

# EXHIBIT

# 2

## Supplement to Expert Report by Ryan D. Enos, PhD

1. In this supplement to my expert report, I conduct racially polarized voting and opportunity analysis for enacted Congressional Districts (CDs) 2, 8, 22, and 36, enacted Texas House of Representative Districts (HDs) 53 and 88, and illustrative CDs 9, 16, 18, 20, and 29; calculate opportunity analysis for enacted HD 43; calculate the Latino and Black citizen voting age populations (CVAP) for former and enacted CDs and HDs; identify the voting tabulation districts (VTDs) split by the creation of enacted CDs 23 and 24 and calculate the share of the Anglo, Latino, and Black voting-age population (VAP) in those VTDs retained and excluded from the district; and identify VTDs in former CD 24 with a majority Latino VAP that were retained in the enacted CD 24 and examine the electoral participation by Latinos in these VTDs.
2. I used the same data sources, analyzed the same elections, and, where applicable, used the same methodologies as in my main report.

## Racially Polarized Voting Analysis

### Enacted CDs

3. Analysis of racially polarized voting in enacted CDs 2, 8, 22, and 36 using CVAP is in Figure 1 and using November 2020 Spanish Surname Voter Registration (SSVR) is in Figure 2. These figures present analysis for each CD separately and for the four CDs pooled together. These results are also in Tables 8 to 15. Note that some of my opinions about racial bloc voting in these districts are sensitive to whether the data source is CVAP or SSVR. In contrast, in the main report I prepared, I also examined both CVAP and SSVR, but I found the results to be substantively similar in all districts that I analyzed.
4. Anglos are cohesive in CDs 2, 8, 22, and 36, regardless of the data source. Using CVAP, Latinos are not cohesive in CDs 2 and 22. CD 8 is a marginal case for cohesion, with cohesion increasing in recent elections. Latinos in CD 36 are cohesive in all elections except those in 2014. Anglos and Latinos are polarized in all CDs.
5. Using SSVR, Latinos are cohesive in CDs 2, 8, and 36, but not CD 22. Anglos and Latinos are polarized in CDs 2, 36, and 8, but not in CD 22.




Figure 1: Enacted CDs 2, 8, 22, and 36 voting by race, CVAP




Figure 2: Enacted CDs 2, 8, 22, and 36 voting by race, SSVR

### Enacted HDs

6. Analysis of racially polarized voting in enacted HDs 53 and 88 using CVAP is in Figure 3 and in Figure 4 using SSVR. These results are also in Tables 16 to 21. Note that, similar to the CDs above, some of my opinions about racial bloc voting in HDs 53 and 88 are sensitive to whether the data source is CVAP or SSVR.

7. Using CVAP, Anglos are cohesive in both HDs 53 and 88. Latinos are not cohesive in either HD 53 or 88. Latinos and Anglos are polarized in HD 88 but not HD 53.

8. Using SSVR, Anglos are cohesive in both HDs. In my opinion, Latinos are also cohesive in both HDs because they reach the 60% threshold in nearly all elections. Anglos and Latinos are polarized across groups in both HDs.




Figure 3: Enacted HDs 53 and 88 voting by race, CVAP




Figure 4: Enacted HDs 53 and 88 voting by race, SSVR

### Illustrative CDs

**9.** Analysis of racially polarized voting using CVAP for illustrative CDs 9 and 18 is in Figure 5 and for illustrative CDs 16, 20, and 29 in Figure 6–8. These results are also in Tables 22–26. The analysis of CDs 16, 20, and 29 examines Latino voters and the analysis of CDs 9 and 18 examines Black voters, so these figures display different elections.

**10.** In CDs 9 and 18, Black voters are cohesive in all relevant elections. Anglos in CD 9 are cohesive in all elections except the 2020 Supreme Court election. While Anglos in CD 18 consistently vote as a majority against the minority candidate, they are not cohesive because they usually do not meet the 60% threshold of support for a candidate. Blacks and Anglos are polarized from each other in both CDs 9 and 18.

**11.** In CDs 16, 20, and 29, Latinos and Anglos are each cohesive within their own group and polarized from each other in all relevant elections.




Figure 5: Illustrative CDs 9 and 18 voting by race, CVAP




Figure 6: Illustrative CD 16 voting by race, CVAP




Figure 7: Illustrative CD 20 voting by race, CVAP




Figure 8: Illustrative CD 29 voting by race, CVAP



## Opportunities for Minority Preferred Candidates

### Enacted CDs

**12.** Opportunity analysis for enacted CDs 2, 8, 22, and 36 is in Table 1. These enacted CDs are not opportunity districts for Latino voters. Note that there were no Latino candidates contesting endogenous elections in any of the districts, except for a single election in CD 8. Latino preferred candidates lost badly in all exogenous elections in the former districts and would continue to do so in the enacted districts. In Figures 9–12, I compare the exogenous election results in the former and enacted districts.

District	Former Districts		Former Districts		All Elections		Enacted Districts	
	Endogenous Elections	Exogenous Elections	Exogenous Elections	Exogenous Elections	Margin	Win %	Exogenous Elections	Exogenous Elections
	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %
2		0	-15.90	0	-15.90	0	-35.93	0
8	-47.04	0	-51.62	0	-51.05	0	-36.16	0
22		0	-15.59	0	-15.59	0	-30.32	0
36		0	-48.21	0	-48.21	0	-35.81	0

Table 1: Congressional Districts Opportunity District Analysis

**Enacted HDs**

**13.** Opportunity analysis for enacted HDs 43, 53, and 88 is in Table 2. These enacted HDs are not opportunity districts for Latino voters. Latino preferred candidates lost badly in all exogenous elections in the former districts and would continue to do so in the enacted districts. In Figures 13–15, I compare the exogenous election results in the former and enacted districts.

District	<b>Former Districts</b>						<b>Enacted Districts</b>	
	<u>Endogenous Elections</u>		<u>Exogenous Elections</u>		<u>All Elections</u>		<u>Exogenous Elections</u>	
	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %
43	-22.43	0	-13.15	0	-15.93	0	-16.85	0
53	-56.40	0	-56.05	0	-56.10	0	-55.18	0
88		0	-68.14	0	-68.14	0	-67.91	0

Table 2: House Districts Opportunity District Analysis

**Illustrative CDs**

**14.** Opportunity analysis for illustrative CDs 9, 16, 18, 20, and 29 is in Table 3. Both the enacted and illustrative CDs 16, 18, and 20 are opportunity districts for Latino voters. Both the enacted and illustrative CDs 9 and 18 are opportunity districts for Black voters. In Figures 16–20, I compare the exogenous election results in the enacted and illustrative districts.

District	<b>Enacted Districts</b>		<b>Illustrative Districts</b>	
	Exogenous Elections		Exogenous Elections	
	Margin	Win %	Margin	Win %
9	50.31	100	36.12	100
16	31.80	100	30.57	100
18	45.17	100	41.40	100
20	28.44	100	9.37	100
29	40.36	100	26.78	100

Table 3: Illustrative Congressional Districts Opportunity District Analysis

## Latino and Black CVAP in Former and Enacted CDs

Tables 4 and 5 are of the Latino and Black CVAP in the former and enacted CDs and HDs. These were calculated using Census Block-level CVAP.

Table 4: Former and Enacted Congressional Districts Percent Latino and Black CVAP

District	Latino Enacted	Latino Former	Black Enacted	Black Former
1	9.3	10.6	19.3	18.3
2	21.9	24.1	13.2	15.1
3	11.2	11.0	11.0	12.6
4	9.7	9.2	10.6	11.4
5	18.6	17.8	15.8	17.9
6	22.0	18.4	16.6	24.0
7	20.8	22.5	25.2	19.3
8	22.5	16.5	14.5	10.1
9	25.9	27.1	48.6	50.1
10	17.6	21.1	11.0	13.0
11	32.1	30.5	12.6	4.4
12	17.7	16.9	12.6	11.0
13	20.3	19.9	7.9	6.4
14	17.9	18.9	17.1	21.1
15	74.2	73.5	1.6	2.6
16	78.6	77.0	4.0	4.4
17	18.0	19.8	16.9	14.2
18	28.7	28.4	41.9	44.5
19	32.1	30.9	7.5	7.5
20	67.3	64.1	7.2	6.9
21	26.0	24.4	4.2	4.6
22	23.2	21.5	13.5	17.7
23	56.4	62.2	4.6	4.7
24	12.5	16.2	8.0	15.8
25	15.4	15.5	12.9	7.7
26	13.5	14.5	10.5	10.8
27	47.8	45.9	5.0	5.6
28	69.0	69.4	6.1	6.3
29	62.3	64.7	20.2	17.3
30	22.3	24.8	48.7	51.3
31	18.1	20.0	8.9	13.0
32	21.1	16.3	25.7	16.2
33	42.1	48.9	29.5	26.4
34	86.4	79.5	0.7	1.6
35	46.1	51.8	15.1	10.8
36	22.1	19.8	13.8	10.5
37	20.8		7.2	
38	18.9		11.6	

Table 5: Former and Enacted House Districts Percent Latino and Black CVAP

District	Latino Enacted	Latino Former	Black Enacted	Black Former
1	4.5	5.0	20.5	20.1
2	10.2	10.2	7.0	7.0
3	19.2	18.7	4.6	10.5
4	14.2	13.4	13.5	12.8
5	10.4	11.0	9.3	10.5
6	12.2	12.7	19.2	19.9
7	9.0	8.6	22.0	18.9
8	12.9	14.5	15.7	15.9
9	10.4	5.9	15.1	18.3
10	19.9	19.0	13.7	13.1

11	8.7	11.1	17.1	17.2
12	15.7	17.6	19.9	18.9
13	15.8	14.3	17.2	11.4
14	20.7	21.3	10.6	12.5
15	14.8	14.8	8.5	8.2
16	15.4	17.3	7.4	6.9
17	28.6	33.8	8.2	7.8
18	14.1	17.1	7.8	15.9
19	13.2	5.8	1.5	11.0
20	17.1	16.2	4.8	3.9
21	7.3	11.1	12.6	10.8
22	15.8	13.2	45.9	52.4
23	20.5	20.4	15.5	18.5
24	16.3	16.4	10.7	7.7
25	23.4	27.6	19.4	12.8
26	18.9	15.6	13.7	14.7
27	17.9	16.9	48.4	47.5
28	23.6	18.0	13.4	19.0
29	26.2	23.8	13.8	19.1
30	33.4	36.3	7.7	5.5
31	64.7	75.6	2.2	1.4
32	40.5	48.2	4.4	5.1
33	12.7	12.6	10.9	10.3
34	70.0	67.8	4.1	3.8
35	91.8	84.7	0.3	0.5
36	89.7	90.2	0.4	0.4
37	78.0	86.5	1.1	0.4
38	92.1	87.3	0.4	0.6
39	88.8	88.7	0.2	0.2
40	90.1	91.0	1.3	1.2
41	82.1	82.2	1.0	0.9
42	93.6	94.2	0.6	0.5
43	59.5	61.9	3.4	3.4
44	33.1	33.1	8.2	6.9
45	37.7	32.0	5.9	4.8
46	27.1	29.7	21.2	21.4
47	13.7	14.2	3.9	3.2
48	21.7	21.4	4.7	4.7
49	18.9	17.4	5.0	5.3
50	29.5	24.3	17.4	15.1
51	43.0	43.1	10.4	10.9
52	21.5	25.0	8.7	11.7
53	29.8	26.4	2.0	1.8
54	20.9	20.6	28.8	30.1
55	20.6	20.2	21.2	16.9
56	17.1	17.7	11.0	11.5
57	15.3	11.6	13.9	16.8
58	18.4	17.9	4.1	4.1
59	13.5	15.9	8.2	9.2
60	9.7	12.2	1.8	2.2
61	10.0	9.4	13.0	1.5
62	7.9	7.9	6.6	6.8
63	15.7	12.4	12.3	6.8
64	14.8	16.2	8.6	11.0
65	13.3	16.4	13.8	19.3
66	10.1	9.5	10.5	13.7
67	12.6	11.3	12.4	11.4
68	13.3	16.3	2.8	3.9
69	14.9	14.2	9.5	10.1
70	10.6	11.9	14.0	13.4
71	20.2	21.3	8.2	8.8
72	32.5	33.6	4.1	4.2

73	19.8	20.0	2.4	2.2
74	75.5	74.5	2.5	1.7
75	87.9	87.8	2.9	2.9
76	19.1	87.1	26.5	2.5
77	85.9	74.2	2.5	4.4
78	67.7	66.9	5.0	5.8
79	77.1	78.8	4.7	4.1
80	76.6	85.2	1.3	1.2
81	52.7	52.0	5.5	5.2
82	36.5	37.2	7.5	7.3
83	29.3	30.1	4.5	4.4
84	34.8	34.3	12.8	13.2
85	19.5	30.8	15.7	17.8
86	24.0	24.2	3.3	3.4
87	28.7	28.5	8.7	9.5
88	38.3	38.8	4.1	3.8
89	13.0	11.8	11.6	11.5
90	50.4	59.0	18.9	15.8
91	19.3	18.7	8.4	8.3
92	21.8	14.9	33.3	19.7
93	18.9	20.2	12.1	17.7
94	15.1	16.2	13.7	18.4
95	21.3	21.2	49.1	48.7
96	15.4	17.4	18.7	25.3
97	15.1	15.8	13.2	16.9
98	9.7	9.8	6.0	5.1
99	21.2	21.0	11.5	7.9
100	30.1	25.7	50.0	43.9
101	23.1	26.3	37.3	38.6
102	18.1	15.2	34.6	21.2
103	37.6	38.1	16.0	17.2
104	55.5	60.0	15.7	19.3
105	33.0	33.9	21.2	18.5
106	12.4	13.6	10.8	13.9
107	41.9	28.4	21.6	21.5
108	7.3	11.7	5.3	8.8
109	17.7	18.5	60.4	64.8
110	34.6	38.8	52.8	49.8
111	23.0	24.1	57.0	55.8
112	13.5	20.7	13.1	20.1
113	24.8	24.0	28.8	25.3
114	19.4	13.1	16.2	22.6
115	16.1	19.9	17.6	16.0
116	59.8	60.4	8.6	8.6
117	66.2	56.5	8.4	9.2
118	57.7	68.5	5.8	4.2
119	65.0	61.4	10.9	11.8
120	44.5	44.1	25.4	25.4
121	32.5	35.9	7.1	7.4
122	34.0	32.6	4.9	5.4
123	59.7	61.6	5.2	5.2
124	66.6	66.9	9.9	8.6
125	62.5	68.0	6.0	5.7
126	20.2	25.3	16.1	20.9
127	22.1	22.0	18.8	18.8
128	29.9	30.0	11.9	11.6
129	23.2	22.7	9.4	10.9
130	18.3	19.1	10.3	10.8
131	37.2	34.0	49.3	52.2
132	23.3	30.6	14.4	19.8
133	15.2	14.7	18.6	16.4
134	13.1	13.0	8.1	8.0

135	37.0	28.8	26.0	21.4
136	21.1	17.1	10.1	6.6
137	31.2	31.0	36.2	40.3
138	27.5	33.4	11.0	14.1
139	27.5	31.6	47.0	45.3
140	69.4	68.2	16.4	16.9
141	29.4	29.8	59.5	59.9
142	33.3	34.0	46.7	46.7
143	62.8	63.7	18.2	18.5
144	64.4	67.0	9.1	6.4
145	51.9	60.5	10.9	11.9
146	16.9	19.3	55.8	54.2
147	25.5	25.3	37.8	37.6
148	39.6	42.3	19.9	9.5
149	33.0	29.7	32.8	32.4
150	21.8	21.8	17.7	19.3

---

## Split VTDs in Enacted CDs 23 and 24

**15.** In Table 6, I examine VTDs that are split between enacted CD 23 and adjacent CDs, including the percent of Anglo VAP and the percent of Latino VAP in these VTDs that is retained in CD 23 and the percent of each that is placed in adjacent CDs. I calculate this by examining the Census Blocks in the split VTDs. There are 15 VTDs split across CD 23 and adjacent CDs. 64.0% of the total Anglo VAP in these VTDs is retained in CD 23, and 36.0% of the total Anglo VAP in these VTDs is within adjacent CDs. 56.4% of the total Latino VAP in these VTDs is retained in CD 23, and 43.6% of the total Latino VAP in these VTDs is within adjacent CDs.

	Anglo VAP %	Latino VAP %
In CDs Adjacent to CD 23	36.0	43.6
Retained in CD 23	64.0	56.4

Table 6: Anglo and Latino VAP in VTDs split by Enacted CD 23

**16.** The same analysis for enacted CD 24 is in Table 7. In this CD, I also analyze the percent of Black VAP that is retained in CD 24 and the percent that is placed in adjacent CDs. There are 27 VTDs that are split between CD 24 and adjacent CDs. 38.1% of the total Anglo VAP in these VTDs is retained in CD 24, and 61.9% of the total Anglo VAP in these VTDs is within adjacent CDs. 20.9% of total Latino VAP in these VTDs is retained in CD 24, and 79.1% of the total Latino VAP in these VTDs is within adjacent CDs. 15.2% of total Black VAP in these VTDs is retained in CD 24, and 84.8% of the total Black VAP in these VTDs is within adjacent CDs.

Retained	Anglo VAP %	Latino VAP %	Black VAP %
In CDs Adjacent to CD 24	61.9	79.1	84.8
Retained in CD 24	38.1	20.9	15.2

Table 7: Anglo, Latino, and Black VAP in VTDs split by Enacted CD 24



## **Latino Majority VAP VTDs in Former and Enacted CD 24**

In the former CD 24, there were 253 VTDs. Of those 253 VTDs, 27 had a majority Latino VAP. Of those 27 VTDs, 3 are maintained in enacted CD 24, which has 255 total VTDs. In these three VTDs retained in enacted CD 24, voters with a Spanish surname were 30.5% of registered voters in 2020 (SSVR) and from 2014 to 2020, 24.9% of all voter turnout was by voters with a Spanish surname (SSTO). One of these VTDs only had 42 total registered voters in 2020 and only a single case of turnout by any voter with a Spanish surname between 2014 and 2020.

## Tables of Ecological Inference Results for Racial Bloc Voting

Office	Year	Enacted		
		Latinos	Blacks	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	53 (37, 69)	75 (60, 86)	5 (4, 8)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	47 (32, 64)	78 (63, 88)	11 (8, 15)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	45 (30, 60)	79 (68, 88)	9 (6, 12)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	55 (39, 72)	90 (83, 95)	11 (8, 14)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	56 (38, 77)	90 (83, 95)	9 (7, 12)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	53 (35, 69)	91 (84, 96)	14 (11, 17)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	54 (37, 74)	91 (85, 95)	16 (13, 19)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	56 (36, 74)	91 (85, 95)	19 (16, 22)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	65 (47, 80)	92 (86, 96)	17 (14, 19)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	64 (43, 81)	92 (87, 96)	15 (12, 18)
Avg.		55	87	13

Table 8: EI CVAP: Enacted CD 2

Office	Year	Enacted		
		Latinos	Blacks	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	55 (39, 70)	68 (51, 82)	8 (6, 11)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	51 (35, 68)	67 (48, 83)	9 (7, 11)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	53 (35, 72)	75 (59, 88)	8 (6, 11)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	60 (45, 74)	84 (70, 91)	6 (4, 8)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	48 (32, 62)	84 (75, 91)	6 (5, 8)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	60 (45, 74)	85 (76, 92)	7 (5, 9)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	56 (43, 71)	86 (78, 92)	7 (5, 10)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	64 (49, 76)	87 (79, 92)	8 (6, 10)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	74 (61, 86)	88 (81, 93)	9 (6, 12)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	75 (63, 85)	86 (77, 92)	7 (5, 10)
Avg.		60	81	8

Table 9: EI CVAP: Enacted CD 8

Office	Year	Enacted		
		Latinos	Blacks	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	54 (38, 72)	80 (69, 89)	9 (5, 12)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	52 (34, 70)	77 (62, 87)	14 (10, 19)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	57 (35, 76)	80 (65, 90)	10 (7, 13)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	84 (74, 91)	86 (77, 93)	9 (5, 13)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	80 (69, 89)	87 (78, 93)	8 (5, 11)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	51 (36, 68)	83 (76, 90)	11 (7, 15)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	50 (35, 66)	86 (79, 91)	13 (9, 17)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	59 (45, 71)	83 (74, 90)	17 (12, 21)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	54 (39, 67)	90 (85, 94)	16 (14, 20)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	62 (48, 76)	88 (82, 92)	15 (11, 19)
Avg.		60	84	12

Table 10: EI CVAP: Enacted CD 22

Office	Year	Enacted		
		Latinos	Blacks	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	45 (34, 58)	89 (85, 93)	7 (5, 9)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	57 (44, 70)	91 (86, 94)	8 (6, 10)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	50 (38, 64)	90 (85, 93)	8 (6, 10)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	80 (71, 88)	93 (89, 95)	7 (5, 8)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	69 (58, 79)	92 (89, 95)	7 (5, 9)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	81 (73, 88)	92 (88, 95)	6 (5, 8)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	81 (72, 88)	92 (88, 95)	7 (6, 9)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	82 (74, 89)	93 (90, 95)	9 (7, 10)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	82 (74, 88)	92 (88, 95)	7 (6, 9)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	80 (72, 87)	92 (88, 95)	7 (6, 8)
Avg.		71	91	7

Table 11: EI CVAP: Enacted CD 36

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	83 (70, 91)	16 (13, 20)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	72 (47, 88)	22 (18, 25)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	81 (67, 90)	19 (15, 21)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	82 (69, 92)	26 (23, 28)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	82 (67, 91)	24 (22, 26)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	73 (48, 88)	30 (27, 32)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	78 (58, 89)	31 (29, 33)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	72 (47, 87)	36 (34, 37)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	75 (58, 86)	34 (32, 35)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	76 (58, 88)	33 (31, 35)
Avg.		77	27

Table 12: EI SSVR: Enacted CD 2

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	90 (84, 95)	14 (12, 17)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	88 (80, 94)	17 (14, 19)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	87 (79, 93)	15 (13, 18)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	93 (89, 96)	17 (15, 19)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	93 (88, 96)	17 (15, 19)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	94 (89, 97)	17 (14, 19)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	94 (89, 97)	18 (16, 20)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	95 (91, 97)	21 (18, 23)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	91 (87, 95)	20 (18, 23)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	91 (86, 94)	20 (19, 22)
Avg.		92	18

Table 13: EI SSVR: Enacted CD 8

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	55 (36, 76)	24 (22, 25)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	42 (26, 56)	28 (28, 29)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	67 (51, 82)	26 (24, 27)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	64 (39, 83)	32 (31, 34)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	65 (44, 81)	31 (29, 32)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	55 (37, 71)	34 (33, 35)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	60 (45, 76)	36 (35, 37)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	53 (35, 69)	40 (39, 41)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	39 (19, 67)	39 (37, 40)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	45 (24, 67)	39 (37, 40)
Avg.		54	33

Table 14: EI SSVR: Enacted CD 22

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	68 (46, 84)	25 (23, 27)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	73 (58, 85)	26 (24, 28)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	73 (57, 85)	25 (24, 27)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	87 (76, 94)	24 (23, 26)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	85 (74, 92)	25 (23, 26)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	89 (80, 94)	24 (22, 25)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	89 (82, 94)	25 (24, 27)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	88 (81, 93)	28 (26, 29)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	92 (88, 95)	25 (24, 26)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	87 (79, 93)	25 (24, 26)
Avg.		83	25

Table 15: EI SSVR: Enacted CD 36

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	45 (30, 60)	8 (5, 11)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	46 (32, 61)	13 (10, 16)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	56 (42, 70)	9 (7, 13)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	60 (50, 71)	8 (6, 11)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	51 (39, 62)	10 (7, 13)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	45 (29, 61)	12 (9, 15)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	51 (37, 65)	13 (10, 16)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	49 (34, 63)	15 (12, 18)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	44 (30, 57)	15 (12, 18)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	44 (32, 56)	14 (11, 17)
Avg.		49	12

Table 16: EI CVAP: Enacted HD 53

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	43 (27, 59)	5 (4, 7)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	46 (32, 61)	5 (4, 7)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	51 (34, 69)	5 (4, 7)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	76 (66, 85)	4 (2, 5)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	69 (57, 79)	4 (3, 6)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	78 (67, 87)	3 (2, 5)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	79 (67, 88)	4 (2, 5)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	78 (68, 86)	5 (3, 6)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	60 (51, 70)	3 (2, 5)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	59 (49, 68)	3 (2, 5)
Avg.		64	4

Table 17: EI CVAP: Enacted HD 88

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	49 (37, 59)	9 (7, 10)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	49 (39, 58)	12 (10, 13)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	58 (49, 68)	10 (8, 11)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	70 (62, 78)	7 (6, 8)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	60 (52, 69)	8 (6, 10)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	65 (56, 74)	8 (6, 9)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	67 (57, 78)	9 (8, 11)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	68 (59, 76)	11 (9, 13)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	57 (48, 66)	9 (8, 11)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	56 (48, 64)	9 (7, 11)
Avg.		60	9

Table 18: EI CVAP: Enacted HDs 53 and 88 pooled

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	64 (51, 78)	14 (12, 15)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	65 (52, 78)	17 (15, 19)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	74 (62, 85)	15 (13, 16)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	82 (72, 90)	14 (12, 15)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	69 (59, 79)	14 (13, 16)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	68 (56, 81)	15 (13, 16)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	71 (59, 83)	16 (15, 18)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	71 (59, 82)	18 (17, 20)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	57 (47, 66)	17 (16, 18)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	58 (49, 67)	17 (15, 18)
Avg.		68	16

Table 19: EI SSVR: Enacted HD 53

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	55 (40, 71)	10 (8, 11)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	62 (49, 75)	9 (7, 10)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	72 (57, 84)	9 (7, 10)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	89 (82, 94)	7 (5, 8)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	84 (74, 91)	8 (7, 10)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	85 (76, 93)	7 (5, 8)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	85 (76, 92)	7 (6, 9)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	88 (81, 93)	8 (6, 10)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	81 (70, 89)	6 (5, 7)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	78 (69, 87)	6 (5, 7)
Avg.		78	8

Table 20: EI SSVR: Enacted HD 88

Office	Year	Enacted	
		Latinos	Non-Latinos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	64 (54, 73)	13 (12, 14)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	66 (54, 76)	15 (13, 16)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	76 (67, 84)	13 (12, 14)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	90 (84, 94)	11 (10, 12)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	80 (72, 87)	12 (11, 13)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	82 (74, 89)	12 (11, 13)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	86 (76, 92)	13 (12, 14)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	84 (77, 89)	14 (13, 15)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	70 (63, 76)	13 (12, 14)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	69 (62, 75)	13 (12, 13)
Avg.		77	13

Table 21: EI SSVR: Enacted HDs 53 and 88 pooled



Office	Year	Blacks	Anglos
RR Comm 3 (BD-AR)	2014	97 (96, 98)	30 (25, 34)
RR Comm 1 (AD-BR)	2016	98 (96, 98)	30 (24, 36)
CCA 7 (BD-AR)	2018	98 (97, 99)	37 (30, 43)
CCA Pres Judge (BD-AR)	2018	98 (96, 98)	39 (34, 45)
Comptroller (BD-AR)	2018	98 (97, 98)	35 (29, 40)
CCA 3 (BD-AR)	2020	97 (96, 98)	39 (33, 47)
Sup Ct 7 (BD-AR)	2020	97 (96, 98)	42 (36, 48)
Avg.		97	36

Table 22: EI CVAP: Illustrative CD 9

Office	Year	Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	87 (83, 91)	22 (15, 30)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	89 (85, 92)	19 (14, 25)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	88 (84, 91)	21 (14, 28)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	89 (87, 91)	15 (10, 20)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	81 (78, 84)	18 (12, 26)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	84 (81, 87)	21 (15, 31)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	87 (84, 89)	19 (14, 26)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	92 (89, 94)	25 (17, 33)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	81 (78, 83)	19 (13, 27)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	82 (79, 85)	20 (14, 28)
Avg.		86	20

Table 23: EI CVAP: Illustrative CD 16

Office	Year	Blacks	Anglos
RR Comm 3 (BD-AR)	2014	96 (94, 98)	39 (35, 43)
RR Comm 1 (AD-BR)	2016	97 (95, 98)	40 (34, 44)
CCA 7 (BD-AR)	2018	97 (96, 98)	45 (41, 49)
CCA Pres Judge (BD-AR)	2018	97 (96, 98)	51 (48, 55)
Comptroller (BD-AR)	2018	97 (95, 98)	45 (40, 49)
CCA 3 (BD-AR)	2020	96 (95, 98)	47 (43, 52)
Sup Ct 7 (BD-AR)	2020	96 (95, 98)	50 (46, 55)
Avg.		97	45

Table 24: EI CVAP: Illustrative CD 18

Office	Year	Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	87 (82, 91)	13 (9, 17)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	90 (87, 93)	23 (17, 30)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	91 (87, 93)	17 (12, 23)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	93 (91, 95)	12 (8, 17)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	89 (86, 92)	12 (8, 17)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	88 (84, 92)	18 (13, 25)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	93 (90, 95)	16 (10, 23)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	93 (90, 95)	30 (24, 36)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	91 (88, 93)	18 (14, 23)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	92 (89, 94)	18 (13, 21)
Avg.		91	18

Table 25: EI CVAP: Illustrative CD 20

Office	Year	Latinos	Anglos
Land Comm (AD-LR)	2014	83 (77, 89)	19 (12, 27)
Lt. Governor (LD-AR)	2014	82 (74, 88)	27 (18, 36)
Sup Ct 7 (LD-AR)	2014	85 (80, 91)	24 (16, 34)
Sup Ct 5 (LD-AR)	2016	92 (88, 95)	18 (10, 26)
Sup Ct 9 (AD-LR)	2016	87 (82, 91)	16 (9, 24)
Governor (LD-AR)	2018	90 (85, 93)	26 (16, 36)
Land Comm (LD-LR)	2018	92 (87, 95)	28 (17, 37)
U.S. Sen (AD-LR)	2018	93 (88, 95)	34 (25, 43)
RR Comm 1 (LD-AR)	2020	85 (79, 90)	33 (23, 41)
Sup Ct 8 (LD-AR)	2020	84 (78, 89)	31 (21, 40)
Avg.		87	26

Table 26: EI CVAP: Illustrative CD 29

# Additional Figures for Opportunity District Analysis




Figure 9: Congressional District 2




Figure 10: Congressional District 8




Figure 11: Congressional District 22




Figure 12: Congressional District 36



Figure 13: House District 43




Figure 14: House District 53






Figure 15: House District 88




Figure 16: Illustrative Congressional District 9




Figure 17: Illustrative Congressional District 16




Figure 18: Illustrative Congressional District 18




Figure 19: Illustrative Congressional District 20




Figure 20: Illustrative Congressional District 29

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a horizontal line followed by a loop and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke.

Ryan D. Enos 9 June 2022