

The New Constituents

How Latino Population Growth Will Shape Congressional Apportionment After the 2010 Census



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The New Constituents

How Latinos Will Shape Congressional Apportionment After the 2010 Census

The 2010 Census is upon us and its results will have a profound effect on the American political landscape. Since the last Census in 2000, the Latino population in America has grown dramatically, and Latinos have become the largest minority group in the United States.

This paper examines the role Latinos will play in determining Congressional apportionment following the 2010 Census.ⁱ The bipartisan firm Election Data Services, Inc. used existing Census data to project which states are likely to gain and lose Congressional seats following the 2010 Census.ⁱⁱ Their projections show that nineteen states are poised to see changes in their Congressional representation: eight states will gain at least one House seat, while eleven states will lose at least one seat in Congress.

- **States gaining House seats:** Texas (+4), Arizona (+2), Florida (+1), Georgia (+1), Nevada (+1), Oregon (+1), South Carolina (+1), and Utah (+1).
- **States losing House seats:** Ohio (-2), Illinois (-1), Iowa (-1), Louisiana (-1), Massachusetts (-1), Michigan (-1), Minnesota (-1), Missouri (-1), New Jersey (-1), New York (-1), and Pennsylvania (-1).

Using existing Census data on state populations, voter registration, and voter turnout from 2000 to 2008, along with the above reapportionment projections, America's Voice Education Fund conducted the following analysis, which finds that:

Latinos are not just settling in major cities, but diverse regions of the country. After the 2010 Census, new Members of Congress in states like Georgia and South Carolina as well as Arizona and Texas will owe their positions, in part, to the expanding Latino population.

Latinos represent 51% of population growth in the United States as a whole since 2000.ⁱⁱⁱ They have driven growth in the states poised to gain House seats following the 2010 Census, especially in those projected to gain more than one seat. In these two states, Texas and Arizona, Latinos comprise a combined 59% of population growth since 2000.

States that are losing Congressional representation would have fared worse had Latinos not moved there in record numbers. While their states' Congressional delegations are shrinking overall, Latino voters are gaining power as they expand their share of the electorate.

Latinos make up a combined 77% of the population growth in the eleven states projected to lose a House seat. In nine of the eleven states projected to lose representation in Congress,

Latinos were the majority of the state's population growth since 2000. Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey showed the highest percentage of growth, as each state would have seen a net decline in population over the last decade if not for the influx of Latinos. While Louisiana did see a net population loss this decade, had it not been for strong growth in the state's Latino population, the numbers would have looked much starker. Latinos also made up at least half of the state's population growth since 2000 in Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Iowa.

Not only is the overall Latino population growing, but the number of Latino voters is also increasing dramatically.

Nationwide, Latino voter registration grew 54% and Latino voter turnout grew 64% between 2000 and 2008. In sixteen of the nineteen states projected to gain or lose seats after the 2010 Census, the Latino share of the overall electorate increased between 2000 and 2008. In five of the eight states projected to gain seats, and in all of the eleven states projected to lose seats, Latinos made up a greater share of the overall electorate in 2008 than they did in 2000.

In the eight states poised to gain seats, Latino voter registration grew 45% and Latino voter turnout expanded 50% between 2000 and 2008.^{iv} In the eleven states poised to lose seats, Latino voter registration grew 50% and Latino voter turnout expanded 62% between 2000 and 2008.

As this demographic continues to grow, politicians who ignore or demonize the Latino population in their states will find the road to re-election much more difficult.

Proposition 187 in California, which created a backlash among Latino voters that the state Republican Party is still trying to overcome, marked the beginning of a trend that has been repeated in national, state, and local elections over the last several years. This trend will only continue as the Latino electorate grows, if politicians continue to demonize Latinos and immigrants through harsh rhetoric and policies. For example, according to polling by Bendixen & Associates, 87% of Latino voters refuse to even consider voting for a candidate who advocates mass deportation of undocumented workers.

The following report examines these findings in greater detail. For information on the redistricting process in the states projected to gain or lose seats following the 2010 Census, please see the accompanying appendix.

About This Report

America's Voice Education Fund (AVEF) would like to thank Andres Ramirez, Senior Vice President & Director of Hispanic Programs at NDN, for research assistance and strategic consultation. Mr. Ramirez provided much of the initial research that formed the backbone of this report.

AVEF would also like to thank Election Data Services, Inc. and the firm's president, Kimball Brace, for providing the projection models used as the foundation for this report, and the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) for providing the information used to develop the appendix on redistricting. Neither Election Data Services, Inc. nor NCSL endorses the report contents.

For more information about this report, please call 202.463.8602 or contact Lynn Tramonte, Deputy Director of America's Voice Education Fund, at press@americasvoiceonline.org.

The New Constituents: How Latinos Will Shape Congressional Apportionment after the 2010 Census

States Gaining U.S. House Seats

In each of the states projected to gain Congressional seats after the 2010 Census, the Latino population has grown significantly. While some of these states, such as Texas, have been home to people of Hispanic heritage for many generations, others have seen a dramatic increase in their Latino population over a very short period of time. As the table below shows, Latinos will be a major driver in expanding power in Congress following the 2010 Census.

Latinos have driven the population growth that is resulting in increased representation in the U.S. House of Representatives for a number of states.

States Gaining U.S. House Seats Due to 2010 Census ^v					
State	Current Number of Seats	Projected Seat Gain	Total State Population Growth Since 2000	Total Latino Growth Since 2000	Latino % of Total State Population Growth
Arizona	8	2	1,369,548	660,013	48.19%
Florida	25	1	2,345,962	1,162,354	49.55%
Georgia	13	1	1,499,291	342,017	22.81%
Nevada	3	1	601,910	274,557	45.61%
Oregon	5	1	368,661	140,730	38.17%
South Carolina	6	1	467,788	88,905	19.01%
Texas	32	4	3,475,154	2,200,809	63.33%
Utah	3	1	503,255	127,510	25.34%

Texas, the state projected to gain the most from reapportionment, has seen the highest percentage of Latino population growth out of this group. Latinos comprise 63% of the population growth in Texas since 2000 and are the single largest reason that the state is projected to gain four seats in the U.S. House—the greatest change, positive or negative, among any state in the nation.

In the two states projected to gain more than one Congressional seat, Texas and Arizona, Latinos represent 59% of the total population growth since 2000. In Arizona, Florida, and Nevada, Latino population growth has been approximately half of each state's overall population growth since 2000.

Without Latino population growth, six of the eight states gaining representation would most likely not have achieved their current projected seat gains. Examining state populations in the absence of Latino population growth demonstrates the raw political power Latinos are building in these states. Using the “Gain a Seat” and “Lose a Seat” numbers from the Election Data Services, Inc. report, we arrive at a snapshot of how losing the Latino population would affect each state’s reapportionment projection.^{vi}

Without Latinos, Arizona, Florida, Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina and Texas would each have failed to gain as many seats as they are projected to gain.^{vii} Texas likely would have gained just one seat instead of four; Florida likely would have remained static; Arizona likely would have gained just one seat instead of two; and Nevada, Oregon and South Carolina likely would have remained static. Only Georgia and Utah would have gained their new seats without Latino growth.

In addition to population growth, Latinos have demonstrated increased clout at the ballot box since 2000. Examining trends during the 2000 and 2008 election cycles shows the extent to which Latinos have not only added to their overall numbers in the eight states poised to gain seats in Congress, but have expanded their share of the electorate as well.

Latino Voting Trends in States Gaining House Seats^{viii}							
State	Latino Registered Voters, 2008	Latino Voter Turnout, 2008	% Growth of Latino Registered Voters, 2000-2008	% Growth of Latino Voter Turnout, 2000 vs. 2008	Latino % of Total State Voters, 2000	Latino % of Total State Voters, 2008	% Change in Latino Share of Overall Electorate, 2000-2008
Arizona	410,000	291,000	34.87%	17.81%	15.02%	11.65%	-22.43%
Florida	1,380,000	1,227,000	72.07%	80.97%	11.29%	15.43%	36.70%
Georgia	150,000	128,000	476.92%	392.31%	0.92%	3.06%	232.72%
Nevada	131,000	119,000	147.17%	164.44%	7.02%	11.59%	65.05%
Oregon	43,000	39,000	-10.41%	18.18%	2.15%	2.15%	0%
South Carolina	21,000	18,000	200%	157.14%	0.41%	0.86%	111.22%
Texas	2,441,000	1,697,000	28.14%	30.54%	18.56%	20.12%	8.41%
Utah	24,000	21,000	0%	5%	2.41%	2.24%	-7.30%

Overall, Latino voter registration increased 45% from 2000 to 2008 in the eight states projected to gain a House seat. In half of these states, the number of Latino registered voters jumped by over 70%. In four of the eight states—Florida, Georgia, Nevada, and South Carolina—Latino voter registration increased by 70% or more, led by Georgia’s 477%.

Latino voter turnout increased 50% between 2000 and 2008 in the eight states projected to gain a House seat. In the majority of these states, Latino voter turnout increased by more than 80% from the 2000 election to the 2008 election. In four of the eight states—Florida, Georgia, Nevada, and South Carolina—Latino voter turnout increased by at least 80% between 2000 and 2008, including a 392% jump in Georgia.

In five of the eight states projected to gain Congressional seats, the Latino share of the overall electorate increased between 2000 and 2008. Despite having sizeable Latino voter populations in 2000, both the states of Florida and Nevada demonstrated significant Latino voter growth since then. In Florida, the Latino share of the overall electorate grew by nearly 37% since 2000, and encompassed over 15% of the Florida electorate in 2008. In Nevada, the Latino share of the overall electorate grew by over 65% since 2000, and encompassed nearly 12% of the state's electorate in 2008.

In Texas, the Latino share of the voter population grew between 2000 and 2008 to encompass over one-fifth of the electorate. Although Texas has had a large Latino population throughout its history, Latino voting registration and turnout jumped by approximately 30% from 2000 to 2008, and the Latino share of the overall electorate increased to over 20%.

Of the eight states poised to gain seats in Congress following the 2010 Census, two southern states demonstrated the greatest percentage growth in the Latino share of the overall electorate between 2000 and 2008. Georgia (233% growth in Latino share of the overall electorate between 2000 and 2008) and South Carolina (111% growth) showed the greatest percentage increase.

States Losing U.S. House Seats

The combination of an aging population and economic opportunities elsewhere has caused a slowing or outright decline in the population of many states, which is having a direct impact on the number of seats they hold in Congress. However, in many of these areas, growth in the states' Latino population has actually helped to counteract the shrinkage within other groups.

Latinos make up 77% of the total population growth in the eleven states projected to lose one or more House seats following the 2010 Census.

States Losing U.S. House Seats Due to 2010 Census^{ix}					
State	Current Number of Seats	Projected Seat Loss	Total State Population Growth Since 2000	Total Latino Growth Since 2000	Latino % of Total State Population Growth
Illinois	19	-1	482,270	436,859	90.58%
Iowa	5	-1	76,231	43,980	57.69%
Louisiana	7	-1	-58,180	40,725	Net population loss
Massachusetts	10	-1	148,870	128,168	86.09%
Michigan	15	-1	64,978	89,950	138.43%
Minnesota	8	-1	300,914	73,192	24.32%
Missouri	9	-1	316,394	71,108	22.47%
New Jersey	13	-1	268,311	301,354	112.32%
New York	29	-1	513,840	382,455	74.43%
Ohio	18	-2	132,770	84,978	64%
Pennsylvania	19	-1	167,225	199,898	119.54%

In nine of the eleven states, Latinos contributed the majority of the state's population growth since 2000. Latinos made up at least half of the state's population growth since 2000 in Illinois (91% of population growth), Massachusetts (86%), New York (74%), Ohio (64%), and Iowa (58%). Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey showed the highest percentage of Latino population growth; in fact, each state would have seen a net decline in population over the last decade if not for the influx of Latinos. While Louisiana did see a net population loss this decade, had it not been for strong growth in the state's Latino population, the numbers would have looked much starker.

Without Latino population growth, New York and Pennsylvania would have lost two seats instead of their projected one-seat losses.^x Using the specific "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat"

numbers in the Election Data Services, Inc. report, we arrive at a snapshot of how losing the Latino population would affect each state’s apportionment projection.

Latinos have also demonstrated increased clout at the ballot box since 2000 in these states. Examining the 2000 and 2008 election cycles shows the extent to which Latinos have increased their share of the electorate in the states that are poised to lose Congressional representation. Latino voting power is expanding in these states, and will become concentrated in a smaller number of Congressional districts once the reapportionment process occurs.

Latino Voting Trends in States Losing Seats^{xi}

State	Latino Registered Voters, 2008	Latino Voter Turnout, 2008	% Growth Latino Registered Voters, 2000-2008	% Growth Latino Voter Turnout, 2000-2008	Latino % of Total State Voters, 2000	Latino % of Total State Voters, 2008	% Change in Latino Share of Overall Electorate, 2000-2008
Illinois	385,000	314,000	47%	44%	4.33%	5.78%	33.28%
Iowa	21,000	20,000	-5%	5%	0.80%	1.33%	67.54%
Louisiana	39,000	32,000	3%	45%	1.08%	1.49%	37.40%
Massachusetts	103,000	77,000	0%	51%	1.84%	2.53%	37.49%
Michigan	85,000	70,000	67%	75%	0.92%	1.44%	56.22%
Minnesota	39,000	35,000	333%	289%	0.38%	1.27%	234.90%
Missouri	25,000	20,000	92%	54%	0.49%	0.70%	43.74%
New Jersey	388,000	337,000	83%	88%	5.31%	9.27%	74.65%
New York	836,000	743,000	39%	48%	7.17%	9.83%	37.14%
Ohio	85,000	74,000	81%	72%	0.89%	1.35%	51.38%
Pennsylvania	189,000	161,000	91%	137%	1.36%	2.80%	105.50%

Overall Latino voter registration increased 50% from 2000 to 2008 in the eleven states projected to lose representation in Congress. In the majority of these states, the number of Latino registered voters increased by over 65%. In six of the eleven states—Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—Latino voter registration increased by at least 67%, including by 333% in Minnesota.

Overall Latino voter turnout jumped 62% between 2000 and 2008 in the eleven states projected to lose a House seat. In the majority of these states—Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—Latino turnout increased by at least 51% from 2000 to 2008, with Minnesota’s 289% increase topping the list.

In each of the eleven states projected to lose Congressional seats, the Latino share of the overall electorate increased between 2000 and 2008. The average percentage growth in the Latino share of the overall electorate between 2000 and 2008 was nearly 71% in these eleven states. Of the states projected to lose House seats, the percentage growth in the Latino share of the electorate since 2000 ranged from a low of over 33% growth in Illinois to a high of almost 235% growth in Minnesota.

Why It Matters

The decennial Census provides an unparalleled source of information for academics, students of politics, and statistics enthusiasts. The outcome of the Census will also determine the allocation of billions of dollars in Federal funding to the states. One of the most important functions of the Census is to apportion raw political power in the form of Congressional seats.

The states likely to gain political power following the 2010 Census are currently largely Republican-dominated at both the Congressional and state levels, and in many cases will owe this expanded power to Latinos who moved to their states over the last several years. Ironically, many members of the delegations who will benefit from the increase in Latino population have embraced policies that are hostile to Latinos and immigrants. It will be interesting to see how the 2010 Census impacts politicians' attitudes toward immigrants and Latinos who helped them expand their power in Congress.

The states poised to lose seats are more mixed when it comes to partisan control, though they tip toward the Democratic end of the scale. They too include pockets of politicians who have been hostile to immigrants and Latinos. As the number of Latino voters continues to rise in these states, and concentrates its influence in fewer Congressional districts, politicians will likely adjust their courtship of these voters accordingly.

Not only are Latino residents expanding their power, but Latino citizens are also making their voices heard at the ballot box. The fallout from Proposition 187 in California (in 1994) marked a political turning point in the immigration debate. Whereas anti-immigrant wedge politics looked like a winning strategy at first, Proposition 187 ended up backfiring spectacularly on the candidates and party most identified with the effort: the GOP. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, Proposition 187 "helped spur record numbers of California Latinos to become U.S. citizens and register to vote."^{xii} As National Public Radio noted, the "subsequent backlash among the Latino community may have been largely responsible for turning California into a solidly blue state."^{xiii}

This trend has also been observed in recent elections, where candidates who blamed Latinos or immigrants for a wide array of social ills, as a way to attract Independent voters, found instead that they alienated both groups.^{xiv} One reason is that immigration is a personal issue for the fast-growing Latino community, and anti-immigrant rhetoric is seen as targeting not just undocumented workers, but Latinos as a whole. According to a May 2009 poll of 800 Latino voters,^{xv} conducted for America's Voice by Bendixen & Associates, 69% of Latino voters have a family member, relative, or friend who is undocumented. Furthermore, 87% of Latino voters would not even consider voting for a candidate who supports "forcing most illegal immigrants to leave the country," despite their stances on other issues. Thus, bashing immigrants resonates deeply and ripples broadly through this growing demographic group. Clearly, the

wedge politics of illegal immigration are working against proponents, and this trend shows no signs of reversing as Latino voters expand their share of the electorate.

The 2010 Census will reveal the surging political power of Latinos in America. The results will likely show that Texas may become more like California, in terms of the backfiring illegal immigration wedge strategy, and that Florida already has. Further, the results will show that candidates in states such as Arizona and Nevada will not be able to ride to statewide office on an anti-immigrant platform. And finally, the results will show how the Latino and immigrant influx in the South as well as the Rust Belt will change the landscape of these states' politics in years to come.

Appendix: Redistricting at the State Level

Following the official results of the 2010 Census, the states that lose or gain representation in Congress will have to engage in a process to redraw the boundaries of their Congressional districts. Because each state independently determines its own redistricting process, there is significant variation on the specifics. While most states delegate the responsibility to the legislature, others task independent commissions with the duty, while still others employ a combination of the two options.

The majority of states rely solely on their state legislatures for Congressional redistricting. This means the state's redistricting plan must be approved by both the upper and the lower houses and then signed or vetoed by the governor. Because of the political nature of state legislative bodies, and the high stakes associated with the outcome, the redistricting process often becomes enmeshed in partisan politics. Although legislators are instructed to design districts that are as fair and equal in population as possible, sitting legislators have an obvious interest in maintaining the status quo of the districts that elected them and in maintaining power for their own political party.

Only six states in the nation give "first and final authority for Congressional line drawing" to non-legislative commissions. Depending on the state, these commissions are composed of elected officials, legislative appointees, and members of the court. Thus, in some states, these commissions are less partisan and political than in other states following a legislative process.

Among the nineteen states projected to gain or lose seats in this analysis, Arizona and New Jersey rely on independent commissions while in Iowa, nonpartisan legislative staff develop district maps, with the final plan subject to state legislature approval.

Absent major changes following the 2010 elections, Republicans are poised to control the redistricting process in most of the states poised to gain seats in the U.S. House. As the table below shows^{xvi}, Republicans currently control both houses of the state legislature in six of the eight states poised to gain Congressional seats. While the specific partisan makeup of each state legislature may change by the time redistricting occurs, the snapshot offered by the tables provide insight into how the redistricting process may occur in each state.^{xvii}

Of these eight states, Nevada and Oregon are the lone states in which Democrats would control the redistricting process if held today, given Democratic control of both upper and lower houses of the state legislature there.

Arizona relies on a commission to direct its redistricting process, while in the other five states in which Republicans control both state legislative houses, the redistricting process is legislatively controlled.

Redistricting Overview - States Gaining House Seats			
State and Projected Seat Gains	State Legislature Lower House Partisan Control and Margin	State Legislature Upper House Partisan Control and Margin	Redistricting Governing Body
Arizona (+2)	R +10	R +6	Commission
Florida (+1)	R +32	R +12	Legislative
Georgia (+1)	R +30	R +12	Legislative
Nevada (+1)	D +14	D +3	Legislative
Oregon (+1)	D +12	D +6	Legislative
South Carolina (+1)	R +18	R +8	Legislative
Texas (+4)	R +2	R +7	Legislative
Utah (+1)	R +31	R +13	Legislative

Absent major changes following the 2010 elections, Democrats are poised to control the redistricting process in most of the states poised to lose seats in the U.S. House. Democrats currently control both houses of the state legislature in seven of the eleven states poised to lose Congressional seats. In addition:

Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan have split state legislatures, with Democratic control of the lower chamber and Republican control of the upper chamber.

Missouri is the one state where Republicans would control the redistricting process if held today.

New Jersey and Iowa each rely on types of commissions to direct their redistricting processes.

Redistricting Overview - States Losing House Seats			
State and Projected Seat Losses	State Legislature Lower House Partisan Control and Margin	State Legislature Upper House Partisan Control and Margin	Redistricting Governing Body
Illinois (-1)	D +22	D +15	Legislative
Iowa (-1)	D +12	D +14	Legislative staff
Louisiana (-1)	D +2	D +7	Legislative

Massachusetts (-1)	D +127	D +30	Legislative
Michigan (-1)	D +24	R +4	Legislative
Minnesota (-1)	D +40	D +25	Legislative
Missouri (-1)	R +15	R +12	Legislative
New Jersey (-1)	D +16	D +6	Commission
New York (-1)	D +68	D +3	Legislative
Ohio (-2)	D +7	R +9	Legislative
Pennsylvania (-1)	D +5	R +9	Legislative

Given the political nature of the redistricting process, close scrutiny of the way Congressional district maps are drawn is essential to protecting the rights of voters. A recent example from Texas illustrates what's at stake.

When drawing new Congressional borders following the 2000 Census, the Republican-controlled Texas legislature "moved" 100,000 citizens from the majority Latino Congressional District 23 to Congressional District 25 in order to protect a District 23 incumbent who was out of favor with Latinos.^{xviii} In their place, the legislature added residents from predominantly white Republican counties to District 23, which dropped the Latino share of the citizen voting-age population from 57.5% to 46%.^{xix} To complete the jigsaw puzzle of redistricting, the legislature created an expanded District 25 that ran three hundred miles down the state. Latinos comprised 55% of this new District's citizen voting-age population, but the two primary Latino communities were divided between the far north and the far south of the district.

In *League of United Latin American Citizens et al v. Perry, Governor of Texas, et al*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that "Texas' redrawing of District 23's lines amount[ed] to vote dilution violative of the Voting Rights Act of 1965."^{xx} The District 23 incumbent, Republican Henry Bonilla, lost the next race in 2006 to Democrat Ciro Rodriguez. Though the GOP's gerrymandering attempt was struck down by the Court,^{xxi} it demonstrates how race and politics factor into the redistricting process and provides a cautionary tale for parties and state legislatures seeking to engineer such districts in the next round of redistricting.

Finally, as this report illustrates in detail, Latinos have contributed significantly to states' population growth and are dramatically expanding their share of the electorate. In the coming years, Latinos will play an ever greater role in determining the specific makeup of the state legislatures who draw Congressional maps. Politics is clearly an evolving exercise, and Latinos are an increasingly important factor in a growing number of states.

Methodology

Apportionment Projections: The apportionment projections cited in this report come from the nonpartisan political consulting firm Election Data Services, Inc. For this paper, we relied on the information in Table D of the firm's report, *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2008 Congressional Appointment, But Point to Major Changes for 2010*. This "short-term trend" model provides the projections we use throughout this report.

Please note that the results of the projection model used in this report may differ from other reapportionment projections and that, until the actual Census occurs and apportionment takes place, all projection models include a degree of uncertainty. Additionally, please note that Election Data Services, Inc. does not endorse this report, its content or its conclusions.

America's Voice Education Fund then relied on U.S. Census data to examine how Latinos are playing a role in driving the reapportionment results. The information about the national and state-by-state Latino population in 2000 and 2008, as well as the Latino voter registration and turnout data for the 2000 and 2008 elections, comes from the U.S. Census.

All other data from this report are based on the above sources and reflect calculations performed by America's Voice Education Fund and/or NDN.

Population: Population numbers for 2000 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, "Census 2000 Brief: The Hispanic Population," May 2001. Population numbers for 2008 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, "Table 4: Estimates of the Resident Population by Race and Hispanic Origin for the United States and States: July 1, 2008," May 14, 2009.

Voter Registration and Turnout: 2000 and 2008 Latino voting statistics from U.S. Census Bureau, "Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2000," and "Reported Voting and Registration of the Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2008,"

Projecting Different Scenarios: The "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat" columns in Table I (the "short-term" trend model) of the Election Data Services, Inc. projection report show the number of voters it would take under this projection model for that state to gain an additional seat or lose an additional seat, assuming all other states stayed the same. Though an actual population shift in one state would affect the overall apportionment and allocation of Congressional seats to each state and would require a full and separate 50-state projection chart for each revision, this analysis does not go into that level of detail. By comparing the state's Latino population growth since 2000 with the "Lose a Seat" number total in Table I, it is possible to assess whether the relevant state would lose one Congressional seat. While the one-seat gain or loss is an exact number, multiple-seat gains or losses are harder to extrapolate and rely on a rough approximation.

Endnotes

ⁱ Election Data Services, Inc.'s apportionment projections and Latino population information are based on Census data through July 1, 2008. The apportionment projections rely on Election Data Services, Inc., *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2008 Congressional Appointment, But Point to Major Changes for 2010*. December 22, 2008. For this paper, we relied on the information in Table D of the report (the "short-term" trend model). Census population numbers for 2000 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, "Census 2000 Brief: The Hispanic Population," May 2001: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-3.pdf>. Census population numbers for 2008 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, "Table 4: Estimates of the Resident Population by Race and Hispanic Origin for the United States and States: July 1, 2008," May 14, 2009: <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/SC-EST2008-04.html>.

ⁱⁱ Election Data Services, Inc., *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2008 Congressional Appointment, But Point to Major Changes for 2010*. December 22, 2008. For this paper, we relied on the information in Table D, the "short-term" trend model: http://www.electiondataservices.com/images/File/NR_Appor08wTables.pdf.

ⁱⁱⁱ Census data show the U.S. gained 22,637,818 residents from 2000 to 2008, including 11,637,795 Latinos. Census Data from Population Estimates as of July 1, 2008: <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/NST-ann-est.html>.

^{iv} Information on the Latino vote from U.S. Census Bureau, "Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2000," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/p20-542.html> and "Reported Voting and Registration of the Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2008," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/cps2008.html>.

^v Projected Seat Gains from Election Data Services, Inc. report and population data from U.S. Census Bureau.

^{vi} The "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat" columns in Table I of the Election Data Services, Inc. projection report show the number of people it would take under this projection model for that state to gain an additional seat or lose an additional seat, assuming everyone else stays the same. Though an actual population shift in one state would affect the overall apportionment and allocation of Congressional seats to each state, and would require a full and separate 50-state projection chart for each revision, this analysis does not go into that level of detail. Instead, this analysis relies on the current Election Data Services, Inc., numbers in Table I to demonstrate the role of Latinos in affecting each state's number of seats under this existing projection model.

^{vii} By comparing the state's Latino population growth since 2000 with the "Lose a Seat" number total in Table I, it is possible to assess whether the relevant state would lose one Congressional seat. While the one-seat gain or loss is an exact number, multiple-seat gains or losses are harder to extrapolate and rely on a rough approximation.

^{viii} 2000 and 2008 Latino voting statistics from U.S. Census Bureau, "Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2000," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/p20-542.html> and "Reported Voting and Registration of the Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2008," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/cps2008.html>.

^{ix} Projected Seat Gains from Election Data Services, Inc. report and population data from U.S. Census Bureau.

^x This also relies on the "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat" columns in Table I of the Election Data Services, Inc. projection report.

^{xi} 2000 and 2008 Latino voting statistics from U.S. Census Bureau, “Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2000,” <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/p20-542.html> and “Reported Voting and Registration of the Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2008,” <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting/cps2008.html>.

^{xii} Teresa Watanabe and Hector Becerra, “500,000 Pack Streets to Protest Immigration Bills,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 26, 2006: <http://articles.latimes.com/2006/mar/26/local/me-immig26>.

^{xiii} Clare Abreu, “The Latino Vote, on its Own Terms,” National Public Radio, November 7, 2006: <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6450360>.

^{xiv} See http://www.immigration08.com/press_releases/entry/latinos_flex_political_muscle/, http://amvoice.3cdn.net/77076902eaa41d8a76_vqm6id0x0.pdf, and <http://www.americasvoiceonline.org/ImmigrationStatement06> for more information.

^{xv} Bendixen & Associates, National Survey of Hispanic Voters on Immigration Policy, May 18, 2009: http://amvoice.3cdn.net/3c7baeb44f16c977ef_edm6bnqoi.pdf.

^{xvi} Partisan control information of state legislatures from National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) website, <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=16507>.

^{xvii} Redistricting information from National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) website. Main NCSL redistricting page available at <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=16637>.

^{xviii} Justin Levitt. Brennan Center for Justice, *A Citizen’s Guide for Redistricting*, p. 12. 2008.

^{xix} District information and percentage breakdown from *League of United Latin American Citizens et al v. Perry, Governor of Texas, et al*. Supreme Court of the United States, 2006.

^{xx} Quote from Justice Anthony Kennedy, *League of United Latin American Citizens et al v. Perry, Governor of Texas, et al*. Supreme Court of the United States, 2006.

^{xxi} The Supreme Court ruled only that the District 23 plan violated the Voting Rights Act, not the entire state’s redistricting plan.