



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 2005 Estimates

December 22, 2005

CLARK BENSEN¹

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

Once again, as Congress tries to leave town along with the rest of us, 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. The last set was released in early 2005, with projections made out to 2030. These may be useful for a longer term perspective, but it is the annual releases of estimates that form the base from which a projection out to 2010 can be made, and updated, in anticipation of the effects of the apportionment of seats in the U.S. House.

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 2003-2004 and from 2004-2005, are averaged. This rate is then applied to the 2005 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

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.

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?

Overall Growth: As expected, there is nothing really new in the overall trend of the population growth and decline. 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 two generations ago. Following the 1940 census the East and Midwest accounted for 251 members in the U. S. House. Following the 2000 census the South and the West accounted for 252 members in the U. S. House, a huge shift of political power.

Overall, the nation would be expected to grow from 281.4 million persons (for the 50 states and the District) to 315.1 millions by July 2010. This represents a national growth rate of 11.2%, or about 1.1% a year, a slightly higher rate of growth over the 2004 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 35%; Florida, up 25%; Idaho, up 23%; Utah, up 22%; and Georgia, up 21%; Texas misses the 20% mark with a 19.3% growth over the decade. Note, however, that these are estimates as of July 1, 2005, before Hurricane Katrina and the dislocation in LA, MS, AL and TX.

The areas expected to show the slowest rates of growth are: District of Columbia, down 7%; Massachusetts, the same%; North Dakota, up 1%, West Virginia, up 1%; Ohio, up 2%; and New York, up 2%.

States close to the national growth rate for this period, with these projections, would be New Hampshire, Tennessee, and Hawaii, all growing about 10 to 11%.

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: Texas, up 4.1 million; California, up 4.0 million persons; Florida, up 4.0 million; Arizona, up 1.8 million; and Georgia, up 1.8 million.

These latest estimates show a slight decline in the rate of growth for California and a slight increase of Arizona in relation to California.

Areas with the fewest new residents would be the District of Columbia, down 40,000 persons; Massachusetts, a gain of 2,800, North Dakota, a gain of 3,600; Vermont, a gain of 25,000; and West Virginia, a gain of 25,000.

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

Based upon these projections, and a 435 member House, the number of persons per district would be close to 725,000 persons compared to 647,000 based upon the 2000 census numbers.

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', there would be 11 seats shifting amongst 15 states, 6 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: Nevada, up 1 to 4; Utah, up 1 to 4; Arizona, up 2 to 10; 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.

States that were near, but *above* the cutoff point for the 435th seat include: Louisiana, at 435, it would receive the last seat (before Katrina); New Jersey, at 434; Pennsylvania, at 433; Texas at 432; and California at 431.

States that were near, but *below* the cutoff include: Minnesota, at 436 to stay at 8 seats; Missouri at 437 to stay at 9 seats; California at 438 to gain 1 to 54 seats; Washington at 439 to gain 1 to 10 seats; and a very close Michigan and Illinois at 440 to retain one seat at 15 and 19 seats respectively.

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 2005, we can already confirm some trends: five states would lose a seat: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa and now Massachusetts; five states would gain a seat: Florida, Texas, Arizona, Utah and now Nevada. 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 continued towards safer territory for its 13th seat, now seat 430.

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 256 electoral votes. 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 115 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 293 Bush, 245 Kerry, a gain of 7 for the Republican ticket.

Other Notes: Based upon these projections, the following interesting tidbits should be noted:

- This may be the first time California has not gained ANY seats since statehood;
- Florida stands poised to rise ahead of New York to become the third most populous state, sending 28 members to the House, 1 more than New York;
- Texas is on its way to becoming an electoral powerhouse, at 35 seats in 2010 it would be the fourth largest state delegation in the U. S. House ever; only three other states have actually sent 35 or more members to the U. S. House in any congress: California and New York both surpassed this hurdle several times and Pennsylvania did actually send 36 to the House on the basis of the 1910 census, which lasted for two decades as there was no apportionment made following the 1920 census.

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\2005\wprel22a.doc]

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