



# POLIDATA Political Data Analysis

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

---

CLARK BENSEN

---

POLIDATA • 3112 Cave Court, Suite B • Lake Ridge, VA 22192-1167  
Tel: 703-690-4066 • Fax: 703-494-4061 (24hrs) • email: polidata@aol.com  
PUBLISHER OF THE POLIDATA® DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL GUIDES AND ATLASES  
website: [www.polidata.org](http://www.polidata.org)

## PRESS RELEASE

Thursday, Jan. 21, 1999

### **Congressional Reapportionment: Winners and Losers in 2000**

*New Set of Population Projections Adds Colorado as A Winner*

- ⇒ **New Study Projects State Populations, Reviews Congressional Apportionment**
- ⇒ **15 States to see Change in Size of the U.S. House Delegation**
- ⇒ **10 Seats to Shift Among States**
- ⇒ **7 states to gain seats: GA, FL, TX, CO, AZ, NV and CA**
- ⇒ **8 states to lose seats: CT, NY, PA, OH, IL, WI, MS and OK**
- ⇒ **Colorado Newest Addition to List of Likely Gainers**
- ⇒ **Montana to Stay as Single Member At-Large State**
- ⇒ **Georgia, Texas and Arizona to Gain 2 seats each**
- ⇒ **New York, Pennsylvania to Lose 2 seats each**
- ⇒ **California to Gain Only 1 House Seat, Possibly 2**
- ⇒ **Texas to Gain At Least 2 seats, Possibly 3**
- ⇒ **Census Adjustment Could Affect 2 Seats/4 States: IN, MI Losing to CA, TX**

**Summary.** A new analysis of population figures projects the April 1, 2000 population for the 50 states to assess the shift of political power which will follow the 2000 Census. The study generally confirms other analyses released just last month but adds Colorado to the list of states which will see an increase in its Congressional delegation after 2000.

California, the biggest winner in the last two House Apportionments following both the 1980 and 1990 censuses will not be the big winner following the 2000 Census. Despite a recent turnaround in growth and California's net gain of 3.7 million persons, it's growth rate was only 12.4% over the decade, barely above the nation's growth rate of 10.4%. As a result, California will net only one additional House seat. Texas, on the other hand, with a growth rate of 20.2%, will gain at least 2 seats in the 108th Congress.

Visit our website at [www.polidata.org](http://www.polidata.org) for an online library of election results.  
Population data will be available in POPULATION ESTIMATES, 1998, States & Counties (4/99).

However, if the Clinton Administration's plan for a sampled and adjusted census withstands court scrutiny, it is possible that *both* California and Texas could gain an additional seat. This would increase California from its current 52 to 54, and increase Texas from its current 30 to 33. These seats would come from Indiana and Michigan, dropping Indiana to 9 and Michigan to 15 seats.

**Details of the Study.** Just a month ago the Census Bureau released its annual estimates of state populations. While they were only estimates through last July, the new study uses these numbers to project the state populations for April 1, 2000, Census Day for the decennial census.

POLIDATA, a demographic and political research firm outside of Washington, projected out the population for the 21 months from July 1, 1998 until April 1, 2000. The analysis made several growth assumptions, all based upon the 1998 annual estimate as a starting point. The factors considered the annual growth rate over three different time periods, one year, two years and three years. In addition, two different methods of averaging the rates were used. All assume, to varying degrees, that the best predictor of the future is the past. All reflect the most recent annual growth rates and extend them out for the 21 month period from July 1, 1998 until April 1, 2000.

In many states, the growth rate was fairly constant over the last three years. Whether a state's growth rate was going up or down over the three years affected the relative position of its "priority" for an extra seat in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The analysis confirms that Georgia will gain 2 seats, resulting in three states which will gain 2 seats in 2000: Arizona, Georgia and Texas.

On the down side of House seats, the new study confirms the loss of 2 seats each for the states of New York and Pennsylvania. Aside from Colorado, differences over analyses released last month using the 1998 estimates are seen in Illinois and Montana. Based upon the 1998 estimates both states were very close to the last seats apportioned. The 2000 projections would leave Montana at one member as an At-Large state and have Illinois lose one seat, down from 20 to 19.

**The Actual Enumeration.** The start of the census is over a year away and it is still nearly two years until the Commerce Department will deliver to the President the population numbers which will form the basis for the next peaceful transition of political power in America. Yet, political analysts constantly reassess population growth patterns due to the impact of apportionment in several arenas of the political process. The Census results in a change in the number of congressional delegations in several states. Even in states whose delegation size does not change, the boundaries certainly will. Likewise, the boundaries of state legislative districts for seven thousand state legislators will need to be reviewed. In addition, the new numbers will affect the Electoral Votes in the Presidential Elections of 2004 and 2008.

**Growth Patterns and Projections.** The Bureau released projections several years ago for the 2000 population, which are still the most current *official* projections for 2000. But the Bureau projections were released in 1996 and reflect growth only through 1994. Significant changes have been seen in several states since then.

Perhaps the most notable change was in California, which has rebounded in its growth rate. Yet despite California's expected net growth of 3.7 million persons over the decade, it needed to gain some 3.1 million just to stay even with the national growth rate of 10.4%. Texas, which would gain 3.4 million persons by 2000, needed 1.8 million to keep even with the nation. California, with 0.6 million persons 'extra' nets it 1 extra seat, while Texas' 1.6 million 'extra' net it 2 additional seats.

Based upon the projections for 2000, 15 states could be affected by a gain or loss of a seat, representing a shift of 10 seats among states.

⇒ **The 7 gainers: GA (+2), FL (+1), TX (+2), CO (+1), AZ (+2), NV (+1), and CA (+1).**

⇒ **The 8 losers: CT (-1), NY (-2), PA (-2), OH (-1), IL (-1), WI (-1), MS (-1) and OK (-1).**

The general shift of population from the Northeast and Midwest to the South and West, a trend established a generation ago, continues. Of the 7 states expected to gain seats in 2000, 5 are in the West and 2 in the South. Of the 8 states losing seats in 2000, 6 are in the East and Midwest, 1 in the South (MS) and 1 in the West (OK).

**Limitations.** Of course, these are just projections, based upon recent growth trends. A few states still deserve watching. If their growth exceeds recent rates, the most likely states to gain additional seats: TX, MT, and UT, possibly FL or MS (to stay at 5).

It is important to understand the limitations on the use of the estimates or projections for apportionment analysis. The actual assignment of seats will still require a full Census in April of 2000. In fact, it is this apportionment for which the Constitution requires an "actual Enumeration" once a decade. Also the POLIDATA projections do not reflect any addition or subtraction to the apportionment population based upon overseas residents. The projections are based upon the annual estimates, which are based upon the 1990 Census (a 100% count) and updated through a review of births, deaths and migration, providing a good clue where the actual shifts of seats will occur.

**Census Adjustment.** The impact which the much discussed census adjustment issue would have on apportioning the U.S. House is another factor about which political stakeholders are still concerned. The 2000 projections confirm the fundamental result of an adjustment through sampling and estimation on apportionment: *as between states*, the shift in seats caused by an adjustment will be small in the *number* of seats affected.

The new study confirms that the most likely state to lose is Indiana but adds Michigan as a potential loser due to an adjustment. Likely winners of additional seats

are California and Texas. Applying the undercount rates for the 1990 Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) to the 2000 projections results in Indiana losing in all but one projection series. It wasn't affected in one series as it was already seat 436. Texas would pick up an additional seat in four projections, California in three. In two projections, the shift was two seats among four states.

**States which would lose seats under an adjustment.** Our analysis from previous years indicated the apportionment effect of adjustment would most likely affect IN and MS. The new study confirms the status of Indiana as a probable loser. Mississippi has moved off the likely gainer list due to its very slow growth over the past few years. Michigan has joined the list of potential adjustment losers as it's growth rate has plummeted in the last two years.

One must also bear in mind that the mathematical formula by which the seats in the U.S. House are assigned, the so-called "method of equal proportions" can be very susceptible to small differences in population between any pair of states. This is a situation which could affect these 2000 projections as well. In each projection series there are several states which were above or below the 435 cutoff by less than 50,000 persons.

These are projections which make assumptions, as would any adjustment done by the Clinton Administration. A numerical difference caused by an adjustment (by whatever name the Clinton Administration calls their plan, this is what it is), or an error in the implementation of an adjustment (as occurred in 1990), could cause a seat shift. This is one of the real dangers of using *statistical inference to account for*, and not physical evidence to count, the population, which determines the votes in our legislative chambers.

**Let History be the Guide.** Contemporaneous with the decision to *not* adjust the 1990 head count numbers, a set of adjustment factors was released in June 1991. Had the adjustment gone forward with this first set of numbers, there would have been two losers for Congressional seats, WI and PA, and two gainers, CA and AZ. When a second set of revised adjustment numbers was released in July 1992, the number of states had dropped to 2, leaving WI losing a seat to CA (which would have made CA 53 and WI 8), solely by virtue of an adjustment. There is still a substantial likelihood that the shortened timeframe and a more complex plan will foreshadow a return to a similar situation for 2000.

**Questions Remaining.** The Supreme Court heard oral argument on the census case on November 30, 1998. However, the case may still have several outcomes. The case may be thrown out for lack of standing of the parties, it might be affirmed, killing the Clinton plan, or reversed, returning adjustment to the front burner, or back for trial.

Regardless, those directly involved in the apportionment process in every state will continue to monitor this closely. Concerns about the quality of the data used for

*PRESS RELEASE, page 5*

*Apportionment based upon 2000 POLIDATA Projections*

apportionment and its redistricting portion are paramount to those responsible for these most important institutional elements of our experiment in American democracy.

-####-

FIND THIS DOCUMENT AND RELATED DATA TABLES AT [WWW.POLIDATA.ORG/NEWS.HTM](http://WWW.POLIDATA.ORG/NEWS.HTM)

[01/21/99 3:53 PM-WPR9A21A.DOC]