Iowa has only elected white men to Congress in its history. In 2012, Christie Vilsack, the wife of Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, was the Democratic nominee in Iowa’s 4th district, but lost to incumbent Steve King. All four congressional districts are majority white.

Majority Partisanship

- Statewide Partisanship: 49% R, 51% D
- Current Delegation: 2 R, 2 D
- 2014 Projections: 1 R, 3 ?

Partisanship is a measure of voters’ underlying preference for Democrats or Republicans. See our Methodology section to learn how Partisanship is determined.

District Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Partisanship</th>
<th>Swing (50%-53%)</th>
<th>Lean (53%-58%)</th>
<th>Safe (58%+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Iowa Legislative Service Agency, a nonpartisan state bureau, has been responsible for redistricting since 1980. It uses software to design districts, accounting only for population, existing county lines, and geographical cohesiveness. As a result, Iowa has not experienced as much contention over redistricting as do most states, and was the first state to complete redistricting this cycle.

The plan received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Iowa legislature. Some of the few “no” votes came from Cedar Rapids and Iowa City legislators, who objected to the separation of what they saw as one “community of interest.”

Redistricting

2014 Projections: 1 R, 0 D, 3 ?
FairVote only projects one winner in Iowa’s 2014 congressional elections. Iowa’s districts are relatively competitive, although three districts have a distinct lean toward the party of the representative now representing them. Democrats and Republicans hold two seats each, but either party could conceivably win three seats in 2014.

Date 2014 Projections Announced: April 2013.
2012 Projections: 0 R, 0 D, 4 ?.
Races to Watch: Although he will not be running, Tom Latham’s district (IA-3) is split almost exactly evenly between Democrats and Republicans, with 50.2% Democratic partisanship. While Democrats will hope to gain IA-3, Republicans will try to pick up IA-1, where incumbent Bruce Braley will not run for re-election.

Strongest Candidate: King (IA-4, R): -2.1% POAC*
Weakest Candidate: Loebuck (IA-2, D): -5.0% POAC

*POAC (Performance Over Average Candidate) is a measure of the quality of a winning candidate’s campaign. It compares how well a winner did relative to what would be projected for a generic candidate of the same party and incumbency status. See our Methodology section to learn how POAC is determined.

Race and Gender in the U.S. House
Iowa has only elected white men to Congress in its history. In 2012, Christie Vilsack, the wife of Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, was the Democratic nominee in Iowa’s 4th district, but lost to incumbent Steve King. All four congressional districts are majority white.

Dubious Democracy
Iowa’s Democracy Index Ranking: 2nd (of 50)
Iowa’s excellent ranking is the product of its competitive 2012 U.S. House elections and the proportionality of their results. None of Iowa’s 2012 House races were won by a landslide margin, and the average margin of victory was a relatively low 11.3%. Turnout was high: the state’s presidential battleground status contributed to a turnout of 68%, the second-highest in the nation. Iowa’s House seats are also the most proportionally allocated in the nation, as each major party won roughly 50% of the vote in 2012 and 50% of the state’s seats.

View redistricting alternatives at FairVotingUS.com
Listed below are recent election results and 2014 election projections for Iowa’s four U.S. House districts. All metrics in this table are further explained in the Methodology section of this report.

**Partisanship** is an indicator of voters’ underlying preference for Democrats or Republicans. It is determined by measuring how the district voted for president in 2012 relative to the presidential candidates’ national averages. Developed by FairVote in 1997 and adapted by Charlie Cook for the Cook Partisan Voting Index, this definition of partisanship is based on only the most recent presidential election.

**Performance Over Average Candidate (POAC)** is an indicator of how well the winner did compared to a hypothetical generic candidate of the same district, incumbency status, and party, based on their winning percentages in 2010 and 2012. A high POAC suggests that the winner appealed to independents and voters from other parties in addition to voters from his or her own party. A low POAC suggests that the winner did not draw many votes from independents and other parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Race/Gender</th>
<th>Year First Elected</th>
<th>2012 2-Party Winning Percentage</th>
<th>POAC (% Diff from 2012 Average)</th>
<th>District Partisanship (Dem)</th>
<th>2014 Projected Dem %</th>
<th>2014 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OPEN (Braley, Bruce)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>No Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loebsack, David</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>No Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OPEN (Latham, Tom)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>No Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>King, Steve</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>Likely R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Iowa’s Fair Representation Voting Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super District (w/current Cong. Dist. #s)</th>
<th># of Seats</th>
<th>Pop. Per Seat</th>
<th>% to Win (plus 1 vote)</th>
<th>Partisanship (D/R %)</th>
<th>Current Rep.: 2 R, 2D</th>
<th>Super District Rep.: 2 R, 2 D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (CDs – 1,2,3,4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>761,589</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51 / 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 R, 2 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan and Racial Impact: This fair representation voting plan would maintain Iowa’s generally competitive congressional races through more varied voter choice within parties and improved prospects for independents. It would most likely produce a consistent two-two split between the parties, reflective of the evenly divided partisanship of the state’s voters. As Iowa is over 90% white, racial minorities are not close to the threshold for electing a candidate of choice.

How Does Fair Representation Voting Work?

Fair representation voting methods such as ranked choice voting describe American forms of proportional representation with a history in local and state elections. They uphold American electoral traditions, such as voting for candidates rather than parties. They ensure all voters participate in competitive elections and ensure more accurate representation, with the majority of voters likely to elect most seats and backers of both major parties likely to elect preferred candidates.

Instead of four individual congressional districts, our fair voting plan combines these districts into one larger “super district.” Any candidate who is the first choice of more than a fifth of voters will win.

Comparing a Fair Representation Voting Plan to Iowa’s Current Districts

Partisanship is an indicator of voters’ underlying preference for Democrats or Republicans. See our Methodology section to learn how Partisanship is determined.

Benefits of a Fair Representation Voting Plan

More accurate representation: Congressional delegations more faithfully reflect the preferences of all voters. Supporters of both major parties elect candidates in each district, with accurate balance of each district’s left, right, and center.

More voter choice and competition: Third parties, independents and major party innovators have better chances, as there is a lower threshold for candidates to win a seat. Because voters have a range of choices, candidates must compete to win voter support.

Better representation of racial minorities: Racial minority candidates have a lower threshold to earn seats, even when not geographically concentrated. More voters of all races are in a position to elect candidates.

More women: More women are likely to run and win. Single-member districts often stifle potential candidates.

View more fair voting plans at FairVotingUS.com
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