



POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

DATABASE DEVELOPMENT, ANALYSIS AND PUBLICATION;
POLITICAL AND CENSUS DATA; REDISTRICTING SUPPORT

CLARK BENSEN

POLIDATA · 3112 Cave Court, Suite B · Lake Ridge, VA 22192-1167
Tel: 703-690-4066 · Fax: 202-318-0793 (efax) · email: clark@polidata.org

PUBLISHER OF THE POLIDATA® DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL GUIDES AND ATLASES
[website: www.polidata.org](http://www.polidata.org)

PRESS RELEASE

POSSIBLE CHANGES IN THE HOUSE: APPORTIONMENT IN 2010 Population Trends for the 2000s; the 2004 Estimates

January 10, 2004

CLARK BENSEN¹

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

Each year, during the December holiday season, the Bureau of the Census releases its annual estimates of population in the states. While these numbers provide a snapshot view of where the growth in the nation is taking place, for political observers, these numbers allow another quick review of potential shifts in seats in the U.S. House following the next census.

While the Bureau does release estimates by state annually, it does not provide projections of the population to the next census on a regular basis. Nevertheless, these annual estimates form the base from which a projection out to 2010 can be made.

Projection: There are several means of projection, some more sophisticated than others. For the sake of these projections, based upon estimates very early in the decade, an unsophisticated methodology is used. The growth rates for each state for the previous two years, here from 2002-2003 and from 2003-2004, are averaged. This rate is then applied to the 2004 estimate in a step-wise, compounding fashion through 2010. The apportionment formula is then run on the basis of these 2010 projections.

Note also that this simple methodology does not account for several oddities of the apportionment process: 1) the estimates are based upon a date of July 1 for each; the census numbers will be based upon the April 1 census date; 2) there is no modification to account for any overseas population; and 3) there is no estimation made as to differing growth scenarios; the projections assume the most recent growth rate will continue, without variation, throughout the decade. These caveats being dispensed with, what do these projections indicate?

¹ Clark H. Bensen, B.A., J.D., consulting data analyst and attorney doing business as POLIDATA® Polidata Data Analysis and a publisher of data volumes operating as POLIDATA® Demographic and Political Guides. POLIDATA is a demographic and political research firm located outside Washington, D.C.

Overall Growth: As expected, and as a look at the accompanying maps will illustrate, the growth patterns experienced in the nation during the 1990's are, for the moment, quite similar to those experienced for the first few years of the new decade. There is still a general trend for the population to shift to, or the new immigration to arrive in, the states in the South and West. This general trend confirms the overall shift of population from the East and Midwest that began a generation ago.

Overall, the nation would be expected to grow from 281.4 million persons (for the 50 states and the District) to 311.5 millions by July 2010. This represents a national growth rate of 10.6%, or about 1% a year, a slightly smaller rate of growth from the 2003 estimates. Overall, the average growth rate for the 50 states and the District is 9.8%.

The states that would be expected to have the largest rates of growth from 2000-2010 include: Nevada, up 46%; Arizona, up 32%; Florida, up 23%; Idaho, up 20%; Texas, up 20%; and Georgia, up 19%.

The areas expected to show the slowest rates of growth are: District of Columbia, down 9%; North Dakota, down 1%, Massachusetts, up 1%; West Virginia, up 2%; Ohio, up 3%; and New York, up 2.5%.

The states closest to the national growth rate for this period, with these projections, would be New Hampshire, up 11% and Tennessee, up 10%.

The percentages are the most relevant for the apportionment formula as these are the states most likely to gain, or lose, a seat if their rates are much higher, or lower, than that of the nation².

From the perspective of raw population growth, the states with the largest new residents over the decade would be: California, up 4.9 million persons; Texas, up 4.1 million; Florida, up 3.8 million; Georgia, up 1.6 million; and Arizona, up 1.6 million.

Areas with the fewest new residents would be the District of Columbia, down 51,000 persons; North Dakota, down 6,000; Vermont, a gain of 27,000; Wyoming, a gain of 35,000; and South Dakota, a gain of 48,000.

The average growth for all states and the District is 596,000 persons. The states closest to this overall average include Colorado, with a gain of 625,000 persons and Tennessee, with a gain of 550,000. Based upon these projections, and a 435 member House, the number of persons per district would be 716,000 persons compared to 647,000 based upon the 2000 census numbers.

² However, there are other factors that play into the formula.

Seat Shifts: How do these population numbers translate into the shift of seats based upon this set of projections? As these are only projections, several years out, there are 'probable changes' and 'possible changes' amongst the states.

As to the 'probable changes', the number of states for which the size of the current delegation would change is 16, 7 gainers and 9 losers. All the gainers are in the South and West and all of the losers are in the East and Midwest.

Based upon these projections, the biggest gainers are: Texas, up 3 to 35 seats and Florida, up 3 to 28. The other gainers are: California, up 1 to 54; Nevada, up 1 to 4; Utah, up 1 to 4; Arizona, up 1 to 9; and Georgia, up 1 to 14.

The losing states would be New York, down 2 to 27 and Ohio, down 2 to 16. The other losers are: Massachusetts, down 1 to 9; Pennsylvania, down 1 to 18; Michigan, down 1 to 14; Illinois, down 1 to 18; Minnesota, down 1 to 7; Iowa, down 1 to 4; Missouri, down 1 to 8.

The number of seats to shift in these 16 states would be 11.

States that were near, but *above* the cutoff point for the 435th seat include: Louisiana, at 435, it received the last seat; Florida, at 434; Alabama, at 433; Pennsylvania, at 432; and Georgia, at 431.

States that were near, but *below* the cutoff include: Arizona, at 436 to go to 9 seats; Minnesota, at 437 stay at 8 seats; Michigan, at 438 to stay at 15 seats; California, at 439 to go to 55 seats; and Illinois, at 440 to stay at 19.

In the 'possible changes', some of these states near the cutoff appear. The possibility here is based upon the number of persons above or below the cutoff. The most likely 'possible changes' based upon these numbers include: Alabama could drop a seat to 6; Louisiana, which received the last seat, could drop to 6; Arizona could gain another seat to 10; Minnesota could stay at 8 and Michigan could stay at 15.

Regionally, the Northeast would lose 4 seats, from 101 to 97; the Midwest would lose 7 seats, from 124 to 117; the South would gain 7 seats, from 189 to 196; and the West would gain 4 seats, from 124 to 128 seats. This would result in a loss of 4 seats for the 27 states (inc. DC) East of the Mississippi from 313 to 309 and a gain of 4 seats for the 24 states West of the Mississippi from 225 to 229.

Already "Confirmed": It is early in the decade and there is still a lot of play in these projections. However, based upon the growth rates through 2004, we can already confirm some trends: four states would lose a seat: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Iowa; four states would gain a seat: Florida, Texas, Arizona and Utah. These results are not unexpected. Based upon the 2000 apportionment, Iowa was ranked 431 to stay at 5; Ohio was ranked at 433 to drop to only 18; Utah was ranked at 436, just missing a new seat; and Texas was ranked at 438 to pickup a third seat last time. North Carolina, one of

the few surprises from the actual 2000 apportionment, finally broke into safe territory for its 13th seat, having been seat 435 based upon the 2001-2002 and 2003 estimates.

Other Items of Interest: In addition to the apportionment shifts, it is interesting to note than these latest estimates indicate a shift in the list of most populous states. Based upon these simple two-year average projections, Florida would surpass New York by 2010 as the third most populous state. Also, New Jersey would lose its top-ten rank, dropping to 11 and being replaced by Georgia and North Carolina.

Electoral College Effect: From an Electoral College standpoint, the top ten states following 2010 (CA, TX, FL, NY, IL, PA, OH, MI, GA and NC) would total 257 electoral votes, an increase of 1. The split on these 10 states in 2004 was 5 for Bush and 5 for Kerry. The overall break for these 10 states in 2004 was 145 votes for Kerry and 111 for Bush. Based upon the 2010 projections, the break would be 141 for Kerry and 116 for Bush. Overall, given a 2004 Electoral Vote of 286 Bush to 252 Kerry³, the vote count based upon these 2010 projections would have been 292 Bush, 246 Kerry, a gain of 6 for the Republican ticket.

Enclosures:

1-Map, Population Growth, % Change, 2000 to 2010

2-Map, States Gaining/Losing Seats based upon 2010 Projections

3-Map, States just Above or just Below the Cutoff

4-Map, Number of Members by State Delegation

[M:\poligeo\us\apa\2004\wprea09a.doc]

³ In actuality, in 2004, one Democrat elector voted for Edwards, just as one Democrat elector failed to vote for Gore in 2000.