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Abstract

We introduce the Geography and Election Outcome (GEO) metric, a new method for identifying potential partisan gerrymanders. In contrast with currently popular methods, the GEO metric uses both geographic information about a districting plan as well as election outcome data, rather than just one or the other. We motivate and define the GEO metric, which gives a count (a non-negative integer) to each political party. The count indicates the number of additional districts in which that party potentially could have been competitive, without losing any currently won districts, by making reasonable changes to the input map. We then analyze GEO metric scores for each party in several recent elections.
Partisan gerrymandering is an issue which has been adjudicated many times in recent years, including at the Supreme Court [22]. In these cases, the metrics used to identify partisan gerrymandering fall broadly into two categories. The first category contains those that use data about a map to identify irregularly shaped districts and flag them as potential gerrymanders. Possibly the most widely used of these map metrics is the Polsby Popper Ratio, which calculates a multiple of the ratio of the district’s area to the square of its perimeter. Thus, it effectively measures the irregularity of a district’s boundary. Other common map metrics are the Reock ratio (the ratio of a district’s area to the area of the smallest disk containing the district), the Convex Hull ratio (the ratio of the area of the district to the area of its convex hull), and the Perimeter test (which simply sums the perimeters in all the districts) [16]. But modern technology has allowed partisan demographers to create hundreds of thousands of maps, all having reasonably shaped districts, and then select the most partisan among those. Thus, looking for irregularly shaped districts is no longer an effective way of finding partisan bias in a map. Technology also makes computation of boundaries ill-defined, depending on the level of map precision, as was discussed in [9]. These issues and others have led to the introduction of metrics relying on election data instead.

Thus, the second typical category of metrics is those that use election outcome data. Very generally, these metrics attempt to measure the “packing and cracking” that is widely understood to be how gerrymandering occurs. “Packing and cracking” is present when a mapmaker “packs” her opponents into a small number of districts which are won with an overwhelming majority, and then “cracks” the remaining opponents among many districts in which they cannot gain a majority. Perhaps the most common examples of metrics using election outcome data only are the Mean Median Difference and the Efficiency Gap. The Mean-Median Difference calculates the median vote share among all districts, and subtracts from that median the average (the mean) of the vote shares among all districts. The Efficiency Gap is based on the concept of a “wasted vote”; a vote is considered “wasted” if it was for a losing candidate or if it was a vote beyond the majority needed to win in a district. The Efficiency Gap calculates the difference between two parties’ wasted votes, and then divides by the total votes. Other metrics using only election data include the Partisan Bias and the Declination [16]. All of these metrics use nothing about the map, outside of how many votes each candidate received in each district. They are not influenced at all by the locations of the voters, or the locations of the districts.

In what follows we define a new method, the Geographic and Election Outcome (GEO) metric, which uses both map and election outcome data to identify partisan gerrymanders. But first, we provide an example which motivates the need to incorporate both the geographic information and the election outcome information in order to more accurately detect the presence of gerrymandering.
1.1 A motivating example

Consider two states, State X and State Y, each with ten districts and the election outcome data in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>$V_A$</th>
<th>$V_B$</th>
<th>$V_A$</th>
<th>$V_B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Two states with the same election outcomes. $EG = 0$ for both states.

Aside from the district numbers, these have the exact same election outcome data and therefore will have the same results from a metric using only election data, such as the Efficiency Gap. Indeed, if we assume equal turnout in all districts, then the Efficiency Gap of both of these elections is 0.

Now consider the maps in Figure 1 which correspond to State X and State Y.

Figure 1: Vote shares are for party A.
We see that in State X, districts 3, 4, 7, and 8 appear to be potentially cracked for Party A, as they are losses for A, have a vote share close to 50%, and are adjacent to districts which are safe wins for Party A. That is, party A has the possibility of improving its election outcome, based on the locations of the districts within the state. On the other hand, in State Y, while districts 7, 8, 9, and 10 have the same vote shares for Party A as districts 3, 4, 7, and 8 in State X, their loss for Party A seems more an artifact of the lack of Party A voters in the southern part of the state than an intentional cracking. Through this example, we can see that the location of the voters matters when it comes to the potential presence of packing and cracking.

In other words, gerrymandering occurs when district lines are drawn so as to include or exclude voters in particular districts, resulting in an outcome that is partisan beyond what the distribution of voters within the region would naturally dictate. This idea assumes that the lines could have been re-drawn so as to have a different outcome. That is, certain districts have voters nearby that could have changed the outcome in that district. In defining the GEO metric, we capture this missing aspect of election outcome data only methods: whether the “packing and cracking” detected via election outcome data is geographically realizable or is simply an artifact of the voter distribution within the state. Indeed, in Section 3.1 we will see that for the Example in Figure 1, the GEO metric score indicates a disadvantage for the pink party (party A) in state X, but indicates no advantage for either party in state Y.

### 1.2 An overview of the GEO metric

The inputs for the GEO metric are both a districting plan $D$ and district-level election data $\Delta$. In this introductory paper, we assume there are just two parties; party A and party B. A score is given to each of the parties in the election, which we denote by

$$
GEO_X(D, \Delta)
$$

for party $X \in \{A, B\}$. This score is in fact a count, as it corresponds to the number of additional districts that might have become competitive for a party (and thus that party potentially might have won), given small perturbations in the map, and without losing any currently held districts. The GEO metric detects these new potential wins by considering vote swaps with other districts with whom it shares a border. Vote swaps are limited so that a district’s vote share does not fall unprobabilistically low, given the regional average vote share. Along with the GEO score giving the count of newly competitive districts, we can list which districts became newly competitive through these vote swaps, which districts won by party X contributed to making another district newly competitive, and which districts lost by party X contributed to making another district newly competitive.

We note that the GEO metric is not symmetric in the two parties. That is, party A’s GEO score is not the negative of party B’s GEO score. We view
this as a benefit, in that it recognizes that party A’s voters may distribute themselves throughout a state very differently from party B’s voters. We agree with DeFord et al. in their argument that “there are serious obstructions to the practical implementation of symmetry standards” and that methods centered on varying districting lines (rather than votes) are better at assessing the presence of partisan map manipulation [7].

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 contains relevant definitions and background. In Section 3 we describe the algorithm by which we compute the GEO metric for a given districting plan and election outcome data. In Section 4 we analyze real world elections and in Section 5 we give a mathematical description and discussion of the GEO metric. In Section 6 we explore the use of the GEO metric on ensembles of maps. Finally, in Section 7 we highlight some caveats, clarifications, and takeaways.

2 Definitions

First, we introduce the notation that will be used throughout. We start with a districting plan $D$, consisting of districts $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ and election data $\Delta$. We start by making the districting graph. More specifically, the vertices of our graph are $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ and we say that $(D_i, D_j)$ is an edge if districts $i$ and $j$ share a boundary. A districting graph from the states in Figure 1 can be seen in Figure 2.

Each district $D_i$ has a vote share for party $A$, which we denote by $V_i$. Each district is put into one of four categories, depending on $V_i$.

**Definition 1** Loss: We say a district is a loss for party $A$ if party $A$ wins some percentage of the vote share less than 50%: $V_i < 0.5$.

Unstable win: A district is an unstable win for party $A$ if party $A$ wins some percentage of the vote share which is larger than 50% but smaller than 55%: $V_i \in (0.5, 0.55)$.

Stable win: A district is a stable win for party $A$ if party $A$ wins some percentage of the vote which is at least 55%: $V_i \geq 0.55$.

Competitive: If the vote share for party $A$ in the district is precisely 50% we say that district is competitive: $V_i = 0.5$.

We let $N_i = \{j \neq i : D_j$ shares a boundary with $D_i\}$ denote the indices of $D_i$’s neighboring districts. We calculate district $D_i$’s average neighborhood vote share by averaging the vote shares of $D_i$, along with all of its neighbors in the districting graph:

$$A_i = \frac{V_i + \sum_{j \in N_i} V_j}{1 + |\{j \in N_i\}|} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$$

The value $A_i$ can be considered to be the regional support for party $A$ in the region surrounding district $D_i$.

We let $\sigma$ be the standard deviation of the set of all $A_i$ for each district in the map:
\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mu - A_i)^2}{n}} \]

where \[ \mu = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i}{n} \]

Since \( \sigma \) is the standard deviation of the regional average vote shares \( A_i \), we expect it to be smaller than the standard deviation of the \( V_i \)s.

**Definition 2** We define district \( D_i \)’s shareable vote share \( S_i \) to be the vote share that \( D_i \) has available to swap with neighbors, according to the algorithm we define for the GEO metric. For stable wins and losses this figure is the vote share that can be swapped without changing the district’s classification, and without it dropping to the level of one standard deviation below its average neighbor vote share as follows.

That is, for a losing district,

\[ S_i = \max \{0, V_i - (A_i - \sigma)\} \]

And for a winning district,

\[ S_i = \max \{0, \min \{V_i - 0.55, V_i - (A_i - \sigma)\}\} \]
Districts $D_i$ which are already competitive or unstable wins are not altered by the GEO algorithm and have no shareable votes; thus, for those districts, $S_i = 0$.

3 The GEO Metric

The algorithm which calculates the GEO metric swaps vote shares between neighboring districts in a manner that is beneficial for the party in consideration, which we shall call party $A$. We consider districts to be neighboring if they share a boundary, which in turn means that their corresponding vertices in the districting graph share an edge. Vote shares are swapped between neighboring districts in order to turn a lost district into a competitive district. Specifically, vote shares are swapped in order to increase the vote share in a lost district to exactly 50%. We only move vote shares out of a district which is either a loss or a stable win, as districts categorized as an “unstable win” are unlikely to represent an entrenched bias. We do not allow so many vote shares to be moved out of a safely won district so as to make it anything but a safely won district after the movement. That is, after swapping vote shares out of a safely won district, we require that the district keep a vote share of at least 0.55. We also do not allow so many vote shares to be moved out of a losing district or a safely won district so as to make the vote share for party $A$ drop below the regional average, minus one standard deviation of regional averages. That is, using the notation in Section 2 we do not allow a district’s vote share to drop below $A_i - \sigma$. Finally, when votes are swapped into district $D_i$, they are swapped in from all its neighboring districts proportional to their shareable votes. That is, we let $C_i$ be the vote share that district $D_i$ needs to become competitive, and we let $T_i$ be the vote shares that can be transferred in from $D_i$’s neighbors:

$$T_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} S_j$$

Then if we have $T_i \geq C_i$, neighboring district $D_j$ swaps

$$S_j \cdot \frac{C_i}{T_i}$$

vote shares for party $A$ into district $D_i$ (while district $D_i$ swaps out $S_j \cdot \frac{C_i}{T_i}$ vote shares for party $B$ into district $D_j$).

We then count the number of districts that party $A$ lost which are now competitive. That count will be an indication of how many more districts party $A$ “could have won” in addition to all of the districts it already did win. We emphasize that the purpose of this algorithm is not to find the optimal way of moving voters so as to benefit party $A$. Rather, we would like to notice any places where it seems likely that a revision of district lines could have benefitted party $A$.

It remains to describe the details of algorithm that swaps vote shares from one district into a neighboring district. The algorithm is based in the intuitive
idea that, to find gerrymandering, we look for where we think it is most likely. That is, we look for districts that party $A$ lost, but which are in a region in which party $A$ has the highest vote share.

### 3.1 The Algorithm

We describe here the details of the algorithm which calculates the GEO metric. For those interested in calculating the GEO metric, the authors are happy to share the Python code they’ve written to implement this algorithm.

For each district $D_i$, let $A_i$ be the average vote share for party $A$ among that district and all of its neighbors. Thus, if a district is in a region in which party $A$ is very popular, then this average should be high. In general, the higher this average, the more we would expect party $A$ to win districts in the area. Then re-order the districts $D_1, D_2, \ldots$ so that

$$A_1 \geq A_2 \geq A_3 \geq \cdots$$

With this ordering, we do the following:

1. In order $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, consider district $D_i$
2. If that district was won by party $A$, we don’t need to do anything further. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).
3. Otherwise, that district was lost by party $A$. Let $C_i$ be the amount of vote shares that district $D_i$ needs in order to be competitive: $C_i = 0.5 - V_i$.

Let $T_i$ be the sum of shareable votes by all of $D_i$’s neighbors:

$$T_i = \sum_{j \in N_i} S_j$$

If $T_i < C_i$, $D_i$’s neighbors don’t have enough vote shares for party $A$ in order to make party $A$ competitive. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).

4. Otherwise, $D_i$’s neighbors do have enough vote shares for party $A$ in order to make party $A$ competitive: $T_i \geq C_i$. For each neighbor $D_j$ of $D_i$, that neighbor swaps out $S_j \cdot \frac{C_i}{T_i}$ vote shares for party $A$, and swaps in $S_j \cdot \frac{C_i}{T_i}$ vote shares from party $B$ from district $D_i$.

   (a) District $D_i$’s vote share is thus updated to be $V_i = 0.5$

   (b) District $D_i$’s neighbor’s vote shares are updated to be $V_j - S_j \cdot \frac{C_i}{T_i}$, and their shareable vote shares (described in Section 2) are updated similarly.

5. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).

The value $\text{GEO}_A$ for this map and election outcome is then the number of newly competitive districts after the algorithm has gone through each district. As an example of the algorithm in action, we consider the sample state $X$ from
(a) Initial setup. 
\( A_i \) is defined in the algorithm. 

(b) Direction of first vote share swap 
(c) Outcome of first vote share swap 

(d) Direction of second vote share swap 
(e) Outcome of second vote share swap 
(f) Direction of third vote share swap 
(g) Outcome of third vote share swap 

Figure 3: Here, \( \text{GEO}_A = 3 \). (Party \( A \) is the green party).
Section 1.1 whose districting graph appears in Section 2. The steps of the algorithm calculating the GEO metric can be seen visually in Figure 3.

At this point, we can also categorize some of the districts into: newly competitive, contributing stable wins, and contributing losses:

1. If a district was previously a loss for party \( A \) but was made competitive by the algorithm calculating GEO\(_A\), that district is called “newly competitive.”

2. If a district was won by party \( A \) and had vote shares transferred out of it in order to make another district competitive during the algorithm, we call that district a “contributing stable win.”

3. If a district was lost by party \( A \) and had vote shares transferred out of it in order to make another district competitive during the algorithm, we call that district a “contributing loss” district.

Recall that \( A_i \) is the average vote share to party \( A \) among district \( D_i \) and all of its neighbors. Thus in general, the larger \( A_i \), the more we would expect party \( A \) to win district \( D_i \). This is another way of delineating the districts in each of these three categories. In Section 3, we will list the districts in each of those categories in order of largest \( A_i \) to smallest.

In the example from Figure 3, we show the steps of the algorithm calculating the GEO metric for party \( A \) (the pink party) for state \( X \) from Section 1.1. In this example, we can see that Districts 7, 8, and 3 are newly competitive for party \( A \), Districts 9 and 10 are contributing stable wins, and Districts 4 and 1 are contributing lost districts. We won’t show the steps for these calculations here, but we do note that party \( B \)’s GEO score for state \( X \) is 0. This pair of GEO scores indicates that the map is drawn to optimize party \( B \)’s outcome (since party \( B \) has very little room for improvement). Whereas, for state \( Y \) in Section 1.1, party \( A \)’s GEO score is 3, and party \( B \)’s GEO score is 2, indicating an absence of gerrymandering, since both parties have essentially the same room for improvement on their current outcome. We will come back to these examples in Section 6.

We note here that, while the GEO metric counts the number of newly competitive districts, and thus indicates how many additional districts a party potentially could have won, the GEO metric score is not intended to count the number of additional districts a party should have won. It is unreasonable that a party would win all of its competitive districts. Rather, it would be more reasonable to say that party \( A \) could reasonably have won approximately GEO\(_A\)/2 districts, with reasonable changes to the current map. More importantly, the GEO score indicates the flexibility that a party has in improving its outcome. If one party has a lot of flexibility to improve its outcome, while another has just a little or even none at all, this would indicate influence by the mapmaker to benefit the party which has little or no ability to improve its outcome.
4 Analysis of Elections

In this section, we show the results of the GEO metric analysis on the 2011 North Carolina Congressional districting map, the 2011 Pennsylvania congressional districting map, Colorado’s 2013-enacted congressional districting map and the 2011 Maryland congressional districting map. We’ve chosen these maps because North Carolina and Pennsylvania are states that are largely understood to have been intentionally gerrymandered for the Republican party. Indeed, the Pennsylvania State Supreme court declared that Pennsylvania’s map violated the state constitution [12]. And North Carolina’s congressional redistricting map was struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States as an unconstitutional racial gerrymander [6]. The Brennan Center for Justice [18] and others have argued that Maryland’s 6th district is a gerrymander for the Democratic party. We’ve chosen Colorado because it is a state whose 2013-enacted map was recently argued to not have effective partisan manipulation [4].

For each state, we’ve chosen elections for statewide or national offices to calculate the GEO Metric. As with all metrics using election data, those using the GEO Metric will want to take consideration into which elections or other data sets they use to represent party preference.

For this introductory paper, we focus on the two-party calculation and analysis of elections with two parties. Thus, all data in this section (Section 4) and in Section 6 have omitted votes that are not for the Democratic or Republican candidates.

Each table shows the GEO score for each party; the newly competitive districts, i.e. those districts which became competitive under the GEO algorithm; and the contributing districts, i.e. those that shared votes to contribute to at least one district becoming competitive. The “newly competitive” districts are ordered in the order they are analyzed: from largest to smallest average neighborhood vote share $A_i$. The contributing districts are categorized as either contributing stable wins (districts whose initial vote share was more then 55%) or as contributing losses (districts whose initial vote share was less than 50%). In each of those contributing district categories, the districts are ordered by the total vote shares they swapped with other districts (from highest vote share swap to lowest).

The 2011 North Carolina Congressional districting map [19] can be seen in Figure 4.

The GEO scores for both parties in North Carolina, using the 2011 election districting map and the 2016 Presidential election data, can be seen in Table 2.

We note that the districts that are labeled as newly competitive, and contributing districts align with the analysis done by the Quantifying Gerrymandering Group’s blog post, “Towards a Localized Analysis” [14].

The 2011 Pennsylvania Congressional districting map [20] can be seen in Figure 5.

The GEO scores for both parties in Pennsylvania, using the 2011 election districting map and the Senate 2016 election outcome data, can be seen in Table 3.
Figure 4: 2011 NC Congressional districting map

![NC Congressional Map - Enacted 2011](image)

Table 2: GEO scores using North Carolina 2011 districting map and the 2016 Presidential election data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC 2016 Presidential</th>
<th>GEO Score</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Contributing Stable Wins</th>
<th>Contributing Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6, 13, 2, 3, 8, 9</td>
<td>12, 1, 4</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: 2011 PA Congressional districting map

![Pennsylvania Congressional Districts](image)
Table 3: GEO scores using Pennsylvania 2011 districting map and the Senate 2016 election outcome data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pennsylvania 2016 Senate</th>
<th>GEO Score</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Contributing Stable Wins</th>
<th>Contributing Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7, 8, 18, 6, 15, 12, 17, 4, 9</td>
<td>14, 1, 2, 13</td>
<td>5, 3, 11, 16, 10, 9, 17, 15, 12, 4, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: 2013-enacted CO Congressional districting map

We note that the districts that are labeled as newly competitive and contributing districts captures the districts flagged in the analysis done by Azavea in their article, “Exploring Pennsylvania’s Gerrymandered Congressional Districts” [15]. Specifically, that article described districts 1, 13, as Democratically packed and the GEO flags them as winning contributing districts. They also identify districts 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 as cracking Democratic constituencies and the GEO metric flags them as lost newly competitive or contributing districts (the contributing districts among those contributing higher vote shares).

The 2013-enacted Colorado Congressional districting map [5] can be seen in Figure 6.

The GEO scores for both parties in Colorado, using the 2013-enacted districting map and the Governor 2018 election outcome data, can be seen in Table 4.

Recall that Clelland et al, in their analysis of Colorado [4], stated that they “do not find evidence of effective partisan manipulation in the 2011/2012
Table 4: GEO scores using Colorado’s 2013-enacted districting map and the Governor 2018 election outcome data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>GEO Score</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Contributing Stable Wins</th>
<th>Contributing Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td>2, 1, 6,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4, 5,</td>
<td>7, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Legislative District Boundary lines are based on Census TIGER/Line. The streets are State Highway Administration Grid map. In some instances the 2010 Census TIGER/Line may not align with the SHA street grid.

Figure 7: 2011 MD Congressional districting map

adopted maps.” Nevertheless, they do point out several districts that seemed unusual. Specifically, in section 5.1 of [4], Districts 2, 4, 5, and 7 were singled out for various unusual characteristics. The GEO scores similarly do not show evidence of partisan manipulation as the parties have similar GEO scores. We find it notable, however, that particularly Districts 2 and 4 are singled out by the GEO metric as “Newly Competitive” for the Republicans and Democrats respectively, and districts 4, 5 and 7 appear in the Republican party’s “Contributing Districts.”

The 2011 Maryland Congressional districting map [13] can be seen in Figure 7.

The GEO scores for both parties in Maryland, using the 2011 election districting map and the 2012 Presidential election outcome data, can be seen in Table 5.

Note that, in Table 5, we do see District 6 coming up as a flagged district for the Republican party, as we would expect from [18] and many other apolitical analyses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maryland 2012 Presidential</th>
<th>GEO Score</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Contributing Stable Wins</th>
<th>Contributing Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7, 2, 8, 3</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: GEO scores using Maryland 2011 districting map and the 2012 Presidential election outcome data.

5 GEO metric analysis

Many analyses of metrics intended to detect partisan gerrymandering have centered on instances in which the metric is equal to 0, as this is the "ideal" value of the metric [23], [2], [7]. We do not consider a GEO metric score of 0 to be more desirable than nonzero GEO scores that are relatively balanced in each party. Indeed \( \text{GEO}_A = 0 \) indicates that party \( A \) has no reasonable room for improvement, suggesting that the map is designed to benefit party \( A \). So we focus our analysis on what properties would contribute to a larger GEO score for party \( A \).

Using the notation from Section 2, let’s suppose that district \( D_1 \) contributes to party \( A \)'s GEO score. Say that the neighboring districts of \( D_1 \) that party \( A \) lost are \( D_2, D_3, \ldots, D_k \), the neighboring districts that party \( A \) won are \( D_{k+1}, D_{k+2}, \ldots, D_m \). Furthermore, suppose that \( D_{k+1}, D_{k+2}, \ldots, D_\ell \) are the districts whose vote share is only allowed to go down to \( A_i - \sigma \). That is,

\[
A_i - \sigma > 0.55
\]

While \( D_{\ell+1}, D_{\ell+2}, \ldots, D_m \) are the districts whose vote share is only allowed to go down to 0.55. That is,

\[
A_i - \sigma \leq 0.55
\]

Then, since \( D_1 \) contributes to party \( A \)'s GEO score, we must have that, if \( V_i^* \) is the current recorded vote share for district \( D_i \) when district \( D_1 \) is considered in the algorithm,

\[
0.5 - V_1^* < \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} (V_i^* - (A_i - \sigma)) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{m} (V_j^* - 0.55)
\]

\[
= N\sigma + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} (V_i^* - A_i) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{m} (V_j^* - 0.55) \quad (1)
\]

\(^1\)Note that the moment when a district is encountered in the algorithm impacts whether or not it contributes to the GEO metric.
where \( N \) is the size of the set \( \{ i : 2 \leq i \leq \ell, V_i^* > A_i - \sigma \} \). Certainly, the left hand side of Equation (1) is small (making the equation more likely to be true) if \( V_i^* \) is close to 0.5. So what makes the right hand side of Equation (1) large?

Certainly, if there are many packed districts for party \( A \), then the sum
\[
\sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell} V_i^* - A_i - \sigma (V_i^* - A_i) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{m} V_j^* - 0.55
\]
will be large. If there are many districts whose vote share is somewhat large, compared to the average neighborhood vote share, then the sum
\[
\sum_{i=2}^{k} V_i^* - A_i
\]
will be larger. This arguably gets at where party \( A \) is cracked.

How about the number \( N\sigma \)? If district \( D_1 \) has more neighbors, then \( N \) could potentially be larger (as well as the other sums in Equation (1)). And \( \sigma \) is larger if the standard deviation of the \( A_i \) is large.

We summarize this discussion in terms of vote shares. District \( D_1 \) is more likely to contribute to party \( A \)'s GEO score if:

1. Party \( A \) is packed in nearby districts
2. Party \( A \) is cracked in nearby districts
3. District \( D_1 \) has many neighbors
4. There is large variation in the average vote shares of the districts \( A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n \)

Items (1) and (2) are of course desired, but it’s worth discussing whether (3) and (4) are intuitive and/or desired. A district having many neighbors certainly could indicate an irregularly drawn district. For example, Pennsylvania’s 7th district from the map in Figure 3 (the so-called ‘Goofy Kicking Donald Duck District’) has many neighbors, arguably because of the way that the districts have been cut around it in order to increase the number of Republican-won districts. Having many neighbors may indeed indicate something unusual in the district drawing. But a thorough analysis of the relationship between gerrymandering and districts incident with many neighbors has not, to our knowledge, been explored. The relationships between districts with many neighbors, gerrymandering, and the GEO metric are worth further exploration.

Having a large variation among the vote shares \( A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n \) could certainly mean that districts are intentionally drawn to be far from the mean (by packing, for example). It could also simply be a result of having two sections of the state which are both geographically separated, and also politically polarized. Or it could be the result of very politically polarized regions in the state, and the districts are drawn along the lines of partisan polarization. In this way, one could argue that the GEO score is likely to be higher in a politically polarized state. The precise ways in which this plays out are also worth exploring. We finally note that if \( \sigma = 0 \), then \( A_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i}{n} \) for each \( i \). In other words, the state is extremely homogeneous politically, which makes it very difficult for a mapmaker to draw a map to benefit any party. In that situation, it is expected that the GEO metric would be quite low.
6 Using GEO metric with ensembles

In the past five years or so, mathematicians have promoted the usage of outlier analysis for the purpose of detecting gerrymandering. See, for example, [21] for an overview of the outlier analysis method. We briefly describe this method as follows: a large number of potential districting maps is created; the set of such maps is called an ensemble. All maps in the ensemble satisfy that state’s set of restrictions, whether they include Voting Rights Act requirements, compactness requirements, or any other state-specific requirements. A proposed map is then compared to all other maps in the ensemble. This comparison can be made using any kind of metric. For example, we could use a single set of election data and simply see how many districts the Republican party would have won with each map in the ensemble (in this example the metric is simply number of seats). Each map in the ensemble has a number of Republican seats associated with the map, and each number of Republican seats has some frequency in the ensemble. The proposed map can be compared with all maps in the ensemble by seeing how unusual the proposed map’s number of Republican seats is. That is, we can see if the proposed map’s number of Republican seats is typical, unusually high, or unusually low as compared with the number of Republican seats in all maps in the ensemble.

There are a variety of ensemble creation methods that have been promoted; because of the mathematical theory and rigor behind them, we focus on ensemble creation methods that use a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) process. For examples of the kinds of MCMC algorithms that have been proposed for the purpose of creating an ensemble of districting maps, see [11], [10], [8], [9], [1]. While the GEO metric does take both geographic and election outcome data into account, it does not look at the actual locations of voters to see if the vote swaps incorporated in calculating the GEO metric are physically possible. The creation of an ensemble of maps does create a wide variety of allowable maps, and thus enhances the utility of the GEO metric by allowing us to compare a map’s GEO metric to the GEO metric of many other allowable maps. We used the Metric Geometry Gerrymandering Group’s publicly available GerryChain Recom MCMC [8] to create an ensemble of maps for each of North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Colorado’s 2011 maps. (Maryland’s data is not yet working in the GerryChain Recom MCMC, which is why we are unable to include that analysis). We followed the description parameters set up at [17]. We also took 10,000 steps in the chain for each map.

The outcome of this outlier analysis can be seen in Figures [8, 9] and [10]. As expected, we can see that the Democratic GEO metric scores in both North Carolina and Pennsylvania are unusually high, while the Republican GEO metric scores in those states are unusually low. And the GEO scores for both parties in Colorado are fairly low, as expected.

We believe that the GEO metric can achieve much of what the ensemble method can achieve, but without any potential sampling bias. Furthermore, we believe that the value of the GEO metric is much more useful than other highly-utilized methods, like the Mean-Median Difference and the Efficiency
Figure 8: Ensemble outcomes for North Carolina, using the 2016 Presidential election outcome data. The yellow line is the value of GEO_{Dem} for the 2011 Congressional redistricting map.

Figure 9: Ensemble outcomes for Pennsylvania, using the Senate 2016 election outcome data. The yellow line is the value of GEO_{Dem} for the 2011 Congressional redistricting map.

Figure 10: Ensemble outcomes for Colorado, using the Governor 2018 election outcome data. The yellow line is the value of GEO_{Dem} for the 2013-enacted Congressional redistricting map.
Figure 11: Ensemble outcomes for State X.

Gap. Indeed, consider the states X and Y from Section 1.1. In Figures 11 and 12 we can see that the ensemble distributions for State X for all metrics indicate that this state is potentially gerrymandered. And the ensemble distributions for State Y all suggest that State Y is likely not gerrymandered. However, the Mean-Median Difference and Efficiency Gap values for both states are identical, and suggest no gerrymandering in both states. It’s only the GEO metric values for State X that indicates potential gerrymandering.

7 Caveats, Clarifications, and Takeaways

The big idea behind the GEO metric is to detect when boundary lines between two districts could potentially be adjusted so that a political party might gain
Figure 12: Ensemble outcomes for State Y.
an additional seat without losing any of its current seats. This is achieved by considering which districts are adjacent, and looking at the vote shares of those adjacent districts. The metric does not look at the actual locations of voters to see if the vote swaps incorporated in calculating the GEO metric are physically possible, and thus does not propose a specific alternative map. So while it can suggest that a better outcome for a particular party seems likely, it cannot guarantee that such a better outcome is available.

The significance of a particular GEO metric value is highly dependent on the number of districts in a state. Thus, when evaluating the GEO metric values for different parties within a state, one should also consider the number of districts. A GEO metric score of 5 for party A and 0 for party B is much more concerning in a state with 10 districts than in a state with 100 districts. We’ve chosen to keep the GEO metric score as a count (by not dividing by the number of districts, for example) because we’d like the value to have more meaning than simply “this map appears to be gerrymandered.” Specifically, the GEO metric score is an indication of how many more districts could have potentially been won by a party.

However, we emphasize that the goal of the GEO metric is not to declare the number of additional districts that a party should have won, but rather the number of additional districts a party could have won. In general, because the algorithm behind the GEO metric changes the district’s vote share to be 50/50, it is indeed most reasonable to say that party A more likely could have won

$$\frac{\text{GEO}_A}{2}$$

districts; the idea being that after the transferring of vote shares, party A has a 50/50 chance of winning each of the “newly competitive” districts. We chose not to have the algorithm behind the GEO metric swap vote shares in order to give party A a safe win because we didn’t want to advocate for a party A gerrymander. Rather, we’d like to see how much potential party A has for improvement.

This idea of potential for improvement of each party is the best way to think about the GEO metric. If, for example, a state has 15 districts, and we know that GEO(A) = 5, while GEO(B) = 0, this indicates that party A could potentially have a much better outcome, while party B has no flexibility to improve its outcome. This lack of flexibility for party B indicates that the map has likely been drawn to optimize party B’s outcome. Whereas, if a state has 15 districts and we have GEO(A) = 5, and GEO(B) = 4, both parties have flexibility to improve their outcome. Because it focuses on this presence of flexibility, the GEO metric does a better job than other metrics of determining when a party is potentially the beneficiary of gerrymandering. Specifically, if a party’s GEO score is 0, this indicates a lack of flexibility in the map to improve that party’s outcome.

The GEO metric is an improvement on prior metrics. It uses both the Geography of the map and Election Outcome data to detect the presence of gerrymandering. The GEO metric is a fixed deterministic calculation that does
not rely on sampling method choices or hidden probability distributions, and thus has the potential for wider acceptance in the courts. As we have seen, the value of the GEO metric has more meaning than the values of metrics like the Efficiency Gap or Mean-Median Difference. The GEO metric is a count of the number of districts that could have become competitive for each party, under reasonable changes to the map. Whereas the Efficiency Gap and Mean-Median difference values have no meaning unless compared with other maps in an ensemble. There are no fixed threshold values that we promote in order to determine exactly when gerrymandering has happened, but a reasonable comparison of the GEO metric score for each party, taking into account the total number of districts, will indicate the potential for improvement in that party’s outcome with the given election outcome data.
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