

Virginia Redistricting Map Proposal Report Card

Plan Name	Partisan Fairness	Description
Peterson	A	The Petersen plan is not a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Packing of partisan voters show mixed results, twice disadvantaging Republican voters and four times disadvantaging Democratic voters. • There is no indication of harm in any of the six elections. All six elections abide by majority rule, regardless of which partisan voters are disadvantaged.
Governor	A	The Governor plan is not a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Packing of partisan voters show small magnitudes, indicating small degrees of packing, and no tendency to favor one set of partisan voters over the other. The packing runs against Democrats three times and against Republicans three times. • There is no indication of harm in any of the six elections. When either set of partisan voters is disadvantaged and casts a vote majority, the vote majority carries a majority of districts.
Bull Elephant A	B	The Bull Elephant Plan A is, so far as we can tell, not a gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The one election shows Democratic voters are disadvantaged; • Despite the disadvantage, the Democratic vote majority in the 2008 presidential carries a majority of the plan's districts.
Bull Elephant B	B	The Bull Elephant Plan B is, so far as we can tell, not a gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The one election shows Democratic voters are disadvantaged • Despite the disadvantage, the Democratic vote majority in the 2008 presidential carries a majority of the plan's districts.
NAACP	B	The NAACP plan is not, so far as we can tell, a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three elections show Democratic voters are disadvantaged. • Under our computations, one election operates as a partisan gerrymander, one other does not, and the third has the advantaged Republican voters casting a majority of the votes and carrying a majority of precincts. • An observable gerrymander effect does not result more often than not.
Rapoport	D	The Rapoport plan is a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan persistently packs Democratic voters; the packing disadvantages Democratic voters in all four elections for which we have information. • The magnitude of the packing, ranging from 2.6 to 3.9 points, is sizable enough that in two of the three elections, more often than not, Democrats cast a majority of the votes but fail to carry a majority of districts.
Richmond First	D	The Richmond First plan is a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan persistently packs Democratic voters; the packing disadvantages Democratic voters in all six elections. • The magnitude of the packing, ranging from 3.6 to 5.3 points, is sizable enough that Democratic voters suffer vote weight harm because when they constitute a vote majority they do not carry a majority of districts.
Plaintiffs	D	The Plaintiffs plan is a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on three 2013 elections, the plan shows bias running against Democratic voters. • Two of the three 2013 elections lead to Democratic voter majorities carrying only a minority of districts. • More often than not the Plaintiffs plan operates as a partisan gerrymander.
Intervenor 1	F	Intervenor Plan #1 is a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan packs Democratic voters; it disadvantages Democratic voters in all six elections. • The magnitude of the packing, ranging from -2.6 to -5.1 points, is sizable enough that Democratic voters suffer known vote weight harm because when they cast a vote majority they do not carry a majority of districts.
Intervenor 2	F	Intervenor Plan #2 is a partisan gerrymander because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan packs Democratic voters; it disadvantages Democratic voters in all six elections. • The magnitude of the packing, ranging from 2.5 to 5.0 points, is sizable enough that Democratic voters suffer known vote weight harm because when they cast a vote majority they more often than not do not carry a majority of districts. • The gerrymander effect in the 2012 U.S. Senate election is equivocal. The Intervenor report a 50:50 vote percentage split in District 4, and thus we cannot say whether the Democratic vote majority would have, on the basis of a precise vote count, carried a majority of districts.