The Appendix to *Ballot Battles: The History of Disputed Elections in the United States* contains three tables concerning overtime statewide elections. Accompanying the three tables in the appendix is a general explanation of the methodology and sources used to generate the data for those tables. This document supplements that general explanation with information on sources used for specific entries in the tables (along with, as needed, additional notes).

The structure of the following information is that for each row, a source that supplies information for multiple columns in a row is identified by the first such column. For example, if a source provides the information for the “Date Conceded” and also the existence (or absence) of a recount or litigation, the source is listed below in connection with the “Data Conceded” column. (Occasionally, a source is repeated to avoid confusion with an intervening source.)

**Table A.1  Overtime Gubernatorial Elections, 1878 to Present**

**1878 OR:** *Initial Margin:* “The Vote on Governor,” *Morning Oregonian*, June 8, 1878; *Date Conceded:* “Oregon,” *Morning Oregonian*, June 21, 1878.


**1886 NH:** *Date Conceded:* “Sawyer Gets There,” *Salt Lake City Herald*, June 2, 1887.


1902 NY: Date Conceded: “Coler Thanks Murphy,” Los Angeles Times, November 7, 1902.


1912 ID: Date Conceded: “Idaho Safe for Taft,” Santa Ana Register (CA), November 7, 1912.


1919 MD: Date Conceded: “Platform Promises to be Kept—Ritchie,” Daily News (MD), November 10, 1919.

1924 MO: Date Conceded: “Nelson Will Not Contest Baker’s Vote,” Macon-Chronicle Herald (MO), December 20, 1924.
1924 NM: Initial Margin: “Coolidge Wins in New Mexico by the Latest Returns,” Santa Cruz Evening News (CA), November 7, 1924; Date Conceded: “Otero Drops Case,” El Paso Herald (TX), September 21, 1925; Recount: “File Motion to Strike Otero’s Name from Suit,” Albuquerque Journal, January 23, 1925.

1926 AZ: Initial Margin: “No Title,” Philadelphia Inquirer, November 3, 1926. (Associated Press dated November 2, 1926); Date Conceded: “E.S. Clark, Defeat’d Candidate Gov. Decides to Not Contest,” Casa Grande Valley Dispatch (AZ), December 17, 1926.


1926 NM: Date Conceded: “Hannett Concedes Defeat,” El Paso Herald (TX), November 4, 1926.

1926 WY: Initial Margin: “[No Title],” Philadelphia Inquirer, November 3, 1926 (Associated Press dated November 2, 1926); Date Conceded: “Emerson Elected,” Big Piney Examiner (WY), November 4, 1926; “Woman Governor Admits Defeat,” San Bernardino County Sun (CA), November 5, 1926.


1932 ME: Initial Margin: “G.O.P. Maine Loss is First in 18 Years,” Washington Post, September 14, 1932 (election held on Monday, September 12; totals from the following Wednesday, with 619 of 632 precincts reporting); Date Conceded: “Says Martin Will Not Ask Recount Governor Vote,” Lewiston Daily Sun (ME), November 22, 1932; Recount: “Second Day Shows Gains for Democrats,” Portsmouth Herald (NH), October 19, 1932 (partial recount).


1940 IN: Initial Margin: “Indiana,” Washington Post, November 7, 1940; Final Margin: “Press Fight in Two States Over Election of Governors,” Chicago Tribune, January 23, 1941; Date Conceded: “Give Schricker Clear Title to Governor Seat,” Chicago Tribune, March 7, 1941; Recount: The losing candidate petitioned the legislature for a recount in early January and a legislative committee was convened to investigate his claims. “Group Named to Hear Vote Fraud Claims,” Vidette-Messenger (IN), January 24, 1941; “Hammond Lawyer Asks Gubernatorial Recount,” Franklin Evening Star (IN), January 14, 1941; Litigation: “Give Schricker Clear Title to Governor Seat,” Chicago Tribune, March 7, 1941.
1940 KS: Initial Margin: “Kansas,” Washington Post, November 7, 1940; “Kansas Race Continues Close,” Los Angeles Times, November 8, 1940; Date Conceded: Even after Ratner’s inauguration, Burke surrogates continued to openly discuss the potential of further contest proceedings, which the coverage treated as a serious possibility. See, e.g., “Ratner Takes the Oath for Second Term,” Emporia Gazette (KS), January 13, 1941. The first located article deeming the dispute effectively over was “Contest Deadline Near,” Iola Register (KS), January 20, 1941 (quoting “capital observers [who] now believe there is little chance of [a contest].”) Burke’s next public appearance—a speech before the Kansas State society’s annual dinner in Washington, DC—seemed to confirm this observation, as the “unsuccessful Democratic candidate for governor” delivered a lengthy and wide-ranging speech but made no mention of any planned dispute. “Kansans Panned in Burke Speech,” Emporia Gazette (KS), January 29, 1941; Recount: Rumors of a potential recount occasionally appeared, but never materialized. See, e.g., “Fees Blasts Dems,” Iola Register (KS), December 9, 1940; Litigation: Burke v. State Board of Canvassers, 152 Kan. 826 (1940).


1940 WA: Initial Margin: “Seattle’s Mayor Increases Lead in Race for Governor,” Los Angeles Times, November 7, 1940; Date Conceded: “G.O.P. Quashes Washington State Contest,” Salt Lake Tribune (UT), January 15, 1941; Litigation: The losing candidate (or at least his surrogates) publicly considered—but ultimately rejected—court challenges. See “Dill May Take Vote Into Court,” Fairbanks Daily News-Miner (AK), November 15, 1940; “Dill Concedes Loss of Governor Race,” Salt Lake Tribune (UT), December 5, 1940.

1944 UT: Initial Margin: “Election Returns Given by States,” Los Angeles Times, November 9, 1944; Date Conceded: “Lee Drops Fight to Obtain Governor Ballot Recount,” Salt Lake Tribune (UT), May 27, 1945; Recount: The losing candidate dropped his efforts to obtain a recount after his petition in Utah district court was denied; Litigation: “Lee Files Court Action to Disqualify Maw,” Salt Lake Tribune (UT), December 23, 1944.


1950 MI: Final Margin: This was the margin of victory certified by the state canvassing board. The losing candidate subsequently pursued a recount, but abandoned it on December 12, when results from 3,082 of the state’s 4,355 precincts showed the winning candidate increased his total from 1,154 to 4,119 votes. See Roy R. Glashan, American Governors and Gubernatorial

1952 MI: Final Margin: This was the margin of victory certified by the state canvassing board. The losing candidate subsequently pursued a recount, but abandoned it on December 16 when results from 1,800 of the state’s 4,479 precincts showed the winning candidate increased his total from 8,618 to 10,710 votes. See Glashan, America’s Governors, 154; Date Conceded: “Alger Concedes Williams Victory,” News-Palladium (MI), December 17, 1952; Recount: “Recount is Ordered in Michigan Contest,” New York Times, November 29, 1952; Litigation: “Alger Concedes Williams Victory,” News-Palladium (MI), December 17, 1952.


1956 RI: Initial Margin %: The Times’ Thursday edition indicated that 11,069 absentee ballots remained uncounted. That Friday’s edition appears to confirm that these 11,069 were the only uncounted ballots. This estimated margin reflects those conclusions; Final Margin: Roberts v. Board of Elections, 85 R.I. 203 (1957); Date Conceded: “Roberts’ Election To Be Challenged,” Newport Daily News (RI), January 2, 1957; Recount: “Rhode Island Recount Gives Governor Hope,” Los Angeles Times, November 20, 1962.


2010 CT: Date Conceded: Christopher Keating & Jon Lender, “Foley Gives up Fight; Concedes to Malloy, says Election Valid,” Hartford Courant (CT), November 9, 2010.


Table A.2 Overtime U.S. Senate Elections, 1914 to Present


1978 VA: Date Conceded: “Around the Nation: Recount Call is Dropped in Virginia Senate Race,” *New York Times*, December 18, 1978; Recount: The losing candidate requested a recount,
but rescinded his request when his campaign was unable to pay for it. “Warner’s Foe Drops Request for Recount,” Los Angeles Times, December 18, 1978.


2004 AK: Date Conceded: A third party, Alaskans for Fair Elections requested and triggered the recount. The date reported here is the day election officials resolved the requested recount because the Democratic nominee did not contest the election. See Matt Volz, “Vote Recount of Senate Race Results in No Changes,” Anchorage Daily Press (AK), December 18, 2004.


Additional Note: The 1992 Georgia election for US senator has been left off of this chart, despite not being settled until well after Election Day. In 1992, the Democratic incumbent received 49 percent of the vote to his Republican challenger’s 48 percent. Ronald Smothers, “Georgia Senator in Runoff,” New York Times, November 4, 1992. However, because Georgia law required that a candidate in a statewide win by a majority vote, the Democrat and Republican were forced into a runoff against each other. Ibid. The Republican later won the runoff held on November 24, 1992 by a 51 percent to 49 percent margin. Ronald Smothers, “Republicans Taking Heat From Senate-Runoff Victory in Georgia,” New York Times, November 26, 1992. Although there was litigation over the validity of the runoff election, the litigation was initiated by parties independent of the two candidates. See Public Citizen, Inc. v. Miller, 992 F.2d 1548 (11th Cir. 1993). The unique circumstances caused by the peculiarities of the Georgia law ultimately take the election outside the scope of overtime elections analyzed in this book.

Table A.3 Overtime Statewide Elections: 2000 to Present


Recount: No recount was requested. Instead, this election went into overtime because the Democratic candidate decided to wait until all of the absentee and provisional ballots were counted. This number totaled more than 60,000 uncounted.


2010 AK US Senate: Initial Margin: Because Senator Murkowski’s votes were included with all other write-in candidates, it is impossible to know the precise initial margin separating her and Republican Party nominee Joe Miller. Early newspaper totals counted all write-in votes as votes for Murkowski, which likely slightly inflated her totals. See Brendan Joel Kelley, “History—At the Culmination of a Poisonous Political Season, Senator Murkowski Appears to Have Won Her Write-in Campaign,” Anchorage Press (AK), November 4, 2010 (reporting a margin of 13,588 between Miller’s tally and the write-in votes); “West: Too Close to Call, but Lots of Fun to Watch (At Least from Afar),” New York Times, November 4, 2010; Final Margin: Lisa Demer, “Court Rejects Miller, Lifts Certification Hold,” Anchorage Daily News (AK), December 29, 2010; Final Margin %: This % accounts for votes cast for other candidates, including the Democrat. Ibid. (reporting Murkowski’s and Miller’s totals); See also “2010 General Election,” www.elections.alaska.gov/results/10GENR/data/results.pdf (reporting totals for other candidates), State of Alaska Division of Elections, accessed February 20, 2015; Date Conceded: Richard Mauer, “Miller Gives up Election Challenge,” Anchorage Daily News (AK), January 1, 2011; Litigation: Miller v Treadwell, 245 P3d 867 (Alaska 2010).

2010 CT Governor: Date Conceded: Christopher Keating & Jon Lender, “Foley Gives up Fight; Concedes to Malloy, Says Election Valid; Governor’s Race,” Hartford Courant (CT), November 9, 2010.


2011 WI Supreme Court: \textit{Initial Margin}: “Recount Expected in Wisconsin Supreme Court Justice Election,” \textit{Wausau Daily Herald} (WI), April 7, 2011; \textit{Final Margin}: “2011 Supreme Court Statewide Recount Information,” State of Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, accessed February 20, 2015, \url{http://gab.wi.gov/node/1719}. The winner of the election flipped from the Democratic nominee to the Republican between the initial reported margin and the final certified results; \textit{Date Conceded}: Jason Stein & Don Walker, “Kloppenburg Concedes Race,” \textit{Milwaukee Journal Sentinel} (WI), May 31, 2011; \textit{Winning Party}: The election was technically a nonpartisan election, but Prosser received support from Republicans, while the Democratic Party backed Kloppenburg.