Two of Maryland’s districts are majority black, and both are represented by black incumbents. Donna Edwards is the only female U.S. House Member from Maryland.

By way of contrast, women make up 30% of the legislators in the Maryland State House, which uses multi-member districts.

Majority Partisanship
- Swing (50–53%)
- Lean (53–58%)
- Safe (58%+)

| Districts | 0 | 1 | 7 |

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

None of Maryland’s eight districts are likely to be seriously contested in 2014, as seven districts are safe for Democrats and one is safe for Republicans. All eight incumbents won by margins of at least 20% in 2012, and only one district has a partisanship of less than 59% in favor of the incumbent’s party.

Democrats gerrymandered the state during redistricting such that MD-6 favored Democrats, and were able to win the seat in 2012. That district is still the closest to partisan balance, with a Democratic partisanship of 54.5%. But John Delaney’s 22% margin of victory over a Republican incumbent indicates that he will be very difficult to defeat.

Date 2014 Projections Announced: April 2013.
2012 Projections: 7 D, 1 R. All projections accurate.

Races to Watch: None

Strongest Candidate: Sarbanes (MD-3, D): +4.4% POAC*
Weakest Candidate: Edwards (MD-4, D): -1.8% 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
Two of Maryland’s districts are majority black, and both are represented by black incumbents.

Donna Edwards is the only female U.S. House Member from Maryland. By way of contrast, women make up 30% of the legislators in the Maryland State House, which uses multi-member districts.

Dubious Democracy
Maryland’s Democracy Index Ranking: 16th (of 50)

In 2012, 42.7% of Maryland’s eligible voting population voted for a winning candidate, the third highest percentage in the U.S. That relatively high level of representation gives Maryland its respectable Democracy Index ranking. Maryland’s least democratic characteristic is its votes-to-seats distortion – only 12.5% of districts favor Republicans compared to 39% of voters.

Maryland’s U.S. House incumbents typically coast to re-election. In 2012, one incumbent lost in the general election – just the second time that had occurred since 2002. The average margin of victory in 2012 Maryland congressional races was 39.1%.

View redistricting alternatives at FairVotingUS.com
Listed below are recent election results and 2014 election projections for Maryland’s eight 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</th>
<th>District Partisanship (Dem)</th>
<th>2014 Projected Dem %</th>
<th>2014 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harris, Andy</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>Safe R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ruppersberger, Dutch</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>+3.6%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sarbanes, John</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>+4.4%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Edwards, Donna</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Black/F</td>
<td>2007.5</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hoyer, Steny</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>+0.9%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Delaney, John</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>+8.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>Likely D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cummings, Elijah</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Black/M</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Van Hollen, Chris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>White/M</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>+0.6%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>Safe D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland’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.:</th>
<th>Super District Rep.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (CDs – 6,7,8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>721,529</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63 / 37</td>
<td>3 D</td>
<td>1 R, 2 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (CDs - 1,2,3,4,5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>721,529</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>60 / 40</td>
<td>1 R, 3 D</td>
<td>2 R, 3 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partisan and Racial Impact: Instead of having 8 lopsided districts that grossly distort representation, this fair voting plan would provide Maryland Republicans with a proportionate number of seats to their vote share. We project five Democratic wins and three GOP wins, with voters having a greater variety of choices within and outside of the major parties. Black voters would be able to elect at least two preferred candidates – one in each super district.

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 eight individual congressional districts, our fair voting plan combines these districts into two larger “super districts” with 3 or 5 representatives. Any candidate who is the first choice of more than a quarter of voters in a three-seat district will win a seat. Any candidate who is the first choice of more than a sixth of voters will win in a five-seat district.

Comparing a Fair Representation Voting Plan to Maryland’s Redistricting Plan

Statewide Partisanship: 61% D, 39% R

2014 Projections: 1 R, 7 D

FairVote’s Plan: 3 R, 5 D

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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