

December 28, 2000

Contact: Kimball W. Brace

Tel. (202) 789-2004

E-mail: [Kbrace@aol.com](mailto:Kbrace@aol.com)

## ***2000 Census Counts Produce Surprises in Congressional Delegations***

Today's announcement of new population counts from the 2000 census produced at least four surprises in the reallocation of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. The surprises were **Florida's** gain of a *second* seat, **North Carolina's** gain of one seat, and the loss of seats by **Indiana** and **Michigan**.

The new census counts produced changes in the size of congressional delegations in 18 states. Gaining two seats each were **Arizona, Florida, Georgia,** and **Texas**. The states of **California, Colorado, Nevada,** and **North Carolina** each gained one seat. **New York** and **Pennsylvania** lost two seats each, while **Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, Oklahoma,** and **Wisconsin** each lost one seat. Overall, 12 seats were shifted among the states.

The new census counts reflect the number of persons residing in each state on April 1, 2000. The census counts include overseas military and federal civilian employees (and their dependents living with them). The counts have not been statistically adjusted for any known undercount. In 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that sampling procedures to adjust the census are unconstitutional for congressional apportionment.

A study of the new population counts by **Election Data Services Inc.** highlights the closeness of the apportionment numbers. For example, **North Carolina** secured the last seat (number 435) in the House of Representatives by just 3,087 people. **Utah**, next in line in position number 436, missed gaining an additional seat by just 856 people. The state of **Montana**, which lost its second seat in the Congress after the 1990 census, missed reversing that loss after the 2000 census by only 8,168 people. In 2000, **Montana** was among the next ten states to gain a seat, occupying position number 441. Here are the states "on the edge":

"Last Six" and people to spare

430: **Georgia** (142,389)  
431: **Iowa** (44,338)  
432: **Florida** ( 212,934)  
433: **Ohio** (79,688)  
434: **California** (33,942)  
435: **North Carolina** (3,087)

"Next Six" and people missed by

436: **Utah** (-856)  
437: **New York** (-47,249)  
438: **Texas** (-86,272)  
439: **Michigan** (-50,888)  
440: **Indiana** (-37,056)  
441: **Montana** (-8,168)

Given the tightness the apportionment numbers, efforts by states such as **Georgia** to cooperate with the Census Bureau and seek a full and complete count in the 2000 census may have paid off. **Georgia** was among the states gaining two seats.

“Gains by states such as Arizona and Texas coupled with losses by New York and Pennsylvania are indicative of the nation’s population shift from the Northeast to the South and West,” said Kimball Brace, the president of Election Data Services Inc. “Although people are moving west, they have obviously stayed to enjoy the cactuses of the Mountain West, rather than continue on to the California coast.”

**California**, in fact, was the biggest disappointment in the new census counts. California gained just one new seat, and it secured that seat—the next-to-last seat (number 434)—by only 33,942 people. Had California failed to gain a seat after the 2000 census, it would have been the first time since 1850 that California’s congressional delegation has not grown. “It’s clear that California’s near recession in the early 1990s continues to be felt,” noted Brace.

The losses by **Indiana** and **Michigan** were predicted by reapportionment studies that Election Data Services has conducted over the past decade with census population estimates. Indiana, which missed holding onto a congressional seat by 37,056 people after the 2000 census, has not been a stranger to close apportionment numbers. In 1980, Indiana lost a congressional seat by just over 7,000 people.

The surprise gains by **Florida** and **North Carolina** were not predicted by the reapportionment studies, although both states were usually positioned high on the lists of states next in line to gain seats. **North Carolina**’s gain of one congressional seat in after the 2000 census is attributed to the inclusion of overseas military and federal civilian employees in the census population counts.

[Click here for the apportionment results table, including individual state seat allocations.](#)

### **Impact of the Military & Overseas Population**

Had overseas populations not been included in the apportionment calculation, Election Data Services Inc. has determined that **North Carolina**’s surprise gain would have instead gone to the state of **Utah**. **Utah** would have gained the 435<sup>th</sup> and final seat, with just 691 persons to spare, while **North Carolina** would have missed the seat by 2,493 people. All other seats would have been allocated to the same states as unveiled this morning.

**North Carolina**’s gain is directly attributable to the way the overseas population is counted. Individuals were allocated to states using the “home of record” in their personnel files, or the state from which Americans overseas entered government service. Although several military bases are located in the state of **Utah**, the number of **North Carolina** residents living overseas is almost six times the number of **Utah** residents overseas.

The inclusion of overseas personnel for congressional apportionment, a practice used only twice before in 1990 and 1970, had a similar impact following the 1990 census. A study by Election Data Services

Inc. at the time showed that the state of **Washington** gained a seat at **Massachusetts'** expense because the overseas population was included in the apportionment.

### **Political Impacts of 2000 Apportionment Process**

The state gains and losses after the 2000 census are likely to have political implications. In the recent presidential election, Al Gore carried all but two of the states in the Northeast and Midwest that lost seats in the current apportionment—**New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin**. (Bush carried **Indiana** and **Ohio**, which also lost seats.) George W. Bush, on the other hand, carried all of the states, except **California**, that gained seats —**Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Nevada, North Carolina, and Texas**. Had the current congressional apportionment been in effect for the November 2000 elections, Bush would have had 278 electoral votes (compared to the 271 he officially received), and Gore would have gone from 267 to 260 electoral votes.

### **Ideal District Sizes for Next Round of Redistricting**

With the release of the resident population of each state (without overseas military or federal civilian employees), one can calculate the ideal district size that will be used by each state legislature to redraw Congressional, State Senate and State House districts. However, this calculation of ideal district size is based on the “unadjusted” census data that was used for the congressional apportionment process. If the Census Bureau determines that an adjustment is warranted and the new Bush administration allows the adjusted data to become public, the ideal district size can be recalculated with “adjusted” census data. Individual states will determine which set of data to use for redistricting. When the “adjusted” data is released in March 2000, Election Data Services will recalculate the ideal district size for the adjusted data.

The ideal district size based on “unadjusted” data varies wildly among the states and for various types of districts. For Congressional districts, the smallest and largest districts in the country will be single-district states. **Wyoming's** population of 493,782 will be the smallest district in the country, while **Montana's** population of 902,195 will be the largest. In fact, **Montana's** single Congressional district will be the largest district in the 200-year history of the country, according to research performed by Election Data Services. An average Congressional district will have a population of about 645,000.

State legislative district sizes will fluctuate even more. **North Dakota** will have the smallest State Senate districts, with an ideal district size of just 13,106. **California** will have the largest State Senate districts, with an ideal district size of 846,791, almost one-third larger than the State's Congressional districts. The California Senate has 40 members. An average State Senate district nationwide will have a population of about 142,000.

The use of multi-member districts in the lower chambers of state legislatures complicates the calculation of ideal district sizes. For example, **New Hampshire's** 400-member lower chamber (the largest in the nation) would appear to have an ideal district size of 3,089 people, but actual district sizes will be larger with multi-member districts. The ideal district size for **California's** 80-member State House is 423,395,

nearly the size of the State's Congressional districts. An average State House district nationwide will have a population of about 51,000.

[Click here for the table of ideal district sizes.](#)

### **Number of Seats Needed for No State to Lose a District**

The number of congressional seats has been fixed at 435 since 1911 (with the temporary increase to 437 in 1959 to allow for the entry of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union). In that time the average size of a congressional district has more than tripled in population, from 210,583 following the 1910 census to 646,947 with the 2000 census.

Using the new 2000 census population counts, Election Data Services Inc. determined that the number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives would need to be increased to 473 if no state were to lose a congressional district. (In the current apportionment, the last seat to be lost was the 21<sup>st</sup> seat in **Pennsylvania**, seat number 473.) Ten states lost at least one seat in the 2000 apportionment process. In a 473-member Congress, those losses would be canceled and 23 states would gain at least one seat. The gains from 1990 would be: California and Texas (+5), Florida (+4), Arizona and Georgia (+3), and single seat gains by Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

**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](http://www.electiondataservices.com)) or can be obtained by calling (202) 789-2004**