

2022 Congressional District Swing to Lose Pendulum 2012-20 Party Index

Congress Plan: 2022 PW 8C03

	Democratic Seats	Swing	Republican Seats
District	Incumbent	to Lose	District Incumbent
5	Omar	28	
		27	
		26	
		25	
		24	
		23	
		22	
		21	
		20	
		19	
		18	
		17	
		16	
4	McCollum	15	
		14	
		13	
		12	
		11	
		10	
		9	6 Emmer
		8	7 Fischbach
		7	
		6	
3	Phillips	5	
		4	
		3 2	
		2	1 Hagedorn
2	Craig	1	8 Stauber

Names in blue are DFL Names in red are Republican

2012 Dem Index: Obama

2014 Franken + Dayton + Simon + Otto + Swanson

2016

2018 Smith + Waltz + Simon + Blaha + Ellison

Biden + Smith 2020

2012 Rep Index: Romney

> 2014 McFadden + Johnson + Severson + Gilbert + Newman

2016

2018 Housley + Johnson + Howe + Myhra + Wardlow

2020 Trump + Lewis

Third Index: Johnson + Harris + Goode + Morstad + Stein + Carlson + Lindsay + Anderson + Write-In 2012

Carlson + Johnson + Write-In + Nicollet + Holbrook + Wright + Write-In + Helland + Odden + Write-In + 2014

Dean + Iversen + Schwartzbacker + Write-In + Borgos + Dawkins + O'Connor + Vacek + Write-In

2016 Castle + Vacek + Kennedy + Stein + De La Fuente + McMullin + Johnson + Write-In

Wellington + Trooien + Write-In + Wright + Welter + Write-In + Denney + Write-In + Ford + Dock + Write-2018

In + Johnson + Write-In

2020 De La Fuente +Hawkins + West + Pierce + La Riva + Kennedy + Jorgensen + Write-In +

O'Connor + Steinberg + Write-In

Partisanship

Thursday, April 8, 2021 6:09 PM

Partisanship - 2012-20 Index

		Dem Index	Rep Index	Third Index
Districts with a Plurality		4	4	0
Percent of Total Seats		50 %	50 %	
Proportional Seat Gap		Dem Vote	Rep Vote	Third Vote
Statewide Vote		51 %	44 %	6%
		Dem Seats	Rep Seats	Third Seats
Proportional Seats		4	3	
Gap (Districts with a plurality minus			1	
proportional seats)	Total	Democratic	Republican	Third
Competitive Districts (8% Plurality or less)	3	1	2	0
Safe Seats (20% Plurality or more)	2	2	0	0
Mean-Median Gap	Dem Minus Rep	Dem Vote	Rep Vote	Third Vote
Mean Vote		51 %	44 %	6%
Median Vote		47 %	47 %	6%
Gap (Ideal is 0.)	7 %	4 %	-4 %	0 %
Lopsided Wins Gap	Dem Minus Rep	Dems Win By	Reps Win By	
(Democratic winning margin minus Republican winning margin. Ideal is 0.)	15 %	24 %	9%	
Declination (Losing and winning Democratic pluralities graphed from smallest to largest. Difference of angles of losing and winning graphs converted to a scale of -1 to 1. Ideal is 0.)	18 %			
Efficiency Gap	Dem Minus Rep	Dem Wasted Votes	Rep Wasted Votes	
(Democratic wasted votes minus Republican wasted votes. Ideal is 0.)	10 %	33 %	23 %	

Note: Percentage totals may not add due to rounding.

District	Index Votes	Dem Plurality	Dem Index %	Rep Index %	Third Index %
1	4,157,983	(3)	45.4	48.5	6.0
2	4,438,655	1	47.9	46.5	5.6

District	Index Votes	Dem Plurality	Dem Index %	Rep Index %	Third Index %
3	4,720,959	9	52.0	43.2	4.9
4	4,267,870	29	61.8	32.5	5.7
5	4,229,914	56	74.9	19.1	6.0
6	4,277,358	(17)	38.8	55.4	5.7
7	4,227,230	(16)	39.5	55.0	5.5
8	4,579,358	(1)	46.4	47.8	5.7
State Total:	34,899,327		17,736,165	15,201,653	1,961,508 6
			5	1	44

= Dem Index - Rep Index (a negative number is a Republican plurality)
= 2012 Obama+2014 Franken+Dayton+Simon+Otto+Swanson+2016 Clinton
+2018 Smith+Walz+Simon+Blaha+Ellison+2020 Biden+Smith
= 2012 Romney+2014 McFadden+Johnson+Severson+Gilbert+Newman+2016 Trump
+2018 Housley+Johnson+Howe+Myhra+Wardlow+2020 Trump+Lewis
$=2012\ Johnson+Harris+Goode+Morstad+Stein+Carlson+Lindsay+Anderson+Write-In$
+2014 Carlson+Johnson+Write-In+Nicollet+Holbrook+Wright+Write-In
+Helland+Odden+Write-In+Dean+Iverson+Schwartzbacker+Write-In
+Borgos+Dawkins+O'Connor+Vacek+Write-In
+2016 Castle+Vacek+Kennedy+Stein+De La Fuente+McMullin+Johnson+Write-In
+2018 Wellington+Trooien+Write-In+Wright+Welter+Write-In+Denney+Write-In
+Ford+Dock+Write-In+Johnson+Write-In
+2020 De La Fuente+Hawkins+West+Pierce+La Riva+Kennedy+Jorgensen+Write-In
+ O'Connor+Steinberg+Write-In

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, April 8, 2021 6:09 PM

Number of Incumbents Paired:0Number of Open Seats:0Democrat v. Democrat:0Republican v. Republican:0Democrat v. Republican:0

DISTRICT	NAME	PARTY	Previous District
1	Jim Hagedorn	R	1
2	Angie Craig	DFL	2
3	Dean Phillips	DFL	3
4	Betty McCollum	DFL	4
5	Ilhan Omar	DFL	5
6	Tom Emmer	R	6
7	Michelle Fischbach	R	7
8	Pete Stauber	R	8

Core	Constit	tuen	cies					
Thursday,	April 8, 2021							6:24 PN
		[19POP]	Ī	[20VOTER	RS]		Average Core of Prior District	93%
							Population Moved	437,046
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District	1			710,026	Total Population	,
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 1	6	83,966	96%	376,429	96%			
Dist. 2		26,060	4%	15,101	4%			
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District 2	2			709,354	Total Population	
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 2	6	71,144	95%	407,257	95%			
Dist. 3		27,750	4%	16,047	4%			
Dist. 4		292	0%	157	0%			
Dist. 6		10,168	1%	6,655	2%			
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District :	3			711,008	Total Population	
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 3	6	76,497	95%	422,564	95%			
Dist. 5		14,623	2%	9,907	2%			
Dist. 6		19,888	3%	10,251	2%			
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District 4	4			709,780	Total Population	
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 4	6	90,964	97%	386,763	97%			
Dist. 6		18,816	3%	12,622	3%			
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District !	5			709,732	Total Population	
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 5	7	709,732	100%	393,386	100%			
Plan: 202	2 PW 8C03,	District (6			710,147	Total Population	
From Pla	n: 2020 PW	CBase19						
Dist. 2		23,943	3%	13,720	3%			
Dist. 3		26,927	4%	18,123	4%			
Dist. 4		37,131	5%	21,014	5%			
Dist. 5		15,528	2%	9,668	2%			
Dist. 6	5	55,756	78%	331,124	78%			
		E0 0C2	7%	29,530	7%			
Dist. 7		50,862	1 70					
	2 PW 8C03,					710,241	Total Population	
Dist. 7 Plan: 202 From Plan		District				710,241	Total Population	
Plan: 202		District		690	0%	710,241	Total Population	
Plan: 202	n: 2020 PW (District CBase 19	7	690 67,913	0% 17%	710,241	Total Population	

Plan: 2022 F	W 8C03, District 8				710,049	Total Population
From Plan:	2020 PW CBase19					
Dist. 7	36,538	5%	17,994	4%		
Dist. 8	673,511	95%	402,627	96%		

Maptitude For Redistricting Page 1 of 1

Population Summary

Thursday, April 8, 2021 6:11 PM

Overall Range:			0.23 Percent	1,654 Persons
Largest District:	711,008	Deviation:	0.14 Percent	966 Persons
Smallest District:	709,354	Deviation:	-0.10 Percent	-688 Persons
		Mean Deviation:	0.04 Percent	319 Persons
		Standard Deviation:	450	450.30 Persons

Ideal District: 710,042

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.
1	710,026	-16	0.00%
2	709,354	-688	-0.10%
3	711,008	966	0.14%
4	709,780	-262	-0.04%
5	709,732	-310	-0.04%
6	710,147	105	0.01%
7	710,241	199	0.03%
8	710,049	7	0.00%

State Total: 5,680,337

Contiguity Report

Monday, May 24, 2021 9:21 AM

Number of Districts with More than One Area

0

District	Number of Distinct Areas
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	1
7	1
8	1

Political Subdivison Splits Between Districts

Thursday, April 8, 2021 6:11 PM

Number of subdivisions split into multiple districts:

County 2012-20 ER 9

Citytown 2012-20 ER 0

Number of times a subdivision is split into multiple districts: Number of splits involving no population:

County 2012-20 ER 13 County 2012-20 ER 0

Citytown 2012-20 ER

County 2012-20 ER	Citytown 2012-20 ER	District	[19POP]
Split Counties:			
Anoka		3	82,693
Anoka		5	51,293
Anoka		6	228,660
Carver		2	37,918
Carver		3	26,278
Carver		6	42,983
Clearwater		7	7,809
Clearwater		8	999
Cottonwood		1	2,675
Cottonwood		7	8,541
Hennepin		3	602,037
Hennepin		5	658,439
Hennepin		6	19,508
Ramsey		4	517,436
Ramsey		6	40,819
Scott		2	124,516
Scott		6	23,943
Stearns		6	1,577
Stearns		7	158,635
Washington		2	45,555
Washington		4	192,344
Washington		6	24,852

0

Measures of Compactness Report

Sunday, May 23, 2021 8:10 PM

Number of cut edges: 537

	Reock	Polsby- Popper	Minimum Convex Hull	Population Polygon	Population Circle	Ehrenburg	Schwartzberg	Alternate Schwartzberg	Perimeter	Length-Width
Mean	0.39	0.29	0.74	0.72	0.37	0.35	1.73	1.94		56.87
Min	0.22	0.16	0.60	0.24	0.15	0.20	1.30	1.37		2.30
Max	0.58	0.53	0.85	0.93	0.66	0.53	2.31	2.51		203.43
Std. Dev.	0.14	0.11	0.08	0.24	0.23	0.11	0.29	0.34		87.11
Sum									4,514	

Higher Number is Better					Lower Number is Better					
District	Reock	Polsby- Popper	Minimum Convex Hull	Population Polygon	Population Circle	Ehrenburg	Schwartzberg	Alternate Schwartzberg	Perimeter	Length-Width
1	0.22	0.31	0.83	0.93	0.16	0.30	1.75	1.80	703.46	188.69
2	0.25	0.28	0.71	0.66	0.21	0.30	1.78	1.89	323.74	43.85
3	0.54	0.22	0.69	0.49	0.37	0.31	1.77	2.14	164.24	4.02
4	0.58	0.53	0.85	0.88	0.66	0.45	1.30	1.37	100.64	2.30
5	0.48	0.33	0.80	0.85	0.58	0.44	1.60	1.74	71.46	5.75
6	0.36	0.16	0.60	0.24	0.18	0.20	2.31	2.51	537.06	2.40
7	0.28	0.21	0.76	0.79	0.15	0.26	1.77	2.16	1,339.30	203.43
8	0.42	0.27	0.71	0.89	0.65	0.53	1.52	1.94	1,274.09	4.52

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Indian Reservation	District	[19POP]	%
Minnesota Chippewa	7	1	8.0
Minnesota Chippewa	8	7	92.1
Red Lake	7	16	0.3
Red Lake	8	5,881	99.7

2022 Congressional Plan Comparison

	2002			2022 PW 8C03
December 5 and Education	Court	Court	PW CBase19	PW 8CU3
Population Equality				
Overall Range - Persons	1	1	70,762	1,654
Overall Range - Percent	0.00%	0.00%	9.97%	0.23%
Political Subdivision Splits				
Counties				
Number split	8	9	9	9
Times split	13	12	12	13
Cities, Townships, Unorganized Territories				
Number split	7	7	8	0
Times split	7	7	8	0
Precincts				
Number split	12	9	0	0
Times split	12	9	0	0

	2002 Court	2012 Court	2020 PW CBase19	2022 PW 8C03
Compactness				
Reock Mean (higher is better)	.42	.41	.41	.39
Polsby-Popper Mean (higher is better)	.31	.33	.32	.29
Convex Hull (higher is better)	.77	.77	.77	.74
Population Polygon (higher is better)	.68	.71	.71	.72
Population Circle (higher is better)	.34	.36	.36	.37
Ehrenburg (higher is better)	.38	.38	.39	.35
Schwartzberg (lower is better)	1.71	1.68	1.60	1.73
Alternate Schwartzberg (lower is better)	1.84	1.79	1.81	1.94
Perimeter Length (shorter is better)	4,226	4,243	4,284	4,514
Length-Width (lower is better)	62.64	63.66	63.59	56.87
Cut edges (fewer is better)	2,843	3,212	477	537
Communities of Interest Splits				
Indian Reservations				
Number split	2	2	2	2
Times split	2	2	2	2
Cores of Prior Districts				
Average core of prior district		92%	NA	93%
Incumbent Pairs				
Incumbents Paired	2	2	0	0
Open Seats	1	1	0	0
Democrat v. Democrat	0	0	0	0
Republican v. Republican	0	0	0	0
Democrat v. Republican	1	1	0	0

Peter S. Wattson 2

	2002 Court	2012 Court	2020 PW CBase19	2022 PW 8C03
Partisanship	1998 Index	2006-10 Index	2012-20 Index	2012-20 Index
Democratic Vote Statewide	45%	48%	51%	51%
Republican Vote Statewide	46%	45%	44%	44%
Third Party Vote Statewide	9%	7%	6%	6%
Democratic Plurality	3	3	4	4
Democratic Seat Gap (Districts with a plurality minus proportional seats)	(1)	(1)	0	0
Republican Plurality	5	5	4	4
Republican Seat Gap (Districts with a plurality minus proportional seats)	1	1	1	1
Competitive (Plurality 8% or less)	3	5	4	3
Safe (Plurality 20% or more)	0	1	2	2
Mean-Median Gap (Democratic minus Republican mean plurality minus median plurality. Ideal is 0.)	3%	7%	7%	7%
Lopsided Wins Gap (Democratic average winning plurality minus Republican average winning plurality. Ideal is 0.)	4%	15%	13%	15%
Declination (Losing and winning Democratic pluralities graphed from smallest to largest. Difference of angles of losing and winning graphs converted to a scale of -1 to 1. Ideal is 0.)	14%	29%	16%	18%
Efficiency Gap (Democratic wasted votes minus Republican wasted votes. Ideal is 0.)	9%	17%	9%	10%

Peter S. Wattson 3