**Methodological Appendix**

This appendix describes in more detail how we measure different indicia found in the literature. These measures include the *efficiency gap* (McGhee, 2017), the *mean/median gap* (Best et al., 2018a), and partisan symmetry calculations (Grofman and King, 2007; McGann et al. 2015, 2016). The first two of these measures are straightforward, though estimates will differ depending upon the elections from which they are calculated.

The Efficiency Gap is calculated as defined in McGhee (2014), where all the party’s votes are wasted if they lose the district, and all the winner’s votes over 50% are wasted. The difference between each party’s wasted votes is then divided by the total votes cast to produce the Efficiency Gap, with a value of zero denoting what is regarded as ideal. As noted in the text, this is equivalent to taking an aggregate swing ratio of 2 as ideal.

The Mean/Median gap is the difference between the average vote percentage for a party and its share in the median district when districts are sorted according to two-party vote share. This measure is a variant of skewness, such that when the mean is substantially higher or lower than the median, this is indicative of bias.

However, there are a number of different ways to estimate partisan bias based on the shape of the votes to seats distribution. Here we calculate partisan bias by centering the contest at a 50% vote share for both parties, then incrementally adding (or subtracting) one percentage point to find aggregate seat outcomes under these differing mean vote shares. The resulting (s,v) points on the votes to seats curve are then converted to a log odds form by using log(s/1-s) as the dependent variable, and log(v/1-v) as the independent variable, and the points that fall between 40% and 60% vote share are entered into a regression. Partisan Bias is then calculated from the intercept of this regression using an exponential transformation (for details see Grofman, 1983). Partisan bias is calculated from the Democratic perspective, so a negative bias indicates bias against Democrats. We also examine the standard errors to determine the probability that the observed bias is not due to random chance.Table 3 also reports the *swing ratio*,a measure of responsiveness that is defined as the slope of the same regression used to generate partisan bias.

Table 3 in the text reports the measures of gerrymandering described above. The 2011 adopted plan is the worst on all three measures, by far. The Joint Legislative plan proposed by the Republican leaders of the state legislature is second worst on two of the three measures, and third worse on the other. By way of contrast, the Remedial Court adopted plan of 2018 scores the best on two of three measures, and second best on the other.

We also offer an alternative way of presenting district specific vote share or projected vote share data, of the sort provided in Table 2 of the main text. Figure A1’s shadings indicate the extent to which the districts are tilted toward one or the other party.

**<< Figure A1 about here >>**