



# POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

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

---

CLARK BENSEN

---

POLIDATA LLC • 1303 HAYWARD RD, P.O. BOX 530 • CORINTH, VT 05039

Tel: 802-526-2176 • Fax: 202-318-0793 • email: [clark@polidata.org](mailto:clark@polidata.org)

PUBLISHER OF THE POLIDATA® DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL GUIDES AND ATLASES

## **PRESS RELEASE**

### *MID-RECESSION MIGRATION: APPORTIONMENT IN 2010*

#### *Population Trends for the 2000s; the 2009 Estimates*

December 23, 2009

CLARK BENSEN<sup>1</sup>

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

December in our Nation's Capital usually means two events occurring: Congress leaving for the holidays and the Bureau of the Census releasing new state-level population estimates. This year there was another event: a massive (18 inch) snowstorm that interrupted all sorts of plans, including adding a day to the release of the numbers from the Bureau. Yet, census staffers managed to release the numbers in order to allow interested researchers to not only review the recent population shifts and trends but also to allow political observers a chance to review how the results of the 2010 Census will affect the apportionment of the U.S. House.

The Bureau does not undertake the steps to project the annual state-level estimates outward to the April 1, 2010 Census date so researchers are on their own. Of course, this is just a projection based upon the estimates, even though they are the last set of estimates to be released before the December 2010 release of the official apportionment numbers delivered by the Bureau to the President.

**Summary.** There are two timeframes for which the apportionment calculations are reviewed here: 1) using the 2009 estimates only, as if apportionment were accomplished using those numbers alone; and 2) projecting these estimates forward to April 1, 2010.

- 1) Based upon the 2009 estimates only, without any projection forward, that is, if apportionment were done today, the differences over the number of seats actually apportioned as a result of the 2000 Census would be:

States gaining based upon July 1, 2009 estimates only:

AZ +1; FL +1; GA +1; NV +1; SC +1; TX +3; UT +1; WA +1 (8 states).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

States losing based upon July 1, 2009 estimates only:

IL -1; IA -1; LA -1; MA -1; MI -1; NJ -1; NY -1; OH -2; PA -1 (9 states).

(These numbers are not projected forward and do not include any estimate for overseas population.)

- 2) Projecting these estimates out to April 1, 2010, the differences over the number of seats actually apportioned as a result of the 2000 Census would be:

States gaining based upon July 1, 2009 estimates only:

AZ +1; FL +1; GA +1; NV +1; SC +1; TX +4; UT +1; WA +1 (8 states).

States losing based upon July 1, 2009 estimates only:

IL -1; IA -1; LA -1; MA -1; MI -1; MN -1; NJ -1; NY -1; OH -2; PA -1 (10 states).

(These also do not include any overseas population.)

- 3) The only differences between the 2009 Estimates only and the 2010 Projections would be in two states: MN would lose a seat and TX would gain 4 seats.

**Methods.** Generally, in order to project out the population from the July 1, 2009 date to the April 1, 2010 Census date, several factors must be reviewed and assumptions made. Then again, the closer one gets to the Census date of April 1, 2010, the fewer options are available that would swing seats from one state to another. However, the apportionment formula is very sensitive to small shifts in persons.

Because the most recent estimates are as of July 1, 2009 and the Census date is April 1, 2010, a mere nine-months after, the most relevant factor seems to be the 2009 estimates, subject only to a few other considerations. These considerations include: a) the degree to which other shifts in population are already taking place since July 1 and the degree to which they will continue for the next three months (including the displacement of Katrina victims); b) the degree to which international in- and out-migration might be affected by the economic situation; c) the degree to which the overseas population are included in the apportionment numbers; and d) the degree to which the census operations find as many inhabitants as possible and get them to respond.

When the apportionment numbers were released following the 2000 Census the Polidata projections that had been made throughout the previous decade were very close. However, there were still a handful of surprises: two states were gainers and two states were losers in the final count compared to the projections. Three of these four states were close to the cutoff anyway, though one was not very close.

In order to review which states are most likely to gain or lose a seat when the final numbers are released next year, the following is a listing of the states near the cutoff of the 435<sup>th</sup> seat<sup>2</sup>.

States which would receive the last 5 seats under these projections:

435: MO with about 10,000 to spare

434: TX with about 40,000 to spare

---

<sup>2</sup> Actually, inasmuch as every state gets one seat based regardless, the cutoff is the 385<sup>th</sup> seat but it is referred to as the 435<sup>th</sup> seat for clarity.

433: CA with about 120,000 to spare

432: WA with about 30,000 to spare

431: SC with about 20,000 to spare

States which would not receive seats but are close to the cutoff:

436: MN would be about 10,000 short

437: OR would be about 20,000 short

438: AZ would be about 50,000 short

439: FL would be about 150,000 short

440: NC would be about 75,000 short

441: IL would be about 140,000 short

442: OH would be about 130,000 short

443: NJ would be about 110,000 short

444: MA would be about 90,000 short

445: LA would be about 70,000 short

**Results.** Based upon these projections as outlined above, the shifts of congressional seats would be as follows: a shift of 11 seats among 18 states, from 10 donor states to 8 recipient states. Of these 18 states, those with the largest shifts in seats would be Texas at +4 to 36 seats; and Ohio at -2 for 16 seats. The other 16 states would see a net shift of 1 seat.

*States expected to gain* under these projections include: Arizona, up 1 to 9 seats; Florida, up 1 to 26; Georgia, up 1 to 14; Nevada, up 1 to 4; South Carolina, up 1 to 7; Texas, up 4 to 36 seats; Utah, up 1 to 4; and Washington, up 1 to 10. (In comparison with the projections released last year and based upon the 2008 estimates, the difference here is Washington replaces Oregon as gaining 1 seat and Arizona gains only 1 seat to 9.)

*States expected to lose* under these projections include: Illinois, down 1 to 18; Iowa, down 1 to 4; Louisiana, down 1 to 6; Massachusetts, down 1 to 9; Michigan, down 1 to 14; Minnesota, down 1 to 7; New Jersey, down 1 to 12; New York, down 1 to 28; Ohio, down 2 to 16; and Pennsylvania, down 1 to 18. (In comparison with the projections released last year and based upon the 2008 estimates, the difference here is Missouri stays even.)

California, at this point, still seems likely to remain at the current 53 seats but even so, this would become the first apportionment that the state has not gained a seat since statehood.

**Estimates.** As anyone can imagine, the economic downturn has caused significant shifting of the population and a decrease in the rate of population growth. Based upon last year's release of numbers, from 2007 to 2008, the net increase in the nation's population was estimated to be 2.769 million persons; for 2008 to 2009 it is estimated to have been 2.631 million.

Some states saw large changes in their numbers of net residents. Based upon last year's release TX was the biggest gainer with 488k new net residents; this year it was about the same at 478k;

CA had been the second biggest gainer for 2007-2008 at 379k; this year it was about the same at 381k. However, the next few states in the rankings for 2007-2008 with the largest net gains saw decreases. NC was 180k for 2007-2008 and 134k for 2008-2009. GA was 162k for 2007-2008 and 131k for 2008-2009. AZ was 147k for 2007-2008 and 96k for 2008-2009. FL was 129k for 2007-2008 and 114k for 2008-2009.

Based upon the 2008 estimates, 33 states experienced a decrease in their rate of growth from 2007 to 2008, with only 18 seeing an increase. Based upon the 2009 estimates, 28 states experienced a decrease in the rate of growth with 23 seeing an increase. Some states seeing an increase in 2009 included some of the more populous states in the Midwest.

The population estimates also allow for a review of how some components of change contribute to the net population growth or loss. By comparing these components to the net overall change it is possible to get a better view of how these components interact.

Utah and Alaska remain at the top with respect to the percentage of their estimated population that was a result of the Birth-Death ratio: 1.53% of Utah's estimated population and 1.17% of Alaska's population could be attributed to a high birth-death ratio. West Virginia was the only state to have fewer births than deaths.

Florida and California had the highest percentage of their population coming from net foreign migration: 0.47% of Florida's estimated population and 0.45% of California's population could be attributed to net foreign migration.

Wyoming, the District of Columbia, and Colorado had the highest percentage of their population coming from net domestic migration: 1.32% of Wyoming's estimated population and 0.74% of the District's and 0.71% of Colorado's population could be attributed to net domestic migration.

The top five states based upon total population are now: California; Texas; New York, Florida, and Illinois. States in the next five slots are: Pennsylvania; Ohio; Michigan; Georgia; and North Carolina. These are likely to remain the top ten for a few more years although positions might shift between Illinois and Pennsylvania or Michigan and Georgia.

**Source.** This press release and the accompanying maps can be found online at this link:

<http://www.polidata.org/news.htm> or directly at:

<http://www.polidata.org/census/est009dl.htm>

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