

---

# THE SENSITIVITY OF THE U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION TO COORDINATED VOTER RELOCATION

---

C. Cardonha<sup>1</sup>, D. Bergman<sup>1</sup>, A. Cire<sup>2</sup>, L. Lozano<sup>3</sup>, T. Yunes<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Business, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06028, United States.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Management, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, M1C 1A4, Canada.

<sup>3</sup> Linder College of Business, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, United States.

<sup>4</sup> Herbert Business School, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33146, United States.

October 2, 2024

## ABSTRACT

U.S. presidential elections are decided by the Electoral College, established in 1789, and designed to mitigate potential risks arising from the collusion of large groups of citizens. A statewide winner-take-all popular voting system for electors is implemented in all but two states, which has led to instances where narrow victories in key states were decisive in several recent elections. Small groups of voters can significantly impact the election, for example, through voter turnout. However, another dynamic can also influence this: a surprisingly small number of dedicated voters moving short distances across state lines. The extent to which the election's outcome is sensitive to small and well-coordinated movements of people has not been investigated in detail. Using a combination of forecasting, simulation, and optimization, we show that a candidate's probability of winning can be increased by 1% through the strategic relocation of approximately 10,000 people no farther than 100 miles from their current county of residence, less than 0.006% of the eligible voting population. Moreover, an 8% probability increase can be realized by a mere 50,000 voters relocating across state lines, or 0.03% of the voting population. Given the remarkably small number of people involved and the fact that establishing electoral residence in many states takes about a month, this coordinated relocation of voters is not nearly as challenging as previously thought. As it stands, U.S. presidential elections may be vulnerable to the exploitation of the aforementioned loophole. Therefore, we anticipate our findings will have direct consequences on policymaking and campaign strategy, as well as motivate new operations research methods within the political sciences.

## 1 Introduction

Could a small, coordinated interstate movement of voters influence the outcome of a U.S. presidential election? While this idea is often dismissed due to perceived legal, financial, and logistical challenges, we demonstrate that under current political conditions, even a modest, strategically coordinated movement of voters could significantly impact the 2024 election. To put this into perspective, relocating just half a football stadium's worth of voters a mere 100 miles could increase one candidate's chance of winning by nearly 8%—a potential game-changer that could determine who sits in the Oval Office.

Our analysis is rooted in the intricate dynamics of the Electoral College, where in all but two states (Maine and Nebraska) a winner-takes-all allocation of the electoral votes from that state is almost always implemented. The power of the states in determining the outcome of a presidential election is heterogeneous (Rabinowitz and MacDonald 1986), and the current electoral system amplifies the importance of *swing* states. Over the past 25 years, elections have been determined by remarkably narrow differences in the popular vote within these states. One notable example is the 2000 presidential election, won by George W. Bush with 271 electoral votes (versus 266 for Al Gore). In that election, the Republican candidate won Florida's 25 electoral votes by a margin of 537, representing just 0.005% of eligible voters in the state (Federal Election Commission 2000).

Beyond these thin margins of victory, another key factor to consider is the geographic proximity between swing states and states with more predictable outcomes. For example, the neighboring swing states Nevada and Arizona share a border with California, a Democratic stronghold. Similarly, the swing state of Georgia is bordered almost entirely by Republican strongholds Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Alabama. Referencing the 2000 election again and assuming one had access to perfect information, relocating 538 Democratic voters from Alabama or Georgia to Florida would have changed the outcome of that presidential election.

Building on these two factors and through a combination of forecasting, simulation, and optimization, we demonstrate how precisely coordinated, small-scale, short-distance moves could dramatically influence the outcome of the 2024 election and possibly future ones. Our analysis is grounded in data-driven methods based on historical data on existing polls, showing that these subtle yet strategic adjustments are not only feasible but also significant in altering the electoral landscape.

Our work contributes to the existing research on elections in the operations research and the political science literature. Specifically, U.S. elections have been studied since the 1960's (Hess et al. 1965, Garfinkel and Nemhauser 1970). Special attention has been dedicated to political districting and gerrymandering (Validi and Buchanan 2022, Validi et al. 2022, Swamy et al. 2023), and to the location of polling places (Haspel and Knotts 2005). Districting plays a more important role in local elections, though, as the state-level popular vote is not affected by internal subdivisions (except for Maine and Nebraska). The interest in election forecasts has also grown significantly over the years (Hummel and Rothschild 2014, Kaplan and Barnett 2003), especially after numerous polls failed to predict the outcome of the 2016 election, won by Donald Trump (Wright and Wright 2018). Additional applications of optimization to political problems include the allocation of resources to maximize seats in parliament (Güney 2018) and estimating the minimal fraction of the popular vote necessary to elect a president in the Electoral College (Belenky 2008).

## 2 Analytical Framework and Models

We identify potential voter relocation strategies in a three-step process that results in a stochastic formulation of the problem. First, we design a simulation model to produce scenarios of voter turnout by party and county using voting data from 2004 to 2020 (Data and Lab 2018). Next, we calibrate the results of this model using a Bayesian-style update with predictions from Nate Silver's projection site (Silver and McKown-Dawson 2024), which aggregates recent news and polls. Finally, we apply an optimization model based on sample average approximation (Kleywegt et al. 2001) that processes scenarios from the simulation model to identify voter movements from county to county. If movements are done in unison and by voters already planning to vote the same way, our solution maximizes the estimated probability that either the Republican or Democratic candidate wins the election. For practicality, we ensure that relocation distances are limited to counties located at most 100 miles apart and that the destination county of a move must be located in one the following swing states: Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These were chosen because there was no candidate having more than a 70% chance of winning these states when this study was conducted. The remainder of this section formalizes the problem and presents the three models, detailing the inputs and methodologies employed.

### 2.1 Problem Description

We investigate the problem from the perspective of the two main parties. We refer to them as  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  in our model, and assume without loss of generality that we are solving the problem for party  $p_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the set of electoral units, which is a partition  $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{D}$  of state units  $\mathcal{S}$  and district units  $\mathcal{D}$ . Each U.S. state has a one-to-one mapping to state units in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Further, Maine and Nebraska are associated with two and three district units, respectively, in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Each unit  $u$  is assigned  $v_u \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  electoral votes in the presidential election, with  $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} v_u = 538$ . A candidate who wins the popular vote at a unit  $u$  receives all  $v_u$  votes.

Each unit  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is composed of counties  $C_u$ , where  $\mathcal{C} := \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} C_u$  is the set of U.S. counties. Each county belongs to exactly one state unit, and all votes in a county  $c \in \mathcal{C}_s$  count towards the state  $s$ . A county  $c$  in the states of Maine and Nebraska belongs to at least one district unit  $C_d$ ,  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ . Let  $f_{c,d} \in [0, 1]$  be the fraction of county  $c$ 's population within district unit  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ . We assume that each vote in a county  $c \in C_d$  counts for  $f_{c,d}$  votes towards the district  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ .

We wish to identify a movement matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{C}| \times |\mathcal{C}|}$  to most effectively increase the probability of  $p_1$  winning, where  $x_{i,j}$  is the number of people relocating from county  $c_i$  to county  $c_j$ . Each movement only considers identifiable, highly engaged electors of  $p_1$ , i.e., they will vote in the elections and choose  $p_1$ . Specifically, let  $\tilde{N}_{p_1,u}$  and  $\tilde{N}_{p_2,u}$  be random variables representing the number of votes parties  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  receive in unit  $u$ , respectively. We consider the following

stochastic problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{\mathbf{X}} \quad & \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} v_u \tilde{W}_u \geq 270 \right) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{W}_u = \mathbb{I}(\tilde{T}_u > \tilde{N}_{p_2, u}) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U} \\
 & \tilde{T}_s = \tilde{N}_{p_1, s} + \sum_{c_i \in \mathcal{C}_s} \sum_{c_j \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_s} (x_{j,i} - x_{i,j}) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \\
 & \tilde{T}_d = \tilde{N}_{p_1, d} + \sum_{c_i \in \mathcal{C}_d} f_{c_i, d} \sum_{c_j \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_d} (x_{j,i} - x_{i,j}) \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{D} \\
 & \mathbf{X} \in \Omega.
 \end{aligned} \tag{P}$$

In formulation **P**,  $\tilde{T}_u$  is a random variable that denotes the number of votes received by  $p_1$  in unit  $u$  after the relocations in and out of all counties in  $\mathcal{C}_u$ , as defined in the second and third constraints. Party  $p_1$  obtains all  $v_u$  electoral votes if  $\tilde{T}_u > \tilde{N}_{p_2, u}$ , which here is modelled as a Bernoulli random variable  $\tilde{W}_u$  in the first constraint. The objective maximizes the probability that  $p_1$  wins the election by receiving at least 270 electoral votes. Finally, the set  $\Omega$  contains the feasible solutions to **P**; we discuss the constraints derived from practical considerations in §2.3.

## 2.2 Voter Turnout Simulation Model

We simulate the number of votes received by each candidate in each of the 3,150 counties using growth models derived from county-level voting returns for the last five U.S. presidential elections (2004-2020) with data from the MIT Election Data Science Lab (<https://electionlab.mit.edu/>). Our statistical model is designed to capture a well-known spatial correlation across counties under partisan stability across the years; see, e.g., Kim et al. (2003), Fiorino et al. (2022), Bump and Bronner (2024).

Specifically, the number of voters per county per candidate is modeled as a collection of correlated lognormal distributions that defines the baseline for simulating voter turnout. For each party  $p$ , county  $c$ , and election year  $t$  (indexed by 1, 2, ..., 5, where 1 represents 2004, 2 represents 2008, and so forth), let  $V_{p,c}$  be the logarithm of the number of people who voted for party  $p$  in county  $c$ . We define the number of voters for party  $p$  in county  $c$  as  $\tilde{V}_{p,c} \sim \mathcal{LN}(\mu_{p,c}, \sigma_{p,c})$ , i.e., a lognormal distribution with mean  $\mu_{p,c}$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_{p,c}$ .

The lognormal distribution was chosen for four primary reasons: (a) it is positive; (b) captures counties with small voting populations; (c) correlates variables based solely on historical trends; and (d) accounts for heteroskedasticity observed in our data. We employed a Breusch-Pagan test for heteroskedasticity using 2020 county population data, which yields a Lagrange multiplier of 1,289.73, p-value  $\leq 0.0001$ , when fit to votes for the Democratic candidate. That is, the variance of the residuals is not constant when using the 2020 county population, thereby justifying the use of a distribution that can accommodate such variability. All voters for candidates other than the primary Republican or Democratic candidate are grouped into a single “other” category. Thus, our model consists of 9,450 lognormal random variables, where 6,300 variables are associated with the two main candidates. Finally, we note that the discrete outcomes (number of votes) are typically sufficiently large so that a continuous distribution is still applicable.

The simulation is parameterized by a vector  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  describing estimates for the expectations of each random variable and a covariance matrix  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ . We model voter turnout using estimates of the average growth rate  $\hat{g}_{p,c}$  for each party  $p$  and county  $c$  based on historical voter data, as follows:

$$\hat{g}_{p,c} := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{t=1}^4 \frac{(V_{p,c,t+1}) - (V_{p,c,t})}{V_{p,c,t}}.$$

Based on the growth rates above, the expected turnout for 2024 is estimated as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{p,c} := \mathbb{E}[\log(\tilde{V}_{p,c})] = V_{p,c,5} \cdot \hat{g}_{p,c}.$$

We derive  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$  by computing the sample covariance of the log-transformed voter turnout from the past five elections. If the resulting matrix is not positive semi-definite, we replace it with the nearest symmetric positive semidefinite matrix within the Frobenius norm (Higham 1988).

Thus, given  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ , we generate  $z$  scenarios of voter turnout as follows:

1. (Normal Data Simulation) We sample  $z$  matrices  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_z$  from the distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})$ . Each sample  $v_{q,p,c}$  represents the log-transformed voter turnout of party  $p$  in county  $c$  sampled in scenario  $q \in [z] := \{1, \dots, z\}$ .

2. (Lognormal Rescale) We exponentiate the adjusted normal data to recover the sampled voter turnout  $\xi'_{q,p,c}$  for each party, county, and scenario, i.e.,  $\xi'_{q,p,c} := e^{v_{q,p,c}}$ .

The matrix  $\Xi' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{z \times 3 \times |C|}$  is the result of the process described above, which includes sampled data describing voting turnout in each scenario.

**Bayesian-style Update Model.** The simulation model is based on historical voter trends and does not account for up-to-date information available from recent polls and prediction services. To incorporate this data, we develop a Bayesian-style update to transform  $\Xi'$  into a matrix  $\Xi$  such that the proportion of simulations in which a party wins a state matches the given predictions. Our analysis considers Nate Silver's state-by-state predictions as of August 18, 2024 (Silver and McKown-Dawson 2024) as our basis. Other dates for data extraction were tested and produced similar results.

Formally, consider a state unit  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  for which a party's exogenous winning probability  $\theta_s$  (from Nate Silver's prediction) is greater than its winning probability in  $\Xi'$  by more than 0.01. We refer to such a party as the *increasing party*  $p_\uparrow$ , as its number of votes must increase for the winning probability to match  $\theta_s$ . The adversarial party, in turn, is referred to as the *decreasing party*  $p_\downarrow$ . Our goal is to switch  $\lambda_s$  percent of the voters from  $p_\downarrow$  to  $p_\uparrow$  in  $\Xi'$ . We use the following mixed-integer programming formulation to identify the minimum  $\lambda_s$ :

$$\lambda_s^* := \min_{\lambda_s, w} \lambda_s \tag{1a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } y_q^{p_\uparrow} = \sum_{c \in C_s} \xi'_{q,p_\uparrow,c} + \lambda_s \sum_{c \in C_s} \xi'_{q,p_\downarrow,c} \quad \forall q \in [z] \tag{1b}$$

$$y_q^{p_\downarrow} = (1 - \lambda_s) \sum_{c \in C_s} \xi'_{q,p_\downarrow,c} \quad \forall q \in [z] \tag{1c}$$

$$y_q^{p_\uparrow} + M(1 - w_q) \geq y_q^{p_\downarrow} + w_q \quad \forall q \in [z] \tag{1d}$$

$$\frac{1}{z} \sum_{q \in [z]} w_q \geq \theta_s \tag{1e}$$

$$\lambda_s \in [0, 1], w_q \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall q \in [z].$$

In addition to variable  $\lambda_s$ , which we wish to minimize in (1a), the model uses auxiliary variables  $y_q^\uparrow$  and  $y_q^\downarrow$  to represent the updated number of votes for each party and county in the  $q$ -th scenario. Moreover, the model uses binary variables  $w_q$  to indicate whether or not the increasing party wins  $s$  in scenario  $q$ . Constraints (1b) and (1c) set the values of  $y_q^\uparrow$  and  $y_q^\downarrow$  based on  $\lambda_s$ . Constraints (1d) set each binary variable  $w_q = 1$  if and only if  $p_\uparrow$  receives more votes than  $p_\downarrow$  in the  $q$ -th scenario;  $M$  is a sufficiently large constant. Lastly, (1e) asserts that our win probability estimate for  $p_\uparrow$  matches the prediction  $\theta_s$ .

Given an optimal solution  $\lambda_s^*$ , we update the voter turnout scenarios in  $\Xi'$  for state  $s$  as follows:

$$\xi_{q,p_\uparrow,c} = \xi'_{q,p_\uparrow,c} + \lambda_s^* \xi'_{q,p_\downarrow,c} \quad \forall c \in C_s, \forall q \in [z]$$

$$\xi_{q,p_\downarrow,c} = (1 - \lambda_s^*) \xi'_{q,p_\downarrow,c} \quad \forall c \in C_s, \forall q \in [z].$$

Maine and Nebraska use a modified model to account for district units. Instead of defining a single multiplier for the whole state, we consider two multipliers per district, each denoting the switch of voters between the parties in one district to the other. For the constraints, we require that the updated estimated probability for the state and the districts be within a small tolerance of the exogenous winning probability. Finally, the objective is to minimize the sum of all the multipliers, again aiming to switch the least amount of people.

**Validation of the Simulation Model.** We validate the accuracy of our simulation model by comparing our results with the estimates of the online prediction market platform PredictIt (PredictIt 2024). At the time of data extraction, the presumptive Republican and Democratic candidates had a 44.66% and 54.37% chance of winning the general election, respectively, assuming a basic normalization on betting lines. In 5,000 scenarios from our simulation model, the Republican and Democratic candidates win 41.70% and 58.02% of the time, respectively, showing reasonable calibration with betting markets at the time of data extraction. The histogram of electoral votes for the 5,000 scenarios (Figure 1) shows a reasonable distribution of electoral votes. The electoral votes won by the Republican candidate have a first quartile (Q1) of 219, a median of 262, and a third quartile (Q3) of 301. The electoral votes won by the Democratic candidate have a Q1 of 237, a median of 276, and a Q3 of 319. The mean number of electoral votes is

257.95 and 280.05 for Republican and Democratic candidates, respectively. The electoral-unit level pre-movement summary statistics of the scenarios are detailed in Table 1. Relevant data generated from our simulation model can be accessed at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/efwttk3xg21nh6z/ElectionsPaperData.zip?dl=1>.

### 2.3 Network Flow Model

Let  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  be a fixed upper limit on the number of relocation movements. We restrict the set of possible relocations to pairs  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C \times C$  for practicality reasons. Specifically, we consider the destination county to be within a swing state and restrict relocation distances to 100 miles. We also remove from  $\mathcal{A}$  relocation moves with data consistency issues and other operational difficulties. We refer to Appendix A for details and the relocation data sources for modeling.

Electoral Unit	Electoral Votes	Total Votes (M)	Rep. Votes (M)	Dem. Votes (M)	Bayesian Factor ( $\lambda_s^*$ )	Rep. Win Prob.	Dem. Win Prob.
AL	9	2.442	1.527 (1.354,1.736)	0.915 (0.794,1.058)	0.000	100%	0%
AK	3	0.349	0.185 (0.120,0.302)	0.165 (0.122,0.229)	0.014	81%	19%
AZ	11	3.849	1.920 (1.524,2.387)	1.929 (1.421,2.571)	0.028	50%	50%
AR	6	1.251	0.822 (0.698,0.970)	0.429 (0.379,0.508)	0.000	100%	0%
CA	54	18.967	6.245 (5.160,7.508)	12.723 (9.861,16.204)	0.000	0%	100%
CO	10	3.572	1.703 (1.445,2.009)	1.868 (1.423,2.421)	0.119	10%	90%
CT	7	1.879	0.868 (0.792,0.953)	1.011 (0.862,1.179)	0.125	2%	98%
DE	3	0.543	0.251 (0.214,0.295)	0.291 (0.236,0.358)	0.122	6%	94%
DC	3	0.374	0.019 (0.013,0.027)	0.355 (0.278,0.448)	0.000	0%	100%
FL	30	12.164	6.215 (4.972,7.724)	5.949 (4.835,7.277)	0.007	81%	19%
GA	16	5.617	2.827 (2.428,3.311)	2.790 (2.137,3.608)	0.057	62%	38%
HI	4	0.628	0.263 (0.197,0.351)	0.366 (0.285,0.463)	0.130	4%	96%
ID	4	0.942	0.606 (0.492,0.741)	0.336 (0.258,0.429)	0.000	100%	0%
IL	19	6.193	2.796 (2.479,3.148)	3.398 (2.963,3.902)	0.081	1%	99%
IN	11	3.199	1.856 (1.591,2.165)	1.343 (1.061,1.682)	0.031	98%	2%
IA	6	1.734	0.951 (0.798,1.125)	0.783 (0.655,0.937)	0.000	89%	11%
KS	6	1.415	0.767 (0.693,0.847)	0.648 (0.533,0.783)	0.023	99%	1%
KY	8	2.225	1.411 (1.203,1.659)	0.814 (0.707,0.942)	0.000	100%	0%
LA	8	2.188	1.134 (1.050,1.242)	1.054 (0.990,1.128)	0.135	98%	2%
ME	2	0.834	0.386 (0.331,0.448)	0.448 (0.385,0.517)	0.000	20%	80%
ME Dist. 1	1	0.454	0.177 (0.158,0.197)	0.277 (0.228,0.338)	0.034	0%	100%
ME Dist. 2	1	0.379	0.209 (0.173,0.251)	0.170 (0.138,0.207)	0.000	87%	13%
MD	10	3.182	0.972 (0.920,1.042)	2.210 (1.794,2.702)	0.000	0%	100%
MA	11	3.764	1.199 (1.103,1.300)	2.565 (2.155,3.034)	0.000	0%	100%
MI	15	5.712	2.796 (2.370,3.293)	2.916 (2.467,3.428)	0.011	37%	63%
MN	10	3.360	1.616 (1.468,1.789)	1.744 (1.501,2.009)	0.044	9%	91%
MS	6	1.370	0.714 (0.660,0.780)	0.656 (0.556,0.778)	0.093	94%	6%
MO	10	3.086	1.807 (1.604,2.056)	1.279 (1.053,1.561)	0.000	99%	1%
MT	4	0.646	0.356 (0.291,0.432)	0.289 (0.230,0.359)	0.035	96%	4%
NE	2	0.998	0.577 (0.503,0.659)	0.421 (0.340,0.520)	0.000	100%	0%
NE Dist. 1	1	0.349	0.195 (0.167,0.227)	0.154 (0.123,0.191)	0.000	97%	3%
NE Dist. 2	1	0.350	0.154 (0.139,0.170)	0.196 (0.148,0.256)	0.035	1%	99%
NE Dist. 3	1	0.280	0.213 (0.183,0.247)	0.066 (0.050,0.088)	0.014	1%	99%
NV	6	1.579	0.791 (0.600,1.028)	0.788 (0.603,1.013)	0.040	51%	49%
NH	4	0.828	0.405 (0.367,0.445)	0.423 (0.364,0.489)	0.065	25%	75%
NJ	14	4.797	2.268 (1.961,2.616)	2.529 (2.117,3.009)	0.109	4%	96%
NM	5	0.966	0.460 (0.394,0.535)	0.507 (0.410,0.617)	0.084	14%	86%
NY	28	9.021	4.190 (3.467,5.027)	4.832 (4.175,5.567)	0.134	1%	99%
NC	16	6.186	3.109 (2.562,3.769)	3.078 (2.358,3.963)	0.026	59%	41%
ND	3	0.371	0.250 (0.203,0.305)	0.121 (0.091,0.159)	0.000	100%	0%
OH	17	5.974	3.219 (2.862,3.632)	2.755 (2.399,3.195)	0.012	92%	9%
OK	7	1.564	1.044 (0.960,1.135)	0.520 (0.449,0.607)	0.000	100%	0%
OR	8	2.478	1.174 (0.982,1.397)	1.304 (1.048,1.596)	0.121	7%	93%
PA	19	7.218	3.591 (3.046,4.221)	3.627 (3.185,4.118)	0.007	44%	56%
RI	4	0.534	0.247 (0.215,0.283)	0.287 (0.248,0.330)	0.115	3%	97%
SC	9	2.801	1.450 (1.168,1.790)	1.351 (1.063,1.702)	0.058	96%	4%
SD	3	0.428	0.251 (0.213,0.294)	0.177 (0.145,0.219)	0.074	99%	1%
TN	11	3.235	2.017 (1.692,2.404)	1.217 (1.020,1.449)	0.000	100%	0%
TX	40	12.701	6.583 (5.473,7.874)	6.118 (4.592,8.092)	0.033	87%	13%
UT	6	1.725	0.985 (0.746,1.273)	0.740 (0.519,1.020)	0.000	97%	3%
VT	3	0.378	0.112 (0.091,0.138)	0.265 (0.216,0.322)	0.000	0%	100%
VA	13	4.852	2.335 (2.106,2.616)	2.517 (1.975,3.202)	0.101	18%	82%
WA	12	4.368	2.052 (1.715,2.446)	2.317 (1.821,2.899)	0.136	2%	98%
WV	4	0.812	0.586 (0.474,0.717)	0.227 (0.149,0.365)	0.000	100%	0%
WI	10	3.359	1.652 (1.422,1.911)	1.707 (1.476,1.961)	0.009	39%	61%
WY	3	0.278	0.201 (0.181,0.224)	0.077 (0.060,0.097)	0.000	100%	0%

Table 1: 5000 Scenarios: Electoral Unit, Electoral Votes, Total Votes (in millions), Republican and Democratic votes (with 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles),  $\lambda_s^*$ , and the win probabilities.




Figure 1: Electoral Vote Count for Republicans in 5,000 Simulations

We identify an optimal relocation strategy using the following network flow model:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}} \frac{1}{z} \sum_{q \in [z]} \hat{w}_q \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } y_{s,q} = \sum_{c_i \in C_s} \left( \xi_{q,1,c_i} + \sum_{c_j \in C \setminus C_s} (x_{j,i} - x_{i,j}) \right) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall q \in [z] \quad (2b)$$

$$y_{d,q} = \sum_{c_i \in C_d} f_{c_i,d} \left( \xi_{q,1,c_i} + \sum_{c_j \in C \setminus C_d} (x_{j,i} - x_{i,j}) \right) \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{D}, \forall q \in [z] \quad (2c)$$

$$y_{u,q} + M(1 - w_{u,q}) \geq \sum_{c_i \in C_u} \xi_{q,2,c_i} + w_{u,q} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}, \forall q \in [z] \quad (2d)$$

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} v_u w_{u,q} \geq 270 \hat{w}_q \quad \forall q \in [z] \quad (2e)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}} x_{i,j} \leq L \quad (2f)$$

$$0 \leq x_{i,j} \leq \min_{q \in [z]} \{ \xi_{q,1,c_i} \} \quad \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2g)$$

$$y_{u,q} \geq 0, w_{u,q} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}, \forall q \in [z]$$

$$\hat{w}_q \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall q \in [z].$$

Variable  $y_{u,q}$  in (2) represents the total number of votes for party  $p_1$  in unit  $u$  under the  $q$ -th scenario after the movements. Binary variable  $w_{u,q}$  equals 1 if and only if  $p_1$  wins the popular vote in unit  $u$  under  $q$ . Similarly, binary variable  $\hat{w}_q$  indicates if  $p_1$  wins the election in  $q$ . Each variable  $x_{i,j}$  represents the number of people moved from county  $c_i$  to county  $c_j$ .

Our goal in (2a) is to maximize the estimated win probability of  $p_1$ . Constraints (2b) and (2c) count the votes for each state and district, respectively, per scenario after the relocations; recall that  $f_{c_i,d}$ , used in (2c), is the fraction of county  $c_i$  within district unit  $d$ . Constraints (2d) and (2e) set the activation variables indicating the victory per state and nationwide, respectively. Constraint (2f) limits the total number of movements to  $L$  voters. Lastly, constraints (2g) limit the number of movements out of each county to the minimum number of voters observed in that county across all scenarios.

**Post-optimization Adjustments.** We implement two post-optimization routines to fine-tune the solutions obtained from the network flow model. First, we avoid excessively small relocation sizes by transferring movements between pairs  $(i, j)$  involving fewer than 1,000 people to other movements with more than 1,000 people whenever possible. If the resulting aggregation violates any upper bound constraints, our post-optimization routine simply reverts back to the original solution.

A second post-optimization routine tries to reduce the total distance traversed by all movements while maintaining the same aggregate flows out of each state and the same aggregate flows into each state as in the original solution. Note that such modifications do not change the estimated win probability.

**Training and Testing Data.** A collection of scenario batches were used for model calibration and testing. For the results reported below, we considered a new training set of 1,000 random scenarios (not used before for calibration or testing) as input to our optimization models. After obtaining an optimal relocation plan, we considered another test set of 5,000 scenarios to compute win probabilities and supporting statistics.

### 3 Small Movements, Large Impact

The optimization model identifies relocation plans that maximize win probabilities by selecting 10,000, 15,000, 20,000, 25,000, 50,000, 100,000, 150,000, 200,000, and 250,000 voters in favor of each candidate, solved separately for each such level. All optimization models were solved using a standard commercial mixed-integer linear programming solver (CPLEX 20.1) to optimality in less than one hour.

The line plot in Figure 2 shows the increase in win probability that would be realized for each candidate as a function of the number of people moving. Surprisingly, for 10,000 moves, the Republican candidate could already realize a 1.06% increase in election win probability, and with 250,000 moves, an 18.92% increase. For the Democratic candidate, changes are still substantial but less effective: 10,000 and 250,000 moves increase the Democratic win probability by 0.34% and 9.8%, respectively.




Figure 2: Movement patterns for 50,000 people for Republicans (top) and Democrats (bottom), and impact of the number of people moved on the probability of winning for different relocation sizes (line plot).

To explain the cause of this disparity between the candidates for the current election, the maps in Figure 2 depict the prescribed relocation strategies for 50,000 people, for both the Republican (top) and the Democratic (bottom) candidates. We observe that 7.72% and 1.76% win probability increases could be attained for the Republican and Democratic candidates in this setting, respectively. For the Republican candidate, the model suggests large movements into New Hampshire (34,755) and Nevada (15,244). For the Democratic candidate, the focus is on Pennsylvania

(41,754), accompanied by relatively few moves into Nevada (4,072) and North Carolina (4,173). In this scenario, the average weighted distances traveled by Republican and Democratic supporters are a mere 57.31 and 33.94 miles, respectively. Detailed results for all relocation sizes tested are provided in Appendix B.

We hypothesize that the difference in relocation strategy efficiency between the two parties is due to New Hampshire's small size and current political lean. With only four electoral votes and about 800,000 registered voters, a significant shift in New Hampshire's outcome can be achieved with just a few relocations. Specifically, relocating 35,000 Republican voters would increase their candidate's win probability from 24.71% to 73.02%, and considering a total number of movements of 50,000, this still allows additional moves into Nevada, boosting its win probability. In this plan, Republican voters are moving only from Massachusetts and California, states where the Republican candidate is unlikely to win. In contrast, Democrats focus on Pennsylvania, where the candidate has a 55.58% chance of winning. Pennsylvania's larger population of 8.8 million registered voters requires more relocations – 42,000 voters only increase the Democratic candidate's win probability to 61.62%. The remaining 8,000 relocations are insufficient to significantly impact other states, unlike the Republican's dual strategy with New Hampshire and Nevada.

These results are surprising for two reasons. First, they suggest that engaging less than 0.02% of the U.S. voting population is sufficient to increase the Republican candidate's chance of winning by almost 8%. Second, with the same number of movements, the increase in the Democratic candidate's chances of winning do not exceed 2%. Asymmetries like this are not uncommon; for example, rain and snow hurt turnout, and these fluctuations have historically been more beneficial for Republicans (Gomez et al. 2007).

Note that the long-term impact of the movement patterns suggested is complex to estimate. The 50,000-person movement for Republican voters, for example, involves relocating individuals from Democratic strongholds to purple states, potentially achieving a dual effect: flipping a purple state red and increasing the Republican electoral vote count (after a new census) in future elections.

## 4 Legal, Financial, and Logistical Considerations

How feasible would such a relocation strategy be in practice? A close inspection of the main potential hurdles indicates that it would be far less challenging to implement than what common perception might suggest.

Current U.S. legislation does not impose barriers on relocation strategies. There is a 30-day limit on residency requirements for voting in federal elections, including presidential elections, based on the 1970 amendments to the Voting Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 1973aa-1). This federal law stipulates that no state may impose a residency requirement of more than 30 days for voting in any presidential election. Additionally, the U.S. Supreme Court reinforced this in the 1972 case *Dunn v. Blumstein* (405 U.S. 330), where the Court ruled that lengthy residency requirements violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, despite what some politicians might have called for (Bump and Bronner 2023). Therefore, relocation translates to voting eligibility in a relatively short period.

Another consideration is engagement, as the relocation burden for a voter would be far greater than just voting in their current state of residence. Although turnout initiatives typically focus on motivating the less engaged segments of voters, the small number of movements observed in our study suggest that attention should be placed on enthusiastic voters who are already planning to vote. Election rallies frequently have tens of thousands of people in attendance (Peoples et al. 2024). Considering that the average moving distance in our results is less than 60 miles, such a relocation may have little impact on an individual's social and professional life. Note that 50,000 interstate relocations are far less than what typically happens annually in the U.S., where nearly 8 million people have moved between states in recent years in an un-coordinated fashion (Ismail 2023). Moreover, the 100 companies with the largest workforce in the U.S. employ more than 80,000 people each (Stock Analysis 2024), so even a corporate relocation could move the needle and be decisive in any given election.

From a financial standpoint, an estimate for the total expense required to move up to 50,000 people is far less than the amount spent by campaigns during each election. For example, as of August 15, 2024, the estimated cost of moving a two-bedroom house from Lowell, MA to Nashua, NH is between \$2,081 and \$2,542 (Move, Inc. 2024). Using the midpoint of this cost range, a rough estimate for the total cost of moving 50,000 people is around \$150 million. For reference, over 200,000 people have donated over \$3,300 to 2024 presidential election campaigns by August 15, 2024 (Open Secrets 2024). Instead of donating to a campaign, the money could be used to move passionate voters and directly impact vote totals, noting that campaign dollars do not necessarily translate to votes (Krasno and Green 2008).



## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we explore whether a small but strategic movement of people could meaningfully influence the outcome of a U.S. presidential election. Specifically, we approach this question through an analytical lens, leveraging predictive models and operations research methodologies. Although this idea has often been dismissed as impractical, politicians have, in fact, called on people to relocate to vote in key elections (Yang 2020). By building on the structure of the electoral college and examining the proximity of swing states to neighboring states with solid partisan majorities, we demonstrate that even modest population shifts can significantly alter win probabilities.

However, these movements would require careful coordination. One could envision a grassroots effort where motivated voters from critical border counties unite to push their preferred candidate over the finish line. Even more alarming is the prospect of well-funded, malicious actors paying voters to relocate, amplifying their political power in a targeted way. It is important to clarify that the authors neither endorse nor condone these relocation strategies; instead, we aim to shed light on how such planned efforts could be exploited and their potentially profound impact on the democratic process.

Whether or not these tactics should be considered a violation of voting laws, or merit new legislative measures to detect or prevent such collective actions, is beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, it is an issue that warrants further policy discussion and debate. We hope this work will inspire future research in operations modeling and algorithms, contributing to more resilient and equitable election systems.

## References

- Alexander S Belenky. A 0-1 knapsack model for evaluating the possible Electoral College performance in two-party US presidential elections. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 48:665–676, 2008.
- Philip Bump and Lenny Bronner. Here’s what actually happens when voters move between states. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2023/03/02/marjorie-taylor-greene-national-divorce-partisan-voting/>, 2023. Accessed: August 16, 2024.
- Philip Bump and Lenny Bronner. Where 2024 voters moved since 2020 — and how they registered. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2024/04/11/where-2024-voters-moved-since-2020-how-they-registered/>, 2024. Accessed: August 16, 2024.
- MIT Election Data and Science Lab. County presidential election returns 2000-2020, 2018.
- Federal Election Commission. 2000 presidential general election results. [https://www.fec.gov/resources/cms-content/documents/FederalElections2000\\_PresidentialGeneralElectionResultsbyState.pdf](https://www.fec.gov/resources/cms-content/documents/FederalElections2000_PresidentialGeneralElectionResultsbyState.pdf), 2000. Accessed: August 15, 2024.
- Nadia Fiorino, Nicola Pontarollo, and Roberto Ricciuti. Detecting dividing lines in turnout: Spatial dependence and heterogeneity in the 2012 us presidential election. *Journal of Geovisualization and Spatial Analysis*, 6(2):34, 2022.
- Robert S Garfinkel and George L Nemhauser. Optimal political districting by implicit enumeration techniques. *Management Science*, 16(8):B-495, 1970.
- Brad T Gomez, Thomas G Hansford, and George A Krause. The republicans should pray for rain: Weather, turnout, and voting in US presidential elections. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(3):649–663, 2007.
- Evren Güney. Efficient election campaign optimization using integer programming. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 11(2):341–348, 2018.
- Moshe Haspel and H. Gibbs Knotts. Location, location, location: Precinct placement and the costs of voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 67(2):560–573, 2005.
- Sidney Wayne Hess, JB Weaver, HJ Siegfeldt, JN Whelan, and PA Zitlau. Nonpartisan political redistricting by computer. *Operations Research*, 13(6):998–1006, 1965.
- Nicholas J. Higham. Computing a nearest symmetric positive semidefinite matrix. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 103:103–118, 1988. ISSN 0024-3795. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795\(88\)90223-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(88)90223-6). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0024379588902236>.
- Patrick Hummel and David Rothschild. Fundamental models for forecasting elections at the state level. *Electoral Studies*, 35:123–139, 2014.
- Mehreen S. Ismail. Number and percentage of state-to-state movers increased between 2021 and 2022. <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2023/11/state-to-state-migration.html>, 2023. Accessed: August 16, 2024.
- Edward H Kaplan and Arnold Barnett. A new approach to estimating the probability of winning the presidency. *Operations Research*, 51(1):32–40, 2003.
- Jeongdai Kim, Euel Elliott, and Ding-Ming Wang. A spatial analysis of county-level outcomes in us presidential elections: 1988–2000. *Electoral studies*, 22(4):741–761, 2003.

- A. J. Kleywegt, A. Shapiro, and T. Homem de Mello. The sample average approximation method for stochastic discrete optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12:479–502, 2001.
- Jonathan S. Krasno and Donald P. Green. Do televised presidential ads increase voter turnout? evidence from a natural experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(1):245–261, 2008. doi: 10.1017/S0022381607080176. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381607080176>.
- Move, Inc. Moving cost calculator for moving estimates. <https://www.moving.com/movers/moving-cost-calculator.asp/>, 2024. Accessed: August 15, 2024.
- Open Secrets. Donor demographics. <https://www.opensecrets.org/elections-overview/donor-demographics>, 2024. Accessed: September 15, 2024.
- Steve Peoples, Mike Catalini, and Meg Kinnard. Trump rallies 'mega crowd' of approx. 100k at jersey shore. <https://www.fox5ny.com/news/donald-trump-heading-to-jersey-shore-to-rally-mega-crowd>, 2024. Accessed: August 15, 2024.
- Predicit. Which party will win the 2024 u.s. presidential election? <https://www.predictit.org/markets/detail/6867/Which-party-will-win-the-2024-US-presidential-election>, 2024. Accessed: August 12, 2024.
- George Rabinowitz and Stuart MacDonald. The power of the states in U.S. presidential elections. *American Political Science Review*, 80(1):65–87, 1986.
- Nate Silver and Eli McKown-Dawson. Silver bulletin 2024 presidential election forecast. <https://www.natesilver.net/p/nate-silver-2024-president-election-polls-model>, 2024. Accessed: August 11, 2024.
- Stock Analysis. Biggest u.s. employers. <https://stockanalysis.com/list/most-employees/>, 2024. Accessed: August 15, 2024.
- Rahul Swamy, Douglas M King, and Sheldon H Jacobson. Multiobjective optimization for politically fair districting: A scalable multilevel approach. *Operations Research*, 71(2):536–562, 2023.
- Hamidreza Validi and Austin Buchanan. Political districting to minimize cut edges. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 14(4):623–672, 2022.
- Hamidreza Validi, Austin Buchanan, and Eugene Lykhovyd. Imposing contiguity constraints in political districting models. *Operations Research*, 70(2):867–892, 2022.
- Fred A Wright and Alec A Wright. How surprising was Trump's victory? Evaluations of the 2016 us presidential election and a new poll aggregation model. *Electoral Studies*, 54:81–89, 2018.
- Andrew Yang. An interesting tweet about voter movement, November 2020. URL <https://x.com/AndrewYang/status/1324809476940189698?>

## A Relocation Data

Movements in and out were prohibited for a few states, either for simplicity or due to data challenges. Specifically, a) due to distance, we do not allow movements in or out of Alaska and Hawaii; b) due to district electoral units, we do not allow movements in or out of Maine and Nebraska; and c) due to discrepancies in naming conventions, movements in and out of Connecticut were also prohibited. In the voting data for Connecticut, the voting records are broken down by Planning Regions, as opposed to CT Counties (see e.g. [https://portal.ct.gov/csl/research/ct-towns-counties?language=en\\_US](https://portal.ct.gov/csl/research/ct-towns-counties?language=en_US)). A similar discrepancy is also present in Alaska, noting that movements are restricted in the model anyways.

The distance between two counties is calculated as the distance between the centroid of their cities weighted by the population of such cities. Specifically, for every city, we first extract the population, latitude, longitude, and county from SimpleMaps (<https://simplemaps.com/>). Next, we compute the coordinates of the county centroids as the weighted average of the latitude and longitude of the cities in each county, weighted by population size.

## B Movement Patterns

This section presents tables with detailed movement patterns for each of the two candidates, for the number of movements tested (10,000, 15,000, 20,000, 25,000, 50,000, 100,000, 150,000, 200,000, and 250,000 people). Each table presents the origin county and state, the destination county and state, the movement (number of people), and the distance (in miles) between the counties. The tables also show the movements aggregated at the state level.

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	10000	45

Table 2: Republicans (10,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	1039	19
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4787	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	3344	47
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	555	90
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	543	26
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	4173	21
			North Carolina	4173	

Table 3: Democrats (10,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	7005	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	1963	90
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	854	47
			Nevada	130	26
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	7994	
			New Hampshire	7994	45

Table 4: Republicans (15,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	1039	19
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	698	90
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
Washington	New York	Sullivan	New Hampshire	4844	99
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	4173	21

Table 5: Democrats (15,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	20000	45

Table 6: Republicans (20,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
McCormick	South Carolina	Lincoln	Georgia	1278	19
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3172	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	4173	21
New Castle	Delaware	Chester	Pennsylvania	5237	36
Camden	New Jersey	Philadelphia	Pennsylvania	5237	18

Table 7: Democrats (20,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	25000	45

Table 8: Republicans (25,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	1710	19
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	387	90
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	4173	21
New Castle	Delaware	Chester	Pennsylvania	14484	36

Table 9: Democrats (25,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>15244</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	10202	90
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	854	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	130	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>34755</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	34755	45

Table 10: Republicans (50,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>4072</b>	
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3172	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>4173</b>	
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	4173	21
			<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>41754</b>	
New Castle	Delaware	Chester	Pennsylvania	19741	36
Washington	Maryland	Franklin	Pennsylvania	11006	24
Tioga	New York	Bradford	Pennsylvania	5638	28
Chemung	New York	Bradford	Pennsylvania	5367	33

Table 11: Democrats (50,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Arizona</b>	<b>12473</b>	
Imperial	California	Yuma	Arizona	12473	96
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>1661</b>	
Hamilton	Tennessee	Catoosa	Georgia	1661	15
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>29885</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	19070	90
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	5772	91
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	854	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	130	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>42163</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	42163	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>13816</b>	
Unicoi	Tennessee	Yancey	North Carolina	4883	29
Johnson	Tennessee	Watauga	North Carolina	4573	30
Carter	Tennessee	Avery	North Carolina	2698	37
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	1661	21

Table 12: Republicans (100,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>31087</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	25514	90
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	1328	91
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>6441</b>	
Washington	New York	Sullivan	New Hampshire	6441	99
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>62471</b>	
York	South Carolina	Mecklenburg	North Carolina	43757	33
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	6703	25
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	6595	32
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	5109	21
Dillon	South Carolina	Robeson	North Carolina	306	37

Table 13: Democrats (100,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Arizona</b>	<b>12473</b>	
Imperial	California	Yuma	Arizona	6462	96
Mckinley	New Mexico	Apache	Arizona	6010	63
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>40937</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	19070	90
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	16824	91
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	854	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	130	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>51054</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	51054	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>32949</b>	
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	12395	25
Danville	Virginia	Caswell	North Carolina	5967	19
Grayson	Virginia	Alleghany	North Carolina	4907	16
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	4098	32
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	3507	21
Galax	Virginia	Alleghany	North Carolina	1425	25
Carroll	Virginia	Surry	North Carolina	646	30
			<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>2215</b>	
New Castle	Delaware	Chester	Pennsylvania	2215	36
			<b>Wisconsin</b>	<b>10370</b>	
Lake	Illinois	Kenosha	Wisconsin	10370	27

Table 14: Republicans (150,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>10765</b>	
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	10765	19
			<b>Michigan</b>	<b>4125</b>	
Lucas	Ohio	Monroe	Michigan	2643	28
Lagrange	Indiana	St. Joseph	Michigan	808	25
Elkhart	Indiana	Cass	Michigan	673	33
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>33217</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	25514	90
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	3459	91
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>8883</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	8883	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>93008</b>	
York	South Carolina	Mecklenburg	North Carolina	43757	33
Lancaster	South Carolina	Union	North Carolina	14117	38
Spartanburg	South Carolina	Polk	North Carolina	12227	41
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	6703	25
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	6595	32
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	5109	21
Dillon	South Carolina	Robeson	North Carolina	4497	37

Table 15: Democrats (150,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Arizona</b>	<b>18611</b>	
Imperial	California	Yuma	Arizona	12600	96
Mckinley	New Mexico	Apache	Arizona	6010	63
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>25986</b>	
Russell	Alabama	Muscogee	Georgia	8179	16
Chambers	Alabama	Troup	Georgia	7452	27
Randolph	Alabama	Heard	Georgia	6569	29
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	3312	19
Cleburne	Alabama	Haralson	Georgia	472	33
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>40688</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	19070	90
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	16575	91
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	854	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	130	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>54773</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	54773	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>50753</b>	
Greene	Tennessee	Madison	North Carolina	16634	43
Carter	Tennessee	Avery	North Carolina	15183	37
Washington	Tennessee	Yancey	North Carolina	9479	48
Unicoi	Tennessee	Yancey	North Carolina	4883	29
Johnson	Tennessee	Watauga	North Carolina	4573	30
			<b>Wisconsin</b>	<b>9186</b>	
Lake	Illinois	Kenosha	Wisconsin	9186	27

Table 16: Republicans (200,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>19548</b>	
Aiken	South Carolina	Richmond	Georgia	11745	28
Jasper	South Carolina	Effingham	Georgia	5293	26
Mccormick	South Carolina	Lincoln	Georgia	2510	19
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>48509</b>	
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	25514	90
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	18751	91
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>6441</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	6441	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>125501</b>	
York	South Carolina	Mecklenburg	North Carolina	43757	33
Spartanburg	South Carolina	Polk	North Carolina	43326	41
Lancaster	South Carolina	Union	North Carolina	14117	38
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	6703	25
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	6595	32
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	5109	21
Dillon	South Carolina	Robeson	North Carolina	4497	37
Greenville	South Carolina	Polk	North Carolina	1393	45

Table 17: Democrats (200,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Arizona</b>	<b>18611</b>	
Imperial	California	Yuma	Arizona	13965	96
Mckinley	New Mexico	Apache	Arizona	4645	63
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>24987</b>	
Hamilton	Tennessee	Catoosa	Georgia	24987	15
			<b>Michigan</b>	<b>2773</b>	
Lagrange	Indiana	St. Joseph	Michigan	2773	25
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>46591</b>	
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	22478	91
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	19070	90
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	4056	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	854	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	130	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>54773</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	54773	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>62719</b>	
York	South Carolina	Mecklenburg	North Carolina	17867	33
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	12395	25
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	7679	32
Carter	Tennessee	Avery	North Carolina	5458	37
Grayson	Virginia	Alleghany	North Carolina	4907	16
Unicoi	Tennessee	Yancey	North Carolina	4883	29
Johnson	Tennessee	Watauga	North Carolina	4573	30
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	3507	21
Danville	Virginia	Caswell	North Carolina	1446	19
			<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>2215</b>	
New Castle	Delaware	Chester	Pennsylvania	2215	36
			<b>Wisconsin</b>	<b>37327</b>	
Lake	Illinois	Kenosha	Wisconsin	37327	27

Table 18: Republicans (250,000 movements)

Origin		Destination		Movement	Distance
County	State	County	State		
			<b>Georgia</b>	<b>19229</b>	
Nassau	Florida	Camden	Georgia	11044	19
Gadsden	Florida	Decatur	Georgia	8184	34
			<b>Nevada</b>	<b>59728</b>	
El Dorado	California	Douglas	Nevada	29970	91
Nevada	California	Carson	Nevada	25514	90
Inyo	California	Esmeralda	Nevada	3344	78
Sierra	California	Washoe	Nevada	555	47
Alpine	California	Douglas	Nevada	343	26
			<b>New Hampshire</b>	<b>8883</b>	
Essex	Massachusetts	Hillsborough	New Hampshire	8883	45
			<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>162158</b>	
York	South Carolina	Mecklenburg	North Carolina	43757	33
Spartanburg	South Carolina	Polk	North Carolina	43326	41
Greenville	South Carolina	Polk	North Carolina	38051	45
Lancaster	South Carolina	Union	North Carolina	14117	38
Cherokee	South Carolina	Cleveland	North Carolina	6703	25
Chesterfield	South Carolina	Anson	North Carolina	6595	32
Marlboro	South Carolina	Scotland	North Carolina	5109	21
Dillon	South Carolina	Robeson	North Carolina	4497	37

Table 19: Democrats (250,000 movements)