



William C. Velásquez Institute

MEMORANDUM

TO: Antonio Gonzalez, President, William C. Velasquez Institute,
Concerned Parties

FROM: Steven Ochoa, Director of Voting Rights Policy and Research, William C. Velasquez Institute

DATE: July 10, 2007

Re: Analysis of Texas State House of Representative District Recent Registration Patterns and Targeted Potential Latino Influence Districts

INTRODUCTION

In the attached table and maps, you will find a general analysis of Texas House of Representative Districts. I did a comparison of the most detailed registration and turnout information, which dates from the November 2000 General Election to the 2006 November General Election. This data comes from the Texas Legislative Council. I included turnout information as well.

Aside from growth and comparison figures, there is an attempt to measure potential Latino influence districts. A Latino influence district is described as having a Latino registration percentage between 25%-50%. A defined potential Latino influence district is defined by adding 10,000 Latino registered voters (and therefore adding 10,000 voters to the total registration) and determining what would be the district's Latino registration percentage. If the potential Latino registration fell between 25%-50%, then the district was classified as a possible Latino influence district.

GENERAL FINDINGS

In the 6 years between 2000 and 2006, Texas gained 639,553 registered voters and 342,474 Latino registered voters. Latinos represented 53.55% of the Texas registration growth. Latinos outpaced total registration growth 17.10% to 6.23%. If Latinos are removed from the total registration, one notices that Latinos grew 17.10% in 6 years compared to non-Latinos growing 3.59%.

	Total Reg	Latino Reg	Latino Reg %	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg %
Texas 2000	10,267,143	2,002,791	19.51%	8,264,352	80.49%
Texas 2006	10,906,696	2,345,265	21.50%	8,561,431	78.50%
Growth	639,553	342,474	53.55%	297,079	46.45%
Growth %	6.23%	17.10%		3.59%	

Generally speaking, the urban cores of San Antonio, Houston, Dallas, and Fort Worth saw losses in total registration between 2000 and 2006, however most of those areas saw modest increases Latino registration in the same time frame, implying that Latinos are moving into the areas (and registering) while non-Latino groups are moving away. Regional descriptions are as follows:

National Office • 206 Lombard, 1st Floor • San Antonio, TX 78228 • (210) 922-3118 • Fax (210) 922-7095
California Office • 2914 N. Main St., 1st Floor • Los Angeles, CA 90031 • (323) 222-2217 • Fax (323) 222-2011
Florida Office • 2646-A NW 21st Terrace • Miami, FL 33142 • (305) 635-6965 • Fax (305) 822-7025

- In the El Paso area, urban House Districts 76 and 77 lost total registration, along with Latino registration, while the suburban El Paso districts all saw significant total registration growth. These bumps in total registration can be attributed to Latino registration, as the non-Latino registration figures show losses or comparatively small gains.

El Paso State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
75	Chente Quintanilla	D	16,636	32.46%	14,977	40.48%	90.03%	1,659	11.64%	9.97%
76	Norma Chavez	D	-2,097	-2.96%	-1,116	-1.88%	53.22%	-981	-8.67%	46.78%
77	Paul Moreno	D	-3,694	-6.34%	-2,120	-5.03%	57.39%	-1,574	-9.74%	42.61%
78	Pat Haggerty	R	7,825	11.62%	7,495	28.10%	95.78%	330	0.81%	4.22%
79	Joseph Pickett	D	5,252	9.22%	7,022	21.26%	133.70%	-1,770	-7.40%	-33.70%

- The Fort Worth area saw the urban core districts (90, 94, 96) lose total registration, with surrounding areas gain. Suburban districts 96, 98, and 99 featured tremendous registration growth, which were attributed to non-Latino registration growth. It should be noted that Latino registration did grow significantly as a percentage, but small in comparison of totals. And many districts that saw growth in Latino registration showed loss in non-Latino registration (90, 92, 95).

Fort Worth State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
90	Lon Burnam	D	-1,868	-4.44%	1,973	11.97%	-105.62%	-3,841	-14.99%	205.62%
91	Kelly Hancock	R	4,982	7.23%	2,143	47.16%	43.01%	2,839	4.41%	56.99%
92	Tod Smith	R	723	1.01%	1,361	35.23%	188.24%	-638	-0.94%	-88.24%
93	Paula Pierson	D	3,515	6.52%	2,124	41.34%	60.43%	1,391	2.85%	39.57%
94	Diane Patrick	R	-2,261	-3.01%	1,021	27.73%	-45.16%	-3,282	-4.60%	145.16%
95	Marc Veasey	D	-2,391	-3.61%	1,865	47.72%	-78.00%	-4,256	-6.84%	178.00%
96	Bill Zedler	R	23,072	31.81%	4,189	80.70%	18.16%	18,883	28.04%	81.84%
97	Anna Mowery	R	2,929	3.70%	1,984	41.79%	67.74%	945	1.27%	32.26%
98	Vicki Truitt	R	28,486	35.65%	3,077	89.11%	10.80%	25,409	33.24%	89.20%
99	Charlie Geren	R	16,546	23.19%	4,029	76.23%	24.35%	12,517	18.94%	75.65%

- Dallas County House districts almost all featured a loss in total registration and increases in Latino registration. Districts 102, 107, and 114 featured the largest losses in total registration, but little change in Latino registration, which significantly increased the Latino registration percentage in those districts.

Dallas State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
100	Terri Hodge	D	-2,836	-5.47%	1,950	33.41%	-68.76%	-4,786	-10.40%	168.76%
101	Thomas Latham	R	-874	-1.35%	1,893	32.28%	-216.59%	-2,767	-4.72%	316.59%
102	Tony Goolsby	R	-7,556	-12.79%	250	7.60%	-3.31%	-7,806	-13.99%	103.31%
103	Rafael Anchia	D	-3,199	-9.12%	523	4.51%	-16.35%	-3,722	-15.86%	116.35%
104	Roberto Alonzo	D	646	1.77%	3,750	21.95%	580.50%	-3,104	-15.91%	-480.50%
105	Linda Harper-Brown	R	-3,500	-6.65%	1,587	33.58%	-45.34%	-5,087	-10.61%	145.34%
106	Krik England	R	524	0.96%	3,389	40.66%	646.76%	-2,865	-6.17%	-546.76%
107	Allen Vought	D	-7,385	-10.21%	1,381	24.27%	-18.70%	-8,766	-13.15%	118.70%
108	Dan Branch	R	-2,582	-4.08%	-90	-1.42%	3.49%	-2,492	-4.37%	96.51%
109	Helen Giddings	D	9,420	12.72%	1,378	35.70%	14.63%	8,042	11.46%	85.37%
110	Barbara Mallory	D	-4,818	-7.64%	1,962	33.86%	-40.72%	-6,780	-11.83%	140.72%
111	Yvonne Davis	D	-649	-0.90%	2,611	47.56%	-402.31%	-3,260	-4.90%	502.31%
112	Fred Hill	R	-3,569	-4.77%	992	25.02%	-27.79%	-4,561	-6.44%	127.79%
113	Joe Driver	R	6,531	10.69%	2,088	38.50%	31.97%	4,443	7.98%	68.03%
114	Will Hartnett	R	-9,976	-14.93%	-423	-11.86%	4.24%	-9,553	-15.10%	95.76%

- The Austin/Travis County area of the state was a region that saw significant registration growth. Only 1 district (49) saw a loss in registration, with it attributed to a loss in non-Latino registration. Conversely, significant increases in total registration to House districts 47, 48, 50, and 52 can primarily attributed to non-Latino registration.

Austin State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
46	Dawna Dukes	D	130	0.23%	1,411	14.34%	1085.38%	-1,281	-2.69%	-985.38%
47	Valinda Bolton	D	17,154	20.70%	2,283	21.34%	13.31%	14,871	20.60%	86.69%
48	Donna Howard	R	5,384	6.63%	971	20.79%	18.03%	4,413	5.76%	81.97%
49	Elliott Naishtat	D	-5,028	-6.13%	-595	-6.19%	11.83%	-4,433	-6.13%	88.17%
50	Mark Strama	D	11,959	16.41%	2,782	39.08%	23.26%	9,177	13.95%	76.74%
51	Eddie Rodriguez	D	99	0.19%	562	2.54%	567.68%	-463	-1.48%	-467.68%
52	Mike Krusee	R	15,845	22.87%	3,405	40.94%	21.49%	12,440	20.40%	78.51%

- Almost all districts in the San Antonio/Bexar County area lost total registration, with the exception of districts 117, 122, and 124 in the western part of the county. Districts that lost total registration generally saw increases in Latino registration, where districts that saw massive total registration growth owe most of it to total non-Latino registration growth. Districts 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, and 125 all saw significant changes to Latino registration percentage due to the increases/maintenance of Latino registration, and loss of non-Latino registration.

Bexar County State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
116	Trey Martinez Fischer	D	-8,118	-12.11%	-2,092	-5.66%	25.77%	-6,026	-20.05%	74.23%
117	David Leibowitz	D	10,584	17.78%	5,467	16.36%	51.65%	5,117	19.60%	48.35%
118	Joe Farias	D	-1,703	-2.39%	408	1.03%	-23.96%	-2,111	-6.63%	123.96%
119	Robert Puente	D	-5,371	-7.40%	-812	-2.01%	15.12%	-4,559	-14.17%	84.88%
120	Ruth McClendon	D	-3,422	-5.06%	1,732	8.77%	-50.61%	-5,154	-10.77%	150.61%
121	Joe Straus	R	-1,845	-2.08%	3,166	20.82%	-171.60%	-5,011	-6.84%	271.60%
122	Frank Corte Jr.	R	18,716	19.93%	5,892	41.09%	31.48%	12,824	16.12%	68.52%
123	Mike Villareal	D	-7,840	-11.57%	-2,314	-6.07%	29.52%	-5,526	-18.67%	70.48%
124	Jose Menendez	D	4,519	6.64%	4,384	11.62%	97.01%	135	0.45%	2.99%
125	Joaquin Castro	D	-2,229	-2.79%	819	1.82%	-36.74%	-3,048	-8.70%	136.74%

- South Texas saw the most significant increases in total and Latino registration in the state. Most of the districts with the largest total increases in Latino registration reside along the Mexican border area. Only districts 33 and 34 saw losses in total registration, which can be attributed to loss of non-Latino registration.

South Texas State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
30	Geanie Morrison	R	1,108	1.33%	3,262	23.21%	294.40%	-2,154	-3.12%	-194.40%
31	Ryan Guillen	D	8,395	14.47%	8,127	15.49%	96.81%	268	4.83%	3.19%
32	Juan Garcia	D	1,047	1.22%	1,347	5.23%	128.65%	-300	-0.50%	-28.65%
33	Soloman Ortiz Jr.	D	-1,277	-1.76%	1,706	4.54%	-133.59%	-2,983	-8.48%	233.59%
34	Abel Herrero	D	-2,412	-3.26%	179	0.47%	-7.42%	-2,591	-7.26%	107.42%
35	Yvonne Gonzalez	D	1,505	1.94%	2,891	7.23%	192.09%	-1,386	-3.68%	-92.09%
36	Kino Flores	D	6,852	11.11%	8,256	17.14%	120.49%	-1,404	-10.39%	-20.49%
37	Rene Oliveira	D	3,778	7.41%	3,679	8.92%	97.38%	99	1.02%	2.62%
38	Eddie Lucio	D	9,608	18.24%	9,154	23.67%	95.27%	454	3.24%	4.73%
39	Armando Martinez	D	6,403	11.33%	7,817	18.00%	122.08%	-1,414	-10.83%	-22.08%
40	Aaron Pena	D	9,142	19.85%	8,940	22.54%	97.79%	202	3.16%	2.21%
41	Veronica Gonzales	D	8,568	16.38%	9,919	31.34%	115.77%	-1,351	-6.54%	-15.77%
42	Richard Raymond	D	7,897	12.90%	7,199	13.79%	91.16%	698	7.74%	8.84%
43	Juan Escobar	D	2,196	3.44%	3,596	8.38%	163.75%	-1,400	-6.69%	-63.75%

- The Houston/Harris County area posted a serious loss in total registration. Only 8 of the 25 House districts in the county posted increases in total registration, with significant increases occurring in the western part of the county (130, 132). Like other parts of the state, those districts owe most of their total registration growth to non-Latino registration. Latino registration grew in all but 2 of the 25 House districts.

Harris County State House Districts										
2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison										
House District	2007 Member Name	Party	Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
126	Patricia Harless	R	2,477	3.66%	2,481	43.43%	100.16%	-4	-0.01%	-0.16%
127	Joe Crabb	R	9,489	11.95%	3,192	61.46%	33.64%	6,297	8.49%	66.36%
128	Wayne Smith	R	422	0.66%	2,682	29.53%	635.55%	-2,260	-4.16%	-535.55%
129	John Davis	R	-1,127	-1.48%	1,161	20.23%	-103.02%	-2,288	-3.26%	203.02%
130	Corbin Van Arsdale	R	31,470	44.95%	4,827	99.28%	15.34%	26,643	40.89%	84.66%
131	Dr. Alma A Allen	D	-22	-0.04%	1,628	27.39%	-7400.00%	-1,650	-3.48%	7500.00%
132	Bill Callegari	R	17,372	26.53%	6,164	86.83%	35.48%	11,208	19.20%	64.52%
133	Jim Murphy	R	-4,074	-7.42%	363	6.52%	-8.91%	-4,437	-9.00%	108.91%
134	Ellen Cohen	D	-4,334	-5.08%	212	4.35%	-4.89%	-4,546	-5.65%	104.89%
135	Gary Elkins	R	4,499	7.45%	3,320	41.13%	73.79%	1,179	2.25%	26.21%
136	Beverly Woolley	R	-6,153	-8.09%	527	11.85%	-8.56%	-6,680	-9.33%	108.56%
137	Scott Hochberg	D	-4,365	-13.41%	-55	-0.91%	1.26%	-4,310	-16.27%	98.74%
138	Dwayne Bohac	R	-4,974	-8.55%	1,476	16.60%	-29.67%	-6,450	-13.08%	129.67%
139	Sylvester Turner	D	-1,157	-1.92%	1,848	24.95%	-159.72%	-3,005	-5.68%	259.72%
140	Kevin Bailey	D	-3,387	-7.89%	3,178	16.78%	-93.83%	-6,565	-27.38%	193.83%
141	Senfronia Thomson	D	-685	-1.12%	2,531	40.86%	-369.49%	-3,216	-5.86%	469.49%
142	Harold Dutton Jr.	D	-5,601	-8.43%	2,055	23.22%	-36.69%	-7,656	-13.29%	136.69%
143	Ana Hernandez	D	-4,990	-11.33%	840	3.50%	-16.83%	-5,830	-29.07%	116.83%
144	Robert Talton	R	-108	-0.18%	5,239	43.51%	-4850.93%	-5,347	-10.83%	4950.93%
145	Rick Noriega	D	-3,124	-7.23%	1,233	5.01%	-39.47%	-4,357	-23.41%	139.47%
146	Borris Miles	D	-7,726	-10.07%	600	14.67%	-7.77%	-8,326	-11.46%	107.77%
147	Garnet Coleman	D	-2,259	-3.60%	1,402	18.78%	-62.06%	-3,661	-6.61%	162.06%
148	Jessica Farrar	D	-1,998	-3.87%	-781	-3.49%	39.09%	-1,217	-4.17%	60.91%
149	Hubert Vo	D	3,033	5.18%	2,141	30.34%	70.59%	892	1.73%	29.41%
150	Debbie Riddle	R	8,599	11.36%	3,472	57.83%	40.38%	5,127	7.35%	59.62%

POTENTIAL LATINO INFLUENCE DISTRICTS

House District	2007 Member Name	Party	2006 General					POTENTIAL - Adding 10,000 Latino Registered Voters per District to 2006 Totals			
			Total Reg	Latino Reg	Latino Reg %	Total Votes Cast	Turnout %	Total Reg	Latino Reg	Latino Reg %	Percent Increase
120	Ruth McClendon	D	64,177	21,490	33.49%	20,299	31.63%	74,177	31,490	42.45%	8.97%
137	Scott Hochberg	D	28,175	5,997	21.28%	9,094	32.28%	38,175	15,997	41.90%	20.62%
81	Geroge West	R	68,999	22,713	32.92%	21,822	31.63%	78,999	32,713	41.41%	8.49%
32	Juan Garcia	D	86,690	27,089	31.25%	37,003	42.68%	96,690	37,089	38.36%	7.11%
144	Robert Talton	R	61,317	17,280	28.18%	20,379	33.24%	71,317	27,280	38.25%	10.07%
84	Carl Isett	R	67,043	19,163	28.58%	24,207	36.11%	77,043	29,163	37.85%	9.27%
85	Joe Heflin	D	72,289	20,911	28.93%	29,903	41.37%	82,289	30,911	37.56%	8.64%
106	Krik England	R	55,310	11,724	21.20%	21,910	39.61%	65,310	21,724	33.26%	12.07%
82	Tom Craddick	R	76,596	18,607	24.29%	31,603	41.26%	86,596	28,607	33.04%	8.74%
44	Edmund Kuempel	R	92,157	23,345	25.33%	39,709	43.09%	102,157	33,345	32.64%	7.31%
72	Drew Darby	R	69,364	15,896	22.92%	26,903	38.79%	79,364	25,896	32.63%	9.71%
138	Dwayne Bohac	R	53,216	10,369	19.48%	21,695	40.77%	63,216	20,369	32.22%	12.74%
46	Dawanna Dukes	D	57,673	11,249	19.50%	22,380	38.80%	67,673	21,249	31.40%	11.89%
100	Terri Hodge	D	49,040	7,787	15.88%	16,636	33.92%	59,040	17,787	30.13%	14.25%
87	David Swinford	R	59,293	10,822	18.25%	23,258	39.23%	69,293	20,822	30.05%	11.80%
45	Patrick Rose	D	92,394	20,370	22.05%	42,057	45.52%	102,394	30,370	29.66%	7.61%
142	Harold Dutton Jr.	D	60,841	10,905	17.92%	18,026	29.63%	70,841	20,905	29.51%	11.59%
128	Wayne Smith	R	63,884	11,764	18.41%	22,488	35.20%	73,884	21,764	29.46%	11.04%
121	Joe Straus	R	86,668	18,376	21.20%	41,022	47.33%	96,668	28,376	29.35%	8.15%
30	Geanie Morrison	R	84,287	17,316	20.54%	33,435	39.67%	94,287	27,316	28.97%	8.43%
135	Gary Elkins	R	64,926	11,392	17.55%	23,253	35.81%	74,926	21,392	28.55%	11.00%
139	Sylvester Turner	D	59,134	9,254	15.65%	16,284	27.54%	69,134	19,254	27.85%	12.20%
131	Dr. Alma A Allen	D	53,359	7,571	14.19%	17,347	32.51%	63,359	17,571	27.73%	13.54%
105	Linda Harper-Brown	R	49,164	6,313	12.84%	22,582	45.93%	59,164	16,313	27.57%	14.73%
83	Delwin Jones	R	84,793	16,065	18.95%	38,656	45.59%	94,793	26,065	27.50%	8.55%
149	Hubert Vo	D	61,546	9,198	14.94%	23,418	38.05%	71,546	19,198	26.83%	11.89%
27	Dora Olivo	D	89,594	16,701	18.64%	34,800	38.84%	99,594	26,701	26.81%	8.17%
147	Garnet Coleman	D	60,568	8,869	14.64%	20,608	34.02%	70,568	18,869	26.74%	12.10%
141	Senfronia Thomson	D	60,424	8,725	14.44%	16,102	26.65%	70,424	18,725	26.59%	12.15%
25	Dennis Bonnen	R	69,280	10,773	15.55%	29,676	42.83%	79,280	20,773	26.20%	10.65%
133	Jim Murphy	R	50,819	5,929	11.67%	21,175	41.67%	60,819	15,929	26.19%	14.52%
110	Barbara Mallory	D	58,266	7,757	13.31%	17,604	30.21%	68,266	17,757	26.01%	12.70%
88	Warren Chisum	R	77,300	12,547	16.23%	33,425	43.24%	87,300	22,547	25.83%	9.60%
93	Paula Pierson	D	57,449	7,262	12.64%	22,256	38.74%	67,449	17,262	25.59%	12.95%
132	Bill Callegari	R	82,842	13,263	16.01%	30,255	36.52%	92,842	23,263	25.06%	9.05%

Based on 2006 registration figures, if 10,000 Latinos were registered in the 35 House districts listed in the table above, Latinos would gain significant election influence; enough to become 25%-50% of the registered voters. Democrats currently represent 16 of this influence districts, and 19 are represented by Republican members. The table above is sorted by potential Latino registration. It is of particular note that when one examines the growth patterns of the top potential districts, that these districts represent areas that are already growing in Latino registration and falling in non-Latino registration. The table below shows that the top 9 potential influence districts all show this pattern. In fact, a full 27 of these districts have shown a net loss in non-Latino

registration, whereas only 1 district showed a loss in Latino registration (and that district only showed a loss of 55 Latino voters).

House District	2007 Member Name	Party	2000-2006 Registration Growth Comparison							
			Total Reg	Total Reg Growth %	Latino Reg	Latino Reg Growth %	Latino % of Total Reg Growth	Non-Latino Reg	Non-Latino Reg Growth %	Non-Latino % of Total Reg Growth
120	Ruth McClendon	D	-3,422	-5.06%	1,732	8.77%	-50.61%	-5,154	-10.77%	150.61%
137	Scott Hochberg	D	-4,365	-13.41%	-55	-0.91%	1.26%	-4,310	-16.27%	98.74%
81	Geroge West	R	1,242	1.83%	4,068	21.82%	327.54%	-2,826	-5.75%	-227.54%
32	Juan Garcia	D	1,047	1.22%	1,347	5.23%	128.65%	-300	-0.50%	-28.65%
144	Robert Talton	R	-108	-0.18%	5,239	43.51%	-4850.93%	-5,347	-10.83%	4950.93%
84	Carl Isett	R	-1,853	-2.69%	1,128	6.25%	-60.87%	-2,981	-5.86%	160.87%
85	Joe Heflin	D	-2,283	-3.06%	1,511	7.79%	-66.18%	-3,794	-6.88%	166.18%
106	Krik England	R	524	0.96%	3,389	40.66%	646.76%	-2,865	-6.17%	-546.76%
82	Tom Craddick	R	866	1.14%	3,127	20.20%	361.09%	-2,261	-3.75%	-261.09%
44	Edmund Kuempel	R	11,812	14.70%	3,346	16.73%	28.33%	8,466	14.03%	71.67%
72	Drew Darby	R	-597	-0.85%	1,800	12.77%	-301.51%	-2,397	-4.29%	401.51%
138	Dwayne Bohac	R	-4,974	-8.55%	1,476	16.60%	-29.67%	-6,450	-13.08%	129.67%
46	Dawanna Dukes	D	130	0.23%	1,411	14.34%	1085.38%	-1,281	-2.69%	-985.38%
100	Terri Hodge	D	-2,836	-5.47%	1,950	33.41%	-68.76%	-4,786	-10.40%	168.76%
87	David Swinford	R	-1,025	-1.70%	1,851	20.63%	-180.59%	-2,876	-5.60%	280.59%
45	Patrick Rose	D	16,594	21.89%	4,233	26.23%	25.51%	12,361	20.72%	74.49%
142	Harold Dutton Jr.	D	-5,601	-8.43%	2,055	23.22%	-36.69%	-7,656	-13.29%	136.69%
128	Wayne Smith	R	422	0.66%	2,682	29.53%	635.55%	-2,260	-4.16%	-535.55%
121	Joe Straus	R	-1,845	-2.08%	3,166	20.82%	-171.60%	-5,011	-6.84%	271.60%
30	Geanie Morrison	R	1,108	1.33%	3,262	23.21%	294.40%	-2,154	-3.12%	-194.40%
135	Gary Elkins	R	4,499	7.45%	3,320	41.13%	73.79%	1,179	2.25%	26.21%
139	Sylvester Turner	D	-1,157	-1.92%	1,848	24.95%	-159.72%	-3,005	-5.68%	259.72%
131	Dr. Alma A Allen	D	-22	-0.04%	1,628	27.39%	-7400.00%	-1,650	-3.48%	7500.00%
105	Linda Harper-Brown	R	-3,500	-6.65%	1,587	33.58%	-45.34%	-5,087	-10.61%	145.34%
83	Delwin Jones	R	7,773	10.09%	3,132	24.22%	40.29%	4,641	7.24%	59.71%
149	Hubert Vo	D	3,033	5.18%	2,141	30.34%	70.59%	892	1.73%	29.41%
27	Dora Olivo	D	22,098	32.74%	4,024	31.74%	18.21%	18,074	32.97%	81.79%
147	Garnet Coleman	D	-2,259	-3.60%	1,402	18.78%	-62.06%	-3,661	-6.61%	162.06%
141	Senfronia Thomson	D	-685	-1.12%	2,531	40.86%	-369.49%	-3,216	-5.86%	469.49%
25	Dennis Bonnen	R	-687	-0.98%	1,695	18.67%	-246.72%	-2,382	-3.91%	346.72%
133	Jim Murphy	R	-4,074	-7.42%	363	6.52%	-8.91%	-4,437	-9.00%	108.91%
110	Barbara Mallory	D	-4,818	-7.64%	1,962	33.86%	-40.72%	-6,780	-11.83%	140.72%
88	Warren Chisum	R	-4,249	-5.21%	2,168	20.89%	-51.02%	-6,417	-9.02%	151.02%
93	Paula Pierson	D	3,515	6.52%	2,124	41.34%	60.43%	1,391	2.85%	39.57%
132	Bill Callegari	R	17,372	26.53%	6,164	86.83%	35.48%	11,208	19.20%	64.52%