



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

DISPLACEMENT OF KATRINA VICTIMS STILL HAS IMPACT: APPORTIONMENT IN 2010

Population Trends for the 2000s; the 2007 Estimates

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:00AM December 27, 2007

CLARK BENSEN¹

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

As the decennial 2010 Census approaches, uncertainty still lingers over which states are likely to be directly impacted by the shift of population over the decade since the 2000 congressional apportionment. For the second time, the displacement of persons due to the 2005 Katrina and Rita hurricanes still raises a few questions as to which states may be affected. While Louisiana and Mississippi have made some progress on recovery, there are still several years before the actual enumeration in April of 2010. There will also be two more annual releases of population estimates (in December of 2008 and 2009) before the final apportionment numbers are released in December of 2010.

The Bureau does release population estimates for states annually, but it does not provide projections of the population on a regular basis, so analysts use the annual estimates to make their own projections.

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 2005-2006 and from 2006-2007, are averaged. This rate is then applied to the 2007 estimate in a step-wise, compounding fashion through 2010. The apportionment formula is then run on the basis of these 2010 projections.

For the 2007 estimates there continues to be a wrinkle: Hurricane Katrina, which caused the migration of many persons from the state of Louisiana during the autumn months of

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.

2005. Louisiana, which was already losing pace with population growth before Katrina, saw several hundred thousand persons leave the state after this. Many of these persons migrated to Texas, the neighboring state to its west. Indeed, Texas, which has been experiencing high growth for some time, saw a large increase in its annual estimate. Yet, even though Louisiana saw nearly 50,000 persons swell its population over the past year, Texas continued to gain as well.

In order to accommodate for this Katrina impact, a modification was made in the projections from the 2007 estimates to the 2010 projection: while the projected rate of growth for all states was defaulted to an average of the 2005-2006 and the 2006-2007 rates of growth, the rate of growth for Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas were based upon the one-year change, from 2006 to 2007. This minimizes the loss in the first two states but whether it underestimates the anticipated growth rate remains unclear. As mentioned above, Texas continues to gain population regardless of the influx of Katrina victims.

Note also that even with these modifications, 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 mentioned above) the projections assume the most recent growth rate will continue, without variation, throughout the remainder of 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 315.0 millions by July 2010. This represents a national growth rate of 11.9%, or about 1.2% a year, a slightly lower rate of growth over the 2006 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 41%; Arizona, up 36%; Utah, up 29%; Georgia, up 25%; Idaho, up 25%; and Texas, up 22%. Florida, whose rate was nearly 23% through the 2006 estimates, appears to have slowed down a bit, now at 19% for the decade. This may also be the result of revisions to earlier estimates.

Based upon these numbers, three states would be expected to actually lose population by 2010: Rhode Island, down 0.3%; and Louisiana, even using the estimated growth for 2006 to 2007 for the remaining years, would still be down 0.5%. The areas expected to show the slowest rates of growth are: North Dakota at 0.5%; West Virginia, up 0.7%; Michigan up 0.8%, and Ohio, up 1.1%. Massachusetts shows a slight rebound at 2.0%.

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 3.6 million persons; Florida, up 3.1 million; Georgia, up 2.1 million; and Arizona, up 1.8 million.

Based upon these projections, the average number of persons per district would be close to 722,000 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 14 seats shifting amongst 21 states, 9 gainers and 12 losers. All the gainers are in the South and West and all of the losers are in the East and Midwest except Louisiana and...drum roll please, California.

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: North Carolina, up 1 to 14; South Carolina, up 1 to 7; Georgia, up 1 to 14; Utah, up 1 to 4; Nevada, up 1 to 4; and Oregon, up 1 to 6.

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; New Jersey, down 1 to 12; 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; Louisiana, down 1 to 6, and California, down 1 to 52.

However, the apportionment formula (the so-called Method of Equal Proportions) is susceptible to small differences in population as between any pair of states. The states that were near, but *above* the cutoff point for the 435th seat include: Pennsylvania at 435 for 18 seats; North Carolina at 434 for 14 seats; South Carolina at 433 for 7 seats; Texas at 432 for 36 seats; and Oregon at 431 for 6 seats.

States that were near, but *below* the cutoff include: Washington at 436 for 10 seats; California at 437 for 53 seats; Minnesota at 438 for 8 seats; Missouri at 439 for 9 seats; and

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

Georgia at 440 for 15 seats. The states closest to the cutoff point from a numerical perspective include South Carolina and Oregon, both of which are only above the cutoff by less than 20,000 persons. Note also that Montana, at seat 443, is only 21,000 persons shy of returning to 2 seats.

More information on the trends will be forthcoming as time allows. Due to the release of this information on the day after Christmas, with only 1 day turnaround, this is an abbreviated summary. Check the website, www.polidata.org for updates.

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:\PoliCorp\Press_Releases\wprgl26a.doc]