

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

October 2006



the
Williams
INSTITUTE

Gary J. Gates, PhD
Senior Research Fellow, The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation
Law and Public Policy, UCLA School of Law

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

INTRODUCTION

The news that same-sex couples lived in nearly every county of the United States marked one of most reported on statistics from the release of Census 2000 data. Since then, policy debates focusing on marriage and partnership rights for same-sex couples have led academics and policy-makers alike to use these data in hopes of gaining a more complete and accurate understanding of this population (e.g., Gates and Ost 2004; Congressional Budget Office 2004; Badgett and Sears 2005).

The release of new data from the American Community Survey (ACS) this month offers the first opportunity to update what we have learned and to assess possible changes in the geographic and demographic characteristics of same-sex couples. **Analyses of the ACS 2005 data reveal that:**

- **The number of same-sex couples in the U.S. grew by more than 30 percent from 2000 to 2005, from nearly 600,000 couples in 2000 to almost 777,000 in 2005.** Such an increase is five times the six percent rate of growth in the U.S. population. Most likely as stigma associated with same-sex partnering and homosexuality in general decreases, more same-sex couples are willing to identify themselves as such on government surveys like the ACS.
- **At the state level, the largest percentage increase in the number of same-sex couples occurred throughout the Midwest, an area that had relatively low rates of these couples in Census 2000.** The ten states with the largest percentage increase include Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio. In addition, Colorado and New Hampshire also ranked in the top ten in terms of percentage growth.
- **Six of the eight states with a 2006 ballot initiative that would ban same-sex marriage—Arizona, Colorado, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin—experienced increases in the number of same-sex couples in excess of the national rate of 30 percent.**
- **There are an estimated 8.8 million gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) persons in the U.S.**
- **Among the states, California, Florida, New York, Texas, and Illinois have the largest GLB populations along with the District of Columbia. New York, Los**

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, and Boston have the largest GLB populations among metropolitan areas.

- **Ranking states by the percentage of the adult population who are GLB, the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Washington, Massachusetts and Maine come out on top.** Among large metropolitan areas, San Francisco, Seattle, Boston, Portland (OR), and Tampa rank in the top five in this statistic.
- **Same-sex couples are found in all Congressional districts in the U.S.** The release of the 2005 ACS marks the first time that data regarding same-sex couples are available for current Congressional districts. Congressional districts with the highest number and percentage of GLB individuals in the population tend to be more urban with California's 8th district (San Francisco) ranking first in both categories.

THE NUMBER OF SAME-SEX COUPLES INCREASED BY 30% IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 2000-2005

Census 2000 officially counted 594,391 same-sex couples in the United States. As of 2005, that figure has grown to an estimated 776,943 couples, an increase of more than 30 percent. In contrast, the national population grew by only 6% from 2000 to 2005. The increase was larger for male couples (37 percent) than for female couples (24 percent). Of the same-sex couples, 413,095 (53 percent) are male and 363,848 (47 percent) are female.


Note that Census 2000 counts come from an actual count of the full U.S. population, while data from the American Community Survey are estimates drawn from a 1.4 million household sample of the U.S. population. The ACS is designed to replace the long-form in the 2010 census.

MORE SAME-SEX COUPLES ARE IDENTIFYING THEMSELVES IN THE MIDWEST

The pattern of the increases in same-sex couples is not uniform across the country. As shown in the map below and in Table 1, the largest increases are observed in New Hampshire, many states across the Midwest, and Washington. Smaller increases are observed in more populous states like California and Texas.

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Increase in Same-Sex Couples, 2000-2005



Notably, six of the eight states with measures to ban same-sex marriage on the 2006 ballot evidenced increases in the number of same-sex couples exceeding 30 percent.

Table 1. Top ten states (and DC) ranked by the percent increase in same-sex couples from 2000 to 2005.

Rank	% Increase in Same-sex couples, 2000 to 2005	
1	New Hampshire	106%
2	Wisconsin	81%
3	Minnesota	76%
4	Nebraska	71%
5	Kansas	68%
6	Ohio	62%
7	Colorado	58%
8	Iowa	58%
9	Missouri	56%
10	Indiana	54%

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Increases and decreases in population are often understood as indicators of mobility patterns in the population. This is likely not the case for same-sex couples as the changes observed differ from broader mobility patterns in the United States, namely population movements to the South and West. Increases in the number of same-sex couples are more likely a result of at least two important factors, both related to increasing acceptance of same-sex relationships within the U.S. population:

1. Larger portions of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals may be choosing to couple with partners of the same sex.
2. Larger numbers of same-sex couples may be willing to report the nature of their relationship to the Census Bureau.

While both of these trends might be occurring, it seems likely that coupling rates of GLB individuals would not change on the order of the magnitude observed in these data over such a short period of time. Increased visibility represents the most likely scenario to explain such a rapid increase.

ACS USEFUL IN ESTIMATING THE SIZE OF THE GLB POPULATION

Census and ACS are the only sources of data available that count the number of same-sex couples at state and local levels. These data can be useful in generating estimates of the size of the entire gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) population for states, metropolitan areas, and within Congressional districts.

Analyses from the National Survey of Family Growth find that 4.1 percent of men and women aged 18-45 identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual. If 4.1 percent of all adults identify as such, then an estimated 8.8 million adults are gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the United States.

Assuming that the proportion of all same-sex couples who live in a given state or locality is the same as the proportion of all GLB individuals living in that area, then ACS data can be used to estimate the size of this population within states, metropolitan areas, and Congressional districts. The size of the GLB population in any area can be estimated by multiplying the estimate of 8.8 million GLB adults by the percentage of all same-sex couples residing in a given state, metropolitan area, or Congressional district. For example, since nearly 15 percent of same-sex couples live in California, the estimated size of the GLB population in California is approximately 1.3 million (15 percent of 8.8 million GLB people in the U.S.)

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

DC HAS THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE OF GLB INDIVIDUALS IN THE POPULATION AND CALIFORNIA HAS THE LARGEST NUMBER OF GLB ADULTS

Table 2 ranks states by the estimated percentage of the adult population that is GLB. This measure provides a sense of how common it is to find a GLB person in a state, regardless of the state's size. The District of Columbia ranks first in the percentage of gay men, lesbians and bisexuals in the population. This is perhaps not surprising given its urban character. Previous studies have shown that lesbians and gay men are somewhat more likely to live in cities than the general population (Gates and Ost 2004). Other states with the largest percentages of GLB individuals cluster primarily in the Northeast (New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont) and West (Washington, California, Colorado, and New Mexico). Minnesota is the only state in this top ten from the Midwest.

Table 2. Top ten states (and DC) ranked by the estimated percent of adults who are gay, lesbian or bisexual.

Rank	Estimated % of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals in the adult population	
1	District of Columbia	8.1%
2	New Hampshire	6.6%
3	Washington	5.7%
4	Massachusetts	5.7%
5	Maine	5.2%
6	California	5.2%
7	Colorado	5.1%
8	Vermont	5.1%
9	New Mexico	4.9%
10	Minnesota	4.7%

Table 3 shows the ten states with the largest GLB populations. States with relatively large populations generally rank among those with the largest GLB population, though Massachusetts and Washington both rank higher in this category than their population size would predict. Nine of the ten states in this list were in the top ten in Census 2000, with Washington as the new entrant likely due to its 50 percent increase in same-sex couples between 2000 and 2005.

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Table 3. Top ten states (and DC) ranked by the estimated size of the gay, lesbian and bisexual population.

Rank	Estimated size the of gay, lesbian, and bisexual population	
1	California	1,338,164
2	Florida	609,219
3	New York	592,337
4	Texas	579,968
5	Illinois	345,395
6	Ohio	335,110
7	Pennsylvania	323,454
8	Georgia	278,943
9	Massachusetts	269,074
10	Washington	266,983

SAN FRANCISCO RANKS FIRST IN THE PERCENTAGE OF GLB INDIVIDUALS IN THE POPULATION AND NEW YORK CITY HAS THE LARGEST NUMBER OF GLB ADULTS

The 2005 ACS makes possible new rankings of metropolitan areas by the proportion of GLB population and by the actual size of the GLB population (metropolitan areas are multi-county areas that often include more than one city). However, since geographic definitions of metropolitan areas have changed since Census 2000, estimates of the change in the number of same-sex couples for these areas are not possible.

Table 4 ranks metropolitan areas by the proportion of GLB adults. While it may not be surprising that metropolitan areas like San Francisco, Seattle, and Boston are home to relatively large proportions of GLB residents, some may find it curious that cities like Tampa, Orlando, and Hartford also make the top ten in this ranking. Moreover, with the exception of Austin, the proportion of GLB residents tends to be higher in the actual cities contained within the metropolitan areas shown. The proportion nearly doubles in cities like San Francisco, Seattle, Boston, and Minneapolis.

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Table 4. Top ten metropolitan areas (among the fifty largest in the U.S.) ranked by the estimated percent of adults who are gay, lesbian or bisexual.

Rank	Estimated % of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals in the adult population	Metro	Largest
		Area	City
1	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont	8.2%	15.4%
2	Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue	6.5%	12.9%
3	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy	6.2%	12.3%
4	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton	6.1%	8.8%
5	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater	5.9%	6.1%
6	Austin-Round Rock	5.9%	4.8%
7	Denver-Aurora	5.8%	8.2%
8	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington	5.7%	12.5%
9	Orlando-Kissimmee	5.7%	7.7%
10	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford	5.6%	6.8%

Similar to state rankings, Table 5 shows that rankings by size of the GLB population generally follow broader population patterns, with some notable exceptions. Neither Boston nor San Francisco rank among the ten most populous metropolitan areas.

Table 5. Top ten metropolitan areas (among the fifty largest in the U.S.) ranked by the estimated size of the gay, lesbian and bisexual population.

Rank	Estimated size of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population
1	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island 568,903
2	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana 442,211
3	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet 288,748
4	San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont 256,313
5	Boston-Cambridge-Quincy 201,344
6	Washington-Arlington-Alexandria 191,959
7	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington 183,718
8	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach 183,346
9	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta 180,168
10	Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington 179,459

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

ACS MARKS FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The 2005 ACS marks the first time that estimates of the number of same-sex couples and the size of the GLB population can be made for current Congressional districts (109th Congress). Notably, all districts have same-sex couples present.

The ranking of Congressional districts by both the percentage of GLB adults in Table 6 and the size of the GLB population in Table 7 show the same districts in slightly different order. This is not surprising given that all Congressional districts have relatively similar population sizes. Since urban areas tend to include higher fractions of registered Democrats, it is no surprise that most of the top ten districts, which are relatively urban, are currently represented by Democrats.

Table 6. Top ten Congressional districts (109th Congress) ranked by the estimated percent of adults who are gay, lesbian or bisexual.

Rank	Estimated % of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals in the adult population
1	District 8, California (San Francisco) 16.6%
2	District 7, Washington (Seattle) 13.2%
3	District 9, California (Oakland) 12.4%
4	District 8, Massachusetts (Somerville) 11.3%
5	District 45, California (Palm Springs) 10.8%
6	District 5, Georgia (Atlanta) 10.8%
7	District 8, New York (NY City) 10.6%
8	District 53, California (San Diego) 10.5%
9	District 5, Minnesota (Minneapolis) 9.5%
10	District 9, Illinois (Evanston) 9.3%

Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

Table 7. Top ten Congressional districts (109th Congress) ranked by the estimated size of the gay, lesbian and bisexual population.

Rank	Estimated size of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual population	
1	District 8, California	83,229
2	District 7, Washington	67,652
3	District 45, California	59,533
4	District 8, New York	58,871
5	District 9, California	57,228
6	District 5, Georgia	51,456
7	District 8, Massachusetts	50,837
8	District 53, California	46,791
9	District 9, Illinois	42,861
10	District 5, Minnesota	42,124

Full rankings of states, metropolitan areas, and Congressional Districts are included in the Appendices of this report.

CONCLUSION

This first analysis of 2005 American Community Survey data contains some new insights. The number of same-sex couples increased by 30 percent from counts made in Census 2000. Growth in the number of same-sex couples throughout the Midwest suggests that as acceptance of lesbian and gay couples reaches into America's Heartland, more couples are willing to identify themselves. The ACS data also reveal some consistent geographic patterns among same-sex couples. Geographic distribution patterns across metropolitan areas show that same-sex couples, and presumably the broader GLB population, still tend to cluster in higher concentrations in the Northeast and the West. However, GLB populations are on the rise in other urban areas. Notably two cities in Florida not historically thought of as having large GLB populations, Tampa and Orlando, now rank in the top ten in estimates of the percentage of GLB residents in the population. New estimates of the size of the GLB population by Congressional district also demonstrate that gay men and lesbians live in every district in the country.



Same-sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Jason Ost for production of the map. Thanks also to Brad Sears, Lee Badgett, Deborah Ho and Darcy Pottle for editorial assistance.

REFERENCES

Badgett, MVL, and B Sears. (2005). Putting a price on equality? The impact of allowing same-sex couples to marry on California's budget. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, 16(1), 197-232.

Congressional Budget Office. (2004). The potential budgetary impact of recognizing same-sex marriages. Retrieved October 8, 2006 from <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=5559&sequence=0>.

Gates, GJ and J Ost. (2004). *The Gay and Lesbian Atlas*, Washington, Urban Institute Press.

Appendix 1. Estimates for the number of same-sex couples, increases since 2000 and number of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals in states.

State	Same-sex couples (2005)	Same-sex couples (2000)	Percent increase in couples ^A	Same-sex male couples (2005)	Same-sex female couples (2005)	Est. percent of population that is gay, lesbian, or bisexual	Est. number of gay, lesbian, bisexual adults
Alabama	8,602	8,109	-	3,681	4,921	2.8%	94,639
Alaska	1,644	1,180	-	685	959	4.1%	18,768
Arizona	16,931	12,332	37%	9,472	7,459	4.5%	191,663
Arkansas	5,890	4,423	-	2,810	3,080	3.2%	64,424
California	107,772	92,138	17%	59,963	47,809	5.2%	1,338,164
Colorado	15,915	10,045	58%	7,302	8,613	5.1%	173,674
Connecticut	10,174	7,386	-	5,274	4,900	4.5%	115,511
Delaware	2,087	1,868	-	917	1,170	3.9%	24,001
District of Columbia	3,420	3,678	-	2,319	1,101	8.1%	32,599
Florida	54,929	41,048	34%	30,538	24,391	4.6%	609,219
Georgia	24,424	19,288	27%	13,830	10,594	4.3%	278,943
Hawaii	3,262	2,389	-	1,575	1,687	4.4%	41,785
Idaho	2,096	1,873	-	1,164	932	2.3%	23,615
Illinois	30,013	22,887	31%	16,365	13,648	3.8%	345,395
Indiana	15,714	10,219	54%	9,493	6,221	3.8%	169,700
Iowa	5,833	3,698	58%	3,169	2,664	2.8%	62,494
Kansas	6,663	3,973	68%	3,146	3,517	3.6%	72,557
Kentucky	9,710	7,114	36%	4,429	5,281	3.4%	106,094
Louisiana	9,006	8,808	-	4,992	4,014	3.1%	102,315
Maine	4,847	3,394	43%	2,062	2,785	5.2%	52,801
Maryland	15,607	11,243	39%	7,992	7,615	4.4%	178,266
Massachusetts	23,744	17,099	39%	11,356	12,388	5.7%	269,074
Michigan	22,701	15,368	48%	12,466	10,235	3.4%	251,682
Minnesota	16,081	9,147	76%	8,515	7,566	4.7%	175,611
Mississippi	4,330	4,774	-	2,370	1,960	2.3%	48,711
Missouri	14,722	9,428	56%	8,427	6,295	3.8%	160,912
Montana	1,662	1,218	-	806	856	2.6%	18,703
Nebraska	3,986	2,332	71%	2,376	1,610	3.4%	42,934
Nevada	6,017	4,973	-	2,724	3,293	3.9%	68,565
New Hampshire	5,578	2,703	106%	1,953	3,625	6.6%	63,787
New Jersey	20,677	16,604	25%	12,125	8,552	3.9%	245,628
New Mexico	6,063	4,496	-	3,399	2,664	4.9%	68,411
New York	50,854	46,490	-	27,267	23,587	4.2%	592,337
North Carolina	19,648	16,198	21%	10,459	9,189	3.4%	212,104
North Dakota	1,070	703	-	607	463	2.3%	11,003
Ohio	30,669	18,937	62%	15,720	14,949	4.0%	335,110
Oklahoma	8,159	5,763	42%	3,754	4,405	3.5%	89,561
Oregon	10,899	8,932	22%	5,339	5,560	4.5%	121,645

Pennsylvania	29,213	21,166	38%	14,794	14,419	3.5%	323,454
Rhode Island	2,376	2,471	-	1,014	1,362	3.4%	27,040
South Carolina	10,563	7,609	39%	4,764	5,799	3.8%	117,033
South Dakota	998	826	-	569	429	1.9%	10,554
Tennessee	13,570	10,189	33%	7,669	5,901	3.4%	148,868
Texas	49,423	42,912	15%	28,135	21,288	3.6%	579,968
Utah	4,307	3,370	-	2,309	1,998	3.2%	53,832
Vermont	2,157	1,933	-	1,124	1,033	5.1%	23,871
Virginia	19,673	13,802	43%	10,789	8,884	4.0%	220,309
Washington	23,903	15,900	50%	11,762	12,141	5.7%	266,983
West Virginia	3,423	2,916	-	1,749	1,674	2.7%	37,692
Wisconsin	14,894	8,232	81%	6,909	7,985	3.9%	160,698
Wyoming	1,044	807	-	667	377	3.0%	11,419

^a – indicates that any increase/decrease is not considered statistically significant.

Appendix 2. Estimates for the number of same-sex couples and number of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals within the fifty largest metropolitan areas in the United States and the largest city in each metropolitan area, 2005.

Metropolitan Area	SS Couples	SS Male Couples	SS Female Couples	Est. % GLB	Est. GLB	City	SS Couples	SS Male Couples	SS Female Couples	Est. % GLB	Est. GLB
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	15,493	9,228	6,265	5.1%	180,168	Atlanta	3,812	2,905	907	12.8%	39,085
Austin-Round Rock, TX	5,453	2,935	2,518	5.9%	61,732	Austin	2,362	894	1,468	4.8%	24,615
Baltimore-Towson, MD	8,862	4,274	4,588	5.2%	100,031	Baltimore	2,842	1,601	1,241	6.9%	30,778
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	2,191	1,307	884	3.0%	24,276	Birmingham	895	810	85	5.6%	9,263
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	17,705	8,560	9,145	6.2%	201,344	Boston	4,876	2,755	2,121	12.3%	50,540
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	2,655	1,581	1,074	3.3%	28,193	Buffalo	599	297	302	3.0%	5,668
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	3,350	1,911	1,439	3.3%	36,464	Charlotte	1,660	1,014	646	3.9%	17,170
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	24,375	14,350	10,025	4.3%	288,748	Chicago	10,001	6,218	3,783	5.7%	114,449
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	5,207	2,568	2,639	3.8%	57,027	Cincinnati	992	400	592	4.2%	9,129
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	6,183	3,323	2,860	4.3%	66,943	Cleveland	1,067	786	281	3.5%	10,524
Columbus, OH	6,301	2,939	3,362	5.5%	68,300	Columbus	3,444	1,452	1,992	6.7%	34,952
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	15,554	8,513	7,041	4.5%	183,718	Dallas	5,283	3,550	1,733	7.0%	58,473
Denver-Aurora, CO	9,177	4,403	4,774	5.8%	99,626	Denver	3,387	1,488	1,899	8.2%	33,698
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	8,794	5,503	3,291	3.0%	98,402	Detroit	791	691	100	1.5%	8,591
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	4,365	2,166	2,199	5.6%	49,000	Hartford	507	410	97	6.8%	5,292
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	12,762	8,088	4,674	4.1%	152,288	Houston	5,511	3,926	1,585	4.4%	61,976
Indianapolis, IN	5,030	2,777	2,253	4.5%	52,963	Indianapolis	2,680	1,793	887	4.8%	26,712
Jacksonville, FL	3,361	1,643	1,718	4.0%	36,422	Jacksonville	2,194	1,022	1,172	4.1%	22,840
Kansas City, MO-KS	6,537	4,112	2,425	5.1%	72,080	Kansas City	2,151	1,451	700	6.7%	22,360
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	4,244	1,940	2,304	3.9%	48,532	Las Vegas	1,591	757	834	4.6%	17,925
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	34,152	18,641	15,511	4.8%	442,211	Los Angeles	12,372	7,313	5,059	5.6%	154,270
Louisville, KY-IN	3,268	1,564	1,704	3.9%	35,149	Louisville/Jefferson County	1,649	803	846	4.2%	17,102
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	2,757	1,295	1,462	3.4%	30,531	Memphis	1,546	773	773	3.5%	16,141
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	15,767	10,002	5,765	4.5%	183,346	Miami	1,353	697	656	5.5%	15,277
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	3,786	1,651	2,135	3.7%	40,407	Milwaukee	1,804	654	1,150	4.6%	18,243
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	11,855	6,395	5,460	5.7%	130,472	Minneapolis	3,356	2,608	748	12.5%	34,259
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN	3,623	1,936	1,687	3.8%	39,263	Nashville-Davidson	2,033	1,274	759	5.1%	20,313

New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	2,990	1,796	1,194	3.7%	35,230	New Orleans	1,427	949	478	5.1%	16,554
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	47,292	26,884	20,408	4.1%	568,903	New York	23,321	13,655	9,666	4.5%	272,493
Oklahoma City, OK	2,619	1,284	1,335	3.3%	28,288	Oklahoma City	1,420	882	538	3.8%	14,877
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	7,238	3,476	3,762	5.7%	81,272	Orlando	1,243	533	710	7.7%	12,508
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	15,696	6,827	8,869	4.2%	179,459	Philadelphia	4,033	1,575	2,458	4.2%	43,320
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	11,658	6,462	5,196	4.8%	132,960	Phoenix	5,535	3,243	2,292	6.4%	63,222
Pittsburgh, PA	4,766	3,035	1,731	2.8%	50,994	Pittsburgh	805	602	203	3.5%	7,935
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	8,299	4,372	3,927	6.1%	94,027	Portland	3,438	1,716	1,722	8.8%	35,413
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	3,810	1,506	2,304	3.6%	43,417	Providence	488	159	329	4.8%	5,564
Richmond, VA	2,630	1,597	1,033	3.4%	28,750	Richmond	482	316	166	3.4%	4,705
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	10,177	5,688	4,489	4.9%	131,555	Riverside	404	252	152	2.5%	5,379
Rochester, NY	3,313	1,953	1,360	4.8%	36,310	Rochester	961	534	427	6.8%	9,371
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	7,052	3,360	3,692	5.5%	81,759	Sacramento	2,824	1,514	1,310	9.8%	32,108
Salt Lake City, UT	2,171	1,101	1,070	3.7%	26,761	Salt Lake City	968	414	554	7.6%	10,726
San Antonio, TX	3,831	2,038	1,793	3.5%	46,188	San Antonio	2,757	1,651	1,106	3.8%	32,631
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	8,759	5,526	3,233	4.9%	102,016	San Diego	5,437	3,700	1,737	6.8%	61,945
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	21,862	13,163	8,699	8.2%	256,313	San Francisco	8,490	6,233	2,257	15.4%	94,234
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	5,081	3,172	1,909	5.0%	63,941	San Jose	2,829	1,740	1,089	5.8%	37,260
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	14,099	7,358	6,741	6.5%	154,835	Seattle	5,762	3,324	2,438	12.9%	57,993
St. Louis, MO-IL	7,562	4,069	3,493	4.1%	83,769	St. Louis	1,642	1,353	289	6.8%	16,868
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	11,194	6,446	4,748	5.9%	119,044	Tampa	1,402	916	486	6.1%	14,119
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	4,058	2,145	1,913	3.9%	44,689	Virginia Beach	1,220	851	369	4.4%	13,913
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	16,730	9,705	7,025	5.0%	191,959	Washington	3,420	2,319	1,101	8.1%	32,599

Appendix 3. Estimates for the number of same-sex couples and number of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals within all Congressional Districts (109th Congress), 2005.

Congressional District	SS Couples	SS Male Couples	SS Female Couples	Est. % GLB	Est. GLB
District 1, Alabama	1,156	297	859	2.7%	12,888
District 2, Alabama	946	436	510	2.2%	10,372
District 3, Alabama	1,409	291	1,118	3.3%	15,308
District 4, Alabama	1,223	807	416	2.9%	13,880
District 5, Alabama	1,252	429	823	2.8%	13,671
District 6, Alabama	1,231	614	617	2.6%	13,616
District 7, Alabama	1,385	807	578	3.4%	14,813
District (at Large), Alaska	1,644	685	959	4.1%	18,768
District 1, Arizona	1,348	670	678	3.1%	15,470
District 2, Arizona	1,379	581	798	2.5%	15,934
District 3, Arizona	2,652	1,382	1,270	5.9%	28,985
District 4, Arizona	3,347	2,198	1,149	9.0%	40,529
District 5, Arizona	1,804	1,130	674	3.8%	19,747
District 6, Arizona	1,991	984	1,007	3.7%	22,864
District 7, Arizona	1,998	1,197	801	4.6%	23,297
District 8, Arizona	2,412	1,330	1,082	4.8%	25,540
District 1, Arkansas	1,655	821	834	3.7%	18,154
District 2, Arkansas	1,440	891	549	3.0%	15,397
District 3, Arkansas	1,508	790	718	3.1%	16,864
District 4, Arkansas	1,287	308	979	2.9%	14,030
District 1, California	2,592	1,237	1,355	5.9%	29,504
District 2, California	2,493	1,233	1,260	5.6%	29,090
District 3, California	2,033	864	1,169	4.4%	23,431
District 4, California	1,669	907	762	3.6%	19,573
District 5, California	3,380	1,607	1,773	7.9%	38,201
District 6, California	3,194	2,064	1,130	7.5%	35,435
District 7, California	1,356	604	752	3.6%	16,805
District 8, California	7,645	5,579	2,066	16.6%	83,229
District 9, California	5,135	2,543	2,592	12.4%	57,228
District 10, California	1,991	1,057	934	4.7%	23,692
District 11, California	2,186	1,394	792	5.1%	26,864
District 12, California	2,498	1,369	1,129	6.2%	30,018
District 13, California	1,352	597	755	3.7%	17,400
District 14, California	1,818	1,233	585	4.4%	21,256
District 15, California	1,854	934	920	4.8%	22,979
District 16, California	1,879	1,238	641	5.7%	25,601
District 17, California	1,547	507	1,040	4.4%	19,307
District 18, California	865	245	620	2.4%	11,369
District 19, California	1,637	858	779	3.9%	20,138
District 20, California	1,180	924	256	3.8%	15,690
District 21, California	1,599	1,068	531	4.3%	20,867

District 22, California	1,389	581	808	3.3%	16,234
District 23, California	1,778	674	1,104	4.7%	22,217
District 24, California	1,559	739	820	4.1%	19,538
District 25, California	1,047	225	822	2.7%	13,456
District 26, California	1,733	623	1,110	4.5%	22,514
District 27, California	2,498	1,127	1,371	6.6%	32,284
District 28, California	2,606	1,422	1,184	7.3%	35,047
District 29, California	1,773	1,151	622	4.5%	21,852
District 30, California	3,524	2,465	1,059	7.4%	37,564
District 31, California	2,297	1,543	754	6.9%	30,655
District 32, California	1,010	258	752	3.3%	15,220
District 33, California	1,741	1,198	543	4.1%	19,781
District 34, California	808	501	307	2.6%	11,232
District 35, California	1,209	627	582	3.4%	15,742
District 36, California	1,697	952	745	3.9%	19,377
District 37, California	2,268	1,086	1,182	6.5%	30,173
District 38, California	2,447	1,175	1,272	8.4%	37,152
District 39, California	1,485	945	540	4.9%	22,253
District 40, California	1,023	699	324	2.8%	13,750
District 41, California	1,710	467	1,243	3.9%	20,396
District 42, California	1,176	576	600	3.3%	15,779
District 43, California	867	408	459	2.6%	12,186
District 44, California	1,403	687	716	3.4%	18,967
District 45, California	4,929	3,511	1,418	10.8%	59,533
District 46, California	1,828	1,134	694	4.5%	22,451
District 47, California	945	432	513	3.5%	14,907
District 48, California	1,601	806	795	3.6%	18,458
District 49, California	1,142	616	526	2.8%	14,162
District 50, California	1,291	936	355	3.0%	15,374
District 51, California	1,052	452	600	3.0%	13,566
District 52, California	1,569	807	762	3.8%	18,168
District 53, California	4,464	3,078	1,386	10.5%	46,791
District 1, Colorado	3,437	1,488	1,949	7.5%	34,119
District 2, Colorado	1,933	824	1,109	4.4%	21,880
District 3, Colorado	1,068	638	430	2.4%	11,544
District 4, Colorado	3,010	1,085	1,925	6.9%	33,772
District 5, Colorado	1,703	842	861	3.9%	18,413
District 6, Colorado	2,230	1,145	1,085	4.9%	25,825
District 7, Colorado	2,534	1,280	1,254	5.9%	27,224
District 1, Connecticut	2,742	1,424	1,318	5.9%	30,645
District 2, Connecticut	2,525	1,327	1,198	5.6%	28,471
District 3, Connecticut	1,364	946	418	3.0%	15,200
District 4, Connecticut	2,259	1,100	1,159	5.3%	26,635
District 5, Connecticut	1,284	477	807	2.8%	14,659
District (at Large), Delaware	2,087	917	1,170	3.9%	24,001
Delegate District (at Large), District of Columbia	3,420	2,319	1,101	8.1%	32,599
District 1, Florida	1,943	1,222	721	4.3%	20,957
District 2, Florida	1,156	454	702	2.5%	12,274

District 3, Florida	1,785	679	1,106	4.2%	18,667
District 4, Florida	1,826	802	1,024	4.0%	19,670
District 5, Florida	3,039	1,709	1,330	5.4%	34,120
District 6, Florida	2,291	1,142	1,149	4.6%	25,425
District 7, Florida	2,035	1,015	1,020	3.9%	22,554
District 8, Florida	2,992	1,493	1,499	6.0%	32,874
District 9, Florida	2,735	1,629	1,106	5.5%	29,689
District 10, Florida	3,743	1,865	1,878	7.4%	37,960
District 11, Florida	2,148	1,340	808	4.6%	21,981
District 12, Florida	1,716	788	928	3.5%	18,942
District 13, Florida	2,337	1,417	920	4.3%	24,870
District 14, Florida	2,051	775	1,276	3.6%	22,074
District 15, Florida	2,451	1,303	1,148	4.7%	27,110
District 16, Florida	1,806	881	925	3.6%	20,568
District 17, Florida	1,251	664	587	3.2%	15,034
District 18, Florida	3,263	2,365	898	7.2%	36,239
District 19, Florida	1,485	819	666	2.9%	16,136
District 20, Florida	3,380	2,176	1,204	7.0%	36,760
District 21, Florida	1,176	543	633	3.0%	15,466
District 22, Florida	2,611	1,774	837	5.3%	28,313
District 23, Florida	1,643	1,125	518	4.0%	18,990
District 24, Florida	2,640	1,739	901	5.3%	30,200
District 25, Florida	1,426	819	607	3.5%	18,960
District 1, Georgia	1,423	572	851	3.4%	15,748
District 2, Georgia	939	456	483	2.4%	10,244
District 3, Georgia	1,703	916	787	4.3%	19,085
District 4, Georgia	2,987	1,636	1,351	7.0%	32,727
District 5, Georgia	4,916	3,653	1,263	10.8%	51,456
District 6, Georgia	1,875	1,058	817	4.2%	22,501
District 7, Georgia	1,535	1,023	512	3.3%	18,633
District 8, Georgia	1,623	856	767	3.5%	19,301
District 9, Georgia	1,228	551	677	2.7%	14,117
District 10, Georgia	2,229	1,282	947	4.9%	26,721
District 11, Georgia	1,766	807	959	4.2%	19,901
District 12, Georgia	1,106	390	716	2.7%	12,030
District 13, Georgia	1,094	630	464	2.5%	13,118
District 1, Hawaii	1,316	792	524	3.4%	16,638
District 2, Hawaii	1,946	783	1,163	5.5%	25,279
District 1, Idaho	922	548	374	2.0%	10,579
District 2, Idaho	1,174	616	558	2.7%	12,965
District 1, Illinois	1,141	578	563	2.9%	13,247
District 2, Illinois	894	401	493	2.2%	10,473
District 3, Illinois	1,294	758	536	3.3%	15,415
District 4, Illinois	2,132	957	1,175	6.6%	29,348
District 5, Illinois	2,466	1,769	697	5.8%	28,176
District 6, Illinois	1,806	720	1,086	4.6%	22,169
District 7, Illinois	1,619	1,081	538	3.8%	16,882
District 8, Illinois	1,391	564	827	3.2%	16,829
District 9, Illinois	3,979	2,926	1,053	9.3%	42,861

District 10, Illinois	1,175	920	255	3.0%	13,859
District 11, Illinois	2,133	716	1,417	4.9%	25,357
District 12, Illinois	1,533	465	1,068	3.5%	16,458
District 13, Illinois	1,470	860	610	3.3%	17,873
District 14, Illinois	919	488	431	2.1%	11,492
District 15, Illinois	1,388	452	936	3.1%	14,869
District 16, Illinois	950	651	299	2.1%	11,096
District 17, Illinois	1,102	457	645	2.5%	11,614
District 18, Illinois	1,269	785	484	2.8%	13,537
District 19, Illinois	1,352	817	535	3.0%	14,561
District 1, Indiana	2,064	1,470	594	4.6%	23,416
District 2, Indiana	1,539	895	644	3.5%	16,740
District 3, Indiana	1,649	1,493	156	3.6%	17,887
District 4, Indiana	1,444	595	849	3.0%	15,869
District 5, Indiana	2,303	1,094	1,209	4.6%	25,312
District 6, Indiana	1,501	944	557	3.3%	16,288
District 7, Indiana	2,092	1,349	743	4.5%	20,289
District 8, Indiana	1,494	798	696	3.3%	16,037
District 9, Indiana	1,628	855	773	3.5%	17,701
District 1, Iowa	1,053	539	514	2.6%	11,396
District 2, Iowa	1,683	758	925	4.0%	17,791
District 3, Iowa	1,090	790	300	2.6%	11,507
District 4, Iowa	856	361	495	2.1%	9,302
District 5, Iowa	1,151	721	430	2.9%	12,396
District 1, Kansas	1,249	840	409	2.8%	13,285
District 2, Kansas	1,427	711	716	3.1%	15,412
District 3, Kansas	2,349	842	1,507	5.0%	26,333
District 4, Kansas	1,638	753	885	3.6%	17,842
District 1, Kentucky	1,151	420	731	2.5%	12,502
District 2, Kentucky	1,887	547	1,340	4.0%	20,917
District 3, Kentucky	1,854	946	908	3.8%	19,266
District 4, Kentucky	1,770	823	947	3.8%	19,830
District 5, Kentucky	807	404	403	1.8%	9,226
District 6, Kentucky	2,241	1,289	952	4.6%	23,847
District 1, Louisiana	1,308	780	528	3.0%	15,056
District 2, Louisiana	1,728	1,164	564	4.7%	20,340
District 3, Louisiana	686	358	328	1.7%	8,263
District 4, Louisiana	1,045	673	372	2.5%	11,400
District 5, Louisiana	951	415	536	2.4%	10,502
District 6, Louisiana	1,265	598	667	3.0%	14,164
District 7, Louisiana	2,023	1,004	1,019	4.8%	22,508
District 1, Maine	3,413	1,360	2,053	7.3%	37,298
District 2, Maine	1,434	702	732	3.1%	15,571
District 1, Maryland	1,913	1,136	777	4.1%	21,713
District 2, Maryland	1,717	676	1,041	3.7%	18,991
District 3, Maryland	2,749	1,163	1,586	6.0%	30,106
District 4, Maryland	1,447	517	930	3.4%	17,018
District 5, Maryland	1,098	703	395	2.5%	13,124
District 6, Maryland	1,995	757	1,238	4.4%	22,986

District 7, Maryland	2,263	1,689	574	5.5%	25,339
District 8, Maryland	2,425	1,351	1,074	5.4%	28,171
District 1, Massachusetts	1,725	478	1,247	4.1%	19,363
District 2, Massachusetts	2,411	1,033	1,378	5.7%	27,706
District 3, Massachusetts	1,997	1,259	738	4.8%	23,134
District 4, Massachusetts	1,678	796	882	4.0%	18,712
District 5, Massachusetts	1,621	776	845	4.1%	19,069
District 6, Massachusetts	2,968	1,765	1,203	7.2%	34,189
District 7, Massachusetts	1,932	570	1,362	4.6%	21,812
District 8, Massachusetts	4,809	2,595	2,214	11.3%	50,837
District 9, Massachusetts	2,210	1,054	1,156	5.5%	25,540
District 10, Massachusetts	2,393	1,030	1,363	5.3%	26,879
District 1, Michigan	1,482	788	694	3.2%	15,942
District 2, Michigan	2,350	1,238	1,112	5.3%	26,436
District 3, Michigan	1,503	765	738	3.4%	16,678
District 4, Michigan	1,813	792	1,021	4.0%	20,135
District 5, Michigan	1,486	699	787	3.4%	16,086
District 6, Michigan	1,441	744	697	3.2%	15,691
District 7, Michigan	1,277	485	792	2.9%	14,183
District 8, Michigan	1,517	832	685	3.4%	17,296
District 9, Michigan	2,359	1,341	1,018	5.1%	25,696
District 10, Michigan	1,508	778	730	3.3%	17,353
District 11, Michigan	1,157	952	205	2.6%	13,248
District 12, Michigan	1,323	791	532	2.9%	14,077
District 13, Michigan	834	551	283	2.2%	9,197
District 14, Michigan	829	558	271	2.1%	9,248
District 15, Michigan	1,822	1,152	670	4.1%	20,439
District 1, Minnesota	1,014	464	550	2.4%	10,966
District 2, Minnesota	1,920	1,017	903	4.4%	22,323
District 3, Minnesota	2,376	1,187	1,189	5.5%	25,993
District 4, Minnesota	2,303	773	1,530	5.6%	24,223
District 5, Minnesota	4,133	2,927	1,206	9.5%	42,124
District 6, Minnesota	1,822	967	855	4.2%	21,516
District 7, Minnesota	1,183	512	671	2.8%	12,722
District 8, Minnesota	1,330	668	662	2.9%	14,241
District 1, Mississippi	1,420	491	929	3.0%	16,307
District 2, Mississippi	589	406	183	1.4%	6,506
District 3, Mississippi	853	558	295	1.8%	9,576
District 4, Mississippi	1,468	915	553	3.1%	16,474
District 1, Missouri	864	478	386	2.1%	9,149
District 2, Missouri	2,589	1,378	1,211	6.0%	30,236
District 3, Missouri	1,967	1,414	553	4.5%	21,474
District 4, Missouri	1,030	705	325	2.4%	11,453
District 5, Missouri	2,629	2,039	590	6.0%	27,639
District 6, Missouri	1,960	802	1,158	4.5%	21,555
District 7, Missouri	785	335	450	1.7%	8,528
District 8, Missouri	1,344	584	760	3.1%	14,567
District 9, Missouri	1,554	692	862	3.6%	16,863
District (at Large), Montana	1,662	806	856	2.6%	18,703

District 1, Nebraska	1,215	699	516	3.0%	13,147
District 2, Nebraska	1,632	1,117	515	4.1%	17,719
District 3, Nebraska	1,139	560	579	2.9%	12,111
District 1, Nevada	2,048	851	1,197	4.3%	23,419
District 2, Nevada	1,773	784	989	3.6%	20,178
District 3, Nevada	2,196	1,089	1,107	3.8%	24,978
District 1, New Hampshire	2,667	982	1,685	6.2%	30,396
District 2, New Hampshire	2,911	971	1,940	7.0%	33,406
District 1, New Jersey	1,674	1,036	638	4.0%	19,369
District 2, New Jersey	1,480	855	625	3.4%	16,918
District 3, New Jersey	1,672	1,013	659	3.7%	19,396
District 4, New Jersey	1,513	807	706	3.5%	17,541
District 5, New Jersey	678	383	295	1.7%	8,178
District 6, New Jersey	2,220	1,268	952	5.5%	26,446
District 7, New Jersey	1,519	777	742	3.8%	18,764
District 8, New Jersey	2,007	1,206	801	5.2%	24,736
District 9, New Jersey	780	704	76	1.8%	9,320
District 10, New Jersey	2,038	1,240	798	5.2%	24,121
District 11, New Jersey	1,752	756	996	4.3%	21,234
District 12, New Jersey	2,036	1,104	932	5.0%	24,662
District 13, New Jersey	1,308	976	332	3.2%	15,281
District 1, New Mexico	2,451	1,167	1,284	5.4%	26,079
District 2, New Mexico	2,085	1,451	634	5.3%	23,604
District 3, New Mexico	1,527	781	746	3.9%	18,311
District 1, New York	1,687	700	987	4.2%	21,359
District 2, New York	1,500	886	614	4.1%	20,174
District 3, New York	1,159	295	864	3.1%	15,058
District 4, New York	1,582	814	768	4.4%	21,646
District 5, New York	999	485	514	2.6%	13,222
District 6, New York	589	305	284	1.7%	8,054
District 7, New York	1,349	783	566	3.3%	16,617
District 8, New York	5,556	4,398	1,158	10.6%	58,871
District 9, New York	1,383	481	902	3.3%	16,484
District 10, New York	1,403	458	945	3.5%	16,447
District 11, New York	2,159	970	1,189	5.3%	25,266
District 12, New York	1,454	835	619	3.7%	17,567
District 13, New York	1,467	670	797	3.5%	18,141
District 14, New York	3,375	2,313	1,062	6.1%	33,509
District 15, New York	1,694	807	887	3.9%	18,706
District 16, New York	1,306	934	372	3.4%	14,529
District 17, New York	1,428	471	957	3.6%	17,285
District 18, New York	1,857	1,117	740	4.7%	22,622
District 19, New York	1,112	534	578	2.8%	13,703
District 20, New York	2,077	881	1,196	4.7%	23,621
District 21, New York	1,619	962	657	3.5%	17,422
District 22, New York	1,746	849	897	4.0%	19,527
District 23, New York	1,488	812	676	3.5%	16,418
District 24, New York	1,909	861	1,048	4.4%	20,893
District 25, New York	2,091	777	1,314	4.7%	22,763

District 26, New York	1,394	1,034	360	3.3%	15,692
District 27, New York	1,413	540	873	3.1%	14,987
District 28, New York	2,230	1,475	755	5.1%	22,716
District 29, New York	1,828	820	1,008	4.2%	20,091
District 1, North Carolina	612	427	185	1.5%	6,642
District 2, North Carolina	1,757	1,007	750	4.2%	19,582
District 3, North Carolina	1,271	712	559	2.9%	13,305
District 4, North Carolina	2,107	884	1,223	4.4%	22,469
District 5, North Carolina	1,265	729	536	2.8%	13,829
District 6, North Carolina	1,200	1,010	190	2.7%	13,386
District 7, North Carolina	1,272	361	911	2.8%	13,642
District 8, North Carolina	1,040	552	488	2.4%	11,216
District 9, North Carolina	1,670	937	733	3.4%	18,161
District 10, North Carolina	1,362	628	734	3.1%	15,045
District 11, North Carolina	2,275	897	1,378	4.8%	23,997
District 12, North Carolina	1,591	1,092	499	3.6%	16,584
District 13, North Carolina	2,226	1,223	1,003	4.8%	23,927
District (at Large), North Dakota	1,070	607	463	2.3%	11,003
District 1, Ohio	1,134	410	724	2.7%	11,647
District 2, Ohio	2,156	1,158	998	4.9%	23,697
District 3, Ohio	1,526	754	772	3.5%	16,488
District 4, Ohio	1,633	707	926	3.9%	17,736
District 5, Ohio	1,320	878	442	3.2%	14,762
District 6, Ohio	1,382	1,019	363	3.3%	15,415
District 7, Ohio	1,110	789	321	2.6%	12,460
District 8, Ohio	1,062	622	440	2.5%	11,896
District 9, Ohio	2,180	884	1,296	5.2%	23,530
District 10, Ohio	2,140	1,586	554	5.0%	22,798
District 11, Ohio	1,374	570	804	3.3%	13,711
District 12, Ohio	2,989	1,395	1,594	6.5%	32,131
District 13, Ohio	1,739	586	1,153	4.0%	19,324
District 14, Ohio	1,556	930	626	3.6%	17,880
District 15, Ohio	2,568	1,146	1,422	5.8%	27,138
District 16, Ohio	1,364	683	681	3.3%	15,432
District 17, Ohio	1,928	1,153	775	4.6%	21,134
District 18, Ohio	1,508	450	1,058	3.6%	17,211
District 1, Oklahoma	2,133	1,186	947	4.4%	23,007
District 2, Oklahoma	922	378	544	2.0%	10,452
District 3, Oklahoma	1,483	607	876	3.3%	16,761
District 4, Oklahoma	1,719	587	1,132	3.6%	19,053
District 5, Oklahoma	1,902	996	906	3.8%	19,850
District 1, Oregon	2,583	1,318	1,265	5.3%	29,117
District 2, Oregon	1,457	788	669	2.9%	16,072
District 3, Oregon	3,333	1,825	1,508	6.9%	36,541
District 4, Oregon	1,181	585	596	2.4%	13,058
District 5, Oregon	2,345	823	1,522	5.0%	26,961
District 1, Pennsylvania	2,069	961	1,108	5.2%	22,805
District 2, Pennsylvania	1,740	629	1,111	4.2%	18,074
District 3, Pennsylvania	1,143	722	421	2.7%	12,513

District 4, Pennsylvania	1,168	790	378	2.7%	13,001
District 5, Pennsylvania	1,419	566	853	3.3%	15,697
District 6, Pennsylvania	1,616	780	836	3.6%	18,486
District 7, Pennsylvania	2,206	1,130	1,076	5.2%	25,308
District 8, Pennsylvania	1,468	637	831	3.5%	17,607
District 9, Pennsylvania	1,187	626	561	2.7%	13,216
District 10, Pennsylvania	1,354	691	663	3.1%	14,763
District 11, Pennsylvania	1,152	571	581	2.5%	12,754
District 12, Pennsylvania	833	468	365	1.9%	9,020
District 13, Pennsylvania	1,792	601	1,191	4.3%	20,374
District 14, Pennsylvania	1,444	964	480	3.2%	14,266
District 15, Pennsylvania	1,774	780	994	4.0%	20,220
District 16, Pennsylvania	1,831	934	897	4.3%	20,775
District 17, Pennsylvania	1,883	1,223	660	4.2%	20,501
District 18, Pennsylvania	1,346	884	462	3.0%	14,809
District 19, Pennsylvania	1,788	837	951	3.9%	19,989
District 1, Rhode Island	1,191	502	689	3.5%	13,492
District 2, Rhode Island	1,185	512	673	3.4%	13,547
District 1, South Carolina	3,152	1,232	1,920	6.1%	34,374
District 2, South Carolina	1,965	931	1,034	4.1%	21,525
District 3, South Carolina	1,187	530	657	2.6%	13,160
District 4, South Carolina	1,861	776	1,085	4.0%	20,627
District 5, South Carolina	1,475	668	807	3.3%	16,817
District 6, South Carolina	923	627	296	2.2%	10,228
District (at Large), South Dakota	998	569	429	1.9%	10,554
District 1, Tennessee	978	701	277	2.1%	10,708
District 2, Tennessee	2,227	1,434	793	4.7%	24,430
District 3, Tennessee	1,488	810	678	3.3%	16,248
District 4, Tennessee	1,455	802	653	3.3%	16,519
District 5, Tennessee	2,216	1,355	861	4.9%	22,711
District 6, Tennessee	1,605	634	971	3.4%	18,017
District 7, Tennessee	1,370	796	574	3.1%	15,991
District 8, Tennessee	1,022	716	306	2.4%	11,226
District 9, Tennessee	1,209	421	788	2.9%	12,561
District 1, Texas	752	310	442	1.8%	8,604
District 2, Texas	1,669	1,022	647	3.9%	19,108
District 3, Texas	1,999	968	1,031	4.1%	23,327
District 4, Texas	1,357	830	527	3.1%	16,003
District 5, Texas	806	537	269	1.9%	9,476
District 6, Texas	1,630	633	997	3.7%	19,213
District 7, Texas	2,229	1,845	384	4.4%	23,601
District 8, Texas	1,644	1,174	470	3.7%	19,435
District 9, Texas	1,728	1,058	670	4.4%	20,542
District 10, Texas	1,551	664	887	3.1%	17,959
District 11, Texas	866	635	231	2.0%	9,560
District 12, Texas	1,995	831	1,164	4.4%	23,632
District 13, Texas	663	447	216	1.6%	7,178
District 14, Texas	922	276	646	2.1%	10,780
District 15, Texas	999	606	393	2.5%	12,403

District 16, Texas	1,210	706	504	3.2%	15,005
District 17, Texas	1,092	733	359	2.6%	12,852
District 18, Texas	1,481	747	734	3.8%	16,863
District 19, Texas	1,167	653	514	2.8%	12,564
District 20, Texas	1,199	721	478	3.2%	14,209
District 21, Texas	2,781	829	1,952	5.5%	31,076
District 22, Texas	1,901	1,009	892	4.3%	24,382
District 23, Texas	1,653	1,198	455	3.9%	20,361
District 24, Texas	1,393	672	721	3.0%	16,100
District 25, Texas	1,419	870	549	3.6%	17,235
District 26, Texas	2,297	1,127	1,170	5.2%	27,582
District 27, Texas	1,282	674	608	3.4%	15,694
District 28, Texas	1,029	514	515	2.7%	12,935
District 29, Texas	1,031	808	223	3.1%	13,599
District 30, Texas	1,904	1,311	593	4.9%	21,901
District 31, Texas	2,408	1,421	987	5.5%	27,820
District 32, Texas	3,366	2,306	1,060	8.2%	38,842
District 1, Utah	1,365	818	547	3.0%	16,760
District 2, Utah	1,777	879	898	3.7%	21,129
District 3, Utah	1,165	612	553	2.8%	15,656
District (at Large), Vermont	2,157	1,124	1,033	5.1%	23,871
District 1, Virginia	1,448	577	871	3.1%	16,731
District 2, Virginia	2,126	1,351	775	5.3%	23,736
District 3, Virginia	1,654	841	813	3.8%	16,893
District 4, Virginia	1,348	755	593	3.1%	15,472
District 5, Virginia	1,390	663	727	3.0%	15,167
District 6, Virginia	1,910	975	935	4.2%	20,410
District 7, Virginia	1,545	729	816	3.3%	17,341
District 8, Virginia	3,489	1,977	1,512	7.4%	37,479
District 9, Virginia	1,033	616	417	2.3%	11,357
District 10, Virginia	1,349	765	584	2.9%	16,230
District 11, Virginia	2,381	1,540	841	5.6%	29,052
District 1, Washington	1,767	840	927	3.7%	19,770
District 2, Washington	1,661	660	1,001	3.6%	18,649
District 3, Washington	3,249	1,571	1,678	6.9%	38,002
District 4, Washington	1,839	800	1,039	4.4%	21,926
District 5, Washington	2,071	1,020	1,051	4.5%	22,389
District 6, Washington	2,323	1,241	1,082	4.9%	25,130
District 7, Washington	6,628	3,682	2,946	13.2%	67,652
District 8, Washington	2,873	1,237	1,636	6.3%	33,167
District 9, Washington	1,492	711	781	3.4%	16,813
District 1, West Virginia	1,318	1,025	293	3.1%	14,328
District 2, West Virginia	1,066	442	624	2.5%	11,756
District 3, West Virginia	1,039	282	757	2.5%	11,572
District 1, Wisconsin	1,726	956	770	3.7%	19,321
District 2, Wisconsin	2,850	1,216	1,634	5.7%	30,679
District 3, Wisconsin	1,478	663	815	3.1%	16,079
District 4, Wisconsin	1,857	707	1,150	4.2%	18,827
District 5, Wisconsin	1,428	691	737	3.0%	15,828

District 6, Wisconsin	1,161	437	724	2.5%	12,471
District 7, Wisconsin	2,291	1,205	1,086	4.7%	24,480
District 8, Wisconsin	2,103	1,034	1,069	4.4%	22,710
District (at Large), Wyoming	1,044	667	377	3.0%	11,419