



# 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: 202-318-0793 (EFAX) · email: [clark@polidata.org](mailto:clark@polidata.org)

PUBLISHER OF THE POLIDATA® DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL GUIDES AND ATLASES  
[website: www.polidata.org](http://www.polidata.org)

## PRESS RELEASE

### *POSSIBLE DELEGATION CHANGES IN THE U.S. HOUSE FOR 2012 Population Trends for the 2010 Apportionment; the 2003 Estimates*

February 19, 2004

CLARK BENSEN<sup>1</sup>

POLIDATA® Political Data Analysis

For political observers, it's never too early to monitor the possibilities of how population shifts over the decade may affect the political landscape following the next census. For politicians seeking higher office, thinking years in advance for the upcoming election calendars, this annual exercise is a must for any potential bid. For those like me, who have been steadily involved in the political thicket of apportionment and districting following the most recent census, well, some things get set aside for a while<sup>2</sup>.

Nevertheless, here we have another installment in the periodic prognostication of how seats will shift amongst the states for the 2012 election. The Bureau of the Census releases estimates of the population by state annually. However, the Bureau does not generally release state-level projections of the population on a regular basis. These annual estimates form the basis for these numbers which are projected out to 2010 by POLIDATA.

**Projection:** There are several means of projection, some more sophisticated than others. For the sake of these projections, based upon estimates very early in the decade, an unsophisticated methodology is used. The growth rates for each state for the previous two years, here from 2001-2002 and from 2002-2003, are averaged. This rate is then applied to the 2003 estimate in a step-wise fashion through 2010. The apportionment formula is then run on the basis of these 2010 projections.

---

<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 located outside Washington, D.C.

<sup>2</sup> The results normally are released in December but we were preparing for the Georgia apportionment trial that commenced the first week of January 2004.

Note also that this simple methodology does not account for several oddities of 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; the projections assume the most recent growth rate will continue, without variation, throughout the decade. These caveats being dispensed with, what do these projections indicate?

**Overall Growth:** As expected, and as a look at the accompanying maps will illustrate, the growth patterns experienced in the nation during the 1990s are, for the moment, quite similar to those experienced for the first few years of the new decade. 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 a generation ago.

Overall, the nation would be expected to grow from 281.4 million persons (for the 50 states and the District) to 311.9 millions by July 2010. This represents a national growth rate of 10.8%, or about 1% a year. Overall, the average growth rate for the 50 states and the District is 9.7%.

The states that would be expected to have the largest rates of growth from 2000-2010 include: Nevada, up 42%; Arizona, up 30%; Florida, up 22%; Texas, up 20%; and Georgia, up 19%.

The areas expected to show the slowest rates of growth are: District of Columbia, down 8%; North Dakota, down 2%, West Virginia, up 2%; Iowa, up 2%; and Ohio, up 2%.

The states closest to the national growth rate for this period, with these projections, would be South Carolina, up 11% and Tennessee, up 9%.

The percentages are the most relevant for the apportionment formula as these are the states most likely to gain, or lose, a seat if there rates are much higher, or lower, than that of the nation<sup>3</sup>.

From the perspective of raw population growth, the states with the largest new residents over the decade would be: California, up 5.2 million persons; Texas, up 4.2 million; Florida, up 3.5 million; Georgia, up 1.6 million; and Arizona, up 1.5 million.

Areas with the fewest new residents would be the District of Columbia, down 44,000 persons; North Dakota, down 12,000; Wyoming, a gain of 29,000; Vermont, a gain of 31,000; and South Dakota, a gain of 35,000.

The average growth for all states and the District is 599,000 persons. The states closest to this overall average include New York, with a gain of 615,000 persons and Tennessee,

---

<sup>3</sup> However, there are other factors that play into the formula.

with a gain of 517,000. Based upon these projections, and a 435 member House, the number of persons per district would be 717,000 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? The number of states for which the size of the current delegation would change is 16, 7 gainers and 9 losers. All the gainers are in the South and West and all but one of the losers are in the East and Midwest. The only exception to this trend is the southern state of Louisiana, expected to lose 1 seat.

Based upon these projections, the biggest gainers are: Texas, up 3 to 35 seats; California, up 2 to 55; and Florida, up 2 to 27. The other gainers are: Nevada, up 1 to 4; Utah, up 1 to 4; Arizona, up 1 to 9; and Georgia, up 1 to 14.

The losing states 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; Illinois, down 1 to 18; Minnesota, down 1 to 7; Iowa, down 1 to 4; Missouri, down 1 to 8; and Louisiana, down 1 to 6.

States that were near, but above the cutoff point for the 435<sup>th</sup> seat include: Michigan, at 435, it received the last seat; Alabama, at 434; California, at 433; Pennsylvania, at 432; and Georgia, at 431.

States that were near, but below the cutoff include: Louisiana, at 436 to stay at 7 seats; New York, at 437 to lose only 1 seat and have 28 seats; Minnesota, at 438 to stay at 8 seats; Illinois, at 439 to stay at 19 seats; and Florida, at 440 to gain a third seat at 28.

The number of seats to shift in these 16 states would be 11.

By Census Region, the shift is as follows: East, from 83 seats to 79, a drop of 4; Midwest, from 100 seats to 94, a drop of 6; South, from 154 seats to 159, a gain of 5; West, from 98 seats to 103, a gain of 5.

Overall, the shift would be: the East and Midwest, from 183 seats to 173, a drop of 10; and the South and West, from 252 seats to 262 seats, a gain of 10.

**Already Confirmed:** It is early in the decade and there is still a lot of play in these projections. However, based upon the growth rates through 2003, we can already confirm some trends. Based upon the 2003 estimates alone, Iowa and Ohio would lose 1 seat each and TX and UT would gain 1 seat each. These results are not 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.

Enclosures:

*1-Map, Population Growth, % Change, 2000 to 2010*

*2-Map, States Gaining/Losing Seats based upon 2010 Projections*