



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

THE POLITICAL IMPACT OF KATRINA: APPORTIONMENT IN 2010

Population Trends for the 2000s; the 2006 Estimates

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:00AM December 22, 2006

CLARK BENSEN¹

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

The 2006 Congressional elections are over. Congress prepares for the transition. Most political observers prepare for the holidays and a well-deserved break to focus on other matters. Yet, it is also that time of year when the Bureau of the Census releases population estimates which form the basis for projections of how the congressional apportionment following the 2010 census will alter the political landscape for the following decade.

Yet, while the Bureau does release population estimates for states 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 basis for any projections of the political impact.

Projection: There are several means of projection, some more sophisticated than others. Normally these projections are based upon previous growth patterns, an understandable yet unsophisticated methodology. The growth rates for each state for the previous two years, here from 2004-2005 and from 2005-2006, are averaged. This rate is then applied to the 2006 estimate in a step-wise, compounding fashion through 2010. The apportionment formula is then run on the basis of these 2010 projections.

Alas, for the 2006 estimates there is a wrinkle: Hurricane Katrina, which caused the migration of many persons from the state of Louisiana during the autumn months of 2005. Based upon these estimates, Louisiana, which was already losing pace with population growth before Katrina, lost an estimated 200,000 persons from July 1, 2005 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.

July 1, 2006. Many of these persons migrated to Texas, the neighboring state to its west. Texas, which has been experiencing high growth for some time, saw a large increase in its annual estimate. Over the period of July 1, 2004 to July 1, 2005, Texas gained an estimated 410,000 persons, or a 1.8% increase. Over the period of July 1, 2005 to July 1, 2006, Texas gained an estimated 580,000 persons, a 2.5% increase. What the real projection is for Louisiana, and the states that received Katrina victims, is unclear, but some modification needs to be done to this simple methodology for the purpose of estimating apportionment numbers.

Two methods were used here; both assume that persons will return to Louisiana over the ensuing few years before the 2010 census. This may, or may not, be a valid general assumption, depending upon a variety of factors beyond the scope of these projections. Both methods ignored the simple average of the growth pattern for Louisiana, which would have been -2.5% for each year remaining in the decade, and adopted a 1% increase over the July 1, 2006 estimate as the growth rate. This represents about 40,000 persons moving into, or returning to, Louisiana each year. Method I applies this 1% to the projection for the remaining years, without regard to the source of the displaced Katrina persons. Method II applies the same 1% to Louisiana but assumes they all moved from Texas to Louisiana and this amount is thus deducted from the Texas projection.

Regardless of which of these two methods were used, there were actually few differences and the projected results of the apportionment would not actually change. Nevertheless, the dislocation of this many persons from one state has, for the moment, put other states into play for the apportionment sweepstakes.

Note also that even with the modifications for Louisiana and/or Texas, this simple methodology does not account for several normal oddities between the estimates and 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; (aside from those for Louisiana and/or Texas mentioned above) the projections assume the most recent growth rate will continue, without variation, throughout the decade. In addition, the estimates are for the resident population but the treatment, and estimations, of the Group Quarters population is another issue. 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 316.0 millions by July 2010. This represents a national growth

rate of 12.5%, or about 1.2% a year, a slightly higher rate of growth over the 2005 estimates. Overall, the average growth rate for the 50 states and the District is 10.2%.

The states that would be expected to have the largest rates of growth from 2000-2010 include: Nevada, up 43%; Arizona, up 38%; Utah, up 27%; Georgia, up 26%; Idaho, up 25%; Florida, up 23%; and Texas, up 22% (excluding some of the Louisiana returnees).

Based upon these numbers, three states would be expected to actually lose population by 2010: North Dakota, down 1%; Rhode Island, down 0.3%; and Louisiana, which even with our estimated growth of 1% each year for the remaining years, would still be down 0.2%. The areas expected to show the slowest rates of growth are: Ohio, up only 1.4%; West Virginia, up 1.4%; Massachusetts, up 1.4%; Michigan, up 1.6%; and New York, up 1.9%. These numbers reflect a turnaround of sorts for the District of Columbia: it might actually grow 2.3%, or some 13,000 persons, by 2010.

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

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 4.6 million; California, up 3.9 million persons; Florida, up 3.6 million; Georgia, up 2.1 million; and Arizona, up 2.0 million.

Areas with the fewest net residents would be Louisiana (estimated as above); North Dakota, losing 6,300 persons; Rhode Island, losing 3,000 persons; the District of Columbia, gaining 13,000 persons; and Vermont, gaining 21,000 persons over the decade.

Based upon these projections, the average 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 could be 13 seats shifting amongst 19 states, 8 gainers and 11 losers. All the gainers are in the South and West and all of the losers are in the East and Midwest except Louisiana.

Based upon these projections, the biggest gainers are: Texas, up 4 to 36 seats and Florida, up 2 to 27 and Arizona, up 2 to 10. The other gainers are: Georgia, up 1 to 14; Utah, up 1

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

to 4; Nevada, up 1 to 4; and new to the list: Oregon, up 1 to 6 and Washington, up 1 to 10.

The losing states losing the most 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. New to the list of losers would be New Jersey, down 1 to 12; and Louisiana, down 1 to 6.

States that were near, but *above* the cutoff point for the 435th seat include: Washington at 435 for 10 seats; Texas at 434 for 36 seats; Oregon at 433 for 6 seats; Pennsylvania at 432 for 18 seats; and California at 431 for 53 seats.

States that were near, but *below* the cutoff include: Florida at 436 for 28 seats; Minnesota at 437 for 8 seats; Missouri at 438 for 9 seats; Georgia at 439 for 15 seats; and South Carolina at 440 for 7 seats. The states closest to the cutoff point from a numerical perspective include Washington and Oregon, both of which are only above the cutoff by less than 25,000 persons; and Florida which is only about 60,000 persons below the cutoff. In addition, Minnesota and Missouri are also below the cutoff by about 50,000 persons.

Regionally, the Northeast would lose 5 seats, from 83 to 78; the Midwest would lose 7 seats, from 100 to 93; the South would gain 6 seats, from 154 to 160; and the West would gain 6 seats, from 98 to 104 seats. This would result in a loss of 6 seats for the 27 states (inc. DC) East of the Mississippi River from 258 to 252 and a gain of 6 seats for the 24 states West of the Mississippi River from 177 to 183³.

Already "Confirmed": Even though the decade is halfway over, the impact of Katrina alone means there is still a lot of play in these projections. However, based upon the growth rates through 2006, we can already confirm some trends: seven states would lose a seat: Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, Missouri*, and Louisiana*; six states would gain at one seat: Georgia*, Florida, Texas (2 seats), Arizona, Utah, and Nevada. These results are not altogether 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. (The * indicates a state new to the list of gainers or losers.)

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 the most populous states. Based upon these simple two-year average projections, Florida would surpass New York by 2010 as the third most populous state. Based upon the 2006 estimates, North Carolina has already forced New Jersey to lose its top-ten rank, dropping to 11 and being replaced by North Carolina.

³ My apologies for an error in the 2005 Press Release which summarized Electoral Votes by region rather than seats in the House in this paragraph.

Electoral College Effect: From an Electoral College standpoint, the top ten states following 2010 (CA, TX, FL, NY, IL, PA, OH, GA, MI 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 140 for Kerry and 116 for Bush. Overall, given a 2004 Electoral Vote of 286 Bush to 252 Kerry⁴, the vote count based upon these 2010 projections would have been 292 Bush, 246 Kerry, a gain of 6 for the Republican ticket.

Redistricting Control Update: Among all the states there is a variety of mechanisms to determine which institution is initially responsible for the drafting of congressional plans. Of course, the normal mode would still be to have the legislature draft a plan, pass it as a bill and submit it the Governor for approval. In fact, this is the situation in 35 states. However, the degree to which a political party can actually affect the drafting process varies as well. Nevertheless, based upon the results in the 2006 elections for Governor and legislatures, the break down of the projected 2012 districts by parties in "control" of the process is: Republican: 95; Democrat: 88; Commission: 39; At-large states: 7; and Mixed between parties: 206.

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. Based upon these projections, it would be sending 27 members to the House, the same as New York, though it is close to getting 28 seats;
- Texas is on its way to becoming an electoral powerhouse, at 35 or 36 seats in 2010 it would be the third or 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

[D:\PoliData\Press_Releases\wprfl22a.doc]

⁴ In actuality, in 2004, one Democrat elector voted for Edwards, just as one Democrat elector failed to vote for Gore in 2000.