

Unadjusted Exit Polls for 2020 Presidential and Senate Races Show Inexplicably Political Red-Shift Pattern Similar to Prior US Elections

By Ron Baiman, Peter Peckarsky, Jonathan Simon

October 24, 2022

Presidential Election in 2020

Unadjusted Exit Poll (UEP) analysis of the 2020 US Presidential and Senate elections shows the same "red-shift" pattern of Republican favoring discrepancies from Unadjusted Exit Polls (UEPs) that has prevailed in every general US Presidential election since 2004.¹

UEPs are samples of voter responses taken after they vote in-person or by absentee ballot. These are obtained from screen shots of exit polls reported by US media right before, or soon after, polls close, and include UEP candidate vote shares and sample sizes. These differ from the exit polls that are adjusted to match official election results, or Adjusted Exit Poll (AEP) candidate vote shares and sample sizes, that are widely reported in US media.

In the United States, an adjusted exit poll is created by the exit pollsters after the polls have been

¹ See Baiman 2017: [U.S. 2016 Unadjusted Exit Poll Discrepancies Fit Chronic Republican Vote-Count Rigging, not Random Statistical Patterns: https://www.opednews.com/articles/U-S-2016-Unadjusted-Exit-by-Ron-Baiman-2016-Elections-Exit-Polls-161208-153.html](https://www.opednews.com/articles/U-S-2016-Unadjusted-Exit-by-Ron-Baiman-2016-Elections-Exit-Polls-161208-153.html) , Updated, Expanded and Corrected Affidavit Version: U.S. 2016 Unadjusted Exit Poll Discrepancies Fit Chronic Republican Vote - Count Rigging, not Random Statistical, Patterns: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319205877> Updated Expanded and Corrected Affidavit Version US 2016 Unadjusted Exit Poll Discrepancies Fit Chronic Republican Vote - Count Rigging not Random Statistical Patterns?channel=doi&linkId=599b2d5ca6fdcc500349b9a5&showFulltext=true ; Dopp et al. 2005: [History of the Debate Surrounding the 2004 Presidential Election](#) ; and Hartmann 2020: [The Hidden History of the War on Voting](#), p. 87-93, for more background.

closed for several hours. The adjustments from the unadjusted exit poll to the adjusted exit poll are based on the assumption that the reported results must accurately reflect how the ballots were cast. When sending observers to watch and report on foreign elections the State Department does not make this assumption. Whether or not intended, in the US the AEP serves to obscure the meaning of UEP when the official vote count lies outside the margin of error of the unadjusted exit poll. The meaning is that the official vote count may not accurately state how the voters voted.

In foreign nations, when a candidate seeking election pays for all versions of an exit poll (unadjusted and adjusted), the candidate is free to obtain an AEP that more closely matches the reported vote count than does the original UEP. When sending observers to watch a foreign election, the U.S. State Department pays for one exit poll - an Unadjusted Exit Poll. The State Department does not pay for an AEP. The State Department observes the foreign election for the purpose of checking on the officially reported results and not for the purpose of legitimizing an inaccurate vote count.²

These UEP and AEP data were captured for all 22 states, and the nation, 9 General Election Senate races, and the two Georgia run-off Senate races, where exit polling was conducted. Screen shots with Presidential UEP shares and sample sizes can be found [here](#).³ UEPs are calculated from gender vote shares except for Kentucky where regional weighted average vote shares were calculated, as shown in table displayed in the link above. Presidential VCs can be found [here](#). National Presidential AEP and sample sizes can be found [here](#). State Presidential AEPs and sample sizes can be found

² <https://columbusfreepress.com/article/why-united-states-state-department-would-not-certify-trump%e2%80%99s-election-legitimate>

³ Note: Zoom-in magnifying function is required to make out some of the data displayed in this pdf.

by searching NYTimes 2020 Presidential exit polls for each state. For example, Presidential AEP with sample size for Kentucky can be found [here](#).

For each of these races Republican Vote Counts (VCs) are compared to Republican UEPs, and Democratic VCs to Democratic UEPs. In almost all cases Republican VCs are higher than their UEPs and Democratic VCs lower than their UEPs, leading to a "red shift", or Republican minus Democratic VC differences that are larger than Republican minus Democratic UEP differences.

A statistical analysis of Trump VCs minus UEPs for 22 states and the nation for which UEPs were conducted is presented in Table 1 below. Note that in Table 1 the ratios of UEP/AEP sample sizes are 93% or more for 20 of 22 states, and 96% or more for 18 of these states. Exceptions are SC 64% and WI 78%. This suggests that, except for SC and WI, UEPs are from samples that are almost identical, or very close, to AEP samples. Table 1 also shows that the national UEP sample is also very close (91.3%) to the size of the complete AEP sample which is 15,590.

Table 1 below shows Trump favoring UEP discrepancies, or VC vote share greater than UEP vote share ($VC - UEP > 0$), in 21 of the 22 states. The statistical odds of an error in the same direction in 21 out of 22 cases is one out of 4,194,304.

Table 1: US 2020 Presidential General Election Trump Unadjusted Exit Poll Analysis

State	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP Sample Size Ratio	Biden UEP	Trump UEP	UEP Win (Trump=1, Biden=0)	Biden VC 01/18/21 (NYT)	Trump VC 1/18/2021 (NYT)	VC Win (Trump 1, Biden 0)	Trump VC increase relative to exit poll (+ indicates VC share > UEP share for Trump)	Random Sample SD assuming Trump UEP vote share and sample size	Random Sample Adjusted SD with 30% "Cluster Factor" added to Trump SD Estimate	VC - UEP Discrepancy Measured in Z-Score, or Adjusted SD's from Trump UEP Share	One tail P value: Probability of Trump VC share if UEP is True share	Odds of Trump VC if UEP is True: one in x chance	Red shift outside 95% Margin of Error (Odds Greater than 40)	95% Confidence Interval (CI) Low value for Trump VC deviation from UEP	95% Confidence Interval (CI) High value for Trump VC deviation from UEP	Trump VC above 95% CI upper bound	Odds of Trump VC being larger than UEP 21 out of 22 times
AZ	1,639	1,639	100.0%	50.5%	45.0%	0	49.4%	49.1%	0	4.0%	1.23%	1.6%	2.53	0.58%	173.5	AZ	41.9%	48.2%	49.1%	22
CA	2,127	2,271	93.7%	61.5%	36.5%	0	63.5%	34.3%	0	-2.2%	1.04%	1.4%	-1.63	5.18%	19.3		33.9%	39.2%		4,194,304
CO	1,677	1,677	100.0%	57.0%	39.1%	0	55.4%	41.9%	0	2.8%	1.19%	1.5%	1.78	3.75%	26.6		36.1%	42.2%		0.00001
FL	5,858	5,906	99.2%	48.9%	49.3%	1	47.9%	51.2%	1	2.0%	0.65%	0.8%	2.32	1.02%	98.3	FL	47.6%	50.9%	51.2%	190,650
GA	4,230	4,385	96.5%	50.2%	47.4%	0	49.5%	49.2%	0	1.8%	0.77%	1.0%	1.84	3.28%	30.5		45.4%	49.4%		
IA	2,562	2,602	98.5%	49.2%	48.3%	0	44.9%	53.1%	1	4.8%	0.99%	1.3%	3.73	0.01%	10513.9	IA	45.8%	50.8%	53.1%	
KY	1,613	1,656	97.4%	40.8%	58.2%	1	36.2%	62.1%	1	3.9%	1.23%	1.6%	2.45	0.71%	141.1	KY	55.0%	61.3%	62.1%	
ME	1,367	1,423	96.1%	54.5%	40.6%	0	53.1%	44.0%	0	3.4%	1.33%	1.7%	1.99	2.34%	42.6	ME	37.2%	44.0%	44.0%	
MI	2,698	2,719	99.2%	54.1%	44.9%	0	50.6%	47.8%	0	2.9%	0.96%	1.2%	2.36	0.91%	109.3		42.5%	47.3%		
MN	2,881	3,109	92.7%	52.5%	45.1%	0	52.4%	45.3%	0	0.1%	0.93%	1.2%	0.12	45.21%	2.2		42.8%	47.5%		
MT	1,089	1,121	97.1%	43.8%	51.8%	1	40.5%	56.9%	1	5.1%	1.51%	2.0%	2.60	0.47%	214.7	MT	47.9%	55.7%	56.9%	
NC	4,481	4,603	97.3%	49.0%	48.1%	0	48.6%	49.9%	1	1.9%	0.75%	1.0%	1.91	2.80%	35.7		46.2%	50.0%		
NH	2,218	2,300	96.4%	53.8%	43.7%	0	52.8%	45.5%	0	1.7%	1.05%	1.4%	1.27	10.25%	9.8		41.0%	46.4%		
NY	872	912	95.6%	62.6%	35.4%	0	60.9%	37.7%	0	2.3%	1.62%	2.1%	1.09	13.80%	7.2		31.3%	39.6%		
NV	3,834	3,927	97.6%	50.1%	43.9%	0	50.1%	47.7%	0	3.7%	0.80%	1.0%	3.60	0.02%	6174.2	NV	41.9%	46.0%	47.7%	
OH	5,865	5,946	98.6%	46.4%	51.7%	1	45.2%	53.3%	1	1.6%	0.65%	0.8%	1.85	3.20%	31.3		50.0%	53.4%		
OR	667	667	100.0%	56.5%	39.0%	0	56.5%	40.4%	0	1.4%	1.89%	2.5%	0.56	28.88%	3.5		34.2%	43.8%		
PA	3,069	3,090	99.3%	50.5%	47.5%	0	50.0%	48.8%	0	1.3%	0.90%	1.2%	1.08	14.08%	7.1		45.2%	49.8%		
SC	1,069	1,684	63.5%	46.0%	52.2%	1	43.4%	55.1%	1	3.0%	1.53%	2.0%	1.49	6.81%	14.7		48.3%	56.0%		
TX	4,734	4,768	99.3%	47.5%	51.1%	1	46.5%	52.1%	1	1.0%	0.73%	0.9%	1.07	14.30%	7.0		49.2%	52.9%		
VA	4,685	4,810	97.4%	55.1%	43.9%	0	54.1%	44.0%	0	0.1%	0.73%	0.9%	0.10	45.96%	2.2		42.1%	45.7%		
WI	3,069	3,954	77.6%	54.0%	43.5%	0	49.5%	48.8%	0	5.3%	0.89%	1.2%	4.58	0.00%	431627.7	WI	41.2%	45.8%	48.8%	
USA	14,318	15,690	91.3%	53.2%	44.8%	0	51.3%	46.8%	0	2.0%	0.42%	0.5%	3.66	0.01%	8076.0	USA	43.8%	45.9%	46.8%	

Table 1 also shows that in all 8 of the states (AZ, FL, IA, KY, ME, MT, NV, and WI) where the VC - UEP discrepancy was statistically significant (or outside of the statistical margin of error at the standard 95% Confidence Interval (CI)), this discrepancy was a "red shift" for Trump. Five of these states (AZ, FL, IA, NV, and WI) were "battleground" states. These highly statistically significant discrepancies, particularly in in IA and WI where Trump Vote Count shares had odds of less than one in 10,513 and 431,627, respectively, of occurring through random chance, strongly suggest possible vote miscount and should be forensically investigated. Trump's national VC red shift of 2% is

also well outside of the UEP 95% margin of error and thus highly statistically significant, with odds of less than one in 8,076 of occurring through random error.

A similar statistical UEP analysis of UEP discrepancies against Biden in Table 2 below shows that Biden got a lower VC than UEP share in all but one (CA) of the 22 states for which exit polls were conducted. Again, the statistical odds of an error in the same direction in 21 out of 22 cases is one out of 4,194,304.

Table 2: US 2020 Presidential General Election Biden Unadjusted Exit Poll Analysis

State	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP sample size ratio	Biden UEP	Trump UEP	UEP Win (Trump=1, Biden=0)	Biden VC (01/18/21 NYT)	Trump VC (1/18/21 NYT)	VC Win (Trump 1, Biden 0)	Biden VC decrease relative to exit poll (- indicates VC share < UEP share for Biden)	Random Sample SD assuming Biden UEP vote share and sample size	Random Sample Adjusted SD with 30% "Cluster Factor" added to Biden SD Estimate	UEP - VC Discrepancy Measured in Z-Score, or Adjusted SD's from Biden UEP Share	One tail P value: Probability of Biden VC share if UEP is True share	Odds based on Biden one tail Probability: one in x chance	Red shift outside 95% Margin of Error (Odds Greater than 40)	Biden VC Lower than bound of 95% CI	95% Confidence Interval (CI) Low value for Biden VC deviation from UEP	95% Confidence Interval (CI) High value for Biden VC deviation from UEP	Odds of Biden VC share being less than UEP share 21 out of 22 times
AZ	1639	1,639	100.0%	50.5%	45.0%	0	49.4%	49.1%	0	-1.1%	1.23%	1.6%	-0.68	24.95%	4.0			47.3%	53.6%	22
CA	2127	2,271	93.7%	61.5%	36.5%	0	63.5%	34.3%	0	2.0%	1.06%	1.4%	1.47	7.10%	14.1			58.8%	64.2%	4,194,304
CO	1677	1,677	100.0%	57.0%	39.1%	0	55.4%	41.9%	0	-1.6%	1.21%	1.6%	-1.03	15.12%	6.6			53.9%	60.1%	0.00001
FL	5858	5,906	99.2%	48.9%	49.3%	1	47.9%	51.2%	1	-1.0%	0.65%	0.8%	-1.16	12.21%	8.2			47.2%	50.5%	190,650
GA	4230	4,385	96.5%	50.2%	47.4%	0	49.5%	49.2%	0	-0.7%	0.77%	1.0%	-0.69	24.59%	4.1			48.2%	52.1%	
IA	2562	2,602	98.5%	49.2%	48.3%	0	44.9%	53.1%	1	-4.3%	0.99%	1.3%	-3.36	0.04%	2,523.1	IA	44.9%	46.7%	51.7%	
KY	1613	1,656	97.4%	40.8%	58.2%	1	36.2%	62.1%	1	-4.6%	1.22%	1.6%	-2.90	0.18%	542.1	KY	36.2%	37.7%	43.9%	
ME	1637	1,423	115.0%	54.5%	41.0%	0	53.1%	44.0%	0	-1.4%	1.23%	1.6%	-0.90	18.28%	5.5			51.4%	57.7%	
MI	2698	2,719	99.2%	54.1%	44.9%	0	50.6%	47.8%	0	-3.5%	0.96%	1.2%	-2.78	0.27%	365.6	MI	50.6%	51.7%	56.5%	
MN	2881	3,109	92.7%	52.5%	45.1%	0	52.4%	45.3%	0	-0.1%	0.93%	1.2%	-0.07	47.20%	2.1			50.1%	54.9%	
MT	1089	1,121	97.1%	43.8%	51.8%	1	40.5%	56.9%	1	-3.2%	1.50%	2.0%	-1.64	5.02%	19.9			39.9%	47.6%	
NC	4481	4,603	97.3%	49.0%	48.1%	0	48.6%	49.9%	1	-0.5%	0.75%	1.0%	-0.47	32.01%	3.1			47.1%	50.9%	
NH	2218	2,300	96.4%	53.8%	43.7%	0	52.8%	45.5%	0	-0.9%	1.06%	1.4%	-0.68	24.79%	4.0			51.1%	56.5%	
NY	872	912	95.6%	62.6%	35.4%	0	60.9%	37.7%	0	-1.7%	1.64%	2.1%	-0.79	21.53%	4.6			58.4%	66.7%	
NV	3834	3,927	97.6%	50.1%	43.9%	0	50.1%	47.7%	0	0.0%	0.81%	1.0%	-0.02	49.12%	2.0			48.0%	52.1%	
OH	5865	5,946	98.6%	46.4%	51.7%	1	45.2%	53.3%	1	-1.1%	0.65%	0.8%	-1.32	9.28%	10.8			44.7%	48.0%	
OR	667	667	100.0%	56.5%	39.0%	0	56.5%	40.4%	0	0.0%	1.92%	2.5%	-0.02	49.25%	2.0			51.6%	61.4%	
PA	3069	3,090	99.3%	50.5%	47.5%	0	50.0%	48.8%	0	-0.5%	0.90%	1.2%	-0.44	32.91%	3.0			48.2%	52.8%	
SC	1069	1,684	63.5%	46.0%	52.2%	1	43.4%	55.1%	1	-2.5%	1.52%	2.0%	-1.27	10.17%	9.8			42.1%	49.8%	
TX	4734	4,768	99.3%	47.5%	51.1%	1	46.5%	52.1%	1	-1.0%	0.73%	0.9%	-1.08	13.96%	7.2			45.7%	49.3%	
VA	4685	4,810	97.4%	55.1%	43.9%	0	54.1%	44.0%	0	-1.0%	0.73%	0.9%	-1.07	14.24%	7.0			53.3%	57.0%	
WI	3069	3,954	77.6%	54.0%	43.5%	0	49.5%	48.8%	0	-4.5%	0.90%	1.2%	-3.89	0.01%	19,700.9	WI	49.5%	51.7%	56.3%	
USA	14318	15,590	91.8%	53.2%	44.8%	0	51.3%	46.8%	0	-1.9%	0.42%	0.5%	-3.58	0.02%	5,795.2	USA	51.3%	52.2%	54.3%	

Table 2 also shows that in all four of the states (IA, KY, MI, and WI) where the UEP - VC < 0 discrepancy was statistically significant, or outside of a 95% margin of error or Confidence Interval (CI), this discrepancy

was a "red shift" against Biden. Of these 4 states, 3 (IA, MI and WI) were "battleground" states and in all three the shift against Biden was highly significant with odds of less than 1 in 2,523, 542, and 365 respectively. Table 2 also shows a national (USA) red shift of 1.9% against Biden that is well outside of the UEP 95% CI and thus highly statistically significant, with odds of less than one in 5,795 of occurring through random error.

Fortunately, in this election (unlike in 2004 and 2016, see references above) these red-shifts for Trump and against Biden did not change the final outcome of the national election, though Biden's UEP share was larger than Trump's in two additional states (IA and NC), and in IA the Trump favoring and Biden disfavoring UEP-VC discrepancies were both highly significant with odds of less than one in 10,513 and one in 2,523 of occurring because of random error.

More generally this pattern of consistent pro-Republican UEP - VC < 0 disparities (like similar red-shift patterns in prior US elections) strongly suggests politically motivated vote miscount and should be forensically investigated. This is particularly the case for states where these discrepancies are statistically highly significant or highly improbable - for example in WI and IA, where Trump VC shares had odds of less than one in 431,627 and 10,513, respectively, of being so much larger than UEP shares, and Biden VC shares had odds of less than one in 19,700 and 2,523, respectively, of being so much smaller than UEP shares, because of random error.⁴

Similarly suspect is the fact that in the national (USA) UEP Biden's margin of victory was almost 3% larger than in the official VC (8.4% rather than 5.5%),

⁴ A documented example showing that miscount may have contributed to changing the final outcome of the 2004 Presidential race can be found here: <https://freepress.org/article/official-states-electronic-voting-system-added-votes-never-cast-2004-presidential-election>

suggesting a popular vote win by more than 13 million rather than 8.5 million votes.

Senate Elections in 2020

UEP and AEP Senate data were captured for nine states (AL, GA, IA, KY, ME, NC, NH, SC, TX), covering nine General Election Senate races and the two Georgia run-off Senate races, where exit polling was conducted. Screen shots with Senate UEP shares, and sample sizes for states other than AL, IA, ME, NH, and TX can be found [here](#).⁵ Also, again, UEPs are calculated from gender vote shares except for Kentucky where regional weighted average vote shares were calculated as shown in table displayed in the link above. The AL Senate UEP sample size is estimated to be equal to the AL Senate AEP sample size. IA, ME, NH, and TX Senate UEP sample sizes are estimated to be equal to Presidential UEP sample sizes for these states. State U.S. Senate VCs can be found [here](#). State U.S. Senate AEPs and sample sizes can be found by searching "CNN election 2020 exit polls" for each state. For example, the AEP and sample size for the 2020 Alabama Senate race can be found [here](#).

Again, for each of these races Republican U.S. Senate Vote Counts (VCs) are compared to Republican U.S. Senate UEPs, and Democratic U.S. Senate VCs to Democratic U.S. Senate UEPs. As with the Presidential election in most cases U.S. Senate Republican VCs are higher than their UEPs and U.S. Senate Democratic VCs lower than their UEPs, leading to a "red shift", or Republican minus Democratic VC differences that are larger than Republican minus Democratic UEP differences.

⁵ Note, again: Zoom-in magnifying function is required to make out some of the data displayed in this pdf.

Table 3: US 2020 General Election Republican minus Democratic Senate Unadjusted Exit Poll Analysis

State Senate Race	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP Sample Size Ratio	Dem UEP	Rep UEP	UEP Win (Rep = 1, Dem = 0)	Dem VC	Rep VC	VC Win (Rep = 1, Dem = 0)	Vote Count Information Collection Date (NYT)	Rep VC increase relative to exit poll (+ indicates VC share > UEP share for Rep)	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP Sample Size Ratio	Random Sample SD assuming Rep UEP and Sample Size	Random Sample Adjusted SD with 30% "Cluster Factor" added to Rep SD Estimate	UEP - VC Discrepancy Measured in Z Score, or Adjusted SD's from Rep UEP Share	One tail P value: Probability of Rep VC share if UEP is True share	Odds based on Rep one tail Probability: one in x chance	Significant Red or Blue Shifts Outside of 95% Margin of Error (Odds Greater than 40)	Rep VC below lower bound of 95% CI	95% Confidence Interval (CI) Low value for Rep VC deviation from EP	95% Confidence Interval (CI) High value for Rep VC deviation from EP	Rep VC above upper bound of 95% CI
AL Jones/Tuberville	1180	1180	100.0%	46.2%	53.4%	1	39.7%	60.1%	1	1/20/2021	6.7%	1180	1180	100.0%	1.45%	1.9%	3.56	0.0%	5,333.0	AL Red shift to Tuberville	49.7%	57.1%	60.1%	
GA Warnock/Loeffler	4020	4172	96.4%	38.0%	28.8%	0	32.9%	25.9%	0	11/9/2020	-2.9%	4020	4172	96.4%	0.71%	0.9%	-3.12	0.1%	1,118.8	GA Blue shift to Warnock	25.9%	27.0%	30.6%	
GA Ossoff/Perdue	4192	4347	96.4%	49.0%	47.5%	0	47.9%	49.8%	1	11/11/2020	2.3%	4192	4347	96.4%	0.77%	1.0%	2.27	1.1%	87.1	GA Red shift to Purdue	45.6%	49.5%	49.8%	
IA Greenfield/Ernst	2562	2585	99.1%	48.2%	50.3%	1	45.2%	51.8%	1	1/20/2021	1.5%	2562	2585	99.1%	0.99%	1.3%	1.17	12.2%	8.2		47.8%	52.8%		
KY McGrath/McConnell	1615	1657	97.5%	42.8%	52.9%	1	38.2%	57.7%	1	1/20/2021	4.9%	1615	1657	97.5%	1.24%	1.6%	3.02	0.1%	793.3	KY Red shift to McConnell	49.7%	56.0%	57.7%	
ME Gideon/Collins	1119	1412	79.2%	45.8%	47.4%	1	42.4%	50.9%	1	1/20/2021	3.5%	1119	1412	79.2%	1.49%	1.9%	1.81	3.5%	28.2		43.6%	51.2%		
NC Cunningham/Tillis	4418	4536	97.4%	48.9%	48.1%	0	46.9%	48.7%	1	1/20/2021	0.6%	4418	4536	97.4%	0.75%	1.0%	0.62	26.7%	3.7		46.2%	50.0%		
NH Shaheen/Messner	2218	2277	97.4%	56.1%	42.9%	0	56.6%	41.0%	0	1/20/2021	-1.9%	2218	2277	97.4%	1.05%	1.4%	-1.37	8.5%	11.7		40.2%	45.5%		
SC Harrison/Graham	1603	1676	95.6%	47.8%	51.3%	1	44.2%	54.5%	1	1/20/2021	3.2%	1603	1676	95.6%	1.25%	1.6%	1.99	2.3%	43.3	SC Red shift to Graham	48.1%	54.4%	54.5%	
TX Hegar/Cornyn	4734	4768	99.3%	45.5%	53.1%	1	43.9%	53.5%	1	1/21/2021	0.5%	4734	4768	99.3%	0.73%	0.9%	0.49	31.3%	3.2		51.2%	54.9%		
GA Ossoff/Perdue Runoff	5759	5948	96.8%	50.3%	49.7%	0	50.6%	49.4%	0	1/20/2021	-0.3%	5759	5948	96.8%	0.66%	0.9%	-0.35	36.5%	2.7		48.0%	51.4%		
GA Warnock/Loeffler Runoff	5762	5948	96.9%	50.3%	49.7%	0	51.0%	49.0%	0	1/20/2021	-0.7%	5762	5948	96.9%	0.66%	0.9%	-0.84	19.9%	5.0		48.0%	51.4%		

Table 3 displays a statistical analysis of Senate Republican VCs minus UEP discrepancy for 11 Senate races in 10 states for which UEPs were conducted, and for the 2 later Georgia runoff races. Note that in the table the ratios of UEP/AEP sample sizes are 95% or more for all except the ME Senate race where this ratio is 79.2% again suggesting that UEP samples are in almost all cases very close to complete AEP samples.

As in the prior Tables, most of the UEP discrepancy is red shift, or higher VC than UEP, for Republican U.S. Senate candidates. There is red shift in 8 of the 10 General Election races (not Georgia Runoff) in the top 10 rows of Table 3. The exceptions are the GA-Warnock/Loeffler and NH Senate races. In four of these races (AL, GA (Ossoff/Perdue), KY, and SC) the UEP discrepancy is statistically significant (outside the 95% CI). Only one race, the GA-Warnock/Loeffler race, shows a statistically significant "blue shift", or

Loeffler receiving fewer votes than her UEP. However, this one case of statistically significant blue shift (2.9% against Loeffler) in all of the races for which UEPs were taken in the 2020 elections, is negated by the more than offsetting red shift (5.1% for Loeffler) against Warnock displayed in Table 4 below.

Table 4: US 2020 General Election Democratic minus Republican Senate Unadjusted Exit Poll Analysis

State Senate Race	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP Sample Size Ratio	Dem UEP	Rep UEP	UEP Win (Rep = 1, Dem = 0)	Dem VC	Rep VC	VC Win (Rep = 1, Dem = 0)	Vote Count Information Collection Date (NYT)	Rep VC increase relative to exit poll (+ indicates VC share > UEP share for Rep)	UEP Sample Size	AEP Sample Size	UEP/AEP Sample Size Ratio	Random Sample SD assuming Rep UEP and Sample Size	Random Sample Adjusted SD with 30% "Cluster Factor" added to Rep SD Estimate	UEP - VC Discrepancy Measured in Z-Score, or Adjusted SD's from Rep UEP Share	One tail P value: Probability of Rep VC share if UEP is True share	Odds based on Rep one tail Probability: one in x chance	Significant Red or Blue Shifts Outside of 95% Margin of Error (Odds Greater than 40)	Rep VC below lower bound of 95% CI	95% Confidence Interval (CI) Low value for Rep VC deviation from EP	95% Confidence Interval (CI) High value for Rep VC deviation from EP	Rep VC above upper bound of 95% CI
AL Jones/Tuberville	1180	1180	100.0%	46.2%	53.4%	1	39.7%	60.1%	1	1/20/2021	6.7%	1180	1180	100.0%	1.45%	1.9%	3.56	0.0%	5,333.0	AL Red shift to Tuberville		49.7%	57.1%	60.1%
GA Warnock/Loeffler	4020	4172	96.4%	38.0%	28.8%	0	32.9%	25.9%	0	11/9/2020	-2.9%	4020	4172	96.4%	0.71%	0.9%	-3.12	0.1%	1,118.8	GA Blue shift to Warnock	25.9%	27.0%	30.6%	
GA Ossoff/Perdue	4192	4347	96.4%	49.0%	47.5%	0	47.9%	49.8%	1	11/11/2020	2.3%	4192	4347	96.4%	0.77%	1.0%	2.27	1.1%	87.1	GA Red shift to Purdue		45.6%	49.5%	49.8%
IA Greenfield/Ernst	2562	2585	99.1%	48.2%	50.3%	1	45.2%	51.8%	1	1/20/2021	1.5%	2562	2585	99.1%	0.99%	1.3%	1.17	12.2%	8.2			47.8%	52.8%	
KY McGrath/McConnell	1615	1657	97.5%	42.8%	52.9%	1	38.2%	57.7%	1	1/20/2021	4.9%	1615	1657	97.5%	1.24%	1.6%	3.02	0.1%	793.3	KY Red shift to McConnell		49.7%	56.0%	57.7%
ME Gideon/Collins	1119	1412	79.2%	45.8%	47.4%	1	42.4%	50.9%	1	1/20/2021	3.5%	1119	1412	79.2%	1.49%	1.9%	1.81	3.5%	28.2			43.6%	51.2%	
NC Cunningham/Tillis	4418	4536	97.4%	48.9%	48.1%	0	46.9%	48.7%	1	1/20/2021	0.6%	4418	4536	97.4%	0.75%	1.0%	0.62	26.7%	3.7			46.2%	50.0%	
NH Shaheen/Messner	2218	2277	97.4%	56.1%	42.9%	0	56.6%	41.0%	0	1/20/2021	-1.9%	2218	2277	97.4%	1.05%	1.4%	-1.37	8.5%	11.7			40.2%	45.5%	
SC Harrison/Graham	1603	1676	95.6%	47.8%	51.3%	1	44.2%	54.5%	1	1/20/2021	3.2%	1603	1676	95.6%	1.25%	1.6%	1.99	2.3%	43.3	SC Red shift to Graham		48.1%	54.4%	54.5%
TX Hegar/Cornyn	4734	4768	99.3%	45.5%	53.1%	1	43.9%	53.5%	1	1/21/2021	0.5%	4734	4768	99.3%	0.73%	0.9%	0.49	31.3%	3.2			51.2%	54.9%	
GA Ossoff/Perdue Runoff	5759	5948	96.8%	50.3%	49.7%	0	50.6%	49.4%	0	1/20/2021	-0.3%	5759	5948	96.8%	0.66%	0.9%	-0.35	36.5%	2.7			48.0%	51.4%	
GA Warnock/Loeffler Runoff	5762	5948	96.9%	50.3%	49.7%	0	51.0%	49.0%	0	1/20/2021	-0.7%	5762	5948	96.9%	0.66%	0.9%	-0.84	19.9%	5.0			48.0%	51.4%	

Table 4 depicts U.S. Senate Democratic VC - UEP < 0 discrepancies 2020 for U.S. Senate Democratic candidates.

Again, almost all of the discrepancies in the General Election (9 out of 10) show red shift, the lone exception (NH) shows statistically insignificant blue shift. In this case all six of the statistically significant discrepancies (AL, GA (for Loeffler), IA, KY, NC, and SC) are red shifts. Moreover, the statistically significant red shift against Cunningham

(for Tillis) in NC suggests that Cunningham may have won when the voters marked their ballots as Cunningham had a larger UEP Vote Share than Tillis.

Finally, Tables 3 and 4 both show blue shift for Ossoff and Warnock in the GA Senate runoff races, but as these blue shifts are in all cases within the 95% CI they are more likely to be a result of random statistical (or other) UEP error.

This pattern of consistent pro-Republican UEP - VC discrepancies (like similar red-shift patterns in prior US elections) strongly suggests politically motivated vote miscount and should be forensically investigated, particularly in cases where the discrepancies are statistically significant and may have changed the final election outcome as in the Senate race in NC.

About the authors:

Ron Baiman is an Associate Professor of Economics teaching courses in economics and statistics at Benedictine University in Lisle, Illinois.

Peter Peckarsky was a 2022 candidate for the Democratic nomination to be a U.S. Senator from Wisconsin.

Jonathan Simon is Executive Director of the Election Defense Alliance.