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1. My name is Ronald Keith Gaddie. I reside at 3801 Chamberlyne Way, Norman, Oklahoma, 73072. I have been retained as an expert to provide analysis of the Wisconsin Assembly and Senate districts by counsel for the members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board and its executive director. I am being compensated at a rate of $300.00 per hour. I am a tenured professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma. I teach courses on electoral politics, research methods, and southern politics at the undergraduate and graduate level. I am also the general editor (with Kelly Dampousse) of the journal Social Science Quarterly. I am the author or coauthor of several books, journal articles, law review articles, and book chapters and papers on aspects of elections, including most recently The Triumph of Voting Rights in the South. In the last decade I have worked on redistricting cases in several states, and I provided previous expert testimony on voting rights, redistricting, and statistical issues. I have also testified in trials or provided expertise to defendants, plaintiffs, intervenors, and jurisdictions in California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, and appeared as an expert witness before committees of the U.S. House, the U.S. Senate, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Since 2008 I have testified in person or via affidavit in Lepak v. City of Irving 3:10-cv-00277 (N.D. Tex.); Egolf, et al. v. Duran, et al D-101-CV-2011-02942 (1st Jud. Dist. N.M.); and Fletcher v. Lamone, No. 8:11-CV-03220 (D. Md.). A complete list of my cases and retentions appears along with my academic background and list of publications in my attached vita (Exhibit A).
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2. This report describes: equal population treatment; racial fairness and treatment of minority majority districts; delayed voting effects; treatment of political subdivisions (counties and municipalities); compactness; core constituency retention; pairing of incumbents in the Assembly and Senate districts in Act 43 of the Wisconsin Legislature; and the general features of Act 44, the U.S. Congressional district map for the state of Wisconsin.

3. Equal population treatment

The “One-Person, One-Vote” criterion looms largest in the redistricting literature and case law. The standard, initially advanced in the Baker v. Carr and later given name in Gray v. Sanders, started the reapportionment revolution. Wisconsin’s 1992 and 2002 state legislative maps were crafted by the federal court. The most recent map is a legislative product. Tables 1 and 2 show
population deviation data for Assembly and Senate maps, respectively, since 1992.

The 1992 Assembly plan met a 1% standard (+/-0.5%) with an overall range of deviation of 0.91 percent, with 48 districts below the ideal and 51 above the ideal. Only one district was more than a half point away from the idea. In the Senate, the 1992 plan had an overall deviation range 0.52% with 15 districts above the ideal population and 18 below the ideal. The 2002 Federal court map had an overall range of 1.59 percent, with 47 districts above the ideal, 51 below the ideal, and one exactly apportioned district. In the Senate, the overall deviation range of the 2002 map was 0.98% with 15 districts above the ideal population, 17 below, and one at the perfectly apportioned. Of the 99 Assembly districts in 2002, 77 districts were within +/- 0.5% of the ideal population; in the Senate, 32 of 33 districts fell in this range.

The application of the 2010 census to the existing district boundaries shows many districts outside legally permissible bounds; 44 of 99 Assembly seats had populations more than 5.0% above or below the ideal, as did 11 of 33 Senate districts.

Act 43 rectifies the population variations by drawing 99 Assembly districts that fall within a range of 0.76% (+0.39% to -0.37%); 56 districts are above the ideal population, 41 are below the ideal, and two districts are perfectly apportioned. In the Senate, population variations fall within a range of 0.62% (+0.35% to -0.27%); 17 districts are above the ideal population, 14 are below the ideal, and two districts are perfectly apportioned.

4. Treatment of minority majority districts

African American and Hispanic populations are of approximately equal size in Wisconsin. African Americans are 6.3% of the Wisconsin statewide population and 26.8% of the population of Milwaukee County. The state population is 5.9% Hispanic origin, and Milwaukee County is 13.3% Hispanic. The African American population is largely concentrated in Milwaukee; over 70% of the 358,280 African American Wisconsinites are in the county, and then largely in the City of Milwaukee and north of the East-West Freeway. By comparison, just 37.5% of the 335,532 Hispanic Wisconsinites live in Milwaukee County, and that population has its greatest concentration south of the East-West Freeway.

Of the existing Assembly districts, five are majority African American districts where minority voters elect a candidate of choice (5.05% of seats statewide); of the existing Senate districts, two are majority African American districts where minority voters elect a candidate of choice (6.06% of seats statewide). There is currently one majority Hispanic Assembly seat and no majority Hispanic Senate seats.

As Table 3 shows, Act 43 includes six majority African American Assembly districts and two majority African American Senate districts. Of the six Assembly districts, five are between 60.4% and 61.9% African American voting age population (VAP), and the sixth is 51.5%
African American (VAP). The Act includes two majority Hispanic Assembly districts that are 54.0% Hispanic VAP and 60.5% Hispanic VAP, respectively. No part of Wisconsin is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. However if the state were covered by Section 5 the new plan would meet the non-retrogression standard used by the federal government to assess whether a proposal protects minority voting rights. The new Wisconsin Assembly plan not only avoids retrogression, it creates an additional African American district and an additional Hispanic district.

In Milwaukee County, the 2002 court-drawn baseline map had sixteen Assembly districts wholly within the county, and another three districts that crossed the county line; the county population (940,164) would have accommodated seventeen whole districts plus a third of another. African-American majority districts constituted 28.8% of the potential whole districts that could have been crafted in Milwaukee county, compared to 24.6% African American in the county population. African American majority districts were 26.3% of all districts that were wholly or partially in Milwaukee County.

Act 43 had thirteen Assembly districts wholly within the county, and another eight districts that crossed the county line; the county population (947,735) would have accommodated sixteen whole districts plus half of another. African American majority districts constitute 36.4% of the potential whole districts that could have been crafted in Milwaukee county, compared to 26.8% African American in the county population. African American majority districts are 28.6% of all districts that are wholly or partially in Milwaukee County. Under Act 43, Hispanic majority Assembly districts are 2.02% of all districts in the state, 12.1% of potential whole districts that might be drawn in Milwaukee County, and 9.5% of all districts that are wholly or partially in Milwaukee County.

5. Delayed Voting Effects

The Wisconsin legislature enjoys distinct features that must be considered in the evaluation of legislative maps. Each state Senate district is composed of three entire state Assembly districts, so changes in the Assembly districts will necessarily carry through to the Senate districts. The final evaluation of changes to districts for one chamber must be made in the context of how proposed changes affect the districts of the other chamber.

Assembly members serve two-year terms. Senators serve four-year, staggered terms with half elected in presidential years and the other half coincident with gubernatorial elections. Redistricting results in shifts of voters among Senate districts that will result in temporary delayed voting of some voters. Voters who previously resided in even-numbered Senate districts (which vote at in presidential years) but who are moved to odd-numbered Senate districts (which vote in midterm years) by redistricting will go six years without the opportunity to vote for a state senator. In Wisconsin the delayed voting issue is considered significant and is closely related to the fundamental principles of fairness and equality that underlie the dominant
principles of population equality and racial fairness.

The delayed voting effects of the last three redistricting efforts appear in Table 4. In 1992, the map drawn by the Federal District Court moved 257,000 persons (or about 5.25% of all persons in Wisconsin according to the 1990 census) into districts where voters would wait six years between opportunities to vote for state senator. In 2002, the Federal District Court map moved 171,163 persons (3.14% of the state population according to the 2000 census) into districts where voters would have a six-year delayed vote. In 2011, Act 43 moves 299,704 persons (5.26% of all persons in Wisconsin according to the 2010 census) into new districts that result in similar delayed voting. The number of persons per district experiencing delayed voting ranges from a low of 133 to a high of 72,431, with an average for the 17 districts involved of 17,630 persons per district. The number of people with temporarily delayed votes is numerically similar to the number observed in Oklahoma, where the most recent state Senate map moves 299,528 persons (8.0% of the state) to districts where they will be temporarily disfranchised in state Senate elections. I am currently identifying other states with similar staggered senate elections to ascertain if the Wisconsin and Oklahoma delayed voting effects are exceptional or common.

Delayed voting is not without means for the public to redress. Wisconsin is one of nineteen states that allows for recall of state elected officials.1 This past summer, senators in nine of the sixteen even-numbered Senate districts were subject to recall, meaning that potentially numerous delayed voters who would have waited from 2008 to 2014 for the chance to vote for senator were able to exercise the franchise via recall, and therefore will not wait six years between opportunities to vote again, but only three. A total of 164,843 persons who reside in the districts who would otherwise have delayed voting also lived in districts where a recall was conducted in 2011. Accounting for the use of the recall, the actual period of delayed voting for these 164,843 persons is just three years, not six. Thus, only 134,861 persons endure the six-year voter delay.

6. Treatment of political subdivisions

Cities and counties are creatures of the state (Dillon’s Rule). They can be created, consolidated, or eliminated. Wisconsin’s Constitution expressly provides that county, municipality, and ward boundaries be preserved, if possible (Wisconsin Constitution, article IV). Some city and county lines must be ignored to comply with equal population standards. The Federal Court Plan of 1992 acknowledged both that preference and a preference for preserving municipal boundaries in particular in the crafting of state legislative maps.

---

1 Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington also have election recall. Virginia has a recall petition, but the recall is made via a recall trial (similar to an impeachment) rather than a vote of the people.
As reported in Table 5, the 1992 Federal Court map for the Assembly split 72 municipalities and the Senate map split 45 municipalities; in 2002, the Federal Court’s Assembly map split 50 municipalities and the Senate map split 24 municipalities. Act 43 splits 62 municipalities in the Assembly and 37 in the Senate, which is between the numbers of municipal splits in the previous two court-ordered maps.

The 1992 Federal Court map split 47 counties in the Assembly and 35 in the Senate; in 2002, the Federal Court divided 51 counties in the Assembly and 42 in the Senate. Act 43 splits 58 counties in the Assembly and 46 in the Senate, which continues the pattern of greater numbers of counties getting split over time.

7. Compactness

A variety of statistical measures have evolved to assess compactness, though they usually reduce down to two: indicators of circular shape, and indicators of circular filling. The two most widely used measures of compactness applied to legislative districts are the Perimeter-to-Area measure and the Smallest Circle score. These measures were regularly offered in post-Shaw litigation of the 1990s. And, traditionally, districting plans are assessed in the context of total (average) plan compactness, though the compactness of individual districts is advanced when attempting to lend context to the design of particular districts (illustrations of both measures are in Figure 1.)

The Perimeter-to-Area (PTA) measure compares the relative length of the perimeter of a district to its area. It represents the area of the district as the proportion of the area of a circle with the same perimeter. The score ranges from 0 to 1, with a value of 1 indicating perfect compactness. This score is achieved if a district is a circle. Most redistricting software generates this measure as the Polsby-Popper statistic.

Smallest Circle (SC) scores measure the space occupied by the district as a proportion of the space of the smallest encompassing circle, with values ranging from 0 to 1. A value of 1 indicates perfect compactness and is achieved if a district is a circle. This statistic is often termed the Reock measure by redistricting applications.

Compactness scores for Act 43 appear in Table 6. The average smallest circle score for the entire Assembly map is .28 (range from .06 to .63). The average perimeter to area score for the

---


Assembly map is .28 (range of .05 to .56), and the Senate map has a mean perimeter to area score of .29 (range from .06 to .58). The Assembly compactness scores are marginally lower for Act 43 than for the predecessor, court-crafted plan.

8. Core constituency retention

Core retention measures the extent to which constituencies are maintained or disrupted by a proposed map. There are several ways to measure core constituency retention:

Simple Core Retention: How much of district #X in the old map continues into district #X in the new map? (#X old/ N new) This approach is potentially problematic if there has been a radical renumbering of the districts. This can be used with confidence only if there is a conscious effort to keep district numbers attached to geographic areas. This almost necessarily entails giving each incumbent a district. In this instance the measure would closely correspond to incumbent-oriented core retention.

Largest Constituency Core Retention: In the new district, what is the largest proportion in the district that was previously together in one particular, previous district? (Figures for this retention appear in Table 7).

Incumbent Core Retention: In the Incumbent’s new district, what proportion of the population comes from their old district? (Figures for this retention appear in Table 8).

The average largest core retention is 66.35% in the Assembly, with a low of 30.88% and a high of 99.91%, as reported in Table 7. The average Senate core retention is 78.82% with a low of 57.89% and a high of 99.92%.

Average incumbent core retention reported in Table 8 is lower than the average for the largest core retention shown in Table 7. In the Assembly, average incumbent core retention is 61.65%, with a low of 8.55% and a high of 99.91%. The average core retention for Democratic incumbents is 54.6%, and 65.86% for Republican incumbents. The lowest Democratic incumbent core is 8.55%, the highest is 99.91%; for Republicans, the low is 17.74% and the high

4 The 2002 compactness scores and Senate smallest circle scores could not be generated in time for the submission of this report. They will be provided as soon as they are ready.

5 An example of the limitations of this measure is the 1992 Georgia congressional redistricting. In that redistricting, in which Georgia gained a seat, the district of incumbent congressman Newt Gingrich (R-6) was completely dismantled, and a new district 6 created that contained none of the old district’s population. Gingrich did “follow the number” and ran successfully in the new district 6.
is 97.67%.

In the Senate, average incumbent core retention is 78.23%, with a low of 42.03% and a high of 99.92%. Democratic incumbent core retention averages 78.84%, compared to 77.64% for Republican incumbents. The low Democratic incumbent score is 42.03%, the high is 99.53%. Among Republican incumbents, the low is 57.97%; the high is 99.92%.

9. Incumbent pairings

There are a total of 11 Assembly pairings involving 22 incumbents. Of these pairings, three involve two Democrats; three involve two Republicans; and five involve bipartisan pairings. The incumbent pairings and the associated core retentions of the involved incumbents appear in Table 9. The Act 43 map contained ten pairings. An additional pairing occurred when Rep. Chris Taylor (D) was elected to Assembly District 48 in a July 2011 special election. Until the result of this election, more Republicans than Democrats were paired under Act 43.

10. Act 44, U.S. Congressional Map

Equal population: Act 44 apportions the 2010 census population of the state of Wisconsin perfectly, into eight districts with a variance of one person. Districts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 have a population of 710,873, while districts 1 and 2 have a population of 710,874.

Racial fairness: The total white, non-Hispanic population of Wisconsin is approximately 4,737,259 (.833 * 5,686,986 total persons). There are approximately 949,727 persons who are not Anglo whites in the state. Of these, 358,280 are African American; 335,532 are Hispanic; 130,801 are Asian American; and 56,869 are American Indians. The greatest concentration of minority voters is in Milwaukee County, where there are 514,620 non-Hispanic whites, there are approximately 253,993 African Americans; 126,048 Hispanics; 32,333 Asian Americans; and 6,634 American Indians. No one of these minority groups is sufficiently numerous to constitute the majority of a single congressional district. Act 44 maintains congressional district 4 in Milwaukee County in a configuration that includes 110,488 Hispanics and 285,413 other non-Hispanic minority voters, primarily African Americans. Hispanics make up 15.54% of the district population and other minorities make up 40.15% of the district population, for a total racial, ethnic and linguistic population that is 55.68% of the district.
Treatment of political subdivisions: The congressional map crafted under Act 44 makes 26 splits in 12 counties. Of the 72 counties in the state, only Milwaukee County (947,735) is large enough to wholly contain a congressional district. The county splits are as follows:

- Chippewa: 3, 7
- Dodge: 5, 6
- Jackson: 3, 7
- Juneau: 3, 7
- Milwaukee: 1, 4 (wholly in the county), 5, 6
- Monroe: 3, 7
- Richland: 2, 3
- Rock: 1, 2
- Walworth: 1, 5
- Winnebago: 6, 8
- Wood: 7, 8
- Waukesha: 1, 5

The following municipalities are also split by Act 44. There are a total of 32 split municipalities encompassing 64 splits:

- Alma: 3, 7
- Anson: 3, 7
- Bayside: 4, 6
- Beaver Dam: 5, 6
- Beloit: 1, 2
- Buena Vista: 2, 3
- Butler: 4, 5
- Clearfield: 3, 7
- Dousman: 1, 5
- Edson: 3, 7
- Germantown: 3, 7
- Goetz: 3, 7
- Harmony: 1, 2
- Hubbard: 5, 6
- Janesville: 1, 2
- LaGrange: 3, 7
- LaPrairie: 1, 2
- Libson: 3, 7
Lomira: 5, 6
Milton: 1, 2
New Berlin: 1, 5
Oak Grove: 5, 6
Oshkosh: 6, 8
Rock: 1, 2
Theresa: 5, 6
Tomah: 3, 7
Turtle: 1, 2
Vinland: 6, 8
Waukesha: 1, 5
Whitewater: 1, 2
Winneconne: 6, 8
Wolf River: 6, 8

Core Retention:
All of the congressional districts retain their incumbents, and the incumbents largely retain their districts (see Table 10). The Largest Core and the Incumbent Core are identical. The average core retention for Act 44 is 84.33%, with a high of 96.52% (District 1) and a low of 74.99% (District 5). The average core retention for Democratic incumbents is 83.70%, and 85.36% for Republican incumbents. The lowest Democratic incumbent core is 75.91%, the highest is 91.12%; for Republicans, the low is 74.99% and the high is 96.52%.

Compactness: Compactness scores for Act 44 appear in Table 11. The average smallest circle score is .44; for Republican incumbent districts, the average is .46; for Democratic incumbent districts, the average is .40. The average perimeter to area score is .21; for Republican incumbent districts, the average is .20; for Democratic incumbent districts, the average is .24. The map has increased compactness on the smallest circle score when compared to the previous map, while compactness has decreased on the perimeter to area score.

Pairing of incumbents: No incumbent members of Congress are paired in one district.

11. Conclusion

Act 43 of the Wisconsin Legislature creates districts of substantively equal population in the Assembly and the Senate. These districts are crafted to a variation of less than one percentage point. The Senate map maintains existing African American voting opportunities in the Senate,
and the Assembly map increases by one the number of majority African American Assembly seats, from five to six. The Assembly map also maintains the existing Hispanic opportunity in Milwaukee County and also contains a second district that is majority Hispanic by VAP and which holds out prospects for a second Hispanic opportunity in the future. Both maps are generally compact, adhere to the Wisconsin state requirement to respect county and municipal boundaries, and maintain constituency cores at an average of over 66% in the Assembly and 78% in the Senate. Assembly core retention is lower in the context of incumbency, and lower on average in Democratic incumbent districts than Republican incumbent districts. The Senate map has a delayed voting level of 5.26% -- comparable to the Federal Court map in 1992 -- and subsequent to the summer 2011 recall elections over half of the persons in delayed voting areas resided in areas that had recall elections, and will vote for the Senate again in 2014.

Act 44 creates eight congressional districts with a total population deviation of one person. One of the eight districts is a combined majority minority district, which currently elects an African American incumbent, U.S. Rep. Gwen Moore. The map splits 12 counties and 32 municipalities. Every incumbent member of the delegation is placed in a continuing district and is not paired with another incumbent.
## Tables and Figures

### Table 1: Population Deviations Under Act 43 for the Wisconsin Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>1992 Court**</th>
<th>2002 Court***</th>
<th>2002 Court***</th>
<th>2011 Act 43***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 to 10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 to 4.99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-.499</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No deviation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to - .499</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.5 to -4.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.0 to -10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; -10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-0.53%</td>
<td>-0.77%</td>
<td>-15.77%</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>+0.38%</td>
<td>+0.82%</td>
<td>+32.59%</td>
<td>+0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1990 Census  
**2000 Census  
***2010 Census
Table 2: Population Deviations Under Act 43 for the Wisconsin Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Senate 1992</th>
<th>2002 Court</th>
<th>2002 Court***</th>
<th>2011 Act 43***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 to 10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 to 4.99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No deviation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to -.499</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.5 to -4.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.0 to -10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-10.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-0.29%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>-11.36%</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>+0.23%</td>
<td>+0.51%</td>
<td>+14.82%</td>
<td>+0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1990 Census

**2000 Census

***2010 Census
Table 3: Majority-Minority Districts Under Act 43, Assembly and Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1992 Court</th>
<th>2002 Court</th>
<th>2011 Act 43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American VAP</td>
<td>Hispanic VAP</td>
<td>African American VAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[32.8%]</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[22.9%]</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[18.3%]</td>
<td>[32.8%]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[45.0%]</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bracketed] data are notable concentrations of minority voters illuminated by the court.

Sources:
Prosser et al. v. Elections Board et al., 793 F Supp. 859 (W.D. Wis. 1992);
Baumgart et al v. Wendelberg et al and Jensen et al, 02-C-0366 (E.D. Wis. 2002).
Table 4: Senate Delayed voting Effects from Redistricting Under Act 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1992 Court</th>
<th>2002 Court</th>
<th>2011 Act 43</th>
<th>2011 Act 43, Net**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Displaced Persons</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>171,613</td>
<td>299,704</td>
<td>134,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of State</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per district*</td>
<td>15,117</td>
<td>10,726</td>
<td>17,630</td>
<td>16,857***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Baumgart et al v. Wendelberg et al and Jensen et al, 02-C-0366 (E.D. Wis. 2002).

**Net delayed voting accounting for persons in areas that voted in the July and August 2011 recalls.
***Average for the eight districts that did not participate in the 2011 recall elections.
Table 5: County and Municipal Splits Under Act 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1992 (U.S. Court)</th>
<th>2002 (U.S. Court)</th>
<th>2011 (Act 43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Municipal Splits</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Municipal Splits</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly County Splits</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate County Splits</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau; Baumgart et al v. Wendelberg et al and Jensen et al, 02-C-0366 (E.D. Wis. 2002).
Figure 1: Compactness, illustrated
Table 6: Compactness Scores Under Act 43, Wisconsin Assembly and Wisconsin Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002 Map</td>
<td>2011 Map</td>
<td>2002 Map</td>
<td>2011 Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter-to-area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Largest Core Retention Under Act 43, Assembly and Senate Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>78.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>99.91</td>
<td>99.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Incumbent Core Retention Under Act 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>61.65%</td>
<td>78.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Incumbent</td>
<td>54.60%</td>
<td>78.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
<td>99.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Incumbent</td>
<td>65.86%</td>
<td>77.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>57.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>97.67%</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act 43 District</td>
<td>Incumbent / 2002 District</td>
<td>% Deviation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 92</td>
<td>Danou-D, 91</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radcliffe-D, 92</td>
<td>+2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 7</td>
<td>Kiusick-D, 7</td>
<td>-2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zepnick-D, 9</td>
<td>+5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 76</td>
<td>Pocon-D, 78</td>
<td>-4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor-D, 48</td>
<td>+6.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 31</td>
<td>Loudenbeck-R, 45</td>
<td>+3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August-R, 32</td>
<td>+4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 88</td>
<td>Klenke-R, 88</td>
<td>+1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacque-R, 2</td>
<td>+6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 89</td>
<td>Nygren-R, 89</td>
<td>+6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Roy-R, 90</td>
<td>+2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 33</td>
<td>Jorgensen-D, 37</td>
<td>+2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nass-R, 31</td>
<td>+7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 14</td>
<td>Cullen-D, 13</td>
<td>-6.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kooyenga-R, 14</td>
<td>-8.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 22</td>
<td>Kessler-D, 12</td>
<td>-3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pridemore-R, 99</td>
<td>+10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 23</td>
<td>Pasch-D, 22</td>
<td>-7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ott-R, 23</td>
<td>-3.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly 61</td>
<td>Steinbrink-D, 65</td>
<td>+7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerkman-R, 66</td>
<td>+7.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate 21</td>
<td>Wirch-D, 22</td>
<td>+4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanggaard-R, 21</td>
<td>-3.25%</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population deviation of the incumbent's previous district under the 2002 Federal Court-drawn map.
**Percentage of the new district that comes from the incumbent's previous district.
Table 10: Core Retention, Congressional Districts, Act 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
<th>Retained Core</th>
<th>Core Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>710,874</td>
<td>686,159</td>
<td>96.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>710,874</td>
<td>633,024</td>
<td>89.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>539,603</td>
<td>75.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>647,764</td>
<td>91.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>533,051</td>
<td>74.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>565,950</td>
<td>79.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>538,884</td>
<td>75.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>651,119</td>
<td>91.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>599,444</td>
<td>84.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. Avg.</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>606,797</td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Avg.</td>
<td>710,873</td>
<td>595,033</td>
<td>85.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2002 Map Smallest Circle</td>
<td>Act 44 Smallest Circle</td>
<td>2002 Map Perimeter to Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dem. Avg. | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 0.24 |
Rep. Avg. | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.22 | 0.20 |
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