

# Exhibit J

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
NORTHERN DIVISION**

MISSISSIPPI STATE CONFERENCE OF THE  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE; DR.  
ANDREA WESLEY; DR. JOSEPH WESLEY;  
ROBERT EVANS; GARY FREDERICKS;  
PAMELA HAMNER; BARBARA FINN; OTHO  
BARNES; SHIRLINDA ROBERTSON; SANDRA  
SMITH; DEBORAH HULITT; RODESTA  
TUMBLIN; DR. KIA JONES; MARCELEAN  
ARRINGTON; VICTORIA ROBERTSON,

*Plaintiffs,*

vs.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTION  
COMMISSIONERS; TATE REEVES, *in his official  
capacity as Governor of Mississippi*; LYNN FITCH,  
*in her official capacity as Attorney General of  
Mississippi*; MICHAEL WATSON, *in his official  
capacity as Secretary of State of Mississippi*,

*Defendants,*

AND

MISSISSIPPI REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE,

*Intervenor-Defendant.*

**CIVIL ACTION NO.  
3:22-cv-734-DPJ-HSO-LHS**

**EXPERT REPORT OF DR. LISA HANDLEY ON  
THE 2025 MISSISSIPPI SENATE AND HOUSE REMEDIAL PLANS**

## **Introduction**

**Scope of Project:** The Mississippi Legislature recently adopted remedial state house and state senate district plans in response to the Court’s finding of minority vote dilution in violation of the Voting Rights Act in certain areas of the state with respect to the prior 2022-adopted senate and house plans. I have been asked to review the state senate remedial plan (the “Remedial Senate Plan”) in the northwest area of the state around DeSoto County – the area of the state that corresponds to what I referred to as “area of interest #1” in my amended expert report dated December 22, 2023 (the “December 2023 Expert Report,” admitted into evidence at trial as Exhibit PTX-004), which I incorporate here by reference along with my trial testimony.

I have also been asked to review the remedial state house plan (the “Remedial House Plan”) in the Golden Triangle area of the state around Chickasaw and Monroe Counties – the area of the state that corresponds to “area of interest #6” in my December 2023 Expert Report. I compared both of these remedial legislative plans to alternative plans drawn in these two areas by Plaintiffs’ demographic expert Bill Cooper.

In addition to reviewing the remedial state legislative plans, I have updated my analysis of voting patterns by race provided in my December 2023 Expert Report to include the November 2023 and November 2024 elections in the two geographic areas of interest. I also conducted an analysis of participation rates by race (turnout as a percentage of voting age population) in recent elections in these two areas.

**Summary Conclusions:** Because voting in the DeSoto County and Golden Triangle areas of the state has been and remains starkly racially polarized, districts must be drawn to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to state legislative office despite high levels of racial polarization. Black voters will not be able to participate in the electoral process and elect candidates of their choice to office in the absence of these districts. A district-specific, functional analysis of the remedial plans recently adopted by the Mississippi Legislature shows that those plans continue to dilute Black voting strength in the two areas of focus.

The analysis of the Remedial Senate Plan demonstrates that one of the reconfigured majority Black districts adopted in the DeSoto County area (Senate District

1) will not provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state senate. Accordingly, the Remedial Senate Plan does not add any additional opportunity districts in the DeSoto County area as compared to the 2022 senate plan.

The Remedial State House Plan creates a new majority Black district (House District 22) in the Golden Triangle area that is likely to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. However, it does so at the expense of an existing majority Black district. Based on my analysis, I do not believe that Remedial House District 16 provides Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect candidates of their choice to the state house.

Plaintiffs' alternative senate and house plans, by contrast, do offer additional opportunity districts for Black voters in each of the areas of focus.

### **State Senate Remedial Plan in DeSoto County Area**

The Court held that the state senate plan adopted by the Legislature in 2022 violated the Voting Rights Act by diluting Black votes in the DeSoto County area of the state. In response, the Legislature has drawn a remedial plan that includes two majority Black state senate districts rather than the one offered in the original map in this area. However, a functional “performance” analysis – one that is based on actual election results rather than simply the demographic composition of the district – indicates that one of these majority Black districts (Senate District 1) will not provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state senate.<sup>1</sup>

Voting in the DeSoto County area of the state is racially polarized.<sup>2</sup> This was the case with respect to voting in the elections prior to 2023 and this continues to be the case for the elections in 2023 and 2024. There were eight statewide election contests in 2023, five of which included Black candidates. In 2024, there were two statewide federal contests on the ballot: U.S.

---

<sup>1</sup> As I explained in my December 2023 Expert Report (on page 14), a “functional” analysis “relie[s] not only upon the demographic composition of the districts but on the voting patterns in the area and whether the candidates preferred by Black voters are likely to usually win in the districts.”

<sup>2</sup> In my December 2023 Expert Report, I included the following counties in my analysis of voting patterns in this area: Coahoma, DeSoto, Lafayette, Marshall, Panola, Quitman, Tate, Tunica, and Union. I have included the same counties in this updated analysis.

president and U.S. Senate. Both included Black candidates. The statistical methods I used to produce estimates of voting patterns by race are standard for this type of analysis and are described in my December 2023 Expert Report. The estimates of Black and White support for candidates competing in the 2023 and 2024 elections in this area are found in Appendix A (Area of Interest #1).

All ten of the 2023 and 2024 election contests analyzed were racially polarized, with Black and White voters consistently supporting different candidates in this area of the state. Black voters were very cohesive in support of their preferred candidates, with an average of 93 percent of Black voters supporting the same candidate. White crossover voting for these ten candidates was remarkably low – an average of less than nine percent (8.6%) of White voters supported Black-preferred candidates. White crossover voting was highest (17.3%) for one of the White candidates supported by Black voters: Brandon Presley in his bid for governor in 2023. These results are entirely consistent with my analysis of racially polarized voting patterns in pre-2023 elections as set forth in my December 2023 Expert Report.

I used two statistical measures to carry out a functional analysis of the state senate (and state house) districts. The first measure, which I refer to as an effectiveness score, is the same measure I employed in my December 2023 Expert Report (described at pages 14 to 15), although I have updated it here to include the seven 2023 and 2024 election contests that included Black candidates supported by Black voters, bringing the total number of contests in the dataset to 19. The *effectiveness score* is simply the average vote share, expressed as a proportion, received by the 19 Black-preferred Black candidates in each of the proposed districts.<sup>3</sup> This score allows me to

<sup>3</sup> Because no state legislative elections have been held in these districts, an alternative method must be used to assess the opportunity of Black voters to elect their candidates of choice. As described and used in my December 2023 Expert Report, previous election results, recompiled to conform to the boundaries of proposed districts to determine who would win these election contests, is one approach commonly adopted. Only statewide contests can be used for this analysis as it requires that the same candidates be compared across all of the districts of interest. The best elections to use for this purpose are statewide contests that included Black candidates supported by Black voters, but not by White voters. To conduct this analysis, precinct election returns for all of the candidates competing in the 19 elections chosen were disaggregated down to the level of the census block. The block-level election data was then reaggregated up, or recompiled, to conform to the boundaries of the remedial districts and to those of the districts in Mr. Cooper's alternative plans.

determine how Black-preferred Black candidates are likely to fare in proposed districts. A score of less than .5 means that the average vote share received by the Black-preferred Black candidates is less than 50% and the district is not likely to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

The effectiveness scores reported here are calculated on the basis of recompiled election results for the following 19 contests: the November 2024 contests for U.S. president and U.S. senate; the November 2023 contests for secretary of state, state treasurer, state auditor, commissioner of insurance, and commissioner of agriculture; the November 2020 election for U.S. senate; the November 2019 contests for secretary of state, attorney general, state treasurer, and commissioner of insurance; the 2018 special elections (general and general runoff) for U.S. senate; the November 2015 elections for governor, secretary of state, and commissioner of agriculture;<sup>4</sup> the November 2012 election for U.S. president; and the 2011 election for governor.

The second measure I relied on in my functional analysis I refer to as a “percent won” score. The **percent won score** is simply the number of contests the Black-preferred Black candidates won divided by the total number of election contests (19) included in the recompiled election returns. This is another way to assess the opportunity of Black voters to elect their candidates of choice. It is useful here because some of the contests incorporated in the recompiled results included more than two candidates and only a plurality of the vote was necessary to win these election contests.<sup>5</sup> While the line is not precise, in my opinion a percent won score of less than 60% can indicate that the district is not likely to provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

Table 1, below, provides the effectiveness and percent won scores for the districts in the Remedial State Senate Plan in the DeSoto County area. The percent Black voting age population in the district is also included in the table.

---

<sup>4</sup> I inadvertently neglected to analyze the 2015 commissioner of agriculture contest in which Black candidate Addie Lee Green competed in my December 2023 expert report. I have since analyzed this contest and the results are included in the appendices. Because the contest was racially polarized and Black voters supported the Black candidate, I have included this contest in the recompiled election results and therefore the effectiveness and percent won scores.

<sup>5</sup> The percent won score metric was accepted as one measurement of effectiveness by the district court in both *Robinson v. Ardoin* and *Nairne v. Ardoin*, Louisiana redistricting cases where I also served as an expert witness.

**Table 1: Functional Analysis of Remedial State Senate Plan in the DeSoto County Area**

Remedial State Senate Plan			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
1	52.5	.491	42.1
2	25.0	.334	0.0
10	29.3	.376	5.3
11	50.9	.502	63.2
19	24.0	.291	0.0

As this table makes clear, Senate District 1 in the Remedial Senate Plan is not likely to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The Effectiveness Score is only .491 and the Black-preferred Black candidate won only eight of the 19 contests – that is, 42.1 percent. There are at least two reasons for the non-performance of this majority Black district. One is because the candidates of choice of Black voters, especially if these candidates are Black, receive only an extremely small percentage of White votes. The second reason is the turnout disparity between Black and White voters. Based on turnout estimates that I calculated using state election results and the ecological inference method described in my December 2023 Expert Report, there is a decided turnout gap between the Black and White age-eligible population in the DeSoto County area. The turnout estimates I calculated are found in Appendix C. This turnout gap may be due to the history of discrimination and the lower socioeconomic status of the Black age-eligible population.<sup>6</sup> At least in the area comprising Senate District 1 in the Remedial Senate Plan, a simple majority of Black voting age population is evidently insufficient to provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

Based on this functional analysis, it is my opinion that the Remedial Senate Plan does not create an additional district in the DeSoto County area where Black voters have an opportunity to elect a candidate of choice as compared to the 2022 plan. The results of the analysis make this

---

<sup>6</sup> I understand that these considerations, among other of the so-called Senate Factors, were discussed in the expert reports and testimony of Dr. Robert Luckett, Dr. D’Andra Orey, and Dr. Marvin King, respectively.

very clear, with Senate District 1 falling below the applicable threshold on both metrics. Indeed, not only is Senate District 1 not a functional opportunity district for Black voters, but the effectiveness score of Senate District 11 has been reduced, from .582 in the 2022 senate plan (when it was the only majority Black district in the area) to .502 in the Remedial Senate Plan (with a percent won score of 63.2%).

Conducting the same analysis on the Plaintiffs' alternative senate plans demonstrates that it is possible to create two state senate districts that provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice in this area. Plaintiffs have drawn two state senate plans: Plaintiffs' Senate Plan A and Plaintiffs' Senate Plan B. Tables 2 and 3 report the effectiveness and percent won scores for Plaintiffs' Senate Plans A and B in the DeSoto County area.

**Table 2: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan A**

Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan A			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
1	57.2	.536	89.5
2	15.9	.244	0.0
10	29.4	.379	5.3
11	50.1	.509	78.9
19	29.2	.337	0.0

**Table 3: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan B**

Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan B			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
1	57.1	.522	73.7
2	15.7	.250	0.0
10	28.6	.367	0.0
11	50.1	.509	78.9
19	31.3	.370	0.0



Unlike the Remedial Senate Plan, Plaintiffs' plans offer two districts that will provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state senate in the DeSoto County area. The effectiveness scores for the two majority Black districts in Plaintiffs' Senate Plan A are .536 (District 1) and .509 (District 11); the percent won scores for these two districts are 89.5 (District 1) and 78.9 (District 11). The effectiveness scores for the two majority Black districts in Plaintiffs' Plan B are .522 (District 1) and .509 (District 11) and the percent won scores are 73.7 (District 1) and 78.9 (District 11).

### **State House Remedial Plan in the Golden Triangle Area**

The Court held that the state house plan adopted by the Legislature in 2022 violated the Voting Rights Act by diluting Black voting strength in the Golden Triangle area of the state. The Remedial House Plan does not remedy this dilution, as my functional analysis of these districts demonstrates.

Voting in this area of the state remains starkly racially polarized.<sup>7</sup> The estimates of Black and White support for candidates competing in the 2023 and 2024 elections are found in Appendix B (Area of Interest #6). All ten of the 2023 and 2024 election contests analyzed were racially polarized, with Black voters very cohesive (over 95%) in support of their preferred candidates and White crossover voting for these candidates strikingly low (5.4%). As in the DeSoto County area, White crossover voting was highest (15.6%) for Brandon Presley in his race for governor.

The results of the functional analysis of the Remedial House Plan in the Golden Triangle area are reported in Table 4, below.

---

<sup>7</sup> In my December 2023 Expert Report, I included the following counties in my analysis of voting patterns in this area: Chickasaw, Clay, Lee, Lowndes, Monroe, Oktibbeha and Pontotoc. I have included the same counties in this updated analysis.

**Table 4: Functional Analysis of Remedial State House Plan in the Golden Triangle Area**

Remedial State House Plan			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	53.2	.503	57.9
22	51.2	.530	84.2
36	54.6	.580	100.0
39	18.5	.244	0.0

In my December 2023 Expert Report, I identified Districts 16 and 36 as majority Black districts that were effective opportunity districts for Black voters in this area under the 2022 plan. In the Remedial House Plan, as shown in Table 4, Districts 22 and 36 will provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state house. However, I believe the new majority Black district (District 22) was drawn in a manner that has an unnecessary negative impact of the performance of majority Black District 16. It is my expert opinion that District 16, with an effectiveness score of only .503 (just a hair over .5) and the percent won score of only 57.9 (below 60%), does not provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their preferred candidates.

Conducting the same analysis on the Plaintiffs' alternative house plans demonstrates that it is possible to create an additional majority Black state house district in the Golden Triangle area without unduly harming the performance of the other majority Black districts in this area, as demonstrated by the Plaintiffs' State House Plans A and B. Tables 5 and 6 provide the results of a functional analysis of these two plans in the Golden Triangle area.

**Table 5: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' State House Plan A**

Plaintiffs' State House Plan A			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	56.0	.531	89.5
22	54.3	.554	94.7
36	54.6	.580	100.0
39	18.5	.244	0.0

**Table 6: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' State House Plan B**

Plaintiffs' State House Plan B			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	57.4	.541	89.5
22	52.9	.557	94.7
36	55.4	.576	100.0
39	19.6	.236	0.0

While District 36 is effective in all three of the plans,<sup>8</sup> Districts 16 and 22 in Plaintiff's State House Plans A and B are both likely to perform better for Black voters than these two districts as drawn in the Remedial State House Plan. The effectiveness and percent won scores for District 16 in Plan A are .531 and 89.5; they are .541 and 89.5 in Plan B. The effectiveness and percent won scores for the new majority Black district, District 22 in Plan A are .554 and 94.7; they are .557 and 94.7 in Plan B.

---

<sup>8</sup> The boundaries of another existing majority Black district in the Golden Triangle area, House District 41, change in the various plans considered here but the district provides a realistic opportunity to elect in all three plans: the Remedial Plan, and Plaintiffs' Plans A and B.

## Conclusion

My analysis of voting patterns by race in the 2023 and 2024 statewide elections did not change my opinion that voting is starkly racially polarized in the DeSoto County and the Golden Triangle areas of the state. The Black community is cohesive in supporting their preferred candidates and White voters consistently bloc vote to defeat these candidates. Racially polarized voting substantially impedes the ability of Black voters to elect candidates of their choice in these two areas of the state unless districts are drawn that provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state legislature.

On the basis of a district-specific, functional analysis, I conclude that the Remedial Senate and House Plans continue to dilute the voting strength of Black voters in Mississippi by failing to create additional districts that provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect candidates of their choice to the state legislature in the two areas of focus discussed here.

I reserve the right to amend or supplement my report considering additional facts, testimony and/or materials that may come to light. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct according to the best of my knowledge, information, and beliefs.



---

Dr. Lisa Handley

March 14, 2025

Estimates of Voting Patterns by Race in Recent Statewide Elections														
APPENDIX A DeSoto County Area Area of Interest 1			Black Voters						White Voters					
			Race	Party	EI rxc	95% confidence	EI 2x2	ER	HP	EI rxc	95% confidence	EI 2x2	ER	HP
						interval					interval			
2024 General														
<i>President</i>														
Kamala Harris	B	D	94.5	92.5, 96.0	92.0	96.3	91.6	10.2	7.9, 12.5	8.2	1.5	7.8		
Donald Trump	W	R	3.9	2.5, 5.8	7.1	1.9	7.7	89.2	86.8, 91.4	89.6	97.5	91.4		
Others			1.6	1.1, 5.3	1.1	1.8	0.8	0.6	.4, .9	1.1	1.1	0.7		
<i>US Senate</i>														
Ty Pinkins	B	D	94.7	92.1, 96.6	91.5	95.0	90.2	7.7	5.5, 10.5	7.9	1.7	7.7		
Roger Wicker	W	R	5.3	3.4, 7.9	8.5	4.9	9.8	92.3	89.5, 94.5	92.2	98.3	92.3		
2023 General														
<i>Governor</i>														
Brandon Presley	W	D	94.0	91.9, 95.6	96.0	100.2	93.3	17.3	14.2, 20.2	14.3	9.8	17.5		
Tate Reeves	W	R	4.1	2.6, 6.1	2.9	-2.4	4.6	81.7	78.9, 84.8	83.9	89.0	81.2		
Gwendolyn Grey	B	I	1.9	1.4, 2.4	2.2	2.3	2.1	0.9	.7, 1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4		
<i>Lieutenant Governor</i>														
Ryan Grover	W	D	92.5	89.4, 95.0	92.0	97.4	87.3	6.4	3.7, 10.1	8.6	3.6	9.7		
Delbert Hosemann	W	R	7.5	5.0, 10.6	8.0	2.7	12.7	93.6	89.9, 96.3	91.3	96.4	90.3		
<i>Secretary of State</i>														
Ty Pinkins	B	D	91.0	87.3, 94.0	90.6	94.6	84.9	7.1	4.6, 10.1	8.9	3.6	8.2		
Michael Watson	W	R	9.0	6.0, 12.7	9.5	5.4	15.1	92.9	89.9, 95.4	91.1	96.4	91.8		
<i>Attorney General</i>														
Greta Kemp Martin	W	D	90.3	86.4, 93.5	90.8	93.6	84.6	7.9	5.1, 11.1	9.3	4.5	9.3		
Lynn Fitch	W	R	9.7	6.5, 13.6	9.3	6.4	15.4	92.1	88.9, 94.9	90.7	95.6	90.7		
<i>State Treasurer</i>														
Addie Lee Green	B	D	94.2	91.2, 96.4	92.8	99.2	90.5	7.1	4.5, 10.2	9.5	3.0	9.0		

Estimates of Voting Patterns by Race in Recent Statewide Elections												
APPENDIX A DeSoto County Area Area of Interest 1			Black Voters					White Voters				
			95% confidence					95% confidence				
			Race	Party	El rxc	interval	El 2x2	ER	HP	El rxc	interval	El 2x2
David McRae	W	R	5.8	3.6, 8.8	7.3	0.7	9.5	92.9	89.8, 95.5	90.6	96.9	91.0
<i>State Auditor</i>												
Larry Bradford	B	D	92.4	89.0, 95.1	91.9	96.1	86.6	8.2	5.2, 11.8	9.7	4.8	9.5
Shad White	W	R	7.6	4.9, 11.0	8.4	3.9	13.4	91.8	88.2, 94.8	90.2	95.2	90.5
<i>Commissioner of Insurance</i>												
Bruce Burton	B	D	92.3	89.0, 95.0	91.4	97.2	87.1	6.5	4.2, 9.4	8.7	2.7	7.9
Mike Chaney	W	R	7.7	5.0, 11.0	8.8	2.8	12.9	93.5	90.6, 95.8	91.3	97.4	92.1
<i>Commissioner of Agriculture</i>												
Robert Bradford	B	D	94.3	91.7, 96.3	93.6	100.3	91.2	7.6	4.9, 10.8	10.2	3.6	9.2
Andy Gipson	W	R	5.7	3.7, 8.3	6.4	-0.3	8.8	92.4	89.2, 95.1	89.8	96.4	90.8
2015 General												
<i>Commissioner of Agriculture</i>												
Addie Lee Green	B	D	87.5	82.9, 91.3	88.6	92.5	86.3	12.1	8.6, 15.8	12.7	10.4	18.0
Cindy Hyde Smith	W	R	10.0	6.3, 14.5	8.7	4.7	10.1	86.1	82.9, 89.5	84.7	86.6	78.5
Cathy Toole			2.5	1.7, 3.5	2.7	2.8	3.6	1.8	1.3, 2.4	3.2	3.0	3.5

APPENDIX B  
Golden Triangle  
Area of Interest 6

Estimates of Voting Patterns by Race in Recent Statewide Elections

APPENDIX B Golden Triangle Area of Interest 6			Black Voters					White Voters												
			EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP	EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP								
Race	Party																			
2024 General																				
<i>President</i>																				
Kamala Harris	B	D	96.3	94.7, 97.5	93.8	102.8	94.3	4.7	3.1, 6.6	7.5	-0.7	7.4								
Donald Trump	W	R	2.8	1.7, 4.3	5.4	-4.1	4.5	94.9	93.0, 96.5	91.6	100.0	92.0								
Others			0.9	.6, 1.3	1.5	1.4	1.2	0.4	.3, .6	0.8	0.7	0.6								
<i>US Senate</i>																				
Ty Pinkins	B	D	95.5	93.4, 97.2	94.0	100.2	92.8	3.4	2.1, 5.1	6.1	0.0	8.4								
Roger Wicker	W	R	4.5	2.8, 6.6	6.0	-0.2	7.2	96.6	94.9, 97.9	93.9	100.0	91.6								
2023 General																				
<i>Governor</i>																				
Brandon Presley	W	D	95.5	93.6, 97.0	95.8	105.9	73.1	15.6	12.2, 18.7	19.6	13.7	20.8								
Tate Reeves	W	R	3.7	2.3, 5.6	4.3	-6.7	26.4	83.8	80.6, 87.1	79.0	85.0	78.0								
Gwendolyn Grey	B	I	0.8	.5, 1.1	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.7	.4, .9	0.6	1.2	1.2								
<i>Lieutenant Governor</i>																				
Ryan Grover	W	D	93.3	89.8, 95.9	93.6	97.7	66.3	3.8	2.4, 5.6	7.3	2.3	9.3								
Delbert Hosemann	W	R	6.7	4.1, 10.2	6.4	2.3	33.7	96.2	94.4, 97.6	92.7	97.7	90.7								
<i>Secretary of State</i>																				
Ty Pinkins	B	D	94.4	91.7, 96.5	94.1	102.2	68.3	4.1	2.7, 5.9	9.3	1.8	8.6								
Michael Watson	W	R	5.6	3.5, 8.3	5.9	-2.1	31.7	95.9	94.1, 97.3	90.7	98.3	91.4								
<i>Attorney General</i>																				
Greta Kemp Martin	W	D	94.2	91.4, 96.4	94.5	101.0	66.5	4.7	3.0, 6.7	9.4	2.8	9.6								
Lynn Fitch	W	R	5.8	3.6, 8.6	5.5	-1.0	33.5	95.3	93.3, 97.0	90.6	97.1	90.4								
<i>State Treasurer</i>																				
Addie Lee Green	B	D	95.2	92.8, 97.1	94.7	104.8	69.5	3.9	2.6, 5.7	10.7	2.2	9.6								

APPENDIX B Golden Triangle Area of Interest 6		Estimates of Voting Patterns by Race in Recent Statewide Elections													
		Black Voters							White Voters						
		Race	Party	EI rxc	95% confidence		EI 2x2	ER	HP	EI rxc	95% confidence		EI 2x2	ER	HP
					interval						interval				
David McRae	W	R	4.8	2.9, 7.2	5.4	-4.7	30.5	96.1	94.3, 97.4	89.3	97.8	90.4			
<i>State Auditor</i>															
Larry Bradford	B	D	95.3	92.9, 97.1	95.3	102.9	69.0	5.4	3.5, 7.6	10.3	4.1	11.3			
Shad White	W	R	4.7	2.9, 7.1	4.7	-2.8	31.0	94.6	92.4, 96.5	89.6	95.8	88.7			
<i>Commissioner of Insurance</i>															
Bruce Burton	B	D	95.3	93.0, 97.0	92.5	102.2	67.6	3.8	2.4, 5.6	9.4	0.9	8.2			
Mike Chaney	W	R	4.7	3.0, 7.0	7.4	-2.2	32.4	96.2	94.4, 97.6	90.7	99.1	91.8			
<i>Commissioner of Agriculture</i>															
Robert Bradford	B	D	95.5	93.3, 97.2	95.1	105.5	70.9	4.2	2.6, 6.1	11.4	3.2	10.1			
Andy Gipson	W	R	4.5	2.8, 6.7	4.9	-5.6	29.1	95.8	93.9, 97.4	88.6	96.8	89.9			
2015 General															
<i>Commissioner of Agriculture</i>															
Addie Lee Green	B	D	92.3	88.8, 95.1	94.4	97.4	92.8	8.0	6.1, 10.2	7.8	7.1	15.4			
Cindy Hyde Smith	W	R	6.5	3.7, 10.0	4.6	1.3	5.7	91.0	88.9, 93.0	90.8	90.7	82.4			
Cathy Toole			1.2	..8, 1.7	0.9	1.2	1.5	0.9	.6, 1.2	2.3	2.3	2.2			



Estimates of Turnout by Race in Recent Statewide Elections										
APPENDIX C Turnout as a Percentage of Voting Age Population	Black Voters					White Voters				
	EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP	EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP
Area of Interest #1 DeSoto County Area										
2024	39.2	(34.3, 44.2)	38.6	38.8	43.2	71.5	(68.2, 74.5)	71.7	71.1	64.0
2023	33.9	(30.0, 37.8)	33.4	34.7	36.1	39.7	(37.4, 42.0)	39.3	39.9	39.7
2019	35.5	(31.4, 39.8)	34.0	36.1	29.4	40.7	(38.2, 42.9)	40.9	41.7	43.7
Area of Interest #6 Golden Triangle Area	EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP	EI rxc	95% confidence interval	EI 2x2	ER	HP
2024	47.9	(43.5, 52.4)	47.7	48.7	43.1	65.9	(63.4, 68.3)	63.9	64.4	64.5
2023	42.9	(38.8, 47.2)	43.5	43.9	28.2	40.9	(38.3, 43.4)	39.6	40.3	40.3
2019	43.8	(39.8, 47.9)	44.0	45.6	36.7	44.7	(42.1, 47.0)	42.9	43.6	46.4