

Scope of Work  
Assessment of Racially Polarized Voting (RPV) in San Diego County

**Short Description**

In preparation for redistricting of the five Board of Supervisor districts in San Diego county, the independent redistricting commission should consider the extent to which there exists racially polarized voting in the County. If racially polarized voting does exist, then the commission will need to determine that newly drawn district boundaries do not discriminate against racial minority group(s). This proposal outlines a plan for two sets of analyses: 1) the team of RPV consultants will analyze the extent to which there exists racially polarized voting in San Diego County; and, if racially polarized voting is found, 2) the RPV consultants will analyze the effectiveness of proposed map(s) drawn by the San Diego independent redistricting commission (IRC) in their ability to elect candidate(s) of choice. We will conduct RPV analyses so the San Diego IRC can evaluate whether their proposed plans will achieve compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the California Voting Rights Act.

**Team Expertise**

We have compiled a team that collectively holds expertise in redistricting, statistical methodology, the Voting Rights Act, racially polarized voting, Asian American and Latino voting, and the law. San Diego County has a 34.1% Hispanic population and a 12.6% Asian population, so an understanding of these two groups is incredibly important in racially polarized voting analyses in San Diego County. We have experience in statistical techniques typically employed in voting rights litigation including racially polarized voting.

*Christian Grose* is Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Policy at the University of Southern California. He is the Academic Director of the USC Schwarzenegger Institute for State and Global Policy. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Rochester and his B.A. from Duke University. He is the author of more than 40 articles and chapters about American politics; legislative politics; race and ethnicity; voting rights; and statistical methodology. His research has been funded by the Russell Sage Foundation, the Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation, the MIT Election Data Science Center, and others. Grose directs USC's Fair Maps and Political Reform Lab, which produces research about redistricting, the top-two primary, and independent commissions. He has worked as an expert witness and consultant on numerous voting rights cases, and has extensive experience analyzing racially polarized voting and minority ability-to-elect districts. He has experience working with bipartisan and nonpartisan groups such as commissions.

*Natalie Masuoka* is Associate Professor of Political Science and Asian American Studies at UCLA. Professor Masuoka's research expertise is on racial minority voting and public opinion with a particular focus on Asian American and Latino voters. Her research uses quantitative statistical techniques to analyze racial voting patterns. She is the author of two books and 12 articles focusing on these areas. She obtained her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Irvine under the supervision of Professor Bernard Grofman, a longstanding expert on racially polarized voting and the Voting Rights Act. She is an expert on racially polarized voting analyses, especially Hispanic and Asian-American RPV in California. She teaches classes that focus on the Voting Rights Act, American

immigration policy, the US Census, political behavior as well as introductory statistics. She has previously held positions at Duke University and Tufts University.

**Jordan Carr Peterson** is Assistant Professor in the School of Public and International Affairs at North Carolina State University. He holds a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Southern California in Los Angeles and a J.D. from the University of Florida Levin College of Law. His research and teaching interests include criminal procedure, criminal law, administrative law and regulatory processes, constitutional law, election law, and voting rights law. He has conducted racially polarized voting analyses and has published extensively about redistricting and local governance in California and other states. His research has been published in the *Journal of Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*, the *Missouri Law Review*, the *Journal of Legal Studies*, the *University of Hawai'i Law Review*, *Law & Policy*, and others. His research on race and local governance was recognized by the Western Political Science Association as the best published in 2020.

### **Analyses to be Conducted**

We will offer an assessment to verify if racially polarized voting occurs in San Diego County. The analyses provided will offer critical background information for the Commission to consider as they determine the new district boundaries. These racially polarized voting analyses will be completed before 9/30/2021, and will allow the IRC to assess compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. We would conduct a racial polarization analysis, focusing on the difference in vote choice across Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, and non-Hispanic white voters in the County on all primary and general election contests for Board of Supervisor seats from 2012 to 2020 (“endogenous elections” in the jargon of racially polarized voting analyses).

We would also conduct racial polarization analyses on other levels of elections to add additional robustness regarding our assessment of the presence and level of racially polarized voting in the County (“exogenous elections” in the jargon of racially polarized voting analyses). These will include an analysis of the set of most probative general elections from every statewide election in 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020. These most probative general elections are those that involve a Hispanic/Latinx candidate facing a non-Hispanic candidate; and those that involve an Asian-American candidate facing a non-Asian candidate. In addition, we will also analyze the multi-candidate 2018 California Gubernatorial primary election and the 2016 California US Senate race, both of which involved candidates of different racial backgrounds which are the most probative cases to evaluate racially polarized voting.

Finally, where data are available to be matched to precinct-level data on race/ethnicity, we may also provide relative comparisons of voting patterns by race and ethnicity across the County by conducting racial polarization analyses of other local elections in which minority candidates run against candidates of other racial backgrounds as these are the most probative cases for evaluating RPV. We will work with those handling geography to request data that match Statewide Database precinct data on Hispanic and Asian registered voters in San Diego County.

### **Deliverables Regarding Methods of Analyzing if there is Racially Polarized Voting**

We will work efficiently and quickly to produce this extensive amount of data regarding the extent of racially polarized voting. To measure racially polarized voting, we will use the following methodologies: (1) ecological regression, the original method that is the standard used since

*Thornburg v. Gingles*; (2) the method of homogenous precinct analysis, which provides an important additional analysis to ecological regression; (3) King’s ecological inference method, which is a more recent method frequently used to evaluate racially polarized voting. (4) In addition, we will analyze the statistical significance of correlations between racial minority groups and vote for candidates of choice in the above RPV analyses, which provides an additional level of analysis. (5) Finally, we will produce visual plots of racially polarized voting to allow additional evaluation and analysis. These analyses will provide extensive insight for the Commission on whether or not there is a cohesive vote by a racial group in San Diego county or if a cohesive racial group vote exists in certain locations in the county.

### **Deliverables Regarding Evaluation of Proposed Board of Supervisors Maps**

If these above racially polarized voting analyses reveal that racially polarized voting does in fact exist, then the Commission would need to avoid drawing districts that dilute the voting power of a racial minority group. We can provide an analysis of vote dilution on up to five proposed draft maps and are able to confirm that map(s) do not dilute minority voting strength. We will employ additional statistical techniques typically employed in voting rights litigation to evaluate vote dilution by extrapolating from past election data to project vote shares of each racial group within the newly redrawn district boundaries. This “ability to elect” analysis will be conducted on any district(s) to show that any new map allows for consistency in the ability for minority voters to elect candidates of choice at levels found in the current Supervisorial map used over the last decade. Using this analysis, we can offer an assessment if racial minority groups have a reasonable chance of electing their candidate of choice and if that chance of electing a candidate of choice can be decided by one racial group alone or in coalition with other racial groups.

In addition to providing these above statistical analyses, our team’s collective expertise in RPV, redistricting, voting, and racial and ethnic politics could be drawn upon by the Commission as well. We are well equipped to clearly explain racially polarized voting and the ability to elect candidates of choice for minority voters; and meet virtually or in person with the Commission or other stakeholders as needed.

### **Budget**

We ask for a flat rate of \$24,000 which would include completing the tasks outlined above and for time to attend meetings or other communications that involve presentations of results regarding racially polarized voting. This flat rate would also include costs for writing up the extensive analyses of racially polarized voting using all five methods identified in the RPV deliverables above; a written description of the statistical analyses and results; as well as writing up the deliverables of the evaluations of the proposed supervisorial maps. The final report of RPV would be approximately 50 pages. This would also require work to merge statement of vote data with registered voter data from separate files in the Statewide Database, evaluating and checking the merges to correct any issues, and to wrangle these precinct, racial, and voting data. We would ask that any local election data (i.e., the “endogenous election” data) be provided to the team with match codes at the “srprec” level (srprec is a geographic coding in the CA SWDB), or we may not be able to provide analyses of the local elections in this short timeline and will have to rely on election data that are available at the srprec level in the SWDB. The flat rate also would include costs to purchase data and/or for us to code data on the race and ethnicity of candidates for office to determine the most probative elections in San Diego County. The proposed flat rate also factors in the short timeline for analyzing racially polarized voting; and evaluating maps.

The total number of hours would be estimated to include 20 hours for data management, coding, cleaning of 'sprec' precinct-level data to match other levels of analysis such as SOV, REG, and VOTE files. The analysis of racially polarized voting would require analyzing approximately 81 candidates across 3 racial groups (Hispanic, Asian, and white/other). The above 5 types of RPV analyses x 3 racial groups x 81 candidates = an estimate of 1,215 unique statistical outputs that will be produced. We estimate these statistical outputs, which will be included in our RPV report, will take approximately 65 hours (about 20+ hours each across each team member). We anticipate that the writing and production of the final report of RPV and the ability to elect/evaluation of new maps will take 15 hours. The total hours of effort allocated would be 100 hours, and this works out to a rate of about \$240/hour.

If travel to San Diego is required for presentations to the Commission or others, we would request travel reimbursement for at least one and no more than the two team members based in Los Angeles, California (Grose and/or Masuoka). These would include hotels and mileage reimbursements at the rate set by the County of San Diego.

### **Timeline**

We would complete the RPV analyses by 9/30/2021, as requested, and we are confident we can conduct all analyses as specified above. If any data we anticipate that are readily available via election and California SWDB sources turn out not to be available in the format required, we will adjust our proposed analyses to meet the 9/30 deadline. We will evaluate proposed maps as soon as possible once the maps are ready, and we are also able to meet and communicate with the IRC, counsel, and relevant stakeholders as needed during the process.

Upon completion of the above deliverables, the contract would be complete. We look forward to hearing from you and look forward to working with you.