearing none. The House Bill 13 will stay in here as amended. I'm sorry, House Bill 7. Sorry about that. I have both of them in front of me, Representative Melerine. House Bill 7, as amended, will stay here in committee. So, House Bill 13, Representative Melerine. Let's go ahead and just read it in, Ms. Smith.

MS. SMITH: This is House Bill 13 by Representative Melerine. It is a constitutional amendment increasing the number of associate supreme court justices from six to eight.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Melerine?
REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah. So, this is -- if you look at the language, it's very plain and straight forward. All it does is say we should have a chief justice and eight associate justices, and it changes the number that concur -- must concur to render an opinion from four to five. That's really the change. The changes in the numbers, it goes exactly with HB 7. Happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes. So, I think we'll go ahead and hold that one here as well in committee. I'm going to make a motion that we defer this Bill as well. Oh, Representative Wright, you have something real quick? Do you want to add to this?

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Yes, Sir, Mr. Chair. Thank you. Thank you. I wanted to jump in on the last Bill when this came up in the subject matter. I don't know if Representative Melerine knows this, but my senator actually a couple of years ago had worked with some supreme court justices to increase it to nine. I want to say it was going to be two -- definitely two, maybe three, majority-minority districts as well. So, this is not a foreign concept, and there was an interest in the supreme court and might not have been everybody, but there was justices currently elected that considered this. So, this is not out of left field. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MELERINE: Yeah. And again, this is not something I came up with on my own. I looked around. I'm not trying to reinvent the wheel. And so, again, if it is something that goes through, we can address those other issues. I know. Look, that's how we get this done. So, thank you all.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. We also had just red card, Ms. A'Niya Robinson with ACLU of Louisiana in opposition as well. Thank you, Representative Melerine. Last Bill for the day, Representative Echols, House Bill 14. Ms. Lowrie?

## [00:55:00]

MS. LOWRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, Representative Echols is bringing House Bill 14 to provide relative to the election districts for members of congress, also provides with respect to positions in office other than congressional that are based upon congressional districts.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Echols, on your Bill?
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I got to go in the middle? Okay. I was trying to get close to Rep. Boyd. Thank you. It's tough to start out here. Oh, first, committee members, I want to say it's an honor to be here with you today. I know that we've all suffered quite a bit of duress over the last few days with hard freezes throughout Louisiana, and that, coupled with a super abbreviated session to try to solve a problem that we worked on last year and presented and to have to come back under this stressful situation, I'm obviously thankful that we have members that are committed to be here and do this. So, I'll read my first statement and then be happy to
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answer any questions around the proposal that I have before you today. So, members, I come before you today to a matter -- address a matter of utmost importance, the congressional redistricting in Louisiana. Our commitment to democracy and fair representation compels us to carefully consider the principles that underpin this process. Today, I'm here to present a proposal that not only adheres to the mandates of the voting rights act and all the other components of making a fair and free maps and the principles of compactness, communities of interest and all that, but all those things combined have been taken into consideration as I developed a proposal for your consideration. As we continue on this redistricting journey, we recognize the imperative to safeguard the democratic rights of all citizens. This process is equally complicated as it is the role of the legislature to adopt districts that represent communities of political geographic and other interest to ensure fair representation. Today, we're here due to a liberal judge forcing the legislature to reconsider the super majority decision to adopt maps that I deemed, as well as many of you and dozens of other of our colleagues, fair and reasonable. For that, I've worked to further design a new concept that provides opportunities for minorities to have two majority districts. While this process has produced some unique outcomes, and I think we're seeing it both on the senate side as well as these concepts we're debating in the house, today, we see a map coming from the senate that is obviously obtuse. In some ways, it even looks racially gerrymandered to a point of dividing communities of interest and making it impossible for fair representation for our elections, which, again, is why I have a proposal before you today. One of the main components and challenges of redistricting is ensuring that the districts are fair and equitable. This requires we meet certain criteria such as population compactness, communities of interest and all the other things that we've considered and you have for the years that you've served on this committee and brought this process to Louisiana citizens. However, these criteria can be difficult to define and can be influenced by many political considerations. Another challenging of redistricting is ensuring that districts are contiguous. That means all parts of the district are connected. Of course, with the geographic makeup of Louisiana, the dispersions of population, communities of interest, black, white, and other populations, this, again, creates dynamics that's set up for gerrymandered or other odd-shaped districts. Finally, the highest, and probably the most difficult reason putting this process forward, is the political process, which plays into many of these situations. We see that with judges being activist judges and creating a process that the judiciary is creating maps versus the legislative as law states. So, in conclusion today, I've committed and have the principles committed towards the voting rights act, compactness and keeping a liberal activist judge at bay by willing to adopt a new concept that creates two majority-minority districts that candidates can come from and have access to elect the representative of their choice.

## [01:00:02]

My goal is to pass fair maps for all of our citizens. I present a concept today that would likely meet the criteria and the spirit of the law and suffice to meet our activist judge's demands. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOWRIE: Representative Marcelle. She left. Representative Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you. Representative Echols, are you aware that you talk about this liberal judge? Are you aware that the Fifth Circuit is not considered to be a liberal circuit in the federal court system? The Fifth Circuit?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I'm aware of the Fifth Circuit.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: They're a conservative circuit, and the United States Supreme Court is pretty conservative, would you say?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: If you say so.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Well, they have all agreed that the map need to be redone, not just this liberal judge you keep talking about. You understand the history of the litigation and how we got to where we are now basically. It's not just --

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I've definitely heard a recap of all those legislative judicial processes.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay. I just want to point out that it's not just this judge that you think is liberal, it's the supreme court. It's the Fifth Circuit that suggests we do something. I noticed that no district, the two minority districts, I guess. Neither one of them are $50 \%$ registration, but they around $48-49 \%$ registration, but they $50 \%$, just slightly $50 \%$ population. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: Voting age population is what you're referring to, to those percentages. Just to reiterate, I think where your point is going, District 6, in this example, the voting age population in this model is 47.828 . And then District 2 , the other majority-minority or black district, is 48.205.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay. So, neither one of them are majority voting age population.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: Each district is majority-minority as a whole. When you roll those stats up, they're well over $55 \%$ each and majority-minority. Now, as far as majority black, yes. The majority over the white population. If you're just looking at black versus white, they are majority black population as well.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: Just looking at the data and reiterating what's on the page.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: How can you tell they're majority-minority but not majority black?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I would consider Asian population part of a minority population, American-Indian part of a minority population.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Your map identifies the Indian population and the --
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: My statistical attachment does the population center. To get to where I think you're going with this, the spirit of the law is asking us to find a majorityminority district, another minority, or at least this activist judge that you referenced. If you continue to up the VAP black percentage, you end up with what the senate currently has, which is a gerrymandered district, which I don't think would hold up long term. We fought this battle 20 years ago, and I think this is a good reference for the record to go back that 20 years. We had a Zorro district, as I'll understand it, I wasn't in the legislature, nor was I probably engaged in the political process as actively as I am now. My goal is to avoid going back to a gerrymandered district. Compactness, communities of interest, that is the intent of this map. Now, there is potential with this map, with some additional tweaks to further enhance that VAP black number, probably by another half a percent to a percent, and still keep the compactness factor. But if you, again, you keep running that number up, you gerrymander. So, I'm trying to avoid that. Splitting parishes and those communities of interest. While this map is not perfect, none of them are. This is, again, with the spirit of the law. That's the intent of what I've done.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: So, how many parish your map split?
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I think 17. I'll have to go back.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Right. I think around 16, 17.
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: 16, 17, yeah, it's 17.
REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Does it split into precincts?
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: We tried to narrow and eliminate precinct splitting because, again, our intent was -- when I set up to do this process, my intent was not to look at where all of our congressmen and congresswomen live, their houses, nor you as representatives. I know I have numerous representatives that don't want to see certain parishes split. They don't want two reps. So, they've made that vibrantly clear.

## [01:05:00]

I've committed with those members to continue to work as long as it doesn't throw the whole equation out of balance, mess with communities of interest, the compactness, to continue to tweak that as we move this Bill forward. I'm just trying to get to reasonable and fair.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: I think you prefer your map over the map in House Bill 4 myself map. Why do you prefer this map over the map we just deferred?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I haven't looked at that. The only map I've looked at is what they passed in the senate. Anything that's active, I've kind of followed. But my focus has strictly been on my map. I'm not being selfish. I'm just trying to find fair. I love my congressmen, congresswomen, everybody in our delegation. They're great people. I think with these maps, the way they're designed now, that each one of them have equal opportunity to win in these respective districts. I also think it creates a phenomenal opportunity for a minority, a black or other to win in the other drawn district, which is six, for example. So, I think the spirit of the law has been met with this design versus some of the other things we've seen moving.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Well, that's what I'm getting to, because it's my understanding, and I might be wrong, that our acts was to create a map with two minority black districts, not two minority districts. I mean, that's a slight distinction. So, this map creates two minority districts.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: Majority-minority, but the majority population within that district is black.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Right. I agree with that. But the majority of the district is minority district, not a black district. It's really not what we were being asked to do. I understand you --

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: And again, I can get to an additional percent to move these up to where you have exactly 50 plus one as a VAP. The problem is, as I suggested before, you end up with a district that starts to look like the Senate Bill. I believe it's eight. Is it Senator Womack's Bill?

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: And I agree with you. I got problems with that Bill, too. Don't assume that Bill is favored by the minority.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I've taken the perspective that I'm not coming in with any favored status. I haven't come in and had national groups and other people ask me to do this. I did this just as a reasonable approach to solving this problem. There are no easy answers to solving this problem. This is one more concept that I hope we could have vibrant debate around that gets us to fair, whatever fair is.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Have you looked at what is the breakdown in the present map we operate under? How this map different from the map we actually operate under?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I don't have the data comparisons, but I do know that -- and I'm going off of memory here from about a week ago when I looked at the current maps, five of the six districts were majority white in those six maps. This map changes that equation and makes two majority-minority, more black districts than those maps. I would think from the way this is designed that if the intent of the legislature is to elect more black people, this provides that opportunity far and above than any other map that's out there.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: All right, thank you.
MS. LOWRIE: Representative Wyble.
REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Thank you, Ms. acting chair. Rep. Echols, thank you for bringing this map and this scenario to us. When you ran scenarios to come up with this, did you consider any that retain that portion of the Florida parishes that's currently in District 5, namely Washington Parish, my area. Did you look at that any?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I did not. I've put blinders on, and we use population and data, and I work with Ms. Lowrie on coming up with potential designs that kept the compactness. So again, I didn't favor any rep. I didn't favor any congressman or woman to that degree that I said, "okay, I know this congressman or woman wants a certain parish". I did not put that into consideration. I'm sure after this committee hearing, if this Bill moves, I'll get phone calls from elected officials, both Democrats and Republicans. But no, I tried to do this blindly.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Sure. When you consider communities of interest, I'm not expecting you to be an expert on Washington parish.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: And I'm not.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Right. But you can imagine there's probably a lot more community of interest in what you've drawn as District 5 right now in terms of rural challenges, just being a rural community, economy, communities.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: Poverty, river communities.
REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I see, of course, the coastal communities separating a Lafourche and Jefferson and Plaquemines into two different districts.

## [01:10:00]

There could be communities of interest there that don't align, or maybe they do perfectly. It just depends on those community of interest perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Sure. So, if this one would move forward, would you be willing to work with me to see if we could create some scenario that may --

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I am 100\% committed, so I've had several representatives that contacted me about Calcasieu Parish. One that had to leave for another committee a moment ago. I've committed to them and everyone that I'm committed to tweaking things around the edges. As long as we don't end up with a gerrymandered district that I think will be challenged
longer term. I'm more than happy to work with you to come up with a solution to separating, particularly Washington Parish, because now if you look at the map that's coming out of the senate, it breaks Washington Parish into the former fifth congressional district or the current fifth congressional district, which is where it's been. In this case, it would go to District 1 and kind of breaks up from what you've been used to.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: But I'm committed.
REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Yeah. Let's work together on that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Bear with me, Representative Echols, we just kind of -- give me a second.

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: I'm here at the pleasure of the committee.
CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Echols, I have a couple of questions for you. Just as it relates to the maps and the communities of interest. How much focus did you give? I asked the last question specifically in our area on the Bayou Teche region and Acadiana, did you specifically go into some of those areas, and did you focus on that?

REPRESENTATIVE ECHOLS: So, one of the challenges with accumulating the numbers we needed for the appropriate black population, especially in District 6, we did had to dip into Lafayette or St. Martin Parish to grab those communities to make our numbers work. So, we did split some parishes there. Now, as it relates to Cameron and Calcasieu again, we had to get the numbers right for the fourth congressional district, and so we have split some parishes for that. But I think every map that's out there has had to do that to try to reach the numbers we need for a fair, minority-based district.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay, thank you. Representative Echols, we're going to have to recess for a second. We've lost quorum, so as soon as we get quorum back, we're going to recess. So, just for the viewing members, give us a couple of minutes.
[01:12:59]
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New York, NY 10006
Tel: (212) 965-2200
snaifeh@naacpldf.org
ksadasivan@naacpldf.org
vwenger@naacpldf.org
cburke@naacpldf.org
R. Jared Evans

LA. Bar No. 34537
I. Sara Rohani*

NAACP Legal Defense and
Educational Fund, Inc.
700 14th Street N.W. Ste. 600
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 682-1300
jevans@naacpldf.org
srohani@naacpldf.org
Sarah Brannon*
Megan C. Keenan*
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
915 15th St., NW
Washington, DC 20005
sbrannon@aclu.org
mkeenan@aclu.org

By: /s/John Adcock<br>John Adcock<br>Adcock Law LLC<br>3110 Canal Street<br>New Orleans, LA 70119<br>Tel: (504) 233-3125<br>jnadcock@gmail.com

## Counsel for Robinson Intervenors

Robert A. Atkins*
Yahonnes Cleary*
Jonathan H. Hurwitz*
Amitav Chakraborty*
Adam P. Savitt*
Arielle B. McTootle*
Robert Klein*
Neil Chitrao*
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton \& Garrison LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
Tel.: (212) 373-3000
Fax: (212) 757-3990
ratkins@paulweiss.com
ycleary@paulweiss.com
jhurwitz@paulweiss.com
achakraborty@paulweiss.com
asavitt@paulweiss.com
amctootle@paulweiss.com
rklein@paulweiss.com
nchitrao@paulweiss.com
Sophia Lin Lakin*
Garrett Muscatel*
Dayton Campbell-Harris (pro hac vice
forthcoming)**
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
slakin@aclu.org
gmuscatel@aclu.org
dcampbell-harris@aclu.org

Nora Ahmed<br>NY Bar No. 5092374 (pro hac vice forthcoming)<br>ACLU Foundation of Louisiana<br>1340 Poydras St, Ste. 2160<br>New Orleans, LA 70112<br>Tel: (504) 522-0628<br>nahmed@laaclu.org<br>Additional counsel for Robinson Intervenors

* Admitted pro hac vice.
**Practice is limited to federal court.

T. Alora Thomas-Lundborg*<br>Daniel Hessel*<br>Election Law Clinic<br>Harvard Law School<br>6 Everett Street, Ste. 4105<br>Cambridge, MA 02138<br>(617) 495-5202<br>tthomaslundborg@law.harvard.edu dhessel@law.harvard.edu

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA-MONROE DIVISION 

PHILIP CALLAIS, LLOYD PRICE, ) BRUCE ODELL, ELIZABETH ERSOFF, ) ALBERT CAISSIE, DANIEL WEIR, ) JOYCE LACOUR, CANDY CARROLL ) PEAVY, TANYA WHITNEY, MIKE ) JOHNSON, GROVER JOSEPH REES, ) ROLFE MCCOLLISTER, )

Plaintiffs, )
v.

NANCY LANDRY, IN HER OFFICIAL
Case No. 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS

CAPACITY AS LOUISIANA ) SECRETARY OF STATE, )

Defendant. )

# THE PARTIES' TIMESTAMP DESIGNATIONS OF THE 2024 FIRST LEGISLATIVE SESSION AUDIO 

COME NOW Plaintiffs Philip Callais, Lloyd Price, Bruce Odell, Elizabeth Ersoff, Albert Caissie, Daniel Weir, Joyce LaCour, Candy Carroll Peavy, Tanya Whitney, Mike Johnson, Grover Joseph Rees, and Rolfe McCollister (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), as well as Defendant Secretary of State Nancy Landry, Defendant-Intervenor the State of Louisiana, and Defendant-Intervenors Press Robinson, Edgar Cage, Dorothy Nairne, Edwin Rene Soule, Alice Washington, Clee Earnest Lowe, Davante Lewis, Martha Davis, Ambrose Sims, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Louisiana State Conference, and the Power Coalition for Equity and Justice (collectively, "Robinson Intervenors") (altogether, the "Parties"), by and through counsel and designate the following:

## I. Plaintiffs' Designations

| January 15, 2024 House Governmental Affairs |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Committee |  |  |
|  | Start | End |
| Attorney General <br> Murrill | $45: 41$ | $45: 54$ |
| Attorney General <br> Murrill | $55: 32$ | $55: 43$ |
| Representative Marcelle <br> and Attorney General <br> Murrill | $56: 34$ | $57: 23$ |
| Representative Farnum <br> and Attorney General <br> Murrill | $01: 05: 22$ | $01: 05: 48$ |
| Representative Carter | $01: 10: 58$ | $01: 11: 07$ |
| Attorney General <br> Murrill | $01: 15: 48$ | $01: 16: 14$ |
| Attorney General <br> Murrill | $01: 24: 02$ | $01: 24: 08$ |


| January 17, 2024 Senate Floor Session |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Start | End |  |
| Senator Womack | $05: 14$ | $10: 54$ |
| Senator Morris and <br> Senator Womack | $11: 44$ | $12: 08$ |
| Senator Morris and <br> Senator Womack | $12: 48$ | $13: 34$ |
| Senator Morris and <br> Senator Womack | $18: 01$ | $18: 25$ |


| Senator Carter | $24: 36$ | $27: 17$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Senator Duplessis | $34: 15$ | $35: 01$ |
| Senator Pressly | $35: 49$ | $38: 47$ |


| January 18, 2024 House Committee (RO18) |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Start | Stop |
| Senator Womack | $02: 19: 14$ | $02: 19: 49$ |
| Representative Marcelle <br> and Senator Womack | $7: 35$ | $8: 14$ |
| Vice Chairman <br> Representative Lyons | $01: 21: 45$ | $01: 22: 55$ |
| Chairman Beaullieu and <br> Senator Womack | $27: 37$ | $28: 19$ |
| Chairman Beaullieu and <br> Senator Womack | $28: 40$ | $29: 05$ |
| Representative Newell | $01: 38: 17$ | $01: 38: 49$ |
| Representative Marcelle | $01: 51: 34$ | $01: 52: 04$ |


| January 19, 2024 House Floor Session |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Start | End |
| Rep. Beaullieu | $02: 44: 51$ | $02: 50: 02$ |
| Rep. Amedee and Rep. <br> Beaullieu | $02: 50: 59$ | $02: 51: 16$ |


| January 19, 2024 Senate Floor Session |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Start | End |


| Senator Morris | $08: 32$ | $09: 29$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senator Morris | $11: 25$ | $11: 39$ |
| Senator Luneau | $16: 35$ | $16: 53$ |
| Senator Carter | $17: 05$ | $17: 24$ |

II. Robinson Intervenors' Designations

| January 15, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing (Ex. JE19) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $0: 02$ | $37: 09$ |
| $39: 36$ | $1: 49: 30$ |


| January 15, 2024 Joint Session (Ex. JE18) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $10: 03$ | $15: 47$ |
| $26: 16$ | $26: 25$ |
| $26: 45$ | $26: 56$ |
| $41: 35$ | $43: 45$ |
| $47: 06$ | $1: 03: 05$ |


| January 16, 2024 Senate Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing [Part I] (Ex. JE20) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $0: 02$ | $2: 17: 56$ |

January 16, 2024 Senate Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing [Part II] (Ex. JE21)

| Start | Stop |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29: 01$ | $1: 16: 10$ |


| January 17, 2024 Senate Floor Session (Ex. JE23) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Start | Stop |  |
| $0: 05$ | $39: 55$ |  |


| January 17, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing (Ex. JE22) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $3: 37$ | $29: 48$ |
| $33: 20$ | $34: 00$ |


| January 18, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing (Ex. JE25) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $00: 01: 06$ | $01: 55: 39$ |
| $02: 17: 24$ | $02: 21: 46$ |


| January 19, 2024 House Floor Session (Ex. JE26) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $2: 39: 42$ | $3: 06: 58$ |


| January 19, 2024 Senate Floor Session (Ex. JE27) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $00: 39$ | $21: 00$ |

## III. State's Designations

| January 15, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing (Ex. JE19) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $45: 50$ | $46: 52$ |
| $57: 46$ | $58: 14$ |
| $1: 21: 30$ | $1: 23: 36$ |
| $56: 34$ | $57: 14$ |


| January 15, 2024 Joint Session (Ex. JE18) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $49: 40$ | $53: 25$ |


| January 17, 2024 Senate Floor Session (Ex. JE23) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $05: 14$ | $10: 54$ |
| $11: 35$ | $12: 08$ |


| January 18, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing (Ex. JE25) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start | Stop |
| $02: 19: 14$ | $02: 19: 49$ |
| $07: 35$ | $08: 14$ |
| $027: 37$ | $028: 19$ |
| $28: 40$ | $29: 05$ |


| January 19, 2024 House Floor Session (Ex. JE26) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Start | Stop |  |
| $02: 44: 51$ | $02: 50: 02$ |  |
| $02: 50: 59$ | $02: 51: 16$ |  |

Respectfully submitted,

Jason B. Torchinsky (DC Bar No. 976033)*

Holtzman Vogel Baran
Torchinsky \& Josefiak, PLLC
2300 N Street, NW
Suite 643A
Washington, DC 20037
Tel: 202-737-8808
Email: jtorchinsky@holtzmanvogel.com
Phillip M. Gordon (VA Bar No. 95621)*
Zachary D. Henson (NY Bar No.
5907340)*

Holtzman Vogel Baran
Torchinsky \& Josefiak, PLLC
15405 John Marshall Hwy.
Haymarket, VA 20169
Telephone: (540) 341-8808
Facsimile: (540) 341-8809
Email: pgordon@holtzmanvogel.com zhenson@holtzmanvogel.com

Brennan A.R. Bowen (AZ Bar No. 036639)*

Drew C. Ensign (DC Bar No. 976571)*
Holtzman Vogel Baran
Torchinsky \& Josefiak, PLLC
2575 East Camelback Rd, Ste 860
Phoenix, AZ 85016
602-388-1262
Email: bbowen@holtzmanvogel.com
*admitted pro hac vice

## /s / Carey Tom Jones

Carey Tom Jones (LSBA No. 07474)
Office of the Attorney General
Louisiana Department of Justice 1885 N. Third St.
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
(225) 326-6000 phone
(225) 326-6098 fax
jonescar@ag.louisiana.gov

## Counsel for Intervenor-Defendant the State of Louisiana

/s/ Phillip J. Strach<br>Phillip J. Strach* (Lead Counsel)<br>phillip.strach@nelsonmullins.com<br>Thomas A. Farr*<br>tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com<br>Alyssa M. Riggins*<br>alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com<br>Cassie A. Holt*<br>cassie.holt@nelsonmullins.com<br>NELSON MULLINS RILEY \&<br>SCARBOROUGH LLP<br>301 Hillsborough Street, Suite 1400<br>Raleigh, NC 27603<br>Telephone: (919) 329-3800<br>Facsimile: (919) 329-3799<br>/s/ John C. Walsh<br>John C. Walsh (Louisiana Bar Roll No. 24903)<br>SHOWS, CALI \& WALSH, L.L.P.<br>628 St. Louis St. (70802)<br>P.O. Box 4225<br>Baton Rouge, LA 70821<br>Telephone: (225) 346-1461<br>Facsimile: (225) 346-5561<br>john@scwllp.com<br>*Admitted pro hac vice<br>Counsel for Defendant NANCY LANDRY, in her official capacity as Louisiana Secretary of State

PAUL LOY HURD, APLC<br>/s/ Paul Loy Hurd<br>Paul Loy Hurd<br>Louisiana Bar No. 13909<br>Paul Loy Hurd, APLC<br>1896 Hudson Circle, Suite 5<br>Monroe, Louisiana 71201<br>Tel.: (318) 323-3838<br>paul@paulhurdlawoffice.com<br>Attorney for Plaintiffs

## GRAVES GARRETT GREIM LLC

/s/ Edward D. Greim
Edward D. Greim
Missouri Bar No. 54034
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
Jackson Tyler
Missouri Bar No. 73115
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
Matthew Mueller
Missouri Bar No. 70263
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
GRAVES GARRETT GREIM LLC
1100 Main Street, Suite 2700
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Tel.: (816) 256-3181
Fax: (816) 256-5958
edgreim@gravesgarrett.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ Tracie L. Washington
Tracie L. Washington
LA. Bar No. 25925
Louisiana Justice Institute
8004 Belfast Street
New Orleans, LA 70125
Tel: (504) 872-9134
tracie.washington.esq@gmail.com

Counsel for Robinson Intervenors Dorothy Nairne, Martha Davis, Clee Earnest Lowe, and Rene Soule

Stuart Naifeh*
Kathryn Sadasivan*
Victoria Wenger*
Colin Burke*
NAACP Legal Defense and
Educational Fund, Inc.
40 Rector Street, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10006
Tel: (212) 965-2200
snaifeh@naacpldf.org
ksadasivan@naacpldf.org
vwenger@naacpldf.org
cburke@naacpldf.org
R. Jared Evans

LA. Bar No. 34537
I. Sara Rohani*

NAACP Legal Defense and
Educational Fund, Inc.
700 14th Street N.W. Ste. 600
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 682-1300
jevans@naacpldf.org
srohani@naacpldf.org
Sarah Brannon*
Megan C. Keenan*
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
915 15th St., NW
Washington, DC 20005
sbrannon@aclu.org
mkeenan@aclu.org

By: /s/John Adcock
John Adcock
Adcock Law LLC
3110 Canal Street
New Orleans, LA 70119
Tel: (504) 233-3125
jnadcock@gmail.com

## Counsel for Robinson Intervenors

Robert A. Atkins*
Yahonnes Cleary*
Jonathan H. Hurwitz*
Amitav Chakraborty*
Adam P. Savitt*
Arielle B. McTootle*
Robert Klein*
Neil Chitrao*
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton \& Garrison LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
Tel.: (212) 373-3000
Fax: (212) 757-3990
ratkins@paulweiss.com
ycleary@paulweiss.com
jhurwitz@paulweiss.com
achakraborty@paulweiss.com
asavitt@paulweiss.com
amctootle@paulweiss.com
rklein@paulweiss.com
nchitrao@paulweiss.com
Sophia Lin Lakin*
Garrett Muscatel*
Dayton Campbell-Harris (pro hac vice
forthcoming)**
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
slakin@aclu.org
gmuscatel@aclu.org
dcampbell-harris@aclu.org

Nora Ahmed<br>NY Bar No. 5092374 (pro hac vice forthcoming)<br>ACLU Foundation of Louisiana<br>1340 Poydras St, Ste. 2160<br>New Orleans, LA 70112<br>Tel: (504) 522-0628<br>nahmed@laaclu.org<br>Additional counsel for Robinson Intervenors

T. Alora Thomas-Lundborg*<br>Daniel Hessel*<br>Election Law Clinic<br>Harvard Law School<br>6 Everett Street, Ste. 4105<br>Cambridge, MA 02138<br>(617) 495-5202<br>tthomaslundborg@law.harvard.edu dhessel@law.harvard.edu

* Admitted pro hac vice.
**Practice is limited to federal court.

