## Final Census Apportionment Counts Surprises Many Observers; Raising Questions of Why?

The Census Bureau released the final state-level counts from the 2020 Census on April 26, 2021, and with it the results of this decade's round of reapportionment. But the results shifted the number of seats that were projected to change in six different states from the 2019 population estimates released by the Bureau just five months ago. This change appears to be regional in nature, with the southern states of Arizona, Texas and Florida not gaining or not gaining as many seats as expected. On the flip side, the northeastern states of New York and Rhode Island, and the upper Midwest state of Minnesota kept seats that they were expected to lose. See Map \#1 in this press package. Election Data Services, Inc.'s President Kimball Brace speculated that it's possible the southern state changes, with their large and growing Hispanic populations, have been caused by the Trump Administrations efforts to keep non-citizens from being counted in the Census. It is also reported that these three states failed to have an effective state sponsored outreach program to promote the Census.

The final Census counts found 13 states will change their number of representatives in the U.S. House starting in 2022. Six states will be gaining seats due to apportionment, with Texas leading the pack by gaining two seats in the new Congress. Single seat gains were achieved by the states of Colorado, Florida, Montana, North Carolina, and Oregon. As in past decades, single seat loses have been concentrated in the Northeast and upper mid-West states of Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, as well as the state of California. A map of the 2020 gains and loses is attached as Map \#2.

As in past studies and decades, Election Data Services has generated its standard table of apportionment changes that contains more complete tallies than those released by the Census Bureau. The Election Data Services table shows not only how many seats changed for each state, but also how many more people would be needed for the state to gain an addition seat. In addition, the
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Election Data Services' report shows a column with how many people would have to be lost from what the 2020 Census reported for the state to lose a seat. With 435 seats allocated in the apportionment process, the table also shows what seat number was the last seat gained by a state, and then if the calculations continued past the 435 cut-off, what seat number the state would gain if the program extended beyond the 435 cut-off point. See Table 1, attached with the results for the apportionment counts (resident population plus overseas population = apportionment counts).

In table form, the gainers and losers are:

States Gaining Districts (6)
Colorado +1 (from 7 to 8)
Florida +1 (from 27 to 29)
Montana +1 (from At-large to 2)
North Carolina +1 (from 13 to 14)
Oregon +1 (from 5 to 6)
Texas +2 (from 36 to 38)

States Losing Districts (7)
California - 1 (from 53 to 52)
Illinois -1 (from 18 to 17)
Michigan -1 (from 14 to 13)
New York - 1 (from 27 to 26)
Ohio -1 (from 16 to 15)
Pennsylvania -1 (from 18 to 17)
West Virginia -1 (from 3 to 2)

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 cut-off point, either just gaining their last seat, or just missing their next seat. Our tables now contain a page 2, which highlights the last five seats that were obtained (seats \#430 through \#435) as well as the next seats where states just missed gaining a seat (seats \#436 through \#440). In previous reports this table was incorporated into the press release, but now it will be automatically generated in the tables. Map \#3 attached shows graphically the 10 states that were the closest to the 435 cut-off, and labeled with how many people each state just missed or just gained their last seat.

As in every study Election Data Services has done through the decades, this is where some important finding can be found, and 2020 is no different. In fact, we can report that in no other decade since the 1930s (when the "method of equal proportions" was adopted for apportionment), has the margin for the final seat (\#435) been so close. As Table 1, attached notes the State of Minnesota secured the final seat (\#435) with only 26 people to spare. In addition, the State of New York just missed that final seat by only 89 people when they came in with seat \#436. In previous years one state may have had small margins, but this is the first time when two states are so close and battling right to the "finish line". "These highlights more than anything", Brace said, "why it's so important for people to fill out the census. Just as in close elections, every vote and census count matters." Brace further noted that all the calculations of how close or how far a state may be to a change in number of seats is premised on the supposition that all other states' population stay the same and that only the state in question changes its' population by the reported amount.

The Election Data Services, Inc.'s study also showed that additional states were within striking range of keeping or losing their final seat (defined by a margin of less than 100,000 people). Besides the Minnesota and New York margins noted above, some additional examples:

- Alabama was within 85,285 people of losing its $7^{\text {th }}$ district under the final count. Earlier speculation from population estimates anticipated the state would lose a seat, and the state used that fact to file a lawsuit against the Census Bureau seeking to stop it from counting non-citizens in the Census. One might assume the final data has "mooted" this part of the legal challenge for this decade. The state has also brought a challenge to the implementation of the Bureau's "Disclosure Avoidance System"
- Arizona missed gaining an additional congressional district by 79,509 people. As noted above this may have been due to the Trump Administration’s efforts to discourage Hispanics (a large population in the state) to participate in the Census. The building of the "border wall" in the southern United States was a visible symbol of this effort.
- Delaware is the only At-Large state that falls closest to gaining a second district. Calculated manually, the state is 88,205 people away from getting a second congressional district. The state also becomes the largest At-Large district in the nation, replacing Montana's previous distinction.
- Colorado picked up its new $8^{\text {th }}$ congressional district by only 72,445 people to spare.
- Idaho just missed gaining a third seat by only 27,579 people.
- Montana went back to having two seats in the US House (they previously had two seats from 1910 through 1990 before they dropped down to a single seat for the last three decades). It gained back that second seat by only 6,371 people to spare.
- Nebraska kept its three congressional districts, but a loss of 94,387 people would have put the state down to only two seats in the House of Representatives.
- Ohio lost its $16^{\text {th }}$ district by just 11,462 people. If the US House had 437 seats (as it did when Alaska and Hawaii were admitted as states in 1959), then Ohio would have kept their last seat.
- Oregon added a new seat (their $6^{\text {th }}$ ) with just 62,408 people to spare, securing seat number 431, four away from the magic 435-cut-off mark.
- Rhode Island kept its second seat by a margin of only 19,127 people to spare, a marked reversal of a long downward trend in the state and bucking speculation it would end up with only a single At-Large seat in Congress. The population estimates from last year apportionment study expected that the state would lose its second seat by 14,529 people. Therefore, a swing of just over 33,000 people has allowed the state to kept two seats in Congress.
- West Virginia lost its third seat in Congress by not having 73,911 more people counted in the 2020 Census. Congress would need to have at least 454 seats to keep West Virginia from losing a seat.

A map of this information is attached as Map \#4.
While not close, the 2020 Census determined that California would lose a congressional district for the first time since it became a state in 1859. Election Data Services’ 2018 study identified that California was at risk to lose a congressional district for the first time in its nearly 160-year history. The population shift from the state is now shown to be larger than the population estimate series from the Census Bureau previously indicated. The official 2020 Census found that California lost its $53^{\text {rd }}$ seat by 478,805 people, while last year's population estimates indicated it would lose the seat by approximately 300,000 people.
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## Military Overseas Populations

As has been the case since at least 1970, the Census Bureau obtains counts of military and federal civilian employees living overseas (and their dependents living with them) who could be allocated to a home state and adds those numbers for each state to the resident population counted by the Bureau. These additional numbers help form the counts used for apportionment.

Because the Bureau publishes separately the counts of the overseas populations by state (totally 350,686 this decade) and a table of just the resident population counted in 2020, Election Data Services can generate a separate table of what apportionment would look like if the military overseas numbers were not included and just the resident population formed the apportionment numbers (this is similar to the circumstances before 1970). This is attached as Table 2 to this study.

This second and separate Election Data Services table shows that the same states would have gained, or lost seats as reported in table 1 above; thus, the addition of the overseas counts had no impact on the apportionment results this decade. The same resulted in the 2010 cycle, but the 2000 and 1990 apportionment cycles were impacted by the additional overseas population. In 2000 the inclusion of the military overseas population caused the final $435^{\text {th }}$ seat to switch from Utah to North Carolina. As a result, North Carolina captured seat \#435 by only 3,987 people to spare, with Utah falling to seat \#436 and missing that additional seat by only 856 people. After the 2000 census Utah initiated a lawsuit alleging that the Bureau needed to count the Mormon missionaries stationed overseas also but did not prevail.

In 1990 Census reinstated the use of the overseas counts into the apportionment determination and it contributed to Massachusetts losing a House seat to Washington State. Massachusetts sued, claiming under the Federal Administrative Procedure Act that the Commerce Secretary's decision to include the overseas count was "arbitrary and capricious" and won in the lower court. The US Supreme Court however reversed the decision in 1992.

The 1980 Census did not include overseas personnel into the apportionment formula. The 1970 census was the first in which certain categories of Americans overseas were officially included in the apportionment formula. That inclusion reportedly resulted in a change of fewer than 300 persons and caused a congressional seat to shift from Connecticut to Oklahoma. ${ }^{1}$

For 2020 the Census Bureau changed the "residency rules" for counting the military by creating a distinction between personnel who are deployed overseas (usually for short periods of time) compared to those who are stationed or assigned overseas (frequently for longer periods of time). The Bureau used the Department of Defense's administrative records to count deployed personnel at their usual residence in the US for both apportionment and redistricting purposes (they were embedded within the state's resident population counts). On the other hand, personnel who are stationed or assigned overseas were counted to their "home state of record" for apportionment purposes only and showed up as part of a state’s total "overseas count" in
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yesterday's release. Military sources have told the Census Bureau that of all overseas military, approximately $15 \%$ are deployed personnel and $85 \%$ are stationed or assigned overseas.

## Average size of Congressional Districts

The apportionment data released on April 26 included information on the average size of congressional districts moving forward into the decade. This is based upon the apportionment count and includes the overseas population in the calculation. Map \#5, attached depicts a graphically rendition of this information, but focuses on both the largest and smallest states to show the significant range that exists between the states. This is mainly caused by the apportionment process itself, where every state is assigned at least one seat.

But it should be noted that the average size of a district is not the same as the "ideal size" of a district used in the redistricting process (and documented below). The redistricting's "ideal size" is based only upon the "resident" population (also reported on April 26). Given the smaller size of the overseas population reported this decade, the two calculations of "average" and "ideal" are not that far apart. But persons doing redistricting over the next year will need to make certain their district's deviation calculations are calculating from the correct number.

## Electoral College Impact

Because congressional apportionment also impacts the Electoral College and the vote for President, Election Data Services took the 2020 apportionment results for each state and applied the Presidential election results from the past six Presidential contests to determine the Electoral College outcomes in the past 20 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. See Table \#3, attached to this study.

For example, in the 2020 Presidential election, former President Trump would have gained three more electoral votes (from 232 to 235) had the election been held with the new apportionment results, but not enough to give Trump back the White House.

The 2016 Electoral College was muddled because 7 electors voted for a different candidate than what they had pledged based on the vote totals. But at the end of the day, the new apportionment results would have caused Trump to gain one more electoral vote than he received on election night. 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.

In 2012 President Obama would still have won the Electoral College, but with three fewer votes ( 329 vs 332) than he won at the time of voting.

The biggest change would have occurred in the 2000 presidential election when George W. Bush would have gained an additional 18 electoral votes had the new 2020 apportionment projections determined the number of congressional seats in each state. When the 2000 election was finally decided, George W. Bush carried the electoral college with 271 votes compared to Al Gore’s 266
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votes. The 2020 revised counts show George W. Bush winning a more comfortable margin of 289 to 248 votes under the new apportionment results.

It should be noted that the 2020 Presidential election and resulting Electoral College occurred before the results of the 2020 Census were released on April 26th. Therefore, the Electoral College results in 2020 were governed by the state's apportionment allocation as they existed at the time of the election, 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 , which has built an interactive map of the these new apportionment results allowing users to adjust state outcomes to discover Electoral College outcomes for the presidential elections back to 2000.

## State Seat Allocation Table

Election Data Services’ apportionment calculator also creates a table showing all the seat numbers that an individual state receives as a result of the "method of equal proportions". While this table is available for all our apportionment studies, this is the first time Election Data Services have included the results of this table (see Table \#4, attached) within our press release as a way of furthering the education of the apportionment process. Each state receives at least one seat in apportionment, which is shown as seat \#1 being "at large" in the table. Seats 51 through 435 are then shown under the respective state's column with a seat number based on the remaining declining population in a state. As such, California received seat \#51, Texas received seat number \#52, and then seat number \#53 comes back to California.

## Ideal District Size Table

Following reapportionment, the results of the 2020 Census will next be used by each state in its respective redistricting processes (the actual drawing or adjustments to the state's Congressional, State Senate and State House districts). Like last decade, Election Data Services produced a table (see table \#5, attached) showing the ideal district size that will be used for each chamber in each state. This table is generated from the "resident count" numbers announced on Monday and will match the numbers that form the PL 94-171 file that will be released by the Bureau in August and September 2021. Because the overseas count is only available as a single number statewide, it is not used in redistricting, and therefore is not included in calculating the ideal district size. Election Data Services acknowledges the assistance of the National Conference of State Legislature for its compilation of the number of members in each chamber in each state.

## How Good was the Census?

Given how different the projections were from the final census results in a number of states, the question on how solid the Census findings are is bound to be debated in the coming months. The Bureau appears to invite that debase by releasing the most detailed information on the performance of different phases of the census in their Data Quality Metrics table. ${ }^{2}$ Over 70 different numbers are shown for not only nationwide calculations, but the table also reports the same data for each of the 50 states.
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"The Bureau should be congratulated for compiling this look at their performance," said Brace, "but I would urge similar metrics be generated and released for smaller levels of geography when the PL file is released in the fall." Noting some resistance to the concept due to privacy concerns, Brace said "We're not talking about data at the block level, but instead larger geographies like census tracts so that everyone, including redistricters, can evaluate the census in different parts and communities of a state." During the taking of the Census, the Bureau regularly reported self-response rates at the tract level during the spring and summer of 2020. Election Data Services will continue to evaluate and report on information in the Data Quality Metrics.

Past apportionment studies by Election Data Services, Inc. can be found at https://www.elec-tiondataservices.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-17892010.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).

## Apportionment2020_CB2020PopApptCounts_wLegCtrl.xIs Apportionment

| 2020 Apportionment Population Counts from CB Released 4/26/2021 |  |  |  |  | Gain a Seat | Lose a Seat | Last Seat Given | Next Seat At | Average Size | Size Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Population | Compare To | Seats | Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 5,030,053 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 679,700 | 85,285 | 429 | 495 | 718,579 | 40 |
| Alaska | 736,081 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 640 | 736,081 | 34 |
| Arizona | 7,158,923 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 79,509 | 684,702 | 395 | 440 | 795,436 | 7 |
| Arkansas | 3,013,756 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 398,474 | 370,667 | 384 | 493 | 753,439 | 29 |
| California | 39,576,757 | 53 | 52 | -1 | 478,806 | 284,400 | 433 | 441 | 761,091 | 26 |
| Colorado | 5,782,171 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 692,080 | 72,445 | 432 | 489 | 722,771 | 38 |
| Connecticut | 3,608,298 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 570,813 | 196,084 | 414 | 505 | 721,660 | 39 |
| Delaware | 990,837 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 473 | 990,837 | 1 |
| Florida | 21,570,527 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 171,561 | 591,651 | 424 | 439 | 770,376 | 20 |
| Georgia | 10,725,274 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 331,614 | 431,918 | 419 | 448 | 766,091 | 24 |
| Hawaii | 1,460,137 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 408,819 | 381,101 | 324 | 559 | 730,069 | 37 |
| Idaho | 1,841,377 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 27,579 | 762,341 | 258 | 443 | 920,689 | 2 |
| Illinois | 12,822,739 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 524,270 | 239,114 | 427 | 453 | 754,279 | 28 |
| Indiana | 6,790,280 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 448,152 | 316,059 | 416 | 466 | 754,476 | 27 |
| lowa | 3,192,406 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 219,824 | 549,317 | 361 | 467 | 798,102 | 6 |
| Kansas | 2,940,865 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 471,365 | 297,776 | 392 | 507 | 735,216 | 35 |
| Kentucky | 4,509,342 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 435,449 | 330,250 | 404 | 476 | 751,557 | 30 |
| Louisiana | 4,661,468 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 283,323 | 482,376 | 391 | 464 | 776,911 | 15 |
| Maine | 1,363,582 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 505,374 | 284,546 | 342 | 595 | 681,791 | 45 |
| Maryland | 6,185,278 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 288,973 | 475,552 | 401 | 458 | 773,160 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | 7,033,469 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 204,963 | 559,248 | 399 | 447 | 781,497 | 11 |
| Michigan | 10,084,442 | 14 | 13 | -1 | 208,960 | 554,646 | 413 | 444 | 775,726 | 16 |
| Minnesota | 5,709,752 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 764,499 | 26 | 435 | 494 | 713,719 | 41 |
| Mississippi | 2,963,914 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 448,316 | 320,825 | 389 | 503 | 740,979 | 32 |
| Missouri | 6,160,281 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 313,970 | 450,555 | 405 | 460 | 770,035 | 21 |
| Montana | 1,085,407 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 783,549 | 6,371 | 434 | 736 | 542,704 | 50 |
| Nebraska | 1,963,333 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 679,769 | 94,387 | 415 | 584 | 654,444 | 46 |
| Nevada | 3,108,462 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 303,768 | 465,373 | 373 | 477 | 777,116 | 14 |
| New Hampshire | 1,379,089 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 489,867 | 300,053 | 340 | 589 | 689,545 | 44 |
| New Jersey | 9,294,493 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 235,346 | 528,356 | 412 | 445 | 774,541 | 17 |
| New Mexico | 2,120,220 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 522,882 | 251,274 | 386 | 540 | 706,740 | 43 |
| New York | 20,215,751 | 27 | 26 | -1 | 89 | 763,136 | 420 | 436 | 777,529 | 13 |
| North Carolina | 10,453,948 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 602,940 | 160,592 | 430 | 462 | 746,711 | 31 |
| North Dakota | 779,702 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 601 | 779,702 | 12 |
| Ohio | 11,808,848 | 16 | 15 | -1 | 11,462 | 752,010 | 409 | 437 | 787,257 | 9 |
| Oklahoma | 3,963,516 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 215,595 | 551,302 | 376 | 461 | 792,703 | 8 |
| Oregon | 4,241,500 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 703,291 | 62,408 | 431 | 509 | 706,917 | 42 |
| Pennsylvania | 13,011,844 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 335,165 | 428,219 | 422 | 446 | 765,403 | 25 |
| Rhode Island | 1,098,163 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 770,793 | 19,127 | 428 | 724 | 549,082 | 49 |
| South Carolina | 5,124,712 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 585,041 | 179,944 | 421 | 487 | 732,102 | 36 |
| South Dakota | 887,770 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 526 | 887,770 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 6,916,897 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 321,535 | 442,676 | 408 | 457 | 768,544 | 22 |
| Texas | 29,183,290 | 36 | 38 | 2 | 189,645 | 573,546 | 426 | 438 | 767,981 | 23 |
| Utah | 3,275,252 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 136,978 | 632,163 | 352 | 455 | 818,813 | 5 |
| Vermont | 643,503 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 716 | 643,503 | 47 |
| Virginia | 8,654,542 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 111,635 | 652,190 | 403 | 442 | 786,777 | 10 |
| Washington | 7,715,946 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 286,442 | 477,547 | 411 | 451 | 771,595 | 19 |
| West Virginia | 1,795,045 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 73,911 | 716,009 | 265 | 454 | 897,523 | 3 |
| Wisconsin | 5,897,473 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 576,778 | 187,747 | 423 | 478 | 737,184 | 33 |
| Wyoming | 577,719 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 789 | 577,719 | 48 |
| Washington DC | 723,755 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 331,832,189 |  | 435 |  |  |  |  | Median = | 763,247 |  |
| Other Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min $=$ | 542,704 |  |
| 435 | Seats to Apportion |  |  |  |  |  |  | Max = | 990,837 |  |
| 75 | Max Seats to Calculate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Gamma$ Incluide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Seat | State | District | Gain or <br> Loss by |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 430 | North Carolina | 14 | 160,592 |
| 431 | Oregon | 6 | 62,408 |
| 432 | Colorado | 8 | 72,445 |
| 433 | California | 52 | 284,400 |
| 434 | Montana | 2 | 6,371 |
| 435 | Minnesota | 8 | 26 |
| 436 | New York | 27 | 89 |
| 437 | Ohio | 16 | 11,462 |
| 438 | Texas | 39 | 189,645 |
| 439 | Florida | 29 | 171,561 |
| 440 | Arizona | 10 | 79,509 |
|  |  |  |  |


| 2020 Resident Population Counts from CB Released (No Overseas Military) 4/26/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|c} \text { Last Seat } \\ \text { tiven } \end{array}$ | Next Seat At | Average Size | Size Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Population | Compare To | Seats | Change | Gain a Seat | Lose a Seat |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 5,024,279 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 682,216 | 83,058 | 429 | 495 | 717,754 | 40 |
| Alaska | 733,391 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 641 | 733,391 | 35 |
| Arizona | 7,151,502 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 82,800 | 681,925 | 395 | 440 | 794,611 | 7 |
| Arkansas | 3,011,524 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 398,759 | 370,331 | 384 | 493 | 752,881 | 29 |
| California | 39,538,223 | 53 | 52 | -1 | 494,485 | 274,053 | 433 | 441 | 760,350 | 26 |
| Colorado | 5,773,714 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 696,842 | 68,084 | 432 | 489 | 721,714 | 38 |
| Connecticut | 3,605,944 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 570,782 | 196,178 | 414 | 505 | 721,189 | 39 |
| Delaware | 989,948 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 473 | 989,948 | 1 |
| Florida | 21,538,187 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 191,495 | 574,361 | 424 | 439 | 769,221 | 21 |
| Georgia | 10,711,908 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 338,671 | 425,936 | 419 | 448 | 765,136 | 24 |
| Hawaii | 1,455,271 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 412,618 | 377,009 | 325 | 560 | 727,636 | 37 |
| Idaho | 1,839,106 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 28,783 | 760,844 | 259 | 443 | 919,553 | 2 |
| Illinois | 12,812,508 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 526,885 | 237,910 | 427 | 453 | 753,677 | 28 |
| Indiana | 6,785,528 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 448,774 | 315,951 | 416 | 466 | 753,948 | 27 |
| lowa | 3,190,369 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 219,914 | 549,176 | 361 | 467 | 797,592 | 6 |
| Kansas | 2,937,880 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 472,403 | 296,687 | 392 | 507 | 734,470 | 34 |
| Kentucky | 4,505,836 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 436,133 | 329,742 | 404 | 476 | 750,973 | 30 |
| Louisiana | 4,657,757 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 284,212 | 481,663 | 390 | 464 | 776,293 | 14 |
| Maine | 1,362,359 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 505,530 | 284,097 | 342 | 595 | 681,180 | 45 |
| Maryland | 6,177,224 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 293,332 | 471,594 | 401 | 458 | 772,153 | 18 |
| Massachusetts | 7,029,917 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 204,385 | 560,340 | 399 | 447 | 781,102 | 11 |
| Michigan | 10,077,331 | 14 | 13 | -1 | 210,198 | 554,371 | 413 | 444 | 775,179 | 16 |
| Minnesota | 5,706,494 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 764,062 | 864 | 435 | 494 | 713,312 | 41 |
| Mississippi | 2,961,279 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 449,004 | 320,086 | 389 | 503 | 740,320 | 32 |
| Missouri | 6,154,913 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 315,643 | 449,283 | 405 | 460 | 769,364 | 20 |
| Montana | 1,084,225 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 783,664 | 5,963 | 434 | 736 | 542,113 | 50 |
| Nebraska | 1,961,504 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 680,090 | 93,898 | 415 | 583 | 653,835 | 46 |
| Nevada | 3,104,614 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 305,669 | 463,421 | 373 | 478 | 776,154 | 15 |
| New Hampshire | 1,377,529 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 490,360 | 299,267 | 340 | 589 | 688,765 | 44 |
| New Jersey | 9,288,994 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 235,407 | 529,145 | 412 | 445 | 774,083 | 17 |
| New Mexico | 2,117,522 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 524,072 | 249,916 | 386 | 540 | 705,841 | 43 |
| New York | 20,201,249 | 27 | 26 | -1 | 3,056 | 762,589 | 420 | 436 | 776,971 | 13 |
| North Carolina | 10,439,388 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 611,191 | 153,416 | 430 | 462 | 745,671 | 31 |
| North Dakota | 779,094 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 601 | 779,094 | 12 |
| Ohio | 11,799,448 | 16 | 15 | -1 | 14,117 | 750,542 | 409 | 437 | 786,630 | 9 |
| Oklahoma | 3,959,353 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 217,373 | 549,587 | 377 | 461 | 791,871 | 8 |
| Oregon | 4,237,256 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 704,713 | 61,162 | 431 | 509 | 706,209 | 42 |
| Pennsylvania | 13,002,700 | 18 | 17 | -1 | 336,693 | 428,102 | 422 | 446 | 764,865 | 25 |
| Rhode Island | 1,097,379 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 770,510 | 19,117 | 428 | 724 | 548,690 | 49 |
| South Carolina | 5,118,425 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 588,070 | 177,204 | 421 | 486 | 731,204 | 36 |
| South Dakota | 886,667 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 526 | 886,667 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 6,910,840 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 323,462 | 441,263 | 408 | 457 | 767,871 | 22 |
| Texas | 29,145,505 | 36 | 38 | 2 | 210,670 | 556,284 | 426 | 438 | 766,987 | 23 |
| Utah | 3,271,616 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 138,667 | 630,423 | 353 | 455 | 817,904 | 5 |
| Vermont | 643,077 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 716 | 643,077 | 47 |
| Virginia | 8,631,393 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 129,782 | 634,782 | 403 | 442 | 784,672 | 10 |
| Washington | 7,705,281 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 292,541 | 472,074 | 411 | 452 | 770,528 | 19 |
| West Virginia | 1,793,716 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 74,173 | 715,454 | 265 | 454 | 896,858 | 3 |
| Wisconsin | 5,893,718 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 576,838 | 188,088 | 423 | 477 | 736,715 | 33 |
| Wyoming | 576,851 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | at large | 790 | 576,851 | 48 |
| Washington DC | 723,755 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 331,483,491 |  | 435 |  |  |  |  | Median $=$ | 762,608 |  |
| Other Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min $=$ | 542,113 |  |
| 435 | Seats to Apportion |  |  |  |  |  |  | Max = | 989,948 |  |
| 75 | Max Seats to Calculate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Gamma$ incluide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Seat | State | District | Gain or <br> Loss by |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 430 | North Carolina | 14 | 153,416 |
| 431 | Oregon | 6 | 61,162 |
| 432 | Colorado | 8 | 68,084 |
| 433 | California | 52 | 274,053 |
| 434 | Montana | 2 | 5,963 |
| 435 | Minnesota | 8 | 864 |
| 436 | New York | 27 | 3,056 |
| 437 | Ohio | 16 | 14,117 |
| 438 | Texas | 39 | 210,670 |
| 439 | Florida | 29 | 191,495 |
| 440 | Arizona | 10 | 82,800 |
|  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | 2020 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | New <br> Apportionment Count (2020) | New Electoral College Count | 2010s <br> Electoral College Count | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \mathrm{~s} \\ \text { Electoral } \\ \text { College } \\ \text { Count } \end{gathered}$ | 2020 Presidential Victor | Electoral Votes For Biden (D) | Electorial <br> Votes For Trump (Rep) | Revised <br> Electoral <br> Votes For <br> Biden (D) | Revised <br> Electorial Votes For Trump (Rep) |
| Alabama | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | Trump | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Alaska | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 | Biden | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | 52 | 54 | 55 | 55 | Biden | 55 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Colorado | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | Biden | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | Biden | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Biden | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | 28 | 30 | 29 | 27 | Trump | 0 | 29 | 0 | 30 |
| Georgia | 14 | 16 | 16 | 15 | Biden | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Biden | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Trump | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Illinois | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Biden | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | Trump | 0 | 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 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 | Trump | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Biden | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Maryland | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Biden | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 9 | 11 | 11 | 12 | Biden | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | Biden | 16 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Biden | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 | Trump | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Trump | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Nevada | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Biden | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Biden | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 12 | 14 | 14 | 15 | Biden | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Biden | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | 26 | 28 | 29 | 31 | Biden | 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 | Biden | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | Biden | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Biden | 4 | 0 | 4 | 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 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | 38 | 40 | 38 | 34 | Trump | 0 | 38 | 0 | 40 |
| Utah | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Biden | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | 11 | 13 | 13 | 13 | Biden | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Washington | 10 | 12 | 12 | 11 | Biden | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | Trump | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Biden | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington DC | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Biden | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 306 | 232 | 303 | 235 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2016 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  | 2012 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | $\begin{gathered} 2016 \\ \text { Presidential } \\ \text { Victor } \end{gathered}$ | Electoral Votes For Clinton (D) | Electorial Votes For Trump (Rep) | Revised Electoral Votes For Clinton (D) | Revised Electorial Votes For Trump (Rep) | $\begin{gathered} 2012 \\ \text { Presidential } \\ \text { Victor } \end{gathered}$ | Electoral Votes For Obama (D) | Electorial Votes For Romney (Rep) | Revised Electoral Votes For Obama (D) | Revised Electorial Votes For Romney (Rep) |
| Alabama | Trump | 0 | ) | 0 | 9 | Romney | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Alaska | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | Trump | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Arkansas | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | Clinton | 55 | 0 | 54 | 0 | Obama | 55 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Colorado | Clinton | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Connecticut | Clinton | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | Clinton | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | Trump | 0 | 29 | 0 | 30 | Obama | 29 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Georgia | Trump | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | Romney | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | Clinton* | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | Trump | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | Romney | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Illinois | Clinton | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Obama | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | Trump | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| lowa | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Obama | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Kansas | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | Trump | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Romney | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | Trump | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Romney | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | Clinton | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | Clinton | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | Clinton | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | Obama | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | Trump | 0 | 16 | 0 | 15 | Obama | 16 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | Clinton | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mississippi | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | Trump | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | Romney | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Nebraska | Trump | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | Romney | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Nevada | Clinton | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Obama | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | Clinton | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| New Jersey | Clinton | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | Obama | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico | Clinton | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | Obama | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | Clinton | 29 | 0 | 28 | 0 | Obama | 29 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | Trump | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | Romney | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 |
| North Dakota | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | Trump | 0 | 18 | 0 | 17 | Obama | 18 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Oklahoma | Trump | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | Romney | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | Clinton | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | Obama | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | Trump | 0 | 20 | 0 | 19 | Obama | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | Clinton | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| South Carolina | Trump | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | Romney | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | Trump | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Romney | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | Trump\# | 0 | 36 | 0 | 38 | Romney | 0 | 38 | 0 | 40 |
| Utah | Trump | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Romney | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | Clinton | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | Clinton | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | Obama | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Washington | Clinton\& | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | Obama | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| West Virginia | Trump | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | Romney | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | Trump | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | Obama | 10 |  | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | Trump | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Romney | 0 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Washington DC | Clinton | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  | 227 | 304 | 226 | 305 |  | 332 | 206 | 329 | 209 |
|  |  |  |  | -1 | 1 |  |  |  | -3 | 3 |
|  | \#One elector voted for John Kasich for President |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \#One elector voted for Ron Paul for President |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \&Three electors voted for Colin Powell for President |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \&One elector voted for Faith Spotted Eagle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *One elector voted for Bernie Sanders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2008 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  | 2004 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 2008 \\ \text { Presidential } \\ \text { Victor } \end{array}$ | Electoral Votes For Obama (D) | Electorial Votes For McCain (Rep) | Revised Electoral Votes For Obama (D) | Revised Electorial Votes For McCain (Rep) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 2004 \\ \text { Presidential } \\ \text { Victor } \end{array}$ | Electoral Votes For Kerry (D) | Electorial Votes For Bush (Rep) | Revised Electoral Votes Fo Kerry (D) | Revised Electorial Votes For Bush (Rep) |
| Alabama | McCain | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Alaska | McCain | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | McCain | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | Bush | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 |
| Arkansas | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | Obama | 55 | 0 | 54 | 0 | Kerry | 55 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Colorado | Obama | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 |
| Connecticut | Obama | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | Kerry | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | Obama | 27 | 0 | 30 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 27 | 0 | 30 |
| Georgia | McCain | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | Bush | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | McCain | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Illinois | Obama | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Kerry | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | Obama | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| lowa | Obama | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| Kansas | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | McCain | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | McCain | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | Bush | 0 |  | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | Obama | 4 | O | 4 | 0 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 |  |
| Maryland | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Kerry | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | Obama | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 | Kerry | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | Obama | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 | Kerry | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Kerry | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Mississippi | McCain | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | McCain | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | McCain | 0 |  | 0 |  | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Nebraska | McCain | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Nevada | Obama | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| New Hampshire | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| New Jersey | Obama | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 | Kerry | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico | Obama | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| New York | Obama | 31 | 0 | 28 | 0 | Kerry | 31 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | Obama | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 |
| North Dakota | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | Obama | 20 | 0 | 17 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 20 | 0 | 17 |
| Oklahoma | McCain | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | Obama | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | Kerry | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | Obama | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 | Kerry | 21 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | Obama | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Kerry | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| South Carolina | McCain | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | McCain | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | McCain | 0 | 34 | 0 | 40 | Bush | 0 | 34 | 0 | 40 |
| Utah | McCain | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | Obama | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| Washington | Obama | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 | Kerry | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| West Virginia | McCain | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | Obama | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | Kerry | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | McCain | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington DC | Obama | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | Kerry | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  | 365 | 173 | 357 | 181 |  | 251 | 286 | 241 | 296 |
|  |  |  |  | -8 |  |  |  |  | -10 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2000 Presidential Election |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | 2000 Presidential Victor | Electoral Votes For Gore (D) | Electorial Votes For Bush (Rep) | Revised Electoral Votes For Gore (D) | Revised <br> Electorial <br> Votes For <br> Bush (Rep) |
| Alabama | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Alaska | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Arizona | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 |
| Arkansas | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| California | Gore | 54 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Colorado | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 |
| Connecticut | Gore | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Delaware | Gore | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Florida | Bush | 0 | 25 | 0 | 30 |
| Georgia | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 16 |
| Hawaii | Gore | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Idaho | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Illinois | Gore | 22 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Indiana | Bush | 0 | 12 | 0 | 11 |
| lowa | Gore | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Kansas | Bush | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Kentucky | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Louisiana | Bush | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| Maine | Gore | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | Gore | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | Gore | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Michigan | Gore | 18 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Minnesota | Gore | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Mississippi | Bush | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| Missouri | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| Montana | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Nebraska | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Nevada | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| New Hampshire | Bush | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| New Jersey | Gore | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| New Mexico | Gore | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| New York | Gore | 33 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| North Carolina | Bush | 0 | 14 | 0 | 16 |
| North Dakota | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | Bush | 0 | 21 | 0 | 17 |
| Oklahoma | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 |
| Oregon | Gore | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | Gore | 23 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | Gore | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| South Carolina | Bush | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| South Dakota | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Tennessee | Bush | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Texas | Bush | 0 | 32 | 0 | 40 |
| Utah | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| Vermont | Gore | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Virginia | Bush | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| Washington | Gore | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| West Virginia | Bush | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | Gore | 11 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | Bush | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Washington DC | Gore | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  | 266 | 271 | 248 | 289 |
|  |  |  |  | -18 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |







## Gains/Losses in Reapportionment 2020 Census Population







[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ US Commerce Dept, Bureau of the Census, Technical Paper 62, Americans Overseas in U.S. Censuses, by Karen M. Mills, Issued November 1993, page 4, courtesy of Margo Anderson

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-kits/2021/2020-census-quality-and-data-processing.html

