



REDISTRICTING IN LOUISIANA

Committee on House & Governmental Affairs

Committee on Senate & Governmental Affairs

Shreveport

February 28, 2011

Contact Information

To receive a hard copy of the presentation or additional information, or to submit information:

House and Governmental Affairs

P.O. Box 44486

Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Email: hredist2011@legis.state.la.us

Website:

http://house.louisiana.gov/H_Redistricting2011

Senate and Governmental Affairs

P. O. Box 94183

Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Email: sredist2011@legis.state.la.us

Website:

<http://senate.legis.state.la.us/redist2011/>

Legislative PULS line: (800)256-3793

Overview



- Introduction
 - ▣ What Is Redistricting?
 - ▣ Who Is Redistricted?
 - ▣ Why Redistrict?
- Legal Issues
 - ▣ State Law
 - ▣ Federal Law
- Districts: BESE, PSC, Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Senate, House of Representatives, Congress
- Public Comment

Introduction



- What is redistricting?
 - ▣ Apportionment: process of allocating seats in a legislature
 - ▣ Districting: process of drawing the lines of each district
- Districts - Geographical territories from which officials are elected

Introduction



- Who is redistricted?
 - By the state legislature:
 - House and Senate (R.S. 24:35.5 and 35.1)
 - Congress (R.S. 18:1276)
 - Public Service Commission (R.S. 45:1161.4)
 - State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (R.S. 17:2.2)
 - Courts (R.S. 13:101, 312, and 477)
 - Enacted by the state legislature as laws

Introduction



- Why redistrict?
 - ▣ Apportionment of Congress: change in the number of districts
 - ▣ Specific Legal Requirements Involving Redistricting
 - Article III, Section 6 of the Constitution of Louisiana includes a duties and deadlines for legislative redistricting
 - Various statutes involving local districting bodies contain redistricting duties and deadlines
 - ▣ General Legal Requirements
 - Equal Protection
 - Voting Rights Act of 1965

Legal Issues: State Law

- Louisiana Legislature (La. Constitutional Provisions)
 - Article III, §1
 - Requires single member districts
 - Article III, §3
 - Provides a maximum number of members: 39 senators and 105 representatives
 - Article III, §6
 - Legislature must be redistricted by Dec. 31, 2011 or any elector can petition the Supreme Court to do it
 - Must use census population data

Legal Issues: Federal Law



- Equal Population

 - One Person, One Vote

 - Population Equality—how is it measured?

 - Ideal Population—total state population divided by the no. of districts
 - Deviation—amount by which a single district's population differs from the ideal

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Equal Population

▣ Standards—Different standards for congress and state legislative districts

- Based on different legal provisions

- **Congress:** as nearly equal in population as practicable (*Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964))

- Based on Article I, Section 2 and 14th Amendment

- “Representatives ... shall be apportioned among the ... states ... according to their respective numbers”

- Deviation and overall range: as close to zero as possible

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Equal Population

▣ Standards—Different standards for congress and state legislative districts

■ **State Legislatures:** "substantial equality of population among the various districts" (*Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 579 (1964))

- Based on the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment

- 10-Percent Standard: Generally, a legislative plan with an overall range of less than 10% is not enough to make a prima facie case of invidious discrimination under the 14th Amendment (*Brown v. Thompson*, 462 U.S. 835 (1983))

- Not a safe-harbor (*Larios v. Cox*, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga.), *aff'd* 542 U.S. 947 (2004))

Where do we get the word "Gerrymandering?"



- From Elbridge Gerry
 - Signer of the American Declaration of Independence
 - Fifth vice president of the United States (1813–14)
- After four attempts to win election as governor of Massachusetts, Gerry succeeded in 1810 and was reelected in 1811.
- His administration was notable for its use of what became known as gerrymandering.
- The division of electoral districts for partisan political advantage.





- Gerrymandering
- Political Gerrymandering
- Racial Gerrymandering

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Racial Gerrymandering

▣ What is "racial gerrymandering"?

- The "deliberate and arbitrary distortion of district boundaries . . . for [racial] purposes" ((*Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630, 640 (1993))

▣ Initially, used to circumvent application of the 15th Amendment

▣ More recently, challenges made to districts drawn following the 1990 Census in an effort to maximize the number of minority districts

- *Shaw v. Reno* (Shaw I), 509 U.S. 630 (1993) (North Carolina); *U.S. v. Hays*, 515 U.S. 737 (1995) (Louisiana); *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) (Georgia); *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952 (1996) (Texas); *Shaw v. Hunt* (Shaw II), 517 U.S. 899 (1996) (North Carolina); *Lawyer v. Dept. of Justice*, 521 U.S. 567 (1997) (Florida)

Legal Issues: Federal Law



- Racial Gerrymandering
 - Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment
 - Courts attempt to balance constitutional interests:
 - no state shall purposefully discriminate against a person on the basis of race and
 - members of a minority group shall be free from discrimination in the electoral process

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Racial Gerrymandering

□ What was the rationale in drawing district lines?

■ Race-conscious redistricting is not *per se* unconstitutional

- "[T]he legislature is always aware of race when it draws district lines, just as it is aware of age, economic status, religious and political persuasion, and a variety of other demographic factors." (*Shaw v. Reno (Shaw I)*, 509 U.S. at 646)

■ Consideration of race-neutral districting principles

- Compactness, contiguity, communities of interest, respect for political subdivisions, protection of core districts

Legal Issues: Federal Law



- Racial Gerrymandering
 - ▣ If race is found to be the “predominant overriding factor,” strict scrutiny will apply
 - Where the legislature subordinates traditional race-neutral districting principles to racial considerations
 - ▣ What must a state prove for the plan to survive strict scrutiny?
 - A law narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Discrimination Against Minorities

□ The Voting Rights Act of 1965

■ Section 5

- Prohibits the enforcement in a covered jurisdiction of any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on the date used to determine coverage, until either:
 - A declaratory judgment is obtained from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, or
 - It has been submitted to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has interposed no objection within a 60-day period following submission

Legal Issues: Federal Law

□ Discrimination Against Minorities

□ The Voting Rights Act of 1965

■ Section 5

- Louisiana is a covered jurisdiction, as are all of its political subdivisions
- Jurisdiction has burden of showing that the plan neither has the **purpose** nor the **effect** of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group
- Retrogression
- “Any discriminatory purpose”

Legal Issues: Federal Law



- Discrimination Against Minorities

- The Voting Rights Act of 1965

- Section 2

- Prohibits any state or political subdivision from imposing a voting qualification, standard, practice, or procedure that results in the denial or abridgment of any U.S. citizen's right to vote on account of race, color, or status as a member of a language minority group

Legal Issues: Federal Law


□ Discrimination Against Minorities

□ The Voting Rights Act of 1965

■ Section 2

- *Gingles* preconditions (*Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986))
 - Size and geographical compactness
 - Political cohesion
 - Majority votes as a bloc to defeat minority's preferred candidate
- Totality of the circumstances

BESE Districts 2000s



BESE Ideal District Population




2000 Ideal: 558,622


2010 Ideal: 566,671

Deviations of BESE Districts

District	Member	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
District 1	Garvey	595,463	566,671	28,792	5.08%
District 2	Givens	395,097	566,671	-171,574	-30.28%
District 3	Buquet	542,929	566,671	-23,742	-4.19%
District 4	Lee	559,562	566,671	-7,109	-1.25%
District 5	Guice	555,802	566,671	-10,869	-1.92%
District 6	Roemer	708,651	566,671	141,980	25.06%
District 7	Bayard	632,891	566,671	66,220	11.69%
District 8	Johnson	542,977	566,671	-23,694	-4.18%



Public Service Commission Districts 2000s



Public Service Commission Ideal District Population


27

2000 Ideal: 893,795

2010 Ideal: 906,674

Deviations of PSC Districts

District	Member	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
District 1	Skrmetta	960,918	906,674	54,244	5.98%
District 2	Field	984,783	906,674	78,109	8.61%
District 3	Boissiere	774,622	906,674	-132,052	-14.56%
District 4	Holloway	872,823	906,674	-33,851	-3.73%
District 5	Campbell	940,226	906,674	33,552	3.70%



Supreme Court Ideal District Population




1990 Ideal: 602,853

2000 Ideal: 638,425*

2010 Ideal: 647,624


(*Note: Supreme Court Districts were not redrawn following the 2000 Census)

Baseline Supreme Court Districts



Deviations of Baseline Supreme Court Districts


District	Justice	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
District 1	Guidry	696,812	647,624	49,188	7.60%
District 2	Victory	660,437	647,624	12,813	1.98%
District 3	Knoll	698,008	647,624	50,384	7.78%
District 4	Clark	602,663	647,624	-44,961	-6.94%
District 5	Kimball	791,281	647,624	143,657	22.18%
District 6	Weimer	645,962	647,624	-1,662	-0.26%
District 7	Johnson	438,209	647,624	-209,415	-32.34%




**Baseline Supreme Court
Deviation**


- -32.336% - -5.000%
- -4.999% - 4.999%
- 5.000% - 22.182%

Courts of Appeal




Third Circuit Court of Appeal







Louisiana Senate Baseline Plan



Baseline Senate Districts: Northwest



Baseline Senate Districts: Northwest



Baseline Senate Districts: Shreveport




Senate Baseline Plan Ideal District Population

Decade	Ideal Population
2000	114,589
2010	116,240


Deviations of Area Districts

District	Member	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
39	Jackson	107,940	116,240	-8,300	-7.14%
33	Walsworth	110,088	116,240	-6,152	-5.29%
37	Shaw	114,690	116,240	-1,550	-1.33%
31	Long	117,327	116,240	1,087	0.94%
36	Adley	119,479	116,240	3,239	2.79%
35	Kostelka	119,540	116,240	3,300	2.84%
38	Cheek	120,165	116,240	3,925	3.38%


Louisiana Senate Baseline Plan: Deviation from the Ideal




House Districts: 2000s




Baseline House Districts: Northwest



Baseline House Districts: Northwest



Baseline House Districts: Shreveport



House Ideal District Population



Decade	Ideal Population
2000	42,561
2010	43,174


Deviations of Area House Districts

District	Member	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
1	Morris	44,892	43,174	1,718	3.98%
2	Burrell	35,099	43,174	-8,075	-18.70%
3	Norton	39,035	43,174	-4,139	-9.59%
4	Williams	42,978	43,174	-196	-0.45%
5	Seabaugh	47,695	43,174	4,521	10.47%
6	Carmody	44,925	43,174	1,751	4.06%


Deviations of Area House Districts

District	Member	Actual Pop	Ideal Pop	Difference	Percent
7	Burford	44,046	43,174	872	2.02%
8	Jane Smith	53,611	43,174	10,437	24.17%
9	Henry Burns	45,910	43,174	2,736	6.34%
10	Doerge	41,207	43,174	-1,967	-4.56%
23	Nowlin	41,224	43,174	-1,950	-4.52%
24	Howard	45,758	43,174	2,584	5.99%

House Districts: Deviation from the Ideal



Deviations of Shreveport Area Districts



Population changes

The Nation v. Louisiana


Decade	U.S.	Louisiana	Difference	South
1970 to 1980	11.48%	15.51%	4.02%	20.03%
1980 to 1990	9.78%	0.33%	-9.45%	13.37%
1990 to 2000	13.15%	5.90%	-7.25%	17.3%
2000 to 2010	9.71%	1.44%	-8.27%	14.29%

Apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives Based on the 2010 Census



Change from 2000 to 2010

- State gaining 4 seats in the House
- State gaining 2 seats in the House
- State gaining 1 seat in the House
- No change
- State losing 1 seat in the House
- State losing 2 seats in the House



Total U.S. Representatives: 435
Numbers represent reapportioned totals of U.S. Representatives.




Congress

Ideal District Population



Decade	Districts	Ideal Population
2000	7	638,425
2010	6	755,562

Congress - 2001



Current Congressional District Statistics

Six District Ideal: 755,562

District	Member	Actual Pop
District 1	Scalise	686,961
District 2	Richmond	493,352
District 3	Landry	637,371
District 4	Fleming	667,109
District 5	Alexander	644,296
District 6	Cassidy	727,498
District 7	Boustany	676,785




To get more information regarding the Louisiana Senate redistricting process go to:

<http://senate.legis.state.la.us/redist2011/>



To get more information regarding the Louisiana House of Representatives redistricting process go to:

http://house.louisiana.gov/H_Redistricting2011



Like “Louisiana House of Representatives Redistricting” on Facebook

Follow us on twitter @hredist2011

Key Contacts for the House of Representatives

59

House & Governmental Affairs Committee

Shawn O'Brien Secretary 225-342-2403

- ▣ Patricia Lowrey – Dufour Legislative Analyst
225-342-2396
- ▣ Mark Mahaffey Attorney
225-342-2598
- ▣ Alfred Speer Clerk of the House
225-342-7259
- ▣ Stephanie Little Attorney
225-342-2394
- ▣ Dr. William Blair Demographer
225-342-2591

Key Contacts for the Senate

- ▣ Glenn Koepp Secretary of the Senate
225-342-5997
- ▣ Yolanda Dixon First Assistant Secretary of the Senate
225-342-6184
- ▣ Sue Morain Executive Assistant to the Secretary
225-342-2374
- ▣ Committee on Senate and Governmental Affairs
Alden Clement, Attorney 225-342-0640
Tim Prather, Senate Counsel 225-342-8299
Deborah Leblanc, Secretary 225-342-9845
- ▣ Dr. William Blair Demographer
225-342-2591

Public Comment

