This folder shows my renditions of the map presented by Scarnati & Turzai 2/9/18. Because of the low resolution of the presented map, it is certain that I have assigned a few precincts differently, but the overall analysis will be insignificantly different. Shown in this folder are the submitted image and four views of my rendition.

Summary: The submitted map should be rejected as being unfair and unresponsive. This agrees very nicely with an excellent site posted by Mike Johnson <http://www.politicspa.com/heres-how-every-district-would-change-under-the-scarnati-turzai-map/86396/> who gives much more detailed comparison to the current map. Following is my analysis.

I estimate that the submitted map would

1. Produce 5.9 D seats with equal 50% two-party vote

2. Require that Democrats win 55.1% of the vote to obtain 9 seats

3. Have only 4 net responsive districts.

Other maps have been drawn that conform to the traditional neutral map drawing criteria. One of these (N10) produces as many as 7.5 D seats with 50% vote, 9 seats with as little as 51.7% of the vote , and have 7.3 responsive districts. Although this is still not as fair and responsive as could be obtained by not conforming to the traditional criteria, it takes one about half way to having the fairest and most responsive map.

There is obvious evidence of intentional gerrymandering in the submitted map. One egregious example is packing Swarthmore and other D voting precincts in Delaware county into CD1. Another is packing heavily D voting precincts along the Ohio river valley into CD14. My guess is that these were put in as negotiating gambits. Please don’t be hoodwinked. The plan is bad at its core. Making a few tweaks to fix these obvious faults will not increase fairness and responsiveness by enough compared to what one can reasonably be hoped for from a court drawn map.

The analysis used all statewide data aggregated from 2012 and 2014. Similar results were obtained by Michael Waxenberg using the PVI 2012 and 2016 presidential data from a map similarly drawn. Mike Johnson similarly used even more statewide data and nicely displayed the comparison with the current map without aggregation.