

The background of the entire page is a collage of circular buttons and American flag motifs. Many of the buttons are white with a blue border and the word 'VOTE' in bold blue letters. Some buttons feature a full American flag design with stars and stripes. The buttons are scattered across the page, creating a sense of movement and urgency.

TEXAS DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY ELECTION SURVEY 2020

Vote Intention in the
Race for the
Presidential Nomination

HOBBY
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

Texas Democratic Primary Election Survey 2020
Vote Intention in the Race for the Presidential Nomination

The University of Houston Hobby School of Public Affairs conducted an online survey among likely Democratic primary voters in Texas to identify the leading candidates for the Democratic nominees for president and U.S. senator, opinions of salient policies and approval ratings of key national and state politicians. The survey was fielded between February 6 and February 18 with 1,352 YouGov respondents, resulting in a confidence interval of +/-2.7%. The results of this survey will be presented in three separate reports. This report focuses primarily on the vote intention in the Texas Democratic presidential primary election. Subsequent reports will concentrate on the vote intention in the Texas Democratic senate primary election and on the position of Texas Democratic primary voters on a range of policies, especially related to the Green New Deal and health care, and the evaluation of national and state politicians.

1. What Democratic Primary Voters Want Most in a Nominee

As shown in Table 1, a substantial majority (57.1%) of Democratic primary voters believe that the most important trait of a nominee is being able to defeat President Donald Trump in November 2020. A little less than one-third (31.8%) stated that the most important trait of a nominee was agreeing with them on most issues, with only 11.1% listing having the right experience as the most important trait for a nominee.

Table 1: Most Important Democratic Presidential Nominee Trait

| Trait | Distribution of Responses (%) |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Can win the election against Trump | 57.1 |
| Agrees with your position on most issues | 31.8 |
| Has the right experience | 11.1 |

2. Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Table 2 provides the vote intention among likely voters (those who indicated they definitely would vote or probably would vote) in the Texas Democratic primary election. In one column, the eight candidates who remained in the race as of February 18 are included, along with the share of likely voters whose response was that they did not intend to vote for any of the eight candidates (4.3%) or did not know or did not have an opinion about for whom they intended to vote (5.0%). In the next column only the proportion of respondents who supported one of the eight candidates is included. In the subsequent analysis, we focus on the latter results. Finally, the final column is similar to the preceding column, except for the population is restricted to those voters who indicated that they definitely would vote, with the four leading candidates faring slightly better within this population and the bottom four candidates faring slightly worse.

The data reveal that none of the candidates are dominating the vote intention among likely Texas Democratic primary voters. Joe Biden has the highest vote intention (22.5%), followed very closely by Bernie Sanders (22.1%), with Elizabeth Warren (18.3%) rounding out the trio of candidates whose statewide vote intention is above the 15% threshold needed to obtain statewide delegates. Just under the 15% barrier are Michael Bloomberg (13.4%) and Pete Buttigieg (11.9%), with Amy Klobuchar (7.2%) rounding out the second tier trio of candidates. Tulsi Gabbard (3.5%) and Tom Steyer (1.1%) complete the field.

Table 2: Texas Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

| Vote Intention (Percentage) | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | All Voters | All Voters | Most Likely Voters |
| Candidate | All Responses | Valid Responses | Valid Responses |
| Joe Biden | 20.4 | 22.5 | 23.4 |
| Bernie Sanders | 20.1 | 22.1 | 22.6 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 16.6 | 18.3 | 18.8 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 12.2 | 13.4 | 13.8 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 10.8 | 11.9 | 10.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 6.5 | 7.2 | 6.9 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Tom Steyer | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| No One/None of Them | 4.3 | - | - |
| Don't Know/No Opinion | 5.0 | - | - |

3. Ethnicity/Race & Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Table 3 provides information on the distribution of vote intention for the eight candidates among the state’s principal ethnic/racial groups: Anglos, Latinos, African Americans, and Others (principally Asian Americans and those with multiple ethnic/racial identities).

Warren (21.0%) leads in vote intention among Anglos, followed closely by Sanders (20.7%), with Buttigieg (15.7%), Biden (14.8%), and Bloomberg (13.1%) further back in the mid to low teens. Sanders (30.3%) enjoys a substantial lead among Latino voters, with Biden (18.9%) and Warren (16.8%) much further behind. An even larger gap between the front-runner and first runner-up exists among African Americans, where Biden (45.8%) is the preferred candidate of almost half of African Americans, more than double the vote intention of the second and third place candidates among African Americans, Bloomberg (17.0%) and Sanders (15.1%).

Biden’s first place status depends exclusively on his robust support among African Americans, since without it he would be in third place behind Warren and only slightly above the 15% threshold needed to receive delegates statewide. And, any hope Buttigieg has of crossing the 15% threshold statewide is likely doomed as long as his support among African Americans remains in the low single digits (2.8%).

Table 3: Ethnicity/Race and Democratic Presidential Vote Intention

| Distribution of Ethnic/Racial Group Vote Intention Across the Eight Candidates (%) | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|-------------------|--------|-------|
| Candidate | Anglos | Latinos | African Americans | Others | Total |
| Joe Biden | 14.8 | 18.9 | 45.8 | 13.3 | 22.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 20.7 | 30.3 | 15.1 | 21.8 | 22.1 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 21.0 | 16.8 | 13.0 | 25.1 | 18.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 13.1 | 12.1 | 17.0 | 7.3 | 13.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 15.7 | 12.5 | 2.8 | 13.3 | 11.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 11.0 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 9.4 | 7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 3.3 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 9.8 | 3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0.5 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 |

4. Gender and Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Table 4 provides information on the distribution of vote intention for the eight candidates among women and men. Among the five candidates with double digit vote intentions, only Sanders' level of support among women (22.1%) and men (22.2%) is for all intents and purposes the same. Among the other four candidates, two, Warren and Bloomberg, enjoy notably more support among women (21.0% and 15.6%) than among men (14.4% and 10.2%). And, two, Biden and Buttigieg, enjoy notably more support among men (25.1% and 14.7%) than among women (20.7% and 10.0%).

Table 4: Gender and Democratic Presidential Vote Intention

| Distribution of Women and Men's Vote Intention Across the Eight Candidates (%) | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Candidate | Women | Men | Total |
| Joe Biden | 20.7 | 25.1 | 22.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 22.1 | 22.2 | 22.1 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 21.0 | 14.4 | 18.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 15.6 | 10.2 | 13.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 10.0 | 14.7 | 11.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 6.4 | 8.3 | 7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 3.2 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 |

5. Age/Generation & Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Table 5 details the support for the eight candidates among the five main generations present in the Texas electorate: The Silent Generation (born between 1928 and 1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1980), Millennials (1980-1996), and Generation Z (1997-). Among the eight presidential candidates, three are members of the Silent Generation (Sanders, Bloomberg, Biden), three are Baby Boomers (Warren, Steyer, Klobuchar) and two are Millennials (Gabbard, Buttigieg). The multiple members of Generation X, including a former punk rocker from El Paso, departed the race prior to Super Tuesday.

There exist stark generational differences in vote intention for the different candidates among Democratic presidential primary voters. Sanders enjoys Texas-sized support among younger voters, with a vote intention of 43.6% among members of Generation Z and 37.8% among Millennials. In all, Sanders is the preferred candidate of nearly two-fifths (38.6%) of Texans under 40, nearly double that of his closest rival for the youth vote, Warren (20.9%). Conversely, fewer than 1 in 20 Texans under 40 intend to vote for Bloomberg (4.9%) and Klobuchar (3.3%).

Both Bloomberg and Biden possess substantially more support among the grandparents and great grandparents of the Millennials and Generation Z. Nearly one out of every three (30.9%) members of the Silent Generation intend to vote for Biden, with more than one in four (25.8%) intending to vote for Bloomberg. In the combined Silent Generation and Baby Boomers cohort (i.e., those 56 and older), Biden leads the pack with 26.1% of the vote, followed by Bloomberg with 20.9%. Much further back are Warren (14.3%) and Sanders (12.8%).

Within the intermediate Generation X, Biden possesses a slightly higher vote intention (23.3%) than Warren (22.6%) and Sanders (21.5%). Bloomberg’s (9.1%) support in contrast is quite low, much closer to his anemic support among Millennials and Generation Z than to his robust support among Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation.

Table 5: Generation and Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

| Candidate | Silent Generation (1928-1945) | Baby Boomers (1946-1964) | Generation X (1965-1980) | Millenials (1981-1996) | Generation Z (1997-) | Total |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Joe Biden | 30.9 | 25.3 | 23.3 | 16.1 | 13.0 | 22.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 16.5 | 12.2 | 21.5 | 37.8 | 43.6 | 22.1 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 5.1 | 15.9 | 22.6 | 21.7 | 16.3 | 18.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 25.8 | 20.0 | 9.1 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 13.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 9.1 | 11.6 | 14.2 | 9.2 | 21.3 | 11.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 6.0 | 11.3 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 6.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Total | 99.9 | 100 | 100.1 | 100.1 | 101.1 | 100 |

6. Ideological Orientation & Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

The respondents were asked to place themselves into one of five ideological categories: Very Liberal, Liberal, Moderate, Conservative, and Very Conservative. Table 6 contains the distribution of support for the eight candidates within these ideological groups, with the Conservative and Very Conservative collapsed into a single Conservative category due to a dearth of Very Conservative Democratic primary voters.

Among the most liberal (Very Liberal) Democratic primary voters, Sanders (33.9%) and Warren (29.6%) enjoy the highest vote intention with a substantial gap existing between the two of them and the other first and second tier candidates: Biden (16.6%), Buttigieg (8.5%), Bloomberg (7.5%) and Klobuchar (3.2%).

The vote intention distribution among the leading candidates is much more equal among Liberal voters. Biden (21.7%) and Sanders (20.8%) enjoy the most support, followed closely by Warren (19.7%), with Buttigieg (16.8%) and Bloomberg (11.4%) also enjoying double-digit support.

Biden is the favorite of Moderate voters with 28.0%, substantially ahead of Sanders (18.3%) and Bloomberg (16.2%). Warren fares especially poorly among Moderates (10.6%) compared to her support among more liberal voters.

Finally, among the 12% of Democratic primary voters who identify as Conservative or Very Conservative, Biden is the preferred candidate (23.9%), followed by Bloomberg (20.7%) and Gabbard (17.5%). Sanders (12.5%) and Warren (10.3%) are the only other candidates with double-digit support among conservatives.

Table 6: Ideological Orientation and Democratic Presidential Vote Intention Distribution of the Four Ideological Groups Across the Eight Candidates

| Candidate | Very Liberal | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative* | Total |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|----------|---------------|-------|
| Joe Biden | 16.6 | 21.7 | 28.0 | 23.9 | 22.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 33.9 | 20.8 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 22.1 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 29.6 | 19.7 | 10.6 | 10.3 | 18.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 7.5 | 11.4 | 16.2 | 20.7 | 13.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 8.5 | 16.8 | 10.2 | 4.6 | 11.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 3.2 | 7.5 | 10.1 | 7.0 | 7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 0.7 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 17.5 | 3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 1.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 |

* Includes those who identify as Conservative and Very Conservative.

7. Region & Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Texas is a diverse state, containing two of the country’s most populous metro areas, Dallas-Fort Worth (7.5 million) and Houston (7.0 million), with more residents than 37 and 36 states respectively. Texas also has two metro areas that rank among the country’s top 40 in population, San Antonio (2.5 million) and Austin (2.2 million). Table 7 provides the distribution of vote intention for the eight candidates across these four metro regions as well as along the Texas-Mexico border (Border), principally Cameron and Hidalgo Counties in the Rio Grande Valley (RGV), Laredo, and El Paso out west along the state’s border with New Mexico. All other regions are included in the “Other” category, which includes residents of rural counties as well as those living in mid-sized regional hubs such as Corpus Christi, Lubbock and Tyler.

By and large the candidates’ support does not vary notably across the regions, with a few exceptions. These exceptions include Biden’s higher support in Houston (29.6%) and lower support in Austin (13.1%), which is principally the product of the respectively greater and lower proportion of African American Democratic primary voters in both locales. They also include Warren’s relatively weak support along the Border (9.6%) and comparatively strong support in metro Austin (26.8%) and Buttigieg’s stronger than average support of 17.1% in Austin.

Table 7: Region and Democratic Presidential Vote Intention

| Distribution of Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention in Texas Metro Areas | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| Candidate | DFW | Houston | San Antonio | Austin | Border | Other | Total |
| Joe Biden | 17.6 | 29.6 | 15.0 | 13.1 | 33.2 | 27.9 | 22.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 23.8 | 18.7 | 25.5 | 21.2 | 29.3 | 19.7 | 22.1 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 19.9 | 14.9 | 24.4 | 26.8 | 9.6 | 13.8 | 18.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 12.8 | 15.3 | 12.9 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 16.7 | 13.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 12.8 | 10.4 | 14.4 | 17.1 | 11.0 | 7.8 | 11.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 8.9 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 8.6 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 3.4 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Total | 100.1 | 100.1 | 100.1 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

8. 2016 Democratic Presidential Primary Vote & 2020 Democratic Presidential Primary Vote Intention

Four out of five (81.0%) likely 2020 Democratic voters cast a ballot in the 2016 Democratic primary election between Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. Table 8 indicates that slightly less than half (49.7%) of Democrats who cast a vote for Sanders in 2016 intend to vote for him again in 2020. The only other candidate to enjoy double-digit support among 2016 Sanders voters is Warren (22.6%).

Among those Democrats who backed Hillary Clinton in the 2016 Democratic primary election, close to a third (30.7%) intend to vote for Biden, followed by Bloomberg (19.1%), Warren (18.8%) and Buttigieg (11.8%). And, almost one out of every 10 (9.4%) of those who chose Clinton over Sanders in 2016, are opting to vote for Sanders in 2020.

Table 8: 2016 Democratic Primary Vote & 2020 Democratic Primary Vote Intention

| Distribution of 2016 Voters Across the 8 Candidates (%) | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Candidate | Clinton | Sanders | Others |
| Joe Biden | 30.7 | 7.4 | 15.5 |
| Bernie Sanders | 9.4 | 49.7 | 13.3 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 18.8 | 22.6 | 8.7 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 19.1 | 3.6 | 15.1 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 11.8 | 9.3 | 7.2 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 8.1 | 4.0 | 8.5 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 0.8 | 3.0 | 31.8 |
| Tom Steyer | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 |

9. The Reliability of the Democratic Candidates' Base of Support

All respondents who expressed a vote intention were asked how likely they were to change their mind about who to vote for before the election: Very Likely, Somewhat Likely, Not Very Likely, or Not At All Likely (see Table 9). Among the eight candidates, Sanders has the most loyal supporters, with almost half (43.7%) saying that it was Not At All Likely they would change their mind. More than a quarter (28.4%) said it was Not Very Likely, with almost three out of four Sanders' voters (72.1%) indicating it was not

likely they would defect from him. An even greater proportion of Bloomberg voters (77.9%) indicate they intend to stick with the former New York City mayor. Approximately two-thirds of the voters of Biden (69.8%), Buttigieg (68.8%) and Warren (66.0%) also indicate they are not likely to change their mind and cast a vote for another candidate.

Among the first and second tier candidates, Klobuchar stands out as having the least loyal voters, with almost half (46.3%) of those who intend to vote for her indicating they are very or somewhat likely to change their mind.

Table 9: Likelihood The Candidate's Supporters Will Change Their Mind Before Voting

| Candidate | Very Likely | Somewhat Likely | Not Very Likely | Not At All Likely |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Joe Biden | 16.3 | 14.0 | 38.8 | 31.0 |
| Bernie Sanders | 9.9 | 18.0 | 28.4 | 43.7 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 12.4 | 21.6 | 38.5 | 27.5 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 3.6 | 18.6 | 52.4 | 25.5 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 4.6 | 26.6 | 49.5 | 19.3 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 10.3 | 36.0 | 34.7 | 19.0 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 31.6 | 5.3 | 28.9 | 34.2 |
| Tom Steyer | 33.5 | 30.0 | 10.9 | 25.6 |

10. Second Choices of Candidates' Fickle Supporters

In addition to being asked how likely they were to change their vote, respondents were also asked about their second preference as the Democratic nominee. Table 10 contains the distribution of the six leading candidates' most fickle voters (i.e., those who indicated they were very likely or somewhat likely to change their vote) across the other eight candidates, with a combined category employed for Gabbard and Steyer due to their meager vote intention.

The previous section identified Klobuchar as having the highest proportion of doubtful voters, and Table 10 indicates the second preference of these doubtful voters. Were these voters to abandon Klobuchar, the largest share would switch their support to Biden (35.3%) followed by Bloomberg (25.4%) and Buttigieg (21.1%). This suggests that an auspicious route for both Bloomberg and Buttigieg to boost their share of the vote above the 15% threshold would be to fish in Klobuchar's pond, with Biden also likely to find good fishing there as he attempts to best Sanders in the statewide vote.

In a similar vein, Bloomberg would be the most likely beneficiary of a Buttigieg decline. More than two-fifths (42.3%) of Buttigieg's least reliable voters list Bloomberg as their second choice.

Finally, while Sanders and Biden are often seen as occupying opposite positions along the ideological spectrum, 31.5% of doubtful Sanders supporters have Biden as their second choice, just as 29.6% of doubtful Biden supporters have Sanders as their second choice. In both cases, these are the highest values for either candidate, followed by Warren in the case of both the doubtful Sanders (22.7%) and Biden (22.2%) voters. And, while their overall intended vote share is small, more than half (50.2%) of the doubtful supporters of Gabbard and Steyer have Sanders as their second choice.

Table 10: Second Choice of the Democracy Primary Candidates' Doubtful Supporters

| Second Choice of Candidates' (First Vote Choice) Voters Who Are Very Likely or Likely to Defect from First Vote Choice | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|---------------|-------|
| | Biden | Sanders | Warren | Bloomberg | Buttigieg | Klobuchar | Gabbard | Steyer | No One/Others | Total |
| Biden | - | 29.6 | 22.2 | 15.0 | 9.4 | 5.9 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 12.4 | 100.0 |
| Sanders | 31.5 | - | 22.7 | 12.2 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 16.2 | 100.1 |
| Warren | 18.2 | 19.3 | - | 17.4 | 11.9 | 20.8 | 1.3 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Bloomberg | 32.2 | 9.7 | 26.4 | - | 13.5 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 9.2 | 100.1 |
| Buttigieg | 6.4 | 6.8 | 17.0 | 42.3 | - | 13.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 100.1 |
| Klobuchar | 35.3 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 25.4 | 21.1 | - | 6.2 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Gabbard/Steyer | 6.8 | 50.2 | 2.9 | 5.9 | 7.9 | 12.3 | - | - | 14.0 | 100.0 |

Note: Due to the small number of cases as well as their joint status and similar distribution of second preferences, Gabbard and Steyer are combined here.

11. Evaluations of the Democratic Presidential Primary Candidates

Table 11 contains the evaluations of the eight candidates by Democratic primary voters. The candidates with the highest favorability ratings (Very Favorable + Favorable) are Warren (71.6%), Sanders (65.3%) and Biden (65.2%). Voters are very familiar with these three top-tier candidates, with proportions who do not know enough about them to have an opinion (No Opinion) in the single digits ranging from 2.7% for Sanders to 5.3% for Warren. There is less familiarity with the second tier candidates, especially Klobuchar, about whom more than a fifth (23.2%) of Democratic primary voters have No Opinion. The candidate with the lowest favorable (19.6%) and highest unfavorable (50.6%) evaluations is Tulsi Gabbard, in spite of (in the latter case) having the second highest percentage of voters (29.8%) who do not know enough about her to have an opinion.

Table 11: Favorability Ratings of the Democratic Presidential Candidates

| Candidate Evaluation (%) | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------|
| Candidate | Very Favorable | Favorable | Unfavorable | Very Unfavorable | No Opinion |
| Joe Biden | 29.3 | 35.9 | 18.0 | 12.9 | 3.9 |
| Bernie Sanders | 32.9 | 32.4 | 17.7 | 14.3 | 2.7 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 33.0 | 38.6 | 12.2 | 10.8 | 5.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 23.0 | 34.8 | 15.6 | 16.1 | 10.4 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 23.6 | 36.7 | 15.8 | 11.5 | 12.4 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 17.0 | 34.9 | 17.0 | 8.0 | 23.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 5.3 | 14.3 | 19.8 | 30.8 | 29.8 |
| Tom Steyer | 8.8 | 31.9 | 15.1 | 8.4 | 35.8 |

12. The Impact of Bloomberg's Advertising Campaign

As of February 21, Michael Bloomberg had spent over \$30 million dollars on open air television ads in Texas in addition to massive digital and radio ad buys, and, even full page ads in major newspapers. The data in Table 12 suggest these ads have paid off. An overwhelming majority (83.8%) of Democratic primary voters had seen a Bloomberg ad (or ads), and among this group, the ad(s) had caused slightly more than half (52.5%) to have a more favorable impression of Bloomberg, compared to only 12.3% who had a less favorable impression of Bloomberg as a result of the ad(s). The ads caused about a third (35.3%) to have neither a more nor less favorable impression of Bloomberg.

Table 12: The Impact of Michael Bloomberg's Unprecedented Ad Campaign

| Primary Voters | Percentage Distribution |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Who Have Seen a Bloomberg Ad | 83.8 |
| Who Have Not Seen a Bloomberg Ad | 13.4 |
| Who Don't Know | 2.8 |

| Impact of Ad(s) On Those Who Saw Them | Percentage Distribution |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| More Favorable Impression of Bloomberg | 52.5 |
| Less Favorable Impression of Bloomberg | 12.3 |
| Neither A More Nor Less Favorable Impression of Bloomberg | 35.3 |

13. The Allocation of Texas's 228 Elected Convention Delegates

The real prize to be won on March 3 is not bragging rights for first or second place in Texas, but rather the 228 delegates to the Democratic National Convention that will be allocated based on the votes cast in this election. After California (415) and New York (274), Texas will send more elected delegates to the 2020 Democratic National Convention in Milwaukee than any other state.

Texas's 228 delegates are assigned in 33 separate allocation processes, all of which though are based on the single vote cast by Democratic primary voters. Two sets of delegates are allocated at the state level, the 49 At-Large delegates and the 30 Party Leaders and Elected Officials (PLEO) delegates. The remaining delegates are allocated within the 31 Texas Senate districts. The districts have a number of delegates (based on the size of the Democratic vote within them) that ranges from 2 in two West Texas senate districts (SD-28 and SD-31) to 10 in Austin's SD-14, with the median district electing 5 delegates.

The delegates are allocated using a multi-stage process for the two statewide allocations and the 31 senate district allocations known as the LR-Hare form of proportional representation (PR) with a 15% quota. First, candidates that do not win at least 15% of the vote (statewide for the two statewide allocations or at the individual district level for that allocation) are ineligible to receive delegates. The votes won by the candidates who met this threshold are summed together and then divided by the number of delegates to be allocated to generate a quota. Then, the votes won by each candidate are divided by this quota, with candidates receiving a number of delegates equal to the whole number resulting from this calculation. If there are still delegates to be allocated, the candidate with the largest remainder receives the first delegate, and, if there is a second delegate still to be allocated, it goes to the candidate with the second largest remainder, etc.

Projecting the allocation of the 79 statewide delegates is quite simple. Only Biden, Sanders and Warren cleared the 15% threshold, and based on their respective predicted statewide vote shares of 22.5%, 22.1% and 18.3%, they are projected to respectively win 18, 17, and 14 At-Large delegates and 11, 10 and 9 PLEO delegates, for a statewide total of 29 for Biden, 27 for Sanders, and 23 for Warren. See the top section of Table 13.

The projection of the 149 district-level delegates is however not so simple. To accomplish that we employ senate-district level data from 10 years of University of Texas/Texas Tribune polls to provide a "census" of Democratic primary voters in the district, and then use the data from this survey to estimate a projected

share of the vote for all eight candidates in each one of the 31 senate districts via the utilization of a multi-level regression and post-stratification (MRP) method. See senate districts 1-31 in Table 13 on page 11.¹

In this projection, Bloomberg and Buttigieg did not clear the 15% threshold in 30 districts. Only in one district, El Paso's SD-29, did Buttigieg cross the 15% threshold and win a delegate, with Bloomberg achieving a similar feat in East Texas's SD-3. In the remaining districts, all of the delegates were won by Sanders (58), Biden (51) and Warren (38).

¹ To predict the vote intention for each candidate we apply a multilevel regression and post-stratification method known as MRP (Gelman and Little, 1997; Park and Gelman, 2004). Our level of aggregation is the Texas senate district, and the population characteristics are age group, ideology, education, and race. Given that some of these characteristics are not available in the census, instead of census data we use a set of surveys from 2010 to 2019 conducted by The Texas Tribune and the Texas Politics Project at the University of Texas at Austin (texaspolitics.utexas.edu/polling-data-archive).

Table 13: Projection of Delegates Won by Democratic Presidential Primary Candidates

| Projected Delegates by Candidate | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| District | District's General Geographic Location | Number of District Delegates | | | | | |
| | | | Sanders | Biden | Warren | Bloomberg | Buttigieg |
| At-Large | State Wide | 49 | 17 | 18 | 14 | | |
| PLEOS | State Wide | 30 | 10 | 11 | 9 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1 | East Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 2 | DFW Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 3 | East Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| 4 | Houston Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 5 | Austin Metro | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 6 | Houston Metro | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| 7 | Houston Metro | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 8 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 9 | DFW Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 10 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 11 | Houston Metro | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 12 | DFW Metro | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 13 | Houston Metro | 7 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 14 | Austin Metro | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | |
| 15 | Houston Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 16 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 17 | Houston Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 18 | Houston Metro/Bastrop | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 19 | San Antonio Metro | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 20 | RGV/Corpus Christi | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 21 | Laredo/South Texas | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 22 | Central Texas/Waco | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 23 | DFW Metro | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | |
| 24 | Hill Country/Killeen | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 25 | San Antonio Metro | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 26 | San Antonio Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 27 | RGV | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| 28 | West Texas | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 29 | El Paso Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 |
| 30 | North Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 31 | West Texas | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | <i>Total District Delegates</i> | <i>149</i> | <i>58</i> | <i>51</i> | <i>38</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>1</i> |

Subsequently overall, (see Table 14), with 22.1% of the vote, Sanders is projected (based on these data) to win 85 delegates (37.3%), Biden 80 delegates (35.1%), Warren 61 delegates (26.7%), and Buttigieg and Bloomberg 1 delegate each (0.4%). In all, Sanders, Biden and Warren are projected to receive a share of delegates that is substantially greater than their share of the popular vote while Bloomberg, Buttigieg, and Klobuchar are projected to receive a share of delegates that is substantially lower than their share of the popular vote.

Table 14: Summary of the Projection of Texas Delegates Won by Democratic Presidential Candidates

| Projected Total Delegates for Each Candidate | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Candidate | Delegates (228) | Delegate Share (%) | Vote Share (%) | Delegate Share - Vote Share (%) |
| Bernie Sanders | 85 | 37.3 | 22.1 | 15.2 |
| Joe Biden | 80 | 35.1 | 22.5 | 12.6 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 61 | 26.7 | 18.3 | 8.4 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 1 | 0.4 | 13.4 | -13.0 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 1 | 0.4 | 11.9 | -11.5 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | -7.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | -3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | -1.1 |

14. The Impact of a Hypothetical Across the Board 4% Increase for Bloomberg

Among the second-tier candidates (Bloomberg, Buttigieg, Klobuchar), Bloomberg is closest both statewide and in many senate districts, to crossing the 15% threshold. Table 15 contains the hypothetical delegate allocation if Bloomberg obtained a 4% increase in vote intention statewide and in each one of the 31 senate districts, for the sake of this exercise, drawing 2% of this support from Buttigieg and 2% from Klobuchar.

Table 15: Hypothetical Projection of Delegates Won by Democratic Presidential Primary Candidates*

| Projected Delegates by Candidate | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| District | District's General Geographic Location | Number of District Delegates | Sanders | Biden | Warren | Bloomberg | Buttigieg |
| At-Large | State Wide | 49 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 11 | |
| PLEOS | State Wide | 30 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | |
| 1 | East Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 2 | DFW Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 3 | East Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| 4 | Houston Metro | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 5 | Austin Metro | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 6 | Houston Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | |
| 7 | Houston Metro | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 8 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 9 | DFW Metro | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 10 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| 11 | Houston Metro | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 12 | DFW Metro | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 13 | Houston Metro | 7 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | |
| 14 | Austin Metro | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | |
| 15 | Houston Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 16 | DFW Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 17 | Houston Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 18 | Houston Metro/Bastrop | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 19 | San Antonio Metro | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| 20 | RGV/Corpus Christi | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 21 | Laredo/South Texas | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 22 | Central Texas/Waco | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 23 | DFW Metro | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| 24 | Hill Country/Killeen | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 25 | San Antonio Metro | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| 26 | San Antonio Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| 27 | RGV | 4 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| 28 | West Texas | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 29 | El Paso Metro | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| 30 | North Texas | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 31 | West Texas | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | <i>Total District Delegates</i> | <i>149</i> | <i>53</i> | <i>46</i> | <i>38</i> | <i>12</i> | <i>0</i> |
| Total Delegates | | 228 | 74 | 68 | 56 | 30 | |

* Assumes a universal 4% increase in Bloomberg's projected vote statewide and in all 31 senate districts.

Note: 2% of Bloomberg's vote is drawn from Buttigieg and 2% from Klobuchar.

If Bloomberg were to achieve this universal 4% increase, his share of the 228 elected Texas delegates would rise from 1 to 30 as shown in Table 16. Simultaneously Sanders, Biden and Warren would all experience a drop in their number of delegates won, with Sanders experiencing the largest drop off, from 85 to 74, followed closely by Biden, from 80 to 68. Warren would be less affected, falling from 61 to 56.

Buttigieg would lose his one delegate, as a decline of 2% would take him below the 15% threshold in SD-29.

Table 16: Summary of the Hypothetical Projection of Texas Delegates Won by Democratic Presidential Candidates Scenario Where Bloomberg Has a 4% Gain Statewide & in All 31 Senate Districts*

| Hypothetical Projection of Delegates | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Candidate | Delegates (228) | Delegate Share (%) | Vote Share (%) | Delegate Share - Vote Share (%) |
| Bernie Sanders | 74 | 32.5 | 22.1 | 10.4 |
| Joe Biden | 68 | 29.8 | 22.5 | 7.3 |
| Elizabeth Warren | 56 | 24.6 | 18.3 | 6.3 |
| Michael Bloomberg | 30 | 13.2 | 16.4 | -3.2 |
| Pete Buttigieg | 0 | 0.0 | 9.9 | -9.9 |
| Amy Klobuchar | 0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | -5.2 |
| Tulsi Gabbard | 0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | -3.5 |
| Tom Steyer | 0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | -1.1 |

* Drawing 2% from Buttigieg & 2% from Klobuchar.