



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

PRESS RELEASE

Revised after S.Ct. Opinion: Wednesday, Jan. 27, 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**
- ⇒ **Texas to Gain At Least 2 seats**
- ⇒ **Census Adjustment No Longer an Issue for Initial Allocation Between States**

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 for an online library of election results.
Population data will be available in POPULATION ESTIMATES, 1998, States & Counties (4/99).

The recent Supreme Court decision means that an adjustment will not be allowed for, at least, the initial allocation of seats among states. What had predicted as a boon for CA and TX, at the expense of IN and MI has now been clearly ruled illegal. However, the debate continues as to the legality and feasibility of another set of numbers for intrastate districting.

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 had on apportioning the U.S. House is one factor about which political stakeholders are no longer 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 would be small in the *number* of seats affected.

Questions Decided? The response to the recent (January 25, 1999) Supreme Court decision from the proponents of the initiative was that the decision was a narrow one which only applies to the state-level apportionment of seats. They reason that sampling *must* be used for districting. However, this fails the rationality test.

Sampling, if valid at increasing the “accuracy” of the census at any level, is valid at the highest levels only, at the national and arguably at the state level. The Bureau’s own data indicate that the degree of accuracy drops significantly at the level at which districting is accomplished. It would be irrational for a legislature to prohibit sampling for state-level apportionment where it’s level of accuracy would be arguably higher and to allow sampling at the block-level districting where it’s ability to increase the level of accuracy would be hugely variable and questionable.

Moreover, it is clear that the term “apportionment” has been used in an inclusive sense since the 1957 legislation first prohibited the use of sampling for apportionment purposes. Notwithstanding the understanding of redistricting practitioners, apportionment was used by Justice O’Connor as being inclusive even in the Court’s opinion. It is clear the “non-apportionment purposes” of the Census Act relate to the census as a “linchpin of the federal statistical system”, not to its use for redistricting. The Court clearly prohibited the use of sampling for apportionment purposes. Redistricting is clearly an apportionment purpose. Apportionment without districting is an incomplete process.

The Court’s discussion provides nothing inconsistent with its analysis that the proposed uses of sampling are prohibited for purposes (emphasis added) of apportionment, not strictly the state-level ministerial act of dividing up the seats amongst the states. The use of the plural form of the word give credence to this inclusive understanding.

In reality, what the Court said was that the Clinton Administration’s proposal for “accounting for”, rather than counting, our population can not be used for apportionment purposes. Districting is an apportionment purpose and therefore, sampling can not be used for districting. (FOR MORE ON THIS, READ AN AMICUS BRIEF FILED IN THE CENSUS CASE AT WWW.POLIDATA.ORG/98404ABZ.PDF.)

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 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