2016: The Latino Electorate in Georgia Continues To Grow and To Vote

Latina voters lead the voter participation with record-breaking turnout

July 6, 2017

Authored by:

Jerry Gonzalez, M.P.A. Executive Director GALEO & the GALEO Latino Community Development Fund

Voter Turn-Out Database Analysis Conducted by:

Trey Hood, Ph.D. Department of Political Science, University of Georgia (Athens, GA)

&

Latino Surname Match Conducted by:

Dorian Caal, Director of Civic Engagement Research NALEO Educational Fund (Los Angeles, CA)

Editing Contributions by:

Harvey Soto Program Coordinator The GALEO Latino Community Development Fund



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Statewide Latino Electorate	4
NALEO Methodology for Identifying Latino Voters	4
Limitations of Self-Identification for the Purpose of Tagging Latinos	
Statewide Results	
Age of the Georgia Latino Electorate	
Dates of Voter Registration	
Gender Breakdown	
Georgia Counties & Cities	
Top Metro Atlanta Counties	
Ğwinnett County	
Cobb County	
Fulton County	
DeKalb and Hall Counties	
Forsyth County	
Other interesting facts about the Metro Atlanta area counties	
Hall County and the City of Gainesville	
Whitfield County and the City of Dalton	
Trends in the Top 10 Counties of Latino Registered Voters	
Congressional Districts in Georgia and Latino Registered Voters	
Georgia's 6th District Congressional	
Georgia Legislative Districts	
Top 20 Georgia State Senate Districts	
Top 25 Georgia House of Representative Districts	
Latino Georgia State Representatives Marin and Casas	
Conclusion	
Appendix A: County Totals, Turnout and Share of the Electorate for 2016	

Appendix B: County Trends-Totals for 2003, 2008, 2012 and 2016 Appendix C: Georgia Congressional District Totals and Turn Out for 2012 and 2016 Appendix D: 2016 Georgia State Senate District Totals and Turn Out

Appendix E: 2016 Georgia State House District Totals and Turn Out



Executive Summary

The Latino electorate in Georgia continues to grow. The analysis contained in this report indicates an electorate that will continue to increase in importance for Georgia's electoral outcomes. Based upon the statewide voter data file and the analysis in this report as of December 2nd, 2016, the Latino electorate is now 244,190 voters strong, representing 3.66% of Georgia's overall electorate. The Latino electorate **grew by 60,224 new Latino voters** since the 2012 report¹, representing a **growth rate of 25%**. The Latino electorate was identified using a combination of the surname match individuals and those who were not matched with surname and self-identified as "Hispanic/Latino" on their voter registration form.

Nationally, the Latino vote grew by 1.5 million voters since 2012 reaching a record number of 12.7 million in 2016. However, the national Latino voter participation rate held nearly steady at 47.6% as compared to 48% for 2012.² In Georgia during the 2016 election, the Latino electorate outpaced national Latino voter participation rate with 53.3%.

Additionally, the analysis looked at age, dates of voter registration and gender breakdown of the Latino electorate in Georgia. The majority of the Latino electorate is under the age of 40, has registered to vote as early as 2011 and is majority male. However, Latina voters outpaced Latinos in voter participation by large margins.

The top Metro Atlanta counties also account for a large share of the Latino electorate and the top ten counties account for 61% of the total Georgia Latino electorate and accounted for 64% of the actual Latino voter turn out in the 2016 election. Taken all together, the 39 Metro Atlanta counties account for 74% of the total Georgia Latino electorate.

Both Hall and Whitfield counties remain important focus areas of the growing Latino electorate in Georgia and both of these counties had tremendous growth of the Latino electorate in 2016. In fact, both counties surpassed the national Latino voter participation rate; in contrast in 2012, neither county was close to the national Latino voter participation rate. Both counties saw an

¹ Gonzalez, Jerry. "The Continued Growth of the Latino Electorate in Georgia: Latino electorate reaches 183,966 voters and Metro Atlanta Counties lead." GALEO.org. August 6, 2013. Available online: http://galeo.org/old/pdfs/2012GALatinoVoters.pdf.

² Krogstad, Jens Manuel, and Mark Hugo Lopez. "Black voter turnout fell in 2016, even as a record number of Americans cast ballots." Pew Research Center. May 12, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/</u>.



increase of the overall share of the electorate where the Latino share was 18.06% and 11.06% of the overall voters in Whitfield and Hall counties, respectively.

Trends for the top ten counties of Latino registered voters are also important to notice. For example, all of the top ten counties experienced double digit growth rates between 2008 and 2016 elections with Forsyth County leading the way with 48.8% growth of Latino registered voters. Additionally, Latino voter participation rates and total votes cast both increased in all of the top ten counties.

In the top five congressional districts, the Latino vote was also very engaged. In fact, most of the Latino voter density resides in the Metro Atlanta Congressional districts and the voter participation rates of the top five districts outpaced national Latino voter participation rates. Latino voters in the Congressional Districts #6 and #7 had the highest Latino voter participation rates in the state with 60.6% and 57.93%, respectively. Furthermore, ten out of fourteen Congressional districts in Georgia had a higher Latino voter participation rate than the national Latino voter participation rate.

The Georgia Legislative districts also indicated both growth in total number of Latino registered voters and also the total rate of Latino voter participation. In fact, 95% of the top twenty Georgia State Senate districts and 88% of the top 25 Georgia State House of Representatives districts had a higher Latino voter participation rate as compared to the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%.

GALEO has focused over the years to promote voter engagement and much was accomplished in the 2016 election cycle with a combination of paid staff, part-time canvassers and a team of volunteers. The Georgia Latino Vote engagement process included registering new voters across the state and at naturalization ceremonies. Much of our Get Out To Vote (GOTV) activities consisted of the following activities targeting Gwinnett, Hall, Whitfield, DeKalb and Cobb counties: door knocks: 9,742 homes; face-to-face voter conversations: 2,775; live phone calls: 22,457; and, live phone voter conversations: 12,095.

The Latino vote and the engagement will only continue to grow and expand. The influence of the Latino electorate in Georgia will continue to be felt in future elections and all political parties, candidates and non-partisan groups must continue to do their outreach.



Statewide Latino Electorate

NALEO Methodology for Identifying Latino Voters

Latino voters were identified through the application of a "surname-match" process. Using a surname dictionary of 12,248 known Latino surnames, voter file records were cross-referenced for voters matching any of the 12,248 Latino surnames. Voters identified by our surname-match are then tagged as Latino in a field called "SurnameMatch".

The dictionary of Latino surnames used by the NALEO Educational Fund, contains a combination of surnames that have been known to capture up to 95% of the Latino population within a given list. In circumstances where auxiliary data on race and ethnicity is available (as is the case with Georgia's statewide voter file), individuals who may not possess a common Latino surname but self-identified as "Hispanic/Latino" on their registration form are also included in the final likely Latino voter count.

Limitations of Self-Identification for the Purpose of Tagging Latinos

Self-identification is treated as secondary-match criteria in this methodology. Although allowing people to self-identify their racial or ethnic group is a conventional method used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the collection of such information through voter registration forms is not a standardized practice nationwide. For purposes of comparability the primary match criteria applied in our Latino voter analyzes is the person's surname. Additionally, in Georgia, several limitations exist concerning the collection of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity information in voter registration forms and its use for analysis purposes.

 The Hispanic/Latino category in the question on race was not added to voter registration forms until 1999. Prior to 1999, respondents that considered themselves to be of Hispanic/Latino origin were only able to identify as White, Black, Asian, or Other. Further, it is very likely that voter registration forms without the Hispanic/Latino surname were not re-called or discontinued from use immediately after 1999. This means that not all persons registering to vote (registrants) were provided the opportunity to identify as



Hispanic/Latino.

- 2. Many registrants may not provide a response in the Race and Ethnicity box of the voter registration form. Such registrants are categorized as "Unknown" in the Race/Ethnicity field of the state's voter file. There a numerous reasons, we are unable to enumerate in detail here, for why registrants would chose to not provide a response (they might not feel it is relevant, fear of stating a racial or ethnic identification, or simply forgetting to provide a response). Non-response to the Race and Ethnicity box, then, introduces a significant degree of uncertainty to a meaningful analysis of Latino voters. Applying the surname-match criteria permits us to reduce this effect. We know that persons with a Latino surname are highly likely to be of Hispanic/Latino origin.
- 3. Because Latinos may be of any race, registrants may check off more than one racial category on their registration form. For example, a registrant may state that he/she is "White" and "Hispanic/Latino" (or any other Race-Hispanic/Latino combination). Additionally, Latino respondents who identify strongly with their national origin group may provide it [National Origin] as a response in the "Other" category. According to the Elections Division of the Georgia Secretary of State Office, registrants that provide multiple racial/ethnic responses, or that provide a Latino national origin write-in response, are classified as "Other."

For the reasons listed above, we feel that applying our surname-match methodology as the primary criteria for tagging potential Latino Voters is most effective. Secondary criteria (self-identification) allow us to increase our efficiency in tagging registered voters. Self-identification expands our count by including registrants who may not possess one of the 12,248 Latino surnames but identified as Hispanic/Latino.

However, it is extremely important to also consider the challenges presented by selfidentification as "White," "Black," and "Asian" by many registrants with common Latino surnames. A noticeable share of those registrants whom we identified as having a common Latino surname stated that they were "White," "Black," and in some cases "Asian"—**49,649** total. There are several factors to consider in a decision on whether or not to count these registrants as Latino.



- Many of these registrants registered before the Hispanic/Latino category was added to the Race and Ethnicity box of Georgia's voter registration form. Even those who registered after the category was added may not have registered using the new form. There is no certainty that after 1999 all registrants were provided with the opportunity to register using a new form with the Hispanic/Latino category.
- Latinos may be of any race and therefore many might associate racially as "White" or "Black" while still acknowledging that they are Mexican or Puerto Rican or any other Latino national origin identity.
- 3. Latinos may choose to identify with a racial category that they deem may be more acceptable in the broader community in which they live. For example a Latino living in a heavily white community with a small and dispersed Latino population may choose to identify as "White".
- 4. Finally, there are many human errors, which are introduced during the data entry phase of the voter file management process. Data entry personnel may have incorrectly entered a number of race-code entries into the race field for these registered voters. We have no real idea what the significance of this error might be but do feel it is an issue to consider in this process.

Further, research suggests that Latinos in Georgia are very likely to identify racially as "White." 2000 Census figures demonstrate that in Georgia 50% of adult citizens who said they were Hispanic/Latino also identified as racially "White." This means that a majority of Latinos eligible to register to vote consider themselves "White." This fact, in addition to the aforementioned considerations on the issue of self-identification are important to consider in your decision as to what figures are most appropriate for your analysis of Latino voters.

By the strict application of our surname-match methodology we have identified individuals as persons with surnames that indicate they are very likely to be of Latino origin. Because there are



many issues still to be resolved with racial/ethnic self-identification on Georgia's voter registration form, we believe that additional research is needed to address the issues we have listed above, before we could take self-identification as a full count of the number of Latinos registered to vote in the state.

Statewide Results

Georgia currently has self-identification as the basis of its voter file's indication of race/ethnicity. Below we provide a table of the overall self-identification results (Table 1) and the match results for the number of registered voters we identified as very likely Latino through surname-match, listed by self-identified racial categories (Table 2).

Results

Georgia Registered Voters by				
Self-Ider	Self-Identified Race Category			
Race/Ethnicity	Total	Electorate		
		Share		
Hispanic	162,670	2.44%		
White	3,726,834	55.87%		
Black	2,013,422	30.18%		
Asian	122,389	1.83%		
Other	87,847	1.32%		
Unknown	557,358	8.36%		
Total	6,670,520	100%		

Table 1: Registered Voters By Race



Georgia Latino Registered Voters					
Identified by L	Identified by Latino Surname Match,				
Listed by Self-I	dentified Ra	ace Category			
		% of			
Race/		Likely			
Ethnicity	Total	Latinos			
Hispanic	97,603	54.49%			
White	38,355	21.41%			
Black	8,891	4.96%			
Asian	2,403	1.34%			
Other	7,385	4.12%			
Unknown	24,474	13.66%			
Not	12	.01%			
Reported	12	.0170			
Total	179,123	100%			

 Table 2: Registered Voters Matched By Race

In "Table 3" we list the total number of voters in the Georgia statewide voter file that were identified as Latino/Hispanic. The total count in this figure represents those voters tagged through the surname-match and those voters who were not tagged through the surname-match but identified themselves as being "Hispanic/Latino" on their registration form.

Total Latino Voters in Georgia	244,190
Table 3: Total Latino Voters in Georgia	

Based upon the statewide voter data file and the analysis of this report as of November 2016, there were **244,190 Latino voters**, representing 3.66 % of the electorate in Georgia. As compared



to the 2012 analysis, the Latino electorate **grew by 60,224 new Latino registered voters** since the 2012 report³, representing a **growth rate of 25%**.

Election Year	Registered	Voted	% Voted
2008	145,991	78,525	53.8%
2012	183,966	86,666	47.1%
2016	244,190	130,068	53.3%

Finally, we provide the Latino voter participation rate in Table 4.

Table 4: Georgia Latino Voter Participation

The voter participation rate for the Latino electorate in Georgia was 53.3% in the November 2016 elections, increasing from 47.1% in 2012, showing a voter participation rate increase of 6.2%. Since 2012, the Georgia Latino electorate saw an increase of voter participation of 43,402 more Latino voters, which was an increase of 33.4% of Latino voters for the 2016 election cycle. As comparison, from 2008 through 2012, the number of Latino voters in the 2012 election had only grown 9.4%. So, the 2016 elections clearly saw a large increase in voter participation.

Age of the Georgia Latino Electorate

Age	Voted	Registered	Turnout
18-24	21,390	43,815	48.82%
25-39	39,583	86,334	45.85%
40-60	51,664	85,890	60.15%
61+	17,429	28,119	61.98%

Table 5: Age Breakdown of the Georgia Latino Electorate

The age breakdown of the Latino electorate in Georgia clearly indicated that it is a youthful electorate. The majority (53.3%) of the Latino electorate is under the age of 40 with only a small percentage of voters aged over 61 (11.5%). In fact the largest segment of the Latino registered voters is between 25-39 years of age. However, voter participation rates tend to be significantly

³ Gonzalez, Jerry. "Georgia's Latino Electorate in 2008: A significant segment of the electorate with high voter participation and engagement." GALEO. Published June 30, 2009. Available online: http://galeo.org/old/pdfs/063009GLVAnalysisTOTALv1.pdf.



higher (over 60%) for over 40 age groups and the same grouping accounted for over 53.1% of the total Latino vote that actually voted in the 2016 election.

Nationally, Millennials of all races (ages 18-35 in 2016) had a 49.4% voter participation rate, while Generation X of all races (ages between 36-51 in 2016) was 62.6%.⁴

Year Registered	Voted	Registered	Turnout
1941-1950	5	10	50.00%
1951-1960	30	43	69.77%
1961-1970	126	164	76.83%
1971-1980	615	738	83.33%
1981-1990	2,015	2,402	83.89%
1991-2000	12,127	16,490	73.54%
2001-2010	42,922	95,405	44.99%
2011-2016	72,228	128,938	56.02%

Dates of Voter Registration

Table 6: Dates of Voter Registration of Latino Voters

In Table 6, there is a clear indication of recent electoral participation by many of Georgia's Latino voters. During 2011-2016, Georgia experienced the greatest surge of Latino voter registrations: 128,938 new Latino voters, and making up 52.8% of the current Latino electorate. If the other most recent period (2001-2010) is also considered, the total would account for 91.9% of the Latino electorate. The most recent period of voter registration also indicated a robust voter participation in the November election with 56% voter turn out and accounted for 55.5% of the total Latino vote in November 2016. Those registered between 1981-1990 demonstrated the highest voter participation with 84% voter turn out but only accounted for 1.5% of the total Latino vote.

⁴ Krogstad, Jens Manuel and Mark Hugo Lopez. "Black voter turnout fell in 2016, even as a record number of Americans cast ballots." Pew Research Center. May 12, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/</u>.



Gender Breakdown

Sex	Voted	Registered	Turnout
Male	51,934	137,339	37.81%
Female	77,823	106,313	73.20%
Unknown	311	535	58.13%

Table 7: Gender of the Latino Electorate

The gender breakdown also indicates that there are more Latinos registered to vote than there are Latinas, where male voters account for 56.2% of the total Hispanic electorate. However, Hispanic female voters clearly dominated with voter participation rates of 73.2% as compared to Hispanic male voters with a mere 37.8% voter participation rate. Latina voters accounted for 59.8% of the Latino voters in the November 2016 election in Georgia.

For all women nationally, the voter participation rate was 63.3% in 2016; while among Latina voters nationally, the voter participation rate was 50%.⁵ Clearly, Latinas in Georgia lead the way both nationally and statewide with voter participation.

⁵ Krogstad, Jens Manuel and Mark Hugo Lopez. "Black voter turnout fell in 2016, even as a record number of Americans cast ballots." Pew Research Center. May 12, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/</u>.



Georgia Counties & Cities

Top Metro Atlanta Counties

County Name	Latino Voted Nov 2016	TOTAL Latino Registered Nov 2016	Nov 2016 Turnout %
Gwinnett	25,416	44,567	57.03%
Cobb	16,186	27,150	59.62%
Fulton	12,309	22,109	55.67%
DeKalb	8,262	14,508	56.95%
Hall	4,862	10,039	48.43%
Cherokee	4,449	7,568	58.79%
Clayton	3,331	6,900	48.28%
Forsyth	3,908	6,080	64.28%
Henry	3,023	5,557	54.40%
Paulding	2,054	3,591	57.20%

Table 8: Top 10 Metro Atlanta Counties

According to the Census Bureau as of July 2015, the Combined Statistical Area for Metro Atlanta is considered now to be 39 counties, with 24 central counties and 15 outlying counties.⁶ For space consideration, only the top ten counties in order of the total number of Latino Registered voters are included in Table 8. The data for all of the 159 counties in Georgia is available in Appendix A.

Gwinnett County

Gwinnett County lead the pack of metro Atlanta counties with 44,567 Latino registered voters. In the 2016 election, 57.0 % of these Latinos turned out to vote. Taken alone, Gwinnett County accounted for 18.3 % of the state's Latino electorate. According to the 2016 election summary results by the Georgia Secretary of State, Gwinnett County had a total of 431,727 registered voters and Latinos represented 10.32 % of the electorate, a growth from 2012 when it was only 8.24%.

In the 2016 election results, Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton lead Republican candidate Donald Trump by over 19,164 votes in Gwinnett County. In 2012, Republican candidate Mitt Romney won with 27,346 votes.

⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. CENSUS COMBINED STATISTICAL AREAS (CSAs), July 2015 (Available: <u>https://www.census.gov/population/metro/data/def.html</u>).



Another consideration for the continued growth of the Latino electorate and the growing impact in Gwinnett County, one has to consider the fact that Gwinnett County was designated by the U.S. Census Bureau to be one of the Voting Rights Act Section 203 covered jurisdictions for Spanish language inclusion for all elections as of December 2016. The county was one of 263 covered jurisdictions across the country required to provide language assistance to targeted language minority populations. This made Gwinnett County the only jurisdiction at that time to be included in the Census determination list, which was based upon data from the Census Bureau's 2010-2014 American Community Survey five-year estimates.⁷

GALEO and LatinoJustice had petitioned Gwinnett County to start the process in 2015 based upon Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act, which primarily protects Puerto Ricans' access to voting with specific criteria and does not require a numerical population threshold.⁸ Gwinnett County Board of Elections voted against moving forward with Spanish language access in 2015; however, the county now has to comply by the Census designation and is in current implementation of Spanish language access for all elections in the county, including local elections in 2017.

Having access to Spanish language elections information, processes and assistance can have an impact in enhanced voter participation within the Latino voting community which is not fluent in English.⁹ Given these developments, this report serves as a baseline of engagement prior to the expansion of Spanish language voting materials for Gwinnett County. More analysis will be necessary to follow the county's implementation process and outreach efforts to measure impact of voter participation.

Cobb County

Cobb County was in second place with a total number of Latino voters of 27,150 and 59.62% of them turned out to vote in the 2016 election. Taken alone, Cobb County accounted for 11.11% of the statewide Latino electorate. According to the 2016 election summary, Cobb County had a total of 423,890 registered voters. Latinos were 6.40% of the electorate in Cobb County.

⁷ Yeomans, Curt. "Census Bureau: Gwinnett must help Hispanic voters." Gwinnett Daily Post. December 6, 2016. Available online: <u>http://www.gwinnettdailypost.com/local/census-bureau-gwinnett-must-help-hispanic-voters/article_39e05364-1550-5243-b8f3-7bacc1cacafd.html</u>.

⁸ GALEO. "LatinoJustice and GALEO Join to Advocate for Spanish Voting Materials in Gwinnett and Hall counties." November 4, 2015. Available online: <u>http://galeo.org/latinojustice-and-galeo-join-to-advocate-for-spanish-voting-materials-in-gwinnett-and-hall-counties/</u>.

⁹ Hopkins, Daniel J. "Translating into Votes: The Electoral Impacts of Spanish-Language Ballots." American Journal of Political Science. July 27, 2011. Available online: <u>http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00534.x/full.</u>



In the 2016 election, Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton lead Republican candidate Donald Trump by 7,209 votes. In 2012, the Romney campaign was able to succeed in Cobb County with a margin of victory of 38,598 votes.

Fulton County

Fulton County had 22,109 Latino registered voters and came in third place for concentration of the Latino electorate. Fulton County had a 55.67% Latino voter participation rate in the 2016 election. According to the 2016 election summary, Fulton County had a total of 592,088 registered voters and Latinos accounted for 3.73% of the total electorate in Fulton County.

DeKalb and Hall Counties

DeKalb and Hall Counties rounded out the top 5 counties in the metro Atlanta area with 14,508 and 10,039 Latino registered voters, respectively. DeKalb County had a 56.95% Latino voter participation rate, while Hall County Latino voters were at 48.43% voter participation. According to the 2016 election summary, DeKalb County had a total of 420,663 registered voters and Latinos were 3.45% of the electorate in DeKalb County. Hall County had 90,803 registered voters and Latinos accounted for 11.06% of Hall County's electorate.

Forsyth County

Forsyth County tops the metro Atlanta area with the highest Latino voter participation rate at 64.28%. Forsyth County had 6,080 Latino registered voters and 3,908 of them voted in the 2016 elections. According to the 2016 election summary, Forsyth County had a total of 119,721 registered voters and Latinos were 5.08% of the electorate.

Other interesting facts about the Metro Atlanta area counties

Other interesting facts about the Metro Atlanta area counties during the 2016 election are as follows:

- The top ten counties (Gwinnett, Cobb, Fulton, DeKalb, Hall, Cherokee, Clayton, Forsyth, Henry and Paulding) represented 61% of the total Latino electorate in Georgia and accounted for 64% of the total statewide actual Latino vote in the 2016 election.
- The top six counties (Gwinnett, Cobb, Fulton, DeKalb, Hall, Cherokee) represent the majority, 52%, of the total Latino electorate in Georgia and accounted for 55% of the total actual statewide Latino vote in the 2016 election.



- Taken all together, the entire Metro Atlanta area (39 counties) accounted for 180,139 Latino registered voters, or 74% of the Georgia Latino electorate.
- However, in 2016 election in November, the 39 county metro-Atlanta area represented 58% of Georgia Latinos who actually voted in the 2016 election, accounted for 74,815 votes.

Hall County and the City of Gainesville

Hall County was ranked as the fifth county with the total number of Latino registered voters accounted for a total of 10,039. Hall County had a Latino voter participation rate of 48.43% in the 2016 election, which was a significant increase over the 2012 Latino voter participation rate of 36.8%.

According to the 2012 election summary issued by the Georgia Secretary of State, Hall County had a total of 85,079 registered voters and Latinos were 8.34% of the electorate in Hall County. In 2016, Hall County had 90,806 voters and Latinos were 11.06% of the overall electorate in Hall County and demonstrated growing importance.

The City of Gainesville is located within Hall County. GALEO continues efforts to urge for the elimination of at-large voting for its local elections because of concerns of violations of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The City of Gainesville has an at-large voting process that diminishes the Latino and African American communities' ability to elect candidates of choice. Several Latino candidates have run and lost in past local elections. According to the 2010 Census numbers used for the city's approved redistricting, three out of the five wards have a majority of Latino population (Ward 3: 54%; Ward 4: 56%; Ward 5: 61%); one ward has a majority Citizen Voting Age Population (Ward 5: 55%).¹⁰

Year	Registered	Voted	Turnout
2012	1,583	488	30.8%
2016	2,259	951	42.1%

Table 9: City of Gaines	wille Latino Electorate
-------------------------	-------------------------

In Table 9, we look at the increased strength of the Latino electorate in Gainesville. In 2012, Latinos voters totaled 1,583, and accounted for 22% of Hall County Latino voters. However, only 488 Latino Gainesville voters voted in the 2012 election, an astoundingly low voter participation

¹⁰ City of Gainesville, Georgia. Plan name: GAINESCCSB-PROP2RE. Date: July 25, 2011.



rate of 30.8%. In 2016, Latinos voters totaled 2,259 within the City of Gainesville, which accounted for 22.5% of all Latino voters in Hall County. In the 2016 election, 951 voters turned out to vote, accounting for 42.10% voter participation within the city. Taken alone, the voter participation rate may seem low. However, given the several years of work within the City of Gainesville by volunteers and GALEO staff working on voter registration and outreach of the Latino electorate, the increase of voter participation rate from 30.8% in 2012 to 42.10% in 2016 is significant and the total number of Latino voters within the city limits nearly doubled.

GALEO, along with the League of Women Voters of Georgia, have also taken an active role in attending the monthly Board of Elections meetings in Hall County. Under a very unique set of circumstances of the Elections Director and an Elections Board member resigning within close succession after the 2016 election, GALEO was able to work with some of the remaining Election Board members to move forward an initiative to expand Spanish language access.¹¹ Expanding access to voting by providing information in Spanish to the voters in the county that need that assistance is essential in further Latino engagement in voting. GALEO and LatinoJustice will continue to work to move the county forward with implementation using Gwinnett County as a guide.

Whitfield County and the City of Dalton

Whitfield County had the seventh largest concentration of Latino voters in the state with 7,157 Latinos registered to vote. As was the case in Hall County, the Latino voter turnout in Whitfield County produced 3,663 Latino voters, and accounted for a 51.2% Latino voter participation rate. Whitfield County had a total of 39,523 voters and Latinos were 18.11% of the total electorate, making Whitfield County the highest share of Latino voters anywhere as compared to the overall county electorate.

The City of Dalton is the population center for Whitefield County. Similar to the City of Gainesville, the City of Dalton also has an at-large voting process and several city districts that have a majority Latino community presence. GALEO also opposes the at-large voting process in Dalton because it does dilute Latino voter impact and denies Latino voters the ability to elect candidates of choice, raising once again potential violations of the Voting Rights Act, Section 2.

¹¹ GALEO. "GALEO Applauds Hall County Board of Elections for Moving forward with Bilingual Voting Access & Materials for Elections." April 4, 2017. Available online: <u>http://galeo.org/galeo-applauds-hall-county-board-elections-moving-forward-bilingual-voting-access-materials-elections/</u>.



Year	Registered	Voted	Turnout
2012	2,451	881	35.94%
2016	3,335	1,723	51.66%
Table 10: City of Dalton Latino Electorate			

Table 10: City of Dalton Latino Electorate

In Table 10, there are 3,335 Latino voters in the City of Dalton, which accounts for 46.6% of the Latino electorate in Whitfield County. The Latino voter participation rate for the City of Dalton was 51.6% (1,723 Latino voters). For comparison, the number of Latinos who voted in 2016 as compared to 2012 nearly doubled in number and the overall Latino voter participation rate jumped from 35.9% to nearly 52%. Once again, the Latino electorate increased its strength both in numbers and voter engagement.

County Name	Latino Reg. Voters 2008	Latinos Voted 2008	% Voted 2008	Latino Reg. Voters 2012	Latinos Voted 2012	% Voted 2012	Latino Reg. Voters 2016	Latino Voted Nov 2016	Nov 2016 Turnout %
Gwinnett	24,537	13,710	55.87%	32,623	16,053	49.21%	44,567	25,416	57.03%
Cobb	16,365	9,603	58.68%	20,044	10,589	52.83%	27,150	16,186	59.62%
Fulton	13,004	7,285	56.02%	16,352	7,800	47.70%	22,109	12,309	55.67%
DeKalb	9,223	5,413	58.69%	10,814	5,712	52.82%	14,508	8,262	56.95%
Hall	5,246	2,395	45.65%	7,095	2,614	36.84%	10,039	4,862	48.43%
Cherokee	4,295	2,585	60.19%	5,570	3,020	54.22%	7,568	4,449	58.79%
Whitfield	4,066	1,794	44.12%	5,283	1,891	35.79%	7,157	3,663	51.18%
Clayton	4,255	2,106	49.49%	5,326	2,346	44.05%	6,900	3,331	48.28%
Chatham	3,736	1,860	49.79%	4,576	1,975	43.16%	6,157	2,703	43.90%
Forsyth	3,112	2,028	65.17%	4,242	2,468	58.18%	6,080	3,908	64.28%

Trends in the Top 10 Counties of Latino Registered Voters

Table 11: Top 10 Counties (2008, 2012, 2016)

In Table 11, the counties were ranked by 2016 figures of total number of Latino registered voters. All counties listed experienced double-digit growth rates between 2008 and 2016. Forsyth County experienced the largest growth rate of 48.8% of registered Latino voters between 2008-2016, accounting for 2,968 new Latino voters. Hall County experienced the second largest growth rate of 47.7% of Latino registered voters and accounted for 4,793 new Latino voters. Next, Gwinnett County experienced a growth of 20,030 new Latino voters in eight short years, a 44.9%



growth rate. Whitfield County had the fourth largest growth rate of 43.2% and added 3,091 new Latino voters. Similarly positioned growth as Whitfield County, Cherokee County came in with 3,272 new Latino voters with a growth rate of 43.3%.¹²

Looking at voter participation rates, Whitfield County had the largest jump in Latino voter participation between 2012 and 2016 with an increase of 15.4%. The second highest jump in Latino voter participation rate came in Hall County with an increase of 11.6% between 2012 and 2016 election years. Fulton County came in third place with an increase of 7.97% more Latino voter participation rate while Gwinnett County was closely behind with an increased rate of 7.82% Latino voter participation rate. All of the top ten counties saw an increase of Latino votes cast greater than 26% since the 2012 election.

¹² Appendix B has full growth rate data.



District	U.S. Representative	Party	Latino Voted	Latino Registered	Latino Turnout %
	Earl L. "Buddy"				
1	Carter	R	6,410	15,177	42.23%
	Sanford D.				
2	Bishop Jr.	D	3,435	8,538	40.23%
3	Drew Ferguson	R	7,420	13,782	53.84%
	Henry "Hank"				
4	Johnson	D	8,409	15,639	53.77%
5	John Lewis	D	7,841	15,033	52.16%
6	Tom Price	R	13,930	22,986	60.60%
7	Rob Woodall	R	22,326	38,542	57.93%
8	Austin Scott	R	4,582	9,964	45.99%
9	Doug Collins	R	9,172	18,070	50.76%
10	Jody Hice	R	7,383	13,122	56.26%
	Barry				
11	Loudermilk	R	13,894	24,135	57.57%
12	Rick Allen	R	5,329	11,404	46.73%
13	David Scott	D	10,991	19,914	55.19%
14	Tom Graves	R	8,938	17,755	50.34%

Congressional Districts in Georgia and Latino Registered Voters

 Table 12: Latino Electorate in Congressional Districts

In Table 12, the analysis considered the Congressional districts. To begin with, the Latino electorate was the most numerous in the district held by U.S. Representative Rob Woodall (R-7), and the district includes most of Gwinnett County. The Latino electorate in Congressman Woodall's district accounted for 38,542 voters and 22,326 turned out to vote in the 2016 election surpassing by 10.3 % the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%. Clearly, the voter participation demonstrated an actively engaged Latino voting community.

The second most numerous Latino electorate in a Georgia Congressional district is the one represented by U.S. Representative Barry Loudermilk (R-11), with a total of 24,135 Latino voters. These voters outperformed the national Latino voter participation rate by 10.0 %.

The third place Congressional District is the 6th and has its own section because of the



recent electoral activity for the special election to replace U.S. Representative Tom Price.

Rounding out the top five Congressional districts of Latino voters are those represented by Congressmen David Scott (D-13) and Doug Collins (R-9), respectively. U.S. Representative David Scott's (D-13) district accounts for 19,914 Latino voters with a voter participation rate of 55.2 %. U.S. Representative Doug Collins (R-9) accounts for 18,070 Latino voters, of which 9,172 (50.8 %) turned out to vote in the 2016 election.

The top five Congressional Districts with Latino voter density are primarily in the greater metro Atlanta area, accounting for 123,647 Latino registered voters or 50.6 % of the total Latino electorate in the state. All of the top five Congressional Districts also had a voter participation rate higher than the national average of 47.6 %. In fact, ten out of fourteen Congressional Districts in Georgia had a higher Latino voter participation rate than the national Latino voter participation rate than the national Latino voter participation rate than the national Latino voter participation rate.

For comparison to the 2012 election and based upon the data in the previous report, we saw a significant increase in both the growth rate and participation rates of Latino voters across the state¹³. All Congressional districts experienced double digit growth of Latino voters and voter participation amongst the Latino electorate also increase in all of the districts.

The Congressional District with the highest growth rate of Latino voters was the 5th district with a 39.6 % increase in Latino registered voters. The 5th Congressional district had 12,058 Latino voters in 2012 and it increased to 15,639 in 2016. Congressional District 9 also saw an increase of 39.2 % of new Latino voters from 2012-2016, while the Congressional Districts 10, 7 and 11 saw an increase of new Latino voters of 38.8 %, 37.4 % and 35.6 %, respectively.

The increase in growth rates of Latino voter participation in all Congressional Districts was also noteworthy. The highest growth rate of Latino voter turnout was for the Congressional District 14 with 10.9 % increase in Latino voter participation in the 2016 election as compared to the 2012 election. Similarly, Congressional District 9 had an increase of Latino voter participation by 10.0 %. Rounding out the top five Congressional Districts of increase of Latino voter turn out would be Congressional Districts 7, 11 and 6, with an increase of participation between 2012-2016 general elections of 7.5 %, 6.8 % and 6.5 %, respectively.¹⁴

¹³ Gonzalez, Jerry. "The Continued Growth of the Latino Electorate in Georgia: Latino electorate reaches 183,966 voters and Metro Atlanta Counties lead." GALEO.org. August 6, 2013. Available online: http://galeo.org/old/pdfs/2012GALatinoVoters.pdf.

¹⁴ Appendix C includes full data.



Georgia's 6th District Congressional

To complete this section of Congressional districts, special attention is provided to the 6th Congressional District, which comes in third place ranking for the total number of Latino registered voters. This district had 22,986 Latino voters in the Congressional district as of the 2016 election in November. The Latino voters in this district also out performed the national Latino voter participation rate by 13.0 %. In fact, Congressional District 6 had the highest Latino voter participation rate of all of the Congressional districts in the state at 60.6 %.

Clearly, the most recent Congressional special election to replace former U.S. Representative Tome Price (R-6) garnered national attention as one of the most expensive Congressional campaigns in history¹⁵. There were a total of 18 candidates running for the nonpartisan special election, which was held on April 18, 2017. In the April 2017 election, none of the candidates won over 50% of the vote, so a runoff was scheduled for June 20, 2017. The two candidates that advanced from the April 18th election were Democratic Candidate Jon Ossoff with 48.1% and Karen Handel with 19.8% of the vote.¹⁶ Overall voter turn out for the election was high for a special election and reached 43.5%.¹⁷

In the June 20th runoff election, Karen Handel won the election with 51.9% of the vote over Ossoff with a margin of over 9,000 votes. ¹⁸Based upon our surname match analysis, the Latino electorate continued to perform well for a special election. Based on some of our internal analysis of the voter files, Latino voter turn out for the special elections were 25.8% and 37.9% for the April and then June elections, respectively. With regards to gender and voter participation in the 2017 special elections, Latinas also lead in voter participation in both the April and June special elections. Considering low voter turn out for primary elections of the Latino electorate, clearly there was motivation and outreach for the electorate to go out and vote.

GALEO conducted voter engagement activities in the 6th Congressional District with doorto-door canvassing and phone banking activities to educate Latino voters about the special elections and to encourage nonpartisan voter participation by those contacted. For the April 18th

¹⁵ Pathe, Simone. "It's Election Day in the Most Expensive House Race Ever." RollCall.com. June 20, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.rollcall.com/news/politics/most-expensive-house-race-jon-ossoff-karen-handel</u>. ¹⁶ Georgia Secretary of State. Election Results. Available online:

http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/67317/Web02-state/#/. Accessed on June 27, 2017. ¹⁷ NOTE: Georgia Secretary of State calculates voter participation rates while taking into account "Active Voters" and then dividing that by those who voted. For the purposes of voter turn out in the rest of this report, GALEO uses all registered voters (Active & Inactive).

¹⁸ Finnigan, Brandon. "Georgia Sixth Congressional District Special." Available online (accessed July 1, 2017): <u>https://decisiondeskhq.com/results/georgia-sixth-congressional-district-special/</u>.



election, GALEO made 1,829 attempts at door-to-door contact and had 403 face-to-face conversations with people at the doors; and, for the ones we contacted, 27.3% went to vote while those we didn't speak with but did go to their homes had a 12.2% voter participation rate. Additionally, GALEO phone dialed 4,055 voters and accomplished 81 phone conversations with voters. For the June 20th runoff special election, GALEO accomplished 3,419 door-to-door attempts and successfully spoke with 1,029 voters at their doors; and, 46.7% of the people GALEO had conversations with vote, while only 30.6% of the people whose doors GALEO knocked, but didn't canvass, voted. Clearly, having face-to-face conversations with people increased their likelihood of going to cast a ballot. Phone banking was a bit more of a challenge because of the national attention to the election; however, GALEO was able to make 1,744 phone calls and had 249 conversations with Latino voters. Given the level of engagement, GALEO had an impact in turning out the Latino vote for both of the special elections.

Georgia Legislative Districts

The analysis of the growing Latino electorate is also important at the state legislative level. As the state continues to grow and diversify, the Latino electorate continues its growth in Georgia Legislative Districts and legislators and candidates for office must begin to pay attention to the growing influence of Latino voters.



Top 20 Georgia State Senate Districts

District	Name	Party	2016 Latinos Voted	2016 Latino Registered	2016 Latino Turnout %
5	Curt Thompson	D	6,771	12,904	52.47%
	Renee				
45	Unterman	R	5,982	9,743	61.40%
49	Butch Miller	R	4,559	9,368	48.67%
54	Chuck Payne	R	4,445	8,816	50.42%
9	P. K. Martin	R	5,027	8,170	61.53%
	Michael Rhett				
33	Α.	D	4,518	8,063	56.03%
48	David Shafer	R	4,141	7,223	57.33%
37	Lindsey Tippins	R	4,000	6,507	61.47%
40	Fran Millar	R	3,721	6,435	57.82%
	Michael				
27	Williams	R	3,861	5,992	64.44%
6	Hunter Hill	R	3,313	5,978	55.42%
56	John Albers	R	3,445	5,822	59.17%
	Bruce				
14	Thompson	R	3,165	5,790	54.66%
41	Steve Henson	D	3,182	5,754	55.30%
32	Judson Hill	R	3,774	5,669	66.57%
21	Brandon Beach	R	3,477	5,615	61.92%
1	Ben Watson	R	2,300	5,226	44.01%
47	Frank Ginn	R	2,539	4,562	55.66%
42	Elena Parent	D	2,678	4,530	59.12%
34	Valencia Seay	D	2,189	4,529	48.33%

 Table 13: Top 20 Georgia State Senate Districts

The order of ranking in Table 13 lists the top 20 State Senate Districts according to the highest number of Latino registered voters in each of the respective State Senate districts.

Topping the list of largest Latino electorate in a Georgia Senate District is District 5, represented by State Senator Curt Thompson (D-5). District 5 had 12,904 Latino registered voters, and had a total of 6,771 voters cast ballots in the 2016 election with a voter participation rate of 52.47%, which was higher than the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%. This district is in Gwinnett County.



Georgia State Senator Renee Unterman (R-45) represents the second most-dense Senate District with Latino registered voters. In Senate District 45, there were 9,743 Latinos registered to vote and they accounted for 5,982 votes in the 2016 election. The Latino voter participation rate in this district was 61.4%, 13.8% higher than the national Latino voter participation rate (47.6%). Georgia State Senate District 45 is also in Gwinnett County.

Senator Unterman is infamous in the Latino community due to the offensive and disparaging speech that she gave in 2011 in support of Georgia's HB87. During her speech in the Georgia State Senate, Senator Unterman explained her support for racial profiling by law enforcement officials in Gwinnett County, specifically referencing support for the 287 (g) federal immigration program. Latino community members believe Gwinnett County law enforcement officials are abusing their powers and implementing racial profiling tactics. In her wide-ranging speech, she demonstrated a strong level of hostility towards immigrants in general and condemned demographic changes in Gwinnett County. Part of her speech indicated a perceived drain on public resources and she concluded that she "didn't want to take care of Mexico's people."¹⁹

Georgia State Senator Butch Miller (R-49) represents the third largest concentration of Latino registered voters, accounting for 9,368 people. District 49 is in Hall County and encompasses the City of Gainesville. Latino voter participation in the 2016 election was 48.67%, for the first time surpassing the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%. As contrast to the 2012 election, only 2,461 Latino votes were cast, which was a 37.3% Latino voter participation rate. More Latinos were registered to vote and more showed up to vote in the 2016 election, which saw a jump of 11.37 % of Latino voter participation rate between 2012 and 2016 election.

Next, Georgia Senate District 54, represented by State Senator Chuck Payne (R-54), accounts for 8,816 Latino registered voters. District 54 accounted for 4,445 Latino votes in the 2016 election, another high Latino voter participation rate of 50.42%, as compared to the low Latino voter participation rate of 36.1% in 2012. Once again, we did see a dramatic jump of 14.32% voter participation from within the Latino electorate in this 2016 election as compared to the 2012 election. This Senate District is part of Whitfield County and the City of Dalton.

Moving back to Gwinnett County, District 9 is represented by Georgia State Senator P.K. Martin (R). The Senator represents 8,170 Latino registered voters. During the 2016 election this

¹⁹ GALEO. "GA Sen. Renee Unterman's Speech in Support of HB87: 'I don't want to take care of Mexico's people.'" Video Posted on YouTube.com. August 8, 2011. Available online: <u>http://youtu.be/H0yrxLaJlUc</u>



District had a high Latino voter participation rate of 61.53%, 13.93% above the Latino national voter participation rate (47.6%).

Leading the pack on Latino voter participation were Districts 32 and 27 represented by Georgia State Senators Judson Hill (R) and Michael Williams (R), respectively. District 32 accounted for 5,669 Latino voters and 3,774 (66.57%) turned out to vote in the 2016 election, a voter participation rate of 18.97% above the national Latino participation rate (47.6%). District 27 accounted for 5,992 Latino registered voters and 3,861 turned out to vote in the 2016 election, a Latino voter participation rate of 64.44%. This voter turn out rate was 16.84% higher than the national Latino voter participation rate (47.6%).

Ninety-five percent (95% or 19/20 Senate Districts) of the top 20 Georgia Senate Districts listed above surpassed the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%. In the 2012 election, only 55% of the top 20 Georgia Senate Districts performed above the national Latino voter participation rate. In addition, the top 20 Georgia Senate Districts represent 56% of the total Latino electorate statewide.



Top 25 Georgia House of Representative Districts

	2016 2016 20						
			Latinos	Latinos	Voter Turnout		
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%		
4	Bruce Broadrick, Sr.	R	2,349	4,604	51.02%		
100	Dewey McClain	D	2,216	4,376	50.64%		
101	Samuel Park	R	2,298	3,990	57.59%		
30	Emory Dunahoo, Jr.	R	1,937	3,768	51.41%		
99	Brenda Lopez	D	1,800	3,556	50.62%		
96	Pedro "Pete" Marin	D	1,841	3,549	51.87%		
107	David Casas	R	1,987	3,397	58.49%		
29	Matt Dubnik	R	1,415	3,353	42.20%		
104	Chuck Efstration	R	2,011	3,315	60.66%		
41	Michael Smith	D	1,807	3,268	55.29%		
102	Buzz Brockway	R	1,955	3,202	61.06%		
98	David Clark	R	1,773	2,898	61.18%		
103	Timothy Barr	R	1,669	2,787	59.89%		
6	Jason Ridley	R	1,391	2,760	50.40%		
105	Joyce Chandler	R	1,591	2,643	60.20%		
42	Stacey Evans	D	1,169	2,514	46.50%		
108	Clay Cox	R	1,505	2,480	60.69%		
35	Ed Setzler	R	1,508	2,407	62.65%		
38	David Wilkerson	D	1,387	2,345	59.15%		
168	Al Williams	D	875	2,340	37.39%		
97	Brooks Coleman	R	1,430	2,314	61.80%		
81	Scott Holcomb	D	1,258	2,234	56.31%		
44	Don Parsons	R	1,409	2,230	63.18%		
46	John Carson	R	1,452	2,187	66.39%		
37	Sam Teasley	R	1,294	2,173	59.55%		

 Table 14: Top 25 Georgia House of Representative Districts

Table 14 demonstrated the top 25 Georgia House Legislative Districts ranked in order of the total number of Latino registered voters in the respective districts.

Topping the table is House District #4, based in Dalton and represented by Georgia State Representative Bruce Broadrick, Sr. (R-HD4). The district has 4,604 registered Latino voters. During the 2016 election, 2,349 Latino votes were cast, for a 51.02% Latino voter participation rate coming in at 3.42% above the national Latino voter participation rate (47.6%). In 2012, the Latino voter participation rate in this district was only 35.5%, which indicates it increased 15.52% with



more Latino voters registered and more Latino voters actually voting.

Secondly, District 100 in Gwinnett County makes the list because of 4,376 Latino registered voters, with a Latino voter participation rate of 50.64%, which was also higher than the national Latino voter participation rate. The House District was represented by Georgia State Representative Dewey McClain (D-100).

Next, District 101 moves in with 3,990 Latino registered voters and is now represented by Georgia State Representative Sam Park (D-101), also from Gwinnett County. The Latino voter participation rate in this district was 57.59% outperforming the national rate by 9.99%.

Fourth in the ranking is Georgia House District 30 is represented by Georgia State Representative Emory Dunahoo, Jr. (R-30). There are 3,768 Latino registered voters in the district, which had high Latino voter participation rate of 51.41%, accounting for 1,937 votes on election day in 2016.

In fifth place, what is considered the Latino majority (by population) State House Legislative District in Gwinnett County, which is District 99. The district is now represented by Georgia State Representative Brenda Lopez (D-99) with 3,556 Latino registered voters. The Latino voter participation rate was a strong 50.62% as compared to the 2012 election of only 38.6%, which means that the Latino voter participation rate in this district increased by 12.02% between the 2012 and 2016 General Elections in November. Rep. Brenda Lopez is the first Latina legislator in Georgia's history. In the 2016 Democratic primary election in which Lopez won, 231 Latino voters went to the polls to vote. Lopez won the election with a total of 566 votes cast (58% of the total) with a margin of victory of 154 votes.²⁰

The highest Latino voter participation rate of 66.39% in the top 25 ranking on the House of Representative Districts is District 46, represented by Georgia State Representative John Carson (R-46) located in Marietta, in Cobb County.

Finally, 88% of the top 25 House Districts outperformed the national Latino voter participation rate, which means 22 out of 25 House Districts surpassed the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%.

²⁰ Georgia Secretary of State 2016 Primary Election Results. Available: <u>http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/60041/174358/en/summary.html</u>.



Latino Georgia State Representatives Marin and Casas

It is important to take note that the additional two Latino Georgia State Representatives come in sixth and seventh place in the rankings; both districts are located in Gwinnett County.

In sixth place, Georgia House District 96, represented by Georgia State Representative Pedro Marin (D-96). District 96 had 3,549 Latino registered voters in the 2016 General election and accounted for 1,841 votes with a 51.87% Latino voter participation rate.

During the last redistricting process, Georgia State Representative Marin (D-96), an outspoken pro-immigrants rights legislator, was provided with a Republican performing legislative district. GALEO opposed the district as drawn in 2011 during the preclearance process for House District #96 because it diluted the Latino population from 44% (39% Citizen Voting Age Population) to 34% (30% Citizen Voting Age Population).²¹ However despite the challenges of redistricting and low performing previous election turn out rates, Georgia State Representative Pedro Marin (D-96) won re-election in 2016 with his largest margin of victory (3,345 votes) in his legislative history.²²

Finally, we highlight District 107 in seventh place of the ranking of Latino registered voters and represented by Georgia State Representative David Casas (R-107). District 107 has 3,397 Latino registered voters and accounted for 1,987 votes on election day (58.49% voter participation rate). He faced no opposition in the 2016 general election.

Both districts outperformed the national Latino voter participation rate of 47.6%, where District 96 had a 51.87% Latino voter participation rate and District 107 had a 58.79% Latino voter participation rate.

²¹ Gonzalez, Jerry. "Proposed Georgia Legislative Redistricting Maps are Retrogressive against the Latino Community." Letter to the U.S. Department of Justice opposing preclearance for Georgia's redistricting plan. Submission #201-4182. November 14, 2011.

²² Georgia Secretary of State General Election Results, November 6, 2016. Available online: <u>http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/63991/184321/en/summary.html</u>



Conclusion

The Latino electorate continues to grow and engage in the State of Georgia despite the hostile environment of many years of anti-immigrant policies and politics. At 244,190 strong in 2016 and with 25% growth rate since the 2012 election, the Latino electorate is poised to continue its growth and influence in future elections in Georgia. The Latino electorate in Georgia also outpaced the national Latino voter participation rate (47.6%) with a 53.3% Latino voter participation and grew by 33% from 2012 in total number of actual voters who cast a ballot in 2016. Latinas in Georgia lead the way with an historic 73% voter participation rate.

As a base of comparison, the state of Texas saw an increase of 30% more of Latino voters since the 2012 election.²³ Additionally, the Texas Latino voter participation rate was only at 40.5%.²⁴ Nationally, Latino voters, along with many voters of color, had high rates of not voting in the 2016 election. In fact, it is estimated that 25% of Latino voters nationally didn't vote in the 2016 election because they primarily didn't like the candidates or they thought their vote didn't matter.²⁵ There were more Latino nonvoters nationally than there were actual Latino voters.²⁶ Clearly, Georgia was not a state where that trend was dominant and many Latino voters did make it to the polls on election day.

In 2016, the margin of victory for the Trump campaign to win Georgia's electoral college votes was 211,141 votes, with 76.5% voter turn out in the state.²⁷ In 2012, the Romney campaign claimed Georgia's electoral votes with a margin of 304,861 votes with a statewide voter participation rate of 72.19%.²⁸

²³ Associated Press. "Report: Number of Latinos who voted in 2016 surged from 2012." February 13, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.startribune.com/report-number-of-latinos-who-voted-in-2016-surged-from-</u>2012/413620293/. Accessed on February 5, 2017.

²⁴ Ura, Alexa and Ryan Murphy. "Despite high expectations for 2016, no surge in Texas Hispanic voter turnout." The Texas Tribune. May 11, 2017. Available online: <u>https://www.texastribune.org/2017/05/11/hispanic-turnout-2016-election/</u>.

²⁵ Latina Lista. "New census analysis reveals Latino non-voters helped Trump win." July 15, 2017. Accessed online: <u>http://latinalista.com/new-headline/new-census-analysis-reveals-latino-non-voters-helped-trump-win</u>.

²⁶ Krogstad, Jens Manuel and Mark Hugo Lopez. "Black voter turnout fell in 2016, even as a record number of Americans cast ballots." Pew Research Center. May 12, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/</u>.

²⁷ Georgia Secretary of State. Election Results 2016. Available online: http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/63991/184321/en/vts.html?cid=5000.

²⁸ Georgia Secretary of State. Election Results 2012. Available online: <u>http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/42277/113204/en/summary.html</u>.



GALEO, along with other civic engagement groups, have been assisting newly naturalized citizens with voter registration at federal naturalization ceremonies. The efforts are in response to Georgia's citizenship verification process, which tended to cause many problems with newly naturalized U.S. citizens. The initiative began as a collaborative between the civic engagement groups, Georgia's Secretary of State Brian Kemp and U.S.C.I.S. At the ceremonies, civic engagement group trained volunteers assist new U.S. citizens with their voter registration process and make onsite copies of the naturalization certificates to provide both proof of identity and also provide proof of U.S. citizenship. The initiative began in August 2013 and has continued today. Between August 2013 and May 2017, 20,242 new voters have been assisted. Nationally, the number of naturalized citizen voters reached 10.8 million in 2016, which was an increase as compared to 2012 of only 9.3 million. Turn out of naturalized-citizen voters was 54.3%.²⁹

In the 2016 election, GALEO was actively assisting voters with their voter registration process by phone and in person. Additionally, GALEO was also active with active voter participation efforts during the early voting period and leading up to the November 2016 election. In all, GALEO was able to visit 9,742 homes and have 2,775 face-to-face conversations at the doors with voters. For the voters which we had conversations with at the doors in the November 2016 election, 68.3% of the people actually cast a ballot, while only 50.1% of the people whose doors GALEO knocked, but didn't have conversations with, actually voted. Once again, face-to-face conversations increase the likelihood of voters turning out to vote. Furthermore, GALEO had a robust phone banking voter engagement efforts and made over 22,457 phone calls, while having 12,095 phone conversations with voters. GALEO focused door-to-door efforts in Gwinnett, Cobb, Hall and Whitfield Counties. The counties clearly had significant increases in Latino registered voters and also in Latino voter participation.

Clearly, the electorate in Georgia is changing quickly and the Latino community is an integral part of the electorate that should be targeted, respected and courted by all political parties in the state. As the Latino community continues to grow in numbers and influence, elected officials and candidates should begin to pay attention to this important demographic in Georgia.

²⁹ Krogstad, Jens Manuel and Mark Hugo Lopez. "Black voter turnout fell in 2016, even as a record number of Americans cast ballots." Pew Research Center. May 12, 2017. Available online: <u>http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/</u>.



GALEO: "2016: The Latino Electorate in Georgia Continues To Grow and To Vote"

Appendix A:

County Totals, Turn Out and Share of the Electorate for 2016

July 6, 2017 www.GALEO.org / #GALatinoVote / #iamGALEO

	2015		Latino Voted	TOTAL Latino Registered	Nov 2016	TOTAL # Voters Nov	% Latino Share of Electorate
County#	CSA	County Name	Nov 2016	Nov 2016	Turnout %	2016	Nov 2016
1		Appling	98	263	37.26%	9,258	2.84%
2		Atkinson	126	287	43.90%	3,705	7.75%
3		Bacon	50	119	42.02%	5,397	2.20%
4		Baker	8	29	27.59%	1,977	1.47%
5		Baldwin	170	293	58.02%	21,074	1.39%
6		Banks	115	238	48.32%	8,584	2.77%
7	2	Barrow	1,236	2,270	54.45%	37,214	6.10%
8	2	Bartow	1,066	2,178	48.94%	52,240	4.17%
9		Ben Hill	81	185	43.78%	7,903	2.34%
10		Berrien	83	214	38.79%	8,675	2.47%
11		Bibb	632	1,245	50.76%	86,872	1.43%
12		Bleckley	40	. 77	51.95%	6,167	1.25%
13		Brantley	55	132	41.67%	8,314	1.59%
14		Brooks	87	195	44.62%	8,654	2.25%
15		Bryan	493	1,030	47.86%	20,164	5.11%
16		Bulloch	427	826	51.69%	34,800	2.37%
17		Burke	70	166	42.17%	12,485	1.33%
18	2	Butts	135	238	56.72%	12,542	1.90%
19	_	Calhoun	8	20	40.00%	2,689	0.74%
20		Camden	540	1,312	41.16%	25,326	5.18%
21		Candler	87	188	46.28%	4,692	4.01%
22	2	Carroll	838	1,756	47.72%	57,292	3.07%
23	-	Catoosa	347	699	49.64%	34,845	2.01%
24		Charlton	24	49	48.98%	5,161	0.95%
25		Chatham	2,703	6,157	43.90%	155,372	3.96%
26		Chattahoochee	57	377	15.12%	2,513	15.00%
27		Chattooga	54	158	34.18%	11,112	1.42%
28	1	Cherokee	4,449	7,568	58.79%	138,922	5.45%
29	1	Clarke	1,605	2,906	55.23%	60,532	4.80%
30	-	Clay	3	7	42.86%	1,739	0.40%
31	1	Clayton	3,331	6,900	48.28%	134,621	5.13%
32		Clinch	16	31	51.61%	3,498	0.89%
33	1	Cobb	16,186	27,150	59.62%	423,890	6.40%
34		Coffee	367	834	44.00%	18,908	4.41%
35		Colquitt	383	1,019	37.59%	18,474	5.52%
36		Columbia	2,072	3,859	53.69%	81,436	4.74%
37		Cook	66	188	35.11%	8,010	2.35%
38	1	Coweta	1,835	3,285	55.86%	78,796	4.17%
39	-	Crawford	34	84	40.48%	6,529	1.29%
40		Crisp	55	117	47.01%	10,262	1.14%
40		Dade	38	132	28.79%	8,593	1.14%
41	2	Dawson	178	316	56.33%	14,591	2.17%
42	2	Decatur	178	310	43.85%	13,838	2.17%
43	1	DeKalb	8,262	14,508	43.85% 56.95%	420,663	3.45%
	1		0,202	GALEO.		720,003	5.4570

	2015		Latino Voted	TOTAL Latino Registered	Nov 2016	TOTAL # Voters Nov	% Latino Share of Electorate
County#	CSA	County Name	Nov 2016	Nov 2016	Turnout %	2016	Nov 2016
45		Dodge	56	119	47.06%	9,224	1.29%
46		Dooly	31	122	25.41%	5,313	2.30%
47		Dougherty	265	657	40.33%	48,086	1.37%
48	1	Douglas	1,938	3,506	55.28%	74,856	4.68%
49		Early	21	42	50.00%	6,473	0.65%
50		Echols	62	154	40.26%	1,592	9.67%
51		Effingham	454	858	52.91%	30,040	2.86%
52		Elbert	105	195	53.85%	10,210	1.91%
53		Emanuel	70	154	45.45%	10,540	1.46%
54		Evans	70	163	42.94%	4,696	3.47%
55		Fannin	101	195	51.79%	14,699	1.33%
56	1	Fayette	1,993	3,176	62.75%	73,812	4.30%
57		Floyd	799	1,746	45.76%	45,693	3.82%
58	1	Forsyth	3,908	6,080	64.28%	119,721	5.08%
59		Franklin	79	145	54.48%	10,938	1.33%
60	1	Fulton	12,309	22,109	55.67%	592,088	3.73%
61		Gilmer	247	495	49.90%	15,765	3.14%
62		Glascock	5	13	38.46%	1,741	0.75%
63		Glynn	639	1,410	45.32%	45,040	3.13%
64	1	Gordon	823	1,729	47.60%	24,972	6.92%
65		Grady	127	315	40.32%	12,081	2.61%
66		Greene	87	165	52.73%	10,905	1.51%
67	1	Gwinnett	25,416	44,567	57.03%	431,727	10.32%
68		Habersham	386	891	43.32%	20,419	4.36%
69	1	Hall	4,862	10,039	48.43%	90,806	11.06%
70		Hancock	11	21	52.38%	5,409	0.39%
71	2	Haralson	75	144	52.08%	14,496	0.99%
72		Harris	352	581	60.59%	20,254	2.87%
73		Hart	84	174	48.28%	12,874	1.35%
74	2	Heard	34	72	47.22%	5,562	1.29%
75	1	Henry	3,023	5,557	54.40%	125,987	4.41%
76		Houston	1,639	3,305	49.59%	79,218	4.17%
77		Irwin	29	70	41.43%	4,963	1.41%
78	1	Jackson	777	1,392	55.82%	33,747	4.12%
79	2	Jasper	71	139	51.08%	7,675	1.81%
80		Jeff Davis	91	252	36.11%	6,792	3.71%
81		Jefferson	43	78	55.13%	9,255	0.84%
82		Jenkins	8	28	28.57%	4,260	0.66%
83		Johnson	5	19	26.32%	4,707	0.40%
84		Jones	83	162	51.23%	15,407	1.05%
85	2	Lamar	54	110	49.09%	9,807	1.12%
86		Lanier	51	125	40.80%	4,102	3.05%
87		Laurens	170	311	54.66%	25,059	1.24%
88		Lee	194	408	47.55%	17,832	2.29%
				GALEO.		,	

89 Liberty 919 2,709 33.92% 24,735 10.95 90 Lincoln 21 38 55.26% 5,134 0.74 91 Long 180 489 36.81% 6,266 7.80 92 Lowndes 755 1,768 43.27% 53.973 3.28 93 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 15,623 2.63 94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McCbuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 10,775 1.66 102 Molntgomery 36		2015		Latino Voted	TOTAL Latino Registered	Nov 2016	TOTAL # Voters Nov	% Latino Share of Electorate
89 Liberty 919 2,709 33.92% 24,735 10.95 90 Lincoln 21 38 55.26% 5,134 0.74 91 Long 180 489 36.81% 6,266 7.80 92 Lowndes 755 1,768 43.27% 53.973 3.28 93 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 15,623 2.63 94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 727 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 10,775 1.66 100 Mitchell 58	County#	CSA	County Name	Nov 2016	-		2016	Nov 2016
91 Long 180 489 36.81% 6,266 7.80 92 Lowndes 765 1,768 43.27% 53.973 3.28 93 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 15,623 2.63 94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,075 1.66 102 Morgan 88	-		-	919	2,709	33.92%	24,735	10.95%
91 Long 180 489 36.81% 6,266 7.80 92 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 53.973 3.28 93 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 15,623 2.63 94 Macon 26 75 53.09% 15,102 1.82 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 137 32.40% 10,075 1.66 102 Morgan 88 <	90			21		55.26%		0.74%
92 Lowndes 765 1,768 43.27% 53,973 3.28 93 Lumpkin 197 411 47.93% 15,623 2.63 94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 10,775 1.66 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Mongan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,694 51.95% 56,352 2.82 106 Muscogee	91		Long	180	489	36.81%		7.80%
94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.33 103 Monrgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 105 Muray	92		Lowndes	765	1,768	43.27%	53,973	3.28%
94 Macon 26 76 34.21% 6,016 1.26 95 2 Madison 146 275 53.09% 15,102 1.82 96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,075 1.66 102 Mooroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.33 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 105 Muscogee	93		Lumpkin	197	411	47.93%	15,623	2.63%
96 Marion 52 129 40.31% 4,218 3.06 97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 10,475 7.24 106 Murray 543 1,934 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newto	94		Macon	26	76	34.21%		1.26%
97 McDuffie 67 160 41.88% 11,983 1.34 98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 104,75 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,00 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1<	95	2	Madison	146	275	53.09%	15,102	1.82%
98 McIntosh 45 105 42.86% 8,125 1.29 99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 <t< td=""><td>96</td><td></td><td>Marion</td><td>52</td><td>129</td><td>40.31%</td><td>4,218</td><td>3.06%</td></t<>	96		Marion	52	129	40.31%	4,218	3.06%
99 2 Meriwether 62 121 51.24% 12,171 0.99 100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80	97		McDuffie	67	160	41.88%	11,983	1.34%
100 Miller 9 30 30.00% 3,471 0.86 101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 1110 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 1	98		McIntosh	45	105	42.86%	8,125	1.29%
101 Mitchell 58 179 32.40% 10,775 1.66 102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.37% 8,097 1.80 100 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 112 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114	99	2	Meriwether	62	121	51.24%		0.99%
102 Monroe 110 217 50.69% 16,084 1.35 103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 112 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77	100		Miller	9	30	30.00%		0.86%
103 Montgomery 36 94 38.30% 4,681 2.01 104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 1112 2 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114 2 Pike 66 125 52.80% 10,	101		Mitchell	58	179	32.40%	10,775	1.66%
104 2 Morgan 88 151 58.28% 11,468 1.32 105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 112 2 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114 2 Pike 66 125 52.80% 10,637	102		Monroe	110	217	50.69%	16,084	1.35%
105 Murray 543 1,193 45.52% 16,475 7.24 106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 1112 2 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114 2 Pike 66 125 52.80% 10,637 1.18 115 Polk 303 683 44.36% 18,551 3	103		Montgomery	36	94	38.30%	4,681	2.01%
106 Muscogee 2,249 5,369 41.89% 101,004 5.32 107 1 Newton 854 1,644 51.95% 58,352 2.82 108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 112 2 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114 2 Pike 66 125 52.80% 10,637 1.18 115 1 Polk 303 683 44.36% 18,551 3.68 116 Pulaski 28 52 53.85% 4,751	104	2	Morgan	88	151	58.28%	11,468	1.32%
1071Newton8541,64451.95%58,3522.821081Oconee36660760.30%24,0422.521092Oglethorpe7514651.37%8,0971.801101Paulding2,0543,59157.20%82,4284.36111Peach25649252.03%14,6583.361122Pickens16630654.25%17,3351.77113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.69 <t< td=""><td>105</td><td></td><td>Murray</td><td>543</td><td>1,193</td><td>45.52%</td><td>16,475</td><td>7.24%</td></t<>	105		Murray	543	1,193	45.52%	16,475	7.24%
108 1 Oconee 366 607 60.30% 24,042 2.52 109 2 Oglethorpe 75 146 51.37% 8,097 1.80 110 1 Paulding 2,054 3,591 57.20% 82,428 4.36 111 Peach 256 492 52.03% 14,658 3.36 112 2 Pickens 166 306 54.25% 17,335 1.77 113 Pierce 61 136 44.85% 9,318 1.46 114 2 Pike 66 125 52.80% 10,637 1.18 115 1 Polk 303 683 44.36% 18,551 3.68 116 Pulaski 28 52 53.85% 4,751 1.09 117 Putnam 125 239 52.30% 11,929 2.00 118 Quitman 5 16 31.25% 1,431 1.12 <td>106</td> <td></td> <td>Muscogee</td> <td>2,249</td> <td>5,369</td> <td>41.89%</td> <td>101,004</td> <td>5.32%</td>	106		Muscogee	2,249	5,369	41.89%	101,004	5.32%
1092Oglethorpe7514651.37%8,0971.801101Paulding2,0543,59157.20%82,4284.36111Peach25649252.03%14,6583.361122Pickens16630654.25%17,3351.77113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128	107	1	Newton	854	1,644	51.95%	58,352	2.82%
1101Paulding2,0543,59157.20%82,4284.36111Peach25649252.03%14,6583.361122Pickens16630654.25%17,3351.77113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumte	108	1	Oconee	366	607	60.30%	24,042	2.52%
111Peach25649252.03%14,6583.361122Pickens16630654.25%17,3351.77113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot20 <td>109</td> <td>2</td> <td>Oglethorpe</td> <td>75</td> <td>146</td> <td>51.37%</td> <td>8,097</td> <td>1.80%</td>	109	2	Oglethorpe	75	146	51.37%	8,097	1.80%
1122Pickens16630654.25%17,3351.77113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5 <td>110</td> <td>1</td> <td>Paulding</td> <td>2,054</td> <td>3,591</td> <td>57.20%</td> <td>82,428</td> <td>4.36%</td>	110	1	Paulding	2,054	3,591	57.20%	82,428	4.36%
113Pierce6113644.85%9,3181.461142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	111		Peach	256	492	52.03%	14,658	3.36%
1142Pike6612552.80%10,6371.181151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	112	2	Pickens	166	306	54.25%	17,335	1.77%
1151Polk30368344.36%18,5513.68116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	113		Pierce	61	136	44.85%	9,318	1.46%
116Pulaski285253.85%4,7511.09117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	114	2	Pike	66	125	52.80%	10,637	1.18%
117Putnam12523952.30%11,9292.00118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	115	1	Polk	303	683	44.36%	18,551	3.68%
118Quitman51631.25%1,4311.12119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	116		Pulaski	28	52	53.85%	4,751	1.09%
119Rabun10221547.44%9,8902.17120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	117		Putnam	125	239	52.30%	11,929	2.00%
120Randolph71838.89%3,9170.46121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	118		Quitman	5	16	31.25%	1,431	1.12%
121Richmond1,4363,30243.49%105,0303.141221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	119		Rabun	102	215	47.44%	9,890	2.17%
1221Rockdale9601,94349.41%50,0083.89123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	120		Randolph	7	18	38.89%	3,917	0.46%
123Schley235442.59%2,3662.28124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	121		Richmond	1,436	3,302	43.49%	105,030	3.14%
124Screven275549.09%7,5330.73125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	122	1	Rockdale	960	1,943	49.41%	50,008	3.89%
125Seminole288333.73%4,9041.691261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	123		Schley	23	54	42.59%	2,366	2.28%
1261Spalding40884848.11%34,8512.43127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	124		Screven	27	55	49.09%	7,533	0.73%
127Stephens9321443.46%13,1561.63128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	125		Seminole	28	83	33.73%	4,904	1.69%
128Stewart112839.29%2,9220.96129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	126	1	Spalding	408	848	48.11%	34,851	2.43%
129Sumter10327936.92%15,2011.84130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	127		Stephens	93	214	43.46%	13,156	1.63%
130Talbot203655.56%4,1420.87131Taliaferro5862.50%1,1590.69	128		Stewart	11	28	39.29%	2,922	0.96%
131 Taliaferro 5 8 62.50% 1,159 0.69	129		Sumter	103	279	36.92%	15,201	1.84%
	130		Talbot	20	36	55.56%	4,142	0.87%
132 Tattnall 156 426 36.62% 9,302 4.58	131		Taliaferro	5	8	62.50%	1,159	0.69%
	132		Tattnall	156	426	36.62%	9,302	4.58%

	2015		Latino Voted	TOTAL Latino Registered	Nov 2016	TOTAL # Voters Nov	% Latino Share of Electorate
County#	CSA	County Name	Nov 2016	Nov 2016	Turnout %	2016	Nov 2016
133		Taylor	13	32	40.63%	4,378	0.73%
134		Telfair	27	70	38.57%	5,103	1.37%
135		Terrell	25	42	59.52%	5,866	0.72%
136		Thomas	169	409	41.32%	24,759	1.65%
137		Tift	362	817	44.31%	19,047	4.29%
138		Toombs	175	512	34.18%	12,270	4.17%
139		Towns	64	108	59.26%	8,616	1.25%
140		Treutlen	15	40	37.50%	3,777	1.06%
141	1	Troup	306	622	49.20%	35,601	1.75%
142		Turner	30	69	43.48%	4,562	1.51%
143		Twiggs	27	57	47.37%	5,294	1.08%
144		Union	138	231	59.74%	14,372	1.61%
145	1	Upson	56	136	41.18%	14,053	0.97%
146		Walker	188	433	43.42%	33,017	1.31%
147	1	Walton	614	1,246	49.28%	51,339	2.43%
148		Ware	123	265	46.42%	16,170	1.64%
149		Warren	7	15	46.67%	3,104	0.48%
150		Washington	40	65	61.54%	11,011	0.59%
151		Wayne	142	351	40.46%	13,505	2.60%
152		Webster	5	12	41.67%	1,433	0.84%
153		Wheeler	22	41	53.66%	2,710	1.51%
154		White	145	262	55.34%	14,684	1.78%
155		Whitfield	3,663	7,157	51.18%	39,523	18.11%
156		Wilcox	36	75	48.00%	3,937	1.91%
157		Wilkes	17	49	34.69%	5,832	0.84%
158		Wilkinson	8	14	57.14%	5,482	0.26%
159		Worth	51	101	50.50%	10,740	0.94%
			130,068	244,190	53.27%	5,430,571	4.50%



Appendix B:

County Trends-Totals for 2003, 2008, 2012, and 2016

Countritt	County	Latino Reg. Voters 2003	Latino Reg. Voters 2008	Latinos Voted 2008	% Voted 2008	Latino Reg. Voters 2012	Latinos Voted 2012	% Voted 2012	Latino Reg. Voters 2016	Latino Voted Nov 2016	Nov 2016 Turnout %		of Latino Votes Cast	% change in voter participation rates from 2012 to 2016
County#	Name Gwinnett	803	24,537	13,710	55.87%	32,623	16,053	49.21%	44,567	25,416	57.03%	44.94%	36.84%	7.82%
33		1063	,	9,603	58.68%	20,044		49.21% 52.83%	27,150	16,186	59.62%	39.72%	34.58%	
	Cobb		16,365	,		,	10,589		,	,				6.79%
60	Fulton	327	13,004	7,285	56.02%	16,352	7,800	47.70%	22,109	12,309	55.67%	41.18%	36.63%	7.97%
44	DeKalb	1318	9,223	5,413	58.69%	10,814	5,712	52.82%	14,508	8,262	56.95%	36.43%	30.86%	4.13%
69	Hall	468	5,246	2,395	45.65%	7,095	2,614	36.84%	10,039	4,862	48.43%	47.74%	46.24%	11.59%
28	Cherokee	245	4,295	2,585	60.19%	5,570	3,020	54.22%	7,568	4,449	58.79%	43.25%	32.12%	4.57%
155	Whitfield	699	4,066	1,794	44.12%	5,283	1,891	35.79%	7,157	3,663	51.18%	43.19%	48.38%	15.39%
31	Clayton	242	4,255	2,106	49.49%	5,326	2,346	44.05%	6,900	3,331	48.28%	38.33%	29.57%	4.23%
25	Chatham	91	3,736	1,860	49.79%	4,576	1,975	43.16%	6,157	2,703	43.90%	39.32%	26.93%	0.74%
58	Forsyth	179	3,112	2,028	65.17%	4,242	2,468	58.18%	6,080	3,908	64.28%	48.82%	36.85%	6.10%

NOTE: 2003 numbers do not reflect a surname match analysis and were not used for the comparisons only provided for context



Appendix C:

Georgia Congressional District Totals and Turn Out for 2012 and 2016

	U.S.		2016 Latino	2016 Latino	2016 Latino Turnout	2012 Latino	2012 Latino	2012 Latino	Growth 2012-2016 Latino	Latino
District	Representative	Party	Voted	Registered	%	Registered	Voted	Tunrout %	Registered	Turnout %
1	Earl L. "Buddy" Carter	R	6,410	15,177	42.23%	11,630	4,663	40.09%	30.50%	2.14%
2	Sanford D. Bishop Jr.	D	3,435	8,538	40.23%	7,139	2,649	37.11%	19.60%	3.13%
3	Drew Ferguson	R	7,420	13,782	53.84%	11,017	5,672	51.48%	25.10%	2.35%
4	Henry "Hank" Johnson	D	8,409	15,639	53.77%	12,058	5,865	48.64%	29.70%	5.13%
5	John Lewis	D	7,841	15,033	52.16%	10,769	4,920	45.69%	39.60%	6.47%
6	Tom Price	R	13,930	22,986	60.60%	17,456	9,440	54.08%	31.68%	6.52%
7	Rob Woodall	R	22,326	38,542	57.93%	28,058	14,156	50.45%	37.37%	7.47%
8	Austin Scott	R	4,582	9,964	45.99%	7,873	3,416	43.39%	26.56%	2.60%
9	Doug Collins	R	9,172	18,070	50.76%	12,984	5,289	40.73%	39.17%	10.02%
10	Jody Hice	R	7,383	13,122	56.26%	9,451	4,870	51.53%	38.84%	4.74%
	Barry									
11	Loudermilk	R	13,894	24,135	57.57%	17,791	9,040	50.81%	35.66%	6.76%
12	Rick Allen	R	5,329	11,404	46.73%	9,123	3,951	43.31%	25.00%	3.42%
13	David Scott	D	10,991	19,914	55.19%	15,115	7,374	48.79%	31.75%	6.41%
14	Tom Graves	R	8,938	17,755	50.34%	13,586	5,359	39.45%	30.69%	10.90%



Appendix D:

2016 Georgia State Senate District Totals and Turn Out

					2016
			2016	2016	Latino
			Latinos	Latino	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
1	Ben Watson	R	2,300	5,226	44.01%
2	Lester Jackson	D	1,552	3,896	39.84%
3	William Ligon Jr.	R	1,299	2,995	43.37%
4	Jack Hill	R	1,146	2,321	49.38%
5	Curt Thompson	D	6,771	12,904	52.47%
6	Hunter Hill	R	3,313	5,978	55.42%
7	Tyler Harper	R	941	2,154	43.69%
8	Ellis Black	R	1,078	2,538	42.47%
9	P. K. Martin	R	5,027	8,170	61.53%
10	Emanuel Jones	D	1,705	3,168	53.82%
11	Dean Burke	R	870	2,236	38.91%
12	Freddie Powell Sim	D	438	1,085	40.37%
13	Greg Kirk	R	825	1,877	43.95%
14	Bruce Thompson	R	3,165	5,790	54.66%
15	Ed Harbison	D	1,112	3,332	33.37%
16	Marty Harbin	R	1,928	3,283	58.73%
17	Rick Jeffares	R	2,175	4,039	53.85%
18	John F. Kennedy	R	1,068	2,118	50.42%
19	Blake Tillery	R	1,152	3,135	36.75%
20	Larry Walker III	R	1,507	2,854	52.80%
21	Brandon Beach	R	3,477	5,615	61.92%
22	Harold V. Jones II	D	1,191	2,769	43.01%
23	Jesse Stone	R	999	2,080	48.03%
24	Lee Anderson	R	1,872	3,479	53.81%
25	Burt Jones	R	869	1,600	54.31%
26	David Lucas, Sr.	D	431	1,016	42.42%
27	Michael Williams	R	3,861	5,992	64.44%
28	Matt Brass	R	2,084	3,742	55.69%
29	Josh McKoon	R	1,957	3,866	50.62%
30	Mike Dugan	R	1,675	3,263	51.33%
31	Bill Heath	R	1,996	3,597	55.49%
32	Judson Hill	R	3,774	5,669	66.57%
33	Michael Rhett A.	D	4,518	8,063	56.03%
34	Valencia Seay	D	2,189	4,529	48.33%
35	Donzella James	D	2,112	3,940	53.60%
36	Nan Orrock	D	2,085	3,969	52.53%
37	Lindsey Tippins	R	4,000	6,507	61.47%
38	Horacena Tate	D	2,287	4,046	56.52%
39	Vincent Fort	D	1,758	3,576	49.16%
40	Fran Millar	R	3,721	6,435	57.82%
41	Steve Henson	D	3,182	5,754	55.30%
42	Elena Parent	D	2,678	4,530	59.12%

District	Nama	Deuter	2016 Latinos	2016 Latino	2016 Latino Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	<mark>%</mark>
43	Tonya Anderson	D	1,481	3,098	47.81%
44	Gail Davenport	D	2,090	3,946	52.97%
45	Renee Unterman	R	5,982	9,743	61.40%
46	Bill Cowsert	R	1,791	3,336	53.69%
47	Frank Ginn	R	2,539	4,562	55.66%
48	David Shafer	R	4,141	7,223	57.33%
49	Butch Miller	R	4,559	9,368	48.67%
50	John Wilkinson	R	1,488	3,149	47.25%
51	Steve Gooch	R	1,162	2,201	52.79%
52	Chuck Hufstetler	R	1,810	3,890	46.53%
53	Jeff Mullis	R	623	1,413	44.09%
54	Chuck Payne	R	4,445	8,816	50.42%
55	Gloria Butler	D	2,416	4,358	55.44%
56	John Albers	R	3,445	5,822	59.17%



Appendix E:

2016 Georgia State House District Totals and Turn Out

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Dortu	Voted	Registered	%
District		Party Party	VOLEU	Registereu	/0
1	John Deffenheuse	P	150	200	
1	Deffenbaugh	R	150	388	38.66%
2	Steve Tarvin Tom Weldon	R R	310 286	603 595	51.41%
3	Bruce	К	286	595	48.07%
4	Broadrick, Sr.	R	2 2 4 0	4,604	51.02%
4	John	n	2,349	4,004	51.02%
5	Meadows	R	820	1 740	46.88%
				1,749	
6 7	Jason Ridley	R	1,391	2,760	50.40%
-	David Ralston	R	362	720	50.28%
8	Matt Gurtler	R	328	596	55.03%
9	Kevin Tanner	R	417	792	52.65%
10	Terry Rogers	R	412	923	44.64%
11	Rick Jasperse	R	461	947	48.68%
	Eddie	_			
12	Lumsden	R	287	625	45.92%
		_			
13	Katie Dempsey	R	509	1,171	43.47%
	Christian	_			/
14	Coomer	R	461	855	53.92%
15	Paul Battles	R	601	1,284	46.81%
16	Trey Kelley	R	373	847	44.04%
	Howard				
17	Maxwell	R	705	1,226	57.50%
18	Kevin Cooke	R	307	637	48.19%
	Paulette				
19	Rakestraw	R	935	1,590	58.81%
	Michael				
20	Caldwell	R	1,197	1,999	59.88%
21	Scot Turner	R	1,110	1,942	57.16%
22	Wes Cantrell	R	1,110	1,690	65.68%
	Mandi				
23	Ballinger	R	1,029	1,917	53.68%
24	Sheri Gilligan	R	1,210	1,956	61.86%
25	Mike Dudgeon	R	1,166	1,717	67.91%
	Geoff Duncan,				
26	Jr.	R	1,088	1,724	63.11%
27	Lee Hawkins	R	978	1,988	49.20%
	Daniel				
28	Gasaway	R	286	618	46.28%

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
29	Matt Dubnik	R	1,415	3,353	42.20%
	Emory		1,110	3,333	12.2070
30	Dunahoo, Jr.	R	1,937	3,768	51.41%
	Tommy		,	,	
31	Benton	R	721	1,281	56.28%
32	Alan Powell	R	195	369	52.85%
33	Tom McCall	R	262	493	53.14%
34	Bert Reeves	R	1,187	2,041	58.16%
35	Ed Setzler	R	1,508	2,407	62.65%
36	Earl Ehrhart	R	1,022	1,548	66.02%
37	Sam Teasley	R	1,294	2,173	59.55%
	David				
38	Wilkerson	D	1,387	2,345	59.15%
39	Erica Thomas	D	1,095	1,986	55.14%
40	Rich Golick	R	1,133	1,789	63.33%
41	Michael Smith	D	1,807	3,268	55.29%
42	Stacey Evans	D	1,169	2,514	46.50%
43	Sharon Cooper	R	1,123	1,804	62.25%
44	Don Parsons	R	1,409	2,230	63.18%
45	Matt Dollar	R	1,036	1,559	66.45%
46	John Carson	R	1,452	2,187	66.39%
47	Jan Jones	R	1,038	1,666	62.30%
48	Betty Price	R	1,091	1,885	57.88%
49	Chuck Martin	R	1,112	1,764	63.04%
	Drad				
50	Brad	р	856	1 200	61 220/
50	Raffensperger Wendell	R	008	1,398	61.23%
51	Willard	R	934	1,698	55.01%
	vvinaru	n	954	1,090	33.01%
52	Deborah Silcox	R	851	1,512	56.28%
53	Sheila Jones	D	551	957	57.58%
54	Beth Beskin	R	958	1,692	56.62%
55	Marie Metze	D	434	836	51.91%
	Able Mable		1.5 F		51.51/5
56	Thomas	D	468	1,068	43.82%
57	Pat Gardner	D	708	1,464	48.36%
58	Park Cannon	_	782	1,385	56.46%
59	David Dreyer	D	705	1,288	54.74%

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
		-			
60	Keisha Waites	D D	509	1,098	46.36%
61	Roger Bruce William	U	536	1,023	52.39%
62	-	n	520	072	F 4 2 70/
62	Boddie Debra	D	529	973	54.37%
63		D	673	1 104	60.96%
05	Bazemore Derrick		075	1,104	00.90%
64	Jackson	D	626	1 061	59.00%
04	Sharon		020	1,061	59.00%
65	Beasley-	D	592	1 1 1 2	53.19%
05	Teague Kimberly		592	1,113	55.19%
66	Alexander	D	007	1,487	54.27%
00	Micah		807	1,407	54.27%
67	Gravley, II	R	718	1 205	55.88%
68	J Collins	R	494	1,285 1,008	49.01%
69	Randy Nix	R	246	494	49.80%
70	Lynn Smith	R	718	1,418	50.63%
70	David Stover	R	982	1,418	59.66%
71	Josh Bonner	R	1,003	1,588	63.16%
12	JUSH DUINEI	- 11	1,005	1,500	05.1070
73	Karen Mathiak	R	591	1,063	55.60%
- 15	Valencia		551	1,005	33.0070
74	Stovall	D	656	1,407	46.62%
75	Mike Glanton	D	681	1,350	50.44%
76	Sandra Scott	D	559	1,159	48.23%
	Rhonda		555	1,135	+0.2370
77	Burnough	D	599	1,356	44.17%
	Demetrius				
78	Douglas	D	930	1,759	52.87%
70	TomTaylor	R	1,115	1,908	58.44%
	Meagan		_,0	1,000	
80	Hanson	R	974	1,608	60.57%
			271	_,000	
81	Scott Holcomb	D	1,258	2,234	56.31%
	Mary				
	Margaret				
82	Oliver	D	980	1,787	54.84%
	Howard				
83	Mosby	D	491	797	61.61%

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
District	Renitta	r ar cy			<u> </u>
84	Shannon	D	483	859	56.23%
85	Karla Drenner	D	485	839	54.36%
	Michele		455	037	34.30%
86		D	544	899	60.51%
80	Henson "Coach"		544	899	00.31/0
87	Williams	D	574	999	57.46%
88	Billy Mitchell	D	624	1,236	50.49%
00			024	1,230	30.49%
89	Stacov Abrama	D	626	953	65.69%
- 69	Stacey Abrams Pam		020	955	05.09%
90		D	366	697	52.51%
90	Stephenson Vernon Jones	D	462	918	50.33%
91	vernon jones		402	910	50.55%
92	Doreen Carter	D	479	1,105	43.35%
92	Doreen Carter Dar'shun		479	1,105	45.55%
93	Kendrick	D	749	1,391	53.85%
95	Kenunck		749	1,591	55.65%
94	Karen Bennett	D	681	1,235	55.14%
95	Scott Hilton	R	1,134	2,026	55.97%
35	Pedro "Pete"	n	1,134	2,020	55.5770
96	Marin	D	1,841	3,549	51.87%
	Brooks		1,041	3,343	51.0770
97	Coleman	R	1,430	2,314	61.80%
98	David Clark	R	1,773	2,898	61.18%
99	Brenda Lopez	D	1,800	3,556	50.62%
	Dewey		1,000	3,330	30.0270
100	McClain	D	2,216	4,376	50.64%
100	Samuel Park	R	2,298	3,990	57.59%
	Sumuerrank		2,230	3,330	37.3370
102	Buzz Brockway	R	1,955	3,202	61.06%
102	Timothy Barr	R	1,669	2,787	59.89%
105	Chuck		1,005	2,707	33.0370
104	Efstration	R	2,011	3,315	60.66%
	Joyce		2,011	5,515	00.0070
105	Chandler	R	1,591	2,643	60.20%
105	Brett Harrell	R	1,233	2,043	56.90%
100	David Casas	R	1,987	3,397	58.49%
107	Clay Cox	R	1,505	2,480	60.69%
100	Dale Rutledge	R	709	1,266	56.00%
110	Andy Welch	R	548	1,200	49.46%
110			5-0	1,100	+5.40/0

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
District		Party	Voleu	Registereu	/0
	Brian			1 0 0 0	
111	Strickland	R	1,044	1,823	57.27%
112	Dave Belton	R	356	615	57.89%
	Pamela				
113	Dickerson	D	488	983	49.64%
114	Tom Kirby	R	808	1,497	53.97%
	Bruce				
115	Williamson	R	315	657	47.95%
116	Terry England	R	894	1,625	55.02%
117	Regina Quick	R	713	1,288	55.36%
118	Spencer Frye	D	777	1,450	53.59%
	Chuck				
119	Williams	R	622	1,033	60.21%
120	Trey Rhodes	R	267	526	50.76%
121	Barry Fleming	R	767	1,523	50.36%
122	Jodi Lott	R	925	1,644	56.27%
123	Mark Newton	R	591	1,155	51.17%
	Wayne				
124	Howard	D	323	779	41.46%
125	Sheila Nelson	D	374	803	46.58%
126	Gloria Frazier	D	344	775	44.39%
127	Brian Prince	D	333	827	40.27%
128	Mack Jackson	D	79	153	51.63%
129	Susan Holmes	R	252	484	52.07%
130	David Knight	R	355	730	48.63%
	Johnnie				
131	Caldwell	R	145	315	46.03%
	Robert				
132	Trammell	D	258	563	45.83%
133	John Pezold	R	462	811	56.97%
134	Richard Smith	R	922	1,842	50.05%
135	Calvin Smyre	D	340	1,112	30.58%
	Carolyn				
136	, Hugley	D	571	1,569	36.39%
	Debbie				
137	Buckner	D	493	951	51.84%
138	Bill McGowan	D	229	796	28.77%
139	Patty Bentley	D	201	483	41.61%
	. ,				
140	Robert Dickey	R	336	689	48.77%
	- /			-	

					2016
					Latino
			2016	2016	Voter
			Latinos	Latinos	Turnout
District	Name	Party	Voted	Registered	%
142	Miriam Paris	D	158	333	47.45%
143	James Beverly	D	157	342	45.91%
144	Bubber Epps	R	235	442	53.17%
145	Rick Williams	Ι	207	364	56.87%
	Shaw				
146	Blackmon	R	730	1,301	56.11%
147	Heath Clark	R	555	1,342	41.36%
148	Buddy Harden	R	214	396	54.04%
148	Jimmy Pruett	R	138	390	44.81%
	Junity Fluett		130	500	77.01/0
150	Matt Hatchett	R	173	328	52.74%
151	Gerald Greene	R	105	216	48.61%
152	Ed Rynders	R	251	535	46.92%
153	Darrel Ealum	D	171	463	36.93%
154	Winfred Dukes	D	119	302	39.40%
155	Clay Pirkle	R	294	624	47.12%
156	Greg Morris	R	302	864	34.95%
	William				
157	Werkheiser	R	315	831	37.91%
158	Butch Parrish	R	225	489	46.01%
159	Jon Burns	R	263	505	52.08%
160	Jan Tankersley	р	354	683	51.83%
100	William (Bill)	R	554	003	31.05%
161	Hitchens	R	743	1,501	49.50%
161	Carl Gilliard	D	511	1,486	34.39%
	J. Craig		511	1,100	5.13575
163	Gordon	D	359	888	40.43%
164	Ron Stephens	R	819	2,141	38.25%
	Mickey				
165	Stephens	D	376	843	44.60%
166	Jesse Petrea	R	663	1,120	59.20%
167	Jeff Jones	R	485	1,174	41.31%
168	Al Williams	D	875	2,340	37.39%
	Dominic				
169	Lariccia	R	421	1,011	41.64%

District	Name	Party	2016 Latinos Voted	2016 Latinos Registered	2016 Latino Voter Turnout %
	Penny				
170	Houston	R	311	778	39.97%
171	Jay Powell	R	209	532	39.29%
172	Sam Watson	R	429	1,156	37.11%
173	Darlene Taylor	R	250	608	41.12%
174	John Corbett	R	327	748	43.72%
175	Amy Carter	R	354	741	47.77%
176	Jason Shaw	R	390	896	43.53%
177	Dexter Sharper	D	303	762	39.76%
178	Chad Nimmer	R	193	420	45.95%
179	Don Hogan	R	379	828	45.77%
180	Jason Spencer	R	488	1,185	41.18%