Texas Redistricting - Evaluation of Plan C141

by Stephen Ansolabehere and Maxwell Palmer

Last week, the Texas State Senate passed redistricting plan C141. The plan adds four new seats, which were allocated to Texas based on the 2010 census. This memo presents results using standard methods for assessing the likely partisan consequences of plans. We map past election results into the current districts in order to calculate what percent of seats are majority Republican and what percent of seats are majority Democrat. We further consider the possibility of uniform shifts in the statewide vote, either in the direction of Democrats or Republicans, to assess the likely affects of the plan on the division of seats in future elections. Of particular interest is the projected division of seats in the hypothetical case when the statewide vote is divided evenly between the parties. This value is called the “partisan bias” of the districting plan (see Browning and King 1987).

Based on the 2008 presidential election results, twenty-two of the twenty-three current Republican members of Congress will be in districts in which Republicans are expected to receive 55 percent of the vote or more, and eight of the nine current Democratic members of Congress will be in districts in which Democrats are expected to receive 55 percent of the vote or more. Democrat Lloyd Doggett’s 25th district will go from 60% Democratic to 55% Republican. Of the four new districts, two are districts where we expect Republicans to receive 55% or the vote or more, and two are districts where we expect Democrats to receive 55% of the vote or more. Consequently, if Doggett is defeated due to the shift of his district from heavily Democratic to Republican, the Republicans will increase their congressional delegation from twenty-three to twenty six seats, and the Democrats from nine to ten seats.[1] Analysis of the plan also allows us to project the likely division of the legislature for different (hypothetical) divisions of the vote statewide. We plot these results on a seats-votes curve, where each point on the plot represents the percentage of seats that would be won by the Democrats for the given vote share. [2]
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### Projected Democratic Performance Under Plan C141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Measure</th>
<th>Expected Vote (%)</th>
<th>Expected Seats</th>
<th>Seats at 50% of the Vote</th>
<th>Vote Share Bias (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2010 Normal Vote</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Presidential Vote</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Gubernatorial Vote</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This curve reveals two important features of this plan. First, the plan has a partisan bias of 14–17%. Rather than winning 50% of the seats in the hypothetical case where the Democrats win 50% of the vote, the Democrats would win only 43–46% of the seats. To win 50% of the seats, the Democrats would need to win roughly 52–53% of the vote.
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Second, the number of seats won by each party is constant for any Democratic share of the vote between thirty-seven and forty-eight percent. This range includes the recent statewide performance of most Democratic candidates over the last ten years, which has averaged 42%. This flat portion of the seats-votes curve indicates extremely low competitiveness in almost all of the congressional districts under this plan. Thus, the plan is not responsive to small changes in the vote share of either party in the range of vote shares that we expect in the next elections. All of the changes in the makeup of Texas' congressional delegation are likely to be the result of the partisan decisions in the redistricting process, rather than from competitive congressional elections.


[2] We generated three different uniform swing curves using different estimates for the Democratic share of the vote. First, we used a normal vote, which is the mean of the Democratic vote in each voting tabulation district (VTD) for all contested elections between 2002 and 2010. Second, we used the 2008 Presidential vote. Third, we used the 2010 gubernatorial vote.
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From: Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 1:39 PM
To: Gerardo Interiano
Subject: Re: county by county report

huh

On Jun 21, 2011, at 1:27 PM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

For some reason Culberson thought that Patrick was going to offer an amendment to the bill today....

On Tue, Jun 21, 2011 at 1:21 PM, Eric Opiela <eopiela@ericopiela.com> wrote:
Thank you.

No clue why he might be calling. Culberson and I haven't talked since early May.
EO

On Jun 21, 2011, at 1:16 PM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

Just forwarded it to you. Why is Tony Essalih calling me? I just tried to call him back but got his voicemail.

On Tue, Jun 21, 2011 at 1:08 PM, Eric Opiela <eopiela@ericopiela.com> wrote:
I think this is called the 211 report.
EO

On Jun 21, 2011, at 11:49 AM, Eric Opiela wrote:

> GI-
> >
> > could you get tlc to run a report of each congressional district with a county by county breakdown of 08 an 10 republican primary and general election turnout?
> >
> > Thanks
> >
> > eo
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Hi Gerardo –

I hope all is well with you and Aynsley in Austin. I had dinner recently with Kevin Robnett and he mentioned that you guys were doing really well.

I wanted to touch base with you regarding redistricting, as I am handling things for Congresswoman Granger here in Texas. If possible, I would like to chat for just a bit over the phone about how things are looking on your end in order to keep my boss informed as things progress. I know that session starts next week and your life will be full speed through May. My contact information is below but feel free to email if it is easier to set up a time.

Many thanks,

Mattie

Mattie Parker
817-565-5997 cell
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Hey man, Ellie and I came to town for the inauguration today and my boss just called and asked me to go on a goodwill mission to the legislative council office tomorrow and talk to the guy(s) in charge of mapdrawing, just to introduce myself.

Was hoping you might be able to point me in the right direction as far as who the key people are. Thanks so much, man.

Tony Essalih
Chief of Staff
US Rep. John Culberson
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I’m still wondering about timing on the House side—do you have any idea when the committee will meet?

We’re receiving word about movement in both chambers, but it’s short on specifics.

My boss wants me to make the trek to Austin once we know the committee schedule.

Many thanks.

Tony Essalih
Chief of Staff
US Representative John Culberson
(713) 682-8828 - Houston
(202) 225-2571 - Washington, DC
www.culberson.house.gov
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From: Bonnie L. Bruce  
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 10:57 AM  
To: 'Essalih, Tony'; Gerardo Interiano  
Cc: Ryan Downton_HC; Addie Crimmins_HC; Doug Davis_SC  
Subject: RE: Sorry to keep pressing

Tony,

I know we don’t know each other, but I am a person of my word. I told you that when we knew a schedule I would let you know. A schedule has not been agreed to at this point and discussions are ongoing between the House and the Senate. When a schedule is concrete, I will be happy to let all members of the Congressional delegation who have inquired know of Chairman Solomons’ intent. I sympathize and understand the need to make travel arrangements and will try to give you as much advanced notice as is possible.

On a note about the hearing, if the Congressional members wish to have their wishes heard by the Texas Legislative members of the Redistricting Committee, it might be wise for them to deliver their testimony in person.

Cordially,

Bonnie Bruce
Chief of Staff
Room 1W.11
P.O. Box 2910
Austin, TX 78768-2910
512-463-0478

From: Essalih, Tony [mailto:Tony.Essalih@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 10:28 AM  
To: Bonnie L. Bruce; Gerardo Interiano  
Subject: Sorry to keep pressing  

I’m still wondering about timing on the House side – do you have any idea when the committee will meet?

We’re receiving word about movement in both chambers, but it’s short on specifics.

My boss wants me to make the trek to Austin once we know the committee schedule.

Many thanks.

Tony Essalih
Chief of Staff
US Representative John Culberson
(713) 682-8828 - Houston
(202) 225-2571 - Washington, DC
www.culberson.house.gov
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From: Essalih, Tony [Tony.Essalih@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 11:01 AM
To: Bonnie L. Bruce; Gerardo Interiano
Cc: Ryan Downton_HC; Addie Crimmins_HC; Doug Davis_SC
Subject: RE: Sorry to keep pressing

Much appreciated, Bonnie. Didn’t mean to imply that you weren’t, just figured things tend to get extremely busy there and you’re juggling a hundred other things.

Thanks also for the tip on having delegation members testify in person, as well.

From: Bonnie L. Bruce [mailto:Bonnie.Bruce@house.state.tx.us]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 10:57 AM
To: Essalih, Tony; Gerardo Interiano
Cc: Ryan Downton_HC; Addie Crimmins_HC; Doug Davis_SC
Subject: RE: Sorry to keep pressing
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P.O. Box 2910
Austin, TX 78768-2910
512-463-0478
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