

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

6171 Emerywood Court Manassas, Virginia 20112

202 789.2004 tel. or 703 580.7267 703 580.6258 fax Info@electiondataservices.com

Date: December 26, 2017 Contact: Kimball W. Brace

Tel.: (202) 789–2004 or (703) 580-7267 Email: <u>kbrace@electiondataservices.com</u> Website: www.electiondataservices.com

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 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 at-large 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 53rd 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 8th 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)	States Losing Districts (8 or 9)
Arizona +1 (from 9 to 10)	Alabama -1 (from 7 to 6)
Colorado +1 (from 7 to 8)	Illinois -1 (from 18 to 17)
Florida +2 (from 27 to 29)	Michigan -1 (from 14 to 13)
Montana even or +1 (from At-large to 2)	Minnesota -1 or even (from 8 to 7 or no change)
North Carolina +1 (from 13 to 14)	New York -1 (from 27 to 26)
Oregon +1 (from 5 to 6)	Ohio -1 (from 16 to 15)
Texas +2 or +3 (from 36 to 38 or 39)	Pennsylvania -1 (from 18 to 17)
	Rhode Island -1 (from 2 to 1)
	West Virginia -1 (from 3 to 2)

The Census Bureau's press release accompanying the December 20th, 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 Reap	portionment	onment Analysis							
ation Estimates	-	2020 Proje	ections						
	(us	hort-term trend)							
Margin of Gain	Las	t Five Seats	Margin of Gain						
ord) 207,155	431	Arizona (10th)	65,805						
52,560	432	Illinois (17 th)	103,961						
19,589	433	Florida (29th)	120,188						
900	434	Montana (2nd)	2,493						
(2nd) 157	435	California (53rd)	75,770						
Margin of Loss	, Nex	t Seats	Margin of Loss						
7 th) 2,932	436	Minnesota (8th)	10,801						
h) 30,477	437	Texas (39th)	60,103						
?	438	Ohio (16th)	105,213						
u (3rd) 19,492	439	Alabama (7th)	48,850						
92,005	440	Rhode Island (2r	nd) ?						
	2017 Reap ation Estimates Margin of Gain rd) 207,155 52,560 19,589 900 (2nd) 157 Margin of Loss 7 th) 2,932 h) 30,477 (3rd) 19,492) 92,005	2017 Reapportionment ation Estimates (us Margin of Gain Lass rd) 207,155 431 52,560 432 19,589 433 900 434 (2nd) 157 435 Margin of Loss Nex 7 th) 2,932 436 h) 30,477 437 (3rd) 19,492 439) 92,005 440	2017 Reapportionment Analysis 2020 Projet (using 2016-2017 sl (using 2016-2017 sl 						

Election Data Services, Inc. "2017 Reapportionment Analysis" December 26, 2017 Page 4 of 6

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 electoral votes had the new 2020 apportionment projections determined the number of congressional seats in each state.

Election Data Services, Inc. "2017 Reapportionment Analysis" December 26, 2017 Page 5 of 6

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 <u>270ToWin</u>, 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.

Election Data Services, Inc. "2017 Reapportionment Analysis" December 26, 2017 Page 6 of 6

Past apportionment studies by Election Data Services, Inc. can be found at <u>https://www.electiondataservices.com/reapportionment-studies/</u>. 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 <u>https://www.electiondataservices.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/CD-apportionment-1789-2010.pdf</u>.

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).

APPENDIX Main apportionment2017CBEstimatesC1.xls

2017 Population Es	stimates, Generat	ed by Censu	s Bureau	J 12/20/20			; /			
	1	1 /	1		1	ľ		/	1 1	1 1
	4 !	Compare	1		1	1	Last Seat	Next Seat	. 1	1 1
State	Population	То	Seats	Change	Gain a Seat	Lose a Sea	Given	At	Average Size	Size Rank
Alabama	4,874,747	7	7	0	732,336	19,589	433	502	696,392	42
Alaska	739,795	1 1	1	0	1		at large	626	739,795	33
Arizona	7,016,270	9 /	9	0	92,005	659,375	394	440	779,586	10
Arkansas	3,004,279	4	4	0	346,594	409,088	377	484	751,070	21
California	39,536,653	53	53	0	547,966	207,155	431	441	745,975	27
Colorado	5,607,154	7 /	8	1	750,680	900	434	495	700,894	41
Connecticut	3,588,184	5 /	5	0	515,781	237,807	408	499	717,637	39
Delaware	961,939	<u> </u>	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
Idaho	1,716,943	2	2	0	118,406	657,461	276	466	858,472	5
Illinois	12,802,023	18	17	-1	304,988	446,4401	421	447	753,060	20
Indiana	6,666,818	9	9	0	441,457	309,923	414	465	740,758	31
lowa	3,145,711	4 /	4	0	205,162	550,520	358	464	786,428	7
Kansas	2,913,123	4 !	4	0	437,750	317,932	391	503	728,281	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	580,9751	386	450	780,722	9
Maine	1,335,907	2 /	2	0	499,442	276,425	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
Michigan	9,962,311	14	13	-1	146,001	605,215	410	442	766,332	13
Minnesota	5,576,606	8	7	-1	30,477	721,448	383	437	796,658	6
Mississippi	2,984,100	4 !	4	0	366,773	388,909	382	489	746,025	26
Missouri	6,113,532	8 /	8	0	244,302	507,278	400	453	764,192	14
Montana	1,050,493	1 1	1	0	1		at large	438	1,050,493	1
Nebraska	1,920,076	3 /	3	0	675,499	84,9991	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	352,835	398,368	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	749,306	419	436	763,438	15
North Carolina	10,273,419	13	14	1	584,650	166,600	428	460	733,816	34
North Dakota	755,393	1 1	1	0	1	/	at large	611	755,393	18
Ohio	11,658,609	16	16	0	698,800	52,560	432	462	728,663	35
Oklahoma	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	717,767	38
South Dakota	869,666	1 1	1	0	1		at large	529	869,666	4
Tennessee	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
Utah	3,101,833	4 '	4	0	249,040	506,642	362	470	775,458	11
Vermont	623,657	1 1	1	0	4		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
Wisconsin	5,795,483	8	8	0	562,351	189,229	424	477	724,435	37
Wyoming	579,315	1 1	1	0	1	7	at large	771	579,315	49
Washington DC	693,972	0	(1	1	······	Č	ļ,	i	1
	f	/		7	1	······		•••••••	••••••	
	325,719,178		435		T		<u></u>	Median =	746,123	**************************************
Other Inputs:	Seats to Apport	tion	\$·	\$?	í i			Min =	529,820	:
435	Max Seats to C	alculate			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Max =	1.050,493	•••••••
75	States	5	\$	÷					.,,	
50					·	·····÷	\$ }		÷	÷1
	\$¢	,		ş	/		÷	••••••••		



Election 🙀 Data Services

APPENDIX Main apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2016_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimatesC2.xls

2020 Projections b	ased on 2016-201	7 Change in	2017 Po	pulation E	stimates, Gene	rated by Cens	us Bureau 1	2/20/2017,	with No Military	Population
		0					1 (0 4	No. 4 0 4		
04-4-	Demoletien	Compare	0	01			Last Seat	Next Seat		
State	Population	10	Seats	Change	Gain a Seat	Lose a Sea	Given	At	Average Size	Size Rank
Alabama	4,913,917	7	6	-1	48,850	727,520	373	439	818,986	6
Alaska	735,057	1	1	0			at large	637	735,057	36
Arizona	7,316,858	9	10	1	714,621	65,805	431	476	731,686	39
Arkansas	3,048,648	4	4	0	375,986	400,938	380	490	762,162	24
California	40,201,177	53	53	0	765,806	/5,//0	435	441	758,513	25
Colorado	5,821,991	/	8	1	675,796	102,283	430	488	/2/,/49	40
Connecticut	3,589,556	5	5	0	604,747	171,378 416		507	/1/,911	41
Delaware	987,598	1	1	0			at large	4/4	987,598	2
Florida	21,900,186	27	29	2	686,826	120,188	433	447	755,179	29
Georgia	10,751,289	14	14	0	345,794	439,940	418	448	767,949	20
Hawall	1,424,392	2	2	0	451,358	343,469	334	571	712,196	43
Idano	1,820,696	<u> </u>	,	U, U,	55,054	139,113	262	446	910,348	3
IIIINOIS	12,709,583	18	17	-1	685,946	103,961	432	459	747,623	33
Indiana	0,757,495	9	9	0	507,252	271,950	420	409	750,833	31
Iowa	3,180,720	4	4	U O	237,914	239,010	304	408	790,080	9
Kansas	2,927,978	4	4	0	490,000	280,269	397	508 490	731,995	38
Кепциску	4,304,101	0	0	0	400,000	317,703	403	400	750,005	32
Louisiana	4,079,319	0	0	U	283,448	492,922	392	400	779,880	14
Mandand	1,331,360	Z	<u>~</u>	0	324,170	270,007	347	464	075,790	40
Maaaaabuaatta	0,127,939	0	<u> </u>	0	309,047	400,232	407	404	705,992	47
Massachusells	0,959,014	9	12	U 1	303,132	474,073	400	40Z	772 456	17
Minnosoto	5 710 709	0	13	-1	200,099	490,400	270	445	917 101	10 7
Minnesola	3,719,700	0	····· /	- 1	10,001	700,290	200	430	017,101 745 101	24
Mississippi	2,900,400	4	4 0	0	222 550	332,170 455 520	309	499 455	745,121	
Montono	0,175,257	0	<u>°</u>	U 1	702 334	400,029	402	400	5/1 709	19 50
Nobraska	1,003,410	з	2	۱ ۵	602 110	2,495	434	737 597	651 53 <i>1</i>	30 47
Nevada	3 162 031			0	261 704	515 221	366	J07 172	700 733	47
New Hampshire	1 36/ 315	····· 7	····· 2	0	511 / 35	283 302	342	503	682 157	11
New Jersey	9 080 7/8	<u>-</u>	12	0	183 731	200,002	122 122	458	756 720	
New Mexico	2 095 334			0	557 377	233,207	301	548	698 445	27 44
New York	19 885 484	27	26	-1	403 847	398 864	428	443	764 826	23
North Carolina	10,598,116	13	14	1	498 967	286 766	423	453	757 008	26
North Dakota	754 967	······	·····	Ö	100,007	200,100	at large	624	754 967	30
Ohio	11,758,068	16	15	-1	105,213	681,901	412	438	783.871	13
Oklahoma	3,957,486	5	5	0	236.817	539,307	376	463	791,497	10
Oregon	4.301.111	5	6	1	661.656	114,714	424	501	716.852	42
Pennsvlvania	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	250,771	415	477	743,455	35
South Dakota	892,218	1	1	0	·····		at large	528	892,218	4
Tennessee	6,900,912	9	9	0	363,834	415,374	409	456	766,768	21
Texas	29,419,611	36	38	2	60,103	759,855	425	437	774,200	16
Utah	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	700,035	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	564,076	49
Washington DC	720,844	0								
	332,158,27		435					Median =	757,76 [.]	
Other Inputs:	Seats to Apportio	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					Min =	541,708	
435	Max Seats to Calo	culat						Max =	1,065,35	
75	States									
50	{									
hclude Washi			}							



Election 👸 Data Services

Based on Census Bureau estimates released 12/26/2017

APPENDIX Main apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2014_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimatesC2.xls

2020 Projections based on 2014-2017		7 Change in	2017 Po	pulation E	Estimates, Gene	erated by Cens	sus Bureau 1	2/20/2017,	with No Military	Population
		Compare					Last Seat	Next Seat		
State	Population	То	Seats	Change	Gain a Seat	Lose a Sea	Given	At	Average Size	Size Rank
Alabama	4,906,793	7	6	-1	70,512	726,498	374	438	817,799	7
Alaska	742,589	1	1	0			at large	631	742,589	37
Arizona	7,313,407	9	10	1	741,600	72,923	433	477	731,341	40
Arkansas	3,040,950	4	4	0	393,717	397,100	382	491	760,237	26
California	40,318,943	53	53	0	768,049	252,024	435	440	760,735	25
Colorado	5,861,962	7	8	1	654,859	150,592	426	483	732,745	38
Connecticut	3,577,217	5	5	0	629,373	164,021	417	511	715,443	44
Delaware	987,534	1	1	0			at large	476	987,534	3
Florida	orida 22,034,897		29	2	618,282	286,646	431	445	759,824	27
Georgia	10,756,967	14	14	0	372,624	460,647	420	446	768,355	21
Hawaii	1,436,609	2	2	0	444,635	357,262	332	565	718,305	43
Idaho	1,800,494	2	2	0	80,750	721,147	264	450	900,247	4
Illinois	12,728,769	18	17	-1	706,001	141,522	432	458	748,751	33
Indiana	6,735,072	9	9	0	550,956	258,986	421	471	748,341	34
lowa	3,182,989	4	4	0	251,677	539,139	364	469	795,747	11
Kansas	2,925,620	4	4	0	509,046	281,770	397	509	731,405	39
Kentucky	4,494,713	6	6	0	482,591	314,419	405	481	/49,119	32
Louisiana	4,717,157	6	6	0	260,148	536,862	390	457	786,193	13
Maine	1,342,361	2	2	0	538,883	263,014	350	607	671,181	47
Maryland	6,128,312	8	8	0	388,509	416,942	407	466	766,039	23
Massachusetts	6,954,630	9	9	0	331,397	478,545	406	451	772,737	17
Michigan	10,006,187	14	13	-1	354,898	4/3,64/	416	447	769,707	20
Minnesota	5,692,816	8	<i></i>	-1	54,480	746,625	380	437	813,259	9
Mississippi	2,980,001	4	4	0	454,665	336,151	391	500	745,000	35
Mantana	6,164,890	8	8	0	351,931	453,520	402	460	170,611	19
Montana	1,079,348	۱ ک		0	702 705	07 000		430	1,079,348	1
Nebraska	1,950,710	3	3	U	703,705	87,232 515 500	418	287 472	002,239	48
Nevaua Now Hompohiro	3,139,442	4 	4	0	273,224	010,092	300	47Z	109,001	12
	1,353,607	∠ 10	∠ 10	0	520,377	270,520	344	783	755 200	40
New Jersey	9,003,401	12	12	0	529,040	294,799	423	40Z 540	700,200 607 513	30 45
New Wexico	2,092,330		26		120 600	223,034	128	J49 112	766 122	40
North Carolina	10 588 169	13	1/	- 1	5/1/21	201 850	125	454	756 298	22
North Dakota	771 081	10			571,721	231,000	at large	610	771 081	18
Ohio	11 718 404		15	-1	179 629	658 382	413	439	781 227	15
Oklahoma	3 982 803	5	5	0	223 787	569 607	375	459	796 561	10
Oregon	4 317 379	5	6	1 1	659 926	137 084	424	501	719 563	42
Pennsylvania	12,819,483	18	17	-1	615,287	232,235	430	452	754.087	 31
Rhode Island	1.064.112	2	1	-1	0.0,201	,	at large	441	1.064.112	2
South Carolina	5.214.916	7	7	0	532.380	268.724	414	478	744.988	
South Dakota	888.634	1	1	0	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,. – .	at large	529	888,634	6
Tennessee	6.881.637	9	9	0	404.391	405.551	412	463	764.626	24
Texas	29,604,237	36	39	3	729,913	222,975	434	444	759,083	28
Utah	3,259,702	4	4	0	174,964	615,852	354	456	814,926	8
Vermont	621,822	1	1	0			at large	738	621,822	49
Virginia	8,612,962	11	11	0	210,855	608,306	404	443	782,997	14
Washington	7,751,401	10	10	0	303,605	510,918	408	449	775,140	16
West Virginia	1,787,238	3	2	-1	94,007	707,891	268	455	893,619	5
Wisconsin	5,836,321	8	8	0	680,500	124,951	429	488	729,540	41
Wyoming	575,656	1	1	0	·····		at large	791	575,656	50
Washington DC	725,909	0								
	332,480,28		435					Median =	760,48(
Other Inputs:	Seats to Apportio	ו						Min =	575,656	
435	Max Seats to Calo	culat						Max =	1,079,34	
75	States									
50							<u> </u>			
hclude Washington							,			



Election 🙀 Data Services

Based on Census Bureau estimates released 12/26/2017

APPENDIX Main apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2010_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimatesC2.xls

2020 Projections based on 2010-2017		7 Change in	2017 Po	pulation E	Estimates, Gene	rated by Cens	sus Bureau 1	2/20/2017,	with No Military	Population
		Compare					Last Seat	Next Seat		
State	Population	То	Seats	Change	Gain a Seat	Lose a Sea	Given	At	Average Size	Size Rank
Alabama	4,918,973	7	6	-1	88,485	735,322	375	439	819,829	7
Alaska	753,900	1	1	0			at large	629	753,900	32
Arizona	7,330,167	9	10	1	773,638	83,870	435	478	733,017	40
Arkansas	3,045,986	4	4	0	409,489	400,013	382	492	761,496	28
California	40,646,714	53	53	0	689,188	547,628	434	438	766,919	25
Colorado	5,902,421	7	8	1	653,880	186,465	425	483	737,803	38
Connecticut	3,594,666	5	5	0	637,408	178,730	416	512	718,933	43
Delaware	993,365	1	1	0			at large	476	993,365	3
Florida	22,099,273	27	29	2	691,142	333,561	432	445	762,044	27
Georgia	10,794,819	14	14	0	402,196	490,233	420	447	771,059	22
Hawaii	1,459,878	2	2	0	432,763	379,665	325	561	729,939	42
Idaho	1,791,884	2	2	0	100,757	711,671	269	459	895,942	6
Illinois	12,788,504	18	17	-1	727,656	191,151	433	460	752,265	33
Indiana	6,752,879	9	9	0	577,288	271,595	422	470	750,320	35
lowa	3,192,483	4	4	0	262,991	546,510	363	469	798,121	11
Kansas	2,941,197	4	4	0	514,277	295,224	397	509	735,299	39
Kentucky	4,508,217	6	6	0	499,241	324,566	407	482	751,369	34
Louisiana	4,755,775	6	6	0	251,682	572,124	386	455	792,629	13
Maine	1,339,385	2	2	0	553,256	259,172	354	611	669,693	47
Maryland	6,185,926	8	8	0	370,375	469,970	403	463	773,241	19
Massachusetts	7,009,634	9	9	0	320,533	528,349	404	451	778,848	17
Michigan	9,998,426	14	13	-1	425,428	458,233	419	448	769,110	23
Minnesota	5,708,010	8	7	-1	74,104	757,847	381	437	815,430	9
Mississippi	2,991,471	4	4	0	464,003	345,498	392	501	747,868	36
Missouri	6,171,833	8	8	0	384,468	455,877	406	464	771,479	21
Montana	1,080,214	1	1	0			at large	436	1,080,214	1
Nebraska	1,965,243	3	3	0	711,356	94,258	418	589	655,081	48
Nevada	3,149,328	4	4	0	306,146	503,355	370	475	787,332	15
New Hampshire	1,355,104	2	2	0	537,538	274,890	345	603	677,552	46
New Jersey	9,105,974	12	12	0	544,639	330,274	423	462	758,831	30
New Mexico	2,101,491	3	3	0	575,108	230,506	393	548	700,497	45
New York	20,070,659	27	26	-1	401,383	596,822	427	441	771,948	20
North Carolina	10,637,703	13	14	1	559,312	333,117	426	454	759,836	29
North Dakota	798,016	1	1	0			at large	591	798,016	12
Ohio	11,715,063	16	15	-1	255,050	646,162	413	443	781,004	16
Oklahoma	4,016,945	5	5	0	215,130	601,008	374	456	803,389	10
Oregon	4,297,264	5	6	1	710,194	113,613	428	503	716,211	44
Pennsylvania	12,852,967	18	1/	-1	663,193	255,613	430	452	/56,057	31
Rhode Island	1,062,733	2	1	-1	FF0 110	070.000	at large	444	1,062,733	2
South Carolina	5,223,002	/	/	U	559,112	272,839	414	4/9 F00	746,143	31
	896,824	1	1	U	404 000		at large	528	890,824	5
Tennessee	6,895,305	9	9	0	434,862	414,021	412	465	766,145	26
Texas	29,934,070	30	39	3	583,848	529,220	431	440	767,540	24
Ulan Verment	3,275,005	4	4	U	179,809	629,692	300	437	818,910	8
Vermoni	022,703	1	11	0	170 606	696 405		/41	022,703	49
Virginia Weebington	8,097,577	11	10	0	179,090	686,495 502 201	402	44Z	790,089	14
West Virginia	1,149,087	اU م	10	U	১০4,∠17 ০০ 400	503,291	411	400	114,909	٥١ ۸
Wisconsin	1,199,100	ა ი	<u> </u>	- 1	33,48Z	10,940	207 700	403 700	033,300 720 750	4
Wyoming	5,040,015	0	0	U A	110,200	130,000	429 at large	400 700	130,132	4 I 50
Woohington DC	000,000 740,700	۱ ۲		U			ariarge	103	000,000	50
vvasningtön DC	142,108	U								
	224 450 74		405					Modia-	766 501	
Oth an largests	334,153,74		435					ivieulan =	100,532	
	Seats to Apportio) Nulot					}	IVIIN =	586,638	
435	IVIAN SEALS IO UAIO	Julai							1,000,21	
/5							} }			
50										
hclude Washi	naton		({			3			



Election 🙀 Data Services

Electoral College Outcome apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2010_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimates.xls

					2016 Presidential Election							
					,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Electoral	Electorial	Electoral	Electorial			
	New	New	2010s	2000s		Votes	Votes	Votes	Votes			
	Apportionment	Electoral	Electoral	Electoral	2016	For	For	For	For			
	Count (2010-	College	College	College	Presidenti	Clinton	Trump	Clinton	Trump			
State	2017 Trend)	Count	Count	Count	al Victor	(D)	(Rep)	(D)	(Rep)			
Alabama	6	8	9	9	Trump	0	9	0	8			
Alaska	1	3	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	0	16	0	16			
Hawaii	2	4	4	4	<u>Clinton*</u>	3	0	3	0			
ldaho	2	4	4	4	Trump	0	4	0	4			
Illinois	17	19	20	21	Clinton	20	0	19	0			
Indiana	9	11	11		Trump	0	11	0				
lowa	4	6	6	7	Trump 	0	6	0	6			
Kansas	4	6	6	6	Trump	0	6	0	6			
Kentucky	6	8		8	I rump	0	8	0				
Louisiana Maina	6	ð A		9	i rump	U 2	8 4	U				
Maine	2	4	4	4	Clinton	3	1	4	0			
Maryland	8	10	10	10	Clinton	10	0	10	0			
Massachuseus		15	16	12	Trump	·····	16		15			
Minnesota	7	ن م	10	10	Clinton	10	0	0 0	0			
Mississippi	4	6	6	6	Trump	0	6	0	6			
Missouri		10	10		Trump	0	10	õ	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	3	5	5	5	Clinton	5	0	5	0			
New York	26	28	29	31	Clinton	29	0	28	0			
North Carolina	14	16	15	15	Trump	0	15	0	16			
North Dakota	1	3	3	3	Trump	0	3	0	3			
Ohio	15	17	18	20	Trump	0	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	4	0	3	0			
South Carolina	7	9	9	8	I rump	0	9	0	9			
South Dakota	1	3	3	3	I rump	0	3	0	3			
Tennessee	9	11	11	11	Trump	U C	11	U	11			
iexas	39	41 6	38 C	34 E	Trump#	0	ას Բ	0	<u>১</u> প			
Vermont	4	0 3		о 3	Clinton	U 3	0	3				
Virginia		ی 1२	ی 13	ی 13	Clinton	ی 13	0	3 13				
Washington	10	12	10 12	11	Clinton&	,5 .8	0 0	,3 Q	0			
WestVirginia	2	4	5	5	Trump	0	5	0	4			
Wisconsin		10			Trump	0	- 10	Ŭ 0				
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 John Kasich for Presi								
						tor voted f	or Ron Pa	ul for Pres	ident			
					&Three el	ectors vote	ed for Colin	Powell for	President			
					&One elec	ctor voted	for Faith S	potted Ea	gle			
				{	*One elector voted for Bernie Sanders							

Electoral College Outcome apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2010_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimates.xls

					2	2008 Presidential Election								
						Electoral		Electoral	Electorial	······	Electoral	Electorial	Electoral	Electorial
	Now	Now	2010c	20006		Votos	Electorial	Votos	Votos		Votos	Votes	Votos	Votos
	Apportionment	Flectoral	Electoral	ZUUUS	2012	For		For	For	2008	For	For	For	For
		College	College	College	Presidential	Ohama	Romney	Ohama	Romney	Presidential	Ohama	n Or McCain	Ohama	McCain
State	2017 Trend)	Count	Count	Count	Victor	(D)	(Ren)	(D)	(Rep)	Victor	(D)	(Ren)	(D)	(Rep)
4.1.		000111		000	Demanari	(=)	(. cop)	(2)	(MaCain	(_)	((=)	(. top)
Alabama	1	3	9	3	Romney	0	3	0	3	McCain	0	3	0	0 3
Arizona	10	- J 12			Romney	0		0	12	McCain	0		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
ldaho	2	4	4	4	Romney	0	4	0	4	McCain	0	4	0	4
Illinois	17	19	20	21	Obama	20	0	19	0	Obama	21	0	19	0
Indiana	9	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		12	Obama	11		11	0	Obama	12	0	11	0
Michigan	13	15	16	17	Obama	16	0	15	0	Obama	17	0	15	0
Minnesota		9	10	10	Doama	10	0	9	0	Obama	10	0	9	
Mississippi		10	10	11	Romney		10	0	10	McCain		11		10
Montana	0	10 3	10		Romney	0	10 3	0	10 3	McCain	0	יי א	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	
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	1	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	0
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	1	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	1	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	ی 12	3 	3 12	Obama	3 12	0 0	ی 12		Obama	3 12	0 0	3 12	
virginia Washington	11	13 12	13	13 11	Obama	10 10	U 0	13 19	U 0	Obama	13 11	0	10 10	0
WestVirginia	1U 2	ے، 1	12 5	5	Romney	ı∠ ∩	5	i∠ ∩	U 4	McCain	۱۱ ۵	5	ı∠ ∩	U
Wisconsin	<u>۔</u> ۶	- 10	10		Ohama	10	n n	10		Ohama	10	0 0	10	
Wyoming	1	3	3	3	Romnev	0	3	بن 0	3	McCain	0	3	0	3
Washington DC		2	3	2	Obama		0	2	0	Obama		0	2	
		-	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	<u>,</u>		332	206	- 328	- 209		365		- 356	
				·····				-4	3				-9	8
				f										
	~~~~~	~~~~~	~~~~~~	,		~~~~~					~~~~~	~~~~~	~~~~~	
[				}				8						
				{~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~										

#### Electoral College Outcome apportionment2020ProjectionsOn2010_2017ChangeIn2017CBEstimates.xls

					2004 Presidential Election					2000 Presidential Election				
				••••••••	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			Revised	Revised				Revised	Revised
	New	New	2010s	2000s		Electoral	Electorial	Electoral	Electorial		Electoral	Electorial	Electoral	Electorial
	Apportionment	Electoral	Electoral	Electoral	2004	Votes	Votes	Votes	Votes	2000	Votes	Votes	Votes	Votes
	Count (2010-	College	College	College	Presidential	For Kerry	For Bush	For Kerry	For Bush	Presidential	For Gore	For Bush	For Gore	For Bush
State	2017 Trend)	Count	Count	Count	Victor	(D)	(Rep)	(D)	(Rep)	Victor	(D)	(Rep)	(D)	(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		10	Bush	0	8	0	10
Delaware	0 1	' 3	3	3	Kerry	' 3	0	····· '	0	Gore	0 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
ldaho	2	4	4	4	Bush	0	4	0	4	Bush	0	4	0	4
Illinois	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		9	Bush	0	9		8	Bush	0	9	0	
Maine	2	4	4	4	Kerry	4	0	4	0	Gore	4	0	4	0
Maryland	ð	10	10	10	Kerry	10 12	0	10	0	Gore	10	0	10	0
Michigan	13	15		17	Kerry	17	0			Gore	18	0	15	
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 15	Rush	31	0 15	28	0 16	Gore	33	0 14	28	0 16
North Dakota	14	3	10	10 3	Bush	0	10 3		3	Bush	0	14 3	0	3
Ohio	15	17	18	20	Bush	0	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
Utah	4	6	6	5	Bush	0	5		6	Bush	0	5	0	6
Vermont	1 11	3 13		3 13	Buch		13		13	Buch		13		13
Washington	10	12	13	13 11	Kerry	11	13 0	12	15	Gore	11	13 0	12	0
WestVirginia	2	4	5	5	Bush	0	5	0	4	Bush	0	5	0	4
Wisconsin		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
														~~~~~
				ļ]					ļ					
								.						
														
L				1			i	İ	8			<u> </u>		