## ger•ry•man•der

to divide or arrange a territorial unit into election districts in a way that gives incumbents and the majority party an unfair advantage

## South Carolina has among the least competitive legislative elections in the nation.

An average of $70 \%$ of voters have only one candidate on their ballot for House or Senate.

## Unrig the system!

## South Carolina deserves Fair Maps

[^0]
## Talking Points

- South Carolina's state legislative districts have been gerrymandered to have among the least competitive elections in the nation, allowing one political party an unfair advantage on Election Day.
- $69 \%$ of state legislative districts have been gerrymandered by state lawmakers to offer only one major-party candidate in the general election. 117 out of 170 legislative districts offer voters no choice. Just $10 \%$ of legislative seats (17) were won by the competitive margin of $10 \%$ recommended by Fair Maps SC. The current average victory margin for legislators without competition is $89 \%$. The current average victory for all 170 legislative seats is $85.8 \%$.
- No state law establishes criteria for creating congressional and state legislative districts. The legislature has adopted redistricting guidelines that expressly protect their seats for re-election.
- An independent citizen's redistricting commission of qualified voters should be placed in charge of drawing election maps to end the detrimental unfair impact of gerrymandering.
- The commission should be independent of direct control or influence by any elected government official, political party, or politician.
- Politicians, lobbyists, and people with significant conflicts of interest should not be eligible to serve on the commission.
- The commission should be provided with the latest technology to accurately and fairly reapportion competitive districts to reduce "safe seats".
- The commission should be required to follow strict criteria when drawing maps to ensure no political party, politician, or candidate is given a disproportionate advantage.
- The commission should be required to conduct its business publicly, with strong rules in place to ensure the process is fair, impartial, and transparent.
- The commission should hold public hearings across the state to gather feedback from citizens to hear from communities before a final vote to approve district maps. The public could even submit maps for consideration.
- The legislature and governor should be prevented from interfering with the redistricting process, altering, or vetoing its final maps.
- The maps of legislative districts should create competitive races where the winner has to represent people who don't all think alike.


# University of South Carolina survey on mapping district lines in South Carolina 

This is a synopsis of 800 interviews conducted in 2017 for the SC Progressive Network by the USC Institute for Public Service and Policy Research on the process of drawing legislative district lines in South Carolina. The full 16-page summary is posted at FairMapsSC.com.

## Questions posed

1. Are district lines drawn fairly?
2. Are voters satisfied with the choices they have in elections?
3. Would they prefer lines be drawn by the General Assembly or by an independent commission of non-legislators?

As a caveat, half of the respondents were given additional information about legislative districts in South Carolina. The information provided was as follows: In South Carolina $78 \%$ of the state legislative districts are dominated by one political party. This means that for the $78 \%$ of the legislative districts in the state, the candidate who wins the dominant party's primary will win the general election (the $78 \%$ figure was drawn from a metric that used incorporating money, competition and incumbency).

## Question 1: Are lines drawn fairly?

A plurality of respondents ( $45.7 \%$ ) feel the lines are fair, while 26.4 percent that the lines are not fair. Another $27.9 \%$ say they don't know whether the lines are drawn fairly. Those given additional information about the districts were more likely than those who were not to say the drawing of districts is NOT done fairly.

## Question 2: Are voters satisfied with choices?

Respondents were evenly split, with $46.3 \%$ satisfied with the choices compared to $45.9 \%$ who would like more choice. About $8 \%$ t didn't know whether they were satisfied. The additional information provided to some of the respondents had no effect on this question.

## Question 3: How would you prefer lines be drawn?

The majority ( $64.5 \%$ ) prefer that legislative districts be drawn by an independent commission rather than the General Assembly. Republicans supported preventing legislators from drawing their own districts by $64.5 \%$, $65.8 \%$ of Democrats, $66.9 \%$ of Independents and $75.6 \%$ of Others agreed.

When given the additional information mentioned above, respondents were more likely to believe that the drawing of legislative districts in SC is NOT done fairly.

## Notes

- Blacks were significantly less likely than whites to want the drawing of legislative districts be done by an independent commission.
- Respondents in the oldest age cohort (65+) were significantly less likely than younger respondents to want lines drawn by independent commission.
- Respondents with college degrees favored independent commission.
- Respondents with household income of $\$ 25000$ are less likely to prefer independent commission or provided a "don't know" response.
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|  |  | Fair Maps SC: 2016/'18 Election Analysis--SC General Assembly--Alphabetical Listing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 70 SC Leg | tors with no prim | mary or general competi | - $\downarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Chamber | District | Party | First Name | Last Name | Competition for the seat in General | Winning \% in Senate races in '16 General | Winning \% in House races in '18 General | Money raised by winner, 2016 | Money raised by winner, 2018 |
| 5 | 1 | , | Thomas | Alexander | NO | 99.06\% |  | \$135,612 |  |
| 5 | 45 | D | Margie | Bright Matthews | NO | 98.70\% |  | \$14,764 |  |
| s | 44 | R | Paul | Campbell Jr | NO | 98.13\% |  | \$205,424 |  |
| 5 | 43 | R | Chip | Campsen | NO | 98.16\% |  | \$52,469 |  |
| 5 | 18 | R | Ronnie | Cromer | NO | 99.09\% |  | \$48,784 |  |
| 5 | 46 | R | Tom | Davis | NO | 98.86\% |  | \$210,808 |  |
| 5 | 16 | R | Greg | Gregory | NO | 98.84\% |  | \$26,522 |  |
| s | 28 | R | Greg | Hembree | NO | 99.32\% |  | \$126,659 |  |
| 5 | 40 | D | Brad | Hutto | NO | 99.03\% |  | \$65,278 |  |
| 5 | 29 | D | Gerald | Malloy | NO | 98.09\% |  | \$111,651 |  |
| s | 13 | R | Shane | Martin | NO | 98.93\% |  | \$242,339 |  |
| 5 | 39 | D | John | Matthews | NO | 98.91\% |  | \$72,199 |  |
| 5 | 35 | D | J. Thomas | McElveen | NO | 98.66\% |  | \$85,745 |  |
| 5 | 32 | D | Ronnie | Sabb | NO | 98.69\% |  | \$31,345 |  |
| s | 27 | D | Vincent | Sheheen | NO | 98.36\% |  | \$42,249 |  |
| s | 8 | R | Ross | Turner | NO | 98.59\% |  | \$178,090 |  |
| 5 | 9 | R | Daniel | Verdin III | NO | 98.85\% |  | \$34,613 |  |
| 5 | 24 | R | Tom | Young | NO | 99.00\% |  | \$64,538 |  |
| H | 59 | D | Terry | Alexander | NO |  | 98.31\% |  | \$11,055 |
| H | 36 | R | Rita | Allison | NO |  | 97.59\% |  | \$43,449 |
| H | 68 | R | Heather | Ammons Crawford | NO |  | 79.30\% |  | \$71,243 |
| H | 57 | D | Lucas | Atkinson | NO |  | 98.98\% |  | \$40,939 |
| H | 80 | D | Dr. Jimmy | Bales | NO |  | 97.95\% |  | \$11,299 |
| H | 90 | D | Justin | Bamberg | NO |  | 96.57\% |  | \$8,116 |
| H | 24 | R | Bruce | Bannister | NO |  | 97.03\% |  | \$18,715 |
| H | 78 | D | Beth | Bernstein | NO |  | 97.85\% |  | \$33,103 |
| H | 70 | D | Wendy | Brawley | NO |  | 98.21\% |  | \$3,700 |
| H | 3 | R | Gary | Clary | NO |  | 97.17\% |  | \$36,248 |
| H | 107 | R | Alan | Clemmons | NO |  | 97.48\% |  | \$98,340 |
| H | 82 | D | William | Clyburn | NO |  | 96.69\% |  | \$15,050 |
| H | 92 | R | Joe | Daning | NO |  | 97.03\% |  | \$47,799 |
| H | 23 | D | Chandra | Dillard | NO |  | 97.72\% |  | \$40,420 |
| H | 124 | R | Shannon | Erickson | NO |  | 97.43\% |  | \$3,500 |
| H | 39 | R | Cal | Forrest | NO |  | 98.91\% |  | \$17,999 |
| H | 34 | R | Mike | Forrester | NO |  | 97.29\% |  | \$18,464 |
| H | 111 | D | Wendell | Gilliard | NO |  | 98.42\% |  | \$17,163 |
| H | 105 | R | Kevin | Hardee | NO |  | 98.00\% |  | \$8,999 |
| H | 118 | R | Bill | Herbkersman | NO |  | 97.98\% |  | \$11,250 |
| H | 108 | R | Lee | Hewitt | NO |  | 98.49\% |  | \$38,349 |
| H | 83 | R | Bill | Hixon | NO |  | 80.43\% |  | \$22,299 |
| H | 91 | D | Lonnie | Hosey | NO |  | 98.78\% |  | \$10,929 |
| H | 58 | R | Jeffrey | Johnson | NO |  | 98.67\% |  | \$20,111 |
| H | 49 | D | John | King | NO |  | 81.29\% |  | \$27,767 |
| H | 61 | D | Roger | Kirby | NO |  | 98.54\% |  | \$18,399 |
| H | 65 | R | Jay | Lucas | NO |  | 98.83\% |  | \$124,049 |
| H | 109 | D | David | Mack III | NO |  | 87.46\% |  | \$22,228 |
| H | 40 | R | Rick | Martin | NO |  | 98.16\% |  | \$16,374 |
| H | 56 | R | Tim | McGinnis | NO |  | 97.57\% |  | \$16,360 |
| H | 54 | D | Patricia | Moore Henegan | NO |  | 97.79\% |  | \$23,009 |
| H | 30 | R | Steve | Moss | NO |  | 98.87\% |  | \$10,299 |
| H | 29 | R | Dennis | Moss | NO |  | 98.61\% |  | \$17,109 |
| H | 31 | D | Rosalyn | Myers | NO |  | 98.85\% |  | \$13,275 |
| H | 12 | D | Anne | Parks | NO |  | 96.69\% |  | \$10,369 |
| H | 113 | D | Marvin | Pendarvis | NO |  | 98.48\% |  | \$10,722 |
| H | 14 | R | Mike | Pitts | NO |  | 97.87\% |  | \$15,599 |
| H | 44 | D | Mandy | Powers Norrell | NO |  | 93.30\% |  | \$6,324 |
| H | 121 | D | Michael | Rivers, Sr | NO |  | 97.91\% |  | \$1,550 |
| H | 72 | D | Seth | Rose | NO |  | ${ }^{98.66 \%}$ |  | \$ $\$ 90,333$ |
| H | 74 | D | J. Todd | Rutherford | NO |  | 89.92\% |  | \$56,674 |
| H | 67 | R | Murrell | Smith | NO |  | 82.17\% |  | \$153,509 |
| H | 86 | R | Bill | Taylor | NO |  | 97.75\% |  | \$16,937 |
| H | 9 | R | Anne | Thayer | NO |  | 97.88\% |  | \$11,967 |
| H | 88 | R | Mac | Toole | NO |  | 98.24\% |  | \$6,250 |
| H | 79 | D | Ivory | Torrey Thigpen | NO |  | 87.83\% |  | \$ $\$ 6,050$ |
| H | 28 | R | Ashley | Trantham | NO |  | 97.29\% |  | \$35,057 |
| H | 51 | D | David | Weeks | NO |  | 99.01\% |  | \$9,399 |
| H H | 50 | D | Will | Wheeler | NO |  | 98.51\% |  | \$11,799 |
| H $H$ | 1 | R | Bill | Whitmire | NO |  | 98.63\% |  | \$11,366 |
| H H | 16 | R | Mark | Willis | NO |  | 97.10\% |  | \$11,529 |
| H | 53 | R | Richie | Yow | NO |  | 98.37\% |  | \$6,300 |
|  |  |  | 47 Legisla | with primary com | mpetition; no general c | mp. $\downarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Chamber | District | Party | First Name | Last Name | Competition for the seat in General | Winning \% in Senate races in '16 General | Winning \% in House races in '18 General | Money raised by winner, 2016 | Money raised by winner, 2018 |
| s | 38 | R | Sean | Bennett | NO | 98.44\% |  | \$132,329 |  |
| s | 3 | R | Richard | Cash | NO | 98.17\% |  | \$148,498 |  |
| 5 | 15 | R | Wes | Climer | NO | 98.05\% |  | \$90,547 |  |
| s | 5 | R | Thomas | Corbin | NO | 98.98\% |  | \$159,736 |  |
| 5 | 4 | R | Michael | Gambrell | NO | 99.15\% |  | \$136,428 |  |
| s | 34 | P | Stephen | Goldfinch | NO | 98.87\% |  | \$247,043 |  |
| s | 37 | R | Larry | Grooms | NO | 98.34\% |  | \$214,154 |  |
| s | 21 | D | Darrell | Jackson | NO | 98.81\% |  | \$108,096 |  |
| S | 42 | D | Marlon | Kimpson | NO | 98.95\% |  | \$146,122 |  |
| s | 31 | R | Hugh | Leatherman | NO | 98.26\% |  | \$622,265 |  |
| 5 | 25 | R | Shane | Massey | NO | 98.99\% |  | \$207,298 |  |
| s | 14 | R | Harvey | Peeler | NO | 99.09\% |  | \$108,902 |  |
| 5 | 33 | R | Luke | Rankin | NO | 98.80\% |  | \$326,119 |  |
| 5 | 2 | R | Rex | Rice | NO | 98.64\% |  | \$78,058 |  |
| 5 | 19 | D | John | Scott, Jr. | NO | 99.31\% |  | \$115,254 |  |
| 5 | 41 | R | Sandy | Senn | NO | 97.84\% |  | \$233,593 |  |
| 5 | 23 | R | Katrina | Shealy | NO | 98.62\% |  | \$212,243 |  |
| 5 | 12 | R | Scott | Talley | NO | 98.36\% |  | \$201,903 |  |
| s | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{\mathrm{R}}$ | William | Timmons | NO | 84.46\% |  | \$301,452 |  |
| S | 30 | D | Kent | Williams | NO | 99.25\% |  | \$172,816 |  |
| ${ }_{\mathrm{H}}^{\mathrm{H}}$ | 103 | D | Carl | Anderson | NO |  | 98.26\% |  | \$27,049 |
| H | 104 | R | William | Bailey | NO |  | 98.37\% |  | \$44,244 |
| H | 71 | R | Nathan | Ballentine | NO |  | 97.36\% |  | \$72,648 |
| H | 89 | ${ }^{\mathrm{R}}$ | Micah | Caskey | NO |  | 97.34\% |  | \$51,118 |
| H | 5 | R | Neal | Collins | NO |  | 97.17\% |  | \$52,389 |
| ${ }_{\mathrm{H}}^{\mathrm{H}}$ | 21 | R | Bobby | Cox | NO |  | 97.93\% |  | \$70,430 |
| ${ }_{\mathrm{H}}^{\mathrm{H}}$ | 77 | D | Kambrell | Garvin | NO |  | 84.96\% |  | \$48,245 |
| H | 42 | R | Doug | Gilliam | NO |  | 98.21\% |  | \$21,027 |
| ${ }_{\mathrm{H}}^{\mathrm{H}}$ | 55 | D | Jackie | Haves Hill | NO |  | 97.04\% |  | \$62,852 |
| H $H$ | 8 | R | Jonathon | $\frac{\text { Hill }}{}$ | NO |  | 98.15\% |  | \$13,430 $\$ 28,902$ |
| H H | 4 76 | ${ }_{\text {R }}$ | Davey | Howard | NO |  | 99.19\% |  | \$28,902 |
| H | 32 | R | Max | Hyde | NO |  | 98.12\% |  | \$82,949 |




[^0]:    All political power is vested in and derived from the people only, therefore, they have the right at all times to modify their form of government.

    Constitution of the State of South Carolina, Article 1, Section 1

