APPENDIX J

Voting Patterns by Race in Albany County, New York

Dr. Lisa Handley

I. Scope of Project

I was retained by Albany County, New York to conduct an analysis of voting patterns by race/ethnicity. If I were to conclude that voting in recent elections was racially polarized, I may be asked to conduct a district-specific, functional analysis to ensure the redrawn county legislative districts do not dilute minority voting strength in violation of the Voting Rights Act.

II. Professional Experience

I have over thirty-five years of experience as a voting rights and redistricting expert. I have advised scores of jurisdictions and other clients on minority voting rights and redistricting related issues and have served as an expert in dozens of voting rights cases. My clients have included state and local jurisdictions, independent redistricting commissions, the U.S. Department of Justice, national civil rights organizations, and such international organizations as the United Nations.

I have been actively involved in researching, writing, and teaching on subjects relating to voting rights, including minority representation, electoral system design, and redistricting. I co-authored a book, *Minority Representation and the Quest for Voting Equality* (Cambridge University Press, 1992) and co-edited a volume, *Redistricting in Comparative Perspective* (Oxford University Press, 2008), on these subjects. In addition, my research on these topics has appeared in peer-reviewed journals such as *Journal of Politics*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *American Politics Quarterly*, *Journal of Law and Politics*, and *Law and Policy,* as well as law reviews (e.g., *North Carolina Law Review*) and a number of edited books. I hold a Ph.D. in political science from The George Washington University.

I have been a principal of Frontier International Electoral Consulting since co-founding the company in 1998. Frontier IEC specializes in providing electoral assistance in transitional democracies and post-conflict countries. In addition, I am a Visiting Research Academic at Oxford Brookes University in Oxford, United Kingdom.

III. The Voting Rights Act and Racially Polarized Voting

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 prohibits any voting standard, practice or procedure – including redistricting plans – that result in the denial or dilution of minority voting strength. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act was amended in 1982 to establish that intentional discrimination need not be proven (as the Supreme Court determined was required under the 15th Amendment to the Constitution). The U.S. Supreme Court first interpreted the amended Act in *Thornburg v. Gingles*,[1] a challenge to the 1982 North Carolina state legislative plans. In this case the U.S. Supreme Court held that plaintiffs must satisfy three preconditions to qualify for relief:

- The minority group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to form a majority in a single-member district
- The minority group must be politically cohesive
- Whites must vote as a bloc to usually defeat the minority-preferred candidates

What do we mean when we say minority voters must be politically cohesive? And how do we know if white voters usually vote as a bloc to defeat the candidates preferred by minority voters? According to the Court, racially polarized voting is the "evidentiary linchpin" of a vote dilution claim. Voting is racially polarized if minorities and whites consistently vote for different candidates. More specifically, if minorities consistently support the same candidates, they are said to be politically cohesive. If whites are consistently *not* supporting these candidates, they are said to be bloc voting against the minority-preferred candidates.

The Voting Rights Act requires a state or local jurisdiction to create districts that provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice if voting is racially polarized and the candidates preferred by minority voters usually lose. If districts that provide minority voters with the opportunity to elect their preferred candidates already exist, these must be maintained and redrawn in a manner that will continue to offer minority voters an opportunity to elect their preferred candidates.

A. Analyzing Voting Patterns by Race

An analysis of voting patterns by race serves as the foundation of two of the three elements of the "results test" as outlined in *Gingles*: a racial bloc voting analysis is needed to determine

[1] 478 U.S. 30 (1986).

whether the minority group is politically cohesive; and the analysis is required to determine if whites are voting sufficiently as a bloc to usually defeat the candidates preferred by minority voters. The voting patterns of white and minority voters must be estimated using statistical techniques because direct information regarding the race of the voters is not, of course, available on the ballots cast.

To carry out an analysis of voting patterns by race, an aggregate level database must be constructed, usually employing election precincts (often referred to as election districts, or EDs, in NY) as the units of observation. Information relating to the demographic composition and election results in these precincts is collected, merged and statistically analyzed to determine if there is a relationship between the demographic composition and support for specific candidates across the precincts.

Standard Statistical Techniques Three standard statistical techniques have been developed over time to estimate vote choices by race: homogeneous precinct analysis, ecological regression, and ecological inference.[2] Two of these analytic procedures – homogeneous precinct analysis and ecological regression – were employed by the plaintiffs' expert in *Gingles*, have the benefit of the Supreme Court's approval in that case, and have been used in most subsequent voting rights cases. The third technique, ecological inference, was developed after the *Gingles* decision and was designed, in part, to address some of the disadvantages associated with ecological regression analysis. Ecological inference analysis has been introduced and accepted in numerous court proceedings.

Homogeneous precinct (HP) analysis is the simplest technique. It involves comparing the percentage of votes received by each of the candidates in precincts that are racially or ethnically homogeneous. The general practice is to label a precinct as homogeneous if at least 90 percent of the voting age population is composed of a single race. In fact, the homogeneous results reported are not estimates – they are the actual precinct results. However, in most jurisdictions, most voters do not reside in homogeneous precincts. And voters who do reside in homogeneous precincts may not be representative of voters who live in more racially diverse precincts. In fact,

---

[2] For a detailed explanation of homogenous precinct analysis and ecological regression see Bernard Grofman, Lisa Handley and Richard Niemi, *Minority Representation and the Quest for Voting Equality* (Cambridge University Press, 1992). See Gary King, *A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem* (Princeton University Press, 1997) for a more detailed explanation of ecological inference.

in Albany County there are no homogenous Black precincts so homogenous estimates have not been reported.

The second statistical technique employed, ecological regression (ER), uses information from all precincts, not simply the homogeneous ones, to derive estimates of the voting behavior of minorities and whites. If there is a strong linear relationship across precincts between the percentage of minorities and the percentage of votes cast for a given candidate, this relationship can be used to estimate the percentage of minority (and white) voters supporting the candidate.

The third technique, ecological inference (EI), was developed by Professor Gary King. This approach also uses information from all precincts but, unlike ecological regression, it does not rely on an assumption of linearity. Instead, it incorporates maximum likelihood statistics to produce estimates of voting patterns by race. In addition, it utilizes the method of bounds, which uses more of the available information from the precinct returns to produce the estimates.[3] Unlike ecological regression, which can produce percentage estimates of less than 0 or more than 100 percent, ecological inference was designed to produce only estimates that fall within the possible limits.[4] Estimates produced via EI are generally accepted by experts in this area to be the most accurate, with HP and ER estimates considered good checks on the EI estimates.

Database To analyze voting patterns by race using aggregate level information, a database that combines election results with demographic information is required. This database is almost always constructed using election precincts as the unit of analysis. The demographic composition of the precincts is based on voter registration or turnout by race/ethnicity/ethnicity if this information is available; if it is not, then voting or citizen voting age population is used. New York, and specifically Albany County, does not collect voter registration data by race, therefore census data – the PL94-171 redistricting data – was used to ascertain the racial composition of the precincts.

---

[3] The following is an example of how the method of bounds works: if a given precinct has 100 voters, of whom 75 are Black and 25 are white, and the Black candidate received 80 votes, then at least 55 of the Black voters voted for the Black candidate and at most all 75 did. (The method of bounds is less useful for calculating estimates for white voters in this example as anywhere between none of the whites and all of the whites could have voted for the candidate.)

[4] EI does not guarantee that the estimates for all of the candidates add to 100 percent for each of the racial groups examined, however.

Minority groups and geographic areas analyzed Producing reliable estimates of voting patterns by race and ethnicity requires an adequate number of minority and white voters, an adequate number of election precincts, and sufficient variation in the percentage of minority and white voters across the precincts. Only one group of minority voters in Albany County satisfies the first condition – Black voters. It was not possible to produce reliable estimates for Hispanics, Asians, or any other minority group of voters in Albany County because none of these other minority groups constitute a large enough proportion of the voting age population across Albany County precincts to conduct an analysis of their voting patterns.

The second condition also proved challenging when analyzing voting patterns in county legislative districts, as opposed to countywide. Countywide there are more than 300 precincts, but the number of precincts in the district elections I analyzed was less than a dozen in every instance. This is problematic for producing reliable estimates, especially if there is insufficient variation in the percentage of Black voting age population across the precincts. While I have produced and report the estimates in the table in *Appendix A*, they must be considered with extreme caution.

Elections examined I analyzed all recent statewide, countywide, and county legislative elections that included both white and Black candidates. I focused on these biracial elections because the courts, including the Court in the relatively recently decided *Pope v. Cnty. Of Albany*,[5] have indicated that elections that include minority candidates are more probative than contests in which all of the candidates are white.[6]

I analyzed recent general elections and Democratic primaries. Republican primaries were not examined because the vast majority of Black voters in Albany County who choose to vote in primaries cast their ballots in Democratic rather than Republican primaries. As a consequence, Democratic primaries are far more probative than Republican primaries for ascertaining the candidates preferred by Black voters.[7]

---

[5] 94 F. Supp. 3d 302 (N.D. N. Y. 2015).

[6] Election contests that include minority candidates are more probative because it is not sufficient for minority voters to be able to elect their candidates of choice only if these candidates are white. On the other hand, it is important to recognize that not all minority candidates are the preferred candidates of minority voters.

[7] In addition, producing reliable estimates for Black voters in Republican primaries would not have been possible.

While county legislative elections are the most relevant for determining if voting is polarized since they are the elections for the districts at issue (elections for the office at issue are referred to as endogenous elections), as noted above, producing reliable estimates for these endogenous elections was problematic. The estimates for statewide and countywide elections are more reliable. These statewide and countywide elections are useful for another reason as well. If voting in any of these statewide or countywide elections is racially polarized and the minority candidate is preferred by minority voters, these elections can serve as "bellwether elections" to assist in determining if a proposed district is likely to provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The role of bellwether elections is discussed below (see Section IV).

Table 1, below, lists the statewide, countywide, and county legislative biracial elections that I analyzed and the Black candidates that competed in each of these elections.

Table 1. Election Contests Analyzed

Office	**Election cycle**	**Black candidate**
Statewide		
Attorney General	2018 general election	Letitia James
	2018 Democratic primary	Letitia James
		Leecia Eve
Lieutenant Governor	2018 Democratic primary	Jumaane Williams
Countywide		
County District Attorney	2020 general election	David Soares
	2020 Democratic primary	David Soares
County Legislature		
District 1	2019 Democratic primary	Lucille McKnight
		Ira Bethea
		Caroline McLaughlin
	2015 Democratic primary	Lucille McKnight
District 3	2015 Democratic primary	Wanda Willingham

Office	Election cycle	Black candidate
District 6	2019 Democratic primary	James Bouldin, Jr.
	2015 general election	Danielle Hille
	2015 Democratic primary	Danielle Hille
		Christopher Ellis
District 7	2019 general election	Beroro Efekoro
	2019 Democratic primary	Beroro Efekoro

B. Voting Patterns in Recent Albany County Elections

The plaintiff's expert in *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany*, Dr. Baodong Liu, conducted an extensive analysis of voting patterns in Albany County in elections held between 1991-2011. On the basis of this analysis, the Court held that voting in Albany County was racially polarized. The districts were redrawn in 2015 and the number of majority minority county legislative districts were increased from four to five.

My analysis of voting patterns begins in 2015, with the county legislative elections that occurred in the newly drawn districts. As mentioned above, this analysis includes all recent statewide, countywide, and county legislative elections in which Back candidates competed against candidates that were not Black.[8] The summary table found in *Appendix A*, at the end of this report, provides the estimates of the percentages of Black and non-Hispanic white voters who voted for each of the candidates in the election contests analyzed.

Albany County residents voting patterns in statewide elections Voting in Albany County in the only recent statewide general election to include a minority candidate, the 2018 race for Attorney General in which Black Democrat Letitia James ran, was not racially polarized. Black

[8] My analysis did not include Albany City elections or other elections that only included subsets of Albany County or city, other than county legislative districts. This is in keeping with the Court's opinion in *Pope v. Cnty. Of Albany* to give more weight to county legislative and countywide elections: "The Court will afford more weight to County Legislature and County-wide elections than to other elections taking place in subsets of the County. *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany,* 94 F. Supp. 3d 302 (N.D. N. Y. 2015), page 15.

voters were very strongly cohesive in this election, voting overwhelmingly for James (the EI estimate for the percentage of Black voters supported James is 94.8%. A majority of white voters in Albany County also supported James. (The EI estimates of the percentage of white voters who supported James is 53.8%. ER estimate suggests that James garnered slightly less than half, but still a plurality of the white vote.) James easily defeated her white Republican opponent countywide, with over 62% of the vote.

It is not surprising that the general election examined was not polarized because Albany County votes strongly Democratic. For example, Biden won over 64% of the vote in 2020 and Clinton won over 59% of the vote in 2016. This observation led the Court in *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany* to conclude that: "Because the majority of voters in Albany County, and especially in the City, are Democrats, ...primary elections are far more probative than general elections of racial voting patterns in this case."[9]

There were two recent statewide Democratic primaries that included minority candidates: the 2018 contests for the Democratic nomination for Attorney General and Lieutenant Governor. Both of these contests were racially polarized in Albany County. In the Democratic primary for Attorney General, a majority of the Black voters (the EI estimate is 55.2%) supported Letitia James in a contest that included more than four candidates. The first choice of white voters, however, was white candidate Zephyr Teachout, with 50.0% (EI estimate) of the white vote; the second choice of white voters was white candidate Sean Patrick Maloney with 33.3% (EI estimate) of the white vote. Teachout won a plurality of the vote in Albany County; James received only 15.4% of the countywide vote. (Teachout received 41.6% of the vote; Sean Patrick Maloney came in second with 33.0% of the vote.)

In the race for the Democratic nomination for Lieutenant Governor, a majority of the Black voters (the EI estimate is 53.4%) supported Black candidate Jumaane Williams. Kathy Hochul garnered a majority of the white votes (the EI estimate is 57.7%). Hochul carried the county with 54.6% of the vote.

Voting in Albany countywide elections The only recent countywide elections to include a Black candidate were the 2020 primary and general election for County District Attorney. Long-

---

[9] *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany,* 94 F. Supp. 3d 302 (N.D. N. Y. 2015), page 15.

time Black incumbent Democrat David Soares, who did not face a Republican candidate in the general election,[10] received a very large majority of both Black and white voters' support in this election.[11] Soares easily won the election with over 78% of the vote.

Voting in the District Attorney race in the 2020 Democratic primary was much closer. Soares faced the same opponent as in the general election, but Soares won this contest against Matthew Toporowski with only 55.6% of the vote. While the contest appears not to have been racially polarized, the estimates must be overstating his support among voters because Soares actually received a lower percentage of the votes than the percentage of Black and white voters estimated to have supported him.

Dr. Liu in his analysis of earlier District Attorney elections contested by David Soares found that voting in these elections were not racially polarized. The Court in *Pope v. Cnty of Albany* commented on the success of Soares in his 2015 opinion:[12]

> The only candidate to have uniquely sustained success County-wide is District Attorney David Soares, who was first elected in a contested primary election in 2004. Though the Court will not discount Soares' historic success, especially since he has been elected twice since then, the Court also will not interpret one candidate's sustained success as evidence that minority candidates are now generally able to win County-wide elections.

Voting patterns in county legislative elections The summary table in *Appendix A* provides the estimates for the percentage of Black and non-Hispanic white voters who supported each of the candidates competing for seats on the County Legislature in biracial contests. The estimates in all cases are very problematic, however – there were simply not enough precincts to produce reliable estimates in any of the districts examined. Although I have included the estimates in the summary table, they must be considered with caution, especially the ER estimates.

---

[10] Soares' opponent in the 2020 general election was Working Families candidate Matthew Toporowski, the same candidate he ran against in the Democratic primary.

[11] David Soares was unopposed in his bid for re-election in the 2016 Democratic primary and general election.

[12] *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany,* 94 F. Supp. 3d 302 (N.D. N. Y. 2015), page 38.

With the exception of the 2019 primary and general in District 7, the only recent county legislative contests that included minority candidates occurred in majority Black county legislative districts.[13] White candidates did not run in all of these elections: in 2019, the Democratic primaries in Districts 3 and 4 included only Black candidates, as did the general election in District 1; in 2015 the general elections in Districts 1 and 3 included only Black candidates. The results of the biracial contests in the majority Black districts are as follows:

District 1: This district is currently represented by Black Democrat Carolyn McLaughlin, who was first elected in 2019. The 2019 Democratic primary in District 1 was racially polarized, with a strong majority of Black voters supporting McLaughlin, one of four candidates (including Black incumbent Lucille McKnight). The plurality of white voters, however, supported her Hispanic opponent, Carmen Rau. McLaughlin won the primary with a plurality of the vote (45.3%) and proceed to the general election, which she easily won with over 74% of the vote against two Black opponents, Marc Johnson (Republican/Conservative) and Lucille McKnight (Working Families).

The 2015 Democratic primary was also racially polarized. Black voters overwhelming supported Black candidate Lucille McKnight (the EI estimate is 85.0%) but white voters overwhelming supported her opponent, Carmen Rau. McKnight won the primary with 50.2% of the vote. She was challenged by a Black Republican in the general election and won with over 74% of the vote.

District 3: Wanda Willingham, a Black Democrat, represents this district. She was unopposed in the 2019 general election and defeated her Black challenger in the Democratic primary. In the 2015 general election, she easily defeated her Black Republican opponent with over 62% of the vote. In the 2015 Democratic primary, Willingham faced white Democrat Kathleen Schmitz Morfe. This contest was starkly racially polarized, with Morfe garnering overwhelming support from the white voters and Black voters overwhelmingly favoring Willingham, who won with 50.8% of the vote.

District 6: This district is represented by white Democrat Sam Fein in the County Legislature. Unopposed in the 2019 general election, he was challenged by a Black candidate in

[13] William Clay, the Black representative of District 12, faced no opposition in the primary or general elections in 2015 or 2019. In fact, following his appointment to the seat in 2003, and his win in a special election in 2004, he has remained unchallenged in all subsequent county legislative elections.

the Democratic primary and won a majority of both the Black and white vote in this election. In the 2015 general election, he easily defeated his Black Working Families challenger, again with the support of both Black and white voters. The candidates favored by Black and white voters in the 2015 Democratic primary are harder to discern. Fein faced two Black opponents, Christopher Ellis and Danielle Hille. A clear majority of white voters supported Fein, but Black voters appear to have spread their support across all three candidates, more or less equally. Fein won the primary with a plurality of the vote.

The only Black candidate to run for a county legislative seat in a contested election was Black Democrat Beroro Efekoro, who ran and won the primary and general elections in District 7 in 2019. He was clearly the candidate of choice of white voters, and no doubt Black voters as well (the estimates are very unreliable) in the 2019 general. He won with over 73% of the vote against his white Working Families opponent, Douglas Bullock. In the 2019 Democratic primary in which he faced the same opponent, Efekoro appears to have been supported by a majority of both Black and white voters (again, the estimates for this contest are very unreliable).

Conclusion While voting in the recent general elections analyzed was not racially polarized, voting was polarized in a majority of the recent Democratic primaries studied. Democratic primary elections are particularly important in Albany County, as the Court in *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany* pointed out: "Because the majority of voters in Albany County, and especially in the City, are Democrats, ...primary elections are far more probative than general elections of racial voting patterns in this case."[14] This recent pattern, combined with the more extensive analysis conducted by Dr. Liu in *Pope* led me to conclude that districts that provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the County Legislature must be retained.

IV. Drawing Minority Opportunity Districts

There are currently five districts with a significant Black voting age population (VAP): Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. The demographic composition of these districts is displayed in Table 2, below.

[14] *Pope v. Cnty. of Albany,* 94 F. Supp. 3d 302 (N.D. N. Y. 2015), page 15.

Table 2: Total Population and Demographic Composition of County Legislative Districts

District	Total Population	Percent Deviation from Ideal	Total VAP	NH White VAP	NH Black VAP	Percent Black VAP	Percent Minority VAP
1	8008	-1.20%	6003	1529	2754	45.88%	74.53%
2	7573	-6.56%	5756	1622	2957	51.37%	71.82%
3	7815	-3.58%	5939	1610	3101	52.21%	72.89%
4	7610	-6.11%	5460	1029	2848	52.16%	81.15%
6	8120	0.19%	6394	1946	2935	45.90%	69.57%

Three of the districts, Districts 2, 3 and 4, are under-populated and have to gain population to comply with equal population requirements.[15] These districts are majority Black in total and voting age population and are currently represented by Black Democrats.[16] Maintaining these three districts, as well as the other two Black opportunity districts, as districts that provide Black voters with the ability to elect their preferred candidates does not necessarily mean that the districts must be redrawn with precisely the same percentage Black population and voting age population. And it certainly does not require that all of the districts be drawn with 50% or 55% Black, or some other population percentage, as a target.[17] Instead, a district-specific, functional analysis should be undertaken to determine if the proposed districts are likely to continue to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to office. This analysis is especially important if it is possible to draw new minority opportunity districts

[15] The State of New York requires a districting plan to have a total population deviation of 5% or less. This means that no single district should have a deviation of more than approximately 2.5%.

[16] Districts 1, 2, 3, and 4 are represented by Black legislators on the County Legislature. The representative of District 6 is white but is the candidate of choice of both Black and white voters according to the racial bloc voting analysis. There are two additional Black representatives serving on the County Legislature: William Clay, who has represented District 12 since 2004 and Beroro Efekoro, who won election to District 7 in 2019.

[17] Establishing some demographic target (e.g., 55% black voting age population) for all minority districts across the jurisdiction is, in fact, expressly forbidden by the U.S. Supreme Court. See *Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama,* 575 U.S. 254 (2015).

because the current Black opportunity districts should not be jeopardized to create minority districts that may or may not elect minority candidates to office.[18]

There are two related approaches to conducting a district-specific, functional analysis to determine if a district provides minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to office. Both approaches take into account the relative turnout rates and voting patterns of minorities and whites. The first approach uses estimates derived from racial bloc voting analysis to calculate the percent minority population needed in a specific area for minority-preferred candidates to win a district in that area. However, because estimates of Black and white voting patterns are problematic for county legislative district elections, this approach is not the best approach to adopt for Albany County legislative districts.

The second approach relies on election results from previous contests that included minority-preferred candidates (as identified by the racial bloc voting analysis) to determine if these candidates would win election in the proposed districts. The election results for these "bellwether elections" – racially polarized elections that include minority candidates who are preferred by minority voters – are recompiled to reflect the boundaries of the proposed district. If the minority-preferred candidates in these bellwether elections carry the proposed district, this district is likely to provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. This approach can only be used when proposed district boundaries have been drawn. However, because only estimates of Black voter support could be obtained, it is only possible to determine if the proposed minority district is likely to elect Black-preferred candidates – not "minority-preferred" candidates.

Using recompiled election results to assess whether a proposed district is likely to provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice entails (1) identifying "bellwether" elections, (2) reassigning or "recompiling" precinct level results for these elections to conform to the proposed district boundaries,[19] and (3) summing the election results across each

---

[18] There are not a sufficient number of Hispanics or Asians in a sufficient number of precincts to conduct an analysis of the voting patterns of these two groups. For this reason, it is not possible to determine if these communities would vote cohesively with Black voters, particularly in Democratic primaries, if combined minority districts were created.

[19] Recompiling election results is not complicated if whole precincts are assigned to the districts, as is the case with the current legislative district plan. However, if precincts are split in the creation of proposed districts, recompiling election results entails disaggregating the precinct results of previous elections

of the districts to determine if the Black-preferred candidate would win. This recompilation can only be done with elections that cover a broad enough area to encompass all of the draft districts, hence only countywide or statewide elections can be used for this exercise. The two statewide Democratic primaries I analyzed were racially polarized in Albany County. However, despite winning the county legislative contests, the Black-preferred candidates in these two statewide Democratic primaries did not win all five of the Black districts in the plan currently in place. (*Appendix B* provides the results of the recompiled election results for these two contests.) This means caution must be exercised if recompiled election results for these primaries are used to make a decision about the opportunity proposed districts provide Black voters. And of course, the lack of evidence about the voting patterns of other minority voters such as Hispanics and Asian means no conclusions can be drawn about whether proposed districts will elect the candidates of choice of Hispanic or Asian voters.

V. Conclusion

Voting is usually racially polarized in Albany County, at least in the Democratic primary. As a consequence, districts that provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice should be maintained. A district-specific, functional analysis is required to ensure that any plan enacted continues to offer Black voters an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the County Legislature.

---

down the level of the census block and then re-aggregating the block level results up to conform with the boundaries of the proposed districts.

APPENDIX A

Albany County
New York

	Party	Race/ Ethnicity	Actual Vote	Estimates of the Percentage of Black Voters		Estimates of the Percentage of White Voters	
				ER	EI	ER	EI
Statewide elections with minority candidates, Albany County only							
2018 General Election							
Attorney General							
Letitia James	D, W, I	B	62.1	98.5	94.8	49.0	53.8
Keith Wofford	R, C	W	34.5	-0.4	2.8	47.7	44.7
others			3.4	2.1	2.4	3.4	3.1
2018 Democratic Primary							
Attorney General							
Letitia James	D	B	15.4	54.1	55.2	8.9	6.2
Sean Patrick Maloney	D	W	33.0	29.0	18.0	38.2	33.3
Zephyr Teachout	D	W	41.6	-2.6	12.1	41.7	50.0
Leecia Eve	D	B	6.2	11.4	7.6	6.2	5.5
others			3.8	8.1	1.5	5.0	3.8
Lieutenant Governor							
Jumaane Williams	D	B	41.6	51.8	53.4	38.4	38.5
Kathy Hochul	D	W	54.6	39.2	42.8	56.5	57.7
others			3.9	9.0	3.7	5.2	3.8
Countywide elections with minority candidates							
2020 General Election							
County District Attorney							
David Soares	D	B	78.5	81.4	81.1	79.0	80.8
Matthew Toporowski	W	W	21.1	18.6	18.9	21.0	19.2
2020 Democratic Primary							
County District Attorney							
David Soares	D	B	55.6	50.5	59.5	64.3	58.9
Matthew Toporowski	D	W	43.6	49.9	40.5	35.8	41.2
County Legislative elections with minority candidates							
District 1							
2019 Democratic Primary							
Lucille McKnight	D	B	13.3	8.9	19.9	0.4	15.6
Ira Bethea	D	B	18.1	-9.3	14.7	4.3	13.7
Carolyn McLaughlin	D	B	45.3	101.9	60.2	-39.9	25.6
Carmen Rau	D	H	21.7	-2.0	4.2	137.2	42.6

APPENDIX A

Albany County
New York

	Party	Race/ Ethnicity	Actual Vote	Estimates of the Percentage of Black Voters ER	Estimates of the Percentage of Black Voters EI	Estimates of the Percentage of White Voters ER	Estimates of the Percentage of White Voters EI
2015 Democratic Primary							
Lucille McKnight	D	B	50.2	95.1	85.0	-92.4	0.1
Carmen Rau	D	H	44.1	4.8	15.3	192.4	99.3
District 3							
2015 Democratic Primary							
Kathleen Schmitz Morfe	D	W	44.1	23.9	7.8	121.9	94.1
Wanda Willingham	D	B	50.8	76.8	92.2	-20.5	5.9
District 6							
2019 Democratic Primary							
Sam Fein	D	W	69.5	52.1	64.7	47.5	73.8
James Bouldin, Jr.	D	B	28.7	49.1	34.7	52.3	26.1
2015 General Election							
Sam Fein	D	W	77.8	77.0	87.7	58.1	65.5
Danielle Hille	W	B	21.3	23.5	12.2	41.7	33.9
2015 Democratic Primary							
Christopher Ellis	D	B	23.0	52.1	32.2	76.0	33.2
Danielle Hille	D	B	30.3	7.1	33.7	19.4	34.0
Sam Fein	D	W	42.3	41.3	34.1	5.7	32.8
District 7							
2019 General Election							
Douglas Bullock	W	W	26.3	89.4	46.7	21.8	48.1
Beroro Efekoro	D, I	B	73.5	11.5	53.3	80.3	51.9
2019 Democratic Primary							
Douglas Bullock	D	W	36.7	79.4	52.0	48.7	50.2
Beroro Efekoro	D	B	62.9	17.8	51.0	52.8	49.8

ER=ecological regression; EI = ecologinal inference
Race/ ethnicity : W = White; B = Black; H = Hispanic
Party : D = Democrat; R= Republican; C = Conservative;
W = Working Families; I = Independent

APPENDIX B Recompiled Elections Results

	2018Dem PR Attorney General			2018Dem PR Lieut Governor		
	Maloney	James	Eve	Teachout	Hochel	Williams
District 1						
104	39	30	7	32	70	42
105	0	0	0	0	1	0
106	30	25	10	20	43	42
107	28	38	19	20	52	55
108	5	5	2	4	8	7
109	22	20	4	23	44	26
201	20	36	18	12	50	43
202	15	15	5	5	22	22
208	4	4	1	0	4	6
704	26	26	5	25	44	35
706	3	7	0	8	3	15
Total	*192*	*206*	*71*	*149*	*341*	*293*
District 2						
303	1	0	0	2	1	2
304	6	19	3	20	18	30
306	6	24	1	3	18	15
307	30	52	5	14	39	63
310	16	16	0	4	15	20
401	7	29	1	5	26	17
502	12	11	5	6	18	15
503	12	22	2	5	23	16
605	33	34	7	144	85	128
607	0	0	1	2	2	1
Total	*123*	*207*	*25*	*205*	*245*	*307*
District 3						
403	22	23	7	17	32	38
404	43	41	25	17	60	63
405	53	19	3	41	72	46
406	16	15	2	4	19	18
505	40	63	15	14	70	68
507	17	15	3	11	21	27
1101	0	0	0	0	0	0
1102	4	9	2	4	11	10
1207	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	*195*	*185*	*57*	*109*	*285*	*271*

	2018Dem PR Attorney General			2018Dem PR Lieut Governor		
	Maloney	James	Eve	Teachout	Hochel	Williams
District 4						
305	17	10	1	7	19	15
308	10	13	3	4	14	17
501	9	34	1	7	32	20
504	5	11	1	2	12	8
506	20	17	5	14	28	23
1106	26	40	12	29	55	51
1108	6	9	5	13	19	15
Total	*93*	*134*	*28*	*76*	*179*	*149*
District 6						
110	0	1	0	0	1	0
203	5	15	5	3	16	14
204	37	34	6	21	64	38
205	22	18	9	22	34	34
206	14	8	4	56	20	63
209	16	21	4	5	26	20
210	0	0	0	0	0	0
301	20	25	5	42	44	45
309	4	5	0	10	13	6
402	9	11	5	2	10	16
707	14	20	5	28	26	42
Total	*141*	*158*	*43*	*189*	*254*	*278*

					average	elect	seats	
Hochel	Williams	% Hochel	%Williams		score	won	won	
449	334	57.34%	42.66%		0.358957	0	?	
326	399	44.97%	55.03%		0.422391	1	1	
208	202	50.73%	49.27%		0.428042	1	1	
149	122	54.98%	45.02%		0.432317	1	1	
267	300	47.09%	52.91%		0.408935	1	1	
277	338	45.04%	54.96%		0.41192	1	1	
315	268	54.03%	45.97%		0.349467	0	?	
						5	5 (plus 2 possible)	
					0.401718			

Hochel	Williams	% Hochel	%Williams		score	won	won	
440	326	57.44%	42.56%		0.359738	0	?	
324	402	44.63%	55.37%		0.424157	1	1	
206	200	50.74%	49.26%		0.428597	1	1	
149	122	54.98%	45.02%		0.432317	1	1	
277	329	45.71%	54.29%		0.406678	1	1	
318	366	46.49%	53.51%		0.395922	1	1	
314	274	53.40%	46.60%		0.353947	0	?	
						5	5 (plus 2 possible)	
					0.400194			