

**The Plan Library is live!**

[See proposed plans from across the country.](#)



# WA-MC-Geo.json

## State

Washington

## Legislative

U.S. House


## Added to PlanScore

Mar. 23, 2022

PlanScore bases its scores on predicted precinct-level votes for each office (State House, State Senate, and U.S. House) built from past election results and U.S. Census data. [More information about the predictive model used to score this plan.](#)

## Charts and Graphs

**Efficiency Gap: 13.4% R**




+25% D      Balanced      +25% R

### The Plan Library is live!


Votes for Republican candidates are expected to be inefficient at a rate 13.4% R lower than votes for [See proposed plans from across the country](#). Democratic candidates, favoring Republicans in 94% of predicted scenarios.\* [Learn more](#) >

## Sensitivity Testing




Sensitivity testing shows us a plan’s expected efficiency gap given a range of possible vote swings. It lets us evaluate the durability of a plan’s skew.

## Declination: 0.33 R



The difference between mean Democratic vote share in Democratic districts and mean Republican vote share in Republican districts along with the relative fraction of seats won by each party leads to a declination that favors Republicans in 98% of predicted scenarios.\* [Learn more](#) >

## Partisan Bias: 17.6% R




+25% D      Balanced      +25% R

### The Plan Library is live!

Republicans would be expected to win 17.6% R extra seats in a hypothetical, perfectly tied election, favoring [See proposed plans from across the country](#). Republicans in >99% of predicted scenarios.\* [Learn more](#) >


## Mean-Median Difference: 5.7% R



+12% D      Balanced      +12% R

The median Republican vote share is expected to be 5.7% R higher than the mean Republican vote share, favoring Republicans in >99% of predicted scenarios.\* [Learn more](#) >

## District Map



## District Data

**The Plan Library is live!**  
[See proposed plans from across the country.](#)

District	Candidate Scenario	Pop. 2020	Hispanic CVAP 2019	Non-Hisp. Black CVAP 2019	Non-Hisp. Asian CVAP 2019	Non-Hisp. Native CVAP 2019	Chance of 1+ Flips <sup>†</sup>	Chance of Democratic Win	Predicted Vote Shares
1	Open Seat	770,529	7.5%	10.7%	15.1%	1.9%	No	>99%	67% D / 33% R
2	Open Seat	770,528	5.2%	7.4%	14.6%	1.3%	No	>99%	86% D / 14% R
3	Open Seat	770,528	5.1%	3.0%	15.5%	1.0%	No	>99%	70% D / 30% R
4	Open Seat	770,528	6.3%	4.2%	5.3%	2.3%	Yes	27%	47% D / 53% R
5	Open Seat	770,528	5.1%	2.1%	3.3%	3.5%	Yes	28%	47% D / 53% R
6	Open Seat	770,528	12.7%	2.0%	3.7%	2.7%	Yes	22%	46% D / 54% R
7	Open Seat	770,528	8.8%	6.0%	7.8%	2.1%	Yes	16%	45% D / 55% R
8	Open Seat	770,528	12.8%	2.5%	5.9%	1.5%	Yes	26%	47% D / 53% R
9	Open Seat	770,528	5.4%	2.1%	3.8%	2.2%	No	13%	45% D / 55% R
10	Open Seat	770,528	5.6%	1.5%	2.7%	3.7%	Yes	30%	47% D / 53% R

Predicted 46% D / 54% R seat share across scenarios\* vs. 55% D / 45% R vote share.

[Download raw data as tab-delimited text.](#)

Metric	Value	Favors Democrats in this % of Scenarios*	More Skewed than this % of Historical Plans <sup>‡</sup>	More Pro-Democratic than this % of Historical Plans <sup>‡</sup>
<b>Efficiency Gap</b>	13.4% Pro-Republican	6%	91%	3%
<b>Declination</b>	0.33 Pro-Republican	3%	79%	14%

<b>The Plan Library is live!</b>		<b>Favors Democrats</b>	<b>More Skewed than</b>	<b>More Pro-Democratic</b>
<b>See proposed plans from across the country.</b>		<b>in this % of</b>	<b>this % of Historical</b>	<b>than this % of Historical</b>
<b>Metric</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Scenarios*</b>	<b>Plans†</b>	<b>Plans‡</b>
<b>Partisan Bias</b>	17.6% Pro-Republican	<1%	94%	6%
<b>Mean-Median Difference</b>	5.7% Pro-Republican	<1%	77%	12%

## Freedom to Vote Act Races

Section 5003(c)(3) of the FTVA specifies that partisan fairness should be assessed using a state's two most recent elections for U.S. President and two most recent elections for U.S. Senate.

### U.S. President 2020: 20.2% D

Under this plan, votes for the Democratic candidate were inefficient at a rate 20.2% D lower than votes for the Republican candidate.

### U.S. President 2016: 17.6% R

Under this plan, votes for the Republican candidate were inefficient at a rate 17.6% R lower than votes for the Democratic candidate.

### U.S. Senate 2018: 6.9% R

Under this plan, votes for the Republican candidate were inefficient at a rate 6.9% R lower than votes for the Democratic candidate.

### U.S. Senate 2016: 22.0% D

Under this plan, votes for the Democratic candidate were inefficient at a rate 22.0% D lower than votes for the Republican candidate.

\* Scenarios are part of the predictive model used to score this plan.

† 50%+ chance of one or more party flips assuming the plan is used for one decade with five State House elections, five U.S. House elections, or three State Senate elections.

‡ Enacted U.S. House, State House, and State Senate plan metrics are featured in our historical dataset.

**The Plan Library is live!**

[See proposed plans from across the country.](#)



PlanScore is a project of Campaign Legal Center.

