

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION'S
LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON THE 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2022

The Caddo Parish Long Range Planning Committee met in legal session on the above date at 4:05 p.m., in the Government Plaza Chambers, with Mr. Hopkins, Chairman, presiding, and the following members in attendance: Commissioners Atkins, Hopkins, Johnson, and Young (4). ABSENT: Commissioners Chavez, Gage-Watts, and Jackson (3).

Mr. Chavez gave the invocation, and Mr. Young led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Chair placed a 15-minute time limit for all comments and requested that citizens introduce themselves.

Diane Long came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

My name's Diane Long. I was told to do an absentee ballot. I did it. My husband did it, and it was because we were going to absentee. But the reason the main reason why is we really, really knew that there was going to be some disparities and discrepancies because of what we've been reading and seeing. And so, in doing so, there was something that came up. I got mine on time, but my husband did not get ballot until just a day before we had to turn it in. On top of that, I brought it down by hand and gave it to the Registrar of Voters. And so, I know that for a fact it was on time. It was about 4:15, the day before Election Day. Okay. So, I have a friend that knows how to do computers, and she said, let me look online, and let's look at the absentee ballots and make sure that, you know, they've been properly counted. Well, guess what? My ballot was not there and neither was my husband's. To this day, that has not been updated. We still have November 8th on the go vote, and so I don't know where my where my vote is. Why it wasn't counted and why it is that we have winners and losers without a complete count? That's a problem. I don't care who you are, what rank you are, what race you are. Your vote counts. At least, I've always been told that in America. And, I don't know whether or not it was an accident, but what am I to say? What am I to know? I don't know if because I voted for certain people, I was thrown out or, you know. I just want to know, where my vote is? I know there's some other people that probably feel the same way. And, who else was left off the absentee ballot? So, I mean, I can prove everything I've said and I am upset. Yes, I am, because I've had to come down here and represent myself about the very basic thing that we're supposed to have as a citizen and that is a vote and to be accurately counted. So, please, let's get our act together. And one other thing. I know for a fact that machines are corrupt. No matter where you go with it. We've talked to three different cyber experts. They say every machine can be equipped. They can be changed. So can the scanners because they're also connected to the internet. So, this is not rocket science. all we have to do is take a hand count on paper ballots, like they did many years ago and did until computer became the de rigueur of the year. So, let's really let's step back and look at this and let's run our citizens' votes correctly. And I'm not gonna stop until I find out what happened to my vote. That's all I have for that.

Brenda O'Brock came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

Okay, I have a handout. I would like for you to pass this out and make sure everyone gets a staple of three papers here. I want you to know what happened to my neighbor, and I've got the letter attached to this that she received. And this is her statement. She is 90 years old. She has been on hospice for five years, and she's on oxygen. So, I'm speaking for her today. I was taken out of the city without any notice, spent a lot of time on absentee ballot number one and voted for local people who were running for public office, mayor and city council. Then, I received ballot number two with a letter. That letter is attached to this group of papers. With a letter from Dale Sibley instructing me to disregard ballot number one, which took me out of the city but like me and Caddo Parish. It stated that I was in District 11. This letter and ballot number two still had wording of a city council district with conflicting information. I am a Shreveport native, and I feel that my vote was stolen. My question is, do I have to pay City taxes? This is Alice Sour. So, you're losing your tax base? Shreveport is. That's something to be concerned about. After checking with the Tax Assessor's Office today, their records show that Mrs. Sours address and many others on Hasset Avenue are still in the City limits and not in the Parish, which proves these people were robbed of the right to vote for their candidates in this election. After talking to City Engineers today, their statement was the Voters Office used the wrong maps. The correct maps were given to them months ago. I don't know why they chose to use the wrong maps. Whose responsibility was it to inform citizens and then they had been thrust into the Parish losing their right to vote for the City Council and Mayor? Has the Caddo Parish Commission voted on these redistricting lines that were used on the November 8, 2022 election? If the redistricting lines are not official, then why are these lines being used in the November 8, 2022 election? Our 14th amendment section one guarantees due process and equal protection. Many citizens did not receive equal protection nor due process. We need a redo on this election using old district lines and paper ballots that are hand counted. Now, nobody is able to answer my questions. I've been asking for weeks. Who's on this committee that decides for this? Who's on the City Council that decided for this? Who was on the School Board that decided for this? And why is the redistricting so important? We hire the Data Processing Center. I understand his name is Cedric Floyd. Where is he? Mr. Floyd, nice to meet you. Brenda O. Brock. We've hired you to do this. I want to know the proof that you have and the money that is invested in you to do this. What proof do you have that the accomplishment that you want and the citizens want of our city is being done through your process?

Adele Shafferman came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

This is a absentee ballot I got. When I opened it, I saw immediately that I had been placed in the wrong district, District E. I live in Shreveport and my district is D. I made about five phone calls, and I finally got a corrected absentee ballot. However, my husband went to the voting booth on November the A, and he was in the wrong district. He came home and said, well, I could have voted for Tony Nations. I said, Oh, no, you're in the wrong district. So, we can't have, you know, we could have--what is the word--disenfranchised people in District E by canceling their votes with our votes. We didn't have the legal right to vote in District E, because I had been given this ballot and my husband had been also given the machines. There's been a lot of confusion. It's been a lot of people like, my husband and I, that were in the wrong districts. So, I'm asking that--I know this council, this body, maybe cannot call for a re-election. However, you are leaders. You have a voice. You have influence of--please call for re-election. So that people all over the City feel like the election was right and they were not disenfranchised. We do have our right to vote. Without confidence in our votes, we don't even know if you are there are truly elected leaders. We don't have confidence in our democracy. This is deeply important to us, and I think you all know that we're-- many people were given the wrong ballots or put in the wrong District. Thank you.

Mona came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I'm a poll worker at District 97. I've been there for about four years. There was confusion all day long, even though people have been sending out the little cards, you're at precinct number whatever and you're in district whatever. People did not look at those and there was confusion all day long. Coming out of the booth, even. I can't. I've got City Council, whatever, on here and it's not allowing me to vote. There was so much confusion it was unrealistic. We even had people go in, not hit the button and leave, and go back down the hall and read the sheet that says okay, this is what's on the ballot. Here's what you get to vote for whatever. And, and, of course, according to the rules and regulations in the student--we went to school for how to run the polls. Our regulations say stick your hand under the curtain, hit the orange button and back away do not look at what they vote for. That's what we did. We followed every rule, every regulation, every stipulation, and people would come back and say, hey, what did you do? And we said, we follow the rules. We go by the book. We do what we're taught. We didn't look at your poll. We do--the vote is over. We cannot. We got people in line coming. We can't wait for you to--and they were mad. We had other people who didn't realize they were no longer in the City limits. I want to vote for mayor. We hit a button that says number three or number seven, are you inside? Are you outside? I have no control. There were people all day long like this. And I can only tell you what's going on in my district. Or what's on the other side of the room in district 115. And yet, that was all day long. There were some people who even came to this poll. This is--what do you mean I'm no longer here? I have voted here for years. And we said, sorry, you're no longer in the book. And thank God, we had a watcher in the room that could get online and say, oh, you're not here. You've been moved to the church down the road. That helped a lot. Thank you, whoever thought of that wild steam. But that saved us a lot of time and trouble. It wasn't a pretty day

Loretta Bucknell came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I work at Precinct 88 and I read the machines. Loretta Bucknell and I work in precinct 88, and I've been there about three years. And I worked the machine about seven hours that day. And we had people come up to our first machine and they would vote. We--It wouldn't let them cast their votes and they would come get me and they said, why isn't there casting their vote? Well, we had a lady from the voting office. She was there. So, I went and got her, and she did something and she got him to where the machine was work. Okay. Later on, that day, we had two more incidents where people couldn't vote for the mayor, couldn't vote for City Council. And then, we had a Commissioner Charge tell him maybe you can't vote, because you're out of the City limits. You have to be in the city limits to vote this. And one man was there. He said, I'm not leaving until I get the straight. And he was there 45 minutes before he finally was able to leave. To be able to vote. He said, this is wrong. He said, I live where I was supposed to. I have the card that they gave me saying what City limit or out of City limit. He says, but this is wrong. He said, this needs to be fixed. So, we have problems all night long.

Carla Buntyn came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I'm Carla Buntyn. Um, same thing. I've ran for council here. Not a sore loser, but I'm here about principle and equities. I've gotten nothing but phone calls since the election due to my low turn of vote out vote votes about saying things at the polls not able to vote. I've gotten all these things put out the district in the last couple of weeks. Also, I think I went to Mr. Floyd's--think you did something at Bill Cockrell--about redistricting. I had questions in reference to him using numbers from U.S. census, which are bias numbers. We talked about disparities. I would like to know what disparities we're talking about? Are we talking about socio-economic, gender, geographic location? What are we talking about? I have gotten so many calls, and I'm not a sore loser. I could lose and I'm still going to service this community. This is about principle and ethics, and I do to wish you guys look more into this. Because it's not about me, it's not about me winning. I could care less. I'm still servicing Shreveport. Please look into it. Because behind me maybe someone just like Carla who wants to run and they have a right to run and they have a right to win. So, please look into it. I'm having affidavits filled out at this time, and I will be submitting them as well. You can also look at the redistricting the Supreme Court and the most significant case was Miller versus Johnson. I'm gonna leave these here on your desk. Take a look at that. I was--I went to one of your meeting and I was told by someone and I will not say that name out loud. But If you would like to hear the name, I could give it to you. I have a witness coming along that stated this was done--racial gerrymandering is what I was told. Loud and clear. Okay. So, I would like that to be looked at as well in District G. I would like to know

how that was done, the redistricting. We had no idea where those maps were while we were campaigning. We were on streets itself. We just were all over the place, and that's just that's not fair. And after voter turnout, we found out what we were doing was all wrong. I'm not sure what's going on, but please, you guys, please look into it. Not for me, but for someone behind me. Thank you.

Jim O'Brock came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I'm Jim O'Brock. We're okay. We're in the City. We were able to vote. But just one street over, on Hassett street, people that have been in the city forever all of a sudden, they went to the poll they couldn't vote for their--for the mayor even. And I'm thinking okay, how do you move someone out of the City into the Parish? Or do you move the City line in closer, and then all of a sudden, they're in the Parish. So, that's when, you know, I don't see how that can happen. But that's what happened. They were not allowed to vote for any of the City offices and they were allowed to vote for Parish. That's it.

The Chair commented:

Thank each and every one for coming down. We will take this information. Let me say one thing, because we can't really discuss because the way our rules are set up. I will tell you that the Caddo Commission has not redistricted yet. We are in the process. So, we are still using the 2010 information that when it was done. So, we did not do it. What happened, probably, is the City of Shreveport may have redistricted, and in the process made a mistake. So, but it was--we did not do it. We know that. And, you know, we hate to see anybody run into a situation like this, but we will look into it.

Attorney Frazier advised the Committee and attendees that complaints about irregularities in voting need to be sent to the Registrar and the Secretary of State, which will send them to the Elections Commission. The Election Commission oversees the Registrar of Voters. Mr. Atkins commented that the Registrar of Voters and the Secretary of State needs to know about these irregularities. Mr. Atkins said that the Commission is happy to help, but the issue is not in their purview.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if the issues that happened on the day of election be sent to the Clerk of Court. Attorney Frazier responded that is correct, because the Registrar of Voters handles early voting, absentee and voter roll, not election day. Mr. Jackson said he received a call from a constituent about their elderly mother's absentee ballot in District 8. Mr. Jackson explained that due to issues with drawing the District 8 line, some residents realized that they normally voted for District G and received a ballot for District A. Those residents were told to send their ballots back. He further explained that the map that was adopted by the City Council was reviewed, and it was found that the residents were in District A. Mr. Jackson also said there was a discrepancy, because the constituent that called him went to the polls on election day and her poll was for District G. Mr. Jackson pointed out that he does not want the Commission to be like that and pleaded that the Commission does not make changes to the map without citizen input. He explained that he has been unable to schedule a public meeting for his district due to time availability. Mr. Jackson said that he sympathizes with the people who have suffered and that it is unfortunate this kind of situation happens.

Mr. Chavez agreed with Mr. Jackson. Mr. Chavez said that the Caddo Parish Commission appointed the Registrar of Voter, Dale Sibley, and reminded Dr. Wilson about his request for Mr. Sibley to come before the Commission when the ballots were distributed. Mr. Chavez said that the Parish pays the bills at the Registrar of Voters. Mr. Chavez said that Mr. Sibley had rejected the Commission's invitation twice because he was too busy. Mr. Chavez suggested a meeting with Mr. Sibley and Mr. Mike Spence, the Clerk of Court, to address the questions of the citizens. He explained that Mr. Sibley's office explained the district one-one is a slash mark that indicates a citizen is outside of the city limit. Mr. Chavez asked Mr. Clark, the MPC (Metropolitan Planning Commission) Director, whether any citizens were pushed out of the city limits and into the Parish, and Mr. Clark told him that not a single person had been moved out into the Parish. Mr. Chavez requested that the Parish Administrator assemble a meeting between Mr. Sibley and Mr. Spence so that people can ask specific questions. Mrs. Gage-Watts said she also asked Mr. Sibley to come before the Commission and talk about things before the election. Mrs. Gage-Watts said that the Commission could not make Mr. Sibley or Mr. Spence to come to before the Commission, but the Commission can request their attendance. She said that the Parish and its constituents can come together and work amicably on voting issues, but the voting issue is separate from the City, the Parish, and the School Board. Mrs. Gage-Watts received calls on election day about citizens being unable to vote for candidates on their ballot. Dr. Wilson responded that he copied Mr. Chavez on the emails requesting Mr. Sibley to come before the Commission. Dr. Wilson pointed out that the Registrar of voters and the Clerk of Court work directly for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State would have to direct them to do anything. Dr. Wilson reminded the Committee that with the previous Registrar of Voter, Mr. Robinson, and his attorney told the Parish that the Registrar of Voter does not work for the Parish. Dr. Wilson also reminded the Committee that after the Commission makes the initial appointment and provides the resource the Registrar of Voters Office command chain comes from the Secretary of State.

Mr. Atkins encouraged the citizens in attendance to send their input in writing to the key players.

Mr. Young wanted to know if the Commission must have a resolution to contact the Secretary of State and the authorities over the Registrar of Voters. Dr. Wilson said that the Parish could take its concerns directly to the Secretary of State. Mr. Hopkins pointed out that the full body must move to do that. Mr. Young requested that Legal draft a resolution to that effect.

The Chair gave a couple of minutes for citizens to address the Committee.

Greg Young came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I just want to ask one question. A man is really about process. So, what you all are indicating to the group here tonight that the Caddo Parish Commission appoints someone to be the Registrar of Voter? And that person essentially has the job for life? Damn.

It was **moved by Mr. Chavez**, to draft a resolution to request the Secretary of State and include the issues the public has stated. Motion died due to a lack of a second.

Mr. Hopkins recommended that the motion is an agenda addition, and the Committee is not at that part of the meeting yet.

Point of clarification by Dr. Wilson, that the Clerk of Court is an elected official, and he does not answer to the Parish of Caddo or the Secretary of State.

Mr. Jackson asked Attorney Bernstein about the period to challenge an election. Attorney Bernstein responded that for standard elections the period is nine days. Attorney Frazier said that the ninth day is tomorrow at 4:30 p.m. Mr. Chavez commented that due to Veterans Day, there is an extra day.

Breka Peoples came before the Committee and gave the following comment:

I have been in Shreveport. I am not from--well I am from Shreveport, but I have been back home for three years. And within three years, I have seen a lot of voter suppression. I actually, myself, go out. Go get people to vote. I canvas. I go get them. When I went to different elderly communities. The first thing they said, Coach filled out my ballot. Coach, filled out my ballot. You know, I'm fighting. I'm fighting this fight right now in DeSoto Parish. And I do not have any confidence that anybody's going to do anything about Caddo because everybody got their own. The Republicans and the Democrats, they got their own little bunch, and I really think it is gonna be you are gonna be a D.O.J. thing and that is what I am gonna push for. The D.O.J. and the A.C.L.U. because I went out myself. You know it. I went out myself and people tell me, no, coach already filled our ballot. Y'all know who Coach is. It ain't no secret. Yes, that is what they said. Told me to my face. Anybody election could be tampered with. Anybody. Yours. When they want you out of here, you could be gone. Stormy, you can be gone. Steven, you can be gone. So, with this voter suppression, we all going to have to fight this. We all going to have to fight it. It is my personal constitution to lay down about it. I will be pushing it with the D.O.J. Thank you all.

AGENDA ADDITIONS

Mr. Chavez wanted to know if Legal could draft the resolution without a motion. Attorney Frazier responded that she will draft the resolution.

NEW BUSINESS

- *Discuss Alternatives to Proposed Redistricting Plan*

Mr. Hopkins said that the Parish has an existing plan, and the Commission introduced the ordinance. Mr. Hopkins explained that in the past, Commissioners have tried to have a six-six situation. In the Commission's last meeting, Mr. Floyd requested information to compose a plan. Mr. Hopkins had now he has a plan. Mr. Hopkins said that he had secured a certified demographer and provided the demographer with the information the Commission felt the demographer would need to compose a plan including an ordinance. Mr. Hopkins said the Commission must have at least a couple of different alternatives. Mr. Hopkins requested the Committee to review the plans for the demographer to compose a new plan B. Mr. Jackson expressed confusion about who made the alternate plans. Mr. Hopkins responded that a group of commissioners felt like they were not reflected in the redistricting maps and that they should be. Mr. Hopkins said that the group of commissioners have the right to produce an alternative plan. Mr. Hopkins said that Commissioners can bring another plan. Mr. Jackson said that he may want to submit an alternative plan. Mr. Hopkins responded that the group of commissioners included his self, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Atkins, Mr. Young, Mr. Taliaferro, and Mr. Lazarus. Mrs. Gage-Watts said that this Committee meeting is about a meeting a group of commissioners already had. Mr. Chavez pointed out that the group of commissioners did not have a meeting, but they did have discussions.

Mr. Hopkins said the alternative plan was brought to the Committee for the members to look at the alternative plan and propose any changes. He explained that the Committee meeting is not adopting the alternative plan, but there are two plans for the Committee to see which one works best for everyone. Mrs. Gage-Watts wanted to know why the alternative plan was not introduced and why all Commissioners could not draft an alternate plan. She also wanted to know why other members were not included in the initial meeting of the group of commissioners. Mr. Hopkins responded that the Long-Range Planning Committee did not have a meeting, but the alternative plan is being brought before the Committee today. Mr. Jackson expressed confusion about there being another meeting. Mr. Hopkins responded that it was a non-quorum meeting that occurred on the phone or in a meeting with a variable attendance of the group of commissioners. Mrs. Gage-Watts reiterated that at some point the group of commissioners collectively agreed to some things outside of the Long-Range Planning Committee that is being brought to the Long-Range Planning Committee to either agree or disagree or create something different. Mr. Hopkins

said that is correct. Mr. Chavez mentioned that his chief complaint is that he made two or three requests to the Mr. Floyd to draft his district so that it remains intact. Mr. Chavez explained that each time the demographer did not make the changes until Mr. Chavez informed the Committee Chair about it. Mr. Chavez further explained that the alternative plan is exactly what he wanted to see. Mr. Jackson said that something does not sound right and he does not want a copy right now. Mrs. Gage-Watts reiterated that the alternative plan was brought to the Committee and the Long-Range Planning Committee members were not included in the meeting. Mr. Hopkins responded that Mrs. Gage-Watts is correct and that there is nothing wrong with a group of commissioners to secure information and to draft a plan. He explained that the alternative plan could have been an amendment the day of without ever letting other Commissioners see anything. Mr. Hopkins said the group of commissioners did not want to do the alternative plan like that but wanted to share it with the other Committee members for their input.

Mr. Jackson expressed his concerns about the Commission's standard rules of engagement with the demographer to discuss changes to the plan. Mr. Jackson wanted to know who put the alternative plan together. Mr. Floyd responded that he did not anything to do with it. Mr. Atkins wanted to know why he would not look at the alternative plan. Mr. Jackson responded that some commissioners do not have to deal with public email actions insinuating that there is a hidden agenda. Mr. Jackson expressed concern about the presentation of the alternative plan and his issue with Commissioners drafting maps that the Parish pays a demographer to do.

Mrs. Gage-Watts pointed out that whoever Mr. Hopkins is speaking on behalf of could have brought the alternative plan to the floor and made major amendments. Mrs. Gage-Watts said that is not acceptable. Mr. Atkins said that after several requests for Mr. Floyd to provide a six-balance plan, Mr. Floyd responded that there was not a six-balance plan in compliance with the voting rights. Mr. Atkins explained that he had discussions with a demographer who thought there was a six-balance plan available, and the group of commissioners received data for Mr. Floyd to review and create a plan B. Mr. Atkins further explained that Mr. Floyd could generate a plan with the data that Mr. Atkins wanted, but Mr. Floyd could not manipulate that data on his own. Mr. Atkins said that the group of commissioners got a demographer to help them generate a plan to present back to Mr. Floyd. Mrs. Gage-Watts commented that everything was wrong with commissioners hiring a certified demographer to help them with their plan. Dr. Wilson pointed out that the Caddo Parish Commission did an RFP process that led to the selection of its demographer. Mr. Atkins said that he never had a vote on selecting Mr. Floyd and he did not select him.

Mr. Jackson said he had a war of words with Dr. Wilson about certain things but was told to let the Parish Administrator do his job. Mr. Jackson said that in this case, the Parish Administrator did his job selecting the demographer and the situation is like the commissioners are working around. Mr. Atkins said that he is going to back off from that. Mr. Jackson accepted Mr. Atkins apology and expressed that he is confused. Mr. Atkins asked Dr. Wilson if Commissioners have the right to propose other plans without being in violation. Dr. Wilson agreed. Mr. Atkins said that the Administration retained a demographer on behalf of the Commission, but the demographer did not provide Mr. Atkins with the data he was looking for. Mr. Atkins said that the demographer is within his right to believe that there is not a six-six map available, but Mr. Atkins spoke to other experts that thought there is a six-six plan available. Then, he and some of his colleagues brought the six-six plan to the Long-Range Planning Committee for discussion. Mr. Jackson said that during the work session discussion, there was a plan that some commissioners wanted to present that was retrogressive. He explained that during the work session, the demographer mentioned he would not be willing to put forth a retrogressive plan. Mr. Atkins agreed that he heard that during the discussion as well, but the alternative plan may not be retrogressive.

Mr. Chavez reiterated that he tried to get results of what he specifically wanted from Mr. Floyd. Mr. Chavez reached out to Mr. Hopkins, who informed Mr. Chavez that Commissioners could hire a different demographer, and Mr. Chavez decided to hire somebody else. Mr. Chavez said, "So, if citizens have the right to submit a plan with a demographer, we have a right to submit a plan." Mr. Chavez said that the Commissioners and the Parish demographer are working together to have various plans and have citizen input.

Mr. Floyd said that citizens had trouble with Shreveport City Council Districts and that Data Center had nothing to do with that. Mr. Floyd said that he will be in California from the 19th to the 27th and that he is willing to review the alternative plan while he is away. He said that he could report back by the 29th. Mr. Floyd said he is available for the Commission's December 8th meeting but is unsure what the schedule is for the alternative plan. Mr. Hopkins responded that the plan does not have any voting precinct changes for the ordinance description. Mr. Floyd said that he will include whether the alternative plan is up to standard or retrogressive. He explained that most demographers had their plans rejected under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and in his 42 years he had four plans rejected for not meeting standards and been in court 16 times for dilution. Mr. Floyd defined dilution as a Section 2 case and a retrogression as Section 5 which requires a plan's submission for pre-clearance. Mr. Floyd explained that some demographers will create redistricting maps and let the train crash down the road.

Attorney Frazier reminded the Committee that the deadline for their redistricting plan is December 31, 2022. She recommended that alternate plans must be presented and vetted as soon as possible, because the Commission must choose a plan. Mr. Hopkins asked that Mr. Floyd review the plan. Mr. Jackson said that the December 31st deadline is a goal but not the ceiling. He explained that the Secretary of State would say that a plan must be sent four weeks before qualifying to the Secretary of State. Mr. Jackson said that a malfeasance charge must be brought to the Louisiana Legislature and the Louisiana Legislature must meet for the Parish to lose revenue sharing, but the Legislature does not convene until the Spring. Mr. Jackson said that the Commission could not rush their redistricting process. He explained

that Mr. Epperson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Burrell and Mr. Jones had a redistricting meeting, but the alternative plan was not presented there. Mr. Jackson said that the Committee is setting a precedence for Commissioners to hire their an independent third-party. Mr. Jackson wanted to know who paid for the other demographer and who the other demographer is. Mr. Jackson said that every Black Commissioner or Councilmember is "being run up the ringer" about transparency and questioned the involvement of financial interest. Mr. Hopkins responded that Mr. Joiner put the alternative plan together and that he was paid to do the alternative plan without public dollars. Mr. Jackson expressed that the Commission is opening "a can of worms" and is pushing the limits. Mr. Atkins commented that the group of commissioners obtained information and brought it to the Commission retained demographer to develop a plan based on the information. He explained that the group of commissioners asked that the Commission's demographer determine if the alternative plan is retrogressive or not.

Attorney Frazier said that the Committee could make a recommendation from the Committee, but even without a recommendation from the Committee it does not stop the alternative plan from action. Mr. Hopkins commented that the alternative plan was presented early enough for Commissioners to see it. Mr. Atkins commented that if the alternative plan is recommended from the Committee there could be some Commissioners that may feel "bull dogged" into doing something they do not want to do. Mr. Jackson reiterated that some Commissioners held redistricting meetings already, and he has concerns about citizen response to a new plan. Mr. Hopkins said that the Commission may not be ready to vote on December 8th, but the Commission could hold a special meeting after the first of the year. Mr. Floyd reminded the Committee that he will be on vacation from November 19th to the 29th and again on December 22nd through January 3rd. Mr. Floyd said that he does have other obligations.

It was **moved by Mr. Hopkins**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to move the alternative plan forward.* Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez Hopkins, and Young (4). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Gage-Watts, Jackson and Johnson (3). ABSTAIN: None (0).

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



Linda J. Montgomery
Office Specialist I