

Plan Evaluation Form

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Plan Name: ACLU

Plan Submitted By:

Question	Response/Quantify or Explain if necessary
If a statewide plan (House, Senate, PSC, BESE, Congress, or Supreme Court), does the plan assign all the geography of the state?	Yes
Is each district within the plan composed of contiguous geography?	Yes (See attachment - Compactness Report)
If a House, Senate, PSC, BESE, or Congressional Plan, is the plan comprised of single-member districts? For House and Senate Plans, give the # of districts if less than the current number.	Yes (See attachment - Plan Statistics)
What is the overall deviation of the plan?	Absolute=4,348 Relative=9.8% (See attachment - Plan Statistics)
How many majority-minority districts are contained within the plan? List each minority district, quantify by type of protected class, list Tot Pop %, VAP %, Vot Reg %, and describe where in the state each minority district is located.	38 (See attachment - District Population)
How many parishes are split in the plan? Please list. Include any explanation given for each split.	41 (See attachment - Split Parishes)
How many municipalities are split in the plan? Please list. Include any explanation given for each split.	119 (See attachment - Split Places)
How many VTDs (precincts) are split in the plan?	33 (See attachment - Split VTDs)
If there are split VTD's, are they split using visible census tabulation boundaries?	See other observations
Please list each split VTD by Parish and VTD in alpha and numeric order and include the number of districts each VTD is split into and also specify the district numbers. Include any explanation given for each split.	See attachment - Split VTDs
Any other observations regarding the plan?	


Snapshot Report

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Page: 1 of 1

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions



Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 1:07 PM

Compactness Report

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 1 of 3

District	Part	Area (sq miles)	Perimeter	Normalized Area	Reock	Schwartzbern	Holes
District 1	1	450.19	150.44	0.25	0.3552	2	0
District 2	1	23.3	34.3	0.249	0.2861	2	0
District 3	1	20.18	25.46	0.3913	0.5985	1.6	0
District 4	1	209.26	75.56	0.4606	0.6154	1.47	0
District 5	1	583.99	156.63	0.2991	0.4848	1.83	0
District 6	1	27.89	42.64	0.1928	0.4511	2.28	0
District 7	1	1017.16	324.01	0.1218	0.332	2.87	0
District 8	1	37.67	42.28	0.2648	0.6236	1.94	0
District 9	1	245.27	130.77	0.1802	0.4664	2.36	0
District 10	1	1029.75	229.09	0.2466	0.3774	2.01	0
District 11	1	671.49	196.43	0.2187	0.5202	2.14	0
District 12	1	1716.04	285.03	0.2654	0.2592	1.94	0
District 13	1	2613.6	372.57	0.2366	0.4379	2.06	0
District 14	1	177.1	93.9	0.2524	0.325	1.99	0
District 15	1	750.22	154.09	0.397	0.386	1.59	0
District 16	1	57.96	39.67	0.4627	0.4284	1.47	0
District 17	1	259.98	80.89	0.4993	0.468	1.42	0
District 18	1	1491.07	271.14	0.2549	0.3201	1.98	0
District 19	1	2362.12	405.72	0.1803	0.648	2.35	0
District 20	1	2301.66	413.06	0.1695	0.306	2.43	0
District 21	1	1140.89	341.57	0.1229	0.3912	2.85	0
District 22	1	862.27	176.08	0.3495	0.4661	1.69	0
District 23	1	980.53	258.68	0.1841	0.2642	2.33	0
District 24	1	1966.14	356.37	0.1946	0.5488	2.27	0
District 25	1	586.29	169.84	0.2554	0.5879	1.98	0
District 26	1	36.5	38.81	0.3046	0.4475	1.81	0
District 27	1	1191.92	272.03	0.2024	0.3192	2.22	0
District 28	1	1116.13	210.57	0.3163	0.3539	1.78	0
District 29	1	261.94	95.96	0.3575	0.5047	1.67	0
District 30	1	1124.33	286.3	0.1724	0.3621	2.41	0
District 31	1	33.72	31.21	0.4352	0.4555	1.52	0
District 32	1	1284.99	170.34	0.5565	0.5771	1.34	0
District 33	1	85.89	60.92	0.2908	0.4167	1.85	0
District 34	1	101.87	80.22	0.1989	0.4155	2.24	0
District 35	1	230.84	106.89	0.2539	0.4818	1.98	0
District 36	1	13.83	26.18	0.2535	0.4176	1.99	0
District 37	1	845.03	194.09	0.2819	0.5436	1.88	0
District 38	1	1076.83	235	0.245	0.3273	2.02	0
District 39	1	43.15	46.36	0.2523	0.2814	1.99	0
District 40	1	197.32	92.5	0.2898	0.4549	1.86	0
District 41	1	525.97	145.4	0.3126	0.5377	1.79	0
District 42	1	282.23	118.01	0.2547	0.318	1.98	0
District 43	1	60.78	44.69	0.3823	0.345	1.62	0
District 44	1	28.5	32.32	0.3429	0.4157	1.71	0
District 45	1	37.71	37.97	0.3287	0.4562	1.74	0
District 46	1	540.01	163.86	0.2527	0.3266	1.99	0
District 47	1	2962.03	331.49	0.3387	0.2944	1.72	0
District 48	1	487.19	145.27	0.2901	0.3962	1.86	0
District 49	1	1686.41	250.74	0.3371	0.436	1.72	0
District 50	1	1228.53	280.24	0.1966	0.4502	2.26	0
District 51	1	212.69	94.53	0.2991	0.4712	1.83	0
District 52	1	1582.55	238.63	0.3492	0.5308	1.69	0
District 53	1	91.39	52.97	0.4093	0.3942	1.56	0

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 1:07 PM

Compactness Report

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 2 of 3

District	Part	Area (sq miles)	Perimeter	Normalized Area	Reock	Schwartzbern	Holes
District 54	1	1018.88	190.64	0.3523	0.4003	1.68	0
District 55	1	548.7	138.24	0.3608	0.5653	1.66	0
District 56	1	189.79	72.19	0.4576	0.4858	1.48	0
District 57	1	410.34	111.27	0.4165	0.3607	1.55	0
District 58	1	521.88	138.33	0.3427	0.442	1.71	0
District 59	1	43.42	35.6	0.4305	0.4652	1.52	0
District 60	1	263.84	114.6	0.2524	0.424	1.99	0
District 61	1	16.13	24.16	0.3473	0.2763	1.7	0
District 62	1	602.03	188.85	0.2121	0.4936	2.17	0
District 63	1	98.75	60.81	0.3356	0.4742	1.73	0
District 64	1	51.74	46.5	0.3007	0.5116	1.82	0
District 65	1	43.45	48.38	0.2333	0.3328	2.07	0
District 66	1	35.11	33.03	0.4044	0.5014	1.57	0
District 67	1	18.35	24.73	0.3768	0.3148	1.63	0
District 68	1	15.4	33.67	0.1708	0.217	2.42	0
District 69	1	13.87	26.28	0.2524	0.182	1.99	0
District 70	1	29.45	34.2	0.3164	0.4697	1.78	0
District 71	1	49.17	41.33	0.3618	0.4193	1.66	0
District 72	1	554.1	162.61	0.2633	0.428	1.95	0
District 73	1	232.9	88.84	0.3708	0.3171	1.64	0
District 74	1	371.32	118.44	0.3326	0.5082	1.73	0
District 75	1	675.99	143.24	0.414	0.5995	1.55	0
District 76	1	142.63	82.64	0.2625	0.3227	1.95	0
District 77	1	276.56	88.82	0.4405	0.5334	1.51	0
District 78	1	6.93	14.11	0.4375	0.4016	1.51	0
District 79	1	7.1	13.56	0.4855	0.3289	1.44	0
District 80	1	6.94	14.84	0.3958	0.58	1.59	0
District 81	1	384.56	147.34	0.2226	0.4889	2.12	0
District 82	1	16.14	21.7	0.4304	0.4332	1.52	0
District 83	1	20.05	30.25	0.2753	0.3793	1.91	0
District 84	1	1273.41	274.86	0.2118	0.2473	2.17	0
District 85	1	8.52	13.4	0.5968	0.3988	1.29	0
District 86	1	352.39	158.23	0.1769	0.3178	2.38	0
District 87	1	1704.32	325.17	0.2026	0.283	2.22	0
District 88	1	52.83	44.34	0.3377	0.4077	1.72	0
District 89	1	60.49	41.67	0.4378	0.4351	1.51	0
District 90	1	58.08	53.56	0.2544	0.3635	1.98	0
District 91	1	5.35	15.3	0.2872	0.2643	1.87	0
District 92	1	55.96	48.26	0.3019	0.3612	1.82	0
District 93	1	6.53	14.29	0.4017	0.4962	1.58	0
District 94	1	9.84	24.05	0.2138	0.2244	2.16	0
District 95	1	257.97	116.74	0.2379	0.4624	2.05	0
District 96	1	113.22	77.88	0.2346	0.2519	2.06	0
District 97	1	10.05	19.02	0.3488	0.4594	1.69	0
District 98	1	6.87	10.79	0.7413	0.5137	1.16	0
District 99	1	16.27	21.96	0.4239	0.2892	1.54	0
District 100	1	2394.54	239.88	0.5229	0.4374	1.38	0
District 101	1	23.62	29.91	0.3318	0.4457	1.74	0
District 102	1	8.8	18.01	0.3412	0.3282	1.71	0
District 103	1	34.46	33.36	0.3891	0.407	1.6	0
District 104	1	301.65	98.83	0.3881	0.3768	1.61	0
District 105	1	29.8	32.65	0.3513	0.4735	1.69	0

Compactness Report

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

District	Part	Area (sq miles)	Perimeter	Normalized Area	Reock	Schwartzberg	Holes
----------	------	-----------------	-----------	-----------------	-------	--------------	-------

Plan Statistics

Districts:	# of Members	Actual Population	Ideal Population	Absolute Deviation	Relative Deviation
District 1	1	44,511	44,359	152	0.343%
District 2	1	42,848	44,359	-1,511	-3.406%
District 3	1	42,396	44,359	-1,963	-4.425%
District 4	1	44,082	44,359	-277	-0.624%
District 5	1	42,239	44,359	-2,120	-4.779%
District 6	1	42,590	44,359	-1,769	-3.988%
District 7	1	44,608	44,359	249	0.561%
District 8	1	42,714	44,359	-1,645	-3.708%
District 9	1	43,793	44,359	-566	-1.276%
District 10	1	43,686	44,359	-673	-1.517%
District 11	1	42,361	44,359	-1,998	-4.504%
District 12	1	46,485	44,359	2,126	4.793%
District 13	1	42,551	44,359	-1,808	-4.076%
District 14	1	46,474	44,359	2,115	4.768%
District 15	1	45,909	44,359	1,550	3.494%
District 16	1	42,314	44,359	-2,045	-4.610%
District 17	1	43,007	44,359	-1,352	-3.048%
District 18	1	43,108	44,359	-1,251	-2.820%
District 19	1	43,609	44,359	-750	-1.691%
District 20	1	42,483	44,359	-1,876	-4.229%
District 21	1	42,536	44,359	-1,823	-4.110%
District 22	1	43,710	44,359	-649	-1.463%
District 23	1	42,298	44,359	-2,061	-4.646%
District 24	1	44,024	44,359	-335	-0.755%
District 25	1	42,586	44,359	-1,773	-3.997%
District 26	1	45,775	44,359	1,416	3.192%
District 27	1	43,673	44,359	-686	-1.546%
District 28	1	43,737	44,359	-622	-1.402%
District 29	1	42,423	44,359	-1,936	-4.364%
District 30	1	44,717	44,359	358	0.807%
District 31	1	43,472	44,359	-887	-2.000%
District 32	1	44,187	44,359	-172	-0.388%
District 33	1	44,513	44,359	154	0.347%
District 34	1	42,451	44,359	-1,908	-4.301%
District 35	1	43,964	44,359	-395	-0.890%
District 36	1	42,475	44,359	-1,884	-4.247%
District 37	1	46,027	44,359	1,668	3.760%
District 38	1	46,422	44,359	2,063	4.651%
District 39	1	42,805	44,359	-1,554	-3.503%
District 40	1	45,170	44,359	811	1.828%
District 41	1	44,862	44,359	503	1.134%
District 42	1	43,826	44,359	-533	-1.202%
District 43	1	44,253	44,359	-106	-0.239%
District 44	1	42,602	44,359	-1,757	-3.961%
District 45	1	44,264	44,359	-95	-0.214%
District 46	1	43,661	44,359	-698	-1.574%
District 47	1	45,524	44,359	1,165	2.626%
District 48	1	46,449	44,359	2,090	4.712%
District 49	1	45,983	44,359	1,624	3.661%
District 50	1	46,217	44,359	1,858	4.189%
District 51	1	45,893	44,359	1,534	3.458%
District 52	1	45,840	44,359	1,481	3.339%
District 53	1	45,838	44,359	1,479	3.334%
District 54	1	46,458	44,359	2,099	4.732%
District 55	1	46,138	44,359	1,779	4.010%
District 56	1	46,311	44,359	1,952	4.400%
District 57	1	42,477	44,359	-1,882	-4.243%

Plan Statistics

Districts:	# of Members	Actual Population	Ideal Population	Absolute Deviation	Relative Deviation
District 58	1	42,365	44,359	-1,994	-4.495%
District 59	1	44,221	44,359	-138	-0.311%
District 60	1	42,309	44,359	-2,050	-4.621%
District 61	1	42,448	44,359	-1,911	-4.308%
District 62	1	46,378	44,359	2,019	4.552%
District 63	1	42,378	44,359	-1,981	-4.466%
District 64	1	43,770	44,359	-589	-1.328%
District 65	1	42,236	44,359	-2,123	-4.786%
District 66	1	45,492	44,359	1,133	2.554%
District 67	1	43,956	44,359	-403	-0.908%
District 68	1	42,831	44,359	-1,528	-3.445%
District 69	1	44,483	44,359	124	0.280%
District 70	1	42,410	44,359	-1,949	-4.394%
District 71	1	46,188	44,359	1,829	4.123%
District 72	1	43,876	44,359	-483	-1.089%
District 73	1	44,244	44,359	-115	-0.259%
District 74	1	46,403	44,359	2,044	4.608%
District 75	1	45,463	44,359	1,104	2.489%
District 76	1	46,572	44,359	2,213	4.989%
District 77	1	46,183	44,359	1,824	4.112%
District 78	1	46,459	44,359	2,100	4.734%
District 79	1	46,318	44,359	1,959	4.416%
District 80	1	46,461	44,359	2,102	4.739%
District 81	1	43,027	44,359	-1,332	-3.003%
District 82	1	46,432	44,359	2,073	4.673%
District 83	1	45,396	44,359	1,037	2.338%
District 84	1	44,289	44,359	-70	-0.158%
District 85	1	45,637	44,359	1,278	2.881%
District 86	1	46,408	44,359	2,049	4.619%
District 87	1	46,269	44,359	1,910	4.306%
District 88	1	43,884	44,359	-475	-1.071%
District 89	1	46,159	44,359	1,800	4.058%
District 90	1	42,520	44,359	-1,839	-4.146%
District 91	1	44,209	44,359	-150	-0.338%
District 92	1	45,511	44,359	1,152	2.597%
District 93	1	44,889	44,359	530	1.195%
District 94	1	46,136	44,359	1,777	4.006%
District 95	1	45,041	44,359	682	1.537%
District 96	1	44,603	44,359	244	0.550%
District 97	1	44,517	44,359	158	0.356%
District 98	1	46,487	44,359	2,128	4.797%
District 99	1	42,224	44,359	-2,135	-4.813%
District 100	1	46,349	44,359	1,990	4.486%
District 101	1	42,517	44,359	-1,842	-4.152%
District 102	1	42,951	44,359	-1,408	-3.174%
District 103	1	44,701	44,359	342	0.771%
District 104	1	46,282	44,359	1,923	4.335%
District 105	1	42,546	44,359	-1,813	-4.087%

Plan Statistics

<u>Districts:</u>	<u># of Members</u>	<u>Actual Population</u>	<u>Ideal Population</u>	<u>Absolute Deviation</u>	<u>Relative Deviation</u>
Grand Total:	105	4,657,757	4,657,695		
Ideal Population Per Member:		44359			
Number of Districts for Plan Type:	105				
Range of District Populations:	42,224	to	46,572		
Absolute Mean Deviation:	41				
Absolute Range:	-2,135	to	2,213		
Absolute Overall Range:	4,348				
Relative Mean Deviation:	2.99%				
Relative Range:	-4.81%	to	4.99%		
Relative Overall Range:	9.80%				

Ideal - Actual:	-62
Remainder:	62
Unassigned Population:	0

District Population

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 1																
Caddo	44,511	17,272	25,160	213	1,015	1,155	33,695	13,851	18,428	150	659	723	27,415	10,927	15,618	870
District 1	44,511	17,272	25,160	213	1,015	1,155	33,695	13,851	18,428	150	659	723	27,415	10,927	15,618	870
	100.000%	38.804%	56.525%	0.479%	2.280%	2.595%	100.000%	41.107%	54.691%	0.445%	1.956%	2.146%	81.362%	39.858%	56.969%	3.173%
District 2																
Caddo	42,848	11,109	29,239	582	1,430	1,773	33,027	9,589	21,572	470	991	1,241	27,337	7,624	18,407	1,306
District 2	42,848	11,109	29,239	582	1,430	1,773	33,027	9,589	21,572	470	991	1,241	27,337	7,624	18,407	1,306
	100.000%	25.927%	68.239%	1.358%	3.337%	4.138%	100.000%	29.034%	65.316%	1.423%	3.001%	3.758%	82.772%	27.889%	67.334%	4.777%
District 3																
Caddo	42,396	10,601	29,980	387	985	1,271	31,126	8,917	20,892	290	686	837	25,348	7,356	17,047	945
District 3	42,396	10,601	29,980	387	985	1,271	31,126	8,917	20,892	290	686	837	25,348	7,356	17,047	945
	100.000%	25.005%	70.714%	0.913%	2.323%	2.998%	100.000%	28.648%	67.121%	0.932%	2.204%	2.689%	81.437%	29.020%	67.252%	3.728%
District 4																
Caddo	44,082	17,493	23,924	340	1,620	1,669	33,919	14,537	17,479	263	1,103	1,074	27,803	12,548	14,078	1,177
District 4	44,082	17,493	23,924	340	1,620	1,669	33,919	14,537	17,479	263	1,103	1,074	27,803	12,548	14,078	1,177
	100.000%	39.683%	54.272%	0.771%	3.675%	3.786%	100.000%	42.858%	51.532%	0.775%	3.252%	3.166%	81.969%	45.132%	50.635%	4.233%
District 5																
Bossier	42,239	31,455	7,036	740	1,820	2,131	31,184	23,448	5,222	459	1,170	1,308	24,667	19,976	3,662	1,029
District 5	42,239	31,455	7,036	740	1,820	2,131	31,184	23,448	5,222	459	1,170	1,308	24,667	19,976	3,662	1,029
	100.000%	74.469%	16.658%	1.752%	4.309%	5.045%	100.000%	75.192%	16.746%	1.472%	3.752%	4.194%	79.101%	80.983%	14.846%	4.172%
District 6																
Caddo	42,590	31,225	7,045	1,972	1,503	1,806	34,112	25,775	5,091	1,433	1,141	1,289	28,570	23,119	3,582	1,869
District 6	42,590	31,225	7,045	1,972	1,503	1,806	34,112	25,775	5,091	1,433	1,141	1,289	28,570	23,119	3,582	1,869
	100.000%	73.315%	16.541%	4.630%	3.529%	4.240%	100.000%	75.560%	14.924%	4.201%	3.345%	3.779%	83.754%	80.921%	12.538%	6.542%
District 7																
Caddo	21,421	15,757	3,956	540	660	707	16,528	12,390	2,897	402	443	454	14,823	11,539	2,517	767
De Soto	13,801	10,834	2,009	52	445	441	10,372	8,247	1,472	36	268	272	9,734	8,013	1,407	314
Sabine	9,386	5,665	1,361	39	198	391	7,153	4,560	871	25	141	286	6,380	4,604	807	969
District 7	44,608	32,256	7,326	631	1,303	1,539	34,053	25,197	5,240	463	852	1,012	30,937	24,156	4,731	2,050
	100.000%	72.310%	16.423%	1.415%	2.921%	3.450%	100.000%	73.993%	15.388%	1.360%	2.502%	2.972%	90.850%	78.081%	15.292%	6.626%
District 8																
Bossier	42,714	21,724	15,351	1,409	3,435	4,230	31,516	17,471	10,110	997	2,330	2,807	21,772	13,963	6,320	1,489
District 8	42,714	21,724	15,351	1,409	3,435	4,230	31,516	17,471	10,110	997	2,330	2,807	21,772	13,963	6,320	1,489
	100.000%	50.859%	35.939%	3.299%	8.042%	9.903%	100.000%	55.435%	32.079%	3.163%	7.393%	8.907%	69.082%	64.133%	29.028%	6.839%
District 9																
Bossier	43,793	27,873	10,164	1,343	3,123	3,876	33,176	22,012	7,108	992	2,080	2,504	23,304	16,922	4,856	1,526
District 9	43,793	27,873	10,164	1,343	3,123	3,876	33,176	22,012	7,108	992	2,080	2,504	23,304	16,922	4,856	1,526
	100.000%	63.647%	23.209%	3.067%	7.131%	8.851%	100.000%	66.349%	21.425%	2.990%	6.270%	7.548%	70.244%	72.614%	20.838%	6.548%

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 2 of 14

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 10																
Claiborne	6,719	3,860	2,536	38	185	360	5,661	3,390	2,011	22	165	323	3,397	2,025	1,323	49
Webster	36,967	22,735	12,679	208	658	688	28,753	18,144	9,464	154	433	434	22,737	14,938	7,339	460
District 10	43,686	26,595	15,215	246	843	1,048	34,414	21,534	11,475	176	598	757	26,134	16,963	8,662	509
	100.000%	60.878%	34.828%	0.563%	1.930%	2.399%	100.000%	62.573%	33.344%	0.511%	1.738%	2.200%	75.940%	64.908%	33.145%	1.948%
District 11																
Bienville	3,522	845	2,590	7	58	83	2,819	733	2,027	4	34	58	2,614	658	1,933	23
Claiborne	7,451	3,403	3,824	50	89	119	5,846	2,868	2,813	33	65	80	5,201	2,607	2,497	97
Lincoln	31,388	12,191	17,478	631	742	998	25,519	10,526	13,654	542	512	715	14,515	5,870	8,007	638
District 11	42,361	16,439	23,892	688	889	1,200	34,184	14,127	18,494	579	611	853	22,330	9,135	12,437	758
	100.000%	38.807%	56.401%	1.624%	2.099%	2.833%	100.000%	41.326%	54.101%	1.694%	1.787%	2.495%	65.323%	40.909%	55.696%	3.395%
District 12																
Lincoln	17,008	13,843	1,886	261	702	756	13,136	10,780	1,465	202	448	472	11,134	9,802	1,009	323
Morehouse	4,852	4,055	542	44	85	92	3,834	3,226	423	33	67	65	3,504	3,017	423	64
Union	21,107	14,460	5,224	62	1,023	1,135	16,632	11,807	3,861	39	671	709	15,221	11,066	3,692	463
West Carroll	3,518	3,097	263	7	71	105	2,754	2,445	196	6	46	62	2,526	2,331	174	21
District 12	46,485	35,455	7,915	374	1,881	2,088	36,356	28,258	5,945	280	1,232	1,308	32,385	26,216	5,298	871
	100.000%	76.272%	17.027%	0.805%	4.046%	4.492%	100.000%	77.726%	16.352%	0.770%	3.389%	3.598%	89.077%	80.951%	16.359%	2.690%
District 13																
Bienville	9,459	6,105	3,010	50	109	128	7,254	4,753	2,257	26	77	83	6,233	4,185	1,984	64
Grant	9,668	7,395	1,823	42	173	169	7,469	5,827	1,327	28	114	92	6,431	5,148	1,127	156
Natchitoches	5,014	4,009	698	25	126	124	3,982	3,258	507	19	73	72	3,374	2,866	407	101
Red River	4,655	3,520	922	12	67	108	3,565	2,801	624	2	51	63	3,267	2,638	575	54
Winn	13,755	8,594	3,727	210	961	1,023	10,906	6,932	2,695	170	902	941	8,406	5,988	2,292	126
District 13	42,551	29,623	10,180	339	1,436	1,552	33,176	23,571	7,410	245	1,217	1,251	27,711	20,825	6,385	501
	100.000%	69.618%	23.924%	0.797%	3.375%	3.647%	100.000%	71.048%	22.335%	0.738%	3.668%	3.771%	83.527%	75.151%	23.041%	1.808%
District 14																
Morehouse	2,305	1,749	465	11	14	21	1,891	1,434	387	5	8	10	1,647	1,224	395	28
Ouachita	44,169	34,909	6,339	785	1,307	1,375	33,322	26,989	4,209	548	920	899	29,099	25,003	3,042	1,054
District 14	46,474	36,658	6,804	796	1,321	1,396	35,213	28,423	4,596	553	928	909	30,746	26,227	3,437	1,082
	100.000%	78.879%	14.640%	1.713%	2.842%	3.004%	100.000%	80.717%	13.052%	1.570%	2.635%	2.581%	87.314%	85.302%	11.179%	3.519%
District 15																
Jackson	15,031	9,967	4,166	175	468	468	11,783	7,967	3,125	140	377	372	9,449	6,647	2,610	192
Ouachita	30,878	26,097	2,533	512	949	930	23,318	19,953	1,763	354	656	604	20,109	18,116	1,342	651
District 15	45,909	36,064	6,699	687	1,417	1,398	35,101	27,920	4,888	494	1,033	976	29,558	24,763	3,952	843
	100.000%	78.555%	14.592%	1.496%	3.087%	3.045%	100.000%	79.542%	13.926%	1.407%	2.943%	2.781%	84.208%	83.778%	13.370%	2.852%
District 16																

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 3 of 14

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 16																
Ouachita	42,314	12,940	27,059	1,096	812	998	32,063	11,167	19,160	869	558	678	25,735	8,508	16,152	1,075
District 16	42,314	12,940	27,059	1,096	812	998	32,063	11,167	19,160	869	558	678	25,735	8,508	16,152	1,075
	100.000%	30.581%	63.948%	2.590%	1.919%	2.359%	100.000%	34.828%	59.757%	2.710%	1.740%	2.115%	80.264%	33.060%	62.763%	4.177%
District 17																
Ouachita	43,007	14,599	25,286	395	2,089	2,355	31,497	11,865	17,158	347	1,625	1,765	24,809	8,888	15,122	799
District 17	43,007	14,599	25,286	395	2,089	2,355	31,497	11,865	17,158	347	1,625	1,765	24,809	8,888	15,122	799
	100.000%	33.946%	58.795%	0.918%	4.857%	5.476%	100.000%	37.670%	54.475%	1.102%	5.159%	5.604%	78.766%	35.826%	60.954%	3.221%
District 18																
Iberville	7,040	5,021	1,769	21	133	179	5,718	4,123	1,398	16	102	136	5,369	3,770	1,504	95
Pointe Coupee	20,758	12,395	7,504	107	593	625	16,250	10,108	5,502	91	430	429	14,675	9,320	5,121	234
West Feliciana	15,310	10,883	3,740	89	373	651	12,783	9,283	2,951	56	319	572	7,407	5,092	2,180	135
District 18	43,108	28,299	13,013	217	1,099	1,455	34,751	23,514	9,851	163	851	1,137	27,451	18,182	8,805	464
	100.000%	65.647%	30.187%	0.503%	2.549%	3.375%	100.000%	67.664%	28.347%	0.469%	2.449%	3.272%	78.993%	66.234%	32.075%	1.690%
District 19																
Franklin	19,774	12,492	6,802	70	205	276	15,028	9,901	4,779	44	151	183	13,159	9,015	4,034	110
Madison	2,377	1,861	446	3	44	63	1,961	1,531	376	2	34	50	1,664	1,392	240	32
Richland	17,311	10,748	5,968	75	277	351	13,307	8,494	4,350	63	209	266	11,564	7,712	3,643	209
Tensas	4,147	1,744	2,312	23	42	67	3,235	1,446	1,728	12	26	46	3,455	1,503	1,917	35
District 19	43,609	26,845	15,528	171	568	757	33,531	21,372	11,233	121	420	545	29,842	19,622	9,834	386
	100.000%	61.558%	35.607%	0.392%	1.302%	1.736%	100.000%	63.738%	33.500%	0.361%	1.253%	1.625%	88.998%	65.753%	32.954%	1.293%
District 20																
Caldwell	9,645	7,646	1,632	51	166	221	7,478	5,969	1,224	46	123	163	6,031	5,124	818	89
Catahoula	8,906	5,776	2,395	46	570	614	6,951	4,557	1,736	33	538	558	6,467	4,639	1,770	58
Concordia	18,687	10,275	7,725	122	332	459	14,217	8,108	5,613	100	229	310	11,964	7,222	4,540	202
La Salle	5,245	4,450	193	154	307	326	4,086	3,384	156	152	290	293	3,231	3,112	47	72
District 20	42,483	28,147	11,945	373	1,375	1,620	32,732	22,018	8,729	331	1,180	1,324	27,693	20,097	7,175	421
	100.000%	66.255%	28.117%	0.878%	3.237%	3.813%	100.000%	67.268%	26.668%	1.011%	3.605%	4.045%	84.605%	72.571%	25.909%	1.520%
District 21																
East Carroll	7,459	2,054	5,272	29	61	115	5,901	1,773	4,043	19	39	80	4,709	1,306	3,359	44
Madison	7,640	1,614	5,917	17	56	141	5,474	1,375	4,015	7	47	99	5,614	1,102	4,434	78
Morehouse	18,472	6,477	11,477	105	235	268	14,337	5,435	8,490	79	196	217	11,771	4,264	7,313	194
Richland	2,732	1,037	1,635	8	37	49	2,076	844	1,196	3	21	27	2,098	758	1,318	22
West Carroll	6,233	4,797	1,162	20	154	220	4,778	3,778	814	14	97	130	4,512	3,582	866	64
District 21	42,536	15,979	25,463	179	543	793	32,566	13,205	18,558	122	400	553	28,704	11,012	17,290	402
	100.000%	37.566%	59.862%	0.421%	1.277%	1.864%	100.000%	40.548%	56.986%	0.375%	1.228%	1.698%	88.141%	38.364%	60.236%	1.401%

District 22

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 4 of 14

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 22																
Grant	12,501	10,314	1,512	91	175	1,164	10,058	8,137	1,390	69	128	1,087	6,257	6,026	49	182
La Salle	9,546	6,898	1,229	129	1,059	1,076	7,477	5,252	909	112	1,037	1,032	5,561	4,866	590	105
Rapides	21,663	17,928	1,957	402	687	727	16,467	13,786	1,368	304	477	502	13,325	11,946	890	489
District 22	43,710	35,140	4,698	622	1,921	2,967	34,002	27,175	3,667	485	1,642	2,621	25,143	22,838	1,529	776
	100.000%	80.394%	10.748%	1.423%	4.395%	6.788%	100.000%	79.922%	10.785%	1.426%	4.829%	7.708%	73.946%	90.832%	6.081%	3.086%
District 23																
De Soto	13,011	4,450	7,964	65	253	321	10,068	3,662	5,953	50	195	223	8,979	3,317	5,403	259
Natchitoches	26,322	11,010	13,705	198	911	1,176	20,579	9,361	9,915	156	743	945	15,508	6,924	7,889	695
Red River	2,965	675	2,184	13	56	80	2,149	537	1,540	1	42	50	2,364	492	1,843	29
District 23	42,298	16,135	23,853	276	1,220	1,577	32,796	13,560	17,408	207	980	1,218	26,851	10,733	15,135	983
	100.000%	38.146%	56.393%	0.653%	2.884%	3.728%	100.000%	41.347%	53.080%	0.631%	2.988%	3.714%	81.873%	39.972%	56.367%	3.661%
District 24																
Natchitoches	6,179	4,342	1,322	32	276	190	4,788	3,391	993	23	227	123	4,225	3,060	928	237
Sabine	12,769	9,371	2,500	55	243	319	9,911	7,494	1,784	41	178	216	8,167	6,419	1,377	371
Vernon	25,076	18,428	3,990	651	1,119	1,424	18,758	14,118	2,713	469	783	898	15,238	12,025	2,126	1,087
District 24	44,024	32,141	7,812	738	1,638	1,933	33,457	25,003	5,490	533	1,188	1,237	27,630	21,504	4,431	1,695
	100.000%	73.008%	17.745%	1.676%	3.721%	4.391%	100.000%	74.732%	16.409%	1.593%	3.551%	3.697%	82.584%	77.828%	16.037%	6.135%
District 25																
Rapides	42,586	29,931	9,127	975	1,411	1,635	32,670	23,824	6,207	699	1,071	1,143	26,719	20,861	4,568	1,285
District 25	42,586	29,931	9,127	975	1,411	1,635	32,670	23,824	6,207	699	1,071	1,143	26,719	20,861	4,568	1,285
	100.000%	70.284%	21.432%	2.289%	3.313%	3.839%	100.000%	72.923%	18.999%	2.140%	3.278%	3.499%	81.785%	78.076%	17.096%	4.809%
District 26																
Rapides	45,775	14,909	28,497	785	1,017	1,271	34,568	12,354	20,470	605	715	881	27,297	9,668	16,433	1,196
District 26	45,775	14,909	28,497	785	1,017	1,271	34,568	12,354	20,470	605	715	881	27,297	9,668	16,433	1,196
	100.000%	32.570%	62.255%	1.715%	2.222%	2.777%	100.000%	35.738%	59.217%	1.750%	2.068%	2.549%	78.966%	35.418%	60.201%	4.381%
District 27																
Rapides	19,999	14,742	3,011	266	1,276	1,457	15,087	11,409	2,160	178	831	916	12,835	10,357	1,884	599
Vernon	23,674	16,659	3,621	791	1,891	2,751	17,503	12,647	2,420	605	1,346	1,842	8,822	7,157	885	780
District 27	43,673	31,401	6,632	1,057	3,167	4,208	32,590	24,056	4,580	783	2,177	2,758	21,657	17,514	2,769	1,379
	100.000%	71.900%	15.186%	2.420%	7.252%	9.635%	100.000%	73.814%	14.053%	2.403%	6.680%	8.463%	66.453%	80.870%	12.786%	6.367%
District 28																
Avoyelles	39,693	25,625	11,678	434	1,189	1,485	30,578	20,269	8,311	379	1,049	1,257	23,426	16,534	6,294	598
St. Landry	4,044	2,827	1,089	19	62	78	3,107	2,212	805	15	44	51	3,256	2,116	1,076	57
District 28	43,737	28,452	12,767	453	1,251	1,563	33,685	22,481	9,116	394	1,093	1,308	26,682	18,650	7,370	655
	100.000%	65.052%	29.190%	1.036%	2.860%	3.574%	100.000%	66.739%	27.062%	1.170%	3.245%	3.883%	79.210%	69.897%	27.622%	2.455%
District 29																

District Population

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 29																
East Baton Rouge	15,224	1,091	13,865	56	181	257	11,915	941	10,744	41	165	212	9,833	611	8,965	257
West Baton Rouge	27,199	14,307	11,170	287	1,109	1,244	20,526	11,146	8,149	209	803	871	17,141	9,937	6,865	339
District 29	42,423	15,398	25,035	343	1,290	1,501	32,441	12,087	18,893	250	968	1,083	26,974	10,548	15,830	596
	100.000%	36.296%	59.013%	0.809%	3.041%	3.538%	100.000%	37.258%	58.238%	0.771%	2.984%	3.338%	83.148%	39.104%	58.686%	2.210%
District 30																
Beauregard	15,112	11,832	2,161	206	444	709	11,572	9,134	1,624	140	316	463	8,850	7,423	884	543
Calcasieu	29,605	25,302	2,293	186	1,165	1,530	22,134	19,245	1,498	131	775	1,021	16,911	15,353	972	586
District 30	44,717	37,134	4,454	392	1,609	2,239	33,706	28,379	3,122	271	1,091	1,484	25,761	22,776	1,856	1,129
	100.000%	83.042%	9.960%	0.877%	3.598%	5.007%	100.000%	84.196%	9.262%	0.804%	3.237%	4.403%	76.429%	88.413%	7.205%	4.383%
District 31																
Lafayette	43,472	32,009	5,779	2,197	2,856	3,269	33,813	25,685	3,974	1,637	2,014	2,298	28,767	24,150	2,626	1,991
District 31	43,472	32,009	5,779	2,197	2,856	3,269	33,813	25,685	3,974	1,637	2,014	2,298	28,767	24,150	2,626	1,991
	100.000%	73.631%	13.294%	5.054%	6.570%	7.520%	100.000%	75.962%	11.753%	4.841%	5.956%	6.796%	85.077%	83.950%	9.129%	6.921%
District 32																
Allen	22,750	16,327	4,490	246	740	1,893	17,510	12,751	3,275	182	656	1,755	12,201	9,478	2,217	506
Beauregard	21,437	17,697	2,488	196	473	562	15,917	13,170	1,871	129	332	365	13,444	11,348	1,485	611
District 32	44,187	34,024	6,978	442	1,213	2,455	33,427	25,921	5,146	311	988	2,120	25,645	20,826	3,702	1,117
	100.000%	77.000%	15.792%	1.000%	2.745%	5.556%	100.000%	77.545%	15.395%	0.930%	2.956%	6.342%	76.719%	81.209%	14.436%	4.356%
District 33																
Calcasieu	44,513	33,794	5,595	1,995	2,400	2,895	33,880	26,491	3,712	1,439	1,675	1,958	25,042	21,563	2,121	1,358
District 33	44,513	33,794	5,595	1,995	2,400	2,895	33,880	26,491	3,712	1,439	1,675	1,958	25,042	21,563	2,121	1,358
	100.000%	75.919%	12.569%	4.482%	5.392%	6.504%	100.000%	78.191%	10.956%	4.247%	4.944%	5.779%	73.914%	86.107%	8.470%	5.423%
District 34																
Calcasieu	42,451	17,536	22,389	498	1,548	1,843	32,193	13,993	16,381	370	1,079	1,198	23,378	9,861	12,543	961
District 34	42,451	17,536	22,389	498	1,548	1,843	32,193	13,993	16,381	370	1,079	1,198	23,378	9,861	12,543	961
	100.000%	41.309%	52.741%	1.173%	3.647%	4.341%	100.000%	43.466%	50.884%	1.149%	3.352%	3.721%	72.618%	42.181%	53.653%	4.111%
District 35																
Calcasieu	43,964	36,561	4,170	615	1,725	2,067	32,617	27,648	2,797	398	1,167	1,334	26,162	23,150	2,008	1,004
District 35	43,964	36,561	4,170	615	1,725	2,067	32,617	27,648	2,797	398	1,167	1,334	26,162	23,150	2,008	1,004
	100.000%	83.161%	9.485%	1.399%	3.924%	4.702%	100.000%	84.766%	8.575%	1.220%	3.578%	4.090%	80.210%	88.487%	7.675%	3.838%
District 36																
Calcasieu	42,475	15,643	22,973	1,237	2,101	2,519	32,201	13,187	16,190	916	1,513	1,732	20,782	8,771	10,871	1,148
District 36	42,475	15,643	22,973	1,237	2,101	2,519	32,201	13,187	16,190	916	1,513	1,732	20,782	8,771	10,871	1,148
	100.000%	36.829%	54.086%	2.912%	4.946%	5.931%	100.000%	40.952%	50.278%	2.845%	4.699%	5.379%	64.538%	42.205%	52.310%	5.524%
District 37																
Calcasieu	13,777	10,936	1,966	171	450	530	10,141	8,225	1,320	105	307	327	8,236	6,961	998	282

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 6 of 14

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 37																
Jefferson Davis	32,250	25,066	5,837	183	692	734	24,039	19,121	4,006	111	476	489	20,013	16,350	3,202	461
District 37	46,027	36,002	7,803	354	1,142	1,264	34,180	27,346	5,326	216	783	816	28,249	23,311	4,200	743
	100.000%	78.219%	16.953%	0.769%	2.481%	2.746%	100.000%	80.006%	15.582%	0.632%	2.291%	2.387%	82.648%	82.520%	14.868%	2.630%
District 38																
Evangeline	32,350	21,354	9,235	241	1,240	1,336	24,408	16,460	6,483	187	1,061	1,111	20,553	14,566	5,643	344
St. Landry	14,072	10,767	2,928	58	222	237	10,581	8,269	2,080	38	141	166	9,008	7,173	1,653	189
District 38	46,422	32,121	12,163	299	1,462	1,573	34,989	24,729	8,563	225	1,202	1,277	29,561	21,739	7,296	533
	100.000%	69.193%	26.201%	0.644%	3.149%	3.388%	100.000%	70.676%	24.473%	0.643%	3.435%	3.650%	84.487%	73.539%	24.681%	1.803%
District 39																
Lafayette	42,805	24,487	13,498	843	3,378	3,955	32,129	19,746	9,075	623	2,241	2,598	25,555	16,928	7,175	1,452
District 39	42,805	24,487	13,498	843	3,378	3,955	32,129	19,746	9,075	623	2,241	2,598	25,555	16,928	7,175	1,452
	100.000%	57.206%	31.534%	1.969%	7.892%	9.240%	100.000%	61.458%	28.246%	1.939%	6.975%	8.086%	79.539%	66.241%	28.077%	5.682%
District 40																
St. Landry	45,170	17,676	25,982	274	946	1,002	33,861	14,195	18,582	202	670	661	30,948	13,147	16,976	825
District 40	45,170	17,676	25,982	274	946	1,002	33,861	14,195	18,582	202	670	661	30,948	13,147	16,976	825
	100.000%	39.132%	57.520%	0.607%	2.094%	2.218%	100.000%	41.921%	54.877%	0.597%	1.979%	1.952%	91.397%	42.481%	54.853%	2.666%
District 41																
Acadia	25,608	21,637	2,875	91	733	820	18,812	16,166	1,905	65	481	499	17,138	15,170	1,626	342
St. Landry	19,254	12,341	5,837	148	728	861	14,262	9,533	4,030	98	446	496	11,270	7,657	3,300	313
District 41	44,862	33,978	8,712	239	1,461	1,681	33,074	25,699	5,935	163	927	995	28,408	22,827	4,926	655
	100.000%	75.739%	19.420%	0.533%	3.257%	3.747%	100.000%	77.702%	17.945%	0.493%	2.803%	3.008%	85.892%	80.354%	17.340%	2.306%
District 42																
Acadia	31,968	22,843	7,989	147	688	821	24,131	17,905	5,478	108	435	527	20,540	15,385	4,781	374
Lafayette	11,858	9,090	1,827	116	640	749	8,671	6,838	1,228	69	404	457	7,235	5,977	988	270
District 42	43,826	31,933	9,816	263	1,328	1,570	32,802	24,743	6,706	177	839	984	27,775	21,362	5,769	644
	100.000%	72.863%	22.398%	0.600%	3.030%	3.582%	100.000%	75.431%	20.444%	0.540%	2.558%	3.000%	84.675%	76.911%	20.770%	2.319%
District 43																
Iberia	4,708	3,169	727	475	263	295	3,554	2,470	463	367	195	217	2,891	2,306	335	250
Lafayette	38,561	30,661	4,086	1,243	1,942	2,243	27,319	22,214	2,607	800	1,274	1,479	24,092	20,767	1,996	1,328
St. Martin	984	748	133	44	46	55	763	593	99	26	33	40	639	459	153	20
District 43	44,253	34,578	4,946	1,762	2,251	2,593	31,636	25,277	3,169	1,193	1,502	1,736	27,622	23,532	2,484	1,598
	100.000%	78.137%	11.177%	3.982%	5.087%	5.859%	100.000%	79.899%	10.017%	3.771%	4.748%	5.487%	87.312%	85.193%	8.993%	5.785%
District 44																
Lafayette	42,602	16,189	23,387	684	1,960	2,325	33,485	14,073	17,181	568	1,388	1,611	26,290	10,743	14,328	1,219
District 44	42,602	16,189	23,387	684	1,960	2,325	33,485	14,073	17,181	568	1,388	1,611	26,290	10,743	14,328	1,219
	100.000%	38.001%	54.896%	1.606%	4.601%	5.457%	100.000%	42.028%	51.310%	1.696%	4.145%	4.811%	78.513%	40.863%	54.500%	4.637%

District 45

District Population

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
Lafayette	44,264	33,461	6,823	1,221	2,163	2,613	34,737	27,066	4,753	872	1,555	1,879	29,738	24,774	3,363	1,602
District 45	44,264	33,461	6,823	1,221	2,163	2,613	34,737	27,066	4,753	872	1,555	1,879	29,738	24,774	3,363	1,602
	100.000%	75.594%	15.414%	2.758%	4.887%	5.903%	100.000%	77.917%	13.683%	2.510%	4.476%	5.409%	85.609%	83.308%	11.309%	5.387%
District 46																
Lafayette	7,792	5,211	1,960	84	425	506	5,768	4,046	1,310	51	287	301	5,003	3,796	1,007	200
St. Martin	35,869	25,276	8,791	383	1,037	1,183	27,177	19,880	6,026	265	723	804	24,375	18,064	5,715	592
District 46	43,661	30,487	10,751	467	1,462	1,689	32,945	23,926	7,336	316	1,010	1,105	29,378	21,860	6,722	792
	100.000%	69.827%	24.624%	1.070%	3.349%	3.868%	100.000%	72.624%	22.267%	0.959%	3.066%	3.354%	89.173%	74.409%	22.881%	2.696%
District 47																
Cameron	5,617	5,232	125	30	155	197	4,358	4,100	79	23	109	130	4,789	4,610	88	91
Vermilion	39,907	30,333	6,888	1,068	1,233	1,412	29,923	23,473	4,568	746	818	907	26,070	21,143	4,024	903
District 47	45,524	35,565	7,013	1,098	1,388	1,609	34,281	27,573	4,647	769	927	1,037	30,859	25,753	4,112	994
	100.000%	78.124%	15.405%	2.412%	3.049%	3.534%	100.000%	80.432%	13.556%	2.243%	2.704%	3.025%	90.018%	83.454%	13.325%	3.221%
District 48																
Iberia	33,731	21,197	10,245	587	1,305	1,633	25,687	16,842	7,231	387	927	1,110	22,896	15,718	6,428	750
St. Mary	12,718	4,792	6,760	139	372	453	9,774	3,963	5,060	80	260	303	8,792	3,538	4,817	437
District 48	46,449	25,989	17,005	726	1,677	2,086	35,461	20,805	12,291	467	1,187	1,413	31,688	19,256	11,245	1,187
	100.000%	55.952%	36.610%	1.563%	3.610%	4.491%	100.000%	58.670%	34.661%	1.317%	3.347%	3.985%	89.360%	60.767%	35.487%	3.746%
District 49																
Iberia	10,832	8,032	1,509	202	947	1,045	8,251	6,337	1,037	145	634	688	7,249	6,012	908	329
St. Mary	17,699	11,564	4,406	140	1,121	1,265	13,456	9,123	3,111	99	766	833	10,828	8,028	2,367	433
Vermilion	17,452	14,144	1,922	379	769	884	13,089	10,890	1,219	291	519	589	10,699	9,362	970	367
District 49	45,983	33,740	7,837	721	2,837	3,194	34,796	26,350	5,367	535	1,919	2,110	28,776	23,402	4,245	1,129
	100.000%	73.375%	17.043%	1.568%	6.170%	6.946%	100.000%	75.727%	15.424%	1.538%	5.515%	6.064%	82.699%	81.325%	14.752%	3.923%
District 50																
Assumption	8,376	7,536	240	48	410	458	6,696	6,165	134	34	263	306	5,512	5,333	73	106
Lafourche	12,981	7,778	4,326	150	445	571	9,785	6,284	2,890	120	307	407	7,116	4,898	1,980	238
St. Martin	1,368	1,285	13	7	29	44	1,154	1,091	11	5	17	31	993	979	1	13
St. Mary	18,989	10,593	4,825	556	2,468	2,806	14,291	8,508	3,349	414	1,615	1,818	10,590	7,146	2,707	737
Terrebonne	4,503	2,781	1,332	36	165	173	3,510	2,230	1,012	21	114	127	2,776	1,750	891	135
District 50	46,217	29,973	10,736	797	3,517	4,052	35,436	24,278	7,396	594	2,316	2,689	26,987	20,106	5,652	1,229
	100.000%	64.853%	23.230%	1.724%	7.610%	8.767%	100.000%	68.512%	20.871%	1.676%	6.536%	7.588%	76.157%	74.503%	20.943%	4.554%
District 51																
Lafourche	32,494	23,510	6,774	295	1,230	1,358	25,233	18,620	5,114	192	866	946	20,498	16,866	2,959	673
Terrebonne	13,399	7,718	4,330	135	628	717	10,032	6,114	3,010	92	410	458	7,132	4,561	2,201	370
District 51	45,893	31,228	11,104	430	1,858	2,075	35,265	24,734	8,124	284	1,276	1,404	27,630	21,427	5,160	1,043
	100.000%	68.045%	24.195%	0.937%	4.049%	4.521%	100.000%	70.138%	23.037%	0.805%	3.618%	3.981%	78.350%	77.550%	18.675%	3.775%

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 8 of 14

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 52																
Terrebonne	45,840	33,923	5,143	909	2,106	2,606	34,408	26,592	3,338	618	1,396	1,621	27,434	23,106	2,199	2,129
District 52	45,840	33,923	5,143	909	2,106	2,606	34,408	26,592	3,338	618	1,396	1,621	27,434	23,106	2,199	2,129
	100.000%	74.003%	11.219%	1.983%	4.594%	5.685%	100.000%	77.284%	9.701%	1.796%	4.057%	4.711%	79.731%	84.224%	8.016%	7.760%
District 53																
Terrebonne	45,838	25,512	12,342	663	3,220	3,862	34,555	20,695	8,436	508	2,169	2,495	24,378	15,978	6,275	2,125
District 53	45,838	25,512	12,342	663	3,220	3,862	34,555	20,695	8,436	508	2,169	2,495	24,378	15,978	6,275	2,125
	100.000%	55.657%	26.925%	1.446%	7.025%	8.425%	100.000%	59.890%	24.413%	1.470%	6.277%	7.220%	70.548%	65.543%	25.740%	8.717%
District 54																
Lafourche	46,458	36,458	3,509	552	2,859	3,471	35,263	28,760	2,209	411	1,867	2,196	27,141	23,979	1,529	1,633
District 54	46,458	36,458	3,509	552	2,859	3,471	35,263	28,760	2,209	411	1,867	2,196	27,141	23,979	1,529	1,633
	100.000%	78.475%	7.553%	1.188%	6.154%	7.471%	100.000%	81.559%	6.264%	1.166%	5.295%	6.227%	76.967%	88.350%	5.634%	6.017%
District 55																
Lafourche	5,624	3,964	1,246	28	209	272	4,338	3,174	864	15	149	194	3,523	2,724	696	103
St. Charles	40,514	25,918	11,261	597	2,036	2,570	30,566	20,190	8,058	368	1,433	1,699	27,080	18,631	7,198	1,251
District 55	46,138	29,882	12,507	625	2,245	2,842	34,904	23,364	8,922	383	1,582	1,893	30,603	21,355	7,894	1,354
	100.000%	64.767%	27.108%	1.355%	4.866%	6.160%	100.000%	66.938%	25.562%	1.097%	4.532%	5.423%	87.678%	69.781%	25.795%	4.424%
District 56																
Jefferson	34,276	16,502	6,216	2,224	8,733	10,890	26,673	13,544	4,524	1,678	6,482	7,885	19,683	11,638	3,255	4,790
St. Charles	12,035	7,632	2,667	240	1,273	1,571	8,975	5,964	1,832	161	868	1,038	7,905	5,678	1,599	628
District 56	46,311	24,134	8,883	2,464	10,006	12,461	35,648	19,508	6,356	1,839	7,350	8,923	27,588	17,316	4,854	5,418
	100.000%	52.113%	19.181%	5.321%	21.606%	26.907%	100.000%	54.724%	17.830%	5.159%	20.618%	25.031%	77.390%	62.766%	17.595%	19.639%
District 57																
St. John the Baptist	42,477	13,877	25,196	403	2,536	3,291	32,503	11,622	18,437	323	1,771	2,210	28,913	10,219	17,234	1,460
District 57	42,477	13,877	25,196	403	2,536	3,291	32,503	11,622	18,437	323	1,771	2,210	28,913	10,219	17,234	1,460
	100.000%	32.669%	59.317%	0.949%	5.970%	7.748%	100.000%	35.757%	56.724%	0.994%	5.449%	6.799%	88.955%	35.344%	59.606%	5.050%
District 58																
Ascension	9,510	2,962	6,235	43	219	285	7,098	2,386	4,490	33	147	204	6,555	2,391	4,005	159
Assumption	12,663	6,186	5,980	48	333	456	9,920	4,980	4,573	23	247	325	8,927	4,367	4,437	

District Population

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 60																
Ascension	19,108	6,113	10,801	186	1,723	2,180	14,006	5,019	7,498	143	1,151	1,433	11,478	4,242	6,594	642
Iberville	23,201	9,812	11,961	181	1,069	1,239	18,368	8,339	8,834	133	920	1,051	15,093	6,362	8,393	338
District 60	42,309	15,925	22,762	367	2,792	3,419	32,374	13,358	16,332	276	2,071	2,484	26,571	10,604	14,987	980
	100.000%	37.640%	53.799%	0.867%	6.599%	8.081%	100.000%	41.262%	50.448%	0.853%	6.397%	7.673%	82.075%	39.908%	56.404%	3.688%
District 61																
East Baton Rouge	42,448	10,783	26,630	1,797	2,910	3,300	32,238	9,299	19,265	1,361	2,048	2,275	24,636	7,580	15,310	1,748
District 61	42,448	10,783	26,630	1,797	2,910	3,300	32,238	9,299	19,265	1,361	2,048	2,275	24,636	7,580	15,310	1,748
	100.000%	25.403%	62.736%	4.233%	6.855%	7.774%	100.000%	28.845%	59.759%	4.222%	6.353%	7.057%	76.419%	30.768%	62.145%	7.095%
District 62																
East Baton Rouge	12,641	10,731	1,204	72	368	353	9,793	8,377	910	44	252	230	9,179	7,938	1,038	207
East Feliciana	19,539	11,516	7,341	91	329	391	16,183	9,740	5,918	61	266	317	13,600	7,959	5,186	455
Livingston	14,198	12,555	665	102	519	589	10,158	9,080	383	73	366	366	8,989	8,388	301	300
District 62	46,378	34,802	9,210	265	1,216	1,333	36,134	27,197	7,211	178	884	913	31,768	24,285	6,525	962
	100.000%	75.040%	19.859%	0.571%	2.622%	2.874%	100.000%	75.267%	19.956%	0.493%	2.446%	2.527%	87.917%	76.445%	20.540%	3.028%
District 63																
East Baton Rouge	42,378	15,474	24,862	448	1,167	1,286	31,266	12,041	17,737	298	869	931	27,510	11,146	15,441	919
District 63	42,378	15,474	24,862	448	1,167	1,286	31,266	12,041	17,737	298	869	931	27,510	11,146	15,441	919
	100.000%	36.514%	58.667%	1.057%	2.754%	3.035%	100.000%	38.511%	56.729%	0.953%	2.779%	2.978%	87.987%	40.516%	56.129%	3.341%
District 64																
Livingston	43,770	35,189	4,188	577	2,785	3,125	32,763	27,093	2,738	371	1,786	1,925	25,809	23,023	1,759	1,027
District 64	43,770	35,189	4,188	577	2,785	3,125	32,763	27,093	2,738	371	1,786	1,925	25,809	23,023	1,759	1,027
	100.000%	80.395%	9.568%	1.318%	6.363%	7.140%	100.000%	82.694%	8.357%	1.132%	5.451%	5.876%	78.775%	89.205%	6.815%	3.979%
District 65																
East Baton Rouge	42,236	14,922	25,134	319	1,480	1,644	31,519	11,684	18,389	219	927	1,018	28,641	11,070	16,714	856
District 65	42,236	14,922	25,134	319	1,480	1,644	31,519	11,684	18,389	219	927	1,018	28,641	11,070	16,714	856
	100.000%	35.330%	59.508%	0.755%	3.504%	3.892%	100.000%	37.070%	58.343%	0.695%	2.941%	3.230%	90.869%	38.651%	58.357%	2.989%
District 66																
East Baton Rouge	45,492	30,338	8,998	2,862	2,756	3,196	35,783	24,706	6,559	2,065	2,021	2,295	30,974	23,566	4,873	2,535
District 66	45,492	30,338	8,998	2,862	2,756	3,196	35,783	24,706	6,559	2,065	2,021	2,295	30,974	23,566	4,873	2,535
	100.000%	66.689%	19.779%	6.291%	6.058%	7.025%	100.000%	69.044%	18.330%	5.771%	5.648%	6.414%	86.561%	76.083%	15.733%	8.184%
District 67																
East Baton Rouge	43,956	14,919	25,680	1,716	1,346	2,013	37,287	14,341	19,939	1,583	1,163	1,735	20,195	4,499	14,580	1,116
District 67	43,956	14,919	25,680	1,716	1,346	2,013	37,287	14,341	19,939	1,583	1,163	1,735	20,195	4,499	14,580	1,116
	100.000%	33.941%	58.422%	3.904%	3.062%	4.580%	100.000%	38.461%	53.474%	4.245%	3.119%	4.653%	54.161%	22.278%	72.196%	5.526%
District 68																
East Baton Rouge	42,831	15,372	22,548	1,349	3,088	3,592	33,926	13,347	17,014	1,043	2,168	2,474	26,836	11,046	14,154	1,636

District Population

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 68	42,831	15,372	22,548	1,349	3,088	3,592	33,926	13,347	17,014	1,043	2,168	2,474	26,836	11,046	14,154	1,636
	100.000%	35.890%	52.644%	3.150%	7.210%	8.386%	100.000%	39.342%	50.150%	3.074%	6.390%	7.292%	79.102%	41.161%	52.743%	6.096%
District 69																
East Baton Rouge	44,483	13,651	26,597	967	2,848	3,268	33,850	11,555	19,273	704	2,001	2,257	25,228	10,027	13,907	1,294
District 69	44,483	13,651	26,597	967	2,848	3,268	33,850	11,555	19,273	704	2,001	2,257	25,228	10,027	13,907	1,294
	100.000%	30.688%	59.791%	2.174%	6.402%	7.347%	100.000%	34.136%	56.936%	2.080%	5.911%	6.668%	74.529%	39.746%	55.125%	5.129%
District 70																
East Baton Rouge	42,410	30,304	6,352	2,202	2,970	3,658	35,175	25,748	4,940	1,832	2,183	2,717	25,579	20,900	2,770	1,909
District 70	42,410	30,304	6,352	2,202	2,970	3,658	35,175	25,748	4,940	1,832	2,183	2,717	25,579	20,900	2,770	1,909
	100.000%	71.455%	14.978%	5.192%	7.003%	8.625%	100.000%	73.200%	14.044%	5.208%	6.206%	7.724%	72.719%	81.708%	10.829%	7.463%
District 71																
East Baton Rouge	40,165	26,815	8,429	2,184	2,214	2,506	31,342	21,883	5,890	1,519	1,634	1,808	27,337	21,092	4,329	1,916
Livingston	6,023	5,052	270	121	442	511	4,452	3,842	168	83	266	301	3,716	3,470	110	136
District 71	46,188	31,867	8,699	2,305	2,656	3,017	35,794	25,725	6,058	1,602	1,900	2,109	31,053	24,562	4,439	2,052
	100.000%	68.994%	18.834%	4.990%	5.750%	6.532%	100.000%	71.870%	16.925%	4.476%	5.308%	5.892%	86.755%	79.097%	14.295%	6.608%
District 72																
St. Helena	10,920	4,527	6,031	39	189	216	8,463	3,805	4,371	28	150	149	8,321	3,628	4,565	128
Tangipahoa	32,956	13,386	17,542	360	1,298	1,654	25,599	11,367	12,753	312	883	1,152	17,210	7,861	8,797	552
District 72	43,876	17,913	23,573	399	1,487	1,870	34,062	15,172	17,124	340	1,033	1,301	25,531	11,489	13,362	680
	100.000%	40.826%	53.726%	0.909%	3.389%	4.262%	100.000%	44.542%	50.273%	0.998%	3.033%	3.820%	74.954%	45.000%	52.336%	2.663%
District 73																
Tangipahoa	44,244	31,964	8,709	547	2,101	2,423	33,715	25,253	5,952	366	1,468	1,631	26,286	21,116	4,122	1,048
District 73	44,244	31,964	8,709	547	2,101	2,423	33,715	25,253	5,952	366	1,468	1,631	26,286	21,116	4,122	1,048
	100.000%	72.245%	19.684%	1.236%	4.749%	5.476%	100.000%	74.901%	17.654%	1.086%	4.354%	4.838%	77.965%	80.332%	15.681%	3.987%
District 74																
St. Tammany	46,403	37,716	3,435	733	3,380	3,855	36,121	30,041	2,314	532	2,404	2,653	32,284	28,713	1,761	1,810
District 74	46,403	37,716	3,435	733	3,380	3,855	36,121	30,041	2,314	532	2,404	2,653	32,284	28,713	1,761	1,810
	100.000%	81.279%	7.403%	1.580%	7.284%	8.308%	100.000%	83.168%	6.406%	1.473%	6.655%	7.345%	89.377%	88.939%	5.455%	5.606%
District 75																
Washington	45,463	29,943	13,434	216	1,134	1,410	34,951	23,743	9,732	154	761	901	27,587	18,835	8,102	650
District 75	45,463	29,943	13,434	216	1,134	1,410	34,951	23,743	9,732	154	761	901	27,587	18,835	8,102	650
	100.000%	65.862%	29.549%	0.475%	2.494%	3.101%	100.000%	67.932%	27.845%	0.441%	2.177%	2.578%	78.931%	68.275%	29.369%	2.356%
District 76																
St. Tammany	46,572	34,347	6,743	1,252	3,134	3,673	35,529	27,014	4,603	907	2,205	2,451	31,003	25,104	3,707	2,207
District 76	46,572	34,347	6,743	1,252	3,134	3,673	35,529	27,014	4,603	907	2,205	2,451	31,003	25,104	3,707	2,207
	100.000%	73.750%	14.479%	2.688%	6.729%	7.887%	100.000%	76.034%	12.956%	2.553%	6.206%	6.899%	87.261%	80.973%	11.957%	7.119%
District 77																
St. Tammany	36,634	28,951	3,982	505	2,461	2,827	28,501	23,033	2,843	359	1,743	2,019	25,296	21,790	2,150	1,356

District Population

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 77																
Tangipahoa	9,549	7,627	982	86	547	658	7,175	5,924	572	60	390	411	5,813	5,156	407	250
District 77	46,183	36,578	4,964	591	3,008	3,485	35,676	28,957	3,415	419	2,133	2,430	31,109	26,946	2,557	1,606
	100.000%	79.202%	10.749%	1.280%	6.513%	7.546%	100.000%	81.167%	9.572%	1.174%	5.979%	6.811%	87.199%	86.618%	8.219%	5.162%
District 78																
Jefferson	46,459	29,074	6,010	1,752	8,600	10,667	37,096	24,524	4,329	1,282	6,151	7,532	26,999	21,363	2,260	3,376
District 78	46,459	29,074	6,010	1,752	8,600	10,667	37,096	24,524	4,329	1,282	6,151	7,532	26,999	21,363	2,260	3,376
	100.000%	62.580%	12.936%	3.771%	18.511%	22.960%	100.000%	66.110%	11.670%	3.456%	16.581%	20.304%	72.781%	79.125%	8.371%	12.504%
District 79																
Jefferson	46,318	29,527	4,850	3,361	7,894	9,870	36,354	24,328	3,303	2,519	5,693	7,032	28,879	22,578	1,706	4,595
District 79	46,318	29,527	4,850	3,361	7,894	9,870	36,354	24,328	3,303	2,519	5,693	7,032	28,879	22,578	1,706	4,595
	100.000%	63.748%	10.471%	7.256%	17.043%	21.309%	100.000%	66.920%	9.086%	6.929%	15.660%	19.343%	79.438%	78.181%	5.907%	15.911%
District 80																
Jefferson	46,461	30,396	6,517	2,137	6,734	8,440	37,745	25,863	4,834	1,646	4,903	6,054	27,735	22,682	2,264	2,789
District 80	46,461	30,396	6,517	2,137	6,734	8,440	37,745	25,863	4,834	1,646	4,903	6,054	27,735	22,682	2,264	2,789
	100.000%	65.423%	14.027%	4.600%	14.494%	18.166%	100.000%	68.520%	12.807%	4.361%	12.990%	16.039%	73.480%	81.781%	8.163%	10.056%
District 81																
Ascension	9,777	7,944	993	95	568	696	7,424	6,161	695	58	390	447	6,810	5,914	622	274
Livingston	33,250	27,289	2,898	431	1,969	2,122	24,492	20,666	1,768	286	1,270	1,299	18,935	17,128	1,088	719
District 81	43,027	35,233	3,891	526	2,537	2,818	31,916	26,827	2,463	344	1,660	1,746	25,745	23,042	1,710	993
	100.000%	81.886%	9.043%	1.222%	5.896%	6.549%	100.000%	84.055%	7.717%	1.078%	5.201%	5.471%	80.665%	89.501%	6.642%	3.857%
District 82																
Jefferson	46,432	34,779	5,752	1,336	3,823	4,807	38,336	29,253	4,608	1,033	2,887	3,534	31,862	26,684	2,887	2,291
District 82	46,432	34,779	5,752	1,336	3,823	4,807	38,336	29,253	4,608	1,033	2,887	3,534	31,862	26,684	2,887	2,291
	100.000%	74.903%	12.388%	2.877%	8.234%	10.353%	100.000%	76.307%	12.020%	2.695%	7.531%	9.218%	83.112%	83.749%	9.061%	7.190%
District 83																
Jefferson	45,396	13,958	24,276	2,440	4,037	5,108	34,680	11,892	17,547	1,885	2,812	3,528	26,338	9,280	14,421	2,636
District 83	45,396	13,958	24,276	2,440	4,037	5,108	34,680	11,892	17,547	1,885	2,812	3,528	26,338	9,280	14,421	2,636
	100.000%	30.747%	53.476%	5.375%	8.893%	11.252%	100.000%	34.291%	50.597%	5.435%	8.108%	10.173%	75.946%	35.234%	54.754%	10.008%
District 84																
Jefferson	39,850	22,789	9,715	2,503	3,735	4,857	30,644	18,430	6,807	1,922	2,653	3,357	25,369	16,718	5,681	2,970
Plaquemines	4,439	2,404	951	565	337	348	3,339	1,905	637	433	232	228	2,763	1,795	599	369
District 84	44,289	25,193	10,666	3,068	4,072	5,205	33,983	20,335	7,444	2,355	2,885	3,585	28,132	18,513	6,280	3,339
	100.000%	56.883%	24.083%	6.927%	9.194%	11.752%	100.000%	59.839%	21.905%	6.930%	8.490%	10.549%	82.783%	65.808%	22.323%	11.869%
District 85																
Jefferson	45,637	16,031	17,821	2,168	8,581	10,799	34,535	13,414	12,993	1,702	5,648	7,137	23,005	11,046	8,426	3,534
District 85	45,637	16,031	17,821	2,168	8,581	10,799	34,535	13,414	12,993	1,702	5,648	7,137	23,005	11,046	8,426	3,534
	100.000%	35.127%	39.049%	4.751%	18.803%	23.663%	100.000%	38.842%	37.623%	4.928%	16.354%	20.666%	66.614%	48.016%	36.627%	15.362%

District Population

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 86																
Tangipahoa	46,408	28,359	14,646	481	2,068	2,507	35,002	22,661	9,940	362	1,401	1,646	26,947	18,779	7,199	969
District 86	46,408	28,359	14,646	481	2,068	2,507	35,002	22,661	9,940	362	1,401	1,646	26,947	18,779	7,199	969
	100.000%	61.108%	31.559%	1.036%	4.456%	5.402%	100.000%	64.742%	28.398%	1.034%	4.003%	4.703%	76.987%	69.689%	26.715%	3.596%
District 87																
Jefferson	36,332	9,170	20,602	3,388	2,852	3,544	27,544	7,210	15,271	2,676	2,133	2,547	22,228	5,250	13,361	3,617
Plaquemines	9,937	4,790	3,719	327	812	1,035	7,347	3,648	2,741	220	531	616	5,279	2,677	2,174	428
District 87	46,269	13,960	24,321	3,715	3,664	4,579	34,891	10,858	18,012	2,896	2,664	3,163	27,507	7,927	15,535	4,045
	100.000%	30.171%	52.564%	8.029%	7.919%	9.896%	100.000%	31.120%	51.624%	8.300%	7.635%	9.065%	78.837%	28.818%	56.477%	14.705%
District 88																
Ascension	43,884	33,925	5,752	596	2,840	3,271	31,775	25,333	3,720	372	1,813	2,022	27,580	23,492	2,793	1,295
District 88	43,884	33,925	5,752	596	2,840	3,271	31,775	25,333	3,720	372	1,813	2,022	27,580	23,492	2,793	1,295
	100.000%	77.306%	13.107%	1.358%	6.472%	7.454%	100.000%	79.726%	11.707%	1.171%	5.706%	6.363%	86.798%	85.178%	10.127%	4.695%
District 89																
St. Tammany	46,159	39,545	1,874	1,131	2,886	3,366	34,041	29,543	1,252	739	1,997	2,262	32,287	29,293	839	2,155
District 89	46,159	39,545	1,874	1,131	2,886	3,366	34,041	29,543	1,252	739	1,997	2,262	32,287	29,293	839	2,155
	100.000%	85.671%	4.060%	2.450%	6.252%	7.292%	100.000%	86.787%	3.678%	2.171%	5.866%	6.645%	94.847%	90.727%	2.599%	6.675%
District 90																
St. Tammany	42,520	20,216	17,680	1,088	2,571	3,374	31,950	16,392	12,176	807	1,829	2,317	25,762	13,963	9,638	2,143
District 90	42,520	20,216	17,680	1,088	2,571	3,374	31,950	16,392	12,176	807	1,829	2,317	25,762	13,963	9,638	2,143
	100.000%	47.545%	41.580%	2.559%	6.047%	7.935%	100.000%	51.305%	38.110%	2.526%	5.725%	7.252%	80.632%	54.200%	37.412%	8.318%
District 91																
Orleans	44,209	16,434	23,337	925	2,982	4,013	36,183	14,594	18,196	784	2,186	2,923	30,745	11,919	16,336	2,490
District 91	44,209	16,434	23,337	925	2,982	4,013	36,183	14,594	18,196	784	2,186	2,923	30,745	11,919	16,336	2,490
	100.000%	37.173%	52.788%	2.092%	6.745%	9.077%	100.000%	40.334%	50.289%	2.167%	6.042%	8.078%	84.971%	38.767%	53.134%	8.099%
District 92																
Jefferson	45,511	13,610	23,603	1,311	6,328	8,080	34,516	11,312	17,312	1,030	4,363	5,528	26,643	8,864	14,994	2,785
District 92	45,511	13,610	23,603	1,311	6,328	8,080	34,516	11,312	17,312	1,030	4,363	5,528	26,643	8,864	14,994	2,785
	100.000%	29.905%	51.862%	2.881%	13.904%	17.754%	100.000%	32.773%	50.156%	2.984%	12.641%	16.016%	77.190%	33.270%	56.277%	10.453%
District 93																
Orleans	44,889	15,348	23,770	1,402	3,762	4,832	38,336	14,297	19,269	1,302	2,970	3,694	28,521	10,807	14,963	2,751
District 93	44,889	15,348	23,770	1,402	3,762	4,832	38,336	14,297	19,269	1,302	2,970	3,694	28,521	10,807	14,963	2,751
	100.000%	34.191%	52.953%	3.123%	8.381%	10.764%	100.000%	37.294%	50.263%	3.396%	7.747%	9.636%	74.397%	37.891%	52.463%	9.646%
District 94																
Jefferson	8,109	5,099	855	404	1,602	1,995	6,531	4,365	647	319	1,092	1,350	4,360	3,513	321	526
Orleans	38,027	17,986	16,065	1,325	2,300	2,894	29,716	14,318	12,410	1,020	1,690	2,155	25,278	12,788	10,426	2,064
District 94	46,136	23,085	16,920	1,729	3,902	4,889	36,247	18,683	13,057	1,339	2,782	3,505	29,638	16,301	10,747	2,590
	100.000%	50.037%	36.674%	3.748%	8.458%	10.597%	100.000%	51.544%	36.022%	3.694%	7.675%	9.670%	81.767%	55.000%	36.261%	8.739%

District Population

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 95																
Livingston	45,041	36,770	4,637	466	2,246	2,444	33,276	27,751	3,079	286	1,475	1,499	27,119	24,053	2,167	899
District 95	45,041	36,770	4,637	466	2,246	2,444	33,276	27,751	3,079	286	1,475	1,499	27,119	24,053	2,167	899
	100.000%	81.637%	10.295%	1.035%	4.987%	5.426%	100.000%	83.396%	9.253%	0.859%	4.433%	4.505%	81.497%	88.694%	7.991%	3.315%
District 96																
Iberia	20,658	6,808	12,075	859	735	924	15,299	5,646	8,338	663	528	642	11,490	4,251	6,681	558
Lafayette	10,399	2,255	7,776	66	226	323	7,953	1,940	5,789	44	136	206	6,813	1,510	4,998	305
St. Martin	13,546	5,950	6,984	163	339	397	10,310	4,714	5,157	111	240	269	9,113	4,432	4,512	180
District 96	44,603	15,013	26,835	1,088	1,300	1,644	33,562	12,300	19,284	818	904	1,117	27,416	10,193	16,191	1,043
	100.000%	33.659%	60.164%	2.439%	2.915%	3.686%	100.000%	36.649%	57.458%	2.437%	2.694%	3.328%	81.688%	37.179%	59.057%	3.804%
District 97																
Orleans	44,517	17,681	22,909	841	2,636	3,344	36,444	15,125	18,318	646	1,981	2,476	32,607	13,241	16,832	2,534
District 97	44,517	17,681	22,909	841	2,636	3,344	36,444	15,125	18,318	646	1,981	2,476	32,607	13,241	16,832	2,534
	100.000%	39.717%	51.461%	1.889%	5.921%	7.512%	100.000%	41.502%	50.263%	1.773%	5.436%	6.794%	89.472%	40.608%	51.621%	7.771%
District 98																
Orleans	46,487	33,221	8,086	1,776	2,840	5,473	39,840	28,726	6,887	1,454	2,305	4,781	32,756	23,669	5,448	3,639
District 98	46,487	33,221	8,086	1,776	2,840	5,473	39,840	28,726	6,887	1,454	2,305	4,781	32,756	23,669	5,448	3,639
	100.000%	71.463%	17.394%	3.820%	6.109%	11.773%	100.000%	72.103%	17.287%	3.650%	5.786%	12.001%	82.219%	72.259%	16.632%	11.109%
District 99																
Orleans	42,224	777	34,810	4,401	2,057	3,023	30,388	616	24,843	3,541	1,257	1,802	24,889	459	21,120	3,310
District 99	42,224	777	34,810	4,401	2,057	3,023	30,388	616	24,843	3,541	1,257	1,802	24,889	459	21,120	3,310
	100.000%	1.840%	82.441%	10.423%	4.872%	7.159%	100.000%	2.027%	81.753%	11.653%	4.137%	5.930%	81.904%	1.844%	84.857%	13.299%
District 100																
Orleans	27,348	1,383	25,115	239	507	868	20,212	1,218	18,402	166	339	590	17,111	953	15,458	700
St. Bernard	19,001	10,865	5,530	556	1,643	2,262	13,734	8,203	3,694	381	1,153	1,556	11,943	8,086	3,114	742
District 100	46,349	12,248	30,645	795	2,150	3,130	33,946	9,421	22,096	547	1,492	2,146	29,054	9,039	18,572	1,442
	100.000%	26.426%	66.118%	1.715%	4.639%	6.753%	100.000%	27.753%	65.092%	1.611%	4.395%	6.322%	85.589%	31.111%	63.922%	4.963%
District 101																
East Baton Rouge	42,517	11,669	23,099	2,453	4,834	5,478	31,518	9,959	16,130	1,890	3,164	3,587	23,316	8,757	12,594	1,964
District 101	42,517	11,669	23,099	2,453	4,834	5,478	31,518	9,959	16,130	1,890	3,164	3,587	23,316	8,757	12,594	1,964
	100.000%	27.445%	54.329%	5.769%	11.370%	12.884%	100.000%	31.598%	51.177%	5.997%	10.039%	11.381%	73.977%	37.558%	54.014%	8.423%
District 102																
Orleans	42,951	15,319	24,358	601	2,169	2,884	35,111	14,077	18,431	506	1,684	2,164	31,526	12,109	16,808	2,609
District 102	42,951	15,319	24,358	601	2,169	2,884	35,111	14,077	18,431	506	1,684	2,164	31,526	12,109	16,808	2,609
	100.000%	35.666%	56.711%	1.399%	5.050%	6.715%	100.000%	40.093%	52.494%	1.441%	4.796%	6.163%	89.790%	38.410%	53.315%	8.276%
District 103																
Orleans	19,938	2,062	17,025	145	589	834	14,583	1,804	12,145	104	446	613	12,590	1,566	10,424	600

District Population

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 103																
St. Bernard	24,763	13,632	6,779	825	2,987	3,748	18,041	10,789	4,250	601	2,016	2,472	13,710	10,147	2,383	1,181
District 103	44,701	15,694	23,804	970	3,576	4,582	32,624	12,593	16,395	705	2,462	3,085	26,300	11,713	12,807	1,781
	100.000%	35.109%	53.252%	2.170%	8.000%	10.250%	100.000%	38.600%	50.254%	2.161%	7.547%	9.456%	80.615%	44.536%	48.696%	6.772%
District 104																
St. Tammany	46,282	35,866	4,929	1,065	3,420	3,749	36,086	28,598	3,573	731	2,432	2,608	32,147	26,861	3,047	2,242
District 104	46,282	35,866	4,929	1,065	3,420	3,749	36,086	28,598	3,573	731	2,432	2,608	32,147	26,861	3,047	2,242
	100.000%	77.494%	10.650%	2.301%	7.389%	8.100%	100.000%	79.250%	9.901%	2.026%	6.739%	7.227%	89.084%	83.557%	9.478%	6.974%
District 105																
Orleans	33,407	6,251	23,494	1,201	2,202	2,852	25,383	5,477	17,167	997	1,550	1,958	20,221	4,475	13,710	2,036
Plaquemines	9,139	7,093	758	425	637	853	6,648	5,303	479	272	433	533	5,866	5,041	361	464
District 105	42,546	13,344	24,252	1,626	2,839	3,705	32,031	10,780	17,646	1,269	1,983	2,491	26,087	9,516	14,071	2,500
	100.000%	31.364%	57.002%	3.822%	6.673%	8.708%	100.000%	33.655%	55.090%	3.962%	6.191%	7.777%	81.443%	36.478%	53.939%	9.583%
Grand Total	4,657,757	2,657,652	1,543,119	107,288	262,638	322,549	3,570,548	2,124,511	1,115,769	80,416	185,612	223,662	2,894,346	1,827,989	902,748	163,609
	100.000%	57.059%	33.130%	2.303%	5.639%	6.925%	100.000%	59.501%	31.249%	2.252%	5.198%	6.264%	81.062%	63.157%	31.190%	5.653%

Split Parishes

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 1																
Caddo	44,511	17,272	25,160	213	1,015	1,155	33,695	13,851	18,428	150	659	723	27,415	10,927	15,618	870
District 2																
Caddo	42,848	11,109	29,239	582	1,430	1,773	33,027	9,589	21,572	470	991	1,241	27,337	7,624	18,407	1,306
District 3																
Caddo	42,396	10,601	29,980	387	985	1,271	31,126	8,917	20,892	290	686	837	25,348	7,356	17,047	945
District 4																
Caddo	44,082	17,493	23,924	340	1,620	1,669	33,919	14,537	17,479	263	1,103	1,074	27,803	12,548	14,078	1,177
District 5																
Bossier	42,239	31,455	7,036	740	1,820	2,131	31,184	23,448	5,222	459	1,170	1,308	24,667	19,976	3,662	1,029
District 6																
Caddo	42,590	31,225	7,045	1,972	1,503	1,806	34,112	25,775	5,091	1,433	1,141	1,289	28,570	23,119	3,582	1,869
District 7																
Caddo	21,421	15,757	3,956	540	660	707	16,528	12,390	2,897	402	443	454	14,823	11,539	2,517	767
De Soto	13,801	10,834	2,009	52	445	441	10,372	8,247	1,472	36	268	272	9,734	8,013	1,407	314
Sabine	9,386	5,665	1,361	39	198	391	7,153	4,560	871	25	141	286	6,380	4,604	807	969
District 8																
Bossier	42,714	21,724	15,351	1,409	3,435	4,230	31,516	17,471	10,110	997	2,330	2,807	21,772	13,963	6,320	1,489
District 9																
Bossier	43,793	27,873	10,164	1,343	3,123	3,876	33,176	22,012	7,108	992	2,080	2,504	23,304	16,922	4,856	1,526
District 10																
Claiborne	6,719	3,860	2,536	38	185	360	5,661	3,390	2,011	22	165	323	3,397	2,025	1,323	49
District 11																
Bienville	3,522	845	2,590	7	58	83	2,819	733	2,027	4	34	58	2,614	658	1,933	23
Claiborne	7,451	3,403	3,824	50	89	119	5,846	2,868	2,813	33	65	80	5,201	2,607	2,497	97
Lincoln	31,388	12,191	17,478	631	742	998	25,519	10,526	13,654	542	512	715	14,515	5,870	8,007	638
District 12																
Lincoln	17,008	13,843	1,886	261	702	756	13,136	10,780	1,465	202	448	472	11,134	9,802	1,009	323
Morehouse	4,852	4,055	542	44	85	92	3,834	3,226	423	33	67	65	3,504	3,017	423	64
West Carroll	3,518	3,097	263	7	71	105	2,754	2,445	196	6	46	62	2,526	2,331	174	21
District 13																
Bienville	9,459	6,105	3,010	50	109	128	7,254	4,753	2,257	26	77	83	6,233	4,185	1,984	64
Grant	9,668	7,395	1,823	42	173	169	7,469	5,827	1,327	28	114	92	6,431	5,148	1,127	156
Natchitoches	5,014	4,009	698	25	126	124	3,982	3,258	507	19	73	72	3,374	2,866	407	101

Split Parishes

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 13																
Red River	4,655	3,520	922	12	67	108	3,565	2,801	624	2	51	63	3,267	2,638	575	54
District 14																
Morehouse	2,305	1,749	465	11	14	21	1,891	1,434	387	5	8	10	1,647	1,224	395	28
Ouachita	44,169	34,909	6,339	785	1,307	1,375	33,322	26,989	4,209	548	920	899	29,099	25,003	3,042	1,054
District 15																
Ouachita	30,878	26,097	2,533	512	949	930	23,318	19,953	1,763	354	656	604	20,109	18,116	1,342	651
District 16																
Ouachita	42,314	12,940	27,059	1,096	812	998	32,063	11,167	19,160	869	558	678	25,735	8,508	16,152	1,075
District 17																
Ouachita	43,007	14,599	25,286	395	2,089	2,355	31,497	11,865	17,158	347	1,625	1,765	24,809	8,888	15,122	799
District 18																
Iberville	7,040	5,021	1,769	21	133	179	5,718	4,123	1,398	16	102	136	5,369	3,770	1,504	95
District 19																
Madison	2,377	1,861	446	3	44	63	1,961	1,531	376	2	34	50	1,664	1,392	240	32
Richland	17,311	10,748	5,968	75	277	351	13,307	8,494	4,350	63	209	266	11,564	7,712	3,643	209
District 20																
La Salle	5,245	4,450	193	154	307	326	4,086	3,384	156	152	290	293	3,231	3,112	47	72
District 21																
Madison	7,640	1,614	5,917	17	56	141	5,474	1,375	4,015	7	47	99	5,614	1,102	4,434	78
Morehouse	18,472	6,477	11,477	105	235	268	14,337	5,435	8,490	79	196	217	11,771	4,264	7,313	194
Richland	2,732	1,037	1,635	8	37	49	2,076	844	1,196	3	21	27	2,098	758	1,318	22
West Carroll	6,233	4,797	1,162	20	154	220	4,778	3,778	814	14	97	130	4,512	3,582	866	64
District 22																
Grant	12,501	10,314	1,512	91	175	1,164	10,058	8,137	1,390	69	128	1,087	6,257	6,026	49	182
La Salle	9,546	6,898	1,229	129	1,059	1,076	7,477	5,252	909	112	1,037	1,032	5,561	4,866	590	105
Rapides	21,663	17,928	1,957	402	687	727	16,467	13,786	1,368	304	477	502	13,325	11,946	890	489
District 23																
De Soto	13,011	4,450	7,964	65	253	321	10,068	3,662	5,953	50	195	223	8,979	3,317	5,403	259
Natchitoches	26,322	11,010	13,705	198	911	1,176	20,579	9,361	9,915	156	743	945	15,508	6,924	7,889	695
Red River	2,965	675	2,184	13	56	80	2,149	537	1,540	1	42	50	2,364	492	1,843	29
District 24																
Natchitoches	6,179	4,342	1,322	32	276	190	4,788	3,391	993	23	227	123	4,225	3,060	928	237
Sabine	12,769	9,371	2,500	55	243	319	9,911	7,494	1,784	41	178	216	8,167	6,419	1,377	371

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 3 of 8

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 24																
Vernon	25,076	18,428	3,990	651	1,119	1,424	18,758	14,118	2,713	469	783	898	15,238	12,025	2,126	1,087
District 25																
Rapides	42,586	29,931	9,127	975	1,411	1,635	32,670	23,824	6,207	699	1,071	1,143	26,719	20,861	4,568	1,285
District 26																
Rapides	45,775	14,909	28,497	785	1,017	1,271	34,568	12,354	20,470	605	715	881	27,297	9,668	16,433	1,196
District 27																
Rapides	19,999	14,742	3,011	266	1,276	1,457	15,087	11,409	2,160	178	831	916	12,835	10,357	1,884	599
Vernon	23,674	16,659	3,621	791	1,891	2,751	17,503	12,647	2,420	605	1,346	1,842	8,822	7,157	885	780
District 28																
St. Landry	4,044	2,827	1,089	19	62	78	3,107	2,212	805	15	44	51	3,256	2,116	1,076	57
District 29																
East Baton Rouge	15,224	1,091	13,865	56	181	257	11,915	941	10,744	41	165	212	9,833	611	8,965	257
District 30																
Beauregard	15,112	11,832	2,161	206	444	709	11,572	9,134	1,624	140	316	463	8,850	7,423	884	543
Calcasieu	29,605	25,302	2,293	186	1,165	1,530	22,134	19,245	1,498	131	775	1,021	16,911	15,353	972	586
District 31																
Lafayette	43,472	32,009	5,779	2,197	2,856	3,269	33,813	25,685	3,974	1,637	2,014	2,298	28,767	24,150	2,626	1,991
District 32																
Beauregard	21,437	17,697	2,488	196	473	562	15,917	13,170	1,871	129	332	365	13,444	11,348	1,485	611
District 33																
Calcasieu	44,513	33,794	5,595	1,995	2,400	2,895	33,880	26,491	3,712	1,439	1,675	1,958	25,042	21,563	2,121	1,358
District 34																
Calcasieu	42,451	17,536	22,389	498	1,548	1,843	32,193	13,993	16,381	370	1,079	1,198	23,378	9,861	12,543	961
District 35																
Calcasieu	43,964	36,561	4,170	615	1,725	2,067	32,617	27,648	2,797	398	1,167	1,334	26,162	23,150	2,008	1,004
District 36																
Calcasieu	42,475	15,643	22,973	1,237	2,101	2,519	32,201	13,187	16,190	916	1,513	1,732	20,782	8,771	10,871	1,148
District 37																
Calcasieu	13,777	10,936	1,966	171	450	530	10,141	8,225	1,320	105	307	327	8,236	6,961	998	282
District 38																
St. Landry	14,072	10,767	2,928	58	222	237	10,581	8,269	2,080	38	141	166	9,008	7,173	1,653	189
District 39																

Split Parishes

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 39																
Lafayette	42,805	24,487	13,498	843	3,378	3,955	32,129	19,746	9,075	623	2,241	2,598	25,555	16,928	7,175	1,452
District 40																
St. Landry	45,170	17,676	25,982	274	946	1,002	33,861	14,195	18,582	202	670	661	30,948	13,147	16,976	825
District 41																
Acadia	25,608	21,637	2,875	91	733	820	18,812	16,166	1,905	65	481	499	17,138	15,170	1,626	342
St. Landry	19,254	12,341	5,837	148	728	861	14,262	9,533	4,030	98	446	496	11,270	7,657	3,300	313
District 42																
Acadia	31,968	22,843	7,989	147	688	821	24,131	17,905	5,478	108	435	527	20,540	15,385	4,781	374
Lafayette	11,858	9,090	1,827	116	640	749	8,671	6,838	1,228	69	404	457	7,235	5,977	988	270
District 43																
Iberia	4,708	3,169	727	475	263	295	3,554	2,470	463	367	195	217	2,891	2,306	335	250
Lafayette	38,561	30,661	4,086	1,243	1,942	2,243	27,319	22,214	2,607	800	1,274	1,479	24,092	20,767	1,996	1,328
St. Martin	984	748	133	44	46	55	763	593	99	26	33	40	639	459	153	20
District 44																
Lafayette	42,602	16,189	23,387	684	1,960	2,325	33,485	14,073	17,181	568	1,388	1,611	26,290	10,743	14,328	1,219
District 45																
Lafayette	44,264	33,461	6,823	1,221	2,163	2,613	34,737	27,066	4,753	872	1,555	1,879	29,738	24,774	3,363	1,602
District 46																
Lafayette	7,792	5,211	1,960	84	425	506	5,768	4,046	1,310	51	287	301	5,003	3,796	1,007	200
St. Martin	35,869	25,276	8,791	383	1,037	1,183	27,177	19,880	6,026	265	723	804	24,375	18,064	5,715	592
District 47																
Vermilion	39,907	30,333	6,888	1,068	1,233	1,412	29,923	23,473	4,568	746	818	907	26,070	21,143	4,024	903
District 48																
Iberia	33,731	21,197	10,245	587	1,305	1,633	25,687	16,842	7,231	387	927	1,110	22,896	15,718	6,428	750
St. Mary	12,718	4,792	6,760	139	372	453	9,774	3,963	5,060	80	260	303	8,792	3,538	4,817	437
District 49																
Iberia	10,832	8,032	1,509	202	947	1,045	8,251	6,337	1,037	145	634	688	7,249	6,012	908	329
St. Mary	17,699	11,564	4,406	140	1,121	1,265	13,456	9,123	3,111	99	766	833	10,828	8,028	2,367	433
Vermilion	17,452	14,144	1,922	379	769	884	13,089	10,890	1,219	291	519	589	10,699	9,362	970	367
District 50																
Assumption	8,376	7,536	240	48	410	458	6,696	6,165	134	34	263	306	5,512	5,333	73	106
Lafourche	12,981	7,778	4,326	150	445	571	9,785	6,284	2,890	120	307	407	7,116	4,898	1,980	238
St. Martin	1,368	1,285	13	7	29	44	1,154	1,091	11	5	17	31	993	979	1	13

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 5 of 8

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 50																
St. Mary	18,989	10,593	4,825	556	2,468	2,806	14,291	8,508	3,349	414	1,615	1,818	10,590	7,146	2,707	737
Terrebonne	4,503	2,781	1,332	36	165	173	3,510	2,230	1,012	21	114	127	2,776	1,750	891	135
District 51																
Lafourche	32,494	23,510	6,774	295	1,230	1,358	25,233	18,620	5,114	192	866	946	20,498	16,866	2,959	673
Terrebonne	13,399	7,718	4,330	135	628	717	10,032	6,114	3,010	92	410	458	7,132	4,561	2,201	370
District 52																
Terrebonne	45,840	33,923	5,143	909	2,106	2,606	34,408	26,592	3,338	618	1,396	1,621	27,434	23,106	2,199	2,129
District 53																
Terrebonne	45,838	25,512	12,342	663	3,220	3,862	34,555	20,695	8,436	508	2,169	2,495	24,378	15,978	6,275	2,125
District 54																
Lafourche	46,458	36,458	3,509	552	2,859	3,471	35,263	28,760	2,209	411	1,867	2,196	27,141	23,979	1,529	1,633
District 55																
Lafourche	5,624	3,964	1,246	28	209	272	4,338	3,174	864	15	149	194	3,523	2,724	696	103
St. Charles	40,514	25,918	11,261	597	2,036	2,570	30,566	20,190	8,058	368	1,433	1,699	27,080	18,631	7,198	1,251
District 56																
Jefferson	34,276	16,502	6,216	2,224	8,733	10,890	26,673	13,544	4,524	1,678	6,482	7,885	19,683	11,638	3,255	4,790
St. Charles	12,035	7,632	2,667	240	1,273	1,571	8,975	5,964	1,832	161	868	1,038	7,905	5,678	1,599	628
District 58																
Ascension	9,510	2,962	6,235	43	219	285	7,098	2,386	4,490	33	147	204	6,555	2,391	4,005	159
Assumption	12,663	6,186	5,980	48	333	456	9,920	4,980	4,573	23	247	325	8,927	4,367	4,437	123
District 59																
Ascension	44,221	30,197	8,435	1,380	3,489	3,951	31,654	22,237	5,736	908	2,277	2,555	27,494	20,761	4,800	1,933
District 60																
Ascension	19,108	6,113	10,801	186	1,723	2,180	14,006	5,019	7,498	143	1,151	1,433	11,478	4,242	6,594	642
Iberville	23,201	9,812	11,961	181	1,069	1,239	18,368	8,339	8,834	133	920	1,051	15,093	6,362	8,393	338
District 61																
East Baton Rouge	42,448	10,783	26,630	1,797	2,910	3,300	32,238	9,299	19,265	1,361	2,048	2,275	24,636	7,580	15,310	1,748
District 62																
East Baton Rouge	12,641	10,731	1,204	72	368	353	9,793	8,377	910	44	252	230	9,179	7,938	1,038	207
Livingston	14,198	12,555	665	102	519	589	10,158	9,080	383	73	366	366	8,989	8,388	301	300
District 63																
East Baton Rouge	42,378	15,474	24,862	448	1,167	1,286	31,266	12,041	17,737	298	869	931	27,510	11,146	15,441	919
District 64																

Split Parishes

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
Livingston	43,770	35,189	4,188	577	2,785	3,125	32,763	27,093	2,738	371	1,786	1,925	25,809	23,023	1,759	1,027
District 65																
East Baton Rouge	42,236	14,922	25,134	319	1,480	1,644	31,519	11,684	18,389	219	927	1,018	28,641	11,070	16,714	856
District 66																
East Baton Rouge	45,492	30,338	8,998	2,862	2,756	3,196	35,783	24,706	6,559	2,065	2,021	2,295	30,974	23,566	4,873	2,535
District 67																
East Baton Rouge	43,956	14,919	25,680	1,716	1,346	2,013	37,287	14,341	19,939	1,583	1,163	1,735	20,195	4,499	14,580	1,116
District 68																
East Baton Rouge	42,831	15,372	22,548	1,349	3,088	3,592	33,926	13,347	17,014	1,043	2,168	2,474	26,836	11,046	14,154	1,636
District 69																
East Baton Rouge	44,483	13,651	26,597	967	2,848	3,268	33,850	11,555	19,273	704	2,001	2,257	25,228	10,027	13,907	1,294
District 70																
East Baton Rouge	42,410	30,304	6,352	2,202	2,970	3,658	35,175	25,748	4,940	1,832	2,183	2,717	25,579	20,900	2,770	1,909
District 71																
East Baton Rouge	40,165	26,815	8,429	2,184	2,214	2,506	31,342	21,883	5,890	1,519	1,634	1,808	27,337	21,092	4,329	1,916
Livingston	6,023	5,052	270	121	442	511	4,452	3,842	168	83	266	301	3,716	3,470	110	136
District 72																
Tangipahoa	32,956	13,386	17,542	360	1,298	1,654	25,599	11,367	12,753	312	883	1,152	17,210	7,861	8,797	552
District 73																
Tangipahoa	44,244	31,964	8,709	547	2,101	2,423	33,715	25,253	5,952	366	1,468	1,631	26,286	21,116	4,122	1,048
District 74																
St. Tammany	46,403	37,716	3,435	733	3,380	3,855	36,121	30,041	2,314	532	2,404	2,653	32,284	28,713	1,761	1,810
District 76																
St. Tammany	46,572	34,347	6,743	1,252	3,134	3,673	35,529	27,014	4,603	907	2,205	2,451	31,003	25,104	3,707	2,207
District 77																
St. Tammany	36,634	28,951	3,982	505	2,461	2,827	28,501	23,033	2,843	359	1,743	2,019	25,296	21,790	2,150	1,356
Tangipahoa	9,549	7,627	982	86	547	658	7,175	5,924	572	60	390	411	5,813	5,156	407	250
District 78																
Jefferson	46,459	29,074	6,010	1,752	8,600	10,667	37,096	24,524	4,329	1,282	6,151	7,532	26,999	21,363	2,260	3,376
District 79																
Jefferson	46,318	29,527	4,850	3,361	7,894	9,870	36,354	24,328	3,303	2,519	5,693	7,032	28,879	22,578	1,706	4,595
District 80																
Jefferson	46,461	30,396	6,517	2,137	6,734	8,440	37,745	25,863	4,834	1,646	4,903	6,054	27,735	22,682	2,264	2,789

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 7 of 8

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 81																
Ascension	9,777	7,944	993	95	568	696	7,424	6,161	695	58	390	447	6,810	5,914	622	274
Livingston	33,250	27,289	2,898	431	1,969	2,122	24,492	20,666	1,768	286	1,270	1,299	18,935	17,128	1,088	719
District 82																
Jefferson	46,432	34,779	5,752	1,336	3,823	4,807	38,336	29,253	4,608	1,033	2,887	3,534	31,862	26,684	2,887	2,291
District 83																
Jefferson	45,396	13,958	24,276	2,440	4,037	5,108	34,680	11,892	17,547	1,885	2,812	3,528	26,338	9,280	14,421	2,636
District 84																
Jefferson	39,850	22,789	9,715	2,503	3,735	4,857	30,644	18,430	6,807	1,922	2,653	3,357	25,369	16,718	5,681	2,970
Plaquemines	4,439	2,404	951	565	337	348	3,339	1,905	637	433	232	228	2,763	1,795	599	369
District 85																
Jefferson	45,637	16,031	17,821	2,168	8,581	10,799	34,535	13,414	12,993	1,702	5,648	7,137	23,005	11,046	8,426	3,534
District 86																
Tangipahoa	46,408	28,359	14,646	481	2,068	2,507	35,002	22,661	9,940	362	1,401	1,646	26,947	18,779	7,199	969
District 87																
Jefferson	36,332	9,170	20,602	3,388	2,852	3,544	27,544	7,210	15,271	2,676	2,133	2,547	22,228	5,250	13,361	3,617
Plaquemines	9,937	4,790	3,719	327	812	1,035	7,347	3,648	2,741	220	531	616	5,279	2,677	2,174	428
District 88																
Ascension	43,884	33,925	5,752	596	2,840	3,271	31,775	25,333	3,720	372	1,813	2,022	27,580	23,492	2,793	1,295
District 89																
St. Tammany	46,159	39,545	1,874	1,131	2,886	3,366	34,041	29,543	1,252	739	1,997	2,262	32,287	29,293	839	2,155
District 90																
St. Tammany	42,520	20,216	17,680	1,088	2,571	3,374	31,950	16,392	12,176	807	1,829	2,317	25,762	13,963	9,638	2,143
District 91																
Orleans	44,209	16,434	23,337	925	2,982	4,013	36,183	14,594	18,196	784	2,186	2,923	30,745	11,919	16,336	2,490
District 92																
Jefferson	45,511	13,610	23,603	1,311	6,328	8,080	34,516	11,312	17,312	1,030	4,363	5,528	26,643	8,864	14,994	2,785
District 93																
Orleans	44,889	15,348	23,770	1,402	3,762	4,832	38,336	14,297	19,269	1,302	2,970	3,694	28,521	10,807	14,963	2,751
District 94																
Jefferson	8,109	5,099	855	404	1,602	1,995	6,531	4,365	647	319	1,092	1,350	4,360	3,513	321	526
Orleans	38,027	17,986	16,065	1,325	2,300	2,894	29,716	14,318	12,410	1,020	1,690	2,155	25,278	12,788	10,426	2,064
District 95																

Split Parishes

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 95																
Livingston	45,041	36,770	4,637	466	2,246	2,444	33,276	27,751	3,079	286	1,475	1,499	27,119	24,053	2,167	899
District 96																
Iberia	20,658	6,808	12,075	859	735	924	15,299	5,646	8,338	663	528	642	11,490	4,251	6,681	558
Lafayette	10,399	2,255	7,776	66	226	323	7,953	1,940	5,789	44	136	206	6,813	1,510	4,998	305
St. Martin	13,546	5,950	6,984	163	339	397	10,310	4,714	5,157	111	240	269	9,113	4,432	4,512	180
District 97																
Orleans	44,517	17,681	22,909	841	2,636	3,344	36,444	15,125	18,318	646	1,981	2,476	32,607	13,241	16,832	2,534
District 98																
Orleans	46,487	33,221	8,086	1,776	2,840	5,473	39,840	28,726	6,887	1,454	2,305	4,781	32,756	23,669	5,448	3,639
District 99																
Orleans	42,224	777	34,810	4,401	2,057	3,023	30,388	616	24,843	3,541	1,257	1,802	24,889	459	21,120	3,310
District 100																
Orleans	27,348	1,383	25,115	239	507	868	20,212	1,218	18,402	166	339	590	17,111	953	15,458	700
St. Bernard	19,001	10,865	5,530	556	1,643	2,262	13,734	8,203	3,694	381	1,153	1,556	11,943	8,086	3,114	742
District 101																
East Baton Rouge	42,517	11,669	23,099	2,453	4,834	5,478	31,518	9,959	16,130	1,890	3,164	3,587	23,316	8,757	12,594	1,964
District 102																
Orleans	42,951	15,319	24,358	601	2,169	2,884	35,111	14,077	18,431	506	1,684	2,164	31,526	12,109	16,808	2,609
District 103																
Orleans	19,938	2,062	17,025	145	589	834	14,583	1,804	12,145	104	446	613	12,590	1,566	10,424	600
St. Bernard	24,763	13,632	6,779	825	2,987	3,748	18,041	10,789	4,250	601	2,016	2,472	13,710	10,147	2,383	1,181
District 104																
St. Tammany	46,282	35,866	4,929	1,065	3,420	3,749	36,086	28,598	3,573	731	2,432	2,608	32,147	26,861	3,047	2,242
District 105																
Orleans	33,407	6,251	23,494	1,201	2,202	2,852	25,383	5,477	17,167	997	1,550	1,958	20,221	4,475	13,710	2,036
Plaquemines	9,139	7,093	758	425	637	853	6,648	5,303	479	272	433	533	5,866	5,041	361	464

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 1																
Caddo																
Blanchard	3,496	2,688	563	35	101	114	2,580	2,024	388	25	63	61	2,181	1,814	287	79
Shreveport	23,022	2,262	20,292	71	233	364	17,236	1,957	14,941	54	159	258	14,404	1,410	12,558	431
District 2																
Caddo																
Shreveport	42,667	11,020	29,163	579	1,423	1,766	32,879	9,509	21,519	468	984	1,236	27,136	7,587	18,252	1,298
District 3																
Caddo																
Shreveport	42,312	10,538	29,965	384	984	1,267	31,064	8,865	20,885	289	685	836	25,304	7,340	17,025	945
District 4																
Caddo																
Blanchard	42	31	7	0	3	1	30	20	6	0	3	1	29	25	3	0
Shreveport	26,707	5,859	19,454	187	943	1,012	20,011	5,013	14,022	155	622	644	16,036	4,553	10,820	670
District 5																
Bossier																
Bossier City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastwood	2,187	1,597	177	32	292	313	1,597	1,224	116	20	179	183	1,228	1,019	160	52
Haughton	2,080	1,671	218	25	80	80	1,506	1,226	140	23	50	53	1,138	1,013	86	46
Red Chute	5,628	4,360	753	113	252	301	4,170	3,312	524	77	150	179	3,400	2,867	383	147
District 6																
Caddo																
Shreveport	41,129	30,001	6,932	1,939	1,452	1,740	32,927	24,776	4,996	1,407	1,107	1,236	27,583	22,354	3,445	1,801
District 7																
Caddo																
Shreveport	8,848	6,499	1,465	427	303	309	6,516	4,857	1,021	319	200	195	6,336	5,038	882	429
De Soto																
Frierson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gloster	36	26	6	0	4	7	27	22	4	0	1	3	25	23	2	0
Keachi	239	190	38	0	7	6	192	150	35	0	4	5	207	175	32	7
District 8																
Bossier																
Bossier City	35,791	16,780	14,005	1,143	3,210	3,957	26,289	13,666	9,145	809	2,160	2,632	17,516	10,633	5,666	1,220

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 8																
Bossier																
Shreveport	93	8	81	2	1	2	73	8	62	2	1	1	38	10	22	4
District 9																
Bossier																
Bossier City	26,910	16,250	6,753	972	2,180	2,738	20,334	12,902	4,682	710	1,457	1,763	13,809	9,507	3,180	1,131
Eastwood	2,203	1,765	237	60	71	89	1,591	1,295	161	44	49	53	1,609	1,371	172	68
Haughton	2,459	1,549	699	30	104	131	1,730	1,124	473	20	62	75	1,244	891	329	26
Red Chute	1,437	872	156	12	341	383	1,099	720	104	10	221	245	764	647	80	39
Shreveport	2,815	1,322	1,122	174	138	198	2,257	1,162	781	148	114	160	688	445	197	47
District 11																
Bienville																
Arcadia	1,947	445	1,448	6	35	47	1,539	390	1,114	4	19	34	1,409	306	1,093	8
Mount Lebanon	54	36	18	0	0	0	48	34	14	0	0	0	50	16	34	0
Lincoln																
Ruston	18,328	8,354	8,754	567	427	621	14,997	7,451	6,543	494	321	485	7,842	3,371	4,075	401
District 12																
Lincoln																
Ruston	3,838	3,062	443	142	124	142	3,055	2,500	309	110	87	100	2,324	2,032	196	98
West Carroll																
Oak Grove	318	260	28	0	27	23	262	214	27	0	18	14	246	235	12	3
District 13																
Bienville																
Arcadia	799	268	515	1	13	14	621	233	375	1	10	11	485	251	231	8
Mount Lebanon	12	1	11	0	0	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	8	6	3	1
Grant																
Creola	11	0	10	1	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	0	0
Prospect	72	60	0	0	5	3	55	43	0	0	5	3	45	43	0	0
Natchitoches																
Clarence	36	21	13	0	2	1	27	16	9	0	2	1	29	16	8	5
Natchitoches	1,236	897	272	19	37	42	963	728	197	13	18	18	941	737	162	45
Red River																
Coushatta	567	252	302	2	6	13	442	220	215	0	3	7	388	199	182	11

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 14																
Morehouse																
Bastrop	73	54	9	0	5	2	59	47	4	0	3	0	56	40	14	0
Ouachita																
Claiborne	9,136	7,762	674	166	331	349	6,833	5,914	410	108	247	233	5,804	5,350	256	202
Monroe	9,035	7,478	981	208	243	248	7,065	5,967	689	149	156	149	6,516	5,863	415	238
Swartz	2,165	1,521	527	15	52	59	1,600	1,177	332	15	33	35	1,361	1,146	173	48
West Monroe	5,324	3,881	1,037	50	272	314	4,141	3,141	713	33	180	213	3,266	2,718	427	118
District 15																
Ouachita																
Bawcomville	63	39	18	0	6	10	51	36	11	0	4	7	38	27	10	2
Brownsville	2,215	1,189	793	15	171	177	1,646	963	522	13	110	116	1,199	850	310	38
Claiborne	3,495	2,739	337	237	98	101	2,596	2,068	229	147	80	75	2,271	2,067	113	89
West Monroe	1,720	1,352	239	38	53	53	1,486	1,199	188	36	37	35	1,004	861	101	39
District 16																
Ouachita																
Monroe	25,892	6,600	17,918	731	446	601	19,822	5,807	12,958	601	295	400	15,595	3,784	11,181	632
Swartz	2,189	1,410	654	30	51	47	1,654	1,150	425	24	26	22	1,466	868	541	56
District 17																
Ouachita																
Bawcomville	3,409	2,544	418	14	318	364	2,549	2,019	229	13	191	208	1,555	1,311	171	74
Brownsville	2,138	1,237	533	21	296	334	1,684	1,061	375	15	194	212	1,029	682	304	43
Monroe	12,775	520	12,158	20	52	139	8,571	473	8,037	10	32	75	8,111	234	7,673	211
West Monroe	6,059	1,999	3,625	60	304	377	4,467	1,730	2,440	43	201	264	3,105	1,207	1,743	157
District 18																
Iberville																
Crescent	173	159	11	0	3	2	133	122	8	0	3	2	111	109	3	2
White Castle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 19																
Madison																
Tallulah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Richland																
Delhi	1,216	675	491	8	24	35	958	575	339	4	22	31	866	512	318	36

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 4 of 17

[illegible]

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 5 of 17

[illegible]

Time: 1:07 PM

Split Places

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 6 of 17

[illegible]

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 37																
Calcasieu																
Iowa	1,608	1,196	309	16	33	34	1,175	916	184	9	22	24	972	833	105	35
Moss Bluff	3,862	3,174	448	45	129	163	2,830	2,368	305	25	95	98	2,434	2,054	279	100
District 38																
St. Landry																
Morrow	90	8	82	0	0	0	66	6	60	0	0	0	49	32	16	0
Opelousas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 39																
Lafayette																
Carencro	6,877	3,090	3,435	79	214	267	4,989	2,454	2,316	47	134	167	4,167	1,985	1,992	185
Lafayette	11,815	7,410	2,733	470	998	1,250	9,482	6,295	1,951	370	706	895	7,121	5,190	1,353	582
Ossun	1,572	576	926	6	56	62	1,115	453	610	3	41	40	970	507	426	44
Scott	7,826	5,447	1,430	172	636	721	6,027	4,412	969	125	419	475	4,737	3,548	933	245
District 40																
St. Landry																
Opelousas	15,786	2,831	12,537	141	208	257	11,569	2,460	8,807	106	154	173	9,905	2,196	7,478	242
District 42																
Lafayette																
Ossun	573	483	67	2	17	21	414	359	44	1	9	10	372	343	17	16
Scott	151	133	7	3	3	4	112	99	6	0	3	3	92	76	11	0
District 43																
Lafayette																
Broussard	581	482	29	21	38	44	379	320	18	11	22	29	332	280	33	17
Lafayette	5,445	4,024	681	258	396	451	4,110	3,116	492	174	270	297	3,397	2,901	294	208
Youngsville	15,839	12,624	1,668	466	824	1,004	10,876	8,858	1,044	288	512	652	9,539	8,196	837	518
St. Martin																
Broussard	52	47	0	2	1	4	37	33	0	1	1	3	31	22	7	0
Cade	594	405	109	35	39	43	457	317	83	23	28	31	384	277	94	13
District 44																
Lafayette																
Carencro	821	239	476	28	70	74	631	216	348	15	46	52	488	286	185	21
Lafayette	38,602	13,973	22,095	640	1,544	1,867	30,391	12,212	16,257	540	1,124	1,323	23,930	9,238	13,579	1,115

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 8 of 17

[illegible]

Split Places

DR: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 49																
Vermilion																
Abbeville	1,226	617	480	80	38	58	896	510	282	64	33	47	590	404	138	48
Perry	12	5	3	2	0	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0
District 50																
Assumption																
Labadieville	640	535	57	4	37	45	536	467	44	1	23	27	429	381	41	6
Lafourche																
Thibodaux	3,221	1,456	1,602	22	96	160	2,427	1,265	1,044	16	75	130	1,632	791	801	38
St. Mary																
Bayou Vista	1,268	966	160	7	94	109	993	798	102	4	54	70	700	617	55	29
Berwick	1,197	802	240	13	96	129	848	595	139	12	64	82	556	440	89	27
Franklin	899	587	250	1	25	36	693	475	173	1	20	31	654	449	185	26
Morgan City	9,222	5,355	2,283	218	1,140	1,287	7,019	4,361	1,578	146	767	843	5,358	3,787	1,234	338
Patterson	2,141	1,209	715	34	116	114	1,515	918	463	23	64	68	1,086	711	314	65
District 51																
Lafourche																
Bayou Blue	2,129	1,552	247	26	113	144	1,398	1,083	124	9	64	84	1,321	1,153	85	88
Thibodaux	12,727	7,241	4,696	136	489	579	10,390	6,051	3,760	103	363	418	7,418	5,286	1,903	232
Terrebonne																
Bayou Blue	2,189	1,516	396	18	129	156	1,591	1,158	249	13	79	92	1,045	717	267	63
Gray	3,892	1,670	1,866	52	138	141	2,845	1,282	1,327	38	84	90	2,029	989	926	113
District 52																
Terrebonne																
Bayou Blue	1,267	707	137	1	321	381	883	568	59	1	189	210	608	494	59	53
Bayou Cane	15,547	10,952	2,586	345	775	967	11,616	8,593	1,666	245	533	616	8,407	6,915	901	593
Chauvin	1,435	1,284	20	17	30	43	1,080	986	5	17	17	22	777	726	3	54
Gray	1,626	1,125	328	16	94	104	1,232	922	195	14	62	66	869	698	121	51
Houma	10,633	8,768	777	293	364	459	8,034	6,801	530	181	259	321	7,239	6,515	352	384
District 53																
Terrebonne																
Bayou Blue	1,260	1,013	89	12	49	54	956	795	52	6	32	31	747	671	34	51
Bayou Cane	4,223	2,273	1,391	41	267	320	3,210	1,916	916	31	182	218	2,036	1,318	598	120
Chauvin	1,140	981	21	4	31	36	828	738	9	3	17	15	659	621	5	32

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 10 of 17

[illegible]

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
Ascension																
Gonzales	22	14	4	3	1	1	21	13	4	3	1	1	17	13	2	0
Prairieville	20,005	14,132	3,175	800	1,611	1,830	14,338	10,401	2,189	528	1,035	1,147	12,851	10,125	1,800	927
District 60																
Ascension																
Donaldsonville	2,486	373	2,045	7	49	71	1,636	337	1,249	6	34	45	1,566	354	1,179	29
Gonzales	10,817	3,804	5,577	111	1,120	1,440	8,150	3,186	3,968	90	760	970	6,306	2,572	3,307	436
Iberville																
Crescent	638	353	258	1	13	22	518	298	197	1	12	18	533	340	191	6
White Castle	1,722	127	1,572	2	13	13	1,230	118	1,101	1	5	9	1,273	153	1,104	14
District 61																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	33,665	10,531	18,309	1,790	2,742	3,042	25,809	9,092	13,180	1,356	1,934	2,115	18,378	7,399	9,402	1,578
Merrydale	8,783	252	8,321	7	168	258	6,429	207	6,085	5	114	160	6,258	181	5,908	170
District 62																
East Baton Rouge																
Central	9,002	8,066	381	63	293	273	6,898	6,264	246	35	194	178	6,466	6,005	300	162
Livingston																
Watson	252	231	0	5	14	11	193	177	0	5	11	9	137	128	4	5
District 63																
East Baton Rouge																
Baker	11,288	1,607	9,337	43	253	277	8,510	1,481	6,789	31	170	193	6,892	1,235	5,469	187
Baton Rouge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brownfields	1,299	146	1,137	2	7	9	964	141	814	1	5	8	803	153	624	25
Central	138	112	15	0	4	9	115	98	10	0	3	5	103	77	22	2
Zachary	18,423	8,773	8,593	320	485	523	12,961	6,443	5,785	202	345	342	12,007	6,126	5,415	470
District 64																
Livingston																
Denham Springs	9,282	6,738	1,663	144	548	617	7,224	5,440	1,187	110	366	400	5,345	4,491	616	238
Watson	704	626	23	3	29	33	551	502	14	2	16	19	508	485	8	21
District 65																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	15,429	334	14,906	27	136	200	11,386	295	10,950	20	98	136	10,283	248	9,780	247

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 12 of 17

[illegible]

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 13 of 17

[illegible]

Split Places

DR: I A 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 81																
Ascension																
Gonzales	376	199	127	6	40	39	266	150	78	3	31	22	236	182	41	9
Livingston																
Denham Springs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 82																
Jefferson																
Metairie	9,758	8,167	515	184	779	917	7,666	6,548	351	122	562	656	7,098	6,335	288	477
River Ridge	11,276	9,505	562	206	845	1,084	9,222	7,876	441	150	639	793	8,603	7,839	238	529
District 83																
Jefferson																
Harvey	16,045	4,542	8,129	669	2,458	3,056	11,982	3,853	5,731	525	1,670	2,086	7,356	2,635	3,799	924
Marrero	22,239	5,328	14,207	1,321	1,105	1,445	17,079	4,553	10,457	1,041	819	1,031	14,531	3,574	9,739	1,215
Westwego	6,017	3,767	1,574	118	406	543	4,789	3,226	1,064	95	278	372	3,681	2,826	581	274
Woodmere	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 84																
Jefferson																
Marrero	10,143	5,506	2,784	629	1,019	1,331	7,988	4,702	1,886	501	736	952	6,232	4,023	1,387	819
Woodmere	56	23	17	8	6	2	46	18	14	8	6	2	43	27	8	6
Plaquemines																
Empire	874	471	219	75	92	91	686	383	151	71	68	61	568	369	113	83
Port Sulphur	66	36	8	13	2	0	49	29	6	8	2	0	41	30	7	6
District 85																
Jefferson																
Gretna	17,255	7,421	6,224	550	2,716	3,293	13,776	6,394	4,895	419	1,810	2,235	9,715	5,372	3,267	1,078
Harvey	20	10	5	4	1	5	10	4	4	2	0	2	7	5	1	0
Timberlane	3,084	1,411	989	250	378	489	2,291	1,109	669	193	271	344	1,636	857	451	328
District 86																
Tangipahoa																
Amite City	957	686	228	13	25	20	736	551	152	11	18	16	678	562	99	18
Hammond	9,439	4,017	4,815	175	317	421	7,267	3,397	3,418	137	228	284	5,774	2,445	3,073	244
Independence	16	15	0	0	1	1	7	6	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0
Natalbany	801	304	367	20	88	97	567	245	232	15	56	62	354	269	66	13

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 15 of 17

[illegible]

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 16 of 17

[illegible]

Split Places

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 100																
Orleans																
New Orleans	27,348	1,383	25,115	239	507	868	20,212	1,218	18,402	166	339	590	17,111	953	15,458	700
St. Bernard																
Chalmette	3,117	2,001	515	247	301	353	2,174	1,453	319	166	201	225	1,807	1,399	222	185
Meraux	5,053	3,493	748	214	470	660	3,573	2,563	450	148	310	431	3,063	2,494	333	235
District 101																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	19,661	4,343	11,352	1,575	2,179	2,458	14,505	3,768	7,931	1,211	1,425	1,605	10,609	3,449	6,137	1,018
Central	2,609	2,083	295	40	147	151	1,946	1,599	174	28	106	100	1,784	1,639	99	45
District 102																
Orleans																
New Orleans	42,951	15,319	24,358	601	2,169	2,884	35,111	14,077	18,431	506	1,684	2,164	31,526	12,109	16,808	2,609
District 103																
Orleans																
New Orleans	19,938	2,062	17,025	145	589	834	14,583	1,804	12,145	104	446	613	12,590	1,566	10,424	600
St. Bernard																
Chalmette	18,445	9,577	5,591	594	2,274	2,886	13,174	7,523	3,458	413	1,494	1,858	9,549	6,875	1,828	853
Meraux	1,751	1,170	374	31	152	212	1,319	922	244	22	108	141	1,239	982	198	59
District 104																
St. Tammany																
Eden Isle	5,091	4,156	395	184	263	318	4,420	3,687	290	144	219	256	3,642	3,182	175	288
Lacombe	8,148	5,219	2,013	103	608	623	6,570	4,380	1,532	71	439	419	5,618	4,034	1,192	394
Mandeville	6,200	5,066	393	163	462	454	5,000	4,195	287	105	329	324	4,510	3,975	250	293
Slidell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 105																
Orleans																
New Orleans	33,407	6,251	23,494	1,201	2,202	2,852	25,383	5,477	17,167	997	1,550	1,958	20,221	4,475	13,710	2,036
Plaquemines																
Belle Chasse	8,571	6,765	621	391	581	747	6,319	5,112	406	252	396	475	5,617	4,827	343	446
New Orleans Station	561	328	133	32	55	104	326	191	72	19	36	57	248	213	18	18

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 1 of 4

[illegible]

Time: 1:07 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: House - Public Submissions

Page: 2 of 4

[illegible]

Split VTDs

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 65																
East Baton Rouge																
3-1	116	104	0	1	7	8	88	79	0	0	5	5	86	79	5	3
3-8	1,059	130	726	6	197	204	719	110	485	6	118	116	561	85	445	29
3-9	1,150	1,013	80	18	31	24	929	833	53	11	25	13	863	792	48	24
3-37	500	300	179	3	6	7	390	242	128	2	6	7	353	288	55	9
District 76																
St. Tammany																
914	869	358	415	10	61	71	625	265	293	5	42	51	499	183	289	36
922	9	9	0	0	0	2	8	8	0	0	0	2	6	3	2	0
S10	1,351	1,064	161	27	63	76	1,062	851	110	18	53	59	930	796	77	64
District 83																
Jefferson																
211	1,215	733	231	65	161	225	1,012	650	170	53	116	167	350	255	51	43
District 85																
Jefferson																
211	930	344	582	0	1	67	924	344	576	0	1	67	321	234	48	40
District 88																
Ascension																
24	503	333	91	1	66	68	377	252	73	0	41	39	294	243	29	22
District 90																
St. Tammany																
702	499	376	89	4	12	18	373	286	63	2	7	12	331	215	90	25
909	2,547	553	1,831	100	50	69	1,656	438	1,092	79	35	47	1,271	469	675	127
914	431	137	258	0	28	35	346	116	204	0	20	25	275	99	154	13
922	1,135	468	549	31	64	76	864	378	386	27	51	57	684	385	224	74
S10	417	257	104	15	27	44	322	212	75	12	17	27	280	240	16	17
District 96																
St. Martin																
3	1,976	1,197	640	57	72	75	1,486	927	458	34	58	55	1,255	905	311	46
4	505	388	109	3	4	6	379	294	80	1	3	2	359	292	56	14
7	1,576	1,036	446	58	27	33	1,156	772	309	42	26	26	1,044	731	282	29
8	1,428	100	1,309	3	3	20	1,132	80	1,038	2	1	11	1,211	83	1,114	17

Split VTDs

	Total Population	Total White	Total Black	Total Asian	Total Other	Total Hispanic	VAP Total	VAP White	VAP Black	VAP Asian	VAP Other	VAP Hispanic Total	Reg Total Dec 2021	Reg White Dec 2021	Reg Black Dec 2021	Reg Other Dec 2021
District 96																
St. Martin																
14	791	511	240	1	23	18	590	372	185	1	16	12	578	410	160	13
18	2,295	503	1,732	7	37	51	1,635	387	1,216	4	17	34	1,596	556	1,015	20
District 100																
St. Bernard																
32	1,874	1,224	309	136	175	197	1,298	883	189	93	112	121	1,038	815	127	95
33	718	496	102	42	64	77	508	367	55	28	49	54	484	385	54	45
District 101																
East Baton Rouge																
1-55	1,053	446	403	142	44	62	846	379	298	117	37	49	599	317	197	85
1-70	2,003	136	1,732	48	73	91	1,578	123	1,347	37	57	75	1,516	123	1,316	77
1-87	1,677	189	966	245	264	287	1,148	174	609	180	175	192	850	314	404	130
3-8	3,015	313	2,582	33	67	81	2,125	290	1,751	30	41	57	1,663	258	1,322	85
3-9	947	756	121	9	38	41	697	568	72	8	31	32	648	596	37	14
District 103																
St. Bernard																
32	1,011	660	164	43	120	152	757	501	113	32	92	109	603	472	76	56
33	531	382	86	18	40	52	380	288	47	11	29	32	365	288	40	37
District 104																
St. Tammany																
702	1,029	620	306	4	79	56	801	490	244	3	49	30	710	463	192	56
909	1,345	765	379	103	82	86	1,142	668	308	83	67	76	878	324	466	88
922	89	82	4	0	0	7	74	67	4	0	0	7	59	34	20	7

From: Chris Kaiser <ckaiser@laaclu.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:40 AM
To: House & Governmental Affairs; Sen. & Gov Affairs Cmte; Marinovich, Lauren
Subject: Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in State Legislative Redistricting
Attachments: la_sen_aclu_dec20_bef.csv; LA_ACLU_House_12_29.xlsx; 01.19.22 Letter Regarding Louisiana House and Senate Redistricting.pdf

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Please do not click on links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Committee Members,

Please find three attachments:

- 1) A letter from 16 civil and human rights organizations regarding compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in Louisiana House and Senate redistricting
- 2) A comma-delimited block equivalency file containing the ACLU Illustrative Senate district plan, referenced in the letter
- 3) A comma-delimited block equivalency file containing the ACLU Illustrative House district plan, referenced in the letter

We will be in attendance at tomorrow's joint committee meeting. Please contact me if I can answer any questions.

Thank you,

Chris Kaiser | Advocacy Director
Pronouns: he, him
American Civil Liberties Union of Louisiana
PO Box 56157, New Orleans, LA 70156
Mobile: 512.740.1317



This message may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately advise the sender by reply email that this message has been inadvertently transmitted to you and delete this email from your system.



Sent Via Email

January 19, 2022

Senate and Governmental Affairs Committee
Louisiana State Senate
P.O. Box 94183
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
s&g@legis.la.gov

House and Governmental Affairs Committee
Louisiana House of Representatives
Box 94062
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
h&ga@legis.la.gov

Re: Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in State Legislative Redistricting

Dear Chairman Stefanski, Chair Hewitt, and Other Members of the House and Senate Governmental Affairs Committees:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Louisiana, American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., NAACP Louisiana State Conference, Power Coalition for Equity and Justice, Black Voters Matter Fund, Urban League of Louisiana, Fair Districts Louisiana, Louisiana Progress, Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund, Campaign Legal Center, Voice of the Experienced (VOTE), Voters Organized to Educate, League of Women Voters of Louisiana, Louisiana Budget Project, and E Pluribus Unum write to remind you of

your affirmative obligation to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (“Section 2”) during this reapportionment and redistricting cycle when preparing new maps for the Louisiana State Legislature, made-up of the Louisiana House of Representatives and Louisiana Senate. In particular, we urge you to consider the State’s Section 2 obligations, including whether Section 2 requires this body to enact additional opportunity single-member districts comprised of a majority of Black voters (“majority-minority opportunity district”).

Section 2 requires the redistricting body to ensure that voters of color have an equal opportunity “to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice.”¹ Currently, only 25.69 % of the members of the State Legislature are Black.² Of these Black legislative members all but one are elected from single-member majority-minority districts. It is fair, necessary, and logical that Black Louisianans—who, according to the 2020 Census data, comprise nearly one-third of Louisiana’s residents³—have an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice through additional majority-minority districts. Members of State Legislature make decisions and policies that impact every aspect of life in Louisiana, including access to education, economic opportunity, housing, health care, and criminal justice. Under the current House of Representatives and Senate maps, Louisiana’s Black voters are severely underrepresented. Adding a number of new majority-minority opportunity districts, which Section 2 likely requires, would provide Black voters with representation to address the state’s pervasive and ongoing record of inequality of opportunity in various aspects of life.

I. Introduction

During the new redistricting session, in February, the State Legislature will redraw district maps for Louisiana’s State Legislature based on data from the 2020 census, and your committees play an important role in that process.⁴ Currently just 37 out of the 144 (25.69%) members of the Louisiana Legislature are Black even though Black residents comprise 33.1% of the State’s population.⁵ This is a direct consequence of the configuration of Louisiana’s legislative districts. Under the current state legislative maps, Black voters in Louisiana have less opportunity to elect candidates of their choice than white voters. Louisiana’s new State Legislature

¹ *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 34 (1986) (quoting 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b)).

² See La. House of Representatives, *Louisiana Legislative Black Caucus*, https://house.louisiana.gov/H_Reps/H_Reps_Caucus_LLBC (last visited Jan. 18, 2022); see also *Adrian Fisher*, Ballotpedia, https://ballotpedia.org/Adrian_Fisher (last visited Jan. 18, 2022); *Louisiana House of Representatives District 102*, Ballotpedia,

³ The source of this data is the 2021 P.L. 94-171 Restricting Data released by the Census Bureau and accessible at data.census.gov.

⁴ Legislature maps are drawn by the State Legislature and subject to gubernatorial veto. La. Const. art. iii, § 6 (1974).

⁵ The source of this data is the 2021 P.L. 94-171 Restricting Data released by the Census Bureau and accessible at data.census.gov.

maps must adequately represent the State's growing Black population and adequately account for demographic changes within the State.

It is critical that the State Legislature uses this session to remedy long-standing dilution of Black voting strength in Louisiana's State Legislature. Failure to do so would likely further entrench and exacerbate vote dilution over the next 10 years given the State's steadily growing Black population. According to the new Census data the number of Black people in Louisiana increased by 3.78%.⁶ And the total number of Black Louisiana residents over the age of 18—the Black Voting Age Population (“BVAP”)—increased by 7.21%.⁷ Furthermore, although Louisiana's total population grew modestly since 2010, this growth has not been uniform throughout the State and was driven by growth in minority populations that offset a 6.3% decrease in the State's white population. For example, per the 2020 Census data, in the Shreveport area (including Bossier, Caddo, and De Soto Parishes) the overall population decreased by 1.3% but the region's Black population grew by 2.14%.⁸ In the Lake Charles area (including Calcasieu and Cameron Parishes), since 2010, the overall population decreased by 11.42% but the Black population grew by 19.12%.⁹ The Legislature must ensure that these communities are fairly and accurately represented by the new House and Senate districts, even as many districts must be reapportioned due to overall population loss.

II. The State Legislature Has an Obligation to Comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in Redistricting.

The Louisiana Legislature has an affirmative obligation to comply with the Voting Rights Act in the redistricting process. In particular, Section 2 requires the redistricting body to ensure that voters of color have an equal opportunity “to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice,” taking into consideration the state or locality's demographics, voting patterns, and other circumstances.¹⁰ A chief purpose of Section 2 is to prohibit minority vote dilution at all levels of government.¹¹

A district map may violate Section 2 when it dilutes the voting power of voters of color, including by “packing” Black voters into districts where they constitute an unnecessary large percentage of the voting population, which deprives them of the opportunity to elect candidates of choice in other districts.¹² Section 2 prohibits

⁶ See *supra* n. 5.

⁷ See *supra* n. 5.

⁸ See *supra* n. 5.

⁹ See *supra* n. 5.

¹⁰ *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 34 (quoting 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b)).

¹¹ See *St. Bernard Citizens For Better Gov't v. St. Bernard Par. Sch. Bd.*, No. CIV.A. 02-2209, 2002 WL 2022589, at *10 (E.D. La. Aug. 26, 2002); *Fifth Ward Precinct 1A Coal. & Progressive Ass'n v. Jefferson Par. Sch. Bd.*, No. CIV.A. 86-2963, 1989 WL 3801, at *1 (E.D. La. Jan. 18, 1989).

¹² See *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 46, n.11.

minority vote dilution regardless of whether a plan was adopted with a discriminatory purpose.¹³ Indeed, Section 2 outlaws redistricting plans that result in a reduced ability of voters of color to elect candidates of their choice.

In *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), the U.S. Supreme Court set forth three preconditions for assessing whether a districting plan or voting system has resulted in vote dilution. The three “*Gingles* preconditions” are whether (1) an alternative districting plan can be drawn that includes one or more single-member districts in which the minority community is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in the district; (2) the minority group is politically cohesive in its support for its preferred candidates; and (3) in the absence of majority-minority districts, candidates preferred by the minority group would usually be defeated due to the political cohesion of non-minority voters in support of different candidates.¹⁴ Together, the second and third *Gingles* preconditions are commonly referred to as racial bloc or racially polarized voting (“RPV”).¹⁵ The presence of RPV is key evidence of the need to remedy racial vote dilution, as discussed below.

If these three *Gingles* preconditions are met, a decisionmaker must then evaluate the “totality of circumstances” to determine whether minority voters “have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.”¹⁶ Courts consider several factors to determine whether the minority vote has been diluted impermissibly.¹⁷ It will be “only the very unusual case in which the plaintiffs can establish the existence of the three *Gingles* factors but still have failed to establish a violation of § 2 under the totality of circumstances.”¹⁸

¹³ *Id.* at 35.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 50-1.

¹⁵ Racially polarized voting occurs when different racial groups vote for different candidates. In a racially polarized election, for example, Black people vote together for their preferred (frequently Black) candidate, and most non-Black voters vote for the opposing (typically white) candidate.

¹⁶ 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b); *League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399, 425 (2006).

¹⁷ Courts examine the “totality of the circumstances” based on the so-called “Senate Factors,” named for the Senate Report accompanying the 1982 Voting Rights Act amendments in which they were first laid out. *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 43-45. The Senate Factors are: (1) the extent of any history of discrimination related to voting; (2) the extent to which voting is racially polarized; (3) the extent to which the state or political subdivision uses voting practices that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination; (4) whether minority candidates have access to candidate slating processes; (5) the extent to which minority voters bear the effects of discrimination in areas of life like education, housing, and economic opportunity; (6) whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals; (7) the extent to which minority people have been elected to public office; (8) whether elected officials are responsive to the needs of minority residents; and (9) whether the policy underlying the voting plan is tenuous. *Id.* at 36-37. However, “there is no requirement that any particular number of factors be proved, or that a majority of them point one way or the other.” *Id.* at 45 (quoting S. Rep. No. 97-417, at 29 (1982)).

¹⁸ *Clark v. Calhoun Cnty., Miss.*, 21 F.3d 92, 97 (5th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Jenkins v. Red Clay Consol. Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, 4 F.3d. 1103, 1135 (3d Cir. 1993)).

III. New State Legislature Maps Similar to the Current Maps Likely Violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

a. *Gingles* Precondition One: It Is Possible to Draw State Legislature Maps with Additional Majority-Minority Opportunity Districts

It is possible to draw additional majority-minority opportunity districts in both Senate and the House of Representatives. Attached as **Appendix 1 and 2** are illustrative maps for the Louisiana Senate and the House of Representatives. These maps are based on 2020 Census data, and demonstrate that additional majority-minority opportunity districts can be drawn in both the Senate and the House, achieving compliance with the Voting Rights Act. The provided maps illustrate just two possible ways to draw maps that follow traditional redistricting principals²⁰ and meaningfully expand the number of majority-minority opportunity districts. There are countless other potential district configurations of both the Senate and the House that would add a significant number of new majority-minority opportunity districts where the BVAP is the numerical majority,²¹ the Black voting community is geographically compact, and the share of Black majority-minority opportunity districts would fairly reflect the State's population and demographics.

The illustrative Senate map, at **Appendix 1**, demonstrates 14 majority-minority opportunity districts, adding four new majority-minority opportunity districts. In this illustrative plan, BVAP within each of the four new majority-minority opportunity districts is sufficiently large and geographically compact to satisfy *Gingles*' first precondition. This illustrative plan provides 14 majority-minority opportunity districts where the BVAP is over 50%.

The illustrative House of Representatives map, at **Appendix 2**, demonstrates 38 majority-minority opportunity districts, adding nine new majority-minority opportunity districts. Within each of the nine new majority-minority opportunity districts in the illustrative plan, BVAP is sufficiently large and geographically compact to satisfy *Gingles*' first precondition. The illustrative State House map provides 38 majority-minority opportunity districts where the BVAP is over 50%.

Moreover, as compared to the current map, both illustrative maps include more geographically compact communities of Black voters, as reflected by traditional

²⁰ Traditional Redistricting Principles include population equality, non-dilution of minority voting strength, respect for consideration of communities of interest, compactness and contiguity of districts, and other considerations.

²¹ The Supreme Court has held that a minority community is sufficiently large when it "make[s] up more than 50 percent of the voting-age population in the relevant geographical area." *Bartlett*, 556 U.S. at 18.

redistricting principles.²² For example, the illustrative Senate map has fewer overall parish and precinct splits than the current map, and the overall average of the widely recognized statistical measures of compactness of the illustrative Senate map are better than the current map.²³ The most of the majority-minority opportunity districts on the illustrative Senate map also have better compactness scores for two of the widely accepted measures than the current map. And overall, the compactness measures of four new majority-minority opportunity districts are better than, or essentially the same, as that of the current map.

Similarly, the illustrative House map has fewer overall parish and precinct splits than the current map; and the overall average of the widely recognized statistical measures of compactness of the illustrative House map are better than the current map. Additionally, more than half of the majority-minority opportunity districts of the illustrative House map have better compactness scores for two of the widely used measures than the current map. And overall, the compactness measures for the nine new majority-minority opportunity districts are better than, or essentially the same, as that of the current map.²⁴

As shown by the illustrative maps, it is possible to draw a House map with 38 majority-Black districts. Similarly, the Senate map could contain 14 majority-Black districts. Because the State Legislature could create House and Senate maps that both comport with traditional districting criteria and contain more majority-minority opportunity districts, the first *Gingles* precondition would likely be satisfied if Louisiana's new State Legislature maps fail to provide a significant number of additional majority-minority opportunity districts.²⁵

²² *League of United Latin Am. Citizens*, 548 U.S. at 433 ("While no precise rule has emerged governing § 2 compactness, the inquiry should take into account traditional districting principles such as maintaining communities of interest and traditional boundaries." (internal quotations and citation omitted)).

²³ See, e.g., Compactness Reports for Illustrative Maps (on file with ACLU).

²⁴ While the illustrative maps reflect improvements in compactness, it should be noted that the Louisiana State Legislature Redistricting Criteria requires compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and only requires consideration of compactness concerns to the "extent practicable." Therefore, the State Legislature should not prioritize compactness over compliance with Section 2 when creating new State Legislative maps. See House Concurrent Resolution No. 90, Joint Rule No. 21. Redistricting Criteria (2021).

²⁵ See *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 50.

b. *Gingles* Preconditions Two and Three: Louisiana Elections Reflect Racially Polarized Voting Patterns.

There is ample evidence to suggest that the second and third *Gingles* preconditions are satisfied due to Louisiana's well-documented history and ongoing record of racially polarized voting in elections across the state.²⁶

Over the past three decades, numerous federal courts have found that racially polarized voting pervades Louisiana statewide and local elections.²⁷ In the past two decades, the Department of Justice (DOJ) has sued local parishes under Section 2 three times; in each case, the DOJ identified racially polarized voting patterns within the parish.²⁸

The 2020 congressional elections similarly reflected racially polarized voting patterns. For instance, in the five districts comprised of a majority of white voters, there were four contests in which voters had a choice between Black and white congressional candidates. In each, the majority of white voters elected white

²⁶ *Citizens for a Better Gretna v. City of Gretna, La.*, 834 F.2d 496, 499 (5th Cir. 1987) ("Racial bloc voting is the linchpin of a § 2 vote dilution claim . . ."); *McMillan v. Escambia County*, 748 F.2d 1037, 1043 (5th Cir. 1984) ("[RPV] will ordinarily be the keystone of a dilution case . . ."); *see also Clark v. Calhoun County, Miss.*, 88 F.3d 1393, 1397 (5th Cir. 1996); *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 48 n.15; *Westwego Citizens for Better Gov't v. City of Westwego*, 946 F.2d 1109, 1122 (5th Cir. 1991).

²⁷ A district court recently found that there was sufficient preliminary evidence of racially polarized voting statewide to support plaintiffs' challenge to Louisiana's Supreme Court district map. *La. State Conf. of NAACP v. Louisiana*, 490 F. Supp. 3d 982, 1019 (M.D. La. 2020). In *St. Bernard Citizens For Better Government*, the district court found racially polarized voting patterns in statewide gubernatorial elections, as well as local parish elections. 2002 WL 2022589, at *7. *See e.g., Terrebonne Par. Branch NAACP v. Jindal*, 274 F. Supp. 3d 395, 436–37 (M.D. La. 2017), *rev'd sub nom. Fusilier v. Landry*, 963 F.3d 447 (5th Cir. 2020) (The district court found that there were racially polarized voting patterns in the parish's judicial elections, and although the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court's decision, it held that the district court did not err in its finding of racially polarized voting); *Citizens for a Better Gretna v. City of Gretna, La.*, 636 F. Supp. 1113, 1124 (E.D. La. 1986); *Major v. Treen*, 574 F. Supp. 325, 337 (E.D. La. 1983) (The court held that there was racial polarization in Orleans Parish).

²⁸ Most recently, in 2021, the DOJ sued the City of West Monroe under Section 2 over its at-large alderman elections. The DOJ contended that there was racially polarized voting sufficient to satisfy *Gingles* because "[i]n contests between Black candidates and White candidates for West Monroe Board of Alderman and other parish, state, and federal positions, White voters cast their ballots sufficiently as a bloc to defeat the minority's preferred candidate." The court agreed and entered a consent decree between the parties. Complaint at ¶ 17, *United States v. City of West Monroe*, No. 3:21-cv-0988 (W.D. La. Apr. 14, 2021); *see also* Complaint at ¶ 11, *United States v. City of Morgan*, No. 00-cv-1541 (W.D. La. June 27, 2000) ("Racially polarized voting patterns prevail in elections for the City Council of Morgan City. In contests between [B]lack and white candidates for City Council, [B]lack voters consistently vote for [B]lack candidates and white voters vote sufficiently as a bloc to usually defeat the [B]lack voters' candidates of choice."); Answer & Cross-Claim at ¶ 31, *Greig v. City of St. Martinville*, No. 6:00-cv-00603 (W.D. La. Jun. 2, 2000) (The DOJ asserted that "[e]lections in the City of St. Martinville are racially polarized.").

candidates, defeating the Black candidates.²⁹ Furthermore, as noted, currently only one of the 37 Black members of the Louisiana Legislature is from a district that is not a single-member majority-minority district. There is ample evidence to support the conclusion that there are racially polarized voting patterns that may satisfy *Gingles* preconditions two and three.

c. Totality of Circumstances: Louisiana's Voters of Color Have Less Opportunity to Elect Candidates of Their Choice.

In addition to the indicia of the three *Gingles* preconditions, under the "totality of circumstances," Black voters have "less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice" in Louisiana's State Legislature elections.³⁰ Several of the Senate Factors³¹ strongly indicate that vote dilution is occurring, including: the extent of the history of voting discrimination in Louisiana (Factor 1); the extent of racially polarized voting in Louisiana (Factor 2); the extent to which Louisiana has used various voting practices that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against Black voters (Factor 3); the extent to which Black voters bear the effects of discrimination in a variety of areas of life (Factor 5); whether political campaigns in Louisiana have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals (Factor 6); and the extent to which Black candidates have been elected to public office in Louisiana (Factor 7). No set of number of these factors need to be established.³² Senate factors Two and Seven are the most significant³³ and the evidence of them in Louisiana is indisputable. The following are a sample of the indicia under the totality of circumstances impacting Black voters' ability to participate equally in Louisiana's State Legislature elections:

Senate Factor 1:

- The state of Louisiana has an extensive history and ongoing record of voting discrimination that has touched upon the right of Black and other minority voters, to register to vote, to vote, or otherwise to participate in the political process.³⁴ From Reconstruction to present day, Louisiana has passed countless laws to deny Black democratic participation, including

²⁹ See *United States Congressional Delegations from Louisiana*, Ballotpedia, https://ballotpedia.org/United_States_congressional_delegations_from_Louisiana (last visited Sep. 1, 2021).

³⁰ *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 36-37.

³¹ See *id.*

³² *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 45.

³³ *Id.* at 48 n.15.

³⁴ *St. Bernard Citizens For Better Gov't*, 2002 WL 2022589, at *9 (quoting *Citizens for a Better Gretna*, 636 F. Supp. at 1116) ("The history of black citizens' attempts, in Louisiana since Reconstruction, to participate effectively in the political process and the white majority's resistance to those efforts is one characterized by both *de jure* and *de facto* discrimination. Indeed, it would take a multi-volumed treatise to properly describe the persistent, and often violent, intimidation visited by white citizens upon black efforts to participate in Louisiana's political process.")

grandfather clauses, poll taxes, and educational and property qualifications.³⁵

- Louisiana has a long history and ongoing record of using various voting practices, such as at-large elections and redistricting to dilute the weight of Black Louisianans' vote once they cast them. From the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 until the Supreme Court's *Shelby County v. Holder* decision in 2013, the DOJ blocked nearly 150 voting related changes, including many vote dilution as well as vote denial schemes, in Louisiana pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.³⁶ Most recently, the DOJ successfully challenged the City of West Monroe's at-large alderman elections under Section 2.³⁷
- Louisiana's statewide district maps have been challenged under the Voting Rights Act in numerous reapportionment cycles since 1965.³⁸ District 2, Louisiana's only majority-minority Congressional district, was established in 1983, after the 1981 reapportionment cycle, when a federal district court held that the 1981 proposed congressional map diluted Black voting power in Orleans Parish by dispersing the parish's Black majority into two different congressional districts.³⁹

Senate Factor 2:

- As noted above, there is indicia of stark patterns of RPV throughout the State.

Senate Factor 5:

- Black Louisianans continue to experience the brunt of racial discrimination in every sector of public life. Black Louisianans experience higher unemployment rates than white Louisianans. Unemployment data from early 2021 shows that Black people were unemployed at a rate of 9%,

³⁵ Debo P. Adegbile, *Voting Rights in Louisiana: 1982–2006*, 17 S. Cal. Rev. L. & Soc. Just. 413, 416–418 (2008).

³⁶ See *Voting Determination Letters for Louisiana*, U.S. Dep't of Just., <https://www.justice.gov/crt/voting-determination-letters-louisiana> (last visited Jan. 18, 2022).

³⁷ See *United States v. City of West Monroe*, No. 3:21-cv-0988 (W.D. La. Apr. 14, 2021).

³⁸ See *Louisiana House of Representatives v. Ashcroft*, No. 02-0062 (D.D.C. May 21, 2003) (challenge to congressional redistricting after the 2000 census); *Hays v. Louisiana*, 936 F. Supp. 360, 362–68 (W.D. La. 1996) (challenge to congressional redistricting after 1990 Census); *Major v. Treen*, 574 F. Supp. 325 (E.D. La. 1983) (challenge to congressional redistricting after 1980 Census); *Bussie v. Governor of La.*, 333 F. Supp. 452, 454, 463 (E.D. La. 1971) (challenge to state legislative redistricting after 1970 Census).

³⁹ See *Major*, 574 F. Supp. at 327. Although this case predated *Gingles*, the district court found that racially polarized voting, combined with "Louisiana's history of racial discrimination, both *de jure* and *de facto*, continue to have an adverse effect on the ability of its [B]lack residents to participate fully in the electoral process." *Id.* at 339-40.

compared to 4.6% for white people.⁴⁰ Black Louisianans also experience socioeconomic disparities as a result of systemic discrimination. In 2019, 29.4% of Black people lived below the poverty line, compared to 12.5% of white people.⁴¹ Health disparities also persist among Black Louisianans as compared to white Louisianans. Although only one-third of Louisiana's population, Black people accounted for more than 70% of the people who died of COVID-19.⁴²

Senate Factor 6:

- Louisiana political campaigns have been characterized by subtle and overt racial appeals impacting the political process. David Duke, the former grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, has run for public office in Louisiana several times; most recently, in 2016, he unsuccessfully ran for U.S. Senate to “defend the heritage of European American people.”⁴³ Even with his explicit ties to white supremacy, he received over 58 thousand votes.⁴⁴ Current U.S. Representative for Louisiana's first congressional district, Steve Scalise, spoke to a white supremacist group in 2002 while serving as a Louisiana state legislator.⁴⁵ In 2018, a white Tangipahoa School Board Member and candidate for reelection posted a picture of a noose on Facebook with the caption “IF WE WANT TO MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN WE WILL HAVE TO MAKE EVIL PEOPLE FEAR PUNISHMENT AGAIN.”⁴⁶
- In 2001, the St. Bernard Parish School Board was sued under Section 2 for its redistricting plan that eliminated the only district where Black voters

⁴⁰ *State Unemployment by Race and Ethnicity*, Econ. Pol'y Inst., <https://www.epi.org/indicators/state-unemployment-race-ethnicity/> (last updated Nov. 2021).

⁴¹ *Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity*, KFF, <https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/poverty-rate-by-raceethnicity/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D> (last visited Jan. 18, 2022).

⁴² Tegan Wendland, *Black Communities Are Hit Hardest by COVID-19 in Louisiana and Elsewhere*, WWNO - New Orleans Pub. Radio, (Apr. 6, 2020), <https://www.wwno.org/latest-news/2020-04-06/black-communities-are-hit-hardest-by-covid-19-in-louisiana-and-elsewhere>.

⁴³ Camila Domonoske, *Former KKK Leader David Duke Says 'Of Course' Trump Voters Are His Voters*, NPR, (Aug. 5, 2016), <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/08/05/488802494/former-kkk-leader-david-duke-says-of-course-trump-voters-are-his-voters>.

⁴⁴ *United States Senate election in Louisiana, 2016*, Ballotpedia, https://ballotpedia.org/United_States_Senate_election_in_Louisiana,_2016 (last accessed Sep. 1, 2021).

⁴⁵ Dan Roberts, *Senior Republican Steve Scalise spoke at white supremacist meeting in 2002*, The Guardian, (Dec. 30, 2014), <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/dec/29/senior-republican-steve-scalise-spoke-at-white-supremacist-meeting-in-2002>.

⁴⁶ Caroline Grueskin, *Tangipahoa School Board Member Who Posted Noose Meme Opts for Last-minute Run for Reelection*, The Advocate (Jul. 31, 2018), https://www.theadvocate.com/baton_rouge/news/communities/livingston_tangipahoa/article_e0999182-9506-11e8-bf14-fb6afcf2a6ee.html.

had an opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. Lynn Dean, a white state senator who was involved in the redistricting and the highest-ranking public official in the Parish, testified that he use[d] the ["n-word"] and "ha[d] done so recently . . ." ⁴⁷

Senate Factor 7:

- Black people have been largely underrepresented in Louisiana public offices, particularly outside of the majority-Black districts. There is currently only one Black member of the Louisiana Legislature from a district that is not a single-member majority-minority districts. Moreover, Louisiana has never had a Black U.S. Senator, and has not had a Black governor since Reconstruction. Louisianans rarely elect Black candidates to Congress; the state has had only five Black Congresspeople since Reconstruction.⁴⁸ Louisiana's first Black chief Justice of the state Supreme Court was appointed following a consent decree that was entered in a case challenging the use of at-large judicial districts. As part of the consent decree, the court created a majority-minority judicial district that has continued to elect the only Black member of the State Supreme Court.⁴⁹

An additional important factor in evaluating the totality of the circumstances is whether there is rough proportionality between the number of majority-minority voting districts and the minority members' share of the relevant population.⁵⁰ "The relevant proportionality inquiry compares the percentage of total districts that are [minority] opportunity districts with the [minorities] share of the citizen voting-age population."⁵¹

As noted, Black individuals are currently underrepresented in the Louisiana State Legislature. Currently just 37 out of the 144 (25.69%) members of the Louisiana Legislature are Black and there are no other members of color. According to the 2020 census data, Black people make-up 33.1% of the total population in Louisiana.⁵² Additionally, per the 2019 census data, the BVAP population in

⁴⁷ *St. Bernard Citizens For Better Gov't*, 2002 WL 2022589, at *10.

⁴⁸ See *Black-American Members by State and Territory, 1870–Present*, History, Art & Archives: U.S. House of Representatives, <https://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/BAIC/Historical-Data/Black-American-Representatives-and-Senators-by-State-and-Territory/> (last visited Jan. 18, 2022).

⁴⁹ See *Chisom v. Jindal*, 890 F. Supp. 2d 696, 702–05 (E.D. La. 2012).

⁵⁰ See *League of United Latin Am. Citizens*, 548 U.S. at 401 (citing *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1000 (1994)).

⁵¹ *Id.*; see also *Patino v. City of Pasadena*, 677 Fed. App'x, 950, 953 (5th Cir. 2017) (*citation omitted*) (noting that one among many factors in the totality of circumstances to be considered is proportionality, which links the number of majority-minority voting districts to the minority members' share of the relevant population).

⁵² The source of this data is the 2021 P.L. 94-171 Restricting Data released by the Census Bureau and accessible at data.census.gov.

Louisiana was 31.5%; and per the 2020 census data, the current BVAP population is 31.2%.⁵³ However, only 27 out of the 105 Louisiana House of Representatives seats are filled by a Black individual. This is only 25.7% of the total number of House districts. Similarly, the Louisiana State Senate has only 10 seats filled by a Black individual out of 39. This is only 25.6% of the total number of Senate districts. There has not been proportionality between the State Legislature and the Black population in Louisiana in the past, and unless additional majority-minority opportunity districts are added this lack of proportionality will continue.

Our illustrative House of Representatives map, by contrast, includes potentially 38 reasonably compact majority-Black districts out of 105 total statewide that, based on a preliminary analysis, have the opportunity to function for Black voters. Similarly, our illustrative State Senate map creates potentially 14 reasonably compact majority-Black districts out of 39 statewide that, based on a preliminary analysis, have the opportunity to function for Black voters. These maps would create the possibility of achieving representation that is proportional with the percentage of Black Louisianians statewide. As such, our illustrative maps in both the House and Senate clearly “result[] in less disparity than the [current] plan and more closely approximate[] rough, or substantial, proportionality”—especially when considering that Black Louisiana should not “continue to bear the burden of under-representation under the [proposed] scheme while the white majority enjoys over-representation.”⁵⁴ It is possible for the Legislature to draw new State Legislature maps that achieve proportionality.

IV. The Louisiana State Legislature Must Enact Maps with Additional Majority-Minority Opportunity Districts.

For the reasons explained above, the State Legislature must earnestly consider its obligations under the Voting Rights Act and adopt State Legislature maps with a significant number of new additional majority-minority opportunity districts to ensure Black voters’ right to an equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. Failure to do so may lead to costly and unnecessary litigation.⁵⁵ We therefore urge the state to consider map plans that ensure non-dilution of Black voting strength in Louisiana. We are happy to discuss the contents of this letter further and to provide additional assistance with developing a more inclusive districting plan.

Please feel free to contact Chris Kaiser, Advocacy Director with the ACLU of Louisiana, with any questions at 512-740-1317 or email at ckaiser@laaclu.org to discuss these issues in more detail.

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ *Stabler v. Cnty. of Thurston, Neb.*, 129 F.3d 1015, 1022 (8th Cir. 1997).

⁵⁵ NAACP Legal Def. and Educ. Fund, Inc., *The Cost (in Time, Money, and Burden) of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act Litigation as of September 2021*, <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Section-2-costs-9.19.21-Final.pdf> (last visited Jan. 18, 2022).

Sincerely,

/s/

Alanah Odoms, Executive Director
Chris Kaiser, Advocacy Director
Megan Snider, Staff Attorney
ACLU of Louisiana
P.O. Box 56157
New Orleans, LA 70156-6157

T. Alora Thomas
Samantha Osaki
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004

Sarah Brannon
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
915 15th St., NW Washington, DC 20005

Michael Pernick
Leah C. Aden, Deputy Director of Litigation
Stuart Naifeh, Manager of the Redistricting Project
Jared Evans
Victoria Wenger
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund,
Inc.
40 Rector Street, 5th Fl.
New York, NY 10006

President Michael McClanahan
NAACP Louisiana State Conference
3313 Government Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Ashley K. Shelton
Janea Jamison
Power Coalition for Equity and Justice
4930 Washington Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70125

Mark Gaber, Director of Redistricting
Chris Lamar
Valencia Richardson

Campaign Legal Center
1101 14th St NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20002

Terry C. Landry, Jr., Policy Director – Louisiana
Chandra Shae Foster, Policy Associate
Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund
201 St. Charles Ave., Suite 2000
New Orleans, LA 70171
Liza Weisberg, Staff Attorney
P.O. Box 1287
Decatur, GA 30031

Judy Reese Morse
President and CEO
Urban League of Louisiana
4640 S. Carrollton Ave.
New Orleans, LA 70119
504-620-2332

Peter Robins-Brown
Policy & Advocacy Director
Louisiana Progress
504-256-8196
peter@louisianaprogress.org

Omari Ho-Sang, State Organizing Manager -
Louisiana
Keturah Butler-Reed, Southern Region Organizer -
Louisiana
Black Voters Matter Fund
omari@blackvotersmatterfund.org
keturah@blackvotersmatterfund.org

Norris Henderson
Executive Director
Voice of the Experienced
504-453-4819
norris@vote-nola.org

Bruce Reilly
Voters Organized to Educate
504-758-9420
bruce@vote-nola.org



Sent Via Email

January 19, 2022

Senate and Governmental Affairs Committee
Louisiana State Senate
P.O. Box 94183
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
s&g@legis.la.gov

House and Governmental Affairs Committee
Louisiana House of Representatives
Box 94062
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
h&ga@legis.la.gov

Re: Compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in State Legislative Redistricting

Dear Chairman Stefanski, Chair Hewitt, and Other Members of the House and Senate Governmental Affairs Committees:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Louisiana, American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., NAACP Louisiana State Conference, Power Coalition for Equity and Justice, Black Voters Matter Fund, Urban League of Louisiana, Fair Districts Louisiana, Louisiana Progress, Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund, Campaign Legal Center, Voice of the Experienced (VOTE), Voters Organized to Educate, League of Women Voters of Louisiana, Louisiana Budget Project, and E Pluribus Unum write to remind you of

your affirmative obligation to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (“Section 2”) during this reapportionment and redistricting cycle when preparing new maps for the Louisiana State Legislature, made-up of the Louisiana House of Representatives and Louisiana Senate. In particular, we urge you to consider the State’s Section 2 obligations, including whether Section 2 requires this body to enact additional opportunity single-member districts comprised of a majority of Black voters (“majority-minority opportunity district”).

Section 2 requires the redistricting body to ensure that voters of color have an equal opportunity “to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice.”¹ Currently, only 25.69 % of the members of the State Legislature are Black.² Of these Black legislative members all but one are elected from single-member majority-minority districts. It is fair, necessary, and logical that Black Louisianans—who, according to the 2020 Census data, comprise nearly one-third of Louisiana’s residents³—have an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice through additional majority-minority districts. Members of State Legislature make decisions and policies that impact every aspect of life in Louisiana, including access to education, economic opportunity, housing, health care, and criminal justice. Under the current House of Representatives and Senate maps, Louisiana’s Black voters are severely underrepresented. Adding a number of new majority-minority opportunity districts, which Section 2 likely requires, would provide Black voters with representation to address the state’s pervasive and ongoing record of inequality of opportunity in various aspects of life.

I. Introduction

During the new redistricting session, in February, the State Legislature will redraw district maps for Louisiana’s State Legislature based on data from the 2020 census, and your committees play an important role in that process.⁴ Currently just 37 out of the 144 (25.69%) members of the Louisiana Legislature are Black even though Black residents comprise 33.1% of the State’s population.⁵ This is a direct consequence of the configuration of Louisiana’s legislative districts. Under the current state legislative maps, Black voters in Louisiana have less opportunity to elect candidates of their choice than white voters. Louisiana’s new State Legislature

¹ *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 34 (1986) (quoting 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b)).

² See La. House of Representatives, *Louisiana Legislative Black Caucus*, https://house.louisiana.gov/H_Reps/H_Reps_Caucus_LLBC (last visited Jan. 18, 2022); see also *Adrian Fisher*, Ballotpedia, https://ballotpedia.org/Adrian_Fisher (last visited Jan. 18, 2022); *Louisiana House of Representatives District 102*, Ballotpedia,

³ The source of this data is the 2021 P.L. 94-171 Restricting Data released by the Census Bureau and accessible at data.census.gov.

⁴ Legislature maps are drawn by the State Legislature and subject to gubernatorial veto. La. Const. art. iii, § 6 (1974).

⁵ The source of this data is the 2021 P.L. 94-171 Restricting Data released by the Census Bureau and accessible at data.census.gov.

Stephen Kearney
Fair Districts Louisiana
225-235-7955
stephenkearny@gmail.com

Hilda Walker Thomas
President
League of Women Voters of Louisiana
president@lwvofla.org

Jan Moller
Executive Director
Louisiana Budget Project
225-819-7715
jan@labudget.org

Kia Bickham
E Pluribus Unum
kia@unumfund.org

American Civil Liberties Union of Louisiana

The ACLU of Louisiana has worked to advance and preserve the individual rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Louisiana since 1956. The organization is part of a nationwide network of ACLU affiliates that fight tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C.

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation

For 100 years, the ACLU has been our nation's guardian of liberty, working in courts, legislatures, and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whether it's ending mass incarceration, achieving full equality for the LGBT community, advancing racial justice, establishing new privacy protections for our digital age, or preserving the right to vote or the right to have an abortion, the ACLU takes up the toughest civil liberties and civil rights cases and issues to defend all people from government abuse and overreach. With more than one million members, activists, and supporters, the ACLU is a nationwide organization that fights tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C., for the principle that every individual's rights must be protected equally under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, disability, national origin, and record of arrest or conviction.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. ("LDF")

Since its founding in 1940, LDF has used litigation, policy advocacy, public education, and community organizing strategies to achieve racial justice and equity in the areas of education, economic justice, political participation, and criminal justice. Throughout its history, LDF has worked to enforce and promote laws and policies that prohibit voter discrimination, intimidation, and suppression and increase access to the electoral process.

Louisiana NAACP State Conference

Louisiana State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (the "Louisiana NAACP State Conference") is a state subsidiary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Inc. For decades, the Louisiana NAACP State Conference has worked towards its mission to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons and to eliminate race-based discrimination.

Power Coalition for Equity and Justice

The Power Coalition is a group of community-based organizations that work together to educate and empower voters across Louisiana. Through our voter engagement and community organizing work, we seek to unify our collective voices into a stronger, more cohesive force that can successfully advocate for an agenda of shared values and issues.

Campaign Legal Center

The nonpartisan Campaign Legal Center advances democracy through the law at the federal, state, and local levels, fighting for every American's rights to responsive government and a fair opportunity to participate in and affect the democratic process. Since the organization's founding in 2002, CLC has participated in major redistricting, voting rights, and campaign finance cases before the U.S. Supreme Court as well as numerous other federal and state court cases. CLC's work promotes every citizen's right to participate in the democratic process.

Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund

SPLC Action is a catalyst for racial justice in the South and beyond, working in partnership with communities to dismantle white supremacy, strength intersectional movements, and advance the human rights of all people.

Urban League of Louisiana

The Urban League of Louisiana's mission is to assist African Americans and other communities seeking equity to secure economic self-reliance, parity, and civil rights. As an affiliate of the National Urban League, and for over 83 years, the Urban League of Louisiana has worked to ensure quality education, equal employment, entrepreneurial opportunities, economic inclusion, and shared dignity under the law.

Louisiana Progress

Louisiana Progress is a nonprofit organization that is dedicated to informing, engaging, and mobilizing grassroots organizations, advocates, and activists to enact progressive public policy in Louisiana.

Black Voters Matter Fund

The Black Voters Matter Fund believes in the value of the voter 365. In this vein, not only do we support our partners' voting rights during and in between elections, we also support capacity and power building all year long.

Voice of the Experienced (VOTE)

VOTE is a grassroots organization founded and run by formerly incarcerated people (FIP), our families and our allies. We are dedicated to restoring the full human and civil rights of those most impacted by the criminal (in)justice system. Together we have the experiences, expertise, and power to improve public safety in New Orleans and beyond without relying on mass incarceration.

Voters Organized to Educate

Voters Organized is a 501(c)4 non-profit focused on building collective power to create change in the criminal legal system. We are dedicated to building an educated and engaged democracy. We do this by keeping people informed regarding elections, and ongoing issues in city, state, and national policy reform. Through working with organizations and individuals that believe in the principles of social justice and equality, Voters Organized impacts elections and legislation in Louisiana and beyond. We educate and mobilize organizations and individuals that believe in the principles of grassroots movement building, social justice, and equality.

Fair Districts Louisiana

Fair Districts Louisiana is a grassroots, non-partisan alliance of citizens advocating for redistricting and voting reform.

League of Women Voters of Louisiana

The League of Women Voters of Louisiana is a nonpartisan political organization encouraging informed and active participation in government. It influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Louisiana Budget Project


The Louisiana Budget Project monitors and reports on public policy and how it affects Louisiana's low- to moderate-income families.

E Pluribus Unum

Founded by former New Orleans Mayor Mitch Landrieu in 2018, E Pluribus Unum (EPU) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization whose mission is to build a more just, equitable, and inclusive South, uprooting the barriers that have long divided the region by race and class. Incubated at Emerson Collective, EPU is focused on changing the divisive narratives that perpetuate systemic and interpersonal racism, cultivating and empowering courageous leaders who are advancing racial equity, and championing transformative policy change. Learn more at www.unumfund.org.

APPENDIX 2*


ACLU Illustrative Full House Map




©2021 CALIPER

* In this and following House map figures, district lines appear brown, and green shading indicates the concentration of the Black Voting Age Population (BVAP), with darker shades indicating a higher BVAP percentage. District numbers are in black boxes.


Baton Rouge Area Districts of ACLU Illustrative House Map




New Orleans Area Districts of ACLU Illustrative House Map




North Louisiana Districts of ACLU Illustrative House Map




Lafayette Area Districts of Current Enacted House Map



Lake Charles Area Districts of ACLU Illustrative House Map




Current Enacted Full House Map




©2021 CALIPER


Baton Rouge Area Districts of Current Enacted House Map




New Orleans Area Districts of Current Enacted House Map




North Louisiana Districts of Current Enacted House Map



Lafayette Area Districts of Current Enacted House Map



Lake Charles Area Districts of Current Enacted House Map



Current House Plan with 2010 Data:

District	TTLPop10	Deviation	TTLWht10%	TTLBlk10%	WhtVAP10%	BlkVAP10%
1	41626	-3.59%	75.33%	22.32%	76.50%	21.30%
2	43911	1.70%	27.10%	68.35%	30.67%	64.97%
3	41814	-3.15%	9.74%	89.01%	11.95%	86.69%
4	42595	-1.34%	26.30%	71.71%	29.93%	68.08%
5	41713	-3.39%	68.51%	25.98%	71.81%	23.08%
6	43138	-0.09%	81.46%	13.59%	83.22%	12.12%
7	44770	3.69%	73.82%	22.19%	75.54%	20.76%
8	44977	4.17%	72.66%	21.28%	75.12%	19.21%
9	44949	4.11%	77.18%	17.73%	78.74%	16.51%
10	43417	0.56%	65.26%	33.00%	67.35%	31.09%
11	44981	4.18%	37.31%	60.09%	39.35%	57.95%
12	45164	4.61%	74.63%	21.66%	76.33%	20.42%
13	44155	2.27%	68.23%	30.03%	69.03%	29.35%
14	44515	3.10%	78.04%	19.31%	80.54%	17.07%
15	43657	1.12%	92.90%	4.65%	93.43%	4.28%
16	42608	-1.31%	34.89%	62.98%	39.36%	58.40%
17	43019	-0.36%	26.61%	71.73%	31.38%	66.92%
18	41741	-3.32%	57.57%	41.09%	58.07%	40.77%
19	44254	2.50%	67.97%	30.27%	69.97%	28.41%
20	45227	4.75%	73.27%	25.51%	75.12%	23.75%
21	41183	-4.61%	41.31%	57.61%	44.28%	54.66%
22	44570	3.23%	81.74%	15.80%	81.72%	15.98%
23	42704	-1.09%	39.12%	58.18%	43.09%	54.10%
24	45236	4.77%	80.77%	11.14%	82.35%	10.16%
25	44424	2.89%	74.83%	19.31%	76.93%	17.62%
26	42553	-1.44%	27.81%	69.38%	31.97%	65.08%
27	44636	3.38%	85.80%	11.30%	86.66%	10.59%
28	42073	-2.55%	67.00%	30.60%	68.73%	29.09%
29	41209	-4.55%	19.68%	79.27%	22.09%	76.82%
30	45181	4.65%	66.52%	24.82%	69.25%	22.58%
31	41889	-2.98%	85.26%	10.39%	86.85%	9.07%
32	44715	3.57%	79.40%	16.66%	79.88%	16.66%
33	45072	4.39%	88.95%	8.26%	90.57%	6.94%
34	45041	4.32%	25.35%	72.10%	29.12%	68.22%
35	45028	4.29%	85.80%	11.56%	86.65%	10.96%
36	44320	2.65%	81.79%	12.70%	83.87%	10.94%
37	43849	1.56%	79.74%	18.17%	81.68%	16.34%
38	42595	-1.34%	69.97%	28.63%	71.90%	26.82%
39	44786	3.73%	69.11%	27.87%	72.61%	24.64%
40	41047	-4.93%	38.45%	59.64%	41.84%	56.23%
41	43203	0.06%	77.95%	19.53%	79.38%	17.99%
42	41236	-4.49%	75.81%	22.60%	77.98%	20.54%
43	42313	-2.00%	84.60%	11.07%	85.96%	9.91%

District	TTLPop10	Deviation	TTLWht10%	TTLBlk10%	WhtVAP10%	BlkVAP10%
44	41586	-3.68%	33.13%	64.42%	37.99%	59.39%
45	43388	0.49%	78.02%	15.77%	80.55%	13.59%
46	41297	-4.35%	75.54%	21.86%	78.12%	19.49%
47	45107	4.47%	81.10%	15.11%	83.54%	13.04%
48	42819	-0.82%	78.29%	17.01%	80.23%	15.51%
49	41117	-4.77%	74.42%	21.10%	76.87%	18.81%
50	45177	4.64%	58.55%	36.70%	61.05%	34.54%
51	45004	4.24%	64.72%	22.44%	67.78%	20.61%
52	45311	4.95%	77.51%	14.08%	80.02%	12.43%
53	45259	4.83%	70.35%	19.71%	73.70%	17.26%
54	45314	4.95%	86.51%	3.65%	88.31%	2.96%
55	45251	4.81%	72.33%	24.73%	75.15%	22.17%
56	45315	4.96%	75.10%	21.21%	77.04%	19.54%
57	44112	2.17%	36.98%	60.03%	40.06%	57.07%
58	41253	-4.45%	33.34%	65.05%	35.97%	62.55%
59	41749	-3.30%	80.10%	15.24%	81.26%	14.44%
60	42140	-2.40%	59.66%	38.66%	62.40%	35.95%
61	42061	-2.58%	19.27%	77.57%	23.09%	73.57%
62	41170	-4.64%	58.05%	40.41%	59.07%	39.56%
63	42487	-1.59%	20.12%	78.75%	22.13%	76.82%
64	41101	-4.80%	83.78%	14.44%	84.77%	13.62%
65	41840	-3.09%	71.46%	23.17%	75.74%	19.13%
66	44049	2.02%	74.90%	18.94%	77.29%	16.90%
67	41585	-3.68%	39.62%	52.30%	44.62%	46.78%
68	41230	-4.50%	74.28%	20.43%	76.52%	18.40%
69	42600	-1.33%	69.50%	23.27%	72.60%	20.76%
70	41941	-2.86%	66.16%	26.99%	69.45%	23.67%
71	41514	-3.85%	89.18%	7.42%	90.35%	6.52%
72	42105	-2.48%	39.04%	59.04%	42.90%	55.18%
73	41407	-4.10%	76.68%	20.67%	79.63%	17.92%
74	41152	-4.69%	87.96%	9.67%	89.31%	8.49%
75	41070	-4.88%	64.34%	33.93%	66.66%	31.72%
76	41255	-4.45%	74.63%	19.74%	77.02%	17.58%
77	41591	-3.67%	86.93%	10.06%	88.23%	8.96%
78	44733	3.61%	84.35%	9.03%	85.68%	7.96%
79	44927	4.06%	76.73%	11.12%	78.63%	9.81%
80	45222	4.74%	75.48%	14.95%	77.69%	13.08%
81	41132	-4.73%	80.71%	17.44%	82.14%	16.10%
82	45054	4.35%	84.20%	10.55%	85.24%	9.85%
83	44983	4.19%	38.21%	54.57%	41.72%	51.16%
84	41352	-4.22%	72.95%	17.79%	75.35%	16.02%
85	44327	2.67%	50.45%	37.01%	54.48%	33.20%
86	41888	-2.98%	74.11%	22.17%	77.09%	19.42%
87	41461	-3.97%	27.42%	60.60%	30.61%	57.17%

District	TTLPop10	Deviation	TTLWht10%	TTLBlk10%	WhtVAP10%	BlkVAP10%
88	41631	-3.58%	85.08%	11.07%	86.69%	9.88%
89	41737	-3.33%	92.64%	3.53%	93.40%	3.15%
90	41650	-3.53%	77.33%	17.61%	79.81%	15.48%
91	45109	4.48%	34.27%	61.11%	38.09%	57.03%
92	44991	4.21%	54.17%	33.74%	57.08%	30.92%
93	45297	4.91%	30.81%	64.43%	35.26%	59.59%
94	44953	4.12%	80.56%	9.57%	82.07%	8.56%
95	41084	-4.84%	91.82%	5.32%	92.59%	4.85%
96	41607	-3.63%	38.26%	58.05%	42.32%	54.05%
97	43541	0.85%	22.27%	72.62%	25.02%	69.65%
98	44771	3.70%	68.28%	26.65%	70.37%	24.53%
99	41505	-3.87%	15.84%	81.48%	19.67%	77.35%
100	41668	-3.49%	3.07%	87.94%	3.78%	86.69%
101	42828	-0.80%	22.31%	69.08%	27.00%	64.28%
102	44310	2.63%	27.51%	66.94%	31.29%	62.92%
103	42992	-0.42%	65.98%	22.73%	68.57%	20.09%
104	41243	-4.47%	80.53%	14.67%	82.29%	13.19%
105	44925	4.05%	54.97%	34.97%	56.74%	33.34%

Current 2010 House Plan with 2020 Data:

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
1	40448	-8.82%	69.90%	22.48%	71.44%	21.84%
2	37287	-15.94%	22.23%	69.03%	25.27%	66.32%
3	35887	-19.10%	6.99%	90.08%	8.36%	88.99%
4	38713	-12.73%	21.24%	73.84%	24.40%	70.94%
5	45407	2.36%	55.35%	35.01%	59.17%	31.65%
6	42384	-4.45%	69.42%	19.47%	72.02%	17.47%
7	43738	-1.40%	64.28%	27.55%	66.61%	25.74%
8	53050	19.59%	61.33%	25.22%	64.41%	23.14%
9	48092	8.41%	65.88%	20.23%	68.40%	18.90%
10	38844	-12.43%	62.00%	33.22%	63.69%	31.82%
11	41578	-6.27%	36.67%	58.28%	39.05%	55.97%
12	44998	1.44%	71.97%	19.90%	73.94%	18.88%
13	41092	-7.37%	65.31%	27.35%	66.37%	26.02%
14	48883	10.20%	68.54%	24.37%	70.97%	22.33%
15	47535	7.16%	84.35%	6.90%	85.87%	5.95%
16	40502	-8.70%	27.85%	67.73%	31.46%	64.05%
17	41404	-6.66%	22.71%	70.42%	26.77%	65.84%
18	43306	-2.38%	58.80%	34.92%	61.12%	32.81%
19	40137	-9.52%	64.07%	31.61%	66.22%	29.63%
20	42282	-4.68%	69.63%	25.50%	71.30%	23.68%
21	36213	-18.37%	39.33%	57.52%	41.76%	55.27%
22	43149	-2.73%	73.88%	15.15%	73.18%	14.76%
23	40078	-9.65%	36.52%	56.84%	39.65%	53.47%
24	42060	-5.18%	76.33%	11.41%	78.41%	10.25%
25	45267	2.04%	67.53%	21.06%	70.25%	19.14%
26	38266	-13.74%	25.19%	69.86%	28.39%	66.77%
27	46490	4.80%	77.68%	13.61%	79.53%	12.21%
28	39693	-10.52%	63.58%	29.42%	65.30%	27.18%
29	38720	-12.71%	16.81%	79.83%	18.47%	78.42%
30	41987	-5.35%	59.77%	23.91%	62.04%	22.44%
31	50148	13.05%	75.56%	12.12%	77.63%	10.92%
32	42148	-4.99%	75.88%	13.81%	75.95%	13.15%
33	47543	7.18%	81.69%	8.68%	83.76%	7.51%
34	49494	11.57%	22.15%	71.34%	25.12%	68.77%
35	50744	14.39%	79.94%	12.06%	81.22%	11.48%
36	53864	21.42%	68.26%	18.10%	71.20%	15.99%
37	47273	6.57%	75.71%	18.94%	77.85%	17.31%
38	40658	-8.35%	67.06%	28.34%	68.92%	26.51%
39	48299	8.88%	60.06%	31.25%	63.82%	28.55%
40	41112	-7.32%	35.71%	60.17%	38.27%	58.07%
41	41258	-6.99%	73.88%	20.21%	75.65%	18.55%
42	37368	-15.76%	72.68%	22.86%	75.29%	20.85%

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
43	50543	13.94%	75.25%	13.35%	77.29%	11.96%
44	38140	-14.02%	28.00%	65.50%	31.81%	62.36%
45	40768	-8.10%	67.24%	18.64%	70.66%	16.30%
46	41724	-5.94%	72.29%	22.27%	74.86%	20.09%
47	42206	-4.86%	76.83%	16.23%	79.32%	14.38%
48	51194	15.41%	69.82%	19.09%	72.03%	17.59%
49	40005	-9.82%	68.12%	22.63%	71.07%	20.46%
50	40839	-7.94%	53.94%	35.37%	56.86%	33.62%
51	43840	-1.17%	57.70%	23.04%	61.53%	21.35%
52	46618	5.09%	68.22%	16.22%	72.10%	14.25%
53	41949	-5.44%	63.44%	20.77%	67.44%	18.58%
54	42464	-4.27%	80.66%	4.38%	83.74%	3.34%
55	48529	9.40%	65.53%	27.53%	68.06%	25.65%
56	44460	0.23%	66.87%	22.07%	69.37%	20.59%
57	42626	-3.91%	28.29%	62.72%	31.00%	60.61%
58	37296	-15.92%	31.04%	64.01%	33.54%	61.83%
59	52034	17.30%	68.26%	18.34%	70.18%	17.53%
60	40695	-8.26%	57.64%	36.60%	59.66%	34.54%
61	38495	-13.22%	17.06%	76.73%	19.93%	73.99%
62	43573	-1.77%	56.27%	38.77%	58.01%	37.33%
63	41046	-7.47%	16.75%	79.68%	18.05%	78.41%
64	43434	-2.09%	76.14%	16.51%	77.53%	15.68%
65	44932	1.29%	56.42%	27.98%	60.37%	25.12%
66	51268	15.57%	62.38%	23.71%	65.63%	21.51%
67	41035	-7.50%	34.84%	54.05%	38.10%	50.35%
68	44666	0.69%	66.00%	22.30%	68.09%	20.79%
69	44912	1.24%	55.14%	28.68%	59.00%	26.22%
70	47905	7.99%	56.85%	26.00%	59.97%	24.35%
71	45336	2.20%	75.59%	11.39%	78.60%	10.02%
72	40006	-9.82%	36.40%	58.74%	39.91%	55.58%
73	50703	14.30%	68.54%	22.13%	71.70%	19.77%
74	42838	-3.43%	81.18%	9.85%	82.72%	8.94%
75	39046	-11.98%	62.86%	31.99%	65.17%	30.13%
76	45461	2.48%	58.02%	29.21%	61.44%	26.43%
77	59689	34.56%	78.91%	9.20%	80.47%	8.63%
78	44548	0.42%	66.71%	10.90%	69.76%	10.13%
79	45579	2.75%	55.37%	13.11%	58.86%	11.64%
80	47648	7.41%	56.58%	16.65%	60.57%	15.15%
81	44647	0.65%	75.33%	17.44%	77.48%	16.09%
82	46392	4.58%	70.52%	12.04%	72.58%	11.55%
83	43853	-1.14%	28.23%	57.65%	31.65%	54.65%
84	41952	-5.43%	57.48%	21.38%	60.58%	19.75%
85	46567	4.98%	32.95%	38.31%	36.83%	36.72%
86	46150	4.04%	63.78%	26.11%	67.20%	23.44%

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
87	42694	-3.76%	18.81%	62.33%	21.34%	60.26%
88	47971	8.14%	71.64%	16.44%	74.61%	14.82%
89	44398	0.09%	82.15%	4.42%	84.07%	3.95%
90	43502	-1.93%	64.82%	21.81%	68.07%	19.48%
91	49815	12.30%	35.18%	53.15%	38.09%	50.76%
92	44398	0.09%	35.12%	30.65%	38.19%	29.85%
93	48621	9.61%	33.51%	54.40%	37.22%	50.90%
94	52522	18.40%	69.17%	10.19%	71.41%	9.58%
95	46091	3.90%	80.51%	9.48%	82.75%	8.32%
96	38859	-12.40%	35.08%	58.61%	38.03%	56.01%
97	53810	21.30%	25.38%	64.77%	27.26%	63.39%
98	46610	5.07%	65.04%	20.80%	65.79%	20.48%
99	50831	14.59%	16.32%	77.59%	20.04%	73.91%
100	46572	4.99%	1.79%	89.13%	2.13%	88.66%
101	41468	-6.52%	12.33%	72.54%	15.00%	70.64%
102	43158	-2.71%	20.54%	68.42%	23.63%	65.61%
103	52643	18.67%	46.33%	32.72%	50.46%	29.17%
104	43951	-0.92%	69.58%	16.25%	72.08%	14.88%
105	44833	1.07%	45.01%	35.71%	46.56%	34.72%

ACLU House plan with 2020 Data:

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
1	44511	0.34%	38.30%	22.48%	40.64%	54.69%
2	42848	-3.41%	25.14%	69.03%	28.29%	65.32%
3	42396	-4.43%	24.40%	90.08%	28.07%	67.12%
4	44082	-0.63%	39.05%	73.84%	42.37%	51.53%
5	42239	-4.78%	73.19%	35.01%	74.17%	16.75%
6	42590	-3.99%	72.20%	19.47%	74.55%	14.92%
7	44608	0.56%	71.54%	27.55%	73.32%	15.39%
8	42714	-3.71%	49.15%	25.22%	53.92%	32.08%
9	43793	-1.28%	61.82%	20.23%	64.75%	21.43%
10	43686	-1.52%	60.07%	33.22%	61.75%	33.34%
11	42361	-4.51%	38.14%	58.28%	40.67%	54.10%
12	46485	4.79%	75.54%	19.90%	77.15%	16.35%
13	42551	-4.08%	69.03%	27.35%	70.55%	22.34%
14	46474	4.77%	78.08%	24.37%	80.15%	13.05%
15	45909	3.49%	77.87%	6.90%	79.02%	13.93%
16	42314	-4.61%	30.12%	67.73%	34.37%	59.76%
17	43007	-3.05%	33.20%	70.42%	36.94%	54.48%
18	43108	-2.82%	64.53%	34.92%	66.44%	28.35%
19	43609	-1.69%	61.09%	31.61%	63.26%	33.50%
20	42483	-4.23%	65.56%	25.50%	66.62%	26.67%
21	42536	-4.11%	37.16%	57.52%	40.17%	56.99%
22	43710	-1.47%	77.44%	15.15%	76.43%	10.78%
23	42298	-4.65%	37.08%	56.84%	40.17%	53.08%
24	44024	-0.76%	71.57%	11.41%	73.62%	16.41%
25	42586	-4.00%	69.33%	21.06%	72.20%	19.00%
26	45775	3.19%	32.00%	69.86%	35.25%	59.22%
27	43673	-1.55%	69.00%	13.61%	71.21%	14.05%
28	43737	-1.40%	64.08%	29.42%	65.78%	27.06%
29	42423	-4.37%	35.77%	79.83%	36.80%	58.24%
30	44717	0.80%	81.43%	23.91%	82.79%	9.26%
31	43472	-2.00%	72.31%	12.12%	74.75%	11.75%
32	44187	-0.39%	73.86%	13.81%	73.77%	15.39%
33	44513	0.34%	74.30%	8.68%	76.84%	10.96%
34	42451	-4.30%	40.52%	71.34%	42.74%	50.88%
35	43964	-0.89%	81.89%	12.06%	83.67%	8.58%
36	42475	-4.25%	35.73%	18.10%	40.06%	50.28%
37	46027	3.76%	77.45%	18.94%	79.41%	15.58%
38	46422	4.65%	68.67%	28.34%	70.21%	24.47%
39	42805	-3.51%	55.86%	31.25%	60.33%	28.25%
40	45170	1.83%	38.78%	60.17%	41.63%	54.88%
41	44862	1.13%	75.05%	20.21%	77.20%	17.94%
42	43826	-1.20%	72.08%	22.86%	74.75%	20.44%

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
43	44253	-0.24%	77.00%	13.35%	78.86%	10.02%
44	42602	-3.96%	37.08%	65.50%	41.22%	51.31%
45	44264	-0.22%	74.26%	18.64%	76.69%	13.68%
46	43661	-1.58%	69.04%	22.27%	71.97%	22.27%
47	45524	2.62%	77.34%	16.23%	79.81%	13.56%
48	46449	4.71%	55.08%	19.09%	57.94%	34.66%
49	45983	3.66%	72.32%	22.63%	74.82%	15.42%
50	46217	4.19%	63.62%	35.37%	67.42%	20.87%
51	45893	3.46%	67.40%	23.04%	69.57%	23.04%
52	45840	3.34%	72.95%	16.22%	76.47%	9.70%
53	45838	3.33%	54.53%	20.77%	59.00%	24.41%
54	46458	4.73%	77.13%	4.38%	80.52%	6.26%
55	46138	4.01%	63.43%	27.53%	65.77%	25.56%
56	46311	4.40%	47.71%	22.07%	50.82%	17.83%
57	42477	-4.24%	31.42%	62.72%	34.73%	56.72%
58	42365	-4.50%	44.74%	64.01%	46.48%	50.30%
59	44221	-0.31%	67.11%	18.34%	69.21%	18.12%
60	42309	-4.62%	36.65%	36.60%	40.37%	50.45%
61	42448	-4.31%	24.53%	76.73%	28.10%	59.76%
62	46378	4.55%	74.23%	38.77%	74.59%	19.96%
63	42378	-4.47%	35.96%	79.68%	38.00%	56.73%
64	43770	-1.33%	78.86%	16.51%	81.45%	8.36%
65	42236	-4.79%	34.75%	27.98%	36.61%	58.34%
66	45492	2.55%	65.35%	23.71%	67.91%	18.33%
67	43956	-0.91%	32.55%	54.05%	36.94%	53.47%
68	42831	-3.45%	34.80%	22.30%	38.37%	50.15%
69	44483	0.28%	29.98%	28.68%	33.47%	56.94%
70	42410	-4.40%	69.68%	26.00%	71.47%	14.04%
71	46188	4.12%	67.79%	11.39%	70.82%	16.92%
72	43876	-1.09%	40.03%	58.74%	43.75%	50.27%
73	44244	-0.26%	70.95%	22.13%	73.82%	17.65%
74	46403	4.61%	79.56%	9.85%	81.75%	6.41%
75	45463	2.49%	65.08%	31.99%	67.29%	27.84%
76	46572	4.99%	71.94%	29.21%	74.50%	12.96%
77	46183	4.11%	77.46%	9.20%	79.62%	9.57%
78	46459	4.73%	58.78%	10.90%	62.71%	11.67%
79	46318	4.41%	59.84%	13.11%	63.34%	9.09%
80	46461	4.74%	62.45%	16.65%	65.81%	12.81%
81	43027	-3.01%	80.60%	17.44%	83.05%	7.72%
82	46432	4.67%	72.49%	12.04%	74.20%	12.02%
83	45396	2.34%	29.35%	57.65%	33.10%	50.60%
84	44289	-0.16%	54.50%	21.38%	57.79%	21.91%
85	45637	2.88%	32.53%	38.31%	36.44%	37.62%
86	46408	4.62%	60.15%	26.11%	63.90%	28.40%

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
87	46269	4.30%	28.65%	62.33%	29.76%	51.62%
88	43884	-1.07%	76.05%	16.44%	78.73%	11.71%
89	46159	4.06%	83.93%	4.42%	85.38%	3.68%
90	42520	-4.15%	46.02%	21.81%	49.92%	38.11%
91	44209	-0.34%	35.75%	53.15%	38.91%	50.29%
92	45511	2.59%	27.42%	30.65%	30.50%	50.16%
93	44889	1.19%	32.74%	54.40%	35.92%	50.26%
94	46136	4.00%	48.21%	10.19%	49.89%	36.02%
95	45041	1.54%	80.27%	9.48%	82.36%	9.25%
96	44603	0.55%	33.05%	58.61%	36.12%	57.46%
97	44517	0.35%	38.40%	64.77%	40.21%	50.26%
98	46487	4.79%	68.23%	20.80%	68.67%	17.29%
99	42224	-4.82%	1.46%	77.59%	1.71%	81.75%
100	46349	4.48%	25.03%	89.13%	26.43%	65.09%
101	42517	-4.15%	26.23%	72.54%	30.45%	51.18%
102	42951	-3.18%	34.53%	68.42%	39.05%	52.49%
103	44701	0.77%	33.26%	32.72%	36.90%	50.25%
104	46282	4.33%	75.83%	16.25%	77.83%	9.90%
105	42546	-4.09%	29.97%	35.71%	32.45%	55.09%

Field Descriptions:

TTLPop10 - 2010 Total Population (TTL Pop)

TTLPop20 - 2020 Total Population (TTL Pop)

TTLWht10% - 2010 Not-Hispanic White Alone Total Pop%

TTLBlk10% - 2010 Any Part Black Total Pop%

TTLWht20% - 2020 Not-Hispanic White Alone Total Pop%

TTLBlk20% - 2020 Any Part Black Total Pop%

WhtVAP20% - 2020 Not-Hispanic White Alone VAP%

BlkVAP20% - 2020 Any Part Black VAP%