

Plan Evaluation Form

Plan Type: Senate - 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?	Yes (See attachment - Plan Statistics)
For House and Senate Plans, give the # of districts if less than the current number.	
What is the overall deviation of the plan?	Absolute=11,717 Relative=9.81% (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.	14 (See attachment - District Population)
How many parishes are split in the plan? Please list. Include any explanation given for each split.	33 (See attachment - Split Parishes)
How many municipalities are split in the plan? Please list. Include any explanation given for each split.	82 (See attachment - Split Places)
How many VTDs (precincts) are split in the plan?	82 (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?	

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM


Snapshot Report

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 1 of 1



Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Compactness Report

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 1 of 1

District	Part	Area (sq miles)	Perimeter	Normalized Area	Reock	Schwartzberg	Holes
District 1	1	734.51	180.27	0.284	0.4279	1.88	0
District 2	1	860.33	210.07	0.245	0.3817	2.02	0
District 3	1	91.3	67.57	0.2513	0.5118	1.99	0
District 4	1	132.59	62.22	0.4304	0.3419	1.52	0
District 5	1	15.21	28.13	0.2417	0.3627	2.03	0
District 6	1	961.49	206.91	0.2822	0.4855	1.88	0
District 7	1	26.43	29.07	0.393	0.5369	1.6	0
District 8	1	84.52	60.44	0.2907	0.3269	1.85	0
District 9	1	21.54	29.83	0.3041	0.3255	1.81	0
District 10	1	121.32	60.6	0.4151	0.4461	1.55	0
District 11	1	181.18	75.69	0.3974	0.4911	1.59	0
District 12	1	1538.43	247.27	0.3162	0.5218	1.78	0
District 13	1	584.82	186.61	0.211	0.2813	2.18	0
District 14	1	51.51	43.38	0.344	0.4046	1.7	0
District 15	1	66.33	52.36	0.3041	0.4257	1.81	0
District 16	1	67.45	47.76	0.3716	0.6049	1.64	0
District 17	1	1507.22	272.84	0.2544	0.5233	1.98	0
District 18	1	472.62	130.09	0.3509	0.4982	1.69	0
District 19	1	964.34	226.57	0.2361	0.4206	2.06	0
District 20	1	6388.78	471.96	0.3604	0.4959	1.67	0
District 21	1	2640.78	426.89	0.1821	0.3482	2.34	0
District 22	1	2796.7	395.39	0.2248	0.4477	2.11	0
District 23	1	76.16	48.61	0.405	0.5106	1.57	0
District 24	1	259.14	121.91	0.2191	0.2872	2.14	0
District 25	1	3491.33	406.16	0.266	0.3419	1.94	0
District 26	1	1730.59	256.37	0.3309	0.4802	1.74	0
District 27	1	110.27	72.67	0.2624	0.4826	1.95	0
District 28	1	2369.53	338.84	0.2593	0.3647	1.96	0
District 29	1	1333.83	439.71	0.0867	0.1757	3.4	0
District 30	1	2325.85	372.4	0.2108	0.4347	2.18	0
District 31	1	3949.35	479.02	0.2163	0.3732	2.15	0
District 32	1	3554.44	471.54	0.2009	0.4252	2.23	0
District 33	1	2744.79	355.43	0.273	0.2846	1.91	0
District 34	1	2677.23	534.45	0.1178	0.4294	2.91	0
District 35	1	2563.06	486.52	0.1361	0.329	2.71	0
District 36	1	1572.3	239.27	0.3451	0.5959	1.7	0
District 37	1	54.15	63.47	0.1689	0.375	2.43	0
District 38	1	2605.65	333.35	0.2947	0.5879	1.84	0
District 39	1	675.68	181.23	0.2585	0.3713	1.97	0

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>
District 1	1	125,116	119,429	5,687	4.762%
District 2	1	114,554	119,429	-4,875	-4.082%
District 3	1	114,636	119,429	-4,793	-4.013%
District 4	1	114,240	119,429	-5,189	-4.345%
District 5	1	118,062	119,429	-1,367	-1.145%
District 6	1	124,165	119,429	4,736	3.966%
District 7	1	123,608	119,429	4,179	3.499%
District 8	1	119,325	119,429	-104	-0.087%
District 9	1	125,275	119,429	5,846	4.895%
District 10	1	125,255	119,429	5,826	4.878%
District 11	1	125,276	119,429	5,847	4.896%
District 12	1	124,918	119,429	5,489	4.596%
District 13	1	125,144	119,429	5,715	4.785%
District 14	1	114,081	119,429	-5,348	-4.478%
District 15	1	118,949	119,429	-480	-0.402%
District 16	1	124,850	119,429	5,421	4.539%
District 17	1	123,401	119,429	3,972	3.326%
District 18	1	125,122	119,429	5,693	4.767%
District 19	1	113,927	119,429	-5,502	-4.607%
District 20	1	122,720	119,429	3,291	2.756%
District 21	1	123,640	119,429	4,211	3.526%
District 22	1	124,828	119,429	5,399	4.521%
District 23	1	118,207	119,429	-1,222	-1.023%
District 24	1	114,806	119,429	-4,623	-3.871%
District 25	1	125,258	119,429	5,829	4.881%
District 26	1	120,982	119,429	1,553	1.300%
District 27	1	113,559	119,429	-5,870	-4.915%
District 28	1	118,640	119,429	-789	-0.661%
District 29	1	114,821	119,429	-4,608	-3.858%
District 30	1	124,095	119,429	4,666	3.907%
District 31	1	113,671	119,429	-5,758	-4.821%
District 32	1	114,730	119,429	-4,699	-3.935%
District 33	1	120,626	119,429	1,197	1.002%
District 34	1	115,470	119,429	-3,959	-3.315%
District 35	1	114,311	119,429	-5,118	-4.285%
District 36	1	115,768	119,429	-3,661	-3.065%
District 37	1	113,847	119,429	-5,582	-4.674%
District 38	1	113,757	119,429	-5,672	-4.749%
District 39	1	114,117	119,429	-5,312	-4.448%
Grand Total:	39	4,657,757	4,657,731		
Ideal Population Per Member:	119429				
Number of Districts for Plan Type:	39				
Range of District Populations:	113,559	to	125,276		
Absolute Mean Deviation:	300				
Absolute Range:	-5,870	to	5,847		
Absolute Overall Range:	11,717				
Relative Mean Deviation:	3.63%				
Relative Range:	-4.92%	to	4.90%		
Relative Overall Range:	9.82%				

Ideal - Actual:	-26
Remainder:	26
Unassigned Population:	0

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Page: 1 of 7

Plan Type: Senate - 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																
Orleans	10,858	969	5,447	3,075	1,266	1,861	7,494	810	3,324	2,528	765	1,083	5,130	559	2,491	2,080
St. Tammany	114,258	73,196	28,195	2,841	7,297	8,790	87,868	58,903	19,606	2,082	5,216	6,017	74,157	52,840	15,827	5,490
District 1	125,116	74,165	33,642	5,916	8,563	10,651	95,362	59,713	22,930	4,610	5,981	7,100	79,287	53,399	18,318	7,570
	100.000%	59.277%	26.889%	4.728%	6.844%	8.513%	100.000%	62.617%	24.045%	4.834%	6.272%	7.445%	83.143%	67.349%	23.103%	9.548%
District 2																
Ascension	42,315	18,129	20,133	433	3,059	3,766	31,300	14,415	14,115	326	2,042	2,486	26,866	13,331	12,225	1,313
Assumption	5,994	2,202	3,606	21	134	180	4,721	1,786	2,801	9	105	135	4,199	1,560	2,607	39
Iberville	19,105	7,186	10,717	162	912	1,083	15,104	6,144	7,947	119	792	918	12,253	4,486	7,478	291
St. James	20,192	9,973	9,762	60	315	343	15,505	7,883	7,297	31	230	237	14,966	7,254	7,501	211
St. John the Baptist	26,948	6,961	18,353	209	1,198	1,568	20,530	5,800	13,530	166	853	1,074	19,157	5,059	13,324	774
District 2	114,554	44,451	62,571	885	5,818	6,940	87,160	36,028	45,690	651	4,022	4,850	77,441	31,690	43,135	2,628
	100.000%	38.804%	54.621%	0.773%	4.904%	6.058%	100.000%	41.335%	52.421%	0.747%	4.615%	5.564%	88.849%	40.921%	55.700%	3.394%
District 3																
Orleans	75,786	18,897	50,493	2,744	3,034	3,821	60,382	17,442	37,856	2,211	2,361	2,877	52,090	14,820	32,930	4,340
St. Bernard	38,850	20,941	11,743	1,335	4,037	5,149	27,994	16,210	7,532	951	2,730	3,393	22,460	15,508	5,186	1,766
District 3	114,636	39,838	62,236	4,079	7,071	8,970	88,376	33,652	45,388	3,162	5,091	6,270	74,550	30,328	38,116	6,106
	100.000%	34.752%	54.290%	3.558%	6.168%	7.825%	100.000%	38.078%	51.358%	3.578%	5.761%	7.095%	84.355%	40.681%	51.128%	8.190%
District 4																
Orleans	114,240	38,405	65,990	2,384	6,450	8,425	89,392	31,947	50,035	1,847	4,748	6,162	76,473	28,029	42,822	5,622
District 4	114,240	38,405	65,990	2,384	6,450	8,425	89,392	31,947	50,035	1,847	4,748	6,162	76,473	28,029	42,822	5,622
	100.000%	33.618%	57.764%	2.087%	5.646%	7.375%	100.000%	35.738%	55.973%	2.066%	5.311%	6.893%	85.548%	36.652%	55.996%	7.352%
District 5																
Orleans	118,062	44,616	61,950	2,727	7,389	10,344	97,490	39,452	48,898	2,340	5,677	7,874	81,417	32,030	42,550	6,838
District 5	118,062	44,616	61,950	2,727	7,389	10,344	97,490	39,452	48,898	2,340	5,677	7,874	81,417	32,030	42,550	6,838
	100.000%	37.790%	52.472%	2.310%	6.259%	8.761%	100.000%	40.468%	50.157%	2.400%	5.823%	8.077%	83.513%	39.341%	52.262%	8.399%
District 6																
East Baton Rouge	37,783	27,059	8,317	418	1,290	1,353	28,237	20,744	5,808	268	888	892	25,962	19,897	5,292	773
East Feliciana	14,714	9,352	4,808	75	268	341	12,193	7,913	3,857	53	218	278	9,597	6,173	3,138	286
Livingston	60,748	51,247	4,070	671	3,311	3,708	44,692	38,499	2,519	432	2,164	2,300	37,146	33,924	1,864	1,358
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
District 6	124,165	92,185	23,228	1,203	5,058	5,618	93,585	70,961	16,555	781	3,420	3,619	81,026	63,622	14,859	2,545
	100.000%	74.244%	18.706%	0.969%	4.074%	4.525%	100.000%	75.825%	17.690%	0.835%	3.654%	3.867%	86.580%	78.520%	18.339%	3.141%
District 7																
Jefferson	79,036	27,854	31,841	5,196	12,667	15,757	60,004	22,932	23,246	4,106	8,558	10,622	40,651	17,820	16,109	6,723
Orleans	44,572	7,472	32,903	1,151	2,715	3,615	33,597	6,526	23,966	955	1,897	2,463	27,498	5,257	19,960	2,281

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 2 of 7

	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 7	123,608	35,326	64,744	6,347	15,382	19,372	93,601	29,458	47,212	5,061	10,455	13,085	68,149	23,077	36,089	9,004
	100.000%	28.579%	52.378%	5.135%	12.444%	15.672%	100.000%	31.472%	50.440%	5.407%	11.170%	13.980%	72.808%	33.863%	52.927%	13.212%
District 8																
Jefferson	119,325	37,108	62,390	5,949	12,092	15,628	90,742	30,868	45,446	4,615	8,462	10,715	73,492	25,751	39,736	8,009
District 8	119,325	37,108	62,390	5,949	12,092	15,628	90,742	30,868	45,446	4,615	8,462	10,715	73,492	25,751	39,736	8,009
	100.000%	31.098%	52.286%	4.986%	10.134%	13.097%	100.000%	34.017%	50.083%	5.086%	9.325%	11.808%	80.990%	35.039%	54.068%	10.898%
District 9																
Jefferson	104,796	68,549	14,876	4,640	15,098	19,094	84,662	57,968	11,102	3,559	10,835	13,555	62,795	50,455	5,956	6,388
Orleans	20,479	16,103	2,186	775	1,190	2,951	17,841	14,075	1,989	639	960	2,697	13,636	11,291	772	1,572
District 9	125,275	84,652	17,062	5,415	16,288	22,045	102,503	72,043	13,091	4,198	11,795	16,252	76,431	61,746	6,728	7,960
	100.000%	67.573%	13.620%	4.322%	13.002%	17.597%	100.000%	70.284%	12.771%	4.095%	11.507%	15.855%	74.565%	80.787%	8.803%	10.415%
District 10																
Jefferson	125,255	78,664	15,395	6,689	22,213	27,473	99,822	65,524	11,173	5,004	16,359	19,831	77,964	59,112	6,711	12,132
District 10	125,255	78,664	15,395	6,689	22,213	27,473	99,822	65,524	11,173	5,004	16,359	19,831	77,964	59,112	6,711	12,132
	100.000%	62.803%	12.291%	5.340%	17.734%	21.934%	100.000%	65.641%	11.193%	5.013%	16.388%	19.866%	78.103%	75.820%	8.808%	15.561%
District 11																
St. Tammany	125,276	101,704	9,306	2,757	9,126	10,431	94,516	78,278	6,332	1,867	6,349	7,142	86,153	75,903	4,611	5,639
District 11	125,276	101,704	9,306	2,757	9,126	10,431	94,516	78,278	6,332	1,867	6,349	7,142	86,153	75,903	4,611	5,639
	100.000%	81.184%	7.428%	2.201%	7.286%	8.326%	100.000%	82.820%	6.699%	1.975%	6.717%	7.556%	91.152%	88.103%	5.352%	6.545%
District 12																
St. Tammany	25,036	21,741	1,142	176	1,429	1,623	19,844	17,440	823	126	1,045	1,151	18,469	16,981	704	784
Tangipahoa	54,419	31,158	20,115	380	1,873	2,336	41,227	24,848	14,114	310	1,288	1,544	32,748	20,854	10,908	982
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 12	124,918	82,842	34,691	772	4,436	5,389	96,022	66,031	24,669	590	3,094	3,596	78,804	56,670	19,714	2,416
	100.000%	66.317%	27.771%	0.618%	3.551%	4.298%	100.000%	68.767%	25.691%	0.614%	3.222%	3.745%	82.069%	71.913%	25.016%	3.066%
District 13																
Livingston	46,406	37,735	4,382	514	2,837	3,142	34,711	28,833	2,994	347	1,824	1,917	27,318	24,743	1,623	952
Tangipahoa	78,738	50,178	21,764	1,094	4,141	4,906	60,264	40,357	15,103	790	2,854	3,296	43,508	32,058	9,617	1,837
District 13	125,144	87,913	26,146	1,808	6,978	8,048	94,975	69,190	18,097	1,137	4,678	5,213	70,826	58,801	11,240	2,789
	100.000%	70.249%	20.893%	1.285%	5.576%	6.431%	100.000%	72.851%	19.054%	1.197%	4.926%	5.489%	74.573%	80.198%	15.870%	3.938%
District 14																
East Baton Rouge	114,081	40,042	63,442	3,517	6,089	7,797	92,211	36,027	47,837	3,071	4,470	5,830	60,931	21,324	36,230	3,375
District 14	114,081	40,042	63,442	3,517	6,089	7,797	92,211	36,027	47,837	3,071	4,470	5,830	60,931	21,324	36,230	3,375
	100.000%	35.100%	55.611%	3.083%	5.337%	6.835%	100.000%	39.070%	51.878%	3.330%	4.848%	6.322%	66.078%	34.997%	59.461%	5.539%
District 15																
East Baton Rouge	118,949	33,257	70,219	4,919	9,484	10,732	89,884	28,409	50,434	3,754	6,411	7,186	68,928	24,305	39,991	4,632
District 15	118,949	33,257	70,219	4,919	9,484	10,732	89,884	28,409	50,434	3,754	6,411	7,186	68,928	24,305	39,991	4,632
	100.000%	27.959%	59.033%	4.135%	7.973%	9.022%	100.000%	31.606%	56.110%	4.176%	7.133%	7.995%	76.686%	35.261%	58.019%	6.720%

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 3 of 7

	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																
East Baton Rouge	124,850	81,415	26,845	7,055	7,932	9,099	99,176	67,284	19,690	5,155	5,795	6,478	83,415	62,468	14,611	6,338
District 16	124,850	81,415	26,845	7,055	7,932	9,099	99,176	67,284	19,690	5,155	5,795	6,478	83,415	62,468	14,611	6,338
	100.000%	65.210%	21.502%	5.651%	6.353%	7.286%	100.000%	67.843%	19.854%	5.198%	5.843%	6.532%	84.108%	74.888%	17.516%	7.598%
District 17																
East Baton Rouge	55,309	9,553	44,035	354	1,091	1,263	41,610	7,680	32,629	248	835	937	35,758	6,543	28,179	1,036
East Feliciana	4,825	2,164	2,533	16	61	50	3,990	1,827	2,061	8	48	39	4,003	1,786	2,048	169
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 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
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 17	123,401	49,302	68,982	853	3,227	3,833	95,159	40,044	51,292	612	2,435	2,848	78,984	32,678	44,393	1,913
	100.000%	39.953%	55.901%	0.691%	2.615%	3.106%	100.000%	42.081%	53.901%	0.643%	2.559%	2.993%	83.002%	41.373%	56.205%	2.422%
District 18																
Ascension	84,185	63,012	12,083	1,867	5,780	6,617	60,657	46,721	8,024	1,188	3,736	4,175	53,051	43,469	6,589	2,990
East Baton Rouge	5,809	4,743	540	162	276	307	4,494	3,737	392	103	196	216	4,270	3,695	372	203
Livingston	35,128	27,873	4,206	512	1,813	1,941	25,738	21,100	2,623	320	1,175	1,173	20,104	17,395	1,938	771
District 18	125,122	95,628	16,829	2,541	7,869	8,865	90,889	71,558	11,039	1,611	5,107	5,564	77,425	64,559	8,899	3,964
	100.000%	76.428%	13.450%	2.031%	6.289%	7.085%	100.000%	78.731%	12.146%	1.772%	5.619%	6.122%	85.186%	83.383%	11.494%	5.120%
District 19																
Lafourche	45,849	30,158	12,387	322	1,656	2,075	35,085	23,995	8,856	226	1,170	1,431	26,391	19,777	5,635	979
St. Charles	52,549	33,550	13,928	837	3,309	4,141	39,541	26,154	9,890	529	2,301	2,737	34,985	24,309	8,797	1,879
St. John the Baptist	15,529	6,916	6,843	194	1,338	1,723	11,973	5,822	4,907	157	918	1,136	9,756	5,160	3,910	686
District 19	113,927	70,624	33,158	1,353	6,303	7,939	86,599	55,971	23,653	912	4,389	5,304	71,132	49,246	18,342	3,544
	100.000%	61.991%	29.105%	1.188%	5.532%	6.968%	100.000%	64.632%	27.313%	1.053%	5.088%	6.125%	82.140%	69.232%	25.786%	4.982%
District 20																
Jefferson	12,369	8,760	1,715	550	849	1,105	9,424	6,843	1,208	408	603	761	8,199	6,478	1,064	657
Lafourche	32,247	25,578	1,265	463	2,351	2,824	24,482	20,186	715	341	1,513	1,785	18,704	17,045	362	1,297
Plaquemines	23,515	14,287	5,428	1,317	1,786	2,236	17,334	10,856	3,857	925	1,196	1,377	13,908	9,513	3,134	1,261
St. Bernard	4,914	3,556	566	46	593	861	3,781	2,782	412	31	439	635	3,193	2,725	311	157
Terrebonne	49,675	29,740	11,244	717	3,110	3,708	37,308	23,756	7,703	536	2,097	2,382	27,724	19,384	5,875	2,465
District 20	122,720	81,921	20,218	3,093	8,689	10,734	92,329	64,423	13,895	2,241	5,848	6,940	71,728	55,145	10,746	5,837
	100.000%	66.754%	16.475%	2.520%	7.080%	8.747%	100.000%	69.775%	15.049%	2.427%	6.334%	7.517%	77.687%	76.881%	14.982%	8.138%
District 21																
Assumption	15,045	11,520	2,614	75	609	734	11,895	9,359	1,906	48	405	496	10,240	8,140	1,903	190
Lafourche	19,461	15,974	2,203	240	736	773	15,052	12,657	1,506	171	506	527	13,183	11,645	1,167	371
St. Martin	1,368	1,285	13	7	29	44	1,154	1,091	11	5	17	31	993	979	1	13
St. Mary	27,861	17,984	4,997	641	3,058	3,480	21,140	14,353	3,469	469	2,023	2,253	16,279	12,570	2,626	1,083

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 4 of 7

	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 21																
Terrebonne	59,905	40,194	11,903	1,026	3,009	3,650	45,197	31,875	8,093	703	1,992	2,319	33,996	26,011	5,691	2,294
District 21	123,640	86,957	21,730	1,989	7,441	8,681	94,438	69,335	14,965	1,396	4,943	5,626	74,691	59,345	11,388	3,951
	100.000%	70.331%	17.575%	1.609%	6.018%	7.021%	100.000%	73.419%	15.868%	1.478%	5.234%	5.957%	79.090%	79.454%	15.247%	5.290%
District 22																
Iberia	69,929	39,206	24,556	2,123	3,250	3,897	52,791	31,295	17,069	1,562	2,284	2,657	44,526	28,287	14,352	1,887
Iberville	11,136	7,647	3,013	40	290	335	8,982	6,318	2,285	30	230	269	8,209	5,646	2,419	142
St. Martin	22,218	12,618	8,640	261	528	613	17,118	10,079	6,351	183	374	417	15,399	9,039	6,063	297
St. Mary	21,545	8,965	10,994	194	903	1,044	16,381	7,241	8,051	124	618	701	13,931	6,142	7,265	524
District 22	124,828	68,436	47,203	2,618	4,971	5,889	95,272	54,933	33,756	1,899	3,506	4,044	82,065	49,114	30,099	2,850
	100.000%	54.824%	37.814%	2.097%	3.982%	4.718%	100.000%	57.659%	35.431%	1.993%	3.680%	4.245%	86.138%	59.848%	36.677%	3.473%
District 23																
Lafayette	118,207	88,617	17,178	4,053	6,566	7,808	91,170	70,309	11,856	2,976	4,654	5,548	77,236	64,562	8,008	4,666
District 23	118,207	88,617	17,178	4,053	6,566	7,808	91,170	70,309	11,856	2,976	4,654	5,548	77,236	64,562	8,008	4,666
	100.000%	74.968%	14.532%	3.429%	5.555%	6.605%	100.000%	77.119%	13.004%	3.264%	5.105%	6.085%	84.716%	83.591%	10.368%	6.041%
District 24																
Lafayette	71,483	27,627	39,239	651	3,308	3,908	53,920	22,657	28,199	456	2,158	2,472	44,633	18,660	24,056	1,910
St. Landry	43,323	15,942	25,780	248	1,102	1,179	32,252	12,759	18,393	181	744	747	28,457	11,189	16,520	747
District 24	114,806	43,569	65,019	899	4,410	5,087	86,172	35,416	46,592	637	2,902	3,219	73,090	29,849	40,576	2,657
	100.000%	37.950%	56.634%	0.783%	3.841%	4.431%	100.000%	41.099%	54.089%	0.739%	3.368%	3.736%	84.819%	40.839%	55.515%	3.636%
District 25																
Acadia	49,874	38,382	9,561	213	1,239	1,422	37,238	29,414	6,522	154	808	894	32,588	26,150	5,848	603
Calcasieu	37,517	27,054	7,044	1,004	1,757	2,125	27,776	20,688	4,684	709	1,202	1,398	19,996	16,041	2,998	958
Cameron	5,617	5,232	125	30	155	197	4,358	4,100	79	23	109	130	4,789	4,610	88	91
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 25	125,258	95,734	22,567	1,430	3,843	4,478	93,411	73,323	15,291	997	2,595	2,911	77,386	63,151	12,136	2,113
	100.000%	76.429%	18.016%	1.142%	3.068%	3.575%	100.000%	78.495%	16.370%	1.067%	2.778%	3.116%	82.845%	81.605%	15.882%	2.730%
District 26																
Acadia	7,702	6,098	1,303	25	182	219	5,705	4,657	861	19	108	132	5,090	4,405	559	113
Lafayette	52,063	37,119	8,719	1,750	3,716	4,267	38,785	28,642	5,862	1,232	2,487	2,809	31,624	25,423	4,417	1,791
St. Landry	3,858	3,131	464	18	184	245	2,825	2,328	339	11	100	122	2,184	1,860	250	74
Vermilion	57,359	44,477	8,810	1,447	2,002	2,296	43,012	34,363	5,787	1,037	1,337	1,496	36,769	30,505	4,994	1,270
District 26	120,982	90,825	19,296	3,240	6,084	7,027	90,327	69,990	12,849	2,299	4,032	4,559	75,667	62,193	10,220	3,248
	100.000%	75.073%	15.949%	2.678%	5.029%	5.808%	100.000%	77.485%	14.225%	2.545%	4.464%	5.047%	83.770%	82.193%	13.507%	4.292%
District 27																
Calcasieu	113,559	57,426	46,983	2,519	5,147	6,154	86,551	46,293	33,714	1,824	3,619	4,121	62,435	35,271	24,191	2,973

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 5 of 7

	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 27	113,559	57,426	46,983	2,519	5,147	6,154	86,551	46,293	33,714	1,824	3,619	4,121	62,435	35,271	24,191	2,973
	100.000%	50.569%	41.373%	2.218%	4.532%	5.419%	100.000%	53.486%	38.953%	2.107%	4.181%	4.761%	72.137%	56.492%	38.746%	4.762%
District 28																
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
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	35,359	24,538	9,592	233	672	754	26,734	19,122	6,765	161	457	505	23,841	17,044	6,235	563
St. Martin	28,181	19,356	7,268	329	894	1,022	21,132	15,108	4,931	219	622	696	18,728	13,916	4,317	495
District 28	118,640	81,575	30,585	1,049	3,546	5,005	89,784	63,441	21,454	749	2,796	4,067	75,323	55,004	18,412	1,908
	100.000%	68.758%	25.780%	0.884%	2.989%	4.219%	100.000%	70.600%	23.895%	0.834%	3.114%	4.530%	83.894%	73.024%	24.444%	2.533%
District 29																
Bienville	4,682	1,742	2,809	19	65	82	3,735	1,466	2,181	11	37	58	3,237	1,221	1,991	26
Grant	8,310	6,347	1,566	38	151	160	6,303	4,912	1,103	28	103	89	5,363	4,227	995	140
Jackson	6,200	2,789	2,916	118	303	305	4,874	2,261	2,192	109	264	270	3,394	1,673	1,654	68
Lincoln	19,171	4,182	14,153	254	410	506	15,196	3,468	11,086	226	281	351	9,040	1,987	6,683	372
Natchitoches	13,038	3,249	9,080	85	481	727	10,078	2,976	6,512	80	404	638	6,433	1,415	4,752	273
Rapides	52,324	18,303	31,495	648	1,101	1,404	39,306	15,018	22,435	481	791	953	30,832	11,702	17,862	1,270
Winn	11,096	6,138	3,641	183	930	994	8,807	4,987	2,631	153	871	920	6,664	4,315	2,238	110
District 29	114,821	42,750	65,660	1,345	3,441	4,178	88,299	35,088	48,140	1,088	2,751	3,279	64,963	26,540	36,175	2,259
	100.000%	37.232%	57.185%	1.171%	2.997%	3.639%	100.000%	39.738%	54.519%	1.232%	3.116%	3.714%	73.572%	40.854%	55.686%	3.477%
District 30																
Beauregard	36,549	29,529	4,649	402	917	1,271	27,489	22,304	3,495	269	648	828	22,294	18,771	2,369	1,154
Calcasieu	65,709	55,292	5,359	1,179	2,485	3,105	48,839	41,808	3,500	826	1,695	2,051	38,080	34,347	2,324	1,408
Vernon	21,837	14,941	4,376	671	1,140	1,513	16,318	11,463	3,016	483	820	1,014	12,288	8,998	2,279	1,009
District 30	124,095	99,762	14,384	2,252	4,542	5,889	92,646	75,575	10,011	1,578	3,163	3,893	72,662	62,116	6,972	3,571
	100.000%	80.392%	11.591%	1.815%	3.660%	4.746%	100.000%	81.574%	10.808%	1.703%	3.414%	4.202%	78.430%	85.486%	9.595%	4.915%
District 31																
Grant	2,165	1,731	316	13	39	34	1,715	1,389	244	8	24	19	1,464	1,285	145	34
Natchitoches	16,818	11,198	4,390	128	612	544	13,192	9,004	3,239	84	475	346	11,529	8,024	2,912	596
Rapides	45,620	33,727	7,016	1,233	2,330	2,648	35,268	26,729	5,026	902	1,635	1,794	29,580	23,936	4,098	1,546
Sabine	22,155	15,036	3,861	94	441	710	17,064	12,054	2,655	66	319	502	14,547	11,023	2,184	1,340
Vernon	26,913	20,146	3,235	771	1,870	2,662	19,943	15,302	2,117	591	1,309	1,726	11,772	10,184	732	858
District 31	113,671	81,838	18,818	2,239	5,292	6,598	87,182	64,478	13,281	1,651	3,762	4,387	68,892	54,452	10,071	4,374
	100.000%	71.995%	16.555%	1.970%	4.658%	5.804%	100.000%	73.958%	15.234%	1.894%	4.315%	5.032%	79.021%	79.040%	14.819%	6.349%
District 32																
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
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

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 6 of 7

	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 32																
Franklin	6,989	5,412	1,373	23	94	87	5,413	4,261	1,015	9	70	55	4,799	3,770	996	28
La Salle	14,791	11,348	1,422	283	1,366	1,402	11,563	8,636	1,065	264	1,327	1,325	8,792	7,978	637	177
Rapides	25,664	20,334	3,363	446	718	747	19,256	15,547	2,311	314	485	472	16,315	14,124	1,571	621
District 32	114,730	78,770	27,956	1,354	4,269	4,794	87,978	61,378	20,051	1,099	3,698	3,977	71,763	54,267	15,808	1,684
	100.000%	68.657%	24.367%	1.180%	3.721%	4.179%	100.000%	69.765%	22.791%	1.249%	4.203%	4.520%	81.569%	75.620%	22.028%	2.347%
District 33																
Claiborne	10,632	5,328	4,888	70	223	419	8,689	4,674	3,680	46	191	370	6,060	3,137	2,824	99
Morehouse	25,629	12,281	12,484	160	334	381	20,062	10,095	9,300	117	271	292	16,922	8,505	8,131	286
Ouachita	53,507	38,690	11,359	1,039	1,503	1,618	40,619	30,315	7,770	739	1,062	1,087	34,707	27,799	5,581	1,326
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	9,751	7,894	1,425	27	225	325	7,532	6,223	1,010	20	143	192	7,038	5,913	1,040	85
District 33	120,626	78,653	36,380	1,358	3,308	3,878	93,534	63,114	25,621	961	2,338	2,650	79,948	56,420	21,288	2,259
	100.000%	65.204%	29.330%	1.126%	2.742%	3.215%	100.000%	67.477%	27.392%	1.027%	2.500%	2.833%	85.475%	70.571%	26.602%	2.826%
District 34																
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
Franklin	12,785	7,080	5,429	47	111	189	9,615	5,640	3,764	35	81	128	8,360	5,245	3,038	82
Madison	10,017	3,475	6,363	20	100	204	7,435	2,906	4,391	9	81	149	7,278	2,494	4,674	110
Ouachita	61,019	12,477	45,242	1,083	1,753	2,098	44,888	10,839	31,406	914	1,388	1,609	36,598	7,540	27,729	1,329
Richland	20,043	11,785	7,603	83	314	400	15,383	9,338	5,546	66	230	293	13,662	8,470	4,961	231
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 34	115,470	38,615	72,221	1,285	2,381	3,073	86,457	31,942	50,878	1,055	1,845	2,305	74,062	26,558	45,678	1,831
	100.000%	33.442%	62.545%	1.113%	2.062%	2.661%	100.000%	36.946%	58.848%	1.220%	2.134%	2.666%	85.663%	35.859%	61.675%	2.472%
District 35																
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
Grant	11,694	9,631	1,453	82	158	1,139	9,509	7,663	1,370	61	115	1,071	5,861	5,662	36	164
Jackson	8,831	7,178	1,250	57	165	163	6,909	5,706	933	31	113	102	6,055	4,974	956	124
Lincoln	29,225	21,852	5,211	638	1,034	1,248	23,459	17,838	4,033	518	679	836	16,609	13,685	2,333	589
Ouachita	45,842	37,378	4,616	666	1,901	1,942	34,693	28,820	3,114	465	1,309	1,250	28,447	25,176	2,348	924
Rapides	6,415	5,146	718	101	242	291	4,962	4,079	433	89	183	223	3,449	3,070	244	132
Winn	2,659	2,456	86	27	31	29	2,099	1,945	64	17	31	21	1,742	1,673	54	16
District 35	114,311	91,287	14,966	1,822	3,697	5,033	89,109	72,020	11,171	1,227	2,553	3,666	68,194	59,364	6,789	2,038
	100.000%	79.858%	13.092%	1.419%	3.234%	4.403%	100.000%	80.822%	12.536%	1.377%	2.865%	4.114%	78.529%	87.052%	9.955%	2.989%
District 36																
Bossier	75,263	54,224	13,466	1,862	3,686	4,470	56,010	41,144	9,720	1,220	2,435	2,793	43,684	34,684	6,905	2,095
Claiborne	3,538	1,935	1,472	18	51	60	2,818	1,584	1,144	9	39	33	2,538	1,495	996	47
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

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

District Population

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 7 of 7

	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 36	115,768	78,894	27,817	2,088	4,395	5,218	87,581	60,872	20,328	1,383	2,907	3,280	68,959	51,117	15,240	2,602
	100.000%	68.148%	23.855%	1.804%	3.796%	4.507%	100.000%	69.604%	23.211%	1.579%	3.319%	3.722%	78.737%	74.127%	22.100%	3.773%
District 37																
Bossier	26,416	8,584	13,400	724	3,240	3,884	19,178	7,290	8,778	564	2,165	2,594	10,921	4,728	5,306	887
Caddo	87,431	32,116	49,794	1,708	2,629	3,324	67,035	26,895	36,064	1,291	1,850	2,285	53,818	22,698	28,552	2,568
District 37	113,847	40,700	63,194	2,432	5,869	7,208	86,213	34,185	44,842	1,855	4,015	4,879	64,739	27,426	33,858	3,455
	100.000%	35.750%	55.508%	2.136%	5.155%	6.331%	100.000%	39.652%	52.013%	2.152%	4.657%	5.659%	75.092%	42.364%	52.299%	6.337%
District 38																
Bienville	8,299	5,208	2,791	38	102	129	6,338	4,020	2,103	19	74	83	5,610	3,622	1,926	61
Bossier	27,067	18,244	5,685	906	1,452	1,883	20,688	14,497	3,942	664	980	1,232	15,138	11,449	2,627	1,062
Caddo	36,300	27,473	5,419	1,338	1,230	1,338	28,260	21,768	4,023	942	862	894	25,020	20,124	3,391	1,505
De Soto	26,812	15,284	9,973	117	698	762	20,440	11,909	7,425	86	463	495	18,713	11,330	6,810	573
Natchitoches	7,659	4,914	2,255	42	220	219	6,079	4,030	1,664	34	164	156	5,145	3,411	1,560	164
Red River	7,620	4,195	3,106	25	123	188	5,714	3,338	2,164	3	93	113	5,631	3,130	2,418	83
District 38	113,757	75,318	29,229	2,466	3,825	4,519	87,519	59,562	21,321	1,748	2,636	2,973	75,257	53,086	18,732	3,448
	100.000%	66.210%	25.694%	2.168%	3.362%	3.973%	100.000%	68.056%	24.362%	1.997%	3.012%	3.397%	85.989%	70.513%	24.891%	4.582%
District 39																
Caddo	114,117	43,868	64,091	988	3,354	3,719	87,112	36,396	46,272	775	2,311	2,439	72,458	30,291	39,306	2,861
District 39	114,117	43,868	64,091	988	3,354	3,719	87,112	36,396	46,272	775	2,311	2,439	72,458	30,291	39,306	2,861
	100.000%	38.441%	56.163%	0.866%	2.939%	3.259%	100.000%	41.781%	53.118%	0.890%	2.653%	2.800%	83.178%	41.805%	54.247%	3.948%
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%

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Parishes

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 1 of 4

	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																
Orleans	10,858	969	5,447	3,075	1,266	1,861	7,494	810	3,324	2,528	765	1,083	5,130	559	2,491	2,080
St. Tammany	114,258	73,196	28,195	2,841	7,297	8,790	87,868	58,903	19,606	2,082	5,216	6,017	74,157	52,840	15,827	5,490
District 2																
Ascension	42,315	18,129	20,133	433	3,059	3,766	31,300	14,415	14,115	326	2,042	2,486	26,866	13,331	12,225	1,313
Assumption	5,994	2,202	3,606	21	134	180	4,721	1,786	2,801	9	105	135	4,199	1,560	2,607	39
Iberville	19,105	7,186	10,717	162	912	1,083	15,104	6,144	7,947	119	792	918	12,253	4,486	7,478	291
St. John the Baptist	26,948	6,961	18,353	209	1,198	1,568	20,530	5,800	13,530	166	853	1,074	19,157	5,059	13,324	774
District 3																
Orleans	75,786	18,897	50,493	2,744	3,034	3,821	60,382	17,442	37,856	2,211	2,361	2,877	52,090	14,820	32,930	4,340
St. Bernard	38,850	20,941	11,743	1,335	4,037	5,149	27,994	16,210	7,532	951	2,730	3,393	22,460	15,508	5,186	1,766
District 4																
Orleans	114,240	38,405	65,990	2,384	6,450	8,425	89,392	31,947	50,035	1,847	4,748	6,162	76,473	28,029	42,822	5,622
District 5																
Orleans	118,062	44,616	61,950	2,727	7,389	10,344	97,490	39,452	48,898	2,340	5,677	7,874	81,417	32,030	42,550	6,838
District 6																
East Baton Rouge	37,783	27,059	8,317	418	1,290	1,353	28,237	20,744	5,808	268	888	892	25,962	19,897	5,292	773
East Feliciana	14,714	9,352	4,808	75	268	341	12,193	7,913	3,857	53	218	278	9,597	6,173	3,138	286
Livingston	60,748	51,247	4,070	671	3,311	3,708	44,692	38,499	2,519	432	2,164	2,300	37,146	33,924	1,864	1,358
District 7																
Jefferson	79,036	27,854	31,841	5,196	12,667	15,757	60,004	22,932	23,246	4,106	8,558	10,622	40,651	17,820	16,109	6,723
Orleans	44,572	7,472	32,903	1,151	2,715	3,615	33,597	6,526	23,966	955	1,897	2,463	27,498	5,257	19,960	2,281
District 8																
Jefferson	119,325	37,108	62,390	5,949	12,092	15,628	90,742	30,868	45,446	4,615	8,462	10,715	73,492	25,751	39,736	8,009
District 9																
Jefferson	104,796	68,549	14,876	4,640	15,098	19,094	84,662	57,968	11,102	3,559	10,835	13,555	62,795	50,455	5,956	6,388
Orleans	20,479	16,103	2,186	775	1,190	2,951	17,841	14,075	1,989	639	960	2,697	13,636	11,291	772	1,572
District 10																
Jefferson	125,255	78,664	15,395	6,689	22,213	27,473	99,822	65,524	11,173	5,004	16,359	19,831	77,964	59,112	6,711	12,132
District 11																
St. Tammany	125,276	101,704	9,306	2,757	9,126	10,431	94,516	78,278	6,332	1,867	6,349	7,142	86,153	75,903	4,611	5,639
District 12																
St. Tammany	25,036	21,741	1,142	176	1,429	1,623	19,844	17,440	823	126	1,045	1,151	18,469	16,981	704	784
Tangipahoa	54,419	31,158	20,115	380	1,873	2,336	41,227	24,848	14,114	310	1,288	1,544	32,748	20,854	10,908	982

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split Parishes

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 2 of 4

	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																
Livingston	46,406	37,735	4,382	514	2,837	3,142	34,711	28,833	2,994	347	1,824	1,917	27,318	24,743	1,623	952
Tangipahoa	78,738	50,178	21,764	1,094	4,141	4,906	60,264	40,357	15,103	790	2,854	3,296	43,508	32,058	9,617	1,837
District 14																
East Baton Rouge	114,081	40,042	63,442	3,517	6,089	7,797	92,211	36,027	47,837	3,071	4,470	5,830	60,931	21,324	36,230	3,375
District 15																
East Baton Rouge	118,949	33,257	70,219	4,919	9,484	10,732	89,884	28,409	50,434	3,754	6,411	7,186	68,928	24,305	39,991	4,632
District 16																
East Baton Rouge	124,850	81,415	26,845	7,055	7,932	9,099	99,176	67,284	19,690	5,155	5,795	6,478	83,415	62,468	14,611	6,338
District 17																
East Baton Rouge	55,309	9,553	44,035	354	1,091	1,263	41,610	7,680	32,629	248	835	937	35,758	6,543	28,179	1,036
East Feliciana	4,825	2,164	2,533	16	61	50	3,990	1,827	2,061	8	48	39	4,003	1,786	2,048	169
District 18																
Ascension	84,185	63,012	12,083	1,867	5,780	6,617	60,657	46,721	8,024	1,188	3,736	4,175	53,051	43,469	6,589	2,990
East Baton Rouge	5,809	4,743	540	162	276	307	4,494	3,737	392	103	196	216	4,270	3,695	372	203
Livingston	35,128	27,873	4,206	512	1,813	1,941	25,738	21,100	2,623	320	1,175	1,173	20,104	17,395	1,938	771
District 19																
Lafourche	45,849	30,158	12,387	322	1,656	2,075	35,085	23,995	8,856	226	1,170	1,431	26,391	19,777	5,635	979
St. John the Baptist	15,529	6,916	6,843	194	1,338	1,723	11,973	5,822	4,907	157	918	1,136	9,756	5,160	3,910	686
District 20																
Jefferson	12,369	8,760	1,715	550	849	1,105	9,424	6,843	1,208	408	603	761	8,199	6,478	1,064	657
Lafourche	32,247	25,578	1,265	463	2,351	2,824	24,482	20,186	715	341	1,513	1,785	18,704	17,045	362	1,297
St. Bernard	4,914	3,556	566	46	593	861	3,781	2,782	412	31	439	635	3,193	2,725	311	157
Terrebonne	49,675	29,740	11,244	717	3,110	3,708	37,308	23,756	7,703	536	2,097	2,382	27,724	19,384	5,875	2,465
District 21																
Assumption	15,045	11,520	2,614	75	609	734	11,895	9,359	1,906	48	405	496	10,240	8,140	1,903	190
Lafourche	19,461	15,974	2,203	240	736	773	15,052	12,657	1,506	171	506	527	13,183	11,645	1,167	371
St. Martin	1,368	1,285	13	7	29	44	1,154	1,091	11	5	17	31	993	979	1	13
St. Mary	27,861	17,984	4,997	641	3,058	3,480	21,140	14,353	3,469	469	2,023	2,253	16,279	12,570	2,626	1,083
Terrebonne	59,905	40,194	11,903	1,026	3,009	3,650	45,197	31,875	8,093	703	1,992	2,319	33,996	26,011	5,691	2,294
District 22																
Iberville	11,136	7,647	3,013	40	290	335	8,982	6,318	2,285	30	230	269	8,209	5,646	2,419	142
St. Martin	22,218	12,618	8,640	261	528	613	17,118	10,079	6,351	183	374	417	15,399	9,039	6,063	297
St. Mary	21,545	8,965	10,994	194	903	1,044	16,381	7,241	8,051	124	618	701	13,931	6,142	7,265	524

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Parishes

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 3 of 4

	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 23																
Lafayette	118,207	88,617	17,178	4,053	6,566	7,808	91,170	70,309	11,856	2,976	4,654	5,548	77,236	64,562	8,008	4,666
District 24																
Lafayette	71,483	27,627	39,239	651	3,308	3,908	53,920	22,657	28,199	456	2,158	2,472	44,633	18,660	24,056	1,910
St. Landry	43,323	15,942	25,780	248	1,102	1,179	32,252	12,759	18,393	181	744	747	28,457	11,189	16,520	747
District 25																
Acadia	49,874	38,382	9,561	213	1,239	1,422	37,238	29,414	6,522	154	808	894	32,588	26,150	5,848	603
Calcasieu	37,517	27,054	7,044	1,004	1,757	2,125	27,776	20,688	4,684	709	1,202	1,398	19,996	16,041	2,998	958
District 26																
Acadia	7,702	6,098	1,303	25	182	219	5,705	4,657	861	19	108	132	5,090	4,405	559	113
Lafayette	52,063	37,119	8,719	1,750	3,716	4,267	38,785	28,642	5,862	1,232	2,487	2,809	31,624	25,423	4,417	1,791
St. Landry	3,858	3,131	464	18	184	245	2,825	2,328	339	11	100	122	2,184	1,860	250	74
District 27																
Calcasieu	113,559	57,426	46,983	2,519	5,147	6,154	86,551	46,293	33,714	1,824	3,619	4,121	62,435	35,271	24,191	2,973
District 28																
St. Landry	35,359	24,538	9,592	233	672	754	26,734	19,122	6,765	161	457	505	23,841	17,044	6,235	563
St. Martin	28,181	19,356	7,268	329	894	1,022	21,132	15,108	4,931	219	622	696	18,728	13,916	4,317	495
District 29																
Bienville	4,682	1,742	2,809	19	65	82	3,735	1,466	2,181	11	37	58	3,237	1,221	1,991	26
Grant	8,310	6,347	1,566	38	151	160	6,303	4,912	1,103	28	103	89	5,363	4,227	995	140
Jackson	6,200	2,789	2,916	118	303	305	4,874	2,261	2,192	109	264	270	3,394	1,673	1,654	68
Lincoln	19,171	4,182	14,153	254	410	506	15,196	3,468	11,086	226	281	351	9,040	1,987	6,683	372
Natchitoches	13,038	3,249	9,080	85	481	727	10,078	2,976	6,512	80	404	638	6,433	1,415	4,752	273
Rapides	52,324	18,303	31,495	648	1,101	1,404	39,306	15,018	22,435	481	791	953	30,832	11,702	17,862	1,270
Winn	11,096	6,138	3,641	183	930	994	8,807	4,987	2,631	153	871	920	6,664	4,315	2,238	110
District 30																
Calcasieu	65,709	55,292	5,359	1,179	2,485	3,105	48,839	41,808	3,500	826	1,695	2,051	38,080	34,347	2,324	1,408
Vernon	21,837	14,941	4,376	671	1,140	1,513	16,318	11,463	3,016	483	820	1,014	12,288	8,998	2,279	1,009
District 31																
Grant	2,165	1,731	316	13	39	34	1,715	1,389	244	8	24	19	1,464	1,285	145	34
Natchitoches	16,818	11,198	4,390	128	612	544	13,192	9,004	3,239	84	475	346	11,529	8,024	2,912	596
Rapides	45,620	33,727	7,016	1,233	2,330	2,648	35,268	26,729	5,026	902	1,635	1,794	29,580	23,936	4,098	1,546
Vernon	26,913	20,146	3,235	771	1,870	2,662	19,943	15,302	2,117	591	1,309	1,726	11,772	10,184	732	858
District 32																

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Parishes

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 4 of 4

	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 32																
Franklin	6,989	5,412	1,373	23	94	87	5,413	4,261	1,015	9	70	55	4,799	3,770	996	28
Rapides	25,664	20,334	3,363	446	718	747	19,256	15,547	2,311	314	485	472	16,315	14,124	1,571	621
District 33																
Claiborne	10,632	5,328	4,888	70	223	419	8,689	4,674	3,680	46	191	370	6,060	3,137	2,824	99
Ouachita	53,507	38,690	11,359	1,039	1,503	1,618	40,619	30,315	7,770	739	1,062	1,087	34,707	27,799	5,581	1,326
District 34																
Franklin	12,785	7,080	5,429	47	111	189	9,615	5,640	3,764	35	81	128	8,360	5,245	3,038	82
Ouachita	61,019	12,477	45,242	1,083	1,753	2,098	44,888	10,839	31,406	914	1,388	1,609	36,598	7,540	27,729	1,329
District 35																
Grant	11,694	9,631	1,453	82	158	1,139	9,509	7,663	1,370	61	115	1,071	5,861	5,662	36	164
Jackson	8,831	7,178	1,250	57	165	163	6,909	5,706	933	31	113	102	6,055	4,974	956	124
Lincoln	29,225	21,852	5,211	638	1,034	1,248	23,459	17,838	4,033	518	679	836	16,609	13,685	2,333	589
Ouachita	45,842	37,378	4,616	666	1,901	1,942	34,693	28,820	3,114	465	1,309	1,250	28,447	25,176	2,348	924
Rapides	6,415	5,146	718	101	242	291	4,962	4,079	433	89	183	223	3,449	3,070	244	132
Winn	2,659	2,456	86	27	31	29	2,099	1,945	64	17	31	21	1,742	1,673	54	16
District 36																
Bossier	75,263	54,224	13,466	1,862	3,686	4,470	56,010	41,144	9,720	1,220	2,435	2,793	43,684	34,684	6,905	2,095
Claiborne	3,538	1,935	1,472	18	51	60	2,818	1,584	1,144	9	39	33	2,538	1,495	996	47
District 37																
Bossier	26,416	8,584	13,400	724	3,240	3,884	19,178	7,290	8,778	564	2,165	2,594	10,921	4,728	5,306	887
Caddo	87,431	32,116	49,794	1,708	2,629	3,324	67,035	26,895	36,064	1,291	1,850	2,285	53,818	22,698	28,552	2,568
District 38																
Bienville	8,299	5,208	2,791	38	102	129	6,338	4,020	2,103	19	74	83	5,610	3,622	1,926	61
Bossier	27,067	18,244	5,685	906	1,452	1,883	20,688	14,497	3,942	664	980	1,232	15,138	11,449	2,627	1,062
Caddo	36,300	27,473	5,419	1,338	1,230	1,338	28,260	21,768	4,023	942	862	894	25,020	20,124	3,391	1,505
Natchitoches	7,659	4,914	2,255	42	220	219	6,079	4,030	1,664	34	164	156	5,145	3,411	1,560	164
District 39																
Caddo	114,117	43,868	64,091	988	3,354	3,719	87,112	36,396	46,272	775	2,311	2,439	72,458	30,291	39,306	2,861

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 1 of 10

	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																
Orleans																
New Orleans	10,858	969	5,447	3,075	1,266	1,861	7,494	810	3,324	2,528	765	1,083	5,130	559	2,491	2,080
St. Tammany																
Mandeville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 2																
Ascension																
Sorrento	1,322	953	238	14	97	95	971	716	170	11	61	58	890	704	158	28
Assumption																
Belle Rose	1,510	718	750	0	35	43	1,210	583	588	0	35	39	940	472	463	7
Napoleonville	540	84	442	2	8	15	425	68	349	0	5	11	423	66	354	3
Iberville																
Plaquemine	4,585	1,761	2,616	50	112	152	3,460	1,429	1,880	38	77	95	3,339	1,239	2,014	66
St. John the Baptist																
Laplace	13,333	2,707	9,567	160	790	998	9,938	2,238	6,926	136	554	673	8,981	1,975	6,471	533
District 3																
Orleans																
New Orleans	75,786	18,897	50,493	2,744	3,034	3,821	60,382	17,442	37,856	2,211	2,361	2,877	52,090	14,820	32,930	4,340
St. Bernard																
Poydras	193	160	29	0	4	16	149	124	23	0	2	11	147	103	37	7
Violet	5,724	1,655	3,672	49	275	372	4,057	1,281	2,490	36	201	254	3,733	1,365	2,211	158
District 4																
Orleans																
New Orleans	114,240	38,405	65,990	2,384	6,450	8,425	89,392	31,947	50,035	1,847	4,748	6,162	76,473	28,029	42,822	5,622
District 5																
Orleans																
New Orleans	118,062	44,616	61,950	2,727	7,389	10,344	97,490	39,452	48,898	2,340	5,677	7,874	81,417	32,030	42,550	6,838
District 6																
East Baton Rouge																
Central	20,941	17,277	2,102	239	883	892	15,674	13,248	1,346	154	584	580	14,278	12,728	1,131	418
Zachary	8,762	4,220	4,039	143	229	259	6,236	3,133	2,753	91	165	176	5,753	3,098	2,436	221
Livingston																
Denham Springs	6,853	5,656	531	105	432	481	5,372	4,576	347	83	289	315	4,164	3,732	259	178

Split Places

Page: 2 of 10

	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 6																
Livingston																
Walker	3,309	2,397	660	43	131	150	2,503	1,828	482	27	102	112	2,011	1,565	375	69
District 7																
Jefferson																
Harvey	18,797	6,112	8,215	1,501	2,687	3,306	14,214	5,070	5,857	1,166	1,877	2,301	9,237	3,625	4,034	1,573
Marrero	511	338	68	7	75	86	414	300	40	6	46	56	281	228	37	20
Orleans																
New Orleans	44,572	7,472	32,903	1,151	2,715	3,615	33,597	6,526	23,966	955	1,897	2,463	27,498	5,257	19,960	2,281
District 8																
Jefferson																
Estelle	15,135	7,308	4,709	1,003	1,736	2,236	11,372	5,828	3,286	761	1,208	1,493	9,245	5,068	2,918	1,254
Harvey	3,439	711	2,264	104	316	411	2,612	624	1,676	84	203	259	2,012	479	1,381	158
Kenner	13,899	2,626	7,209	160	3,692	4,463	10,217	2,091	5,382	114	2,476	3,002	7,189	1,493	4,881	817
Marrero	31,871	10,496	16,923	1,943	2,049	2,690	24,653	8,955	12,303	1,536	1,509	1,927	20,482	7,369	11,089	2,014
Metairie	2,679	222	2,244	16	186	245	2,066	186	1,735	10	131	150	1,916	252	1,557	110
River Ridge	2,315	799	1,209	45	221	287	1,882	687	985	34	149	184	1,296	475	737	84
District 9																
Jefferson																
Elmwood	890	720	50	20	73	102	752	624	40	15	57	74	562	487	29	37
Metairie	93,273	61,263	12,335	4,411	13,851	17,543	74,900	51,586	9,006	3,369	9,900	12,421	55,514	45,348	4,397	5,775
Orleans																
New Orleans	20,479	16,103	2,186	775	1,190	2,951	17,841	14,075	1,989	639	960	2,697	13,636	11,291	772	1,572
District 10																
Jefferson																
Elmwood	4,759	2,192	1,660	528	324	438	4,195	2,040	1,400	431	282	374	2,118	1,192	662	270
Kenner	52,549	27,117	8,615	3,478	12,434	15,478	40,982	22,373	6,131	2,619	9,182	11,222	30,498	19,489	4,050	6,963
Metairie	47,555	32,221	4,084	2,288	7,982	9,656	37,932	26,828	2,881	1,664	5,787	6,865	29,983	24,381	1,621	3,968
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 11																
St. Tammany																
Mandeville	13,192	10,894	707	433	937	1,028	10,392	8,771	503	277	678	718	9,204	8,197	349	660
District 12																

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 3 of 10

	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 12																
Tangipahoa																
Hammond	5,441	2,443	2,646	69	215	281	4,240	2,034	1,942	60	150	189	3,146	1,593	1,423	130
Independence	1,619	728	796	10	70	75	1,189	595	528	9	43	46	935	512	384	34
Natalbany	437	177	214	2	34	40	341	144	162	2	23	28	234	137	86	8
District 13																
Livingston																
Denham Springs	2,433	1,082	1,136	39	116	137	1,855	864	843	27	77	85	1,183	761	357	60
Walker	3,065	2,675	116	83	131	140	2,323	2,059	78	50	90	91	1,947	1,846	31	63
Tangipahoa																
Hammond	14,143	6,385	6,630	366	559	766	11,533	5,632	5,011	310	427	587	6,886	3,446	3,125	304
Independence	16	15	0	0	1	1	7	6	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	0
Natalbany	2,073	997	859	25	152	173	1,603	862	591	19	99	114	893	637	214	40
District 14																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	100,993	36,725	56,827	3,052	3,558	4,863	82,463	33,076	43,147	2,679	2,864	3,969	55,756	19,816	33,026	2,907
Gardere	10,842	2,031	5,950	317	2,421	2,762	7,649	1,727	4,081	257	1,508	1,704	4,408	992	3,049	369
District 15																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	68,821	18,266	40,632	3,664	5,651	6,326	52,120	15,803	29,118	2,788	3,905	4,317	37,415	13,217	21,198	2,988
Brownfields	3,846	734	3,019	11	55	70	3,034	657	2,308	6	37	49	2,892	686	2,104	101
Central	8,624	6,341	1,621	118	411	457	6,541	5,010	1,085	78	260	278	6,019	4,836	989	194
Meriydale	9,012	258	8,542	7	169	261	6,598	213	6,246	5	115	163	6,424	183	6,066	174
District 16																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	36,140	24,489	7,890	1,506	1,800	2,053	29,224	20,295	6,038	1,164	1,387	1,509	25,504	19,171	4,664	1,672
Gardere	2,361	1,091	701	213	309	402	1,840	915	513	167	208	267	745	460	195	91
Shenandoah	18,257	12,434	3,520	1,085	971	1,070	14,293	10,159	2,502	750	691	746	13,004	10,042	2,023	938
District 17																
East Baton Rouge																
Baton Rouge	21,516	511	20,748	25	195	276	16,433	466	15,758	18	161	205	14,111	163	13,586	351
Brownfields	1,299	146	1,137	2	7	9	964	141	814	1	5	8	803	153	624	25
Meriydale	215	4	210	0	1	0	175	4	170	0	1	0	169	0	163	4
Zachary	10,554	4,932	5,001	219	279	302	7,377	3,806	3,340	141	198	193	6,691	3,224	3,207	260

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 4 of 10

	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 18																
Ascension																
Sorrento	192	140	29	1	13	18	148	106	24	0	10	15	135	107	23	5
East Baton Rouge																
Shenandoah	1,035	940	37	19	31	34	857	793	21	11	27	28	956	903	30	22
District 19																
Lafourche																
Bayou Blue	4,362	3,334	420	40	225	284	3,026	2,430	225	18	137	170	2,516	2,210	140	173
Lafourche Crossing	2,244	1,700	361	14	77	96	1,679	1,296	267	6	53	64	1,439	1,147	234	58
Lockport	29	22	2	0	1	1	21	19	1	0	1	1	13	10	0	0
Thibodaux	12,881	6,279	5,891	87	451	582	10,378	5,364	4,491	68	346	447	6,778	4,137	2,444	203
St. John the Baptist																
Laplace	15,508	6,902	6,837	194	1,338	1,721	11,954	5,809	4,902	157	918	1,135	9,745	5,154	3,908	686
District 20																
Jefferson																
Estelle	2,817	1,650	668	166	224	278	2,084	1,259	477	111	160	188	1,687	1,047	465	178
Lafourche																
Bayou Blue	4,274	3,280	292	36	340	423	3,130	2,543	144	30	210	260	2,260	2,018	75	165
Lockport	2,461	2,101	150	24	103	124	1,860	1,649	74	16	67	77	1,531	1,443	26	62
St. Bernard																
Poydras	2,343	1,557	373	26	307	423	1,780	1,213	266	15	220	288	1,479	1,199	192	90
Violet	34	24	2	4	3	4	25	17	2	3	3	3	20	15	3	1
Terrebonne																
Bayou Blue	1,027	818	84	10	44	49	769	636	48	5	27	26	620	557	29	39
Chauvin	1,140	981	21	4	31	36	828	738	9	3	17	15	659	621	5	32
Houma	25,544	13,929	7,597	375	1,762	2,059	19,426	11,347	5,280	272	1,246	1,410	14,171	8,985	4,120	1,074
District 21																
Assumption																
Belle Rose	188	8	176	0	3	3	153	8	141	0	3	3	152	81	68	4
Napoleonville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lafourche																
Lafourche Crossing	183	154	19	3	4	0	149	135	11	1	1	0	133	122	6	4
Thibodaux	3,067	2,418	407	71	134	157	2,439	1,952	313	51	92	101	2,272	1,940	260	67

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 5 of 10

	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 21																
St. Mary																
Baldwin	134	78	44	0	2	1	112	69	37	0	2	1	94	74	16	0
Bayou Vista	4,184	3,247	412	43	352	407	3,230	2,603	269	32	225	265	2,300	2,056	135	110
Charenton	1,699	790	415	8	28	35	1,296	653	334	4	23	25	1,161	749	255	159
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morgan City	10,412	6,601	2,121	228	1,187	1,339	7,941	5,368	1,422	150	792	863	6,237	4,763	1,118	357
Patterson	684	424	212	8	28	27	514	317	164	5	19	21	394	293	88	17
Siracusaville	8	6	2	0	0	1	7	6	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	0
Sorrel	115	93	16	1	4	1	84	74	6	0	4	0	70	56	14	0
Terrebonne																
Bayou Blue	3,689	2,418	538	21	455	542	2,661	1,885	312	15	273	307	1,780	1,325	331	128
Chauvin	1,435	1,284	20	17	30	43	1,080	986	5	17	17	22	777	726	3	54
Houma	7,862	5,868	1,165	238	267	377	5,957	4,598	827	148	192	254	5,151	4,291	588	279
District 22																
Iberville																
Plaquemine	1,684	1,151	449	13	53	57	1,335	963	305	8	41	47	1,144	910	213	24
St. Martin																
Breaux Bridge	2,348	506	1,770	8	43	42	1,708	426	1,235	6	26	31	1,631	577	1,028	22
Parks	370	250	111	0	7	9	288	190	91	0	5	6	268	189	71	6
St. Mary																
Baldwin	1,628	441	1,110	22	32	35	1,298	360	903	5	16	21	1,292	313	941	38
Bayou Vista	29	6	0	0	20	22	24	6	0	0	15	17	16	10	5	0
Charenton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	6,728	2,445	3,863	57	226	300	5,073	2,026	2,768	32	154	197	4,453	1,791	2,494	180
Morgan City	1,060	201	645	11	185	211	775	167	463	8	120	138	541	112	382	47
Patterson	5,247	2,369	2,472	47	227	235	3,891	1,876	1,727	36	160	161	3,047	1,567	1,358	122
Siracusaville	289	7	274	0	5	9	216	1	208	0	4	5	212	3	205	4
Sorrel	596	247	322	1	22	26	472	204	247	0	17	18	421	163	247	14
District 23																
Lafayette																
Lafayette	73,269	53,793	11,193	2,843	4,366	5,227	58,844	44,601	7,976	2,215	3,198	3,805	48,668	40,438	5,134	3,092
Milton	1,781	1,601	86	32	44	66	1,335	1,234	45	20	23	35	1,500	1,395	41	64
Scott	44	20	10	0	12	11	36	20	7	0	7	7	17	11	5	2

Time: 5:35 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 6 of 10

[illegible]

Split Places

Page: 7 of 10

[illegible]

Split Places

Page: 8 of 10

	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
Natchitoches																
Natchitoches	4,305	2,664	1,377	52	127	133	3,439	2,222	1,020	37	89	76	2,990	1,978	859	160
Rapides																
Alexandria	15,158	10,327	3,218	847	518	580	11,793	8,368	2,258	629	359	411	9,571	7,361	1,580	653
Vernon																
Fort Polk South	7,490	4,416	1,616	348	920	1,335	4,821	2,910	960	250	592	794	785	385	225	173
New Llano	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leesville	12	5	6	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
District 32																
Franklin																
Winnsboro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rapides																
Pineville	8,219	5,145	2,447	212	236	253	6,219	4,068	1,712	150	154	154	4,918	3,737	955	240
District 33																
Claiborne																
Haynesville	2,018	679	1,268	10	21	35	1,520	579	894	3	11	15	931	323	601	9
Homer	1,743	414	1,277	18	14	29	1,242	341	866	11	11	22	1,020	306	691	23
Ouachita																
Brownsville	323	231	37	0	48	58	259	196	26	0	32	37	151	111	36	6
Claiborne	5,108	4,582	209	55	126	136	3,823	3,472	117	34	89	81	3,511	3,292	97	122
Monroe	10,661	8,601	1,388	257	272	291	8,418	6,906	1,027	190	175	177	7,515	6,528	694	288
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	7,324	4,922	1,838	78	386	452	5,691	4,035	1,254	52	266	320	4,144	3,290	685	166
District 34																
Franklin																
Winnsboro	4,862	1,091	3,691	26	36	77	3,376	928	2,391	21	22	52	2,897	991	1,886	22
Ouachita																
Bawcomville	141	98	19	0	17	22	103	81	12	0	7	10	63	38	22	3
Brownsville	16	2	12	0	2	2	12	1	10	0	1	1	7	1	4	0
Monroe	37,041	5,997	29,669	702	469	697	27,040	5,341	20,657	570	308	447	22,707	3,353	18,575	793
Richwood	3,881	556	2,312	230	771	787	3,361	546	1,821	228	760	781	1,162	13	1,116	33
Swartz	2,189	1,410	654	30	51	47	1,654	1,150	425	24	26	22	1,466	868	541	56
West Monroe	4,059	958	2,824	32	190	239	2,917	836	1,899	24	115	157	2,227	635	1,485	109
District 35																

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 9 of 10

[illegible]

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split Places

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 10 of 10

	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 38																
Bossier																
Bossier City	18,969	12,668	3,956	705	1,111	1,458	14,405	10,026	2,703	515	753	948	10,841	8,035	1,950	865
Shreveport	2,080	860	964	117	93	138	1,605	729	670	94	72	106	380	218	137	25
Caddo																
Shreveport	20,666	15,687	2,700	1,191	722	793	15,902	12,271	1,984	831	521	547	14,626	12,038	1,550	1,067
Natchitoches																
Natchitoches	2,504	1,493	838	34	93	100	2,022	1,252	627	26	80	77	1,771	1,110	569	89
District 39																
Caddo																
Shreveport	76,971	18,633	54,871	696	2,001	2,367	58,026	16,038	39,417	574	1,395	1,592	48,584	13,675	32,965	1,954

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 1 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 1																
Orleans																
Voting Districts Not Defined	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 2																
Ascension																
6	1,849	1,167	487	36	146	162	1,301	827	346	30	92	101	1,197	893	239	69
34	1,322	953	238	14	97	95	971	716	170	11	61	58	890	704	158	28
43	1,130	888	104	9	102	130	874	720	60	3	67	78	800	728	39	32
71	2,753	1,650	747	61	224	258	1,894	1,167	490	43	149	173	1,598	1,083	384	131
Assumption																
5-1	540	84	442	2	8	15	425	68	349	0	5	11	423	66	354	3
5-2	560	217	305	6	28	37	454	179	255	2	15	19	345	249	96	7
Iberville																
22	1,519	538	916	14	39	54	1,178	445	676	9	36	46	1,130	712	387	33
District 3																
Orleans																
9-14	522	367	86	20	43	49	466	332	71	15	43	47	458	310	80	68
15-19C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 4																
Orleans																
17-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voting Districts Not Defined	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 5																
Orleans																
9-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-4	638	427	123	47	32	59	566	387	96	44	31	50	465	323	82	60
17-2	439	259	148	12	11	23	385	233	124	12	8	17	374	222	117	36
17-16	1,140	113	910	8	97	120	883	100	701	7	67	91	618	87	506	25
District 7																
Jefferson																
175	511	338	68	7	75	86	414	300	40	6	46	56	281	228	37	20
177	894	622	115	14	110	128	699	506	72	7	82	99	490	416	35	36

Split VTDs

Page: 2 of 8

[illegible]

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

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 12																
Tangipahoa																
143	1,207	579	539	15	47	59	900	463	376	13	32	39	719	469	220	26
District 13																
Tangipahoa																
143	601	452	80	12	44	42	489	375	68	6	31	32	393	257	122	18
District 14																
East Baton Rouge																
1-31	2,256	120	2,071	6	39	62	1,673	103	1,518	6	31	47	1,100	62	1,006	30
1-50	1,225	26	1,186	1	8	14	933	24	900	1	4	11	709	24	660	27
1-69	3,473	2,577	520	200	131	188	3,021	2,276	419	172	119	169	1,927	1,585	201	141
1-73	1,680	401	1,033	56	153	201	1,376	342	864	40	105	137	1,433	584	781	66
3-5	4,312	2,591	1,154	242	260	449	4,024	2,477	1,034	221	232	414	1,255	755	340	160
3-57	3,966	1,057	1,685	208	970	1,136	2,793	923	1,097	163	589	698	1,400	522	752	126
District 15																
East Baton Rouge																
1-31	1,125	38	1,071	2	8	9	720	33	674	2	6	6	474	28	433	15
1-50	469	36	316	9	102	103	353	35	227	7	80	82	267	7	247	11
1-91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 16																
East Baton Rouge																
1-69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-73	432	381	34	1	15	17	336	300	20	0	15	14	348	142	191	17
3-5	2,310	1,233	528	232	281	374	1,902	1,075	428	182	191	257	592	355	162	75
3-57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District 17																
East Baton Rouge																
1-91	2,995	261	2,665	0	64	82	2,331	260	2,005	0	62	80	970	27	922	21
District 18																
Ascension																
6	1,009	820	48	53	48	60	720	607	34	25	25	29	662	492	129	37
34	192	140	29	1	13	18	148	106	24	0	10	15	135	107	23	5
43	476	439	2	2	26	39	368	344	0	2	18	28	335	306	16	14

Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 4 of 8

[illegible]

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

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 25																
Acadia																
1-2	834	686	123	8	11	12	652	569	72	1	8	7	520	402	109	23
1-3	329	276	31	11	8	7	267	234	22	5	5	6	222	187	30	0
1-6	1,196	217	946	4	14	29	931	156	751	3	12	23	1,003	136	856	13
1-9	1,211	1,089	97	1	15	14	929	843	67	1	9	9	768	718	40	12
Calcasieu																
340	2,584	1,590	587	190	177	233	1,989	1,277	399	147	131	180	1,010	706	203	102
District 26																
Acadia																
1-2	946	559	359	2	15	14	697	439	242	2	9	7	559	428	117	0
1-3	1,390	1,038	313	6	23	22	1,094	837	234	4	11	11	920	765	142	18
1-6	90	54	35	0	1	1	65	45	20	0	0	0	70	8	59	1
1-9	111	92	8	0	8	4	82	66	8	0	5	2	69	64	3	0
Lafayette																
34	3,848	2,363	661	457	329	378	2,919	1,856	451	352	230	267	1,986	1,472	286	228
38	356	223	77	36	12	28	279	194	51	25	5	17	243	178	44	22
67	1,441	1,114	148	99	56	73	1,061	841	96	65	40	55	955	788	98	72
86	3,259	2,517	307	260	138	159	2,459	1,958	191	181	96	111	2,240	1,915	141	184
125	710	581	31	50	42	39	539	452	30	32	19	19	561	496	21	47
District 28																
St. Landry																
14	1,946	1,350	502	15	51	53	1,522	1,084	373	11	32	29	1,414	957	419	39
District 29																
Bienville																
3-7	39	9	29	1	0	0	28	9	19	0	0	0	25	8	17	0
7-3	317	205	103	3	1	2	253	155	90	3	1	2	243	143	98	3
Grant																
1-3	4	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
7-2	76	72	0	0	1	1	55	52	0	0	0	0	45	43	1	0
8-2	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Jackson																
13	520	121	389	0	6	4	425	100	316	0	6	4	392	169	214	13
22	251	99	139	3	2	5	184	78	96	3	1	3	184	106	75	0

Date: January 19, 2022

Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 6 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 29																
Lincoln																
1-2	668	193	427	2	40	42	505	148	333	1	19	18	426	139	271	17
3-1	887	358	449	0	56	71	679	275	345	0	39	45	563	230	307	29
3-3	51	29	16	0	6	7	32	19	13	0	0	1	25	17	6	0
Natchitoches																
1-1	1,152	173	929	2	39	40	886	158	689	2	32	37	733	136	553	41
1-2	1,621	588	894	21	81	47	1,197	490	599	21	58	30	946	528	369	59
1-4A	1,573	973	420	42	114	323	1,524	950	402	41	112	319	96	49	45	2
2-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rapides																
C13	2,872	696	2,067	28	48	65	1,984	592	1,312	18	41	42	1,408	429	896	83
C23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C25	2,114	645	1,375	28	57	93	1,558	553	936	26	37	60	1,213	379	763	71
N15	1,087	843	131	23	55	68	780	639	73	8	39	48	593	527	42	26
N16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N19	2,897	2,334	322	20	101	124	2,116	1,764	188	14	63	71	1,560	1,387	99	74
S6B	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winn																
5-2	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0
District 30																
Calcasieu																
340	135	82	18	19	14	14	99	58	17	12	10	12	51	35	10	5
Vernon																
1-5	71	48	11	2	9	11	47	31	8	1	7	9	42	38	1	1
District 31																
Grant																
1-3	924	818	53	9	23	19	759	679	44	6	12	11	632	614	1	17
Natchitoches																
1-1	69	32	36	0	1	1	62	32	30	0	0	1	51	11	39	4
1-4A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rapides																
C13	336	9	30	22	272	271	330	8	26	22	272	267	233	71	148	14
C23	721	635	50	1	18	17	556	506	27	1	10	8	591	567	14	10

Time: 5:35 PM

Plan: ACLU

Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Page: 7 of 8

[illegible]

Date: January 19, 2022
Time: 5:35 PM

Split VTDs

DB: LA 2020 12 - CENSUS
Plan Type: Senate - Public Submissions

Plan: ACLU

Page: 8 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 35																
Grant																
7-2	433	378	5	4	14	20	316	280	2	0	8	13	251	242	2	8
8-2	928	842	15	3	20	23	710	654	3	0	14	15	615	601	0	14
Jackson																
13	318	251	51	5	7	9	261	205	41	5	7	8	236	100	132	0
22	441	267	170	0	4	3	310	211	95	0	4	3	314	180	127	10
Lincoln																
1-2	55	40	13	0	2	2	46	37	7	0	2	0	40	14	25	0
3-1	116	79	29	2	4	0	92	63	27	2	0	0	76	30	40	3
3-3	752	427	269	0	38	47	570	347	177	0	30	33	444	307	116	23
Ouachita																
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	1,781	1,017	452	21	257	282	1,388	869	312	15	163	175	868	538	291	40
Rapides																
N12	105	87	2	2	8	6	78	69	0	1	2	1	73	59	11	2
N15	28	20	8	0	0	0	23	20	3	0	0	0	17	15	0	0
N16	1,456	1,114	166	62	79	104	1,212	947	101	61	73	98	541	485	39	17
N19	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Winn																
5-2	468	416	42	3	1	1	354	311	34	3	1	0	322	278	38	7
District 38																
Bienville																
3-7	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7-3	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
Caddo																
125	2,282	1,485	611	22	64	79	1,872	1,249	500	14	42	53	1,436	925	458	53
Natchitoches																
1-2	594	368	173	9	28	27	461	297	120	9	21	20	362	199	138	15
2-4	413	301	102	0	4	9	349	265	78	0	3	2	322	249	62	11
District 39																
Caddo																
125	135	49	77	3	6	8	88	33	47	2	6	8	67	43	21	3

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.wnno.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

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 1*

ACLU Illustrative Full Senate Map




* In this and following Senate map figures, district lines appear brown, and blue 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 Senate Map




New Orleans Area Districts of ACLU Illustrative Senate Map



Shreveport Area Districts of ACLU Illustrative Senate Map




Current Enacted Full Senate Map




©2021 CALIPER


Baton Rouge Area Districts of Current Enacted Senate Map



New Orleans Area Districts of Current Enacted Senate Map




Shreveport Area Districts of Current Senate Map



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



APPENDIX 3

Current Senate Plan with 2010 Data:

District	TTLPop10	Deviation	TTLWht10%	TTLBlk10%	WhtVAP10%	BlkVAP10%
1	119653	2.94%	76.78%	18.07%	79.09%	16.03%
2	111274	-4.27%	41.68%	56.48%	44.77%	53.54%
3	110993	-4.51%	31.11%	59.34%	33.88%	56.55%
4	110743	-4.73%	31.00%	65.38%	34.80%	61.33%
5	110517	-4.92%	40.76%	53.97%	44.36%	50.12%
6	120032	3.26%	69.53%	26.23%	73.28%	22.71%
7	110828	-4.66%	35.50%	56.06%	38.80%	52.54%
8	119917	3.16%	57.06%	32.06%	60.32%	29.14%
9	118074	1.58%	80.92%	10.35%	82.47%	9.24%
10	118865	2.26%	78.82%	11.26%	80.55%	9.99%
11	121670	4.67%	87.48%	8.79%	88.74%	7.81%
12	121321	4.37%	69.23%	28.55%	71.64%	26.27%
13	118958	2.34%	92.27%	5.02%	93.12%	4.42%
14	115785	-0.39%	29.29%	65.32%	33.57%	60.59%
15	119974	3.21%	22.11%	73.33%	25.79%	69.63%
16	118106	1.61%	75.47%	18.40%	77.83%	16.41%
17	111041	-4.47%	62.10%	36.23%	64.11%	34.36%
18	115438	-0.69%	83.49%	12.82%	84.78%	11.86%
19	111296	-4.25%	59.95%	35.13%	62.57%	32.65%
20	116242	0.00%	74.25%	13.94%	76.98%	12.44%
21	121985	4.94%	66.98%	27.24%	69.63%	25.05%
22	121775	4.76%	68.25%	27.69%	71.14%	25.04%
23	120896	4.01%	82.76%	12.35%	83.92%	11.43%
24	121168	4.24%	41.16%	56.60%	44.81%	53.02%
25	120244	3.44%	81.93%	15.16%	83.78%	13.53%
26	121256	4.32%	78.03%	18.45%	80.60%	16.09%
27	118161	1.65%	62.32%	34.58%	64.91%	32.08%
28	119732	3.00%	69.37%	27.89%	70.90%	26.52%
29	118159	1.65%	38.51%	58.65%	41.67%	55.41%
30	113853	-2.05%	80.65%	13.80%	82.21%	12.59%
31	110877	-4.61%	72.49%	21.59%	74.42%	20.14%
32	112248	-3.43%	75.51%	22.91%	75.70%	22.87%
33	113411	-2.43%	69.49%	28.14%	71.76%	26.18%
34	114714	-1.31%	31.05%	67.50%	34.99%	63.51%
35	112602	-3.13%	84.06%	12.89%	84.30%	12.79%
36	111024	-4.49%	73.09%	24.17%	74.24%	23.28%
37	110770	-4.71%	68.70%	24.66%	72.07%	21.71%
38	111806	-3.81%	60.75%	35.80%	63.52%	33.21%
39	117964	1.48%	28.95%	69.38%	31.83%	66.50%

Current Senate Plan with 2020 Data:

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWht20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
1	128656	7.73%	61.64%	24.68%	64.88%	22.30%
2	108026	-9.55%	39.11%	54.85%	41.83%	52.43%
3	126317	5.77%	25.06%	60.30%	27.83%	57.94%
4	132156	10.66%	31.06%	60.36%	33.80%	57.94%
5	120152	0.60%	41.34%	45.21%	43.98%	43.00%
6	132643	11.06%	58.89%	29.33%	62.66%	26.55%
7	111694	-6.48%	25.91%	56.82%	28.75%	55.09%
8	121086	1.39%	43.08%	35.27%	46.14%	33.06%
9	122806	2.83%	64.95%	12.22%	68.06%	11.24%
10	120330	0.75%	57.99%	13.42%	61.26%	12.34%
11	151481	26.84%	77.79%	9.47%	79.79%	8.58%
12	121376	1.63%	65.40%	27.61%	67.75%	25.81%
13	129458	8.40%	81.53%	8.14%	83.64%	7.07%
14	119671	0.20%	28.06%	61.12%	31.07%	58.50%
15	117106	-1.95%	15.14%	75.91%	17.44%	74.04%
16	124272	4.05%	64.19%	22.18%	67.03%	20.21%
17	108212	-9.39%	59.06%	35.64%	61.24%	33.77%
18	138058	15.60%	71.85%	16.69%	74.36%	15.36%
19	109521	-8.30%	50.62%	35.69%	53.56%	34.02%
20	110837	-7.20%	66.81%	15.94%	70.18%	14.62%
21	119371	-0.05%	60.90%	27.03%	64.30%	25.08%
22	120003	0.48%	62.76%	29.12%	65.56%	26.86%
23	138634	16.08%	73.47%	14.28%	75.70%	12.83%
24	120632	1.01%	37.45%	56.77%	40.46%	54.42%
25	130272	9.08%	74.17%	17.75%	76.47%	16.08%
26	120668	1.04%	72.72%	18.98%	75.51%	17.03%
27	126558	5.97%	55.76%	35.50%	58.30%	33.56%
28	112240	-6.02%	65.18%	27.04%	66.52%	25.14%
29	109718	-8.13%	35.19%	59.01%	37.73%	56.56%
30	113424	-5.03%	76.10%	13.04%	77.59%	12.24%
31	106580	-10.76%	66.75%	21.87%	68.92%	20.16%
32	109020	-8.72%	73.71%	19.28%	74.52%	18.22%
33	109730	-8.12%	65.15%	28.59%	67.60%	26.58%
34	107041	-10.37%	28.02%	67.68%	31.32%	64.11%
35	119065	-0.31%	76.44%	14.54%	77.65%	13.73%
36	116688	-2.30%	68.08%	23.69%	69.49%	23.14%
37	110334	-7.62%	56.22%	29.85%	60.26%	26.70%
38	111086	-6.99%	50.53%	41.99%	53.48%	39.48%
39	102835	-13.90%	27.13%	68.33%	29.60%	66.22%

ACLU Senate Plan with 2020 Data:

District	TTLPop20	Deviation	TTLWhite20%	TTLBlk20%	WhtVAP20%	BlkVAP20%
1	125116	4.76%	57.69%	26.89%	61.22%	24.05%
2	114554	-4.08%	38.01%	54.62%	40.63%	52.42%
3	114636	-4.01%	33.36%	54.29%	36.80%	51.36%
4	114240	-4.35%	32.46%	57.76%	34.62%	55.97%
5	118062	-1.15%	36.25%	52.47%	38.93%	50.16%
6	124165	3.96%	73.18%	18.71%	74.94%	17.69%
7	123608	3.50%	26.79%	52.38%	29.81%	50.44%
8	119325	-0.09%	29.09%	52.29%	32.25%	50.08%
9	125275	4.89%	64.26%	13.62%	67.11%	12.77%
10	125255	4.88%	58.94%	12.29%	62.24%	11.19%
11	125276	4.89%	79.40%	7.43%	81.31%	6.70%
12	124918	4.60%	65.31%	27.77%	67.92%	25.69%
13	125144	4.78%	68.91%	20.89%	71.75%	19.05%
14	114081	-4.48%	33.83%	55.61%	37.74%	51.88%
15	118949	-0.40%	27.01%	59.03%	30.75%	56.11%
16	124850	4.54%	63.92%	21.50%	66.72%	19.85%
17	123401	3.33%	39.29%	55.90%	41.40%	53.90%
18	125122	4.77%	75.20%	13.45%	77.73%	12.15%
19	113927	-4.61%	60.62%	29.10%	63.45%	27.31%
20	122720	2.75%	65.12%	16.47%	68.47%	15.05%
21	123640	3.53%	69.29%	17.58%	72.56%	15.87%
22	124828	4.52%	54.02%	37.81%	56.96%	35.43%
23	118207	-1.02%	73.59%	14.53%	75.86%	13.00%
24	114806	-3.87%	37.29%	56.63%	40.56%	54.07%
25	125258	4.88%	75.60%	18.02%	77.82%	16.37%
26	120982	1.30%	74.05%	15.95%	76.63%	14.23%
27	113559	-4.92%	49.46%	41.37%	52.54%	38.95%
28	118640	-0.66%	67.30%	25.78%	69.01%	23.90%
29	114821	-3.86%	36.47%	57.18%	38.97%	54.52%
30	124095	3.91%	78.86%	11.59%	80.24%	10.81%
31	113671	-4.82%	70.42%	16.55%	72.65%	15.23%
32	114730	-3.94%	67.88%	24.37%	69.02%	22.79%
33	120626	1.00%	64.42%	29.33%	66.79%	27.39%
34	115470	-3.32%	32.99%	62.55%	36.48%	58.85%
35	114311	-4.29%	78.13%	13.09%	79.01%	12.54%
36	115768	-3.07%	67.05%	23.86%	68.61%	23.21%
37	113847	-4.67%	34.65%	55.51%	38.63%	52.01%
38	113757	-4.75%	65.27%	25.69%	67.26%	24.36%
39	114117	-4.45%	37.82%	56.16%	41.22%	53.12%

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%