

Executive Summary of Reports Assessing Racially Polarized Voting in Riverside County and the Ability of the Latino Community to Elect Candidates of its Choice in Proposed Draft Maps

by Dr. Christian R. Grose, Dr. Natalie Masuoka, Nathan Chan, and Matthew Nelson

Updated December 6, 2021

Racially Polarized Voting Analyses

We conducted statistical analyses of racially polarized voting in Riverside County. We conducted a thorough assessment of two sets of probative elections: (1) Board of Supervisor elections from 2014 to 2020; and (2) elections for statewide office within only Riverside County involving a Latino candidate from 2014 to 2020. ***We find that racially polarized voting between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters occurred in the last decade.*** Our evidence shows there to be racially polarized voting in both Board of Supervisor elections and exogenous statewide elections held within Riverside County. In addition, there is evidence that some Latino candidates of choice lose in Riverside County because white voters support white candidates of choice who defeat Latino voters' preferred candidates.

This report provides guideposts for analyzing and understanding these data analyses around racially polarized voting as the County conducts its redistricting process.

Methodology:

- We employ three different statistical methods in this report: ecological regression, ecological inference, and homogenous precinct analysis. All three of these methods are standard in the field for measuring racially polarized voting, and have been widely accepted by the courts. Ecological regression and ecological inference take aggregate data, at the precinct level, and estimate support for candidates by racial and ethnic groups from these aggregate data across all available voting precincts within a district or a county. Homogenous precinct analysis assesses those districts with very high percentages of a racial/ethnic group to see if voting patterns in those high-density minority or high-density white precincts show support for one candidate.
- We examined all contested primary and general elections from 2014 to 2020 for the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. During this period, we find that racially polarized voting between Latino and non-Hispanic white voters has occurred in at least one Supervisor election held in each of the five districts. The topline summary is that racial polarization between Latino and non-Hispanic white voters is found in every Board of Supervisors district.

Findings for Endogenous Elections:

- The analysis of both primary and general Supervisor elections between 2014 and 2020 finds that racially polarized voting has occurred in at least one Supervisor election held in each of the five districts in Riverside County.
- We analyzed all contested primary and general supervisor elections from 2014 to 2020. In 6 out of the 10 total primary races analyzed, we find racial polarization between Latino and non-Hispanic white voters. In 2 out of 3 total general elections analyzed, we find racial polarization between Latino and non-Hispanic white voters.
- In primary elections for supervisor, Latino candidates of choice lose in 40% of elections in which they run; and they lose to white candidates of choice. The candidate preferred by Latino voters in the general election, even if they were not the preferred candidate of Latino voters in the primary, wins in 3 of 3 general elections.

Findings for Exogenous Elections:

- We analyze 7 exogenous general elections held in California since 2014 that feature a Latino candidate running against a non-Latino candidate. Exogenous elections between a Latino candidate and a non-Latino candidate are highly probative for assessing racially polarized voting. In Riverside County, 86% of these exogenous general elections had racially polarized voting between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters. In a number of the exogenous elections in which there was racial polarization between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters, white voters' candidates of choice prevailed over Latino candidates of choice.
- We examined the voting patterns in these statewide exogenous general elections within each of the five supervisor districts. Racial polarization between Latino voters and non-Latino white voters was found in all five supervisor districts when looking at the exogenous general elections. In each district, white voters preferred and voted for different candidates than were preferred by Latino voters. In district 1, 6 of 7 exogenous general elections (86%) demonstrated racial polarization between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters. In district 2, 5 of 7 exogenous general elections (71%) showed racially polarized voting between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters. In district 3, 6 of 7 elections (86%) showed evidence of racially polarized voting between Latino and non-Latino white voters. In district 4, 7 of 7 exogenous general elections (100%) revealed racial polarization between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters. In district 5, 7 of 7 exogenous general elections (100%) showed evidence of racial polarization between Latino voters and non-Hispanic white voters.
- We also examined seven exogenous primary elections since 2014 that featured Latino candidates of choice running against non-Latino candidates, as these are highly probative to study. Latino and non-Hispanic white voters showed evidence of racial polarization across the county in all seven (100%) exogenous primary elections. In one out of seven elections, the Latino candidate of choice does not advance out of the primary. We also

looked at these exogenous primary elections within each supervisor district. We find that there is clear racial polarization between Latino and non-Hispanic white voters in each of the five districts for all seven primary elections analyzed.

We also examined voting patterns and the presence of racially polarized voting between Black voters, Asian American voters, Latino voters, and non-Hispanic white voters in Riverside County overall and within supervisor districts. Based on the exogenous election analyses, Black voters showed some evidence of coalition voting with Latino voters.

Ability-to-Elect Analysis

We also conducted a functional ability-to-elect analysis on four proposed draft maps for the Riverside County Board of Supervisor districts. This type of analysis is the standard methodology for assessing the opportunity for voters of color to elect candidates of choice in newly drawn districts. The functional analysis combines the newly proposed district map boundaries for a given jurisdiction with existing voting data as a method of calculating the projected electoral outcome in regards to the opportunity to elect Latino candidates of choice in the newly proposed district. This is a well-established methodology supported by extensive political science scholarship and used widely in voting rights litigation.

The four proposed draft maps analyzed in this report were: EOTC Draft Map F.5, EOTC Draft Map H.7.2, EOTC Draft Map H.7.3, and Community Map 1.4.

The analysis finds that EOTC Draft Maps F.5, H.7.2, and H.7.3 create one majority Latino citizen voting-age population (CVAP) district. Community Map 1.4 creates two Latino majority CVAP districts. However, the functional analysis methodology requires us to analyze if Latino voters have the ability to elect Latino candidates of choice in the districts, as looking at the racial or ethnic population of a district is not a sufficient indicator of Latino voters having the ability to elect candidates of choice. This functional analysis is what will assist in determining how frequently Latino voters will likely have the opportunity to elect candidates of choice in the districts.

To conduct the ability to elect analyses, we used seven highly probative primary elections and six highly probative general elections. These elections featured a Latino candidate preferred by Latino voters who ran against a non-Latino candidate preferred by non-Hispanic white voters from 2014 through 2018. To conduct the ability to elect analyses, we also used six highly probative general elections for those cases in which Latino candidates of choice who advanced out of the primary. By analyzing both primary and general elections over much of the decade, we are able to have high-quality and exhaustive data to conduct the ability to elect analyses.

Key findings of the functional ability-to-elect analysis for EOTC Map F.5:

- District 1 in EOTC draft map F.5 demonstrates the highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice has the opportunity to win. For District 1, in 86% of exogenous primary elections, the Latino candidate of choice advances to the general election. Then, in 83%

of exogenous general elections, the Latino candidate of choice wins elections in this district. This district is just over 50% Latino CVAP.

- District 4 in map F.5 provides the next highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice will be elected. This district shows evidence that a Latino candidate of choice has a high likelihood of advancing out of an exogenous primary election (in 86% of exogenous primary elections). Then the Latino candidate of choice wins in 67% of exogenous general elections. This district is 39% Latino CVAP.
- Districts 2, 3, and 5 in EOTC draft map F.5 are districts where Latino voters are not likely to elect Latino candidates of choice. In two of these districts, Latino candidates of choice demonstrate the ability to advance out of the primary election, but the analysis of general elections finds that Latino candidates of choice win 0% of the time in districts 2 and 3 and only 33% of the time in district 5.

Key findings of the functional ability-to-elect analysis for EOTC Map H.7.2:

- District 1 in EOTC draft map H.7.2 demonstrates the highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice has the opportunity to win. For District 1, in 86% of exogenous primary elections, the Latino candidate of choice advances to the general election. Then, in 83% of exogenous general elections, the Latino candidate of choice wins elections in this district. This district is just over 50% Latino CVAP.
- District 4 in map H.7.2 provides the next highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice will be elected. This district shows evidence that a Latino candidate of choice has a high likelihood of advancing out of an exogenous primary election (in 86% of exogenous primary elections). Then the Latino candidate of choice wins in 67% of exogenous general elections. This district is 39% Latino CVAP.
- Districts 2, 3, and 5 in EOTC draft map H.7.2 are districts where Latino voters are not likely to elect Latino candidates of choice. In two of these districts, Latino candidates of choice demonstrate the ability to advance out of the primary election, but the analysis of general elections finds that Latino candidates of choice win 0% of the time in districts 2 and 3 and only 33% of the time in district 5.

Key findings of the functional ability-to-elect analysis for EOTC Map H.7.3:

- District 1 in EOTC draft map H.7.3 demonstrates the highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice has the opportunity to win. For District 1, in 86% of exogenous primary elections, the Latino candidate of choice advances to the general election. Then, in 83% of exogenous general elections, the Latino candidate of choice wins elections in this district. This district is just over 50% Latino CVAP.
- District 4 in map H.7.3 provides the next highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice will be elected. This district shows evidence that a Latino candidate of choice has a high likelihood of advancing out of an exogenous primary election (in 86% of exogenous

primary elections). Then the Latino candidate of choice wins in 67% of exogenous general elections. This district is 39% Latino CVAP.

- Districts 2, 3, and 5 in EOTC draft map H.7.3 are districts where Latino voters are not likely to elect Latino candidates of choice. In two of these districts, Latino candidates of choice demonstrate the ability to advance out of the primary election, but the analysis of general elections finds that Latino candidates of choice win 0% of the time in districts 2 and 3 and only 33% of the time in district 5.

Key findings of the functional ability-to-elect analysis for Community Map 1.4:

- District 5 in Community map 1.4 demonstrates the highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice has the opportunity to win. For District 5, in 100% of exogenous primary elections, the Latino candidate of choice advances to the general election. Then, in 83% of exogenous general elections, the Latino candidate of choice wins elections in this district. This district is 51% Latino CVAP.
- District 2 provides the next highest rate that the Latino candidate of choice will be elected. This district shows evidence that a Latino candidate of choice has a high likelihood of advancing out of an exogenous primary election (in 86% of exogenous primary elections). Then the Latino candidate of choice wins in 67% of exogenous general elections. This district is 51% Latino CVAP.
- District 4 also provides a similar rate to district 2 that the Latino candidate of choice will have the opportunity to be elected. This district also shows evidence that a Latino candidate of choice is likely to advance out of an exogenous primary election (86% win rate in primaries). Then the Latino candidate of choice wins in 67% of exogenous general elections. This district is 38% Latino CVAP.
- Districts 1 and 3 in CM 1.4 are districts where Latino voters are not likely to elect Latino candidates of choice. In both districts, there is some propensity of advancing out of the primary (though at different rates). However, in the general elections, Latino voters' preferred candidates win 0% of the time in both districts 1 and 3.

About the Authors

Dr. Christian Grose is 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; Latino politics; Black politics; voting rights; and statistical methodology. These articles have been published in peer-reviewed journals such as the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Politics*. His award-winning book *Congress in Black and White*, analyzes the role of race and ethnicity in the redistricting process. 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 nonpartisan 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.

Dr. 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 U.S. Census, political behavior as well as introductory statistics. She has previously held positions at Duke University and Tufts University.

Nathan Chan is a Ph.D. student at the University of California, Irvine. He is an expert on race, ethnicity, and politics; voting rights; and statistical methodology. His research examines the role of social group identification, including race and ethnicity, on choices that voters make. He has published articles in peer-reviewed journals such as *Political Research Quarterly* and *Politics and Religion*. He was awarded the Alberti prize, which is an award for the most promising Ph.D. student in the social sciences; and he has also a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship recipient.

Matthew Nelson is a Ph.D. student at the University of Southern California. He is an expert on statistical methodology, data science, voting rights, redistricting, and primary election reforms. His research examines election rules and their effects on voting rights. His research on redistricting and voting rights has been covered by media outlets such as *FiveThirtyEight.com*, the *Washington Post*, and *Cal Matters*. He has been awarded a research enhancement grant to study the role of primary electoral institutions. He is a research fellow at the USC Schwarzenegger Institute and is a fellow in the Fair Maps and Political Reform Lab.