



12/02/2014 05:48 PM

To SERS@fec.gov,  
cc  
bcc  
Subject New comment on REG 2014-06 submitted by Shapiro,  
Alexandra

2 attachments



REG\_2014\_06\_Shapiro\_Alexandra\_12\_02\_2014\_17\_48\_13\_File 1.pdf



REG\_2014\_06\_Shapiro\_Alexandra\_12\_02\_2014\_17\_48\_13\_CommentText.txt

Please find attached the contents for the new comment submitted on Tue Dec 02 17:48:13 EST 2014.

User uploaded 1 file(s) as attachment to the comment. Please find them attached to this email.

You will also find a Comment.txt file attached, which has the text comments entered by the user.

You may review the comment in FRAPS system. An approval action from FRAPS is required to send this comment event to the CMS. Thanks.

Dear Mr. Knop,

Attached please find a comment submitted on behalf of Level the Playing Field.

Regards,

Alexandra A.E. Shapiro

Comments provided by :  
Shapiro, Alexandra

November 26, 2014

VIA FEC.GOV

Robert M. Knop,  
Assistant General Counsel  
Federal Election Commission  
999 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: Notice 2014-13, Rulemaking Petition: Candidate Debates

Dear Mr. Knop:

We represent Level the Playing Field, a nonpartisan, nonprofit corporation that petitioned the Federal Election Commission on September 11, 2014 to initiate a rulemaking to revise and amend the FEC's regulations governing the sponsorship of candidate debates. We write to provide the FEC with additional evidence in support of the Petition.

The Petition argues that rules requiring presidential candidates to meet a minimum polling threshold to gain access to general election debates are inconsistent with the FEC's regulations governing debate sponsorship and their underlying purposes. In particular, the Petition demonstrates how polling thresholds systematically discriminate against third-party and independent candidates. One cause of this bias, among others, is the inaccuracy of pre-election polling. First, debate sponsors can rely on polls taken well in advance of the election, which are more inaccurate; the Commission on Presidential Debates ("CPD"), for instance, relies on polls taken approximately two months prior to Election Day. Second, races with a serious third-party or independent contender are prone to distinct volatility. As a result of these factors, polling in three-way races is 8% off two months before the election. At that level of inaccuracy, polls can falsely exclude candidates with support at or near a polling threshold a significant percentage of the time. *See* Petition at 18-20.

As demonstrated below, the most recent election results highlight the inaccuracy of pre-election polls, thereby underscoring the biased nature of polling thresholds.

**I. Pre-election Polls Were Grossly Inaccurate Because Polling Firms Failed To Accurately Predict Which Voters Would Turn Out**

Polling thresholds are meant to measure support. But polls are only accurate if those conducting the poll select the right sample, *i.e.* correctly anticipate who will turn out to vote. *See*

Petition at 18-19. Polls are frequently very inaccurate because they are conducted using unreliable samples, and this most recent election demonstrates the point.

Polling firms failed to predict low Election Day turnout by typical Democratic voters. See Sam Wang, *The Polls Failed To Predict A Republican Landslide. Here's Why.*, The New Republic (Nov. 5, 2014), <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/120147/2014-midterm-predictions-poll-aggregators-hit-midterm-curse>, submitted herewith as Exhibit A; Barnini Chakraborty, *Election results looked nothing like the polls -- what gives?*, FoxNews.com (Nov. 7, 2014), <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/11/07/pollsters-miss-predictions-in-key-races/>, submitted herewith as Exhibit B. As a result, in state after state, polls were abysmal predictors of the final results. In Kansas, for instance, pre-election polls on average showed Greg Orman with a 7.2% lead two months before the election, and a 0.8% lead going into Election Day; he lost by 10.8%. In Virginia, pre-election polls showed Mark Warner with lead of 15% two months out, and a lead of 10.2% in the final polls. Yet Warner won by a mere 0.8% margin. The following table summarizes how many pre-election polls missed the mark.

## Polling Errors In The 2014 Midterm Elections<sup>1</sup>

	Winner's Margin of Victory	Winner's Lead/Deficit, 2 Months Out <sup>2</sup>	Winner's Lead/Deficit, Final Polls <sup>3</sup>	Polling Error, 2 Months Out	Polling Error, Final Polls
Kansas Senate	Roberts +10.8	Roberts -7.2	Roberts -0.8	18	11.6
Arkansas Senate	Cotton +17.0	Cotton +2.4	Cotton +7	14.6	10
Maryland Governor	Hogan +4.7	<i>No data</i>	Hogan -5.2	N/A	9.9
Kentucky Senate	McConnell +15.5	McConnell +5.2	McConnell +5.8	10.3	9.7
Virginia Senate	Warner +0.8	Warner+15	Warner +10.2	14.2	9.4
Iowa Senate	Ernst +8.5	Ernst -1.2	Ernst +2.4	9.7	6.1
Illinois Governor	Rauner +4.8	Rauner +1.4	Rauner -0.8	3.4	5.6
Kansas Governor	Brownback +3.9	Brownback -4.6	Brownback -1.2	8.5	5.1
Georgia Senate	Perdue +7.9	Perdue +2.6	Perdue +3	5.3	4.9
North Carolina Senate	Tillis +1.7	Tillis -3.6	Tillis -0.6	5.3	2.3

This kind of inaccuracy is a recurring problem. Polls have been similarly flawed in one direction or the other in the 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, and 2012 elections. *See* Nate Silver, *The Polls Were Skewed Toward Democrats*, FiveThirtyEight.com (Nov. 5, 2014, 9:08 a.m.), <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-polls-were-skewed-toward-democrats/>, submitted herewith as Exhibit D.

Moreover, this widespread inaccuracy occurred *without* the complicating factor of a viable third-party or independent candidate. The 2014 Senate and gubernatorial races cited

<sup>1</sup> The final election results and polling data used to create this table came from RealClearPolitics.com. Copies of that data are submitted herewith as Exhibit C.

<sup>2</sup> The Winner's Lead/Deficit, 2 Months Out is, in most cases, the average of the eventual winner's lead or deficit in the five latest polls from the period August 1, 2014 to September 4, 2014. Some races, however, did not have five polls taken in that period. For those races, the Winner's Lead/Deficit, 2 Months Out is the average of the eventual winner's lead or deficit in the five latest polls taken from the period August 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> The Winner's Lead/Deficit, Final Polls is the average of the eventual winner's lead or deficit in the last five polls taken before the election.

above were typical two-person, head-to-head contests,<sup>4</sup> and thus were not subject to the increased volatility of races with three viable candidates. *See* Petition at 18-19. The fact that this serious inaccuracy occurred in conditions that are easier to poll underscores the problems in reliance on polling thresholds to determine third-party and independent candidates' access to the presidential debates.

## II. Averaging Did Not Reduce The Inaccuracy Of The Polls

The current presidential debate sponsor, the CPD, purports to make its debate access determination on an average of multiple polls, and may argue against the Petition on the ground that this averaging reduces the risk of polling inaccuracy. Yet averaging multiple polls did not prevent severe inaccuracy in this most recent election. The errors reflected in the table above compare the final results not to one poll, but to an average of five polls, *i.e.* an average comparable to the CPD's average. Those averages were still way off; there were errors in polls taken two months before Election Day of between 8% and 18% in six races.

Commentators who have aggregated polling data have found similar results. One report found that pre-election polling underestimated the Republican share of the vote in Senate races by an average of 5.3%. Sam Wang, *The Polls Failed To Predict A Republican Landslide. Here's Why.*, *The New Republic* (Nov. 5, 2014), <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/120147/2014-midterm-predictions-poll-aggregators-hit-midterm-curse>, submitted herewith as Exhibit A. Another found that, on average, pollsters overestimated Democratic vote share by 4% in Senate races and 3.4% in gubernatorial races. *See* Exhibit D.

The proliferation of web sites that average poll results may in fact be contributing to polling inaccuracy and reducing any potential benefits of poll averaging. As Nate Silver explains, there is evidence that “pollster ‘herding’ — the tendency of polls to mirror one another’s results rather than being independent — has become a more pronounced problem.” *Id.* Thus, averaging polls does not necessarily reduce inaccuracy. It may cause inaccuracy to proliferate, as pollsters copy inaccurate results in order to find comfort in the “herd.”

\* \* \*

One might argue that these polling errors affect the poll numbers of all candidates, not just third-party and independent candidates. That is no answer to the charge of bias against third-party and independent candidates inherent polling thresholds. When it comes to meeting the CPD's 15% threshold, for example, polling inaccuracy systematically disfavors third-party and independent candidates. As explained in the Petition, a candidate with support at or just above the 15% threshold can be up to 1000 times more likely to face exclusion from the debates as a result of polling inaccuracy than a candidate polling at or above 40%. *See* Petition at 19-20.

<sup>4</sup> In none of the races cited above did a third candidate receive more than five percent of the vote. *See* 2014 Senate Election Results, Politico.com, [http://www.politico.com/2014-election/results/map/senate/#.VGTta\\_nF\\_kV](http://www.politico.com/2014-election/results/map/senate/#.VGTta_nF_kV), last visited Nov. 13, 2014, submitted herewith as Exhibit E; 2014 Governor Election Results, Politico.com, [http://www.politico.com/2014-election/results/map/governor/#.VGTtAPnF\\_kU](http://www.politico.com/2014-election/results/map/governor/#.VGTtAPnF_kU), last visited Nov. 13, 2014, submitted herewith as Exhibit F.

Because a third-party or independent candidate is much more likely to be near the 15% threshold, the risks of polling inaccuracy fall overwhelmingly on them, and not on major-party candidates.

For these reasons and those set forth in the Petition, Level the Playing Field respectfully requests that the FEC grant the Petition.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Shapiro". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Alexandra A.E. Shapiro

Encls.

# **Exhibit A**



**2014 MIDTERMS**


NOVEMBER 5, 2014

# The Polls Failed to Predict a Republican Landslide. Here's Why.

**By Sam Wang**

Photo: AP/Nam Y. Huh

As I [noted](http://www.newrepublic.com/article/119844/2014-midterm-predictions-republicans-not-guaranteed-win-senate) - <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/119844/2014-midterm-predictions-republicans-not-guaranteed-win-senate> - last month, we election forecasters depend on polls more than anything else. If the polls are wrong, then we're wrong. On Tuesday, the Midterm Polling Curse [struck us all](http://www.nytimes.com/newsgraphics/2014/senate-model/#comparisons) - <http://www.nytimes.com/newsgraphics/2014/senate-model/#comparisons> - .



*The New York Times*

Every one of the analysts listed above was on the losing side of 50 percent probability in the North Carolina Senate race. Kansas was more of a mixed bag, with some analysts slightly favoring each candidate. As it turns out, such errors are par for the course in midterm elections.

In pre-election polling, six Senate races came into the home stretch with margins of less than three percentage points. On Tuesday, I [pointed out](http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/2014-midterm-elections-who-will-win-senate?int-cid=mod-latest) - <http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/2014-midterm-elections-who-will-win-senate?int-cid=mod-latest> - that given the track record of polling, it would be typical for at least two of these six races to be won by the lagging candidate. In 2010, the underdogs were two Democrats, Harry Reid in Nevada and Michael Bennet in Colorado. This year it was two Republicans, Pat Roberts in Kansas and Thom Tillis in North Carolina.

Roberts and Tillis are part of a broader pattern in which Republicans outperformed polls across the board. Such a phenomenon is not at all unheard of. I wrote [last week](http://election.princeton.edu/2014/10/17/is-ebola-diverting-voter-attention/) - <http://election.princeton.edu/2014/10/17/is-ebola-diverting-voter-attention/> - that midterm polling biases in Senate elections are far worse than in presidential elections. One party or the other outperforms polls by 3 percentage points on average. This bias can go in either direction: in the banner Republican year of 2010, it was Democrats who, somewhat counterintuitively, outperformed polls. Overall, Senate midterm

polling errors are five times larger than in presidential years. For this reason, both narrow Democratic retention and a GOP blowout appeared to be in the range of possibilities last night. We got the blowout.

Here, based on provisional race results from Reuters and the [Princeton Election Consortium](http://election.princeton.edu) - <http://election.princeton.edu> - 's polling medians, is how candidates outperformed the polls:

<b>Senate races, 2014</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Actual margin</b>	<b>Bonus</b>
West Virginia	Capito +22.0%	R +27.5%	R +5.5%
South Dakota	Rounds +13.5%	R +23.3%	R +9.8%
Mississippi	Cochran +15.0%	R +21.3%	R +6.3%
Arkansas	Cotton +7.0%	R +19.0%	R +12.0%
Montana	Daines +17.0%	R +16.3%	D +1.0%
Kentucky	McConnell +7.5%	R +15.5%	R +8.0%
Kansas	Orman +1.0%	R +11.2%	R +12.2%
Georgia	Perdue +3.0%	R +7.8%	R +4.8%
Iowa	Ernst +1.0%	R +7.5%	R +6.5%
Colorado	Gardner +2.0%	R +4.2%	R +2.2%
Alaska	Sullivan +1.0%	R +2.6%	R +1.6%
North Carolina	Hagan +1.0%	R +1.3%	R +2.3%
Virginia	Warner +11.0%	D +0.6%	R +10.4%
New Hampshire	Shaheen +2.0%	D +2.3%	D +0.3%
Minnesota	Franken +10.0%	D +11.0%	D +1.0%
<b>Average</b>			<b>R +5.3%</b>

*Sources: Princeton Election Consortium polling medians, Reuters race results*

On average, this outperformance bonus of 5.3 percentage points for Republicans is larger than in any midterm election since 1990.

It was the same story in gubernatorial races: Republican candidates outperformed polls, but by a smaller amount, an average of 2 percentage points. This was enough to carry the day for two incumbent Republican governors, Paul LePage in Maine and Rick Scott in Florida, who looked tied with their Democratic challengers; and for Illinois'

Republican gubernatorial candidate, Bruce Rauner, who lagged slightly in polls but ended up with a convincing five-point victory over Governor Pat Quinn.

Recently it's been suggested that the polling industry has struggled lately to reach a representative swath of voters. Low response rate, increasing use of mobile phones, and hard-to-reach demographics have all been cited as possible biases. However, those difficulties would tend to undersample Democratic voters, which was not the problem this year. Instead, inaccuracy may have come from what David Wasserman at The Cook Political Report called "[epic turnout collapse](http://cookpolitical.com/story/8067) - <http://cookpolitical.com/story/8067> - " in 2014. And estimating the precise effects of turnout is an older, unsolved problem that looms large for pollsters in every midterm election.

# **Exhibit B**



## Election results looked nothing like the polls -- what gives?

By Barnini Chakraborty

Published November 07, 2014 | FoxNews.com

WASHINGTON – Tuesday's midterm elections were supposed to be a night of nail-biters, from Sen. Mitch McConnell's re-election race in Kentucky to veteran Sen. Pat Roberts' battle in Kansas. The too-close-to-call refrain was expected to be heard throughout the night.

Instead, when the dust settled, Republicans rumbled to one of their biggest victories in decades.

How could so many polls get so many races so wrong?

"I want an investigation of the polls in Virginia," University of Virginia political scientist Larry Sabato told Fox News. "They were completely wrong, just as they were in Georgia. They were also way off in Illinois. And I could go on and on."

Virginia played host to one of the biggest surprises of the night, for anyone who had been basing their election predictions on the polls. In the same state where pollsters failed to predict then-House Majority Leader Eric Cantor's loss to economics professor Dave Brat in the primaries, they also misjudged the race between incumbent Democratic Sen. Mark Warner and Republican Ed Gillespie.

Many polls had Warner with a double-digit lead over Gillespie. Warner is currently clinging to a 1-point lead, with the ballot count ongoing.

It's not just that candidates thought to be dark horses ended up winning, or coming close. A flood of polls also showed several races to be tight in the closing weeks -- but on election night, Republicans soundly defeated Democrats in those contests. Exhibit A is the race between Senate GOP Leader Mitch McConnell and Democrat Alison Lundergan Grimes in Kentucky. Polls showed Grimes within single digits -- one even showed her within a point -- of McConnell. The powerful senator ended up winning by 15 points.

The results have led to some self-reflection, as well as recriminations, over the state and accuracy of political polling.

Sabato, who said the polling industry "needs some housecleaning," clarified to FoxNews.com on Thursday that he wants the polling business -- not the government -- to conduct an internal review of its practices and procedures.

"The government is the last group you'd want conducting any inquiry. Not only would it become partisan, inevitably, but the best polling professionals are well capable of organizing this themselves," he told FoxNews.com in an email.

In Kansas, number-crunchers at FiveThirtyEight had forecast a big loss for Gov. Sam Brownback, but he won by a 4-point margin. Data from FiveThirtyEight also predicted Roberts would be defeated in Kansas -- and many polls showed him virtually tied -- but he won by more than 10 percentage points against independent candidate Greg Orman. Likewise, in Georgia, Republican David Perdue beat Michelle Nunn for an open Senate seat by 8 points, despite polls showing a much closer race.

Sabato, who heads up the Center for Politics' Crystal Ball website, had his own share of misses Tuesday night. Sabato had nine races leaning Democrat. Of those, seven were won by Republicans including the gubernatorial races in Maryland, Maine and Illinois. Maryland was a huge upset, as most polls showed Democrat Anthony Brown well ahead, yet Republican Larry Hogan won comfortably.

Real Clear Politics, an online site that compiles polls from various resources, posted polling averages that largely did not square with the results. In almost every contested Senate race, Republican candidates beat the Real Clear Politics polling data.

Sabato believes that in many cases, pollsters failed to factor in how heavily Republican and conservative the electorate in a low-turnout midterm was going to be.

"After the experience of 2012, when they undercounted Hispanics and young people, they were concerned about the same phenomenon happening again," he said. "Perhaps they over-compensated. I want them to tell us."

Rasmussen Reports defended its polling data on its website, saying in a written statement that they got it right "most of the time."

"It's interesting to note that in the races in which the spread was really off for us (and the Real Clear Politics average of all pollsters), most of the time we were spot-on for the Democratic number but wrong on the Republican number," the message stated.

Rasmussen pointed to a number of unknowns. "If you add the percentage of voters 'not sure' to the GOP side, you will come very close to the final Republican number," the statement said.

Rasmussen believes that the data "suggests the last-minute swing vote went to the Republicans, and while it did not necessarily change the game in terms of the winner, it very much changed the spread between the candidates."

This is not the first time some off-base polling has prompted a review of the methods used by polling firms. After Gallup showed Mitt Romney ahead in the 2012 presidential race -- he lost -- the Gallup Poll reviewed its own methodology of selecting voters.

"It's becoming a much more difficult, nerve-wracking business," Geoff Garin, the president of Hart Research Associates and a leading Democratic pollster, told Bloomberg News at the time.

 Print  Close

---

**URL**

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/11/07/pollsters-miss-predictions-in-key-races/>

---

[Home](#) | [Video](#) | [Politics](#) | [U.S.](#) | [Opinion](#) | [Entertainment](#) | [Tech](#) | [Science](#) | [Health](#) | [Travel](#) | [Lifestyle](#) | [World](#) | [Sports](#) | [Weather](#)

[Privacy](#) | [Terms](#)

This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed. © 2014 FOX News Network, LLC. All rights reserved. All market data delayed 20 minutes.


# **Exhibit C**



# Kansas Senate - Roberts vs. Orman

[Roberts vs. Taylor](#) | [Roberts vs. Taylor vs. Orman](#)

## Candidates



Greg Orman (I)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Pat Roberts (R)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Kansas Snapshot

RCP Average: **Orman +0.8**  
RCP Ranking: **Toss Up**  
2014 Key Races: **Governor** | **KS-2** | **KS-3**

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

2012: **President**  
2010: **Governor** | **Senate** | **KS-3**  
2008: **President** | **KS-2**  
2006: **Governor**  
2004: **President** | **Senate** | **KS-3** | **KS-4**

## Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Orman (I)	Roberts (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>42.5</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>Roberts +10.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/18 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>43.4</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>Orman +0.8</b>
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	963 LV	3.2	47	46	Orman +1
FOX News*	10/28 - 10/30	907 LV	3.0	44	43	Orman +1
YouGov*	10/25 - 10/31	1137 LV	4.8	37	38	Roberts +1
SurveyUSA*	10/22 - 10/26	623 LV	4.0	44	42	Orman +2
NBC News/Marist*	10/18 - 10/22	757 LV	3.6	45	44	Orman +1

**All Kansas Senate - Roberts vs. Orman Polling Data**

### BATTLE FOR THE SENATE

RCP AVERAGES: GOP +7 PICK-UPS

**47** Dem **52** GOP

## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- Have you ever seen trendlines like this at the end of a race? Orman has a lead, but with a huge number of undecideds, it is anyone's ballgame.

**10/28/14** -- Roberts' momentum seems to have stalled out, and we seem to be headed for a genuine photo finish here.

**10/17/14** -- Orman is something of a skier trying to outrun an avalanche. It is nipping at his heels, but the turnoff is just in sight. For now, this appears to be going down to the wire.

**10/7/14** -- The Marist poll was a jarring departure from a steady tightening of this race. One possible explanation? The poll's sample is 82 percent white, while the 2010 and 2012 electorates were around 90 percent white.

**9/29/14** -- Orman's lead seems to have narrowed a touch, and one suspects that the undecided voters are probably primed to vote Republican. So the question becomes: Will voters decide that Orman is close enough to a Republican to pull the lever for him? At the beginning of this cycle, virtually no one would have predicted that control of the Senate might turn on the outcome of a race in Kansas. But it increasingly looks like Harry Reid's ability to hold on to his position as majority leader might depend on breaking an 80-year Republican winning streak in the Sunflower State.

**9/20/14** -- The Supreme Court of Kansas has ruled that Taylor must be removed from the ballot, so this will be a fight between Roberts and Orman going forward. While this clearly hurts Roberts in the short run, its long term effects are a lot more difficult to determine. On the one hand, Roberts would benefit from a divided opposition, and Taylor would draw off some disgruntled Democratic votes from Orman. On the other hand, if Roberts is going to win, he needs to define Orman as a de facto Democrat, and Taylor complicates this message.

### -----Race Preview-----

In the 98 years Kansans have directly elected senators, a majority or plurality of voters have pulled the lever for a Democrat just three times. The last time this happened was in 1932, when George McGill won a three-way race with 46 percent of the vote. Six years later, McGill's 44 percent was not enough to win re-election, and the state has elected only Republicans since then.

This cycle, Kansas has been home to an unusually topsy-turvy race. While it is unlikely to elect a Democrat, it may well elect a non-Republican. This all started when physician Milton Wolf decided to challenge incumbent Republican Pat Roberts in the primary. That challenge ultimately fizzled, but Roberts was held to under 50 percent of the vote. Many of Wolf's supporters suggested that they would stay home, and polling showed an unusually tight three-way race between Roberts, Democrat Chad Taylor, and Independent Greg Orman. Taylor subsequently announced that he would drop out of the race, setting up an Orman-Roberts battle. Orman had actually led Roberts in head-to-head polling, although there was a huge number of undecided. Compounding the back-and-forth, Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach announced that Taylor would have to remain on the ballot. The race is obviously very much in flux right now, and the smart bet seems to be that Wolf's supporters will come home for Roberts. But it really is difficult to say in this environment.

Recent Comment:

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)


Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Orman (I)	Roberts (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>42.5</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>Roberts +10.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/18 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>43.4</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>Orman +0.8</b>
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	963 LV	3.2	47	46	Orman +1
FOX News*	10/28 - 10/30	907 LV	3.0	44	43	Orman +1
YouGov*	10/25 - 10/31	1137 LV	4.8	37	38	Roberts +1
SurveyUSA*	10/22 - 10/26	623 LV	4.0	44	42	Orman +2
NBC News/Marist*	10/18 - 10/22	757 LV	3.6	45	44	Orman +1
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	10/16 - 10/23	1973 LV	4.0	38	42	Roberts +4
Rasmussen Reports	10/20 - 10/21	960 LV	3.0	49	44	Orman +5
Remington Research Group (R)*	10/9 - 10/12	1091 LV	3.0	46	48	Roberts +2
PPP (D)	10/9 - 10/12	1081 LV	3.0	46	43	Orman +3
FOX News*	10/4 - 10/7	702 LV	3.5	39	44	Roberts +5
CNN/Opinion Research	10/2 - 10/6	687 LV	3.5	48	49	Roberts +1
SurveyUSA*	10/2 - 10/5	549 LV	4.3	47	42	Orman +5
NBC News/Marist*	9/27 - 10/1	636 LV	3.9	48	38	Orman +10
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	9/20 - 10/1	2013 LV	3.0	40	40	Tie
USA Today/Suffolk*	9/27 - 9/30	500 LV	4.4	46	41	Orman +5
Rasmussen Reports**	9/16 - 9/17	750 LV	4.0	45	40	Orman +5
FOX News	9/14 - 9/16	604 LV	4.0	48	42	Orman +6
PPP (D)	9/11 - 9/14	1328 LV	2.7	46	36	Orman +10
PPP (D)	8/14 - 8/17	903 LV	3.3	43	33	Orman +10

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) © RealClearPolitics 2014

# Arkansas Senate - Cotton vs. Pryor

## Candidates



Tom Cotton (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Mark Pryor (D)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)


## Arkansas Snapshot

**RCP Average:** Cotton +7.0  
**RCP Ranking:** Leans GOP  
**2014 Key Races:** Governor | AR-2 | AR-4  
 -----PAST KEY RACES-----  
**2012:** President  
**2010:** Governor | Senate | AR-1 | AR-2 | AR-4  
**2008:** President  
**2006:** Governor | AR-1 | AR-2 | AR-3 | AR-4  
**2004:** President | Senate | AR-2

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Cotton (R)	Pryor (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	56.5	39.5	Cotton +17.0
<b>RCP Average</b>	10/16 - 11/1	--	--	48.2	41.2	Cotton +7.0
PPP (D)*	10/30 - 11/1	1092 LV	3.0	49	41	Cotton +8
Rasmussen Reports	10/27 - 10/29	967 LV	3.0	51	44	Cotton +7
The Arkansas Poll	10/21 - 10/27	568 LV	4.1	49	36	Cotton +13
NBC News/Marist*	10/19 - 10/23	621 LV	3.9	45	43	Cotton +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1567 LV	4.0	47	42	Cotton +5

**All Arkansas Senate - Cotton vs. Pryor Polling Data**

AdChoices



## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- Tom Cotton seems to be breaking open a real lead here. He enters Election Day as the favorite.

**10/7/14** -- Subsequent polling has not borne out the findings of the Suffolk poll. Mark Pryor enters the home stretch clearly behind Rep. Tom Cotton.

**9/29/14** -- The recent Suffolk poll seems like an outlier, although we can't be completely certain until we get more polling. Even that poll showed Pryor receiving only 45 percent of the vote. The incumbent is in deep trouble.

**9/7/14** -- Two months before the election, Pryor still seems to be stuck at 43 percent. There's still plenty of room for him to win this race, but he remains the most vulnerable incumbent.

### -----Race Preview-----

When David Pryor won his Senate seat in 1978, Arkansas was still very much a one-party state. Republicans won only six seats that year in the entire 135-member state legislature, although this tied a record set in 1910. Only one Republican had won the governorship since the end of Reconstruction, and only one other Republican had even eclipsed the 40 percent mark. Likewise, only one Republican had bested 40 percent a Senate race since the beginning of direct election of senators in the 1910s.

Pryor's son, Mark, won his Senate seat in 2002 in a somewhat different reality. Republicans had won gubernatorial elections in 1980 and 1998, and had narrowly won a Senate election in 1996. But the state was still politically marginal in presidential elections, and was still strongly Democratic in state elections. Mark Pryor defeated Republican Tim Hutchinson in a good Republican year, and found himself unopposed in 2008.

But things have changed dramatically in Arkansas politics in the years since then. Pryor's colleague, Blanche Lambert Lincoln, lost her 2010 re-election bid by over 20 points, while Republicans captured the General Assembly two years later. A body that had 97 Democrats and 30 Republicans when

### REAL CLEAR DEFENSE

**Defense Impacts:** An incumbent defense appropriator faces an Iraq War veteran and rising star in a race the GOP needs to win the Senate.

More on this race at [RealClearDefense](#)

Pryor was elected now stands at 73 Republicans and 61 Democrats.

Pryor finds himself challenged by freshman Rep. Tom Cotton, one of the NRSC's strongest recruits. Cotton brings a sterling resume – he's a former Army captain and Harvard Law School graduate – as well as the benefit of having represented southern Arkansas in Congress, which is a swing area of the state where Democrats must over-perform in order to win. A recent spate of polling has shown Pryor ahead. He's still at only 44 percent in the RCP Average, and the recent PPP poll shows the president's job approval an awful 13 percent among undecided voters, suggesting that Pryor will have a tough time converting them to his cause. Still, his campaign is showing some signs of life that weren't really there a month ago.

Recent Comments

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)

L.L.Bean  
**SAVE 10%**  
 THROUGH NOVEMBER 11  
 FREE SHIPPING  
 EVERY DAY  
 SHOP NOW

Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Cotton (R)	Pryor (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>56.5</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>Cotton +17.0</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/16 - 11/1</b>	--	--	<b>48.2</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>Cotton +7.0</b>
PPP (D)*	10/30 - 11/1	1092 LV	3.0	49	41	Cotton +8
Rasmussen Reports	10/27 - 10/29	967 LV	3.0	51	44	Cotton +7
The Arkansas Poll	10/21 - 10/27	568 LV	4.1	49	36	Cotton +13
NBC News/Marist*	10/19 - 10/23	621 LV	3.9	45	43	Cotton +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1567 LV	4.0	47	42	Cotton +5
Talk Business Poll*	10/15 - 10/16	2075 LV	2.2	49	41	Cotton +8
Rasmussen Reports	10/13 - 10/15	940 LV	3.0	47	44	Cotton +3
FOX News*	10/4 - 10/7	707 LV	3.5	46	39	Cotton +7
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	1991 LV	2.0	45	41	Cotton +4
Rasmussen Reports	9/24 - 9/25	750 LV	4.0	47	40	Cotton +7
USA Today/Suffolk*	9/20 - 9/23	500 LV	4.4	43	45	Pryor +2
PPP (D)	9/18 - 9/21	1453 LV	2.6	45	39	Cotton +6
NBC News/Marist*	9/2 - 9/4	639 LV	3.9	45	40	Cotton +5
CNN/Opinion Research	8/28 - 9/2	523 LV	4.5	49	47	Cotton +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	1572 LV	3.0	43	39	Cotton +4
Rasmussen Reports	8/25 - 8/26	750 LV	4.0	43	44	Pryor +1
PPP (D)	8/1 - 8/3	1066 RV	3.0	43	41	Cotton +2
Talk Business Poll*	7/22 - 7/25	1780 LV	2.3	44	42	Cotton +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	LV	2.9	50	46	Cotton +4
Impact Management Group (R)	6/29 - 6/29	1290 RV	2.7	47	43	Cotton +4
Magellan Strategies (R)	6/4 - 6/5	755 LV	3.6	49	45	Cotton +4
Rasmussen Reports	5/27 - 5/28	750 LV	4.0	47	43	Cotton +4
PPP (D)	4/25 - 4/27	840 RV	3.4	42	43	Pryor +1
NBC News/Marist	4/30 - 5/4	876 RV	3.3	40	51	Pryor +11
Magellan Strategies (R)	4/14 - 4/15	857 LV	3.4	46	43	Cotton +3
NY Times/Kaiser	4/8 - 4/15	857 RV	4.0	36	46	Pryor +10
Talk Business Poll*	4/3 - 4/4	1068 LV	3.0	43	46	Pryor +3
Opinion Research Associates	4/1 - 4/8	400 RV	5.0	38	48	Pryor +10
CEA/Hickman Analytics (D)	2/17 - 2/20	400 LV	4.9	46	46	Tie
Impact Management Group (R)	2/10 - 2/10	1202 RV	2.8	46	42	Cotton +4
Rasmussen Reports	2/4 - 2/5	500 LV	4.5	45	40	Cotton +5
The Arkansas Poll	10/10 - 10/17	LV	--	37	36	Cotton +1
Impact Management Group (R)	10/24 - 10/24	911 RV	3.2	42	41	Cotton +1

Talk Business Poll	10/8 - 10/8	603 LV	4.0	41	42	Pryor +1
WFB/The Polling Company (R)	8/6 - 8/7	600 RV	4.0	43	45	Pryor +2
Harper (R)	8/4 - 8/5	587 LV	4.0	43	41	Cotton +2

# Maryland Governor - Hogan vs. Brown

## Candidates



Anthony Brown (D)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Larry Hogan (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Maryland Snapshot


RCP Ranking: **Toss Up**  
2014 Key Races: **MD-6**

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

2012: **President** | **Senate** | **MD-6**  
2010: **Governor** | **Senate** | **MD-1**  
2008: **President**  
2006: **Senate** | **Governor**  
2004: **President**

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Brown (D)	Hogan (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>46.9</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>Hogan +4.7</b>
WPA Research (R)***	10/26 - 10/27	504 LV	4.4	39	44	Hogan +5
Gonzales Research***	10/20 - 10/24	822 LV	3.5	46	44	Brown +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1086 LV	5.0	51	38	Brown +13
Baltimore Sun	10/4 - 10/8	800 LV	3.5	49	42	Brown +7
Washington Post*	10/2 - 10/5	549 LV	5.0	47	38	Brown +9
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	1096 LV	4.0	55	38	Brown +17
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	1082 LV	4.0	51	37	Brown +14
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	1409 RV	--	52	39	Brown +13
Rasmussen Reports	7/9 - 7/10	750 LV	4.0	48	35	Brown +13
Washington Post	6/5 - 6/8	962 RV	3.5	51	33	Brown +18

\*\*\*The WPA Research poll was conducted for the Hogan campaign, and the Gonzales Research poll was conducted for the Maryland Republican Party.



## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- This race seems to have closed late, with both parties funneling in money at the last minute. One suspects the undecided voters here should go Democrat, and the GOP was disappointed here in 1994...but not in 2002.

### -----Race Preview-----

Maryland is increasingly a city-state -- all of its congressional districts are anchored partially in either metropolitan Washington, D.C., or Baltimore. The state has long been a Democratic stronghold. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, a Democratic machine in Baltimore combined with voters on the culturally southern Eastern Shore to form a Democratic majority. In the later 20th century, the Democrats lost the Eastern Shore but found increasingly receptive voters in the suburbs of D.C. Post-Civil War, the state has elected only six Republican governors, and only one has managed a second term.

The last Republican governor, Bob Ehrlich, won an open seat against Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, a disappointing candidate for Democrats, in 2002. Ehrlich had a tempestuous relationship with the Democratic legislature, and in 2006 he was defeated by Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley. O'Malley handily won a rematch with Ehrlich in 2010.

Anthony Brown, O'Malley's lieutenant governor, won the Democratic primary, and will face off against Republican Larry Hogan. In a Democratic state like Maryland, Brown has a significant edge, notwithstanding the headwinds Democrats in general are facing this year and Brown's oversight of the state's disastrous Obamacare website.

# Kentucky Senate - McConnell vs. Grimes

## Candidates



Mitch McConnell (R)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Alison Lundergan Grimes (D)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Kentucky Snapshot

**RCP Average:** **McConnell +7.2**  
**RCP Ranking:** **Leans GOP**  
**2014 Key Races:** **KY-6**

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

**2012:** **President** | **KY-6**  
**2011:** **Governor**  
**2010:** **Senate** | **KY-3** | **KY-6**  
**2008:** **President** | **Senate** | **KY-3**  
**2007:** **Governor**  
**2006:** **KY-3** | **KY-4**  
**2004:** **President** | **Senate** | **KY-3**

## Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	McConnell (R)	Grimes (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>56.2</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>McConnell +15.5</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/15 - 11/1</b>	--	--	<b>49.0</b>	<b>41.8</b>	<b>McConnell +7.2</b>
NBC News/Marist*	10/27 - 10/30	556 LV	4.2	50	41	McConnell +9
PPP (D)*	10/30 - 11/1	1503 LV	2.5	50	42	McConnell +8
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	10/25 - 10/29	597 LV	4.1	48	43	McConnell +5
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	10/16 - 10/23	1502 LV	4.0	45	39	McConnell +6
Rasmussen Reports	10/15 - 10/16	1000 LV	3.0	52	44	McConnell +8

**All Kentucky Senate - McConnell vs. Grimes Polling Data**

**DOWNLOAD THE AAA GAME CASE STUDY**

**REALTIME MARKERLESS MOTION CAPTURE**

organic motion

**BATTLE FOR THE SENATE**

RCP AVERAGES: GOP +7 PICK-UPS

**47** Dem **52** GOP

## Race Analysis

**10/28/14** -- The SurveyUSA poll looks like a bit of an outlier, and there really isn't much reason to suspect that Grimes is closing the gap by looking at the trendlines. McConnell enters the home stretch with the lead.

**10/17/14** -- National Democrats seem to be pulling the plug on Grimes' campaign. The fundamentals of the state are just too much for her to overcome.

**10/7/14** -- SurveyUSA is one of two pollsters to show Grimes ahead this cycle. Until there is a confirming poll, we probably should treat it as an outlier. But it is one cause for heartburn for Team Mitch.

**9/8/14** -- As this race engages, Grimes' numbers seem to be falling back to Earth. There is still plenty of time for her to turn things around, but the danger for her is that national Democrats could decide to abandon her campaign if she drops too far behind.

### -----Race Preview-----

Kentucky politics can largely be explained by the state's congressional districts. The 1st and 2nd Districts are (roughly) the Jackson Purchase and Pennyriple areas of the state, which vote like the Deep South. The 3rd and 6th Districts represent urban Louisville and greater Lexington, while the 4th District is the Republican suburbs of Cincinnati and Louisville. The 5th District is an amalgam of two older districts, one of which was old mountain Republican territory, and one of which was heavily unionized and Democratic coal mining country. The name of the game for Republicans is to run well in the 4th and 5th and hold their ground in the 1st and 2nd, while Democrats try to add to their bases in Louisville, Lexington, and the coal mining areas of the 5th.

The problem for Democrats is that the coal mining areas of the 5th have steadily drifted away from them over the past decade. Sen. Rand Paul owes much of his 2010 victory to outsized Republican margins in the area, margins that were matched by Republican presidential candidates in 2008 and 2012. At the same time, Democrats have managed to enjoy continued success at the local level, and hold most statewide offices.


That encapsulates the million-dollar question for 2014, when the very unpopular Senate minority leader, Mitch

McConnell, will face off against Secretary of State Alison Lundergan Grimes. If Grimes can push into the historic Democratic base in coal country, this election will probably stay close. If not, the 44 percent of the vote that Grimes is currently receiving will probably represent something of a ceiling for her.

Recent Comments

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



**New Creative Cloud Photography plan.**  
All-new Photoshop CC plus Lightroom desktop and mobile. Just US\$9.99/mo.

[Join now](#)

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	McConnell (R)	Grimes (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>56.2</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>McConnell +15.5</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/15 - 11/1</b>	--	--	<b>49.0</b>	<b>41.8</b>	<b>McConnell +7.2</b>
NBC News/Marist*	10/27 - 10/30	556 LV	4.2	50	41	McConnell +9
PPP (D)*	10/30 - 11/1	1503 LV	2.5	50	42	McConnell +8
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	10/25 - 10/29	597 LV	4.1	48	43	McConnell +5
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	10/16 - 10/23	1502 LV	4.0	45	39	McConnell +6
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	10/15 - 10/19	655 LV	3.9	44	43	McConnell +1
Rasmussen Reports	10/15 - 10/16	1000 LV	3.0	52	44	McConnell +8
Western Kentucky Univ.*	10/6 - 10/19	LV	4.1	45	42	McConnell +3
FOX News*	10/4 - 10/7	706 LV	3.5	45	41	McConnell +4
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	9/29 - 10/2	632 LV	4.0	44	46	Grimes +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	9/20 - 10/1	1689 LV	3.0	47	41	McConnell +6
Reuters/Ipsos	9/8 - 9/12	944 LV	3.6	46	42	McConnell +4
NBC News/Marist*	9/2 - 9/4	691 LV	3.7	47	39	McConnell +8
Rasmussen Reports	9/1 - 9/2	750 LV	4.0	46	41	McConnell +5
CNN/Opinion Research	8/28 - 9/1	671 LV	4.0	50	46	McConnell +4
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	2130 LV	3.0	47	42	McConnell +5
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	8/25 - 8/27	569 LV	4.2	46	42	McConnell +4
PPP (D)	8/7 - 8/10	991 LV	3.1	47	42	McConnell +5
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA	7/18 - 7/23	604 LV	4.1	47	45	McConnell +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	LV	4.2	50	46	McConnell +4
Magellan Strategies (R)	6/4 - 6/5	808 LV	3.5	46	49	Grimes +3
Rasmussen Reports	5/28 - 5/29	750 LV	4.0	48	41	McConnell +7
Wenzel Strategies (R)	5/23 - 5/24	608 LV	4.0	47	44	McConnell +3
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA*	5/14 - 5/16	1475 LV	2.6	42	43	Grimes +1
NBC News/Marist	4/30 - 5/6	2353 RV	2.0	46	45	McConnell +1
CEA/Hickman Analytics (D)	4/24 - 4/30	500 LV	4.4	46	45	McConnell +1
NY Times/Kaiser	4/8 - 4/15	891 RV	4.0	44	43	McConnell +1
Wenzel Strategies (R)	2/8 - 2/11	1002 LV	3.1	43	42	McConnell +1
Courier-Journal/SurveyUSA	1/30 - 2/3	1082 RV	3.0	42	46	Grimes +4
Rasmussen Reports	1/29 - 1/30	500 LV	4.5	42	42	Tie
PPP (D)	12/12 - 12/15	1509 RV	2.5	43	42	McConnell +1
Wenzel Strategies (R)	7/23 - 7/24	624 LV	3.9	48	40	McConnell +8
Wenzel Strategies (R)	6/1 - 6/2	623 LV	3.9	47	40	McConnell +7
PPP (D)	4/5 - 4/7	1052 RV	3.0	45	41	McConnell +4
PPP (D)	12/7 - 12/9	1266 RV	2.8	47	40	McConnell +7



L.L.Bean



# Virginia Senate - Gillespie vs. Warner

## Candidates



Mark Warner (D)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Ed Gillespie (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Virginia Snapshot

**RCP Average:** Warner +9.7  
**RCP Ranking:** Leans Dem  
**2014 Key Races:** VA-2 | VA-4 | VA-10


-----PAST KEY RACES-----

**2013:** Governor  
**2012:** President | Senate | VA-2  
**2010:** VA-2 | VA-5 | VA-9 | VA-11  
**2009:** Governor  
**2008:** President | Senate | VA-11  
**2006:** Senate | VA-2  
**2004:** President

## Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Warner (D)	Gillespie (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>49.2</b>	<b>48.4</b>	<b>Warner +0.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/1 - 10/29</b>	--	--	<b>48.5</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>Warner +9.7</b>
Christopher Newport Univ.*	10/23 - 10/29	634 LV	3.9	51	44	Warner +7
Roanoke College*	10/20 - 10/25	738 LV	3.6	47	35	Warner +12
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	10/16 - 10/23	1605 LV	4.0	49	39	Warner +10
Univ. of Mary Washington*	10/1 - 10/6	444 LV	5.3	47	37	Warner +10

All Virginia Senate - Gillespie vs. Warner Polling Data



## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- There are rumors of a break toward Gillespie, but no one is releasing polls. The apples-to-apples trendline comparisons for Roanoke College and Christopher Newport University aren't good for Warner, but there just doesn't seem to be enough time for Gillespie.

**10/28/14** -- Virginia voters seem to be waiting stubbornly to make up their minds. Gillespie was probably hoping for Scott Brown-like movement, but it doesn't seem to have materialized.

**10/7/14** -- The Christopher Newport poll showing a 12-point Warner lead is actually quite good for Gillespie, as it had previously shown him down by 20. This race is clearly tightening, but there probably isn't time for Gillespie to close the gap before Election Day.

**9/29/14** -- There's actually been a slight tightening here, with the polls showing Warner at his lowest point in the cycle. But it is far too early to suggest that this is anything other than Warner's race to lose.

**9/23/14** -- With just over 50 days to go, Warner remains fully in control of this contest. If Gillespie is going to make a race of it, things need to start tightening soon.

## -----Race Preview-----

Unlike many Southern states, Virginia has always had a vigorous Republican Party. At first it was based in the mountains and hills east of the Blue Ridge, where there were few blacks and little historical support for slavery (there was an additional ancient base among blacks that, when combined with western Virginia, made Republicans competitive statewide into the late 1800s; this was wiped out by the poll tax in 1902). They also began carrying Arlington County in the northeast as early as the 1920s, establishing a second toehold in the soon-to-be-growing northern Virginia suburbs. The addition of the third base made Republicans a majority when conservative Byrd Democrats finally exited the Democratic Party and began voting Republican.

But during the 1990s and 2000s, Bill Clinton's socially moderate, fiscally conservative message allowed him to become the first Democrat since LBJ to run even in northern Virginia. As the Democratic Party continued to embrace a relatively fiscally conservative stance, the northern suburbs continued to gravitate toward the Party of Jackson. This


trend culminated in 2006, when former Republican Gov. George Allen lost to Jim Webb, a relatively obscure Democratic opponent, largely on the basis of Webb's strong performance in northern Virginia. While Allen's fateful utterance of the word "macaca" is remembered as the incident that began his decline, in truth he was below 50 percent in the polls before that event, and Webb's fundraising was already picking up.

Two years later, former Gov. Mark Warner, one of the original "New Democrats" to win statewide office in the Old Dominion, won the Senate seat of Sen. John Warner by a 31-percentage-point margin over former Gov. Jim Gilmore. Warner carved out a center-left path in the Senate, although, like most Democrats, he voted for a large portion of President Obama's agenda in the 111th Congress. Warner faces former RNC Chairman Ed Gillespie in the general election. Gillespie will have access to plenty of money, but Warner remains personally popular. How competitive this race becomes probably turns on whether the atmosphere improves or not for Democrats by Election Day.

Recent Comments

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



**New Creative Cloud Photography plan.**  
All-new Photoshop CC plus Lightroom desktop and mobile. Just US\$9.99/mo.

Join now

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Warner (D)	Gillespie (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>49.2</b>	<b>48.4</b>	<b>Warner +0.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/1 - 10/29</b>	--	--	<b>48.5</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>Warner +9.7</b>
Christopher Newport Univ.*	10/23 - 10/29	634 LV	3.9	51	44	Warner +7
Roanoke College*	10/20 - 10/25	738 LV	3.6	47	35	Warner +12
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	10/16 - 10/23	1605 LV	4.0	49	39	Warner +10
Univ. of Mary Washington*	10/1 - 10/6	444 LV	5.3	47	37	Warner +10
Christopher Newport Univ.*	9/29 - 10/5	690 LV	3.7	51	39	Warner +12
CBS News/NYT/YouGov*	9/20 - 10/1	1656 LV	3.0	51	39	Warner +12
PPP (D)	9/22 - 9/23	625 LV	3.9	49	37	Warner +12
Quinnipiac	9/17 - 9/22	1010 LV	3.1	50	41	Warner +9
Roanoke College*	9/13 - 9/19	630 LV	3.9	49	29	Warner +20
Christopher Newport Univ.*	9/2 - 9/7	713 LV	3.7	53	31	Warner +22
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	1635 LV	3.0	51	39	Warner +12
Hampton University	7/27 - 7/30	804 LV	2.9	55	32	Warner +23
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	LV	3.2	53	43	Warner +10
Roanoke College*	7/14 - 7/19	566 RV	4.2	47	22	Warner +25
Rasmussen Reports	6/11 - 6/12	750 LV	4.0	53	36	Warner +17
Quinnipiac*	3/19 - 3/24	1288 RV	2.7	46	31	Warner +15
Roanoke College	2/22 - 2/28	707 RV	3.9	56	29	Warner +27
Rasmussen Reports	1/20 - 1/21	1000 LV	3.0	51	37	Warner +14
Christopher Newport Univ.	1/15 - 1/22	1023 RV	3.1	50	30	Warner +20
Roanoke College	1/13 - 1/17	553 RV	4.2	50	21	Warner +29
WFB/The Polling Company (R)	11/19 - 11/20	600 RV	4.0	51	33	Warner +18

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)    © RealClearPolitics 2014



Send Anniversary Smiles!

# Save 15%

on Romantic Flowers & Gifts

SHOP NOW



# Iowa Senate - Ernst vs. Braley

## Candidates



Joni Ernst (R)

[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Bruce Braley (D)

[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Iowa Snapshot

**RCP Average:** Ernst +2.3

**RCP Ranking:** Toss Up

**2014 Key Races:** [Governor](#) | [IA-1](#) | [IA-2](#) | [IA-3](#) | [IA-4](#)

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

**2012:** [President](#) | [IA-1](#) | [IA-2](#) | [IA-3](#) | [IA-4](#)

**2010:** [Governor](#) | [Senate](#) | [IA-1](#) | [IA-2](#) | [IA-3](#)

**2008:** [President](#)

**2006:** [Governor](#) | [IA-1](#) | [IA-3](#)

**2004:** [President](#) | [Senate](#) | [IA-3](#)

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Ernst (R)	Braley (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	52.2	43.7	<b>Ernst +8.5</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	10/27 - 11/3	--	--	48.0	45.7	<b>Ernst +2.3</b>
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	1265 LV	2.8	48	45	Ernst +3
Quinnipiac	10/28 - 11/2	778 LV	3.5	47	47	Tie
Des Moines Register	10/28 - 10/31	701 LV	3.7	51	44	Ernst +7
FOX News	10/28 - 10/30	911 LV	3.0	45	44	Ernst +1
Rasmussen Reports	10/28 - 10/30	990 LV	3.0	48	47	Ernst +1
CNN/Opinion Research	10/27 - 10/30	647 LV	4.0	49	47	Ernst +2

**All Iowa Senate - Ernst vs. Braley Polling Data**

**FARM FRESH LOCAL GROCERIES**  
Order online  
Use code: **FREE** for \$20 in free food.  
**ORDER NOW**

**BATTLE FOR THE SENATE**  
RCP AVERAGES: GOP +7 PICK-UPS  
**47** Dem **52** GOP

## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- The Quinnipiac poll puts a damper on the Republican celebration following the Des Moines Register poll. We should still expect a close race, but Ernst does have an edge.

**10/28/14** -- Loras College breaks a lengthy drought for Braley, who had failed to lead in a poll in over a month. Loras has tended to be favorable toward Braley, and the poll average still favors Ernst; we'd have to have a confirming poll to suggest the fundamental dynamic of the race has shifted.

**10/17/14** -- Ernst has trailed in only a single poll since mid-September. Her lead is narrow, however, and Braley still has time.

**10/7/14** -- Seven of the last eight polls have shown either a tie or an Ernst lead. It's safe to say that Braley no longer holds a lead. In addition, one of those ties (the Loras College poll) previously had Braley up four. Ernst probably has an edge at this point.

**9/29/14** -- Two polls have now shown Ernst with a substantial lead, including the well-regarded Des Moines Register poll. There are still a lot of undecided voters and plenty of time on the clock, so Braley is very much still in this game.

**9/23/14** -- Democrats cheered when Loras College showed Braley up four points, while Republicans celebrated when Quinnipiac found Ernst ahead by six. Everyone else sees a very tight race, which is probably where things stand.

**9/8/14** -- This race remains tight, with neither candidate having led by more than two points since early June. It goes without saying that this one could go either way right now.

## -----Race Preview-----

Iowa was initially one of the most heavily Republican states in the country. From 1858 until 1924, the state had never elected a Democratic senator. Until 1990, it had never sent one to Washington for two full terms. But the GOP's grip on Iowa began to weaken in the 1960s, when the state's dovish tendencies and history of support for social reform movements moved it toward the Democrats. By 1974, it had only one Republican congressman: Charles Grassley.

Grassley won a Senate seat in 1980, defeating Sen. John Culver by a large margin; this followed Roger Jepsen's defeat of incumbent Democrat Dick Clark in 1978 and seemed to signal the beginning of a revival of Republican fortunes.

But the farm crisis of the 1980s reversed this trend, and populist Democrat Tom Harkin, who had been elected to the House in the same year as Grassley, defeated Jepsen by a surprisingly large margin. As the state's ideological positioning stabilized just a hair to the left of center, Harkin won re-election four times, but decided to call it a career in 2014.

Republicans searched in vain for a top-flight candidate, while Democrats settled upon Rep. Bruce Braley. Many analysts concluded that Democrats would hold the seat. But Braley's campaign has been beset by gaffes, while Republicans coalesced around state Sen. Joni Ernst. Some still fear that Ernst won't hold up to the rigors of a long campaign in the spotlight, but for now, this looks to be a very competitive race.

**REAL CLEAR DEFENSE**

**Defense Impacts:** A defense appropriator's seat is vacated as Joni Ernst seeks to become the first female combat veteran in the U.S. Senate.

More on this race at [RealClearDefense](#)

Recent Comments

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



**Save 25% for up to 2 years.**  
New apps for your business in 2014 release of Creative Cloud for teams.  
[Join now >](#)

Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Ernst (R)	Braley (D)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>52.2</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>Ernst +8.5</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/27 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>48.0</b>	<b>45.7</b>	<b>Ernst +2.3</b>
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	1265 LV	2.8	48	45	Ernst +3
Quinnipiac	10/28 - 11/2	778 LV	3.5	47	47	Tie
Des Moines Register	10/28 - 10/31	701 LV	3.7	51	44	Ernst +7
FOX News	10/28 - 10/30	911 LV	3.0	45	44	Ernst +1
Rasmussen Reports	10/28 - 10/30	990 LV	3.0	48	47	Ernst +1
CNN/Opinion Research	10/27 - 10/30	647 LV	4.0	49	47	Ernst +2
YouGov	10/25 - 10/31	1112 LV	4.4	42	43	Braley +1
Reuters/Ipsos	10/23 - 10/29	1129 LV	3.3	45	45	Tie
Quinnipiac	10/22 - 10/27	817 LV	3.4	49	45	Ernst +4
Loras College	10/21 - 10/24	1121 LV	2.9	44	45	Braley +1
NBC News/Marist	10/18 - 10/22	772 LV	3.5	49	46	Ernst +3
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	2322 LV	3.0	44	44	Tie
Quinnipiac	10/15 - 10/21	964 LV	3.2	48	46	Ernst +2
USA Today/Suffolk*	10/11 - 10/14	500 LV	4.4	47	43	Ernst +4
Quinnipiac	10/8 - 10/13	967 LV	3.2	47	45	Ernst +2
Rasmussen Reports	10/8 - 10/10	957 LV	3.0	48	45	Ernst +3
Des Moines Register/Bloomberg	10/3 - 10/8	1000 LV	3.1	47	46	Ernst +1
Loras College	10/1 - 10/3	600 LV	4.0	42	42	Tie
NBC News/Marist	9/27 - 10/1	778 LV	3.5	46	44	Ernst +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	2359 LV	2.0	43	44	Braley +1
PPP (D)	9/25 - 9/28	1192 LV	2.8	45	43	Ernst +2
Des Moines Register*	9/21 - 9/24	546 LV	4.2	44	38	Ernst +6
Rasmussen Reports	9/17 - 9/18	750 LV	4.0	43	43	Tie
FOX News	9/14 - 9/16	600 LV	4.0	41	41	Tie
Quinnipiac	9/10 - 9/15	1167 LV	2.9	50	44	Ernst +6
CNN/Opinion Research	9/8 - 9/10	608 LV	4.0	48	49	Braley +1
Loras College	9/2 - 9/5	1200 LV	2.8	41	45	Braley +4
USA Today/Suffolk*	8/23 - 8/26	500 LV	4.4	40	40	Tie
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	1764 LV	3.0	42	44	Braley +2

PPP (D)	8/22 - 8/24	915 LV	3.2	42	42	Tie
Rasmussen Reports	8/11 - 8/12	750 LV	4.0	43	43	Tie
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	LV	2.7	48	47	Ernst +1
NBC News/Marist	7/7 - 7/13	1599 RV	2.5	43	43	Tie
Quinnipiac	6/12 - 6/16	1277 RV	2.7	40	44	Braley +4
Loras College	6/4 - 6/5	600 LV	4.0	48	42	Ernst +6
Rasmussen Reports	6/4 - 6/5	750 LV	4.0	45	44	Ernst +1
PPP (D)	5/15 - 5/19	914 RV	3.3	39	45	Braley +6
CEA/Hickman Analytics (D)	4/24 - 4/30	500 LV	4.4	40	44	Braley +4
Suffolk	4/3 - 4/8	800 LV	3.5	30	38	Braley +8
Rasmussen Reports	3/24 - 3/25	750 LV	4.0	37	40	Braley +3
Quinnipiac	3/5 - 3/10	1411 RV	2.6	29	42	Braley +13
PPP (D)	2/20 - 2/23	869 RV	3.3	35	41	Braley +6
Quinnipiac	12/10 - 12/15	RV	--	38	44	Braley +6
Harper (R)	11/23 - 11/24	985 LV	3.1	36	42	Braley +6
PPP (D)	7/5 - 7/7	668 RV	3.8	33	45	Braley +12



# Illinois Governor - Rauner vs. Quinn

Three-Way Race: Rauner vs. Quinn vs. Grimm

## Candidates



Pat Quinn (D)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Bruce Rauner (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Illinois Snapshot


RCP Average: **Quinn +0.8**  
 RCP Ranking: **Toss Up**  
 2014 Key Races: **Senate** | **IL-8** | **IL-10** | **IL-11** | **IL-12** | **IL-13** | **IL-17**

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

**2012:** **President** | **House**  
**2010:** **Governor** | **Senate** | **House**  
**2008:** **President** | **IL-10** | **IL-11**  
**2006:** **Governor** | **IL-6** | **IL-8**  
**2004:** **President** | **Senate**

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Quinn (D)	Rauner (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	45.9	50.7	<b>Rauner +4.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/16 - 11/2</b>	--	--	45.6	44.8	<b>Quinn +0.8</b>
PPP (D)	11/1 - 11/2	1064 LV	3.0	48	48	Tie
Chicago Sun-Times*	10/28 - 10/28	823 LV	3.9	45	42	Quinn +3
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	3519 LV	3.0	45	41	Quinn +4
Rasmussen Reports	10/20 - 10/22	1000 LV	3.0	47	48	Rauner +1
Chicago Tribune*	10/16 - 10/21	800 LV	3.5	43	45	Rauner +2

**All Illinois Governor - Rauner vs. Quinn Polling Data**



## Race Analysis

**10/28/14** -- All signs here point to a close race, which probably isn't what Rauner wants. He needs to make the sale to a group of Democratic voters, and so far hasn't done so.

**10/19/14** -- Rauner got some welcome news when Southern Illinois University found him with a small lead over Quinn. But that poll had a huge number of undecided voters, and in a state like Illinois, that is probably rough news for Rauner.

**10/7/14** -- Quinn has bounced back, and holds a lead. The state might just be too blue for Rauner to win.

### -----Race Preview-----

Had you asked a political observer 30 years ago whether a governor's race in Illinois would be competitive, you'd likely have received a look normally reserved for those claim to have been abducted by aliens. Illinois has historically been one of the more politically competitive states in the United States, and a governor's race in Illinois was supposed to be close.

But in recent years it has become more surprising to hear that a Republican was competitive in this race. Even while beset by allegations of ethical impropriety, Rod Blagojevich was able to win re-election handily in 2006 against the lone Republican statewide officeholder, and underwhelming Gov. Pat Quinn was able to fend off a game challenge from Republican Bill Brady in 2010. This time, Quinn is receiving generally poor polls against his challenger, businessman Bruce Rauner. But Brady polled well in 2010 as well, but undecided voters ended up breaking overwhelmingly against him at the end. Quinn is hoping that Democrats once again come home for him, big time, in the end.

## Recent Commentary & News Stories

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)

Joseph Curl, Washington Times

- **Don't Govern on Fantasies**  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- **Scott Walker Wins Again**  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- **Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer**  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



Save 25% for up to 2 years.  
New apps for your business in 2014 release of Creative Cloud for teams.  
[Join now >](#)

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Quinn (D)	Rauner (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>45.9</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>Rauner +4.8</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/16 - 11/2</b>	--	--	<b>45.6</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>Quinn +0.8</b>
<b>PPP (D)</b>	11/1 - 11/2	1064 LV	3.0	48	48	Tie
<b>Chicago Sun-Times*</b>	10/28 - 10/28	823 LV	3.9	45	42	Quinn +3
<b>CBS News/NYT/YouGov</b>	10/16 - 10/23	3519 LV	3.0	45	41	Quinn +4
<b>Rasmussen Reports</b>	10/20 - 10/22	1000 LV	3.0	47	48	Rauner +1
<b>Chicago Tribune*</b>	10/16 - 10/21	800 LV	3.5	43	45	Rauner +2
<b>The Simon Poll/SIU*</b>	9/23 - 10/15	691 LV	3.7	41	42	Rauner +1
<b>Sun-Times/WeAskAmerica*</b>	10/8 - 10/8	1051 LV	3.0	44	41	Quinn +3
<b>CBS News/NYT/YouGov</b>	9/20 - 10/1	3955 LV	2.0	46	43	Quinn +3
<b>Rasmussen Reports</b>	9/24 - 9/25	750 LV	4.0	44	42	Quinn +2
<b>WeAskAmerica*</b>	9/18 - 9/19	1418 LV	3.0	41	44	Rauner +3
<b>Chicago Tribune*</b>	9/3 - 9/12	800 RV	3.5	48	37	Quinn +11
<b>CBS News/NYT/YouGov</b>	8/18 - 9/2	4363 LV	3.0	40	44	Rauner +4
<b>Sun-Times/WeAskAmerica</b>	8/6 - 8/6	1085 LV	3.1	38	51	Rauner +13
<b>Rasmussen Reports</b>	7/29 - 7/30	750 LV	4.0	39	44	Rauner +5
<b>CBS News/NYT/YouGov</b>	7/5 - 7/24	5298 RV	--	43	46	Rauner +3
<b>Rasmussen Reports</b>	4/9 - 4/10	750 LV	4.0	40	43	Rauner +3
<b>WeAskAmerica</b>	1/30 - 1/30	1354 LV	2.7	39	47	Rauner +8
<b>PPP (D)</b>	11/22 - 11/25	557 RV	4.2	41	38	Quinn +3

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) © RealClearPolitics 2014

## Markerless Motion Capture

The easiest to use, most cost effective motion capture system





# Kansas Governor - Brownback vs. Davis

## Candidates



Paul Davis (D)

[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Sam Brownback (R)\*

[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Kansas Snapshot

**RCP Average: Davis +2.0**  
**RCP Ranking: Toss Up**  
**2014 Key Races: Senate | KS-2 | KS-3**

-----PAST KEY RACES-----

**2012: President**  
**2010: Governor | Senate | KS-3**  
**2008: President | KS-2**  
**2006: Governor**  
**2004: President | Senate | KS-3 | KS-4**

### Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Davis (D)	Brownback (R)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	46.1	50.0	<b>Brownback +3.9</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	10/18 - 11/3	--	--	44.6	42.6	<b>Davis +2.0</b>
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	963 LV	3.2	46	45	Davis +1
FOX News*	10/28 - 10/30	907 LV	3.0	48	42	Davis +6
YouGov*	10/25 - 10/31	1137 LV	4.8	38	39	<b>Brownback +1</b>
SurveyUSA*	10/22 - 10/26	623 LV	4.0	46	43	Davis +3
NBC News/Marist*	10/18 - 10/22	757 LV	3.6	45	44	Davis +1

**All Kansas Governor - Brownback vs. Davis Polling Data**

### BATTLE FOR THE SENATE

RCP AVERAGES: GOP +7 PICK-UPS

**47** Dem    **52** GOP

### Race Analysis

**10/28/14** -- Like the Senate race, the polling here is a little bit all over the place. This is looking like a very close battle.

**10/19/14** -- The state's underlying partisan dynamics seem to be asserting themselves here, as Brownback has shot upward in the past few weeks. The state's Senate race might even be helping him by making the race less of a referendum on him and more of a partisan affair.

**10/7/14** -- Davis's lead is small, but steady. Brownback is in real trouble.

**10/1/14** -- The race has tightened somewhat, and it remains an open question whether Davis can really hold on to a lead against Brownback in a year like this one.

### -----Race Preview-----

While Kansas has fairly consistently voted Republican at the federal level since the end of the Great Depression, the state has elected a number of Democratic governors. In fact, Republicans have only held the mansion for 20 of the past 50 years, and no Republican has succeeded another Republican in the state since the 1960s.

In 2002, Kathleen Sebelius was able to take advantage of a longstanding split between moderate and conservative Republicans to edge into the governor's mansion. She then won a large victory in 2006. Republican Sen. Sam Brownback succeeded her, winning by a large margin in 2010. But Brownback has been a controversial governor, and many of his actions have served to inflame the tensions between conservatives and moderates. He starts out in a very tough position against his Democratic opponent.

### Recent Commentary & News Stories

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)

E.J. Dionne, Washington Post

- **Scott Walker Wins Again**  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- **Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer**  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



**Save 25% for up to 2 years.**  
New apps for your business in 2014 release of Creative Cloud for teams.  
[Join now >](#)

Poll	Date	Polling Data			Davis (D)	Brownback (R)	Spread
		Sample	MoE				
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>46.1</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>Brownback +3.9</b>	
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/18 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>44.6</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>Davis +2.0</b>	
PPP (D)*	11/1 - 11/3	963 LV	3.2	46	45	Davis +1	
FOX News*	10/28 - 10/30	907 LV	3.0	48	42	Davis +6	
YouGov*	10/25 - 10/31	1137 LV	4.8	38	39	Brownback +1	
SurveyUSA*	10/22 - 10/26	623 LV	4.0	46	43	Davis +3	
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1973 LV	4.0	40	43	Brownback +3	
NBC News/Marist*	10/18 - 10/22	757 LV	3.6	45	44	Davis +1	
Rasmussen Reports	10/20 - 10/21	960 LV	3.0	52	45	Davis +7	
Remington Research Group (R)*	10/9 - 10/12	1091 LV	3.0	45	48	Brownback +3	
PPP (D)	10/9 - 10/12	1081 LV	3.0	45	44	Davis +1	
FOX News*	10/4 - 10/7	702 LV	3.5	40	46	Brownback +6	
CNN/Opinion Research	10/2 - 10/6	687 LV	3.5	49	49	Tie	
SurveyUSA*	10/2 - 10/5	549 LV	4.3	47	42	Davis +5	
NBC News/Marist*	9/27 - 10/1	636 LV	3.9	44	43	Davis +1	
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	2013 LV	3.0	42	45	Brownback +3	
USA Today/Suffolk*	9/27 - 9/30	500 LV	4.4	46	42	Davis +4	
Rasmussen Reports	9/16 - 9/17	750 LV	4.0	47	43	Davis +4	
FOX News*	9/14 - 9/16	604 LV	4.0	45	41	Davis +4	
PPP (D)	9/11 - 9/14	1328 LV	2.7	45	39	Davis +6	
SurveyUSA*	9/4 - 9/7	555 LV	4.2	47	40	Davis +7	
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	839 LV	5.0	40	47	Brownback +7	
SurveyUSA*	8/20 - 8/23	560 LV	4.2	48	40	Davis +8	
PPP (D)	8/14 - 8/17	903 LV	3.3	44	39	Davis +5	
Rasmussen Reports	8/6 - 8/7	750 LV	4.0	51	41	Davis +10	
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	7/5 - 7/24	1274 RV	--	40	52	Brownback +12	
SurveyUSA*	7/17 - 7/22	1208 LV	2.9	48	40	Davis +8	
SurveyUSA*	6/19 - 6/23	1068 LV	3.1	47	41	Davis +6	
Rasmussen Reports	4/16 - 4/17	750 LV	4.0	40	47	Brownback +7	
PPP (D)	2/18 - 2/20	693 RV	3.7	42	40	Davis +2	
SurveyUSA*	10/23 - 10/24	511 RV	4.4	43	39	Davis +4	

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) © RealClearPolitics 2014

## Markerless Motion Capture

The easiest to use, most cost effective motion capture system



# Georgia Senate - Perdue vs. Nunn vs. Swafford

Note: If no candidate receives 50 percent of the vote plus one, there will be a runoff on January 6.

Two-Way Race: [Perdue vs. Nunn](#)

## Candidates



David Perdue (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Michelle Nunn (D)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)




Amanda Swafford (L)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

## Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Perdue (R)	Nunn (D)	Swafford (L)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>53.0</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Perdue +7.9</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/27 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>47.8</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>Perdue +3.0</b>
WSB-TV/Landmark	11/2 - 11/2	1500 LV	2.5	50	46	2	Perdue +4
PPP (D)	11/1 - 11/3	975 LV	3.1	46	45	5	Perdue +1
SurveyUSA	10/30 - 11/2	591 LV	4.1	47	44	5	Perdue +3
InsiderAdvantage	10/30 - 11/2	1463 LV	2.6	48	45	3	Perdue +3
NBC News/Marist	10/27 - 10/30	603 LV	4.0	48	44	3	Perdue +4

**All Georgia Senate - Perdue vs. Nunn vs. Swafford Polling Data**



## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- Most signs here point to a runoff, but not all of them. What is somewhat surprising is that Perdue is the candidate who seems to be brushing against the runoff door, while Nunn's numbers are in free fall. If we get to a runoff situation, Perdue's election isn't assured, but it is likely.

**10/28/14** -- SurveyUSA and Landmark were previously two of Perdue's worst polls, so there may be some movement back toward the Republican candidate. Of course, the question is still whether either candidate can get to 50 percent plus one, something none of the polls are suggesting.

**10/17/14** -- This is one of the few races in the country to break heavily toward Democrats. Perdue certainly hasn't helped himself with his comments about outsourcing, especially in rural Georgia. The question here is whether Obama's job approval ultimately acts as an anchor on Nunn, and more importantly, whether she can get to the 50 percent needed to avoid a runoff.

**10/7/14** -- Perdue maintains a lead, but comments he made about outsourcing may change the dynamics of this race. Stay tuned . . .

**9/23/14** -- The race is moving away from Nunn, as people tune in and Georgia reverts to its fundamentals. Even Landmark, which has steadily shown a Nunn advantage, finds voters moving toward Perdue.

**9/7/14** -- Recent polls show a tightening in this race, but Nunn's challenge is nevertheless finding a coalition in Georgia to get up around 50 percent.

### -----Race Preview-----

In 2002, Georgia snapped. The state had been among the last in the South to cling to its Democratic roots: Bill Clinton carried Georgia in 1992, and a coalition of African-Americans and rural whites had kept the Democrats in control of the governor's mansion, the legislature and even a Senate seat. All of that changed in 2002, as rural whites revolted, throwing out the Democratic governor, senator, and (two years later) the legislature. Two years later, Republican

Johnny Isakson rolled to a 58 percent-40 percent win over Congresswoman Denise Majette. Democrats enjoyed a reasonably close race in the 2008 general election, but fell badly short in the runoff necessitated when neither Saxby Chambliss nor Jim Martin topped 50 percent.

Democrats are excited about Michelle Nunn's chances of ending the party's 14-year dry spell in the Senate, and changing demographics may indeed help the party of Jackson regain its footing here. But this is still a Republican state, and even with massive black turnout in 2008, Democrats couldn't put the Senate seat away. This race starts out close, with Nunn and Perdue trading leads in the polls, but given the environment and the Republican lean of the state, Perdue probably starts with an edge.

**REAL CLEAR DEFENSE**

**Defense Impacts:** A political neophyte battles the daughter of a former Senate Armed Services Committee chairman in one of the most defense-heavy states. More on this race at [RealClearDefense](#)

Recent Comments

- [A Nail in the Coffin of "Team of Rivals" Theory](#)  
Chris Cillizza, Wash Post
- [The Audacity of John Podesta](#)  
Ben Geman, National Journal
- [America, You've Been Grubered!](#)  
Kurt Schlichter, Townhall
- [Obama Heightens the Contradictions](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [A Small Man in a Big Office](#)  
Kevin Williamson, National Review

[See All Comments](#)



Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Perdue (R)	Nunn (D)	Swafford (L)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>53.0</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>Perdue +7.9</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/27 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>47.8</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>Perdue +3.0</b>
WSB-TV/Landmark	11/2 - 11/2	1500 LV	2.5	50	46	2	Perdue +4
PPP (D)	11/1 - 11/3	975 LV	3.1	46	45	5	Perdue +1
SurveyUSA	10/30 - 11/2	591 LV	4.1	47	44	5	Perdue +3
InsiderAdvantage	10/30 - 11/2	1463 LV	2.6	48	45	3	Perdue +3
NBC News/Marist	10/27 - 10/30	603 LV	4.0	48	44	3	Perdue +4
WSB-TV/Landmark	10/29 - 10/29	1500 LV	2.5	47	47	3	Tie
YouGov	10/25 - 10/31	1743 LV	3.2	44	42	1	Perdue +2
SurveyUSA	10/24 - 10/27	611 LV	4.0	48	45	3	Perdue +3
Atlanta Journal-Constitution	10/16 - 10/23	1170 LV	3.6	44	42	6	Perdue +2
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1774 LV	4.0	47	44	1	Perdue +3
InsiderAdvantage	10/21 - 10/22	704 LV	3.7	45	47	4	Nunn +2
WSB-TV/Landmark	10/20 - 10/21	1000 LV	2.8	47	47	3	Tie
CNN/Opinion Research	10/19 - 10/22	565 LV	4.0	44	47	5	Nunn +3
SurveyUSA	10/17 - 10/20	606 LV	4.1	44	46	4	Nunn +2
WRBL/Ledger-Enquirer/PMB	10/13 - 10/14	1543 LV	2.5	45	46	6	Nunn +1
SurveyUSA	10/10 - 10/13	563 LV	4.2	45	48	3	Nunn +3
WSB-TV/Landmark	10/7 - 10/9	1000 LV	3.1	46	46	4	Tie
SurveyUSA	10/2 - 10/6	566 LV	4.2	46	45	3	Perdue +1
PPP (D)	10/2 - 10/5	895 LV	3.3	45	43	5	Perdue +2
InsiderAdvantage	9/29 - 10/1	947 LV	3.2	47	43	4	Perdue +4
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	1851 LV	3.0	47	43	2	Perdue +4
SurveyUSA	9/19 - 9/22	550 LV	4.3	46	45	4	Perdue +1
InsiderAdvantage	9/10 - 9/11	1167 LV	2.9	50	40	5	Perdue +10
WSB-TV/Landmark	9/9 - 9/11	1109 LV	2.9	43	46	6	Nunn +3
Atlanta Journal-Constitution	9/8 - 9/11	884 LV	4.0	45	41	6	Perdue +4
SurveyUSA	9/5 - 9/8	558 LV	4.2	47	44	5	Perdue +3
CBS News/NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	1900 LV	3.0	47	41	3	Perdue +6
WRBL/Ledger-Enquirer/PMB	8/24 - 8/25	1578 LV	2.5	43	45	7	Nunn +2
WSB-TV/Landmark	8/20 - 8/21	600 LV	4.0	40	47	3	Nunn +7
SurveyUSA	8/14 - 8/17	560 LV	4.2	50	41	3	Perdue +9
InsiderAdvantage	8/12 - 8/13	719 LV	3.7	47	40	8	Perdue +7

WSB-TV/Landmark	7/25 - 7/25	750 LV	3.8	43	47	4	Nunn +4
SurveyUSA	6/3 - 6/5	999 LV	3.2	43	38	6	Perdue +5

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) © RealClearPolitics 2014

westernunion.com  
**\$0 fee\* online to the Philippines**  
when sent bank-to-bank



[Learn More »](#)

**WESTERN UNION WU**  
westernunion.com

# N.C. Senate - Tillis vs. Hagan vs. Haugh

## Candidates



Kay Hagan (D)\*  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Thom Tillis (R)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)



Sean Haugh (L)  
[Bio](#) | [Campaign Site](#)

Polling Data							
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Hagan (D)	Tillis (R)	Haugh (L)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	47.3	49.0	3.7	<b>Tillis +1.7</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	10/19 - 11/3	--	--	44.1	43.4	4.9	<b>Hagan +0.7</b>
PPP (D)	11/1 - 11/3	1333 LV	2.7	46	44	5	Hagan +2
Civitas (R)	10/29 - 10/30	600 LV	4.0	41	41	6	Tie
FOX News	10/28 - 10/30	909 LV	3.0	43	42	4	Hagan +1
Harper (R)	10/28 - 10/30	511 LV	4.3	44	46	6	Tillis +2
CNN/Opinion Research	10/27 - 10/30	559 LV	4.0	48	46	4	Hagan +2
YouGov	10/25 - 10/31	1727 LV	3.0	44	41	2	Hagan +3
High Point/SurveyUSA	10/21 - 10/25	802 LV	3.5	44	44	5	Tie
NBC News/Marist	10/19 - 10/23	756 LV	3.6	43	43	7	Tie

**All N.C. Senate - Tillis vs. Hagan vs. Haugh Polling Data**

## Race Analysis

**11/3/14** -- Both parties are claiming early voting was good for them, which is consistent with the overall take on the race: it is close.

**10/28/14** -- Hagan's lead continues to trickle away. But with only a week to go until Election Day, she may well be able to run out the clock.

**10/17/14** -- Tillis has clearly narrowed the gap here, now that the Republican ad blitz is underway. We'll have to wait for more polling to determine whether he has the lead or not.

**9/23/14** -- The Democratic ad blitz has clearly taken its toll on Tillis, although Hagan has seen only a modest improvement in her numbers and remains stuck at around 45 percent. Still, Tillis has some major image repair to do if he wants to win this race.

**9/8/14** -- This race has been remarkably stable. The only real wild card is Libertarian candidate Sean Haugh, who has polled well and peeled off more ballots from Tillis than from Hagan. Third parties tend to fade down the stretch (except when they don't), so we'd expect things to tilt back Tillis' way. But we really have no way of knowing for sure.

### -----Race Preview-----

Throughout its history, North Carolina has always had a substantial Republican presence in the northwest mountain area. The Democratic Party was split between progressives and conservatives, and as the national Democratic Party moved leftward, it created an opportunity for Republicans to fuse the more conservative Democrats with the Republican rump and create a majority.

Jesse Helms was the first Republican to succeed in bringing those conservatives into the GOP while, at the same time, northerners

**REAL CLEAR DEFENSE**

flocking to the Research Triangle Park brought an even more pronounced Republican bent to the state. For a while it looked like North Carolina would become a solidly red state.

But this didn't happen, as moderate governors like Jim Hunt and Mike Easley kept some of the conservative Democrats in the fold, while suburbanites around RTP drifted toward the Democratic Party. In 2002, Elizabeth Dole successfully held Helms' seat against Democrat Erskine Bowles. Dole was fairly quiet in the Senate, and drew what was thought to be a fairly mediocre opponent in state Sen. Kay Hagan. Dole led Hagan handily for much of 2008, often breaking 50 percent in the polls. But Hagan pulled close after the Democratic convention, and then broke the race open after the financial collapse. She led the Democratic ticket in the state, running ahead of both Barack Obama and gubernatorial candidate Bev Perdue.

Hagan herself has had a reasonably uneventful term. She faces two basic challenges. First, she has mostly backed the national Democratic agenda, and second, she can't rely upon the surge in African-American turnout that accompanied Obama's run for office and helped to propel her across the finish line. Democrats attempted to manipulate the Republican primary to increase the chances the GOP would elect a candidate who would implode, but voters nominated House Speaker Thom Tillis. He is the face of an unpopular legislature, but neither Obama nor Hagan is particularly popular in the state either. Polls show a tight race, but Hagan is below 45 percent, and is in deep trouble.

**Defense Impacts:** An incumbent Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee seeks to defend her seat in a state with a large military population.  
More on this race at [RealClearDefense](#)

Recent Comments

- [Can Obama Duck Lame-Duck Syndrome?](#)  
Steve Coll, The New Yorker
- [For Obama, No Midterm Lesson](#)  
Joseph Curl, Washington Times
- [Don't Govern on Fantasies](#)  
E.J. Dionne, Washington Post
- [Scott Walker Wins Again](#)  
John McCormack, Weekly Standard
- [Valerie Jarrett, the Obama Whisperer](#)  
Noam Scheiber, The New Republic

[See All Comments](#)



**New Creative Cloud Photography plan.**  
All-new Photoshop CC plus Lightroom desktop and mobile. Just US\$9.99/mo.  
[Join now](#)

Polling Data

Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Hagan (D)	Tillis (R)	Haugh (L)	Spread
<b>Final Results</b>	--	--	--	<b>47.3</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>Tillis +1.7</b>
<b>RCP Average</b>	<b>10/19 - 11/3</b>	--	--	<b>44.1</b>	<b>43.4</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>Hagan +0.7</b>
PPP (D)	11/1 - 11/3	1333 LV	2.7	46	44	5	Hagan +2
Civitas (R)	10/29 - 10/30	600 LV	4.0	41	41	6	Tie
FOX News	10/28 - 10/30	909 LV	3.0	43	42	4	Hagan +1
Harper (R)	10/28 - 10/30	511 LV	4.3	44	46	6	Tillis +2
CNN/Opinion Research	10/27 - 10/30	559 LV	4.0	48	46	4	Hagan +2
YouGov	10/25 - 10/31	1727 LV	3.0	44	41	2	Hagan +3
High Point/SurveyUSA	10/21 - 10/25	802 LV	3.5	44	44	5	Tie
NBC News/Marist	10/19 - 10/23	756 LV	3.6	43	43	7	Tie
CBS News/ NYT/YouGov	10/16 - 10/23	1910 LV	4.0	44	41	2	Hagan +3
SurveyUSA	10/16 - 10/20	568 LV	4.2	46	43	6	Hagan +3
PPP (D)	10/16 - 10/18	780 LV	3.5	46	43	5	Hagan +3
Civitas (R)	10/15 - 10/18	600 RV	4.0	41	42	6	Tillis +1
SurveyUSA	10/9 - 10/12	554 LV	4.2	44	41	7	Hagan +3
High Point	9/30 - 10/9	584 LV	4.1	40	40	7	Tie
USA Today/Suffolk	10/4 - 10/7	500 LV	4.4	47	45	4	Hagan +2
NBC News/Marist	9/27 - 10/1	665 LV	3.8	44	40	7	Hagan +4
CBS News/ NYT/YouGov	9/20 - 10/1	2002 LV	3.0	46	45	2	Hagan +1
Civitas (R)	9/25 - 9/28	600 RV	4.0	46	41	4	Hagan +5
CNN/Opinion Research	9/22 - 9/25	595 LV	4.0	46	43	7	Hagan +3
High Point	9/13 - 9/18	410 LV	5.0	42	40	6	Hagan +2
FOX News	9/14 - 9/16	605 LV	4.0	41	36	6	Hagan +5
PPP (D)	9/11 - 9/14	1266 LV	2.8	44	40	5	Hagan +4
SurveyUSA/Civitas (R)	9/9 - 9/10	490 LV	4.5	46	43	5	Hagan +3
American Insights (R)	9/5 - 9/10	459 LV	4.6	46	36	6	Hagan +10
CBS News/ NYT/YouGov	8/18 - 9/2	2059 LV	3.0	42	43	5	Tillis +1
USA Today/Suffolk	8/16 - 8/19	500 LV	4.4	45	43	5	Hagan +2

PPP (D)	8/14 - 8/17	865 LV	3.4	42	38	8	Hagan +4
Civitas (R)	7/28 - 7/29	600 RV	4.0	42	41	8	Hagan +1
PPP (D)	7/17 - 7/20	1062 RV	3.0	41	34	8	Hagan +7
Civitas (R)	6/18 - 6/22	600 RV	4.0	44	37	10	Hagan +7
PPP (D)	6/12 - 6/15	1076 RV	3.0	39	34	11	Hagan +5
Civitas (R)	5/20 - 5/22	600 RV	4.0	37	41	10	Tillis +4
PPP (D)	5/9 - 5/11	877 RV	3.3	38	36	11	Hagan +2

[About Us](#) | [Contact](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) © RealClearPolitics 2014

**The new Adobe Creative Cloud Photography plan.**  
 All-new Photoshop CC plus Lightroom desktop and mobile.  
 Just US\$9.99/mo. [Join now](#)



# **Exhibit D**



2014 MIDTERMS | 9:08 AM | NOV 5, 2014

## The Polls Were Skewed Toward Democrats

By NATE SILVER

For much of this election cycle, Democrats [complained](#) the polls were biased against them. They said the polls were failing to represent enough minority voters and applying overly restrictive likely-voter screens. They [claimed early-voting data was proving the polls wrong](#). They cited the fact that polls were biased against Democrats in 2012.

The Democrats' complaints may have been more sophisticated-seeming than the ["skewed polls" arguments made by Republicans in 2012](#). But in the end, they were just as wrong. The polls did have a strong bias this year — but it was toward Democrats and not against them.

Based on results as reported through early Wednesday morning — I'll detail our method for calculating this in a moment — the average Senate poll conducted in the final three weeks of this year's campaign overestimated the Democrat's performance by 4 percentage points. The average gubernatorial poll was nearly as bad, overestimating the Democrat's performance by 3.4 points.

### Partisan Bias In Senate Polls

Average statistical bias in polls conducted in final 21 days of campaign, 1990-2014

YEAR	AVERAGE BIAS
1990	D+1.0
1992	D+1.1
1994	D+3.1
1996	R+0.2
1998	R+4.9
2000	R+2.1
2002	D+4.0
2004	D+0.2
2006	R+2.7
2008	D+0.2
2010	R+0.9
2012	R+3.4
2014	D+4.0

FIVETHIRTYEIGHT

The problem with Democrats' claims is that they were one-sided. I don't mean that in the typical [false equivalence](#) way. I mean that they were ignoring some important empirical evidence.

This evidence suggests that [polling bias has been largely unpredictable](#) from election to election. Beyond the shadow of a doubt, the polling was biased against Democrats in 1998, 2006 and 2012. However, just as certainly, it was biased against Republicans in 1994, 2002 and now 2014. It can be dangerous to apply the "lessons" from one election cycle to the next one.

Our estimates of polling bias are evaluated in [the same way we've assessed them in the past](#). They rely on a simple average of all polls<sup>1</sup> released in the final three weeks of the campaign. Bias is calculated as the difference between the polled margin and the actual result. (For instance, a poll that projects the Democrat to win by 7 points when she actually wins by just 3 has a 4-point Democratic bias.) We exclude races in which one of the top two finishers was an independent candidate.

We'll publish 2014 data in full soon<sup>2</sup> but here are the preliminary results — first, for this year's Senate polls:

## Senate Polls Had A Democratic Bias

STATE	NUMBER OF POLLS	POLL AVERAGE	ACTUAL RESULT*	BIAS
Colorado	21	R +1.8	R +5.0	D +3.2
North Carolina	21	D +0.5	R +1.7	D +2.2
Georgia	20	R +1.5	R +7.9	D +6.4
Iowa	18	R +1.6	R +8.5	D +7.0
New Hampshire	16	D +2.0	D +3.2	R +1.2
Michigan	11	D +12.6	D +13.3	R +0.7
Louisiana (primary)	10	D +4.7	D +1.1	D +3.6
Arkansas	9	R +4.7	R +17.0	D +12.3
Kentucky	8	R +6.6	R +15.5	D +8.9
Alaska	7	D +0.5	R +4.1	D +4.6
South Dakota	7	R +14.1	R +21.8	D +7.7
Maine	5	R +29.1	R +36.4	D +7.3
Illinois	4	D +11.5	D +10.0	D +1.5
Massachusetts	4	D +18.3	D +24.2	R +6.0
Minnesota	4	D +11.3	D +10.3	D +0.9
New Jersey	4	D +16.5	D +14.0	D +2.5
Oregon	4	D +18.3	D +16.5	D +1.8
Virginia	4	D +8.5	D +0.6	D +7.9
New Mexico	3	D +9.0	D +10.8	R +1.8
Tennessee	3	R +17.7	R +30.0	D +12.3
Hawaii (special)	2	D +39.0	D +42.3	R +3.3
Montana	2	R +16.0	R +28.3	D +12.3
Oklahoma	2	R +35.5	R +39.5	D +4.1
Oklahoma (special)	2	R +32.7	R +38.9	D +6.3
South Carolina	2	R +17.5	R +15.6	R +1.9
South Carolina (special)	2	R +28.0	R +24.1	R +3.9
Texas	2	R +24.0	R +27.3	D +3.3
Delaware	1	D +18.0	D +13.6	D +4.4
Idaho	1	R +31.0	R +32.2	D +1.2

Mississippi	1	R +22.0	R +20.4	R +1.6
Nebraska	1	R +29.0	R +33.7	D +4.7
Rhode Island	1	D +45.0	D +41.0	D +4.0
West Virginia	1	R +22.0	R +27.6	D +5.6
Wyoming	1	R +40.0	R +54.7	D +14.7
<b>Weighted Average</b>		<b>R +1.0</b>	<b>R +5.0</b>	<b>D +4.0</b>

*\*As of 5 a.m., Nov. 5, 2014*



As you can see, the polls were biased toward the Democratic candidate in almost all key races. They were fortunate to have “called” the winner correctly in certain cases: Some of the worst misses came in states like Kentucky and Arkansas where the Republican won, but by a considerably larger margin than polls projected. There was also a near-disaster in Virginia. It looks like Democratic incumbent Mark Warner will pull out the race, but the polls had him up by 9 points rather than being headed for a photo finish.<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile, the average bias in gubernatorial polls was 3.4 points in favor of Democrats.

## Governor Polls Had A Democratic Bias

STATE	NUMBER OF POLLS	POLL AVERAGE	ACTUAL RESULT*	BIAS
Georgia	19	R +3.4	R +8.0	D +4.6
Florida	18	D +0.0	R +1.2	D +1.2
Colorado	17	D +0.7	D +0.5	D +0.2
New Hampshire	14	D +6.4	D +5.2	D +1.2
Iowa	13	R +17.9	R +21.8	D +3.9
Massachusetts	13	R +2.6	R +1.7	R +0.9
Michigan	12	R +1.9	R +4.1	D +2.3
Kansas	10	D +2.8	R +3.8	D +6.6
Arkansas	9	R +4.9	R +13.9	D +9.0
Illinois	8	D +0.3	R +4.8	D +5.1
Connecticut	7	R +0.1	D +1.7	R +1.8
Maine	7	R +1.2	R +3.9	D +2.7
Wisconsin	7	R +1.6	R +5.7	D +4.1
Pennsylvania	6	D +9.7	D +9.8	R +0.1
California	5	D +18.4	D +17.0	D +1.4

South Dakota	5	R +32.0	R +45.3	D +13.3
Arizona	4	R +7.3	R +12.4	D +5.2
Maryland	4	D +2.8	R +9.0	D +11.8
Minnesota	4	D +7.8	D +5.6	D +2.2
New York	4	D +23.3	D +13.4	D +9.9
Oregon	4	D +9.0	D +2.9	D +6.1
Hawaii	3	D +16.7	D +12.9	D +3.8
New Mexico	3	R +15.3	R +14.6	R +0.7
Ohio	3	R +20.7	R +30.9	D +10.2
Rhode Island	3	D +5.7	D +3.9	D +1.8
South Carolina	3	R +14.3	R +14.6	D +0.3
Alabama	2	R +29.7	R +27.2	R +2.5
Idaho	2	R +15.0	R +17.1	D +2.1
Oklahoma	2	R +16.2	R +14.8	R +1.4
Tennessee	2	R +30.5	R +47.4	D +16.9
Texas	2	R +18.0	R +20.4	D +2.4
Nebraska	1	R +20.0	R +18.7	R +1.3
Nevada	1	R +25.0	R +46.5	D +21.5
Vermont	1	D +12.0	D +1.4	D +10.6
Wyoming	1	R +25.0	R +33.6	D +8.6
<b>Weighted Average</b>		<b>R +2.4</b>	<b>R +5.8</b>	<b>D +3.4</b>

*\*As of 5 a.m., Nov. 5, 2014*



In the governor's races there were a higher number of missed "calls" — including in Illinois and Kansas and especially in Maryland, where Republican Larry Hogan wound up winning by 9 percentage points despite trailing in every nonpartisan poll released all year.

This type of error is not unprecedented — instead it's rather common. As I mentioned, a similar error occurred in 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006 and 2012. It's been about as likely as not, historically. That the polls had relatively little bias in a number of recent election years — including 2004, 2008 and 2010 — may have lulled some analysts into a false sense of security about the polls.

Interestingly, this year's polls were not especially inaccurate. Between gubernatorial and Senate races, the average poll missed the final result by an average of about 5 percentage points — [well in line with the recent average](#). The problem is that almost all of the misses were in the same direction. That reduces the benefit of aggregating or averaging different polls together. It's crucially important for [psephologists](#) to recognize that the error in polls is often correlated. It's correlated both within states (literally every nonpartisan poll called the Maryland governor's race wrong, for example)

and amongst them (misses often do come in the same direction in most or all close races across the country).

This is something we've studied a lot in [constructing the FiveThirtyEight model](#), and it's something we'll take another look at before 2016. It may be that pollster "herding" — [the tendency of polls to mirror one another's results](#) rather than being independent — has become a more pronounced problem. Polling aggregators, including FiveThirtyEight, may be contributing to it. A fly-by-night pollster using a dubious methodology can look up the FiveThirtyEight or [Upshot](#) or [HuffPost Pollster](#) or [Real Clear Politics](#) polling consensus and tweak their assumptions so as to match it — but sometimes the polling consensus is wrong.

It's equally important for polling analysts to recognize that this bias can just as easily run in either direction. It probably isn't predictable ahead of time.

To the extent polling bias is predictable, it may call for assessing nonpolling factors — the so-called "fundamentals" — along with the polls in each race. One simple factor is the overall partisanship of a state as measured by its past voting history. In the past, [Republicans have tended to outperform their polls in red states](#) while Democrats have done so in blue states.

[Many of the key races were held in red states this year](#). That [won't be true in 2016](#), and we'll undoubtedly see some pollsters and polling aggregators draw the wrong lessons from 2014. The polls may be biased again in 2016; we just won't know much about the direction of it until votes have been cast and counted.

**CORRECTION (Nov. 5, 2:52 p.m.):** An earlier version of this article misstated how much the average gubernatorial poll overestimated the Democrat's performance. It was 3.4 points, not 4 points.

---

FOOTNOTES

FILED UNDER [2014 MIDTERMS](#), [2014 SENATE ELECTIONS](#), [POLL BIAS](#), [POLLING ACCURACY](#), [POLLING INDUSTRY](#)



NATE SILVER | [@natesilver538](#) | [✉](#)

Nate Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight.

---

COMMENTS [Add Comment](#)

MORE NATE SILVER	MORE 2014 MIDTERMS	MORE POLITICS
FiveThirtyEight's College Football Playoff Forecast <small>NOV 21</small>		
-----		
Can Alabama Afford To Lose? <small>NOV 20</small>		
-----		
Here's Proof Some Pollsters Are Putting A Thumb On The Scale <small>NOV 14</small>		
-----		
The NFL Should Expand To London. But First: Canada, Mexico And LA. <small>NOV 11</small>		
-----		
ALL NATE SILVER		

# **Exhibit E**

Updated: 11/15/14 1:32 AM ET Source:

7253 Shares 4485 Shares 105 Shares


# 2014 Senate Election Results

**Democratic**  
Net -8, Gained 0, Lost 8  
**44**

**Republican**  
Net +8, Gained 8, Lost 0  
**53**

51 of 100 Seats Needed for Majority  
Current Senate: 53 (D); 45 (R); 2 (I)

Democratic Win Republican Win Other Party Win Partial Results No Results No Election



- N.H.
- Vt.
- Mass.
- R.I.
- Conn.
- N.J.
- Del.
- Md.
- D.C.

## Special Senate Elections

## Key Senate Election Results by State

Filter Options

Jump to State... ▼

Alabama	
Senate Election, November 4, 2014	
9% Reporting	
R J. Sessions (I)	Uncontested



(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Alaska

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>D. Sullivan</b>	48.8%	119,579
D	<b>M. Begich (i)</b>	45.6%	111,668
L	<b>M. Fish</b>	3.7%	9,026
N	<b>T. Gianoutsos</b>	1.9%	4,725

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Arkansas

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>T. Cotton</b>	56.5%	476,309
D	<b>M. Pryor (i)</b>	39.5%	332,669
L	<b>N. LaFrance</b>	2.0%	17,103
G	<b>M. Swaney</b>	2.0%	16,717

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Colorado

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

89.5% Reporting

R	<b>C. Gardner</b>	48.5%	965,974
D	<b>M. Udall (i)</b>	46.0%	916,245
L	<b>G. Kent</b>	2.6%	51,225
U	<b>S. Shogan</b>	1.4%	28,604
U	<b>R. Acosta</b>	1.2%	23,342
U	<b>B. Hammons</b>	0.3%	6,217

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Delaware

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>C. Coons (i)</b>	55.8%	130,645
R	<b>K. Wade</b>	42.2%	98,819
G	<b>A. Groff</b>	1.9%	4,560

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Georgia

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>D. Perdue</b>	53.0%	1,355,392
D	<b>M. Nunn</b>	45.1%	1,154,388
L	<b>A. Swafford</b>	1.9%	48,930

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Hawaii

**Special Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>B. Schatz (i)</b>	69.8%	246,720
R	<b>C. Cavasso</b>	27.7%	97,972
L	<b>M. Kokoski</b>	2.5%	8,936

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Idaho

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>J. Risch (i)</b>	65.3%	285,322
D	<b>N. Mitchell</b>	34.7%	151,697

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Illinois

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

99.5% Reporting

D	<b>D. Durbin (i)</b>	53.1%	1,850,862
R	<b>J. Oberweis</b>	43.1%	1,503,942
L	<b>S. Hansen</b>	3.8%	130,762

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Iowa

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>J. Ernst</b>	52.2%	586,921
D	<b>B. Braley</b>	43.7%	491,708
I	<b>R. Stewart</b>	2.4%	26,662
L	<b>D. Butzier</b>	0.7%	8,315
O	<b>B. Quast</b>	0.5%	5,928
I	<b>R. Smith</b>	0.4%	4,711

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Kansas

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>P. Roberts (i)</b>	53.3%	449,974
I	<b>G. Orman</b>	42.5%	358,898
L	<b>R. Batson</b>	4.3%	36,002

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Kentucky

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>M. McConnell (i)</b>	56.2%	806,795
D	<b>A. Grimes</b>	40.7%	584,699
L	<b>D. Patterson</b>	3.1%	44,240

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Louisiana

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>* M. Landrieu (i)</b>	42.1%	618,840
R	<b>* B. Cassidy</b>	41.0%	602,439
R	<b>R. Maness</b>	13.8%	202,413
R	<b>T. Clements</b>	1.0%	14,158
L	<b>B. McMorris</b>	0.9%	13,024
D	<b>W. Ables</b>	0.8%	11,318
D	<b>W. Waymire</b>	0.3%	4,669
D	<b>V. Senegal</b>	0.3%	3,831

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Maine

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>S. Collins (i)</b>	68.4%	411,211
D	<b>S. Bellows</b>	31.6%	189,653

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Massachusetts

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>E. Markey (i)</b>	62.0%	1,285,736
R	<b>B. Herr</b>	38.0%	789,378

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Michigan

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>G. Peters</b>	54.6%	1,693,781
R	<b>T. Land</b>	41.4%	1,283,850
L	<b>J. Fulner</b>	2.0%	62,504
U	<b>R. Matkin</b>	1.2%	37,155
G	<b>C. Wahmhoff</b>	0.8%	26,040

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Minnesota

Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>A. Franken (i)</b>	53.2%	1,052,794
---	-----------------------	-------	-----------

R	<b>M. McFadden</b>	42.9%	849,932
I	<b>S. Carlson</b>	2.4%	47,604
L	<b>H. Johnson</b>	1.5%	29,686

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Mississippi

<b>Senate Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>T. Cochran (i)</b>	60.4%	370,208
D	<b>T. Childers</b>	37.4%	228,974
R	<b>S. O'Hara</b>	2.2%	13,660

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Montana

<b>Senate Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>S. Daines</b>	57.9%	210,863
D	<b>A. Curtis</b>	40.0%	145,601
L	<b>R. Roots</b>	2.1%	7,712

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Nebraska

<b>Senate Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>B. Sasse</b>	64.8%	339,868
D	<b>D. Domina</b>	31.1%	162,874
P	<b>J. Jenkins</b>	3.0%	15,513
P	<b>T. Watson</b>	1.2%	6,114

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## New Hampshire

<b>Senate Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
D	<b>J. Shaheen (i)</b>	51.6%	250,722
R	<b>S. Brown</b>	48.4%	234,846

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## New Jersey

<b>Senate Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
99.9% Reporting			
D	<b>C. Booker (i)</b>	55.8%	1,016,204
R	<b>J. Bell</b>	42.4%	772,991
I	<b>J. Baratelli</b>	0.9%	16,304
I	<b>H. Schroeder</b>	0.3%	5,519
I	<b>J. Boss</b>	0.2%	4,405
I	<b>E. LaVergne</b>	0.2%	3,790

I	<b>A. Sabas</b>	0.2%	3,422
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## New Mexico

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>T. Udall (i)</b>	55.4%	280,074
R	<b>A. Weh</b>	44.6%	225,706

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## North Carolina

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>T. Tillis</b>	49.0%	1,413,269
D	<b>K. Hagan (i)</b>	47.3%	1,364,758
L	<b>S. Haugh</b>	3.7%	108,183

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Oklahoma

**Senate Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>J. Inhofe (i)</b>	68.0%	557,537
D	<b>M. Silverstein</b>	28.5%	233,932
I	<b>J. Farr</b>	1.3%	10,534
I	<b>R. Woods</b>	1.2%	9,890
I	<b>A. DeLozier</b>	0.9%	7,786

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

**Special Senate Election,**

**Special Senate Election, November 4, 2014**

100% Reporting

R	<b>J. Lankford</b>	67.9%	556,382
D	<b>C. Johnson</b>	29.0%	237,531
I	<b>M. Beard</b>	3.2%	25,919

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

**Oregon****Senate Election, November 4, 2014**

94.2% Reporting

D	<b>J. Merkley (i)</b>	55.8%	744,516
R	<b>M. Wehby</b>	37.3%	498,191
L	<b>M. Montchalin</b>	3.0%	40,649
P	<b>C. Lugo</b>	2.2%	28,897
C	<b>J. Leuenberger</b>	1.7%	22,205

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

**Rhode Island****Senate Election, November 4, 2014**

99.8% Reporting

D	<b>J. Reed (i)</b>	70.7%	222,776
R	<b>M. Zaccaria</b>	29.3%	92,389

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## South Carolina

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>L. Graham (i)</b>	54.5%	665,605
D	<b>B. Hutto</b>	38.9%	475,532
P	<b>T. Ravenel</b>	3.9%	47,205
L	<b>V. Kocher</b>	2.7%	33,481

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

### Special Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>T. Scott (i)</b>	61.2%	749,266
D	<b>J. Dickerson</b>	37.1%	454,279
A	<b>J. Bossi</b>	1.8%	21,450

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## South Dakota

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>M. Rounds</b>	50.4%	140,721
D	<b>R. Weiland</b>	29.5%	82,408
I	<b>L. Pressler</b>	17.1%	47,728
I	<b>G. Howie</b>	3.0%	8,469

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Tennessee

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>L. Alexander (i)</b>	61.9%	849,748
D	<b>G. Ball</b>	31.8%	437,175
C	<b>J. Wilmoth</b>	2.6%	36,056
G	<b>M. Pleasant</b>	0.9%	12,530
I	<b>T. Emerson</b>	0.8%	11,146
I	<b>D. Page</b>	0.6%	7,711
I	<b>R. Tyler</b>	0.4%	5,751
I	<b>J. James</b>	0.4%	5,671
I	<b>B. Phillips</b>	0.2%	2,380
I	<b>E. Gauthier</b>	0.2%	2,308
I	<b>E. Schechter</b>	0.1%	1,668
I	<b>C. Salekin</b>	0.1%	784

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Texas

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>J. Cornyn (i)</b>	61.6%	2,855,068
D	<b>D. Alameel</b>	34.4%	1,594,252
L	<b>R. Paddock</b>	2.9%	133,467
G	<b>E. Sanchez</b>	1.2%	54,587

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff



## Virginia

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

99.9% Reporting

D	<b>M. Warner (i)</b>	49.2%	1,071,283
R	<b>E. Gillespie</b>	48.4%	1,054,556
L	<b>R. Sarvis</b>	2.5%	53,396

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## West Virginia

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>S. Capito</b>	62.1%	280,123
D	<b>N. Tennant</b>	34.5%	155,456
L	<b>J. Buckley</b>	1.6%	7,360
M	<b>B. Baber</b>	1.2%	5,448
C	<b>P. Hudok</b>	0.6%	2,544

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Wyoming

### Senate Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>M. Enzi (i)</b>	72.3%	119,534
D	<b>C. Hardy</b>	17.6%	29,043
I	<b>C. Gottshall</b>	8.0%	13,175

**L J. Porambo**

2.2%

3,602


---

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

# **Exhibit F**

# 2014 Governor Election Results

Democratic Win   Republican Win   Other Party Win   Partial Results   No Results   No Election



## Key Governor Election Results by State

Filter Options

Jump to State... ▾

### Alabama

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

R	<b>R. Bentley (i)</b>	63.6%	747,357
D	<b>P. Griffith</b>	36.4%	427,218

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

### Alaska

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

N	<b>B. Walker</b>	48.1%	117,130
R	<b>S. Parnell (i)</b>	46.4%	113,126
L	<b>C. Clift</b>	3.1%	7,442
C	<b>J. Myers</b>	2.4%	5,899

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Arizona

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>D. Ducey</b>	53.5%	799,452
D	<b>F. DuVal</b>	41.6%	621,435
L	<b>B. Hess</b>	3.8%	56,752
A	<b>J. Mealer</b>	1.0%	15,276

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Arkansas

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>A. Hutchinson</b>	55.4%	468,017
D	<b>M. Ross</b>	41.5%	350,535
L	<b>F. Gilbert</b>	1.9%	16,220
G	<b>J. Drake</b>	1.1%	9,670

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## California

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>J. Brown (i)</b>	59.4%	3,856,253
R	<b>N. Kashkari</b>	40.6%	2,640,054

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Colorado

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

99.5% Reporting

D	<b>J. Hickenlooper (i)</b>	49.1%	977,711
R	<b>B. Beauprez</b>	46.2%	921,204
L	<b>M. Hess</b>	1.9%	38,226
G	<b>H. Hempy</b>	1.3%	26,279
U	<b>M. Dunafon</b>	1.2%	23,187
U	<b>P. Fiorino</b>	0.3%	5,725

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Connecticut

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>D. Malloy (i)</b>	50.7%	548,248
R	<b>T. Foley</b>	48.2%	521,645
P	<b>J. Visconti</b>	1.1%	11,422

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Florida

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>R. Scott (i)</b>	48.2%	2,861,390
D	<b>C. Crist</b>	47.1%	2,795,263
L	<b>A. Wylle</b>	3.8%	222,878
N	<b>G. Burkett</b>	0.7%	41,251
N	<b>F. Khavari</b>	0.3%	20,116

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Georgia

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>N. Deal (i)</b>	52.8%	1,341,161
D	<b>J. Carter</b>	44.8%	1,138,476
L	<b>A. Hunt</b>	2.4%	60,151

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Hawaii

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

D	<b>D. Ige</b>	49.5%	181,065
R	<b>D. Aiona</b>	37.1%	135,742
I	<b>M. Hannemann</b>	11.7%	42,925
L	<b>J. Davis</b>	1.7%	6,393

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Idaho

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>B. Otter (i)</b>	53.5%	235,349
D	<b>A. Balukoff</b>	38.6%	169,497
L	<b>J. Bujak</b>	4.1%	17,882
I	<b>J. Humble</b>	2.0%	8,795
C	<b>S. Pankey</b>	1.2%	5,218
I	<b>Pro-Life</b>	0.7%	2,868

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Illinois

## Governor Election, November 4, 2014

99.5% Reporting

R	<b>B. Rauner</b>	50.8%	1,781,052
D	<b>P. Quinn (i)</b>	45.9%	1,609,152
L	<b>C. Grimm</b>	3.4%	118,098

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Iowa

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>T. Branstad (i)</b>	59.1%	664,806
D	<b>J. Hatch</b>	37.3%	419,258
L	<b>L. Hieb</b>	1.8%	20,207
O	<b>J. Hennager</b>	0.9%	10,532
O	<b>J. Narcisse</b>	0.9%	10,252

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Kansas

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>S. Brownback (i)</b>	50.0%	423,666
D	<b>P. Davis</b>	46.1%	390,614
L	<b>K. Umbehr</b>	4.0%	33,708

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Maine

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>P. LePage (i)</b>	48.2%	294,189
D	<b>M. Michaud</b>	43.3%	264,369
I	<b>E. Cutler</b>	8.4%	51,405

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Maryland

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

99.9% Reporting

R	<b>L. Hogan</b>	51.6%	847,107
D	<b>A. Brown</b>	46.9%	770,511
L	<b>S. Quinn</b>	1.5%	23,801

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Massachusetts

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

100% Reporting

R	<b>C. Baker</b>	48.5%	1,041,640
D	<b>M. Coakley</b>	46.6%	1,001,279
U	<b>E. Falchuk</b>	3.3%	71,144
I	<b>S. Lively</b>	0.9%	19,192
I	<b>J. McCormick</b>	0.8%	16,125

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

## Michigan

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

R	<b>R. Snyder (i)</b>	51.0%	1,598,922
D	<b>M. Schauer</b>	46.8%	1,469,375
L	<b>M. Buzuma</b>	1.1%	35,574
U	<b>M. McFarlin</b>	0.6%	19,177
G	<b>P. Homeniuk</b>	0.5%	14,893

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Minnesota

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

D	<b>M. Dayton (i)</b>	50.1%	988,713
R	<b>J. Johnson</b>	44.5%	878,937
I	<b>H. Nicollet</b>	2.9%	56,885
G	<b>C. Wright</b>	1.6%	31,245
L	<b>C. Holbrook</b>	0.9%	18,092

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Nebraska

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

R	<b>P. Ricketts</b>	57.6%	301,646
D	<b>C. Hassebrook</b>	38.9%	203,968
L	<b>M. Elworth</b>	3.5%	18,454

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

Nevada

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

R	<b>B. Sandoval (i)</b>	70.6%	386,535
D	<b>R. Goodman</b>	23.9%	130,742
N	<b>None of these candidates</b>	2.9%	15,757
I	<b>D. VanDerBeek</b>	2.7%	14,548

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

**Lieutenant Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

R	<b>M. Hutchison</b>	59.5%	324,628
D	<b>L. Flores</b>	33.6%	183,598
I	<b>M. Little</b>	3.9%	21,232
N	<b>None of these candidates</b>	3.0%	16,309

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

New Hampshire

**Governor Election, November 4, 2014** 100% Reporting

---

D	<b>M. Hassan (i)</b>	52.6%	255,229
---	----------------------	-------	---------



R	<b>W. Havenstein</b>	47.4%	230,305
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## New Mexico

<b>Governor Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>S. Martinez (i)</b>	57.3%	288,482
D	<b>G. King</b>	42.7%	214,614
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## New York

<b>Governor Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
99.7% Reporting			
D	<b>A. Cuomo (i)</b>	54.0%	1,919,225
R	<b>R. Astorino</b>	40.6%	1,443,713
G	<b>H. Hawkins</b>	4.9%	173,606
L	<b>M. McDermott</b>	0.4%	15,594
O	<b>S. Cohn</b>	0.1%	4,549
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## Ohio

<b>Governor Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>J. Kasich (i)</b>	63.8%	1,922,436
D	<b>E. FitzGerald</b>	32.9%	989,201
G	<b>A. Rios</b>	3.3%	99,415
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## Oklahoma

<b>Governor Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
100% Reporting			
R	<b>M. Fallin (i)</b>	55.8%	459,788
D	<b>J. Dorman</b>	41.0%	337,728
I	<b>K. Willis</b>	2.1%	17,143
I	<b>R. Prawdzienski</b>	1.1%	9,102
(i) Incumbent, * Runoff			

## Oregon

<b>Governor Election</b> , November 4, 2014			
94.1% Reporting			
D	<b>J. Kitzhaber (i)</b>	49.8%	668,816
R	<b>D. Richardson</b>	44.7%	600,330
P	<b>J. Levin</b>	2.0%	26,287
L	<b>P. Grad</b>	1.5%	19,557
C	<b>A. Auer</b>	1.1%	14,590
P	<b>C. Henry</b>	0.9%	12,521

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

### Pennsylvania

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

99.6% Reporting

D	<b>T. Wolf</b>	54.9%	1,899,318
R	<b>T. Corbett (i)</b>	45.1%	1,560,057

(i) Incumbent, \* Runoff

### Rhode Island

**Governor Election**, November 4, 2014

99.8% Reporting

D	<b>G. Raimondo</b>		
---	--------------------	--	--