

**Note: This release comes in three parts – a preliminary report on registration; a final and brief update on statewide primary turnout; and a look at what one may expect November 5. This report also comes with an announcement of the introduction, in CSAE's next report immediately after the election, of a new denominator to analyze and ascertain voter turnout. What this denominator is, how it was arrived at and why it was chosen over other options is detailed in full in Note 2 in the notes section of this report.**

**FOR RELEASE:**

**IMMEDIATE**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT**

Curtis Gans (202) 546-3221  
(703) 478-1943

**REGISTRATION TRENDING LOWER**

**DEMOCRATS LOSE; INDEPENDENTS GAIN**

**LOW GENERAL ELECTION TURNOUT LIKELY**

**MORE THAN 120 MILLION ELIGIBLES WON'T VOTE**

**WASHINGTON, October 31** – After a 1998 surge in registration due to the National Voter Registration Act (the so-called Motor Voter Law), registration is slipping lower in 2002.

Based on final registration figures from 26 states and the District of Columbia:

–National registration will likely be down from 64.6 percent of the Voting Age Population (VAP) to 63.2 percent this year.

–Democratic registration continues its downward spiral; Republican registration will be down slightly; and registration for other parties or as independents will have climbed to its highest level ever.

–About 136 million Americans will have registered when registration totals come in from all states.

–Turnout in the general election next Tuesday is likely to be low, perhaps as low or lower than in 1998, the lowest in 56 years. At least 120 million eligible Americans will not vote.

These are among the findings of a preliminary report on voter registration interpreted from final and official registration statistics from 26 states and the District of Columbia (See Note 4) and on 2002 statewide primary turnout based on final and official returns from 43 states released today by the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate (CSAE), a Washington-based, non-partisan, non-profit research organization.

Among the findings in this report:

- Overall registration which had climbed 2.8 percentage points (5 percent) after the first mid-term implementation of the Motor Voter Act in 1998, is likely to have slipped 1.4 percentage points this year or to a level about on a par with registration levels for the past four decades. (The high point was 66 percent of VAP in 1966).

- Based on the registration figures from 13 states and the District of Columbia which require partisan registration (out of 28 and the District which have this requirement), Democratic registration likely fell to 30.1 percent of VAP, marking the ninth straight mid-term decline. Democratic registration has fallen 37 percent in these states (17.7 percentage points) from its modern apex (47.8 percent of VAP) in 1966. Democratic registration declined in every jurisdiction, except Delaware and Maryland.

- Republican registration in these states fell slightly (0.6 percentage points) to 22.7 percent of VAP. But this masks a fundamental change in the GOP base. GOP registration has been increasing steadily in the South, up nearly three-fold since 1962, but has declined nearly 25 percent in the rest of the nation – particularly in the West and Northeast.

- The big winner is none-of-the-above, those who register for third parties or as independents. In these states, the level of non-major party registration reached 15.7 percent of VAP, up nearly eight-fold from the two percent who were so registered in 1962 and continuing an almost steady increase over the last four decades.

“There are problems in these numbers for each of the major parties and for the political system as a whole,” said Curtis Gans, CSAE’s director.

“Part of the decline in Democratic Party registration can be attributed to the emergence of a two-party South in the aftermath of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but the continuing erosion in Democratic allegiance may also be traced to its lack of consistent message, its lack of continuing grass-roots organization and its inability to maintain a consistent voice as the party of the average person and of popular governance.

“As the Republican Party has drifted rightward, it has picked up support in the more conservative South and mountain states, but it has lost support in the rest of the nation and as the minority population increases, particularly Latinos, it stands to lose even more traction, particularly in Texas, the Southwest and California.

“But the big story in these numbers is the continuing decline in allegiance to either major political party which threatens American politics with a lack of cohesion, increased volatility and de minimus support of leadership and direction. While those registering as none-of-the-above do not, as of now, reflect any coherent philosophy or outlook, they are a landmine of disaffection from business as usual waiting to be detonated.” Gans said.

## **LAST LOOK AT THE PRIMARIES**

Final and official primary figures from all of the 43 states which held statewide primaries (for governor and U.S. Senate), did not change earlier CSAE findings. Turnout in the 38 states which held statewide primaries in both parties was 17.1 percent of VAP, 0.3 percentage points higher than 1998, but still the second lowest turnout ever.

Democratic turnout in the 42 states which held statewide Democratic primaries gained 0.1. percentage point since 1998 to 9.2 percent of VAP, fully 51 percent lower than the party’s high of 19.4 percent of VAP in 1966. GOP turnout in the 39 states which held statewide Republican primaries dipped slightly (0.3 percentage points) to 7.6 percent of VAP. This is 42.8 percent lower than the party’s primary turnout in 1966.

“There is a danger in these numbers,” Gans said. “Because both parties, in pursuing redistricting, are creating an ever-increasing number of safe seats for both the U.S. House of Representatives and state legislatures, the critical election in determining who occupies those seats is the primary. If only nine percent vote in Democratic primaries and less than 8 percent vote in GOP primaries (and likely less for the House and state legislatures) an organized faction representing no more than four percent of the electorate can shape the character of either party. And that is already apparent in one party.

“If we want a healthy polity representing the majority of Americans – one that they can have faith in – then we need to both address the redistricting process and the underlying causes of voter disinterest and disaffection,” Gans said.

## **PROSPECTS FOR TUESDAY**

In 1998 voter turnout was 35.3 percent of VAP (37.6 percent of the citizen eligible population – See Note 2). There is nothing in any of the initial indications that suggest turnout will rise.

Primary turnout in 2002 was comparable to 1998. Registration is slightly down, although turnout has not correlated with registration for a number of elections. Voter interest, as measured by the polls, particularly those of the Pew Center for the People and Press, is at about the same level as 1998. There has been an unprecedented level of spending on attack ads to pollute both the airwaves and citizen respect for any and all public personnas. Nothing has been done to address the myriad of issues that have caused turnout to plummet steadily downward by 25

percent nationally and nearly 30 percent outside of the South since 1966.

Against this backdrop, it is easy to predict a low turnout, that at least 120 million of the citizen eligible population of 200,200,000 will not vote and that turnout will not deviate more than a percentage point or two up or down from the 1998 level.

But, also against this not very hopeful backdrop there are two factors which might propel turnout slightly upwards:

In almost every major populous state – California, Florida, New York, Texas, Michigan, Missouri, Illinois, to name but a few – there are contested statewide races, many of which are very close coming down to the wire and were everything equal should propel turnout upward. But the race in New York has turned one-sided, the disdain for the California gubernatorial candidates is palpable and even while there will be high turnout in Minnesota, especially in the aftermath of the untimely and tragic death of Sen. Paul Wellstone, turnout is not likely to equal 1998 when Gov. Jesse Ventura scored his upset win. Which is to say that the level of competition in major states – some of which will propel turnout upward perhaps particularly in Texas and Florida – is not likely to exert a major influence on national turnout.

The economy, however, may. The economy is seen as the top issue by a large majority of Americans and, for many, their personal economic concerns will be the dominant factor in deciding whether and how to vote. Two of the three significant upturns in turnout during the four-decade period of decline occurred in 1982 and 1992 at times of perceived economic distress and that redounded to the detriment of the party in power in the White House, in both cases the Republicans. The economic issues have not jelled in the same way this year. There is unease but not the anger and fear that were present in the two previous elections and the Democrats have offered nothing coherent in the way of an alternative to the Republicans. Still it is possible that in the closing days of this campaign, with significant economic numbers to be reported and with a new wave of layoffs, economic worries may propel some who ordinarily wouldn't have voted to the polls.

“In this highly amorphous election in which both outcome and turnout is hard to predict, were I a high roller better,” Gans said, “I would wager the equivalent of one thin dime that turnout will go up about a percentage point or two and that at the end of the day, the Democrats will be smiling a little more than the Republicans, particularly with respect to the Senate and governorships.”

## NOTES AND SUMMARY CHARTS

**1. What is Turnout:** Turnout should be a simple calculation in which the numerator is the number of votes cast and the denominator is the number of citizens eligible to vote. But because of various anomalies in election statistics, some of which are outlined in detail below, this calculation is more complicated. By common usage, the numerator in every Presidential election year is the vote for President (even though that tally is usually about one percentage point lower than the actual number of citizens who go to the polls. It is lower because many states, although an ever-diminishing number, do not keep records of all those who go to the polls, the total ballots cast). In mid-term elections, the numerator is the total of votes for the statewide race in each state which draws the highest number of votes and the aggregate total of votes for U.S. House of Representatives in those states which do not have statewide races. (This total tends to be between 1 and 1.5 percentage points lower than the actual total ballots cast but is used for the same reasons – that many states do not compile total ballots cast figures.)

In the part of this report which deals with mid-term primary turnout, only the votes in states which had statewide contests for either U.S. Senate or governor are used as a basis of analysis and the numerators for determining turnout. In the case of a state which had contests for both governor and U.S. Senator, the race which had the highest vote total is used as the basis of analysis.

Turnout is **NOT** the percentage of those registered who voted. There are three basic reasons for this: a. Using registration as a denominator does not account for the whole of the electorate, including those who are not registered. Thus it gives a false picture of true citizen engagement. b. Changes in registration law can dramatically affect the figures. If the nation adopts, as it did, a registration law that provides for national mail registration, registration at motor vehicle bureaus and at social service agencies, registration will go up but turnout of those registered will decline artificially by a greater amount than it does when using the entire eligible electorate as a denominator. c. Registration figures are subject to the fluctuations of election administration. If a state conducts a thorough purge of its registration lists close to election, its registration figures will be lower and thus its percentage of registered voting will be higher. But if registration lists are not so purged, as they are not in many states, the figures for registration will be higher and the turnout based on these inflated registration figures will be lower. Consider how distorted a turnout percentage using registration as a base would be in a state such as Alaska, which because of lack of regular list cleaning and potential flaws with the Census Bureau's estimates of the state's eligible population, registration figures are regularly in excess of 100 percent of the eligible vote.

**2. The denominator for determining turnout:** In its next report – immediately following the November 5 election – CSAE will be introducing a new denominator for ascertaining voter turnout, one which eliminates the greatest flaw in the denominator the Committee and all other sources have been using for the past several decades – the Census Bureau's biennial estimates of age-eligible population (VAP). The Committee is introducing this denominator because it will give a truer picture of actual turnout in the United States and because many have questioned the validity of the VAP estimate because of the several flaws in that figure. Those flaws are: a. It has

not been, for two decades, adjusted backward for the findings of the most recent Censuses (in this case 1990 and 2000); b. It includes as eligibles non-citizens who cannot vote; c. It includes felons and ex-felons who cannot vote; d. It includes a small number of people deemed incompetent to vote who reside in mental institutions; e. It does not include Americans living outside the confines of the United States who are able to vote; f. It does not adjust for the undercount in any given Census, people who were not counted, many of whom are citizens and could vote; and g. It does not include those naturalized between January 1 and election day, who are included in Census' estimates of non-citizens but who have achieved citizenship and thus voting privileges prior to the election. Assuming that the voting figures are constant, factors b., c. and d. would tend to depress the denominator and make the figure for turnout higher; and factors e., f. and g. would raise the denominator and thus make turnout lower. The influence of factor a. would be determined by the results of the actual Census.

The problem with attempting to apply all of these factors is that one is unable to do so given the state of the figures nor is one able to provide these factors for a historical comparison of turnout. Records of the number of felons who cannot vote are approximations and are not available beyond a limited historic period. No one knows how many people have been deemed incompetent, though most agree that such a number is well under a million. There are national figures for those living outside the U.S. (from a combination of the Office of Personnel Management for civilian Americans working outside the U.S.; the Department of Defense for those in the military who are similarly situated and the Consular Service for civilians residing outside the nation's boundaries) but these are not allocated by state or by age. The level of the undercount and its applicability to individual states is not available beyond a certain point in history. And the nature of the figures on naturalizations permit only a national estimate for the months involved and, perhaps, a guesstimate on allocating them to states, but not a fully reliable figure.

It is possible to do all of these calculations **nationally** for all recent years and if done, it produces a turnout rate of 52.7 percent of actually eligible citizens in the election of 2000 as opposed to a turnout of 50.1 based on the VAP standard and a level of 37.1 percent as opposed to 35.3 percent of VAP in the 1998 mid-term. No similar compilation of all these factors is available on the state level.

Because of this inability to apply the full panoply of factors to state level election statistics and because the Committee, in its study of this statistical issue, has found that the sum of the factors – other than non-citizens – which would decrease the denominator (felons and the incompetent) have, in all years produced a total of ineligible people in the VAP estimates substantially less than the total derived from factors (out-of-the United States citizens, the undercount and naturalizations) of eligible citizens who are uncounted in the VAP estimates, the Committee is producing a figure that addresses the two accessible (on the state level) issues to create a better denominator:

The Committee has adjusted, according to formulas provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census

(and replicated below), the VAP estimates for the years 1980-2002 in light of the Censuses of 2000 and 1990. The Census Bureau had already changed the pre-1980 estimates in light of the most recent Censuses for the years prior to that thanks to the work of Jerry Jennings, then of the Bureau, and the intervention of Warren Mitofsky.

For years, the Committee has written in these notes that there was a superior (to the VAP) denominator for evaluating voter turnout that has been faithfully produced each biennium by Dr. Walter Dean Burnham of the University of Texas. Burnham has produced, by interpolating both backwards and forwards from biennial Censuses, the Census counts of non-citizens by state, a denominator for state eligibles which eliminates non-citizens from the total. This set of non-citizen adjusted figures is available back to 1870 (with a one Census hiatus in 1960), the first time that the Census counted non-citizens in the United States. He has provided, for all ensuing Committee reports, one that is adjusted for the newly adjusted VAP estimates for 1980-2002. (It should be noted that the 2000 Census has not yet released its state estimates for 18 years of age and over non-citizens and that the denominators for the decade from 1992-2002 will have to be revised accordingly when those statistics are available.) In its next report and in all subsequent ones, the Committee will be using Burnham data and Burnham's methodology to arrive at a denominator for assessing voter turnout. Charts 1 and 2 show the differences between this new standard and the old VAP standard in recent elections (since 1960).

It should be noted that because the factors other than non-citizens affecting the denominator used to ascertain turnout would, if they could be measured over time and on the state level, produce a higher denominator, the turnout percentages in these reports will be somewhat higher than they actually are. But this denominator eliminates the largest source of distortion in the VAP numbers and will be closer to the truth than the old VAP standard was.

The Committee will continue to provide some charts in its reports based on the old standard for comparison purposes and has produced a paper on all the statistical quirks and their implications which is available upon request.

### **Methodology For VAP Revisions**

**1980 - 1988:** The Census Bureau's publication, "Resident Population for Selected Age Groups: 1980-1989," has intercensal estimates of each state's 18 years of age and older population for each year. Those estimates for the years 1982 - 1988 are as of July 1 of each year. In order to estimate the age-eligible population for November, four-twelfths (one-third) of the difference between the figure for any given year and the following year's estimate is added to the estimate. For 1980, when the Census reported its findings as of April 1, seven-fifteenths of the difference between that report and the July 1 estimate of the following year is added.

**1990 - 1998:** There is no similar state-level intercensal dataset for this decade. The 1990 VAP estimate is arrived at by subtracting the 1990 April 1 decennial Census report of aged 18 and over population for each state from the April 1, 2000 Census report and multiplying it by 7/120ths (for the seven months between April 1, 1990 and November) and adding that to the April 1 figure. For the years between 1992 - 1998, the Census Bureau has produced population numbers, but not 18 and over population numbers for each state. Using the Census Bureau's

publication, "Population for the U.S. Regions and Stats by Selected Age Groups and Sex: Annual Time Series: July 1, 1990 to July 1, 1999," it is possible to derive a ratio for the 18 years and older population for each state, then apply that ratio to the total population of each state as of July 1 of each election year and then add four-twelfths (one-third) of the difference between the election year and following year estimates to that election year estimate to arrive at a November VAP.

**2000:** The 2000 Census produced a figure for the 18 years of age and older population for each state as of April 1, 2000. To project this forward to November, it was necessary to establish a rate of change for each state which was done by comparing the 18 years of age and over estimates between 1998 and 1999 in each states and then, using the decennial April 1 estimates, project the growth rate 7/12ths of the way to a full year to produce a November 2000 estimates.

**Note:** While all the calculations in the summary charts below and most of the charts in back have been done using the old VAP as the denominator (corrected for the results of the 2000 and 1990 Censuses), the primary charts in the back of this report use both the old VAP standard and the new standard based on Burnham's database.

**3. The numerator – the votes:** In this report, there are charts on voting in 2002 statewide primaries (for governor or U.S. Senator). These are final, official and certified by the chief election officer in each state and the District of Columbia. The Committee, in its analysis uses the race in each state which received the largest number of votes. Its overall primary chart is for those states which had statewide primaries in both parties. All comparisons are of mid-term election primary turnout, since primary turnout in Presidential years is likely to be higher due to the fact that citizens cast more votes for President than any other office.

**4. Registration:** The registration figures for the individual states in the back of this report are final, official, certified by the chief election officer of each state and totally misleading. Taken at face value, these figures would indicate a national 10 percentage point jump in registration in this election and in 1998. But this rise in registration figures gives a false picture, owing to provisions in the National Voter Registration Act (the so-called Motor Voter law) implemented for the first time in the 1996 election.

In any given election the official registration figures provided by the states are inaccurate because they contain the names of people who have either died or moved but have not been removed from the registration rolls. The degree of inaccuracy in any given state would pend both when they conducted a list cleaning and how thorough such a list cleaning was. A state which conducted a thorough list cleaning close to an election would likely have fewer names that were not eligible. But because of non-thorough and early list cleaning, some states, notably Alaska, Maine and Mississippi, have often had registration rolls which have exceeded 100 percent of the Voting Age Population. Prior to the enactment of the NVRA, it was at least possible to make a national estimate of registration which would be, on the average, ten percent lower than the official figures provided by the states.

But the NVRA mandated that states must keep even those who have moved or died on their

registration rolls for at least two federal elections, even if the people whose names have remained on the rolls have been determined to have moved or died. And, this, in turn, accounts for the substantially higher official figures than prior to the NVRA's implementation.

While states cannot remove names, they can transfer those for whom they have evidence that they have died or moved to an inactive list, which they are required by the NVRA to report each biennium by March of the year following a national election. A truer picture can be gleaned from the two charts below which compares registration rates based on official figures and rates based on official figures minus those kept on inactive lists:

## 2002 Gross and Adjusted Registration

State	2002 VAP	2002 Gross Registration	2002 % VAP Gross Reg.	2002 Inactive	2002 Adjusted Registration	2002 % VAP Adj. Reg.
Arizona	3,960,000	2,229,180	56.29%	475,737	1,753,443	44.28%
Hawaii	919,000	676,242	73.58%	125,086	551,156	59.97%
Iowa	2,230,000	1,954,801	87.66%	157,427	1,797,374	80.60%
Louisiana	3,299,000	2,801,246	84.91%	286,143	2,515,103	76.24%
Maryland	4,004,000	2,733,357	68.27%	238,361	2,494,996	62.31%
South Carolina	3,128,000	2,367,368	75.68%	320,000	2,047,368	65.45%
Texas	15,708,000	12,563,459	79.98%	2,228,686	10,334,773	65.79%
Overall:	33,248,000	25,325,653	76.17%	3,831,440	21,494,213	64.65%

## Adjusted Registration for 2002-1994

State	2002 VAP	2002 % VAP Gross Reg.	2002 Adjusted Registration	2002 % VAP Adj. Reg.	1998 Adjusted Registration	1998 % VAP Adj. Reg.	+/- 2002-1998	1994 Adjusted Registration	1994 % VAP Adj. Reg.	+/- 2002-1994
Arizona	3,960,000	56.29%	1,753,443	44.28%	1,937,187	54.49%	-10.21%	2,315,762	74.01%	-29.73%
Hawaii	919,000	73.58%	551,156	59.97%	601,404	65.80%	-5.83%	550,509	62.42%	-2.44%
Iowa	2,230,000	87.66%	1,797,374	80.60%	1,693,090	77.88%	2.72%	1,640,533	77.20%	3.40%
Louisiana	3,299,000	84.91%	2,515,103	76.24%	2,508,808	77.77%	-1.53%	2,151,955	69.11%	7.13%
Maryland	4,004,000	68.27%	2,494,996	62.31%	2,327,765	59.66%	2.66%	2,299,580	61.08%	1.23%
South Carolina	3,128,000	75.68%	2,047,368	65.45%	1,958,359	66.18%	-0.73%	1,499,564	54.29%	11.16%
Texas	15,708,000	79.98%	10,334,773	65.79%	9,582,505	66.26%	-0.46%	8,641,848	64.97%	0.82%
Overall:	33,248,000	76.17%	21,494,213	64.65%	20,609,118	66.07%	-1.42%	19,099,751	65.68%	-1.04%

The charts on registration and partisan registration in the summary charts below represent the Committee's best estimate of what actual registration is likely to be, based on the states which have provided final and official registration figures at the time of this report.

**5. Comparisons:** All comparisons in this report are between mid-term elections. The Committee does not believe that comparisons between mid-term and Presidential elections offer any useful guidance as to trends.

**6. Acknowledgments:** CSAE would like to thank several people and sources: the various election officials across the nation from whom we draw our data for putting up with our pestering; the Census Bureau for the valuable data it provides; particularly Jennifer Day of the Census Bureau for her wise guidance in developing new VAP statistics for the period 1980-2002; Dr. Walter Dean Burnham for his historical insights and the new denominator for the states and nation which the Committee is using in this report; Samuel Schreiber for creating a new database program for the Committee which permits analysis of turnout using different denominators, allows for greater flexibility in its analysis and saves paper.

**7. Primary Research:** Primary research for much of this study was conducted by Sean Greene, CSAE's research associate emeritus, and Mark P. Harvey, the committee's current research associate.

**8. Analysis and Conclusions:** The analysis and conclusions in this study have been made by Curtis Gans, CSAE's director who is solely responsible for any and all errors.

## SUMMARY CHARTS

**1. Historic Turnout Trends Using Different Denominators:** The percentage of those aged 18 and over who voted in previous mid-terms based on the race(s) with the highest number of ballots cast and two denominators: a. The one which has been most commonly in use, the Census Bureau's estimates of Voting Age Population (VAP) and b. The VAP minus non-citizens which will be the denominator used in all future CSAE reports:

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>% of VAP Voted</b>	<b>% of Citizen VAP Voted</b>
1998	35.3	37.6
1994	38.5	40.5
1990	36.4	38.1
1986	36.4	38.2
1982	40.2	42.2
1978	37.8	39.5
1974	38.3	40.0
1970	46.8	48.4
1966	48.4	49.3
1962	47.4	49.2

**2. Partisan Turnout 1962-1998 Using Different Denominators:** Partisan turnout percentages based on the statewide race which received the highest number of votes based on the two different denominators in the chart above:

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>% of VAP Voted</b>		<b>% of Citizen VAP Voted</b>	
	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>GOP</b>	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>GOP</b>
1998	18.7	18.9	19.9	20.2
1994	18.8	22.3	19.7	23.4
1990	20.4	18.5	21.3	19.4
1986	20.7	19.0	21.7	19.9
1982	23.0	19.2	24.2	20.2
1978	20.8	18.5	21.8	19.3
1974	23.1	17.1	24.1	17.8
1970	26.4	22.8	27.3	23.6
1966	24.1	25.9	24.5	26.4
1962	25.3	24.5	26.2	25.5

**3. Registration Percentages:** The following are estimates of the percentage of Voting Age Population (VAP) who will be registered at the final close of registration in all states based on the 27 states which have reported registration figures at the time of this release. These figures are based on reducing the state official registration reports for the percentage that are on inactive lists and an additional reduction for what would normally be the degree of inflation if the NVRA did not require to keep everyone on the registration rolls either as active voters or on an inactive list (See Note 4 above):

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Pct. Registered</b>
2002	63.2
1998	64.6
1994	61.8
1990	60.0
1986	61.2
1982	60.0
1978	60.1
1974	61.6
1970	64.9
1966	66.0
1962	64.2

**4. Partisan Registration Percentages:** The percentage of Voting Age Population who are registered for each major party and other (for third parties or unaffiliated) in the 14 states which require partisan registration and have final figures at the time of this report (based on unadjusted registration figures). Actual percentages when figures are adjusted for inactive lists and inflation will be lower. Note that the total of the three categories does not add up to 100 percent. The balance are not registered:

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>DEMOCRATIC</b>	<b>REPUBLICAN</b>	<b>OTHER</b>
2002	30.1	22.7	15.7
1998	32.2	23.3	14.3
1994	32.4	22.3	10.2
1990	33.8	22.4	6.6
1986	36.6	21.6	6.6
1982	37.1	18.9	6.5
1978	38.9	17.9	5.7
1974	40.3	19.1	4.6
1970	43.5	21.0	3.0
1966	47.8	20.8	2.0
1962	44.3	20.9	2.0

**5. Overall Primary Turnout:** The average percentage of Voting Age Population (VAP) who voted in the 38 states which held

statewide primaries in both major parties this year and the average turnout for these states in the years 1962-2002:

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>PCT. VOTED</b>
2002	17.1
1998	16.8
1994	18.8
1990	19.9
1986	20.1
1982	23.6
1978	23.9
1974	24.9
1970	28.2
1966	33.3
1962	29.5

**5. Partisan Primary Turnout:** The average percentage of Voting Age Population (VAP) who voted in 2002 statewide primaries in the 42 states which held Democratic primaries and the 39 states which held Republican primaries (not necessarily the same states) for 1962-2002:

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>DEMOCRATIC TURNOUT</b>	<b>GOP TURNOUT</b>
-------------	---------------------------	--------------------

2002	9.2	7.6
1998	9.1	7.9
1994	9.8	8.3
1990	12.2	7.6
1986	11.5	7.2
1982	14.5	7.8
1978	14.7	8.1
1974	15.6	7.4
1970	16.9	10.4
1966	19.4	13.3
1962	19.0	11.8

**6. State Dropoffs in Primary Turnout:** How much turnout has declined by percent and percentage point difference between the year in which each state recorded its highest primary turnout and 2002 in 15 states which had statewide primaries in both major parties:

<b>STATE</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>HIGHEST YEAR</b>	<b>DIFFERENCE</b>
Ohio	11.9	29.1 (1970)	-59.1% (17.2 p.p.)
California	17.6	42.8 (1966)	-58.9% (25.2 p.p.)
Texas	10.3	23.9 (1978)	-58.5% (14.5 p.p.)
Arkansas	18.3	41.6 (1970)	-56.0% (23.3 p.p.)
New Jersey	6.1	13.7 (1982)	-55.5% (7.6 p.p.)
Idaho	18.7	41.1 (1966)	-54.5% (22.4 p.p.)
Nebraska	16.4	34.9 (1970)	-53.0% (18.5 p.p.)
New Mexico	18.1	32.9 (1970)	-45.0% (14.7 p.p.)
Iowa	12.3	20.7 (1994)	-40.6% ( 8.4 p.p.)
Pennsylvania	18.3	30.6 (1966)	-40.2% (12.3 p.p.)
Montana	21.4	34.9 (1978)	-38.7% (13.5 p.p.)
Oregon	25.9	41.8 (1966)	-38.0% (15.9 p.p.)
Illinois	23.3	28.2 (1962)	-17.4% ( 4.9 p.p.)
South Dakota	31.7	37.9 (1986)	-16.4% ( 6.2 p.p.)
West Virginia	21.2	23.9 (1978)	-11.3% ( 2.7 p.p.)
All These States	16.2	33.2 (1966)	-51.2% (17.0 p.p.)