

Election Data Services

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

December 28, 2001

Contact: Kimball W. Brace

Tel. (202) 789-2004

E-mail: Kbrace@aol.com

New Population Estimates Show Continued Change in Congressional Delegations

Today's announcement of the first population estimates of the 2000 decade produced several changes in the reallocation of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, if the new estimates were used in the apportionment process, according to a study released by Election Data Services, Inc. The new estimates show that **Iowa** and **Ohio** would each lose an additional congressional seat from what they were awarded just a year ago when the final 2000 Census data was announced and the official apportionment took place. In addition, the new 2001 estimates show the state of **Texas** would gain one more additional seat, adding to the two additional seats it received last year. The fourth state that would change would be either **North Carolina** or **Utah**, dependent upon whether military personnel stationed overseas are included in the apportionment process.

Iowa's loss of a seat with the 2001 estimates continues the state's steady decline of congressional representation over the past century. In 1910, **Iowa** had its' all time high of 11 congressional seats, but the 2001 population estimates shows **Iowa** would be down to just 4 congressional districts. **Iowa's** fifth seat, the one that now appears lost with the new estimates, just missed the cut-off point of 435 seats (Congress's size has been set at 435 seats since the 1910 Census). Under the 2001 population estimates, **Iowa** would be delegated seat number 436, having missed keeping the district by just 7,106 people.

The other state to lose a seat with the 2001 estimates, **Ohio**, came in at seat number 437 and the state lost the district by 88,331 people. **Ohio** lost a seat in 2000 with the official apportionment, but was in danger of losing a second seat even then. At that time, its' 18th (and last) seat was seat number 433.

Texas' gain of an additional seat in the new Election Data Services, Inc. study, would give it 33 congressional districts, if the 2001 population estimates were used for the apportionment process. **Texas** had gained two seats last year, another three seats in 1990, and three more seats in 1980. **Texas** has doubled the size of its' congressional delegation in the last century, now placing it as the second largest delegation in Congress, behind **California**.

The final seat to change as a result of the 2001 population estimates is actually complicated by the issue of inclusion of military residing overseas. This issue has been the subject of continued court cases in the past year, when it was discovered that including military overseas gave a seat to **North Carolina**, at the expense of **Utah**, in the final apportionment a year ago. Counts of

military residing overseas have been included in the apportionment process since 1990. However, the 2001 population estimates released by the Census Bureau today failed to include any data on military residing overseas, either in the base population estimates or shown separately. In addition, the war on terrorists since 9/11 has resulted in a major increase in military personnel stationed overseas, and meant that the 2000 military counts used in the 2000 apportionment are now less reliable to use in conjunction with the 2001 population estimates.

Due to this exclusion, the Election Data Services, Inc. study ran the apportionment calculations a number of different ways. In each instance, the results showed that both **North Carolina** and **Utah** would pick up a seat with the 2001 population estimates. **North Carolina**'s gain was their 13th seat, the same seat it gained with the 2000 official Census data in last year's apportionment process. **Utah** increase to four congressional seats turned out to be the final seat given out in this year's study (seat number 435), which the state gained with 5,504 people to spare. The differing results depended upon which dataset from 2000 was used to compare the 2001 population estimate study results.

"Our study seems to indicate that Utah in 2000 was just at the wrong place at the wrong time." noted Election Data Services, Inc. President Kimball Brace. "Another year of population movement to the west has allowed Utah to gain another congressional seat independent of the military overseas issue," said Brace.

The new census population estimates reflect the estimated number of persons residing in each state as of July 1, 2001. The census estimates were generated using records of births, deaths, and estimates of domestic and international migration to update the decennial census base counts. As noted above, the population estimates did not include counts of federal employees abroad (e.g., military personnel), and were not statistically adjusted for any known undercount. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1999 that sampling procedures to adjust the census are unconstitutional for Congressional apportionment.

Election Data Services, Inc. is a Washington, D.C.-based consulting firm that specializes in redistricting, election administration, and the analysis of census and political data. A copy of the current apportionment analysis is attached. A full copy of the study can be found on our Web site (www.electiondataservices.com) or can be obtained by calling (202) 789-2004.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
REAPPORTIONMENT PROGRAM

Source data: July 1, 2001 Population Estimates, without federal overseas
(no Adjusted data) - Released 12/28/2001

Number of districts = 435

	Population	#CDs	Difference from 2000 Census Population
Alabama	4,464,356	7	
Alaska	634,892	1	
Arizona	5,307,331	8	
Arkansas	2,692,090	4	
California	34,501,130	53	
Colorado	4,417,714	7	
Connecticut	3,425,074	5	
Delaware	796,165	1	
Florida	16,396,515	25	
Georgia	8,383,915	13	
Hawaii	1,224,398	2	
Idaho	1,321,006	2	
Illinois	12,482,301	19	
Indiana	6,114,745	9	
Iowa	2,923,179	4	-1
Kansas	2,694,641	4	
Kentucky	4,065,556	6	
Louisiana	4,465,430	7	
Maine	1,286,670	2	
Maryland	5,375,156	8	
Massachusetts	6,379,304	10	
Michigan	9,990,817	15	
Minnesota	4,972,294	8	
Mississippi	2,858,029	4	
Missouri	5,629,707	9	
Montana	904,433	1	
Nebraska	1,713,235	3	
Nevada	2,106,074	3	
New Hampshire	1,259,181	2	
New Jersey	8,484,431	13	
New Mexico	1,829,146	3	
New York	19,011,378	29	
North Carolina	8,186,268	13	
North Dakota	634,448	1	
Ohio	11,373,541	17	-1
Oklahoma	3,460,097	5	
Oregon	3,472,867	5	
Pennsylvania	12,287,150	19	
Rhode Island	1,058,920	2	
South Carolina	4,063,011	6	
South Dakota	756,600	1	
Tennessee	5,740,021	9	
Texas	21,325,018	33	+1
Utah	2,269,789	4	+1
Vermont	613,090	1	
Virginia	7,187,734	11	
Washington	5,987,973	9	
West Virginia	1,801,916	3	
Wisconsin	5,401,906	8	
Wyoming	494,423	1	

REAPPORTIONMENT PROGRAM

Source data: July 1, 2001 Population Estimates, without federal overseas
(no Adjusted data) - Released 12/28/2001

These are the last ten states to get districts:

426:	CA	Received last district with	186,446	people to spare.
427:	FL	Received last district with	385,604	people to spare.
428:	NY	Received last district with	385,428	people to spare.
429:	MN	Received last district with	80,880	people to spare.
430:	PA	Received last district with	199,178	people to spare.
431:	MO	Received last district with	83,365	people to spare.
432:	CA	Received last district with	186,446	people to spare.
433:	TX	Received last district with	84,144	people to spare.
434:	NC	Received last district with	22,274	people to spare.
435:	UT	Received last district with	5,504	people to spare.

These are the next ten states to get districts:

436:	IA	Missed next district by	-7,106	people.
437:	OH	Missed next district by	-88,331	people.
438:	CA	Missed next district by	-552,230	people.
439:	MI	Missed next district by	-159,988	people.
440:	IN	Missed next district by	-101,328	people.
441:	NY	Missed next district by	-315,178	people.
442:	FL	Missed next district by	-308,679	people.
443:	IL	Missed next district by	-290,515	people.
444:	MT	Missed next district by	-22,204	people.
445:	MS	Missed next district by	-72,256	people.