



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The New Constituents

How Latinos Will Shape Congressional Apportionment After the 2010 Census

October 2010 Update

The results of the 2010 Census 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 updated report examines the role Latinos will play in determining Congressional apportionment following the 2010 Census.ⁱ The bipartisan firm Election Data Services, Inc., relying on estimates from the GIS and demographic company Esri, issued new projections about which states are likely to gain and lose Congressional seats following the 2010 Census.ⁱⁱ These updated projections show that eighteen states are poised to see changes in their Congressional representation: eight states will gain at least one House seat, while ten states will lose at least one seat in Congress.

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

Using existing Census data on state populations, voter registration, and voter turnout, along with the above reapportionment projections, America's Voice Education Fund conducted the following analysis,ⁱⁱⁱ 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 Texas and Florida will owe their positions, in part, to the expanding Latino population.

Latinos represent 51% of population growth in the United States from 2000 to 2009.^{iv} They have driven growth in the states poised to gain House seats following the 2010 Census, including the majority of growth in both Texas and Florida, the only states currently projected

to gain more than one seat due to reapportionment. In Texas, Latinos were 63% of the population growth from 2000 to 2009, while in Florida, Latinos were 51% of the state's population growth during those years.

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 made up a combined 75% of the population growth between 2000 and 2009 in the ten states now projected to lose a House seat. In nine of the ten states projected to lose representation in Congress, Latinos were the majority of the state's population growth between 2000 and 2009. Louisiana, Michigan, 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. Latinos also made up at least half of the state's population growth between 2000 and 2008 in Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

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 the 2000 and 2008 elections. In sixteen of the eighteen states projected to gain or lose seats after the 2010 Census, the Latino share of the overall electorate increased between 2000 and 2008. In six of the eight states projected to gain seats, and in all of the ten 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 48% and Latino voter turnout expanded 53% between 2000 and 2008.^v In the ten states poised to lose seats, Latino voter registration grew 49% and Latino voter turnout expanded 60% 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 in 1994 created a backlash among Latino voters that the state Republican Party is still trying to overcome. This ballot initiative also marked the beginning of a trend that has been repeated in national, state, and local elections over the last several years. Candidates embracing hard-line immigration policies have struggled politically, in large part due to Latino voter mobilization. Most recently, Arizona's passage of the SB1070 anti-immigration law has helped to rally Latino voters in the state and become a national flashpoint – though the full impact of SB1070 on Arizona Latino voting habits will not be apparent until after the 2010 elections.

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 ^{vi}					
State	Current Number of Seats	Projected Seat Gain	Total State Population Growth, 2000-2009	Total Latino Population Growth, 2000-2009	Latino % of Total State Population Growth
Arizona	8	1	1,465,146	736,034	50.24%
Florida	25	2	2,555,591	1,306,043	51.11%
Georgia	13	1	1,642,758	380,739	23.18%
Nevada	3	1	644,828	306,323	47.50%
South Carolina	6	1	549,230	108,751	19.80%
Texas	32	4	3,930,482	2,480,022	63.10%
Utah	3	1	551,403	141,608	25.68%
Washington	9	1	770,074	245,855	31.93%

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 from 2000 to 2009 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 Arizona, Florida, and Nevada, Latino population growth was approximately half of each state’s overall population growth from 2000 through 2009.

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.^{vii}

Without Latinos, Arizona, Florida, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington would each have failed to gain as many seats as they are projected to gain.^{viii} Texas likely would have gained just one seat instead of four; while Arizona, Florida, Nevada, South Carolina, and Washington likely would have remained static. Only Georgia and Utah likely would have gained their projected number of new congressional 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^{ix}							
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%
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%
Washington	160,000	148,000	125.35%	150.85%	2.33%	4.82%	106.28%

Overall, Latino voter registration increased 48% from 2000 to 2008 in the eight states projected to gain a House seat. In five of these eight states, the number of Latino registered voters jumped by over 70%. In Florida, Georgia, Nevada, South Carolina, and Washington, Latino voter registration increased by 70% or more, led by Georgia’s 477%.

Latino voter turnout increased 53% between 2000 and 2008 in the eight states projected to gain a House seat. In five of these eight states, Latino voter turnout increased by more than 80% from the 2000 election to the 2008 election. In five of the eight states—Florida, Georgia,

Nevada, South Carolina, and Washington—Latino voter turnout increased by at least 80% between 2000 and 2008, including a 392% jump in Georgia.

In six 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 each 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 75% of the total population growth between 2000 and 2009 in the ten states projected to lose one or more House seats following the 2010 Census.

States Losing U.S. House Seats Due to 2010 Census^x					
State	Current Number of Seats	Projected Seat Loss	Total State Population Growth, 2000 - 2009	Total Latino Population Growth, 2000 - 2009	Latino % of Total State Population Growth
Illinois	19	-1	491,116	439,511	89.49%
Iowa	5	-1	81,533	48,210	59.13%
Louisiana	7	-1	23,100	54,154	234.43%
Massachusetts	10	-1	244,490	153,505	62.79%
Michigan	15	-1	31,283	98,954	316.32%
Missouri	9	-1	392,369	83,405	21.26%
New Jersey	13	-1	293,390	335,626	114.40%
New York	29	-2	564,996	406,594	71.96%
Ohio	18	-2	189,505	105,852	55.86%
Pennsylvania	19	-1	323,713	251,959	77.83%

In nine of the ten states, Latinos contributed the majority of the state's population growth from 2000 to 2009. Latinos made up at least half of the state's population growth from 2000 to 2009 in Illinois (89% of population growth), Pennsylvania (78%), Massachusetts (63%), New York (72%), Ohio (56%), and Iowa (59%). Louisiana, Michigan, 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.

Without Latino population growth, Pennsylvania would have lost two seats instead of their projected one-seat loss.^{xi} The "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat" numbers show how losing the Latino population growth from 2000-2009 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^{xii}							
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%
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 49% from the 2000 election to the 2008 election in the ten states projected to lose representation in Congress. In five of these states, the number of Latino registered voters increased by at least 67% -- Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania each saw their Latino voter registration grow significantly, led by a 92% jump in Missouri.

Overall Latino voter turnout jumped 60% between 2000 and 2008 in the ten states projected to lose a House seat. In five of these states—Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—Latino turnout increased by at least 51% from 2000 to 2008, with Pennsylvania’s 106% increase topping the list.

In each of the ten 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 over 54% in these ten 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 106% growth in Pennsylvania.

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."^{xiii} 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."^{xiv}

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.^{xv} 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 December 2009 poll of 1,010 Latino voters,^{xvi} conducted for America's Voice by Bendixen & Amadi, 62% of Latino voters have a family member, relative, or friend who is undocumented. Furthermore, 72% 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 and may offer important clues to the next generation of political battleground states in 2012 and beyond.

For example, a state like Texas may become more competitive in national elections if current levels of Latino support for Democrats persist and if Republicans continue to embrace anti-immigration politics. Contests in states like Arizona and Nevada may hinge on Latino turnout levels and, especially in future contests, candidates in these states will find it increasingly difficult to ride to statewide office on an anti-immigrant platform. 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 eighteen 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^{xvii}, 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.^{xviii}

Of these eight states, Nevada is the lone state 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. Though Democrats control both houses of the Washington state legislature, the state relies on a commission to direct redistricting, rather than the legislature.

Arizona also relies on a commission to direct their redistricting processes, while in the other five states projected to gain seats 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 (+1)	R +10	R +6	Commission
Florida (+2)	R +32	R +12	Legislative
Georgia (+1)	R +30	R +12	Legislative
Nevada (+1)	D +14	D +3	Legislative
South Carolina (+1)	R +18	R +8	Legislative
Texas (+4)	R +2	R +7	Legislative
Utah (+1)	R +31	R +13	Legislative
Washington (+1)	D +30	D +13	Commission

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 six of the ten 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 lone state projected to lose a congressional seat in which Republicans control both chambers of the state legislature.

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
Missouri (-1)	R +15	R +12	Legislative
New Jersey (-1)	D +16	D +6	Commission
New York (-2)	D +68	D +2	Legislative
Ohio (-2)	D +7	R +9	Legislative
Pennsylvania (-1)	D +5	R +10	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.

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.^{xix} 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%.^{xx} 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.”^{xxi} 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,^{xxii} 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 the firm's report, *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2010 Congressional Apportionment, With A Number of States Sitting Close to the Edge*. September 26, 2010.

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 2009, as well as the Latino voter registration and turnout data for the 2000 and 2008 elections, comes from the U.S. Census, through their American Community Survey for 2009 and their post-2000 election and post-2008 election state recaps of voter registration and voter turnout.

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 2009 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey, released on September 28, 2010.

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 Appendix A 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, 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 are based on overall state population data estimates as of July 2010 generated by Esri, a "leading GIS and demographic company". However, state-by-state Latino population information from the U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS) only extend through 2009. As a result, the paper uses ACS 2009 population figures for both the general population and the Latino population to ensure an "apples to apples" comparison. The apportionment projections rely on Election Data Services, Inc., *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2010 Congressional Appointment, With A Number of States Sitting Close to the Edge*. September 26, 2010. For this paper, we relied on the information in Appendix A of the report. Census Latino 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 Latino population numbers for 2009 obtained via U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, September 28, 2010: http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ACS&_submenuid=&_lang=en&_ds_name=ACS_2009_1YR_G00_&_ts=.

ⁱⁱ Election Data Services, Inc., *New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes for 2010 Congressional Appointment, With A Number of States Sitting Close to the Edge*. September 26, 2010.

ⁱⁱⁱ As noted in Footnote 1, Census state-by-state population numbers through July 1, 2009 do not include a breakdown of the Latino population in each state. As a result, while the reapportionment projections from Election Data Services rely on updated population information, the information about state-by-state Latino population figures still rely on 2008 numbers. The updated Census breakdown of Latino population in each state is due for release in May 2010 if past release schedules remain consistent.

^{iv} Census data show the U.S. gained 25,584,644 residents from 2000 to 2009, including 13,113,506 Latinos. Census Data from 2009 American Community Survey .

^v Information on Latino voter behavior 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>.

^{vi} Projected Seat Gains from Election Data Services, Inc. report and population data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey.

^{vii} The "Gain a Seat" and "Lose a Seat" columns in Appendix A 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 Appendix A to demonstrate the role of Latinos in affecting each state's number of seats under this existing projection model.

^{viii} By comparing the state's Latino population growth since 2000 with the "Lose a Seat" number total in Appendix A, 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.

^{ix} 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>.

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

^{xi} This also relies on the “Gain a Seat” and “Lose a Seat” columns in Appendix A of the Election Data Services, Inc. projection report.

^{xii} 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>.

^{xiii} 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>.

^{xiv} 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>.

^{xv} 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.

^{xvi} Bendixen & Amandi, National Hispanic Voter Study on Immigration Policy, December, 2009.
<http://americasvoiceonline.org/LatinoPollResultsPDF>.

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

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

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

^{xx} 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.

^{xxi} 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.

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