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#### Abstract

NOTE: An inadvertent error in the trend line methodology calculations caused population projections for 2020 to be too high in the study released December 20, 2017. As a result, this caused changes in two seats affecting four states using the short-term methodology (2016-2017) and one seat affecting two states using the middle-term methodology. There were no changes in seat allocations using the long-term methodology, although seat positioning (seen in "last seat given" and "next seat at" columns) were affected in all three methodologies. The below press release, tables, and maps have been updated to reflect these corrections. We regret the error but pleasantly acknowledge the contribution of one reader who found the issue.


## Some Change in Apportionment Allocations With New 2017 Census Estimates; But Greater Change Likely by 2020

New Census Bureau population estimates for 2017 released today shows a change of two more seats between four states from last year's study generated by Election Data Services, Inc. on which states would gain or lose congressional seats if the current numbers were used for apportionment in 2017. But projecting these numbers to 2020, using several different methods, leads to more states being impacted by the decennial census scheduled to take place in just three years.

The Bureau's 2017 total population estimates shows that now 12 states will be impacted by changes in their congressional delegation if these new numbers were used for apportionment today. The state of Colorado joins the previously indicated states of Florida, North Carolina, and Oregon to each gain a single seat while the state of Texas is now shown to gain a second seat with the new data. The states of New York and West Virginia joins the states of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota and Pennsylvania to lose a seat in Congress using the new data.

The new numbers, however, reflect subtle changes taking place across the nation in birth and death rates and resulting total population numbers that become magnified when the information is projected forward to coincide with the taking of the 2020 Census on April 1 that year. Election Data Services created three different methodologies to project the 2017 data forward nearly three years to 2020 (a short-term projection method for the trend occurring in 2016-2017, a middle term methodology using the 2014-2017 trend, and a long-term projection for 2010-2017). All three methodologies added the state of Arizona, along with a second seat for Florida and maybe a third seat for Texas, to the list of states noted above that will gain one or more seats by 2020. The list of losing states will expand to also include Alabama, Ohio, and Rhode Island by the time the Census is taken in 2020.

The three methodologies diverge at one important point, whether Montana will gain a second seat and keep Texas from obtaining a third additional seat. The long-term and mid-term methodologies show Texas would gain three seats by 2020 and Montana would stay at a single atlarge seat. But the short-term methodology points towards Texas having only two additional seats and the state of Montana securing seat \#434 (its second seat) by just 2,493 people to spare.

The projections show that the state of California is very close to actually losing a congressional seat in 2020, the first time that state will have lost a seat in its nearly 160 -year history. For the last several decades California's population growth has been relatively flat when compared to other states. While the state gained seven congressional districts between 1980 and 1990, it gained only one district the following decade and no additional seats between 2000 and 2010. All three projection methodologies for 2020 found California receiving seat \#435 or \#434, just before the cut-off, with the short-term methodology (2016-2017) finding the state kept its $53^{\text {rd }}$ seat with just 75,770 people to spare. The most recent destructive fires in Napa and Ventura counties occurred after the date associated with the Census estimates, so their impact won't be felt until the 2018 estimates are released.

All three projection methodologies show the state of Illinois as losing a single district by 2020. But the state is dangerously close to losing a second seat, which it currently keeps by obtaining seat \#432 or \#433 with between 103,000 and 191,000 people to spare depending on the methodology utilized.

For much of this decade the state of Minnesota is shown to be on the losing side of congressional representation. The 2017 population estimates confirm this, when the state comes up 30,477 short of keeping its $8^{\text {th }}$ seat, and on the wrong side of the magic 435 mark at seat \#437. All three projection methodologies also finds the state losing a seat, but the short-term methodology projection puts Minnesota at seat $\# 436$ and only 10,801 away from obtaining that seat. It is likely the state will continue to be on the representation bubble.

Using either methodology the population projections points toward an eight (8) to ten (10) seat change over 15 to 16 states across the nation come 2020. States that will gain single seats include Arizona, Colorado, North Carolina, and Oregon and maybe Montana, while Florida is set to gain two congressional districts and Texas could gain two or three seats. Single seat losses will again occur in the Midwest and Northeast sections of the nation, where Alabama, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and West Virginia, as well as possibly Minnesota would each lose a seat. All other states would keep the same number of representatives they were awarded in December 2010 when the official 2010 Census numbers were released.

Using the new sets of projected 2020 data, the apportionment calculations show that 15 to 16 states could gain or lose 8 to 10 districts by the time the Census is taken in 2020. The gainers and losers are:

## States Gaining Districts (7)

Arizona +1 (from 9 to 10 )
Colorado +1 (from 7 to 8 )
Florida +2 (from 27 to 29)
Montana even or +1 (from At-large to 2)
North Carolina +1 (from 13 to 14)
Oregon +1 (from 5 to 6)
Texas +2 or +3 (from 36 to 38 or 39 )

## States Losing Districts (8 or 9)

Alabama -1 (from 7 to 6)<br>Illinois - 1 (from 18 to 17)<br>Michigan - (from 14 to 13)<br>Minnesota -1 or even (from 8 to 7 or no change)<br>New York -1 (from 27 to 26)<br>Ohio -1 (from 16 to 15)<br>Pennsylvania - (from 18 to 17)<br>Rhode Island - 1 (from 2 to 1 )<br>West Virginia -1 (from 3 to 2)

The Census Bureau's press release accompanying the December $20^{\text {th }}, 2017$ release of the population estimates notes that Idaho is the nation's fastest growing state in the past year, followed by Nevada and Utah. But this population growth has not impacted these state's congressional allocation, at least not yet. The 2017 numbers show Idaho would stay at two seats, and miss gaining an additional seat by 118,406 people. But projecting the numbers forward to 2020 using the short-term methodology shows Idaho only 55,054 away from gaining a third seat. All the population projection methodologies keep the state of Nevada at four seats and sufficiently away from any margins of a fifth possible seat. Utah is similar in that it would take more than 161,000 extra people for the state to gain a fifth district.

Since 1941, by law the number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives has been capped at 435. As a result, there has always been interest in finding which states are close to that magic bubble, either just gaining their last seat, or just missing their next seat. The following table shows the results of the 2017 population estimates, as well as the short-term trend methodology calculations for the seats within five positions of the 435 cut off.

| 2017 Reapportionment Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 Population Estimates |  |  | 2020 Projections (using 2016-2017 short-term trend) |  |  |
| Last | Five Seats M | Margin of Gain | Last | Five Seats M | Margin of Gain |
| 431 | California (53rd) | 207,155 | 431 | Arizona (10th) | 65,805 |
| 432 | Ohio (16th) | 52,560 | 432 | Illinois ( $17^{\text {th }}$ ) | 103,961 |
| 433 | Alabama(7th) | 19,589 | 433 | Florida (29th) | 120,188 |
| 434 | Colorado ( $8^{\text {th }}$ ) | 900 | 434 | Montana (2nd) | 2,493 |
| 435 | Rhode Island (2nd) | ) 157 | 435 | California (53rd) | 75,770 |
| Next | Seats M | Margin of Loss | Nex | Seats Ma | Margin of Loss |
| 436 | New York ( $27^{\text {th }}$ ) | 2,932 | 436 | Minnesota (8th) | 10,801 |
| 437 | Minnesota (8th) | 30,477 | 437 | Texas (39th) | 60,103 |
| 438 | Montana ( $2^{\text {nd }}$ ) | ? | 438 | Ohio (16th) | 105,213 |
| 439 | West Virginia (3rd) | ) 19,492 | 439 | Alabama (7th) | 48,850 |
| 440 | Arizona (10th) | 92,005 | 440 | Rhode Island (2nd) | ) |
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Kimball Brace, President of Election Data Services, Inc. cautioned users to take the projections as very preliminary and subject to change. "The change in administration and the lack of a Census Director could have a profound impact on how well the 2020 Census is conducted, and therefore the counts that are available for apportionment," Brace noted. "Having worked with Census data and estimates since the 1970s, it is important to remember that major events like Katrina and the 2008 recession each changed population growth patterns and that impacted and changed the next apportionment," he said.

Brace also noted that major changes in the counting process are in the works for 2020 and that reduced budget funding could impact those plans. "History can also be a guide, recalling that the 1920 apportionment was cancelled because the numbers showed for the first time that more people resided in urban areas than rural areas" said Brace.

The new 2017 estimates also point to how close a number of states stand to gain or lose a district. Most notable are the states of:

Rhode Island - While keeping their two congressional districts with the 2017 numbers, the new data shows the state is now only 157 people away from dropping to a single district state. This has steadily decreased over the decade so far. Last year the state was 5,569 people away from losing its' second seat, and in 2015 the margin was 16,130 and in 2014 they kept the second seat by only 21,389 in population The 2010 Census gave Rhode Island their second seat but with only 52,481 people to spare. At this rate, they will be down to just one district in the next several years, the first time this has occurred to Rhode Island since 1789 when the nation was formed. This is confirmed in the 2020 study data. They would join six or seven other states that also just have a single representative in the US House (Alaska, Delaware, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming). Note that one projection method shows Montana gaining a second seat.

Montana - The state is at the cusp of possibly gaining back its second seat in Congress, something it held from 1910 through 1980. The state dropped to a single seat in the House of Representatives from 1990 to the current time. The long-term (2010-2017) and mid-change methodology (2014-2017) showed the state at seat \#436, just missing an additional seat. But, the short-term methodology (2016-2017) gives Montana it's second seat with just 2,493 people to spare.

Because congressional apportionment also impacts the Electoral College and the vote for President, Election Data Services took the 2020 projections for each state and applied the Presidential election results from the past five Presidential contests to determine the Electoral College outcomes in the past 16 years. The study shows that none of the presidential contests would have elected a different presidential candidate using the new apportionment counts but they would have been more Republican in nature. For example, in 2016 President Trump would have gained an additional electoral college vote under the new apportionment projections. In 2012 President Obama would still have won the Electoral College, but with four less votes ( 328 vs 332 ) that he won at the time of the voting. The biggest change would have occurred in the 2000 presidential election where George Bush would have gained an additional 19 electoral votes had the new 2020 apportionment projections determined the number of congressional seats in each state.
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The 2016 Electoral College was muddled because 7 electors voted for a different candidate than what they had pledged based on the vote totals. As a result, the overall change in candidate votes based on the new apportionment numbers shows just one vote difference in the bottom line results. President elect Trump's ability to carry states that will be losing congressional seats in 2020 also contributed to a reversal of the pattern depicted in previous elections.

It should be noted that the 2020 Presidential election and resulting electoral college will occur before the results of the 2020 Census are released by December 31, 2020. Therefore, the electoral college results in 2020 will be governed by the state's apportionment allocation as they exist today, having been first determined in 2011. The first time the new 2020 apportionment results will be utilized will be the 2024 Presidential election. Election Data Services, Inc. has also worked with the website 270 ToWin , who has built an interactive map of the these new apportionment results where users can adjusts state outcomes to discover electoral college outcomes for the presidential elections back to 2000.

Major weather events have also affected apportionment. The Census Bureau's estimated populations released for 2005 showed Louisiana would keep all their congressional districts that decade. Even the Bureau's own projections for 2010 released that same year showed Louisiana staying the same. Then hurricane Katrina hit Louisiana at the end of August 2005 (after the date of the population estimates). Devastation and population loss impacted New Orleans in a major way, and when the Bureau's 2006 population estimates were released Louisiana was looking at losing a congressional seat. That was ultimately confirmed when the 2010 Census was taken, and state data was released at the end of that year.

The year of 2017 saw 18 hurricanes and tropical storms, three of which have the potential of impacting population movements in the US. However, all three significant storms (Harvey (affecting Houston area), Irma (impacting Miami and the Florida Gulf Coast), and Maria (which devastated Puerto Rico)) occurred in August and September 2017, after the date of coverage for the Census Bureau's population estimates released today. "It won't be until next year when we see whether population lost in Houston was enough to keep Texas at gaining only two districts instead of three." noted Brace. "And while Irma may have cut down some population in Florida, Maria's wide-spread and on-going impact in Puerto Rico has reportedly led to more than a quarter million American citizens to move to Florida, mainly in the center of the state." Brace said. The 2017 study released today showed Florida missed gaining a 29th seat by only 366,735 people. It won't be until the 2018 estimates are released next year that the storm's impact will be seen in the numbers.

The 2017 population estimates have not been statistically adjusted for any known undercount. In addition, no estimates were provided for U.S. military personnel overseas. This component has in the past been counted by the Census Bureau and allocated to the states. Overseas military personnel have been a factor in the apportionment formula for the past several decades, including the switching of the final district in 2000 that went from Utah to North Carolina. Observers are also awaiting the Census Bureau's and/or Trump administration's release of the "residency rules" that will dictate where college students, the military, and prisoners will be counted in the 2020 census, which in turn could impact the apportionment process. The lack of a Census Director could also have an impact on how well the Census is conducted, and therefore the quality of the apportionment numbers.
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Past apportionment studies by Election Data Services, Inc. can be found at https://www.electiondataservices.com/reapportionment-studies/. A historical chart on the number of districts each state received each decade from 1789 to current is also available at this web address and linkable at https://www.electiondataservices.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/CD-apportionment-1789-2010.pdf.

Election Data Services Inc. is a political consulting firm that specializes in redistricting, election administration, and the analysis of census and political data. Election Data Services, Inc. conducts the congressional apportionment analyses with each annual release of the census population estimates. For more information about the reapportionment analysis, contact Kimball Brace (703-580-7267 or 202-789-2004 or kbrace@electiondataservices.com).
apportionment2017CBEstimatesC1.xls

| 2017 Population Estimates, Generated by Census Bureau 12/20/2017, with No Military Population Ove |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Population | Compare To | Seats | Change | Gain a Seat | Lose a Sea | Last Seat Given | Next Seat At | Average Size | Size Rank |
| Alabama | 4,874,747 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 732,336 | 19,589 | 433 | 502 | 696,392 | 42 |
| Àlaska | 739,795 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 626 | 739,795 | 33 |
| Ârizona | 7,016,270 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 92,005 | 659,375 | 394 | 440 | 779,586 | 10 |
| Ärkansas | 3,004,279 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 346,594 | 4009,0]88 | 377 | 484 | 7751,0770 | 21 |
| Callifornia | 39,536,653 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 547,966 | 207,155 | 431 | 441 | 745,975 | 27 |
| Colorado | 5,607,154 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 750,6800 | 900 | 434 | 495 | 7000,894 | 41 |
| Connecticut | 3,588,184 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 515,781 | 237,807 | 408 | 499 | 717,637 | 39 |
| Delaware | 961,939 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 479 | 961,939 | 2 |
| Florida | 20,984,400 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 366,735 | 385,706 | 427 | 444 | 749,443 | 24 |
| Georgia | 10,429,379 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 428,690 | 322,560 | 425 | 454 | 744,956 | 28 |
| Hawaii | 1,427,538 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 407,811 | 368,056 | 327 | 560 | 713,769 | 40 |
| İdaho | 1,716,943 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 118,406 | 657,461 | 276 | 466 | 858,472 | 5 |
| -iminois | 12,802,023 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 304,988 | 446,440 | 421 | 447 | 753,060 | 20 |
| İndiana | 6,666,818 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 441,457 | 3009,923 | 414 | 4635 | 740,758 | 31 |
| Towa | 3,145,711 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 205,162 | 550,520 | 358 | 464 | 786,428 | 7 |
| Ǩansas | 2,913,123 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 437,750 | 317,932 | 391 | 503 | 7288,281 | 36 |
| Kentucky | 4,454,189 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 401,687 | 350,831 | 402 | 476 | 742,365 | 30 |
| Louisiana | 4,684,333 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 171,543 | 580,975 | 386 | 450 | 780,722 | 9 |
| Maine | 1,335,907 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 499,442 | 2760,425 | 345 | 597 | 667,954 | 46 |
| Maryland | 6,052,177 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 305,657 | 445,923 | 404 | 457 | 756,522 | 17 |
| Massachusetts | 6,859,819 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 248,456 | 502,924 | 405 | 449 | 762,202 | 16 |
| MMichigan | 9,962,311 | 14 | 13 | -1 | 146,001 | 605,215 | 410 | 442 | 7666,332 | 13 |
| Minnesota | 5,576,606 | 8 | 7 | -1 | 30,477 | 721,448 | 383 | 437 | 7966,658 | 6 |
| M̈ississippi | 2,984,100 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 366,7773 | 388,9009 | 382 | 489 | 746,0225 | 26 |
| Missouri | 6,113,532 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 244,302 | 507,278 | 400 | 453 | 764,192 | 14 |
| M'Montana | 1,050,493 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 438 | 1,050,493 | 1 |
| Nebraska | 1,920,076 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 675,499 | 84,999 | 415 | 583 | 640,025 | 47 |
| Nevada | 2,998,039 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 352,834 | 402,848 | 379 | 486 | 749,510 | 23 |
| New Hampshire | 1,342,795 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 492,554 | 283,313 | 341 | 593 | 671,398 | 45 |
| New Jersey | 9,005,644 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 352,8335 | 3988,368 | 416 | 452 | 750, 470 | 22 |
| New Mexico | 2,088,070 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 507,505 | 252,993 | 387 | 539 | 696,023 | 43 |
| New York | 19,849,399 | 27 | 26 | -1 | 2,932 | 7479,306 | 419 | 436 | 7633,438 | 15 |
| North Carolina | 10,273,419 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 584,650 | 166,600 | 428 | 460 | 733,816 | 34 |
| North Dakota | 755,393 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 611 | 755,393 | 18 |
| Öhio | 11,658,609 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 698,800 | 52,560 | 432 | 462 | 728,663 | 35 |
| Öklahoma | 3,930,864 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 173,101 | 580,487 | 373 | 455 | 786,173 | 8 |
| Oregon | 4,142,776 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 713,100 | 39,418 | 429 | 512 | 690,463 | 44 |
| Pennsylvania | 12,805,537 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 301,474 | 449,954 | 420 | 446 | 753,267 | 19 |
| Rhode Island | 1,059,639 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 775,710 | 157 | 435 | 736 | 529,820 | 50 |
| South Carolina | 5,024,369 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 582,714 | 169,211 | 423 | 485 | 717,707 | 38 |
| South Dakota | 869,666 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 529 | 869,666 | 4 |
| TTennessee | 6,715,984 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 392,291 | 359,089 | 413 | 461 | 746,220 | 25 |
| Texas | 28,304,596 | 36 | 38 | 2 | 540,172 | 213,321 | 430 | 445 | 744,858 | 29 |
| Ütah | 3,101,833 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 249,040 | 506,642 | 362 | 470 | 775,458 | 11 |
| Vermont | 623,657 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 723 | 623,657 | 48 |
| Virginia | 8,470,020 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 138,528 | 612,688 | 406 | 443 | 770,002 | 12 |
| Washington | 7,405,743 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 452,751 | 298,519 | 418 | 463 | 740,574 | 32 |
| West Virginia | 1,815,857 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 19,492 | 756,375 | 256 | 439 | 907,929 | 3 |
| Wösconsin | 5,795,483 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 562,351 | 189,229 | 424 | 477 | 724,435 | 37 |
| Weoroming | 579,315 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 771 | 579,315 | 49 |
| Washington DC | 693,972 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 325,119,178 |  | 435 |  |  |  |  | Median = | 746,123 |  |
| Öther Inputs: | Seats to Appor |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min $=$ | 529,820 |  |
| 435 | Max Seats to C | alculate |  |  |  |  |  | Max $=$ | 1,050,493 |  |
| 75 | States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ГncludeWashi | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| State | Population | Compare To | Seats | Change | Gain a Seat | Lose a Sea | Last Seat Given | Next Seat At | Average Size | Size Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 4,913,917 | 7 | 6 | -1 | 48,850 | 727,520 | 373 | 439 | 818,986 | 6 |
| Älaska | 735,057 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 637 | 735,0357 | 36 |
| Ârizona | 7,316,858 | 9 | 10 |  | 714,621 | 65,805 | 431 | 476 | 731,686 | 39 |
| Ärkansas | 3,048,648 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3775,9866 | 4000,9338 | 380 | 490 | 7\%62,162 | 24 |
| Callifornia | 40,201,177 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 765,806 | 75,770 | 435 | 441 | 758,513 | 25 |
| Colorado | 5,821,991 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 675,7966 | 102,283 | 430 | 488 | 727,749 | 40 |
| Connecticut | 3,589,556 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 604,747 | 1711,378 | 416 | 507 | 717,911 | 41 |
| Delaware | 987,598 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 474 | 987,598 | 2 |
| Filorida | 21,900,186 | 27 | 29 | 2 | 686,826 | 120,188 | 433 | 447 | 755,179 | 29 |
| Georgía | 10,751,289 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 345,794 | 439,940 | 418 | 448 | 767,949 | 20 |
| Hawaii | 1,424,392 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 451,358 | 343,469 | 334 | 571 | 712,196 | 43 |
| İdaho | 1,820,696 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 55,054 | 739,773 | 262 | 446 | 910,348 | 3 |
| Oilininois | 12,709,583 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 685,946 | 103,961 | 432 | 459 | 747,623 | 33 |
| İİdiàna | 6,757,493 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 507, 252 | 2771,9556 | 420 | 469 | 7750, 8333 | 31 |
| lowa | 3,186,720 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 237,914 | 539,010 | 364 | 468 | 7906,680 | 9 |
| Kansas | 2,927,978 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 496,6556 | 2800,2693 | 397 | 508 | 731,995 | 38 |
| Kentucky | 4,504,101 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 458,666 | 317,703 | 403 | 480 | 7300,683 | 32 |
| Louisiana | 4,679,319 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 283,448 | 492,922 | 392 | 465 | 779,886 | 14 |
| Maine | 1,351,580 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 524,170 | 270,657 | 347 | 601 | 675,790 | 46 |
| Maryland | 6,127,939 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 369,847 | 4088,232 | 407 | 464 | 7655,992 | 22 |
| Massachusetts | 6,959,614 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 305,132 | 474,075 | 406 | 452 | 773,290 | 17 |
| Michigan | 10,041,923 | 14 | 13 | -1 | 288,8999 | 495,468 | 414 | 445 | 772,456 | 18 |
| Minnesota | 5,719,708 | 8 | 7 | -1 | 10,801 | 7666,296 | 379 | 436 | 817,101 | 7 |
| M̈ïssissipio | 2,9800,4885 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 444,149 | 332̈,7776 | 389 | 4997 | 745,121 | 34 |
| Missouri | 6,175,237 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 322,550 | 455,529 | 402 | 455 | 771,905 | 19 |
| Montana | 1,083,416 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 792,334 | 2,493 | 434 | 737 | 541,708 | 50 |
| Nebraska | 1,954,601 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 698,110 | 82,388 | 417 | 587 | 651,534 | 47 |
| Nevada | 3,162,931 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 261,704 | 515,221 | 366 | 472 | 790,733 | 11 |
| New Hampshire | 1,364,315 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 511,435 | 283,392 | 342 | 593 | 682,157 | 45 |
| New Jersey | 9,0]07,7487 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 483,734 | 2999,2877 | 422 | 458 | 7756,729 | 27 |
| New Mexico | 2,095,334 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 557,3771 | 223,120 | 391 | 548 | 698,445 | 44 |
| New York | 19,885,484 | 27 | 26 | -1 | 403, 847 | 398,864 | 428 | 443 | 7764,826 | 23 |
| North Carolina | 10,598,116 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 498,967 | 286,7666 | 423 | 453 | 7577,008 | 26 |
| North Dakota | 754,967 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 624 | 754,967 | 30 |
| Öhio | 11,758,068 | 16 | 15 | -1 | 105,213 | 681,901 | 412 | 438 | 783,871 | 13 |
| Ök̇lahoma | 3,957,4866 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 236,817 | 539,307 | 376 | 463 | 79191,497 | 10 |
| Oregon | 4,301,111 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 661,656 | 114,714 | 424 | 501 | 716,852 | 42 |
| Pennsylvania | 12,856,353 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 539,176 | 250,731 | 429 | 451 | 756,256 | 28 |
| Rhode Island | 1,065,351 | 2 | 1 | -1 |  |  | at large | 440 | 1,065,351 | 1 |
| South Carolina | 5,204,183 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 526,326 | 250,7771 | 415 | 477 | 743, 455 | 35 |
| South Dakota | 892,218 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 528 | 892,218 | 4 |
| TTennessee | 6,900,912 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 363,834 | 415,374 | 409 | 456 | 7666,768 | 21 |
| Texas | 29,419,611 | 36 | 38 | 2 | 60,103 | 759,855 | 425 | 437 | 774,200 | 16 |
| Ütah | 3,262,979 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 161,656 | 615,269 | 354 | 454 | 815,745 | 8 |
| Vermont | 624,491 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 738 | 624,491 | 48 |
| Virginia | 8,624,042 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 174,003 | 607,701 | 404 | 442 | 784,004 | 12 |
| Washington | 7,754,851 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 276,628 | 503,798 | 408 | 449 | 775,485 | 15 |
| West Virginia | 1,780,958 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 94,792 | 700,03035 | 269 | 457 | 890,479 | 5 |
| Wisconsin | 5,857,782 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 640,004 | 138,075 | 426 | 485 | 732,223 | 37 |
| Wyoming | 564,076 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 805 | 564,0776 | 49 |
| Washington DC | 720,844 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 332,158,27 |  | 435 |  |  |  |  | Median $=$ | 757,76 |  |
| Other Inputs: | Seats to Apportio |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min $=$ | 541,708 |  |
|  | Max Seats to Calc | ulat |  |  |  |  |  | Max $=$ | 1,065,35 |  |
|  | States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CincludeWashin | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2014_2017Changeln2017CBEstimatesC2.xIs


apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2010_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimatesC2.xIs



|  |  |  |  |  | 2016 Presidential Election |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | New <br> Apportionment Count (20102017 Trend) | New <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2010s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2000s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count |  Electoral <br>  Votes <br> 2016 For <br> President Clinton <br> al Victor (D) | Electorial <br> Votes <br> For <br> Trump <br> (Rep) | Electoral <br> Votes <br> For <br> Clinton <br> (D) | Electorial <br> Votes <br> For <br> Trump <br> (Rep) |
| Alabama | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | Trump 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Alaska | 1 |  | 3 | 3 | Trump 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | 10 | 12 | 11 | 10 | Trump 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Trump 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | 53 | 55 | 55 | 55 | Clinton 55 | 0 | 55 | 0 |
| Colorado. | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | Clinton : 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Clinton:. 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Clinton 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | 29 | 31 | 29 | 27 | Trump 0 | 29 | 0 | 31 |
| Georgia | 14. | 16 | 16 | 15 | Trump | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Clinton* 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Trump 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Illinois | 17. | 19 | 20 | 21 | Clinton:....... 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | Trump | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| lowa | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | Trump : 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Trump 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | ${ }^{6}$ | 8 | 8 | 8 | Trump | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 | Trump | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Clinton 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Clinton 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | Clinton 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | Trump $: 0$ | 16 | 0 | 15 |
| Minnesota | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | Clinton 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Trump | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 | Trump 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Trump 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Nevada | - 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Clinton 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Clinton 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 12 | 14 | 14 | 15 | Clinton 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico. | ................ | ..... 5 | 5 | 5 | Clinton : | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | 26 | 28 | 29 | 31 | Clinton 29 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 14 | 16 | 15 | 15 | Trump | 15 | 0 | 16 |
| North Dakota | + 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump : 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | 15 | 17. | 18 | 20 | Trump | 18 | 0 | 17 |
| Oklahoma | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Trump 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | Clinton 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Trump 0 | 20 | 0 | 19 |
| Rhode Island | - 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | Clinton ${ }^{\text {and.... }} 4$ | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | Trump 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | 9 | 11 | 11. | 11 | Trump | 11. | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | 39 | 41 | 38 | 34 | Trump\# : 0 | 36 | 0 | 39 |
| Utah | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Trump 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Clinton 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | 11. | 13 | 13 | 13 | Clinton | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Washington | 10 | 12 | 12 | 11 | Clinton\& 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| WestVirginia | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | Trump | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin. | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Trump | 10. | 0 | 10. |
| Wyoming | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington DC |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | Clinton 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 227 | 304 | 226 | 305 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \#One elector voted for | for John Ka | asich for Pr | President |
|  |  |  |  |  | \#One elector voted for | for Ron Pau | aul for Presid | ident |
|  |  |  |  |  | \&Three electors vote | ed for Colin | Powell for | President |
|  |  |  |  |  | \&One elector voted $f$ | for Faith Sp | Spotted Eag | gle |
|  |  |  |  |  | *One elector voted for | or Bernie S | Sanders |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | 2012 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  | 2008 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | New <br> Apportionment <br> Count (2010- <br> 2017 Trend) | New <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2010s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2000s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2012 Presidential: Victor | Electoral <br> Votes For Obama (D) | Electorial <br> Votes For <br> Romney <br> (Rep) | Votes <br> For Obama <br> (D) | Electorial <br> Votes <br> For Romney (Rep) | 2008 <br> Presidential <br> Victor | Electoral <br> Votes For Obama (D) | Electorial <br> Votes <br> For <br> McCain <br> (Rep) | Electoral <br> Votes For Obama (D) |  |
| Alabama | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | Romney | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | McCain | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Alaska | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | 10 | 12 | 11 | 10 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 | McCain | 0 | 10 | 0 | 12 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | 53 | 55 | 55 | 55 | Obama | 55 | 0 | 55 | 0 | Obama | 55 | 0 | 55 | 0 |
| Colorado | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | Obama | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | 29 | 31 | 29 | 27 | Obama | 29 | 0 | 31 | 0 | Obama | 27 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Georgia | 14 | 16 | 16 | 15 | Romney | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | McCain | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Romney | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | McCain | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| linois | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Obama | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Obama | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | $\cdots$ | 11 | 11 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Obama | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| lowa | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | Obama | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Kansas | + 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | Romney | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | McCain | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 | Romney | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | McCain | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | Obama | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | Obama | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | Obama | 16 | 0 | 15 | 0 | Obama | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Mississippi | - 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | - 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | McCain | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | - 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nebraska | . | 5 | 5 | 5 | Romney | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | McCain | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Nevada | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Obama | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Obama | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 12 | 14 | 14 | 15 | Obama | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | Obama | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Obama | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | Obama | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | 26 | 28 | 29 | 31 | Obama | 29 | 0 | 28 | 0 | Obama | 31 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 14 | 16 | 15 | 15 | Romney | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | Obama | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| North Dakota | , | 3 | 3 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | 15 | 17 | 18 | 20 | Obama | 18 | 0 | 17. | 0 | Obama | 20 | 0 | 17 | 7 |
| Oklahoma | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Romney | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | McCain | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Obama | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Obama | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | .......... | 3 | 4 | 4 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | Romney | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | McCain | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | $\ldots$ | 3 | 3 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | ....... 9 | 11. | 11 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | McCain | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | 39 | 41 | 38 | 34 | Romney | 0 | 38 | 0 | 41 | McCain | 0 | 34 | 0 | 41 |
| Utah | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | McCain | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | 11 | 13 | 13 | 13 | Obama | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | Obama | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Washington | 10 | 12 | 12 | 11 | Obama | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | Obama | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| WestVirginia | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | Romney | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | McCain | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| WashingtonDC |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 332 | 206 | 328 | 209 |  | 365 | 173 | 356 | 181 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4 | 3 |  |  |  | -9 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : |


|  |  |  |  |  | 2004 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  | 2000 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | New <br> Apportionment <br> Count (2010- <br>  <br> 2017 Trend) | New Electoral College Count | 2010s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2000s <br> Electoral <br> College <br> Count | 2004 <br> Presidentia: <br> Victor | Electoral; <br> Votes <br> For Kerry; <br> (D) | Electorial <br> Votes For Bush (Rep) | Revised <br> Electoral Votes <br> For Kerry: <br> (D) | Revised <br> Electorial <br> Votes <br> For Bush <br> (Rep) | 2000 <br> Presidential: <br> Victor | Electoral <br> Votes <br> For Gore <br> (D) | Electorial <br> Votes For Bush (Rep) | Revised <br> Electoral <br> Votes <br> For Gore <br> (D) | Revised <br> Electorial <br> Votes For Bush (Rep) |
| Alabama | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Alaska | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | 10. | 12 | 11 | 10 | Bush | 0 | 10 | 0 | 12 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 12 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | 53 | 55 | 55 | 55 | Kerry | 55 | 0 | 55 | 0 | Gore | 54 | 0 | 55 | 0 |
| Colorado. | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Kerry | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | Gore | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Gore | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | 29 | 31 | 29 | 27 | Bush | 0 | 27 | 0 | 31 | Bush | 0 | 25 | 0 | 31 |
| Georgia | 14 | 16 | 16 | 15 | Bush | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Gore | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Ilinois. | 17. | 19 | 20 | 21 | Kerry | 21. | 0 | 19. | 0 | Gore | 22 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Bush | 0 | 12 | 0 | 11 |
| lowa | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | Gore | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Kansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Kerry | - 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Gore | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Kerry | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Gore | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | Kerry | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 | Gore | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | Kerry | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 | Gore | 18 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | - 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | Kerry | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | Gore | 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Mississippi | ....... 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Nevada | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| New Jersey | 12 | 14 | 14 | 15 | Kerry | - 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 | Gore | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico. | 3 | 5 | 5. | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | Gore | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | 26 | 28 | 29 | 31 | Kerry | 31 | 0 | 28 | 0 | Gore | 33 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 14 | 16 | 15 | 15 | Bush | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | Bush | 0 | 14 | 0 | 16 |
| North Dakota | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio. | 15. | 17 | 18 | 20 | Bush | ,...... | 20 | 0 | 17 | Bush | 0 | 21 | 0 | 17 |
| Oklahoma | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | Kerry | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | Gore | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Kerry | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Gore | 23 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode island. | 1. | 3 | 4. | - 4 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Gore | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | 9 | 11. | 11. | 11 | Bush | 0 | 11. | 0 | 11. | Bush | 0 | 11. | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | 39 | 41 | 38 | 34 | Bush | 0 | 34 | 0 | 41 | Bush | 0 | 32 | 0 | 41 |
| Utan | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Gore | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | 11 | 13 | 13 | 13 | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| Washington | 10 | 12 | 12 | 11 | Kerry | :11 | 0 | 12 | 0 | Gore | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| WestVirginia | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin. | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Kerry | 10. | 0 | 10 | 0 | Gore | 11. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington DC |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | Gore | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 251 | 286 | 240 | 297 |  | 266 | 271 | 247 | 290 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -11 | 11 |  |  |  | -19 | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

