THE IMPACT OF MEDICAID EXPANSION ON VOTER PARTICIPATION:

EVIDENCE FROM THE OREGON HEALTH INSURANCE EXPERIMENT

ONLINE APPENDIX

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Voting Data

The statewide voter list is maintained by the Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Office, in Oregon. The state's data distinguish between three types of voters: active, inactive, and cancelled. An *active* voter is someone who has voted or re-registered within the last 5 years. In Oregon, people who do not vote for more than 5 years need to re-register to remain active. Only registered individuals may vote, and they must update their voter registration in the case of a move, a name change, or if they wish to register or change an association with a political party (OregonLaws, Chapter 247). An *inactive* voter is someone who has not voted or re-registered in five years; in addition, individuals may be moved from the active to the inactive file for various administrative reasons (such as being incarcerated or having a bounced-back ballot mailing or a signature challenge that the individual did not respond to). *Cancelled* voters are individuals who are *inactive* for five years, who die, we are found to be registered in another state.

We obtained three separate individual-level data sets from the Oregon Secretary of State's Election Division. The two main data sets we use were received in June 2010 (hereafter *2010 data*) and July 2013 (hereafter *2013 data*). Each of these data sets contains a list of currently active voters, currently inactive voters, and a voting history over a series of preceding elections. Two key differences are present between these files. First, they provide information on the list of *active* voters at two different points in time. Second, they contain voting histories for different elections. Specifically, the 2010 data contain voting information on elections from May 2008 through May 2010. By contrast, the 2013 file contain voting data on elections from May 2006 through May 2012, but omits some smaller local elections included in the 2010 data.

We received a third data set in July 2015 that contains a list of all names that were placed on the *cancelled* voter list from 2006 on (hereafter *cancelled voter* data); given that voters may remain on the cancelled voter file indefinitely, names in this file may or may not appear in the 2010 and 2013 data.

We probabilistically matched each of these three data sets to the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment lottery list using LinkPlus software. The match was done based on full name, date of birth, and gender and followed the matching procedure done in earlier work with the lottery list (see e.g. Finkelstein et al. 2012). Due to the protected nature of the lottery data, matching of the lottery data to the voting data was done on a secure, non-networked computer, and all identifiers were removed before analysis.

Individuals on the lottery list could thus match to each of the voter files or not. For each election represented in each voter file (e.g. 2008 election as described in the 2010 voter data file), lottery list members who matched could be characterized as having voted, being registered for the election but not having voted, or not having a record for that particular election (e.g. having registered to vote in 2009, so not having a voting record for 2008). For individuals on the lottery list who have missing voting records in each of 2010 and 2013 data pulls - either because they did not match to the voting file or matched but had no record for particular elections - we match them to voting information in the cancelled voter file. If matched, we replace these people's missing voting records in 2010 or 2013 data with records from the cancelled voter data.

We use these data to define two main outcomes of interest:

Registration: We measure registration – and the political party the individual is registered with – as of June 22, 2010 in the 2010 data pull. Specifically, we define any one on the active voter file as of that date as registered as of that date.

Voting: We measure whether the individual voted in various elections. Specifically we measure whether the individual voted in:

- November 2008 general election. Our baseline specification measures this in the 2010 data pull. We also measure this same outcome (whether the individual voted in the November 2008 general election) in the 2013 data.

- November 2010 statewide election – measured in the 2013 data pull

- Any election post-lottery through June 2010 except the November 2008 election. These were local elections, primaries, or statewide special elections that ran from 5/27/2008 through 6/1/2010. They are listed in Table A3.

- 2006 and 2007 elections. These data are only available in the 2013 data. We use them both to test for balance in voting behavior pre-lottery and as a control variable to increase power in studying the impact of Medicaid on post-lottery voting using the 2013 data. The 2010 data do not contain these pre-lottery elections.

As noted above, in each data set, if the individual is missing a voting record, we tried to match them to the voting information in the cancelled voter file and if we found a match, we replaced the missing voting record with information from the cancelled voter file. In practice, this resulted in few additional voters. For example in the 2010 data, we added 130 voters (0.5 percent) to the

November 2008 election, and in the 2013 data we added 927 additional voters to the November 2008 election.

Assessing data quality

Not everyone in the 2010 voter files appears in the 2013 voter files (and vice versa). Table A4 summarizes these results before we merge the cancelled voter data with 2010 or 2013 data pulls. For example, it shows that of 43,201 people in the 2010 voter files (active or inactive), only 37,310 are in the 2013 voter files. Likewise, of the 40,819 people in the 2013 voter files, only 37,310 are in the 2010 voter files. Several potential reasons could explain this. First, matching noise could be introduced by our probabilistic matching techniques. Second, genuine entry into the data could occur between 2010 and 2013, due to new registrations. Third, genuine exit from the data could occur between 2010 and 2013, due to individuals being moved to the *cancelled* file because of death, incarceration, a move out of state, remaining inactive for 5 years, or other administrative reasons.

Reassuringly, we found that only 170 people (0.2 percent of the lottery list) enter the data between 2010 and 2013 *and* are recorded as having voted in the 2008 election; these presumably reflect errors in our probabilistic match. Likewise, of the 32,383 people who have a voting record (yes/no) in 2008 recorded in the 2010 and 2013 data, only 12 (<0.01 percent) have a different outcome recorded. These checks suggest only a small amount of noise in our measures.

Our primary concern, however, is not with noise (mis-measurement, mis-matching, attrition etc.) per se, but the potential for endogenous selection into the sample based on post-lottery behavior. For example, if the lottery affected voting behavior in 2008, and voting behavior in 2008 affected presence in the 2010 files (i.e. someone who might otherwise have been moved to

cancelled is maintained), then using information in the 2010 file to infer the effect of the lottery on voting behavior in 2008 would be contaminated by differential selection of treatment and control groups into the sample. Likewise, any impact the lottery had on mortality or moves out of state could also affect our ability to measure 2008 or 2010 voting behavior. Reassuringly, prior work on the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment shows no substantial effect of the lottery on mortality (Finkelstein et al., 2012), but the other avenues still have the potential to affect the sample we observe.

Fortunately, we were able to obtain the list of all names placed in the cancelled voter file since 2006, which should capture any exit from our data between 2010 and 2013 due to individuals being moved to the *cancelled* file. About 50 percent, or 2,987, of *exited voters* (those who matched in 2010 but not 2013 data) can be found in the cancelled voter data. Beyond that, we also find 4 percent, or 1,092, of lottery list individuals who did not appear in either 2010 or 2013 data in the cancelled voter file.

In Table A5 and A6 we cross tabulate the match status in cancelled and 2010 data files with respect to voting records of November 2008 and November 2010 elections in order to assess the quality of the cancelled voter file. In particular, we want to see how many missing voting records can be found in cancelled voter file, and how often conflicting voting records exist between the cancelled file and other two data sets. The results show that cases of conflicting voting records are rare (<10 cases or <0.1 percent of exiting records in both elections), and the file only helps us fill in a marginal share of missing voting records among the lottery list individuals - 0.3 percent and 0.7 percent in November 2008 and November 2010 elections, respectively.

Because 50 percent of exits between 2010 and 2013 data are unexplained, we performed two additional tests for potential endogenous measurement as mentioned earlier. First, we looked at whether entry or exit between 2010 and 2013 was correlated with treatment status. Second, using the 2013 file, we analyzed whether pre-lottery (2006 or 2007) voting was correlated with treatment status. Both tests use updated 2010 and/or 2013 data sets after the inclusion of voting records from the cancelled file. In each case we ran the following regression:

$$y_{ih} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LOTTERY_h + X_{ih}\beta_2 + \epsilon_{ih} \tag{1}$$

where i indexes individuals and h indexes households, LOTTERY is an indicator for whether household h was selected in the lottery. X_{ih} includes controls for household size indicators. Standard errors are clustered on the household.

Table A7 shows the results, which are reassuring. The top panel shows that the probability of voting in the pre-lottery period is balanced between treatment and control, and the bottom panel shows that entry into and exit out of the data sets are also balanced.

Appendix B: Analytic Weights

For analyses of outcomes in fall 2009 or later, we use weights to adjust for a new lottery for OHP Standard which the state conducted beginning in the fall of 2009. These weights were previously used in Baicker et al. (2013).

At the start of the new lottery, the state mailed postcards to those on the original list that were not selected (our controls) asking if they would like to be included in this second lottery. Those who returned the postcard were added to the new waiting list and an initial draw was done just from that group. Following that initial draw, the state opened the new waiting list to the general public (including both our controls and our treatments as well people not on our original list); drawings from this list were conducted approximately monthly. Unlike the original 2008 waiting list, the new waiting list remained continuously open: individuals could sign up at any point. As with the original lottery, draws were done on individuals, but the opportunity to apply for OHP Standard (the treatment) was extended to the whole household. After each drawing, we probabilistically matched (using LinkPlus software) the new waiting list to our study population to identify individuals who were eligible for selection by the state (called *opt-ins*) and those who were actually selected in a given drawing (called *selected opt-ins*). By December 6, 2010 the state had selected everyone in our original sample who signed up for the new lottery.

Given the difficulty in interpreting the "treatment" received by those who were drawn in the new lottery, we drop the selected opt-ins from our analytic sample and use weights to correct for this. For each lottery drawing, the set of opt-ins is not a random sample of our study population: signing up for the new list was optional, and thus subject to the influence of factors such as underlying health. However, the set of selected opt-ins *is* a random sample of the opt-ins. We

therefore use weights to adjust for the individuals dropped because of the second lottery using the following principle: within any (even non-random) subset of the original study population, a randomly selected group can be weighted to stand in for the non-selected remainder based on the probability of that random selection.

The weights we use are roughly analogous to weighting done for censoring or attrition in longitudinal data (Cole and Hernán, 2008; Kalton, 1986). As in those settings, we weight each observation at each time point by the inverse probability of being in the sample, and we generate overall weights as the product of the weights across all time points. We do not need to model the probability of being selected in the new lottery as a function of covariates; we know the process was random and we can observe the selection proportions.

More specifically, let O_t be the set of opt-ins in our study population eligible for new lottery drawing on date t. Let S_t be the set of opt-ins selected in drawing on date t. We define the weight for individual i to be:

$$w_t(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-p_t} \ if \ i \ in \ O_t \ and \ in \ S_t \\ 0 \ if \ i \ in \ S_t \\ 1 \ if \ i \ not \ in \ O_t \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where p_t is the probability of an opt-in being selected.

Selection probabilities varied by the number of household members on the new list, so in all cases, we estimated the selection probability separately by strata of *tickets* (household members on the new waiting list at time t).

The final analytic weight W is simply the product all the weights w_t introduced up to the end date. This end date is chosen based on the date of the outcome analyzed. Analysis of different outcomes use different weights.

We refer to the set of weights by their end date (i.e. June 2010 weights use the product of weights up through June 2010). Analyses of November 2008 voting are unweighted (because this occurred prior to the lottery). Analyses of registration (as of June 2010), and of "any other election in the data" (which includes elections through June 1, 2010), use the June 2010 weights; analyses of November 2010 voting use the November 2010 weights.

Table A8 shows the distribution of the June 2010 and November 2010 weights. One can see that the November 2010 weights involve a much greater share of individuals with zero weights (and a higher upweighting of the remaining individuals), reflecting several large new lottery draws that occurred between those dates. The control group is far more impacted by the weights than the treatment group as they were more likely to sign up for the new lottery.

The voting in November 2008 precedes the new lottery so the analysis is unweighted. The June 2010 registration and voting through June 2010 uses weights to account for new lottery draws through June 2010. The November 2010 voting analysis uses weights to account for new lottery draws through November 2010. As the new lottery progressed, the weights become more extreme, which has a potential precision cost.

Appendix References

Baicker, Katherine, Sarah L. Taubman, Heidi L. Allen, Mira Bernstein, Jonathan H. Gruber, Joseph P. Newhouse, Eric C. Schneider, et al. 2013. "The Oregon Experiment--Effects of

Medicaid on Clinical Outcomes." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 368 (18): 1713–22. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa1212321.

Cole, Stephen R., and Miguel A. Hernan. 2008. "Constructing Inverse Probability Weights for Marginal Structural Models." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 168 (6): 656–64. doi:10.1093/aje/kwn164.

Finkelstein, Amy, Sarah Taubman, Bill Wright, Mira Bernstein, Jonathan Gruber, Joseph P. Newhouse, Heidi Allen, Katherine Baicker, and Oregon Health Study Group. 2012. "The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment: Evidence from the First Year." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127 (3): 1057–1106. doi:10.1093/qje/qjs020.

Kalton, Graham. 1986. "Handling wave nonresponse in panel surveys." *Journal of Official Statistics* 2: 303-314.

Legislative Counsel Committee, *CHAPTER 247—Qualification and Registration of Electors*, https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors247.html. 2017

Table A1: Treatment-Control Balance

	Unweighted			June 2010 Weights			November 2010 Weights		
	Control mean	Treatment-control difference	p-value	Control mean	Treatment-control difference	p-value	Control mean	Treatment-control difference	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Lottery List Variables									
Year of Birth	1968.0	0.162	0.104	1968.0	0.179	0.091	1968.1	-0.073	0.826
		(0.100)			(0.106)			(0.335)	
Female	0.557	-0.007	0.039	0.559	-0.009	0.011	0.553	0.007	0.356
		(0.003)			(0.003)			(0.008)	
English as preferred language	0.922	0.002	0.346	0.921	0.004	0.198	0.929	-0.014	0.293
		(0.003)			(0.003)			(0.013)	
Signed up self	0.918	0.000	0.273	0.918	0.000	0.163	0.920	0.001	0.094
		(0.000)			(0.0003)			(0.001)	
Signed up first day of lottery	0.093	0.001	0.627	0.092	0.001	0.647	0.115	-0.031	0.055
		(0.002)			(0.003)			(0.016)	
Gave Phone Number	0.862	-0.003	0.300	0.861	-0.002	0.420	0.869	-0.006	0.424
		(0.003)			(0.003)			(0.008)	
Address is a PO Box	0.117	0.000	0.873	0.116	0.001	0.755	0.118	0.000	0.991
		(0.003)			(0.003)			(0.012)	
Zip code median household income	39265.398	44.891	0.538	39273.504	14.236	0.855	39178.477	4.866	0.989
		(72.887)			(78.168)			(339.460)	
Ever voted in the pre-period	0.225	0.000	0.889	0.225	-0.001	0.787	0.245	-0.026	0.089
		(0.003)			(0.004)			(0.015)	
F statistic		F	p-value		F	p-value		F	p-value
lottery list variables		1.322	0.227		1.718	0.089		1.316	0.230
lottery list variables and pre-period voting		1.175	0.306		1.530	0.131		1.379	0.191

Notes: We report the coefficient on LOTTERY from estimating Equation 1 on the dependent variable shown in the first column. All dependent variables are measured based on the lottery sign up, except for "every voted in the pre-period" which is defined as voting in a 2006 or 2007 election, as measured in the 2013 data pull and the cancelled voter file. All regressions include indicators for the number of household members on the lottery list, adjust standard errors for household clusters. Columns (1)-(3) are unweighted, (4)-(6) use weights through June 2010, and (7)-(9) use weights through November 2010. The final rows report the pooled F-statistics (and p-values) from testing treatment-control balance on sets of variables jointly.

Table A2: November 2008 Voter Turnout (Using 2013 Data)

	N	Control Group Mean	Effect of Lottery Selection	First Stage	Effect of Medicaid Coverage	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Overall, Measured in 2010 Data	74922	33.814	0.691	0.271	2.549	0.073
			(0.385)	(0.003)	(1.420)	
Panel A: Measured in 2013 Data						
Overall	74922	32.789	0.577	0.271	2.129	0.130
			(0.382)	(0.003)	(1.408)	
Gender						
Female	41249	35.657	-0.085	0.264	-0.320	0.864
			(0.493)	(0.004)	(1.868)	
Male	33673	29.182	1.472	0.281	5.244	0.005
			(0.521)	(0.004)	(1.856)	
Age						
Ages 19-49	54814	29.309	0.423	0.263	1.610	0.325
			(0.430)	(0.004)	(1.637)	
Ages 50-64	20108	42.123	1.078	0.294	3.665	0.157
			(0.760)	(0.006)	(2.589)	
English-language lottery materials						
No	6440	6.879	0.468	0.189	2.479	0.503
			(0.699)	(0.011)	(3.702)	
Yes	68482	34.982	0.506	0.279	1.815	0.210
			(0.404)	(0.003)	(1.447)	
Zip in a Democratic county (2008)						
No	26723	31.314	0.057	0.279	0.205	0.929
			(0.639)	(0.006)	(2.290)	
Yes	48199	33.593	0.864	0.267	3.238	0.069
			(0.475)	(0.004)	(1.782)	
Panel B: Measured in 2013 Data, Controlling for Pre-period Voting						
Overall	74922	32.789	0.609	0.271	2.244	0.046
			(0.304)	(0.003)	(1.123)	
Gender						
Female	41249	35.657	0.127	0.264	0.481	0.752
			(0.402)	(0.004)	(1.523)	
Male	33673	29.182	1.244	0.281	4.432	0.003
			(0.420)	(0.004)	(1.498)	
Age						
Ages 19-49	54814	29.309	0.573	0.263	2.181	0.109
			(0.358)	(0.004)	(1.362)	
Ages 50-64	20108	42.123	0.687	0.294	2.334	0.223
			(0.563)	(0.006)	(1.914)	

English-language lottery materials						
No	6440	6.879	0.186	0.189	0.987	0.750
			(0.586)	(0.011)	(3.100)	
Yes	68482	34.982	0.602	0.279	2.156	0.065
			(0.326)	(0.003)	(1.169)	
Zip in a Democratic county (2008)						
No	26723	31.314	0.130	0.279	0.465	0.796
			(0.502)	(0.006)	(1.799)	
Yes	48199	33.593	0.868	0.267	3.255	0.023
			(0.382)	(0.004)	(1.434)	

Notes: This table resembles Panel B of Table 1 except that results all use the 2013 data pull. The first stage variable is an indicator for Medicaid coverage at any point from the first lottery notification through the November 2008 election. Column (3) shows the intent-to-treat estimates from Equation 1; column (4) shows the first stage estimates from Equation 3; column (5) shows the IV estimates of the impact of Medicaid coverage using the lottery as an instrument for Medicaid from Equation 2. All analyses are unweighted, include controls for household size, and adjust the standard errors for household clusters. Panel B additionally includes an indicator variable for whether the individual voted in a pre-lottery election (defined as having voted in at least one of the 2006 or 2007 elections shown in Table A3).

Table A3: Elections in the Data

Date	Election	Data
Pre-Period Elections		
5/16/2006	Statewide primary (including: OR Governor, US Congress, OR supreme court judge, OR state legislature)	2013
11/7/2006	State general election (including: Governor, US Congress, OR supreme court judge, US state legislature)	2013
5/15/2007	Off-year primary election	2013
11/6/2007	Special election	2013
Post-Lottery Elections		
5/20/2008	Statewide primary election (including: President, U.S. Congress state legislature)	2013
5/27/2008	Local elections	2010
7/15/2008	Local elections	2010
9/16/2008	Local elections	2010
10/7/2008	Local elections	2010
11/4/2008	Statewide general election (including: President, U.S. Congress, OR state legislature)	2010, 2013
11/18/2008	Local elections	2010
3/10/2009	Local elections	2010
5/5/2009	Local elections	2010
5/19/2009	Primary election	2010, 2013
6/23/2009	Local elections	2010
8/11/2009	Local elections	2010
9/15/2009	Local elections	2010
9/29/2009	Local elections	2010
10/13/2009	Local elections	2010
10/27/2009	Local elections	2010
11/3/2009	Local elections	2010
11/4/2009	Local elections	2010, 2013
11/17/2009	Local elections	2010
12/8/2009	Local elections	2010
12/15/2009	Local elections	2010
12/29/2009	Local elections	2010
1/26/2010	Statewide special election (to vote on two tax measures)	2010, 2013
3/9/2010	Local elections	2010
5/18/2010	Statewide primary election (including US Congress; OR governor; OR state legislature)	2010, 2013
6/1/2010	Local elections	2010
11/2/2010	Statewide general election (including US Congress; OR governor; OR state legislature)	2013

Table A4: 2010 and 2013 Data Files

			Not matched	Missing Nov 2008 Voting Data	Registered but Did Not vote in November 2008	Voted in November 2008	Total
				2013 data			
				Matched			
		Not matched	28,212	3,245	94	170	31,721
		Missing Nov 2008 Voting Data	3,029	4,818	3	7	7,857
2010 data	**Matched**	Registered but Did Not Vote in Nov 2008	1,155	46	8,731	7	9,939
		Voted in November 2008	1,707	53	5	23,640	25,405
		Total	34,103	8,162	8,833	23,824	74,922

Notes: "Missing" from the 2008 November voting data means that the individual is matched to the voting data but we have no record of whether she voted in that election. That could be, for example, because she was registered to vote after that election (but before the data pull).

Table A5: November 2008 Voting Records in the Cancelled Voter File and in the 2010 Data

			Cancelled Voter Data Matched				
			Not matched	Missing Nov 2008 Voting Data	Registered but Did Not Vote in Nov 2008	Voted in November 2008	**Total**
		Not Matched	30,333	1,213	49	126	31,721
2010 Data	**Matched**	Missing Nov 2008 Voting Data	5,443	2,410	0	4	7,857
		Registered but Did Not Vote in Nov 2008	8,353	83	1,498	5	9,939
		Voted in November 2008	23,280	183	4	1,938	25,405
		Total	67,409	3,889	1,551	2,073	74,922

Notes: "Missing" from the 2008 November voting data means that the individual was not registered at the time of the election. We replace voting records in the 2010 data that are "not matched" or "missing" with matched voting records from the cancelled voter file.

Table A6: November 2010 Voting Records in the Cancelled Voter File and in the 2013 Data

| | | | Cancelled Voter Data | | | | |
| | | | | Matched | | | |
			Not matched	Missing Nov 2010 Voting Data	Registered but Did Not Vote in Nov 2010	Voted in November 2010	Total
	Not Matched		30,024	3,487	277	315	34,103
2013 Data	**Matched**	Missing Nov 2010 Voting Data	8,214	2,267	10	10	10,501
		Registered but Did Not Vote in Nov 2010	13,774	163	490	1	14,428
		Voted in November 2010	15,397	95	2	396	15,890
	Total		67,409	6,012	779	722	74,922

Notes: "Missing" from the 2010 November voting data means that the individual was not registered at the time of the election. We replace voting records in the 2013 data that are "not matched" or "missing" with matched voting records from the cancelled voter file.

Table A7: Tests of Balance for Sample Selection

	Control mean	Treatment-control difference	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Voted in November 2006 election	0.166	0.004	0.147
		(0.003)	
Voted in November 2007 election	0.151	-0.002	0.587
		(0.003)	
Voted in any 2006 or 2007 election	0.225	-0.0005	0.889
		(0.003)	
Entry	0.043	-0.0002	0.898
		(0.002)	
Exit	0.040	0.00001	0.996
		(0.002)	

Notes: We report the coefficient on LOTTERY from estimating Equation 1 on the dependent variable shown in the first column. All regressions include indicators for the number of household members on the lottery list, adjust standard errors for household clusters, and are unweighted. The first three rows (analyzing voting in pre-lottery elections) use data from the 2013 data pull and the cancelled voter data. "Voted in any 2006 or 2007 election" includes the November 2006 state elections and the November 2007 special election (including 2 ballot measures) in the previous rows, as well as the May 2006 and May 2007 primaries. "Entry" is an indicator for individuals who appear in the 2013 data pull but not in the 2010 data pull or the cancelled voter file. "Exit" is an indicator for individuals who appeared in the 2010 data pull but not in the 2013 data pull or the cancelled voter file.

Table A8: Distribution of the Weights

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Median	75th%ile	95%ile	Max	N	Share with zero weight
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
June 2010 weights									
Full Sample	1.0	0.4	0	1	1	1.4	3.9	74922	0.09
Controls	1.0	0.4	0	1	1.3	1.5	3.9	45088	0.13
Treatments	1.0	0.2	0	1	1	1.3	2.7	29834	0.04
June 2010 weights (non-zero weights)									
Full Sample	1.1	0.2	1	1	1.1	1.4	3.9	67885	
Controls	1.2	0.2	1	1	1.4	1.5	3.9	39097	
Treatments	1.0	0.1	1	1	1	1.3	2.7	28788	
November 2010 weights									
Full Sample	1.0	3.2	0	1	1	1	190.0	74922	0.35
Controls	1.0	3.6	0	1	1	1.2	190.0	45088	0.44
Treatments	1.0	2.5	0	1	1	1	139.4	29834	0.21
November 2010 weights (non-zero weights)									
Full Sample	1.5	3.8	1	1	1	3.3	190.0	48767	
Controls	1.8	4.6	1	1	1	9.5	190.0	25217	
Treatments	1.3	2.7	1	1	1	1	139.4	23550	

Notes: Table shows the distribution of weights used to account for the new health insurance lottery that started in the fall of 2009. The top two panels (June 2010 weights) display the distribution of weights used to analyze registration and voting in elections (excluding the 2008 general election and the 2010 midterms), accounting for new lottery selection through June 1, 2010. The bottom two panels (November 2010 weights) report weights used to analyze voting in the 2010 Midterms, accounting for new lottery selection through November 4, 2010.