UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary
THROUGH:
Michael R. Darby $\underset{\text { Mdinisistrator }}{\text { Mich Dank }}$ Under Secretary and Administrator

FROM:

SUBJECT: Barbara Everitt Bryant Banbana Eusrill Bryant Director, Bureau of the census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section 141 (b), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and 2b.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

## United States Department of Commerce

Bureau of the Census
1990 popllation and muber of representatives, by state
WOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
total population ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { STATE } & \text { APPORTIONMENT } \\ & \text { POPULATION }\end{array}$
mumber of REPRESENTATIVES BASED ON THE 1990 CENSUS

UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$
Alabema
Alaska
Arizona
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
$I$ daho
lllinois
Indiana
lowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
Morth Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Okl ahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Ternessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
uyoming
$249,022,783$
$4,062,608$
551,947
$3,676,985$
$2,362,239$
$29,839,250$
$3,307,912$
$3,295,669$
668,696

| 435 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7 | - |
| 1 | - |
| 6 | +1 |
| 4 | - |
| 52 | +7 |
| 6 | - |
| 6 | - |
| 1 | - |
| 23 | +4 |
| 11 | +1 |
| 2 | - |
| 2 | - |
| 20 | -2 |
| 10 | - |
| 5 | -1 |
| 4 | -1 |
| 6 | -1 |
| 7 | -1 |
| 2 | - |
| 8 | - |
| 10 | -1 |
| 16 | -2 |
| 8 | - |
| 5 | - |
| 9 | - |
| 1 | -1 |
| 3 | - |
| 2 | - |
| 2 | - |
| 13 | -9 |
| 3 | - |
| 31 | -3 |
| 12 | +1 |
| 1 | - |
| 19 | -2 |
| 6 | - |
| 5 | - |
| 21 | -2 |
| 2 | - |
| 6 | - |
| 1 | - |
| 9 | - |
| 30 | +3 |
| 3 | - |
| 1 | - |
| 11 | +1 |
| 9 | +1 |
| 3 | -1 |
| 9 | - |
| 1 | - |

1 Total population includes erumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Colunbia.

## Package pruned to units thu e (

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington. D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code,
 apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections ia and ib. Under Section ia, you are to send this information to the 102 nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or state redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureau-will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 199月.

Robert A. Mosbacher
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary

THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator Barbara Everitt bryant Barbara Euvrit Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13 , United States Code, section $141(b)$, I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United states. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and ib.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

## Package proudedto whits thu e (

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington. D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section 141(b), I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2 , United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$. Under Section ia, you are to send this information to the 102 nd congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureay-will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 199月.


Robert A. Mosbacher

Enclosure

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 population and munber of representatives, by state
MOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Comerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION' $249,632,692$

| STATE | APPORTIONMENT | MMRER OF | CHANGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | POPULATION | REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
|  |  | BASED ON THE |  |
|  |  | 1990 CENSUS |  |



1 Total population includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decennial census under Title 13. United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columia.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary
THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:
Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator Barbara Everitt Bryant Banbaua Euerill Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title l3, United States Code, section l4l(b), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April l, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2a and 2b.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 POPULATION AND MMMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE
MOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692
STATE APPORTIONMENT
POPULATION

| MUMBER OF | CHANGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- |
| REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
| BASED ON THE | APPORTIONMENT |
| 1990 CENSUS |  |


| UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,783 | 435 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabena | 4,062,608 | 7 | - |
| Alaska | 551,947 | 1 | - |
| Arizona | 3,677,985 | 6 | +1 |
| Arkensas | 2,362,239 | 4 | - |
| California | 29,839,250 | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 | 6 | - |
| Connecticut | 3,295,669 | 6 | - |
| Delaware | 668,696 | 1 | - |
| Florida | 13,003,362 | 23 | +4 |
| Georgia | 6,508,419 | 11 | +1 |
| Hawai | 1,115,274 | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 | 2 | - |
| -llinois | 11,466,682 | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,564,228 | 10 | - |
| lowe | 2,787,424 | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 2,485,600 | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 | 2 | - |
| Maryland | 4,798,622 | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 4,387,029 | 8 | - |
| Mississippi | 2,586,443 | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 | 9 | - |
| Montena | 803,655 | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 | 3 | - |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 | 2 | - |
| New Hampshire | 1,113,915 | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 7,748,634 | 13 | -1 |
| New Mexico | 1,521,779 | 3 | - |
| New York | 18,044,505 | 31 | -3 |
| North Carolina | 6,657,630 | 12 | $+1$ |
| North Dakota | 641,364 | 1 | - |
| Ohio | 10,887,325 | 19 | -2 |
| Oklahoma | 3,157,604 | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 | 5 | - |
| Pennsylvania | 11,924,710 | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Island | 1,005,984 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699,999 | 1 | - |
| Tennessee | 4,896,641 | 9 | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 | 30 | +3 |
| Utch | 1,727.784 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,964 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 | 11 | $+1$ |
| Washington | 4,887,941 | 9 | $+1$ |
| West Virginia | 1,801,625 | 3 | -1 |
| Uisconsin | 4,906,745 | 9 | - |
| Uyoming | 455,975 | 1 | - |

[^0]2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.

# Package proudedto intr thu e : 

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington. D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code,
 apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$. Under Section aa, you are to send this information to the 102nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureau -will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 199月.


Robert A. Mosbacher
Enclosure

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

## MEMORANDUM FOR: <br> The Secretary

THROUGH:
Michael R. Darby Michael Under Secretary and Administrator

FROM:

SUBJECT: Barbara Everitt Bryant Banbana Eusritl Bryan i Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title lu, United States Code, section l4l(b), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections aa and 2b.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United states Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

```
United States Department of Commerce
```

Bureau of the Census

1990 POPULATION AND MMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE
MOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later then July 15, 1991.

TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692

| STATE | APPORTIONMENT | MURER OF | CHAMGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | POPULATION | REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
|  |  | BASED ON THE |  |
|  |  | 1990 CENSUS |  |


| UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,783 | 435 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 4,062,608 | 7 | - |
| Alaska | 551,947 | 1 | - |
| Arizona | 3,677,985 | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,362,239 | 4 | - |
| Callfornia | 29,839,250 | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 | 6 | - |
| Connecticut | 3,295,669 | 6 | - |
| Delaware | 668,696 | 1 | - |
| Florida | 13,003,362 | 23 | +4 |
| Georgia | 6,508,419 | 11 | +1 |
| Hawaii | 1,115,274 | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 | 2 | - |
| Illinois | 11,466,682 | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,564,228 | 10 | - |
| lowa | 2,787,424 | 5 | -1 |
| Kanses | 2,485,600 | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 | 2 | - |
| Maryland | 4,798,622 | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 4,387,029 | 8 | - |
| Mississippi | 2,586,443 | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 | 9 | - |
| Montana | 803,655 | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 | 3 | - |
| Mevada | 1,206,152 | 2 | - |
| New Hempshire | 1,113,915 | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 7,748,634 | 13 | -1 |
| New Mexico | 1,521,779 | 3 | - |
| New York | 18,044,505 | 31 | -3 |
| Morth Carolina | 6,657,630 | 12 | +1 |
| North Dakota | 641,364 | 1 | - |
| Chio | 10,887,325 | 19 | -2 |
| Okl ahoma | 3,157,604 | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 | 5 | - |
| Pennsylvania | 11,924,710 | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Is land | 1,005,984 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699,999 | 1 | - |
| Ternessee | 4,896,641 | 9 | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 | 30 | +3 |
| Utah | 1,727.784 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,964 | 1 | * |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 | 11 | +1 |
| Uashington | 4,887,941 | 9 | +1 |
| Hest Virginia | 1,801,625 | 3 | -1 |
| Wisconsin | 4,906,745 | 9 | - |
| Wyoming | 455,975 | 1 | - |

1 Total population includes enmerations for the resident population as collected in the 2ist decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.

# Package proudedto bunts the : 

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$, I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2 a and 2 b . Under Section 2 a , you are to send this information to the 102nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureau will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.


Robert A. Mosbacher

| TO Secretary Deputy Secretary Counsellor | Control No |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Date | 1990 |

Through: Michael R. Darby $\quad$ Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

From: Barbara Everitt Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census

Prepared by: C. Jones/Census/US EA/763-5180
Subject: Transmittal of 1990 Apportionment Population counts and the Apportionment from the Secretary of Commerce to the President

Outgoing:
The President
Background:
You are transmitting to the President a statement showing the apportionment population for each state as of April 1, 1990 in accordance with provisions of Title l3, United States Code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$.

Your statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and 2 b .

You, as Secretary of commerce, are to consider the question of adjustment of the 1990 census for possible undercounts or overcounts. If you make a decision to adjust the 1990 census, the Census Bureau will determine new apportionment figures for each state and calculate a new Congressional apportionment, which you will transmit to the president no later than July 15, 1991.

Attachment
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

## MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary

THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator Barbara Everitt Bryant Banboua Eusrill Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section llb), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2 , United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United states Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$, I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each state as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$. Under Section $2 a$, you are to send this information to the 102nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureauwil publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 199月.


Robert A. Mosbacher
Enclosure

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 POPULATION AND MUREER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE
MOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692
STATE APPORTIONMENT POPULATION

## MUREER OF REPRESENTATIVES <br> BASED ON THE <br> 1990 CENSUS

CHANGE FRCM

UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$
Alabema
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
$249,022,783$
$4,062,608$
551,947

Colorado
3,677,985
2,362,239
29,839,250
3,307,912
3,295,669
Connecticut
Delaware 668,696
Floride
13,003,362
Georgia
6,508,419
1,115,274
$1.011,986$
Idaho
$11,466,682$
$5,564,228$


| $2,485,600$ | 4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3,698,969$ | 6 |

Kentucky
3,698,96
$-1$
Lovisiana
4,238,21
Maine
Maryland
$1,233,223$
$4,798,622$
-
Massachusetts
$6,029,051$
$9,328,784$
Michigan
$9,328,784$
$4,387,029$
Mississippi
2,586,443
Missouri
5,137,804
803,655
$1,584,617$
1,206,152
1.113,915

7,748,634
1,521,779
18,044,505
6,657,630
641,364
$10,887,325$
$3,157,604$
$-2$
Nebraska
$2,853,733$
11,924,710
1,005,984
3,505,707
699,999
4,896,641
17,059,805
$+3$
exas
1,727,784
$-$
Vermont
Virginia
6,216,568
Washington
4,887,941
West Virginia
1,801,625
Wisconsin
Wyoming
4,906,745
455,975

1 Total population includes emmerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 states and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columia.

| TO Secretary | Deputy Secretary | Counsellor | Control No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Through: | Michael R. Darby <br> Under Secretary for Economic Affairs |
| :---: | :---: |
| From: | Barbara Everitt Bryant |
|  | Director, Bureau of the Census |
| Prepared by: | C. Jones/Census/US EA/763-5180 |
| Subject: | Transmitta 0 cf 1990 Apportionment Population Counts and the |
|  | Apportionment from the Secretary of Commerce to the President |
| Outgoing: | The President |

Background: You are transmitting to the President a statement showing the apportionment population for each state as of April 1, 1990 in accordance with provisions of Title 13, United States Code, Section $141(b)$.

Your statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$.

You, as Secretary of commerce, are to consider the question of adjustment of the 1990 census for possible undercounts or overcounts. If you make a decision to adjust the 1990 census, the Census Bureau will determine new apportionment figures for each state and calculate a new Congressional apportionment, which you will transmit to the president no later than July 15, 1991.

## Attachment

| Stane | PREPAREO SV | CLEARED ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | CiEARED EY | CIEARED SY | CLEARED $\mathrm{BY}^{\text {Y }}$ | CLEARED BY | CLEARED C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { janization: } \\ & \text { get ro } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]E

UNTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary
THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:
Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator
Barbara Everitt bryan Barbaua Everit Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13 , United States Code, section $141(b)$, I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and 2 b .

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Comerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington. D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section 141(b), I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$. Under Section $2 a$, you are to send this information to the 102 nd congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a stipulation and order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureau -will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.


Robert A. Mosbacher

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 population and mmser of representatives, by state
MOTE: The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692

| StATE | APPORTIONMENT POPULATION | mumber of REPRESEMTATIVES BASED ON THE 1990 CENSUS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHANGE FROM } \\ & \text { 1980 } \\ & \text { APPORTIOMMEMT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UHITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,783 | 435 |  |
| Alabama | 4,062,608 | 7 | - |
| Alaska | 551,947 | 1 | - . |
| Arizona | 3,677,985 | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,362,239 | 4 | - |
| California | 29,839,250 | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 | 6 | - |
| Cornecticut | 3,295,669 | 6 | - |
| Delamare | 668,696 | 1 | - |
| Florida | 13,003,362 | 23 | +4 |
| Georgia | 6,508,419 | 11 | +1 |
| Hawail | 1,115,274 | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 | 2 | - |
| lllinois | 11,466,682 | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,566,228 | 10 | - |
| l owa | 2,787,424 | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 2,485,600 | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 | 2 | - |
| Maryl and | 4,798,622 | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 4,387,029 | 8 | - |
| Mississippi | 2,586,443 | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 | 9 | - |
| Montana | 803,655 | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 | 3 | - |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 | 2 | - |
| New Hampshire | 1,113,915 | 2 | - |
| Mew Jersey | 7,748,634 | 13 | -1 |
| New Mexico | 1,521,779 | 3 | - |
| New York | 18,044,505 | 31 | -3 |
| Morth Carolina | 6,657,630 | 12 | +1 |
| North Dakota | 641,364 | 1 | - |
| Ohio | 10,887,325 | 19 | -2 |
| Okl ahoma | 3,157,604 | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 | 5 | - |
| Pernsylvania | 11,926,710 | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Island | 1,005,984 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699,999 | 1 | - |
| Termessee | 4,896,641 | 9 | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 | 30 | +3 |
| Utah | 1,727,784 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,964 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 | 11 | +1 |
| Washington | 4,887,941 | 9 | +1 |
| West Virginia | 1,801,625 | 3 | -1 |
| Wisconsin | 4,906,745 | 9 | - |
| Wroming | 455,975 | 1 | - |

1 Total population includes erumerations for the resident poputation as collected in the 2ist decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 states and the District of columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.
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1990 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENIATIVES, BY STATE
Note: The population counts set foth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Cormerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692 (248,709,873-Resident Pop., plus 922,819-Population Abroad; TABLE A CPH-2-1)

State
United States Total ${ }^{2}$
Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut Delaware
Florida
Georgita
Hawail
Idaho
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Iouisi
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Viroinia
Washington
West Virginia Wisconsin
Wyaming

Apportiorment
Population
249,022,783
4, 062,608
551,947
3,677,985
$2,362,239$
$29,839,250$
29,839, 250
$3,307,912$
3,295,669
668,696
13,003, 362
6,508,419
1, 011,986
11, 466, 682
5,564,228
2,787,424
2,485,600
$3,698,969$
$4,238,216$
1, 233, 233
4,798,622

| 6, 029, |
| :--- |
| 9, |
| 3281 |

4,387,029
2,586,443
5,137,804
823,655
584,617
1,206,152
1,113,915
7,748, 634
1,521,779
18, 044,505
,657,630
641,364
10,887,325
3,157,604
2,853,733
11,924,710
1,005,984
3,505,707
699,999
4,896,641
17,059,805
1,727,784
564,964
6,216,568
4, 887,941
1, 801, 625
${ }^{1}$ Total population inclused emmerations for the resident population as collected int he 21st decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal Agencies.
2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.
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Public Information Office 301-763-4040

For Immediate Release CB90-232

1990 CENSUS POPULATION FOR THE UNITED STATES IS 249,632,692; REAPPORTIONMENT WILL SHIFT 19 SEATS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The population of the United States counted in the 1990 census is $249,632,692$, an increase of 10.21 percent since the 1980 census of 226,504,825.

The figures were transmitted to the President by Commerce Secretary Robert A. Mosbacher upon their receipt from Commerce Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Michael R. Darby and Census Director Barbara Everitt Bryant. Figures also were provided on final population counts for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The secretary also transmitted the official apportionment of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the 50 states. The apportionment population includes the population of the 50 states plus the overseas military and other overseas federal workers and dependents not in the United States on April 1, 1990. The population of the District of Columbia is not included in the apportionment population.

A total of 19 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives will be shifted as a result of the 1990 census. Eight states will increase their representation in the 103 rd Congress, which will convene in January 1993. California will gain seven seats for a total of 52 , Florida will gain four seats to 23 , and Texas will gain three seats for a total of 30 . Arizona (6), Georgia (11), North Carolina (12), Virginia (11), and Washington (9) each gain one seat.

Thirteen states will have less representation in the 103 rd Congress. New York (31) will lose three seats. Illinois (20), Michigan (16), Ohio (19), and Pennsylvania (21) will each lose two seats. Iowa (5), Kansas (4), Kentucky (6), Louisiana (7), Massachusetts (10), Montana (1), New Jersey (13), and West Virginia (3) each will lose one seat.

An attached table lists the official 1990 census population for the United States and the number of representatives each state will be entitled to elect to the 103 r Congress, which is scheduled to commence in January, 1993.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount and overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
-X-

Dec. 26, 1990

United States Department of Commerce
sureau of the Census
1990 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE
NOTE: The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
total population ${ }^{\mathbf{4}} 249,632,692$
sfate APPORTIONMENT

| MUNBER OF | CHANGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- |
| REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
| BASED ON THE | APPORTIONHENT |
| 1990 CENSUS |  |



[^2]Apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives1990 Census of Population


## PLAN FOR FINAL REVIEW OF APPORTIONMENT DATA

## 1. Review of tables

Table (goes to the President) - Linda
Add check
Check against Table 1
Col 1 - Check against Dennis
Col 2 and 3 - Check against Marie
Table 1 - Linda
Add check
Check against press release Table 1
Col 2 and 3 - Check against Angela
Table 2 - Jean
Add check
Check against Dennis
Check against press release Table 2
Table 3-Jean
Add check
Check against Dennis
Check against press release Table 2
Louisa F Miller To: Carolyn R Tillman/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC
cc:
Subject: '80 and '90

-.-.- Forwarded by Louisa F Miller/POP/HQ/BOC on $12 / 13 / 2000$ 02:44 PM --...


John F Long
12/13/2000 01:18 PM

To: Jorge H delPinal/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, Lois M Kline/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, Robert A Kominski/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, Louisa F Miller/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, Peter O Way/IPC/HQ/BOC@BOC, Signe I Wetrogan/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, James D Fitzsimmons/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, James C Gibbs/IPC/HQ/BOC@BOC, Robert D Bush/IPC/HQ/BOC@BOC, Lisa M Blumerman/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC
cc: Campbell J Gibson/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC
Subject: '80 and '90

FYI-John
----- Forwarded by John F Long/POP/HQ/BOC on 12/13/2000 01:17 PM ---.-


To: MGoodman@doc.gov, ebloom1@doc.gov, robert.shapiro@mail.doc.gov, SSmith@doc.gov
cc: kim.white@mail.doc.gov, lee.price@mail.doc.gov, Kenneth Prewitt/DIR/HQ/BOC@BOC, William G Barron Jr/DIR/HQ/BOC@BOC, Ellen Lee/DIR/HQ/BOC@BOC, John F Long/POP/HQ/BOC@BOC, Paula J Schneider/DIR/HQ/BOC@BOC, John H Thompson/DMD/HQ/BOC@BOC
Subject: '80 and '90
The Census PIO office and others at Census have received numerous inquires in the last two days about the recent history of Census/Commerce press events surrounding the release of apportionment numbers. For the purposes of historical integrity, and to correct the misunderstanding that no events or releases occured, here is a summary by PIO Chief Maury Cagle who was present on both ocassions:
"December 31, 1980: There was a big event, planned well in advance, held in the lobby at Commerce. Director Barabba handed over the results of the 1980 Census to Sec. Phil Klutznick in front of the Population Clock, which was a fixture for many years in the lobby before they refurbished it. There were several hundred people there--press and dignataries.
There was a lot of media coverage of the numbers.
December 26, 1990: Office of $u / s e c$ could not make up its mind about how to publicly release the figures. At 12:02 pm, it was decided to hold a 1 pm news conference. I had 58 minutes to finalize the news release, make 100 copies, obtain a car and get to DOC. Event was held in room 4830 . Room was full---which holds about 50 reporters and seven/eight cameras. Group was kept waiting until 1:15, when U/Sec Darby and Director Bryant came into room. There still was a lot of media coverage in spite of the badly managed event."

Based upon press inquiries Census has been receiving during the last few weeks, we expect intense interest in the release of the first numbes from the Decennial Census.

# Population and Housing Unit Counts United States 



# APPORTIONMENT OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 

## INTRODUCTION

The primary reason for the establishment of the decennial census of population is set forth in Article 1, Section 2, of the Constitution. The Constitution provides for an enumeration of the population to serve as the basis for the apportionment of members of the U.S. House of Representatives among the States, with the provision that each State must have at least one Representative. An apportionment has been made on the basis of each census from 1790 to 1990, except following the census of 1920.

Calculation of a Congressional apportionment requires three factors-the apportionment population of each State, the number of Representatives to be allocated among the States, and a method to use for the calculation.

## APPORTIONMĖNT POPULATION

The apportionment population base always has included those persons who have established a residence in the United States. The first Census Act of 1790 established the concept of "usual residence" which has been applied in that and each subsequent census. (See appendix D for further discussion on "Enumeration and Residence Rules" for the 1990 census). Prior to 1870 , the population base included the total free population of the States, three-fifths of the number of slaves, and excluded American Indians not taxed.

The 14th Amendment, ratified in 1868, removed the fractional count of the number of slaves from the procedure. In 1940, it was determined that there were no longer any American Indians who should be classed as "not taxed" (39 Op. Att'y. Gen. 518 (1940)).

In 1970 and 1990, certain segments of the overseas population (U.S. Armed Forces personnel, civilian U.S. Federal employees, and dependents of both groups) were allocated to their home States and included in the populations of those States for apportionment purposes only. These segments of the overseas population were not distributed to the political subdivisions of the States, nor included in other 1970 or 1990 census data products.

The 1990 apportionment population counts by State are presented in table A of this text. These counts were transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce to the President on December 26, 1990, and from the President to the Congress on January 3, 1991. The population base for the apportionment of each census is shown in table B of this text. Laws related to the census are codified in the United States Code, Title 13.

## NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Constitution set the number of Representatives at 65 from 1787 until the first enumeration in 1790. The first apportionment, based on the 1790 census, resulted in 105 members. From 1800 through 1840, the number of Representatives was determined by the ratio of the number of persons each was to represent ("fixed ratio"), although the way to handle fractional remainders changed. Therefore, the number of Representatives changed with that ratio, as well as with population growth and the admission of new States.

For the 1850 census and later apportionments, the number of seats was determined prior to the final apportionment ("fixed house size"); and thus, the ratio of persons each was to represent was the result of the calculations. In 1911, the House size was fixed at 433 with provision for the addition of one seat each for Arizona and New Mexico when they became States (U.S. Statutes at Large, 37 Stat 13, 14 (1911). The House size, 435 members, has been unchanged since, except for a temporary increase to 437 at the time of admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States. The representation by State resulting from each apportionment is shown in table 3.

## METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT

It is impossible to attain absolute mathematical equality in terms of the number of persons per Representative, or in the share each person has in a Representative, when seats are to be apportioned among States of varying population size and when there must be an whole number of Representatives per State. Proportional voting (fractional seats) has never been attempted in the U.S. House of Representatives. Laws concerning the method of apportionment are codified in the United States Code, Title 2.

Since the first apportionment following the 1790 census, there have been five basic methods used to apportion the House of Representatives.
1790 to 1830-The "Jefferson method" of greatest divisors (fixed ratio with rejected fractional remainders). Under this method, a ratio of persons to Representatives was selected; the population of each State was divided by that number of persons. The resulting whole number of the quotient was the number of Representatives each State received. Fractional remainders were not considered, no matter how large. Thus a State with a quotient of 3.99 received three Representatives, the same number as a State with a quotient of 3.01 . The size of the House of Representatives was not predetermined, but resulted from the calculation.

1840-The "Webster method" of major fractions (fixed ratio with retained major fractional remainders). This method was applied in the same way as the Jefferson method, except if a fractional remainder were greater than one-half, another seat would be assigned. Thus a State with a quotient of 3.51 received four Representatives, while a State with a quotient of 3.49 received three. In this method also, the size of the House of Representatives was not predetermined but resulted from the calculation.

1850-1900-The "Vinton" or "Hamilton" method established a predetermined number of Representatives for each apportionment, and divided the population of each State by a ratio determined by dividing the apportionment population of the United States by the total number of Representatives. The resulting whole number was assigned to each State, with an additional seat assigned, one at a time, to the States with the largest fractional remainders, up to the predetermined size of the House of Representatives. This method was subject to the "Alabama paradox," in which a State could receive fewer representatives if the size of the House of Representatives was increased.

1910, 1930-The method of major fractions assigned seats similarly to the Webster method of 1840 by rounding fractional remainders using the arithmetic mean. The ratio was selected so that the result would be the predetermined size of the House of Representatives. In 1910, the House size was fixed at 433 with provision for the addition of one seat each for Arizona and New Mexico when they became States.

1940-1990 - The "Hill" method of equal proportions assigns seats similarly to the Jefferson and Webster method, except it rounds fractional remainders of the quotient of the State population divided by the ratio differently. With this method an additional seat is assigned if the fraction exceeds the difference obtained by subtracting the integer part of the quotient from the geometric mean of this integer and the next consecutive integer. For example, a State with a quotient of 3.48 receives four Representatives, while a State with a quotient of 3.45 receives three Representatives, since $.48>\sqrt{3 \times 4}-3>.45$. The size of the House of Representatives remained fixed at 435 (except when Alaska and Hawail became States, there was a temporary addition of one seat for each until the apportionment following the 1960 census).

Following the 1990 census, two lawsuits concerning apportionment issues were filed in Federal Courts. The U.S. Supreme Court held that the method of equal proportions was constitutional; that the Congress had properly exercised its apportionment authority; and that the inclusion of U.S. Federal military and civilian personnel, and their dependents, in the apportionment populations of the States was constitutional. These cases were United States Department of Commerce v. Montana 112 S.Ct. 1415 (1992) and Franklin v. Massachusetts 112 S.Ct. 2767 (1992).

Additional information about apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives may be obtained from the Chief, Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233-3400.

Table A. Apportionment and Apportionment Population Based on the 1990 Census

| States | Size of State delegation | Apportionment population | Resident population | United States population abroad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 435 | ${ }^{1} 249,022,783$ | 248,709,873 | 922,819 |
| Alabama | 7 | 4,062,608 | 4,040,587 | 22,021 |
| Alaska | 1 | 551,947 | 550,043 | 1,904 |
| Arizona | 6 | 3,677,985 | 3,665,228 | 12,757 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 2,362,239 | 2,350,725 | 11,514 |
| California | 52 | 29,839,250 | 29,760,021 | 79,229 |
| Colorado | 6 | 3,307,912 | 3,294,394 | 13,518 |
| Connecticut | 6 | 3,295,669 | 3,287,116 | 8,553 |
| Delaware | 1 | 668,696 | 666,168 | 2,528 |
| District of Columbia | ... | ... | 606,900 | 3,009 |
| Florida | 23 | 13,003,362 | 12,937,926 | 65,436 |
| Georgia | 11 | 6,508,419 | 6,478,216 | 30,203 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 1,115,274 | 1,108,229 | 7,045 |
| Idaho | 2 | 1,011,986 | 1,006,749 | 5,237 |
| 1 llinois | 20 | 11,466,682 | 11,430,602 | 36,080 |
| Indiana | 10 | 5,564,228 | 5,544,159 | 20,069 |
| lowa | 5 | 2,787,424 | 2,776,755 | 10,669 |
| Kansas | 4 | 2,485,600 | 2,477,574 | 8,026 |
| Kentucky | 6 | 3,698,969 | 3,685,296 | 13,673 |
| Louisiana | 7 | 4,238,216 | 4,219,973 | 18,243 |
| Maine | 2 | 1,233,223 | 1,227,928 | 5,295 |
| Maryland | 8 | 4,798,622 | 4,781,468 | 17,154 |
| Massachusetts | 10 | 6,029,051 | 6,016,425 | 12,626 |
| Michigan | 16 | 9,328,784 | 9,295,297 | 33,487 |
| Minnesota | 8 | 4,387,029 | 4,375,099 | 11,930 |
| Mississippi | 5 | 2,586,443 | 2,573,216 | 13,227 |
| Missouri | 9 | 5,137,804 | 5,117,073 | 20,731 |
| Montana | 1 | 803,655 | 799,065 | 4,590 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 1,584,617 | 1,578,385 | 6,232 |
| Nevada | 2 | 1,206,152 | 1,201,833 | 4,319 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 1,113,915 | 1,109,252 | 4,663 |
| New Jersey | 13 | 7,748,634 | 7,730,188 | 18,446 |
| New Mexico | 3 | 1,521,779 | 1,515,069 | 6,710 |
| New York | 31 | 18,044,505 | 17,990,455 | 54,050 |
| North Carolina | 12 | 6,657,630 | 6,628,637 | 28,993 |
| North Dakota | 1 | 641,364 | 638,800 | 2,564 |
| Ohio | 19 | 10,887,325 | 10,847,115 | 40,210 |
| Oklahoma | 6 | 3,157,604 | 3,145,585 | 12,019 |
| Oregon | 5 | 2,853,733 | 2,842,321 | 11,412 |
| Pennsylvania | 21 | 11,924,710 | 11,881,643 | 43,067 |
| Rhode island | 2 | 1,005,984 | 1,003,464 | 2,520 |
| South Carolina | 6 | 3,505,707 | 3,486,703 | 19,004 |
| South Dakota | 1 | 699,999 | 696,004 | 3,995 |
| Tennessee | 9 | 4,896,641 | 4,877,185 | 19,456 |
| Texas | 30 | 17,059,805 | 16,986,510 | 73,295 |
| Utah | 3 | 1,727,784 | 1,722,850 | 4,934 |
| Vermont | 1 | 564,964 | 562,758 | 2,206 |
| Virginia | 11 | 6,216,568 | 6,187,358 | 29,210 |
| Washington | 9 | 4,887,941 | 4,866,692 | 21,249 |
| West Virginia | 3 | 1,801,625 | 1,793,477 | 8,148 |
| Wisconsin | 9 | 4,906,745 | 4,891,769 | 14,976 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 455,975 | 453,588 | 2,387 |

[^3]Table B. Population Base for Apportionment and the Number of Representatives Apportioned: 1790 to 1990


[^4]Table 3. Apportionment of Membership of the House of Representatives: $\mathbf{1 7 8 9}$ to 1990
 definitions of terms and meanings of symbols, see text]


## BACKGROUND

## 1990 CENSUS APPORTIONMENT AND THE METHOD OF EQUAL PROPORTIONS

The official apportionment based on 1990 census results was calculated using the method of equal proportions. Since the U.S. Constitution requires every state to have at least one seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, each state started the apportionment process with a single seat. With the current House size being 435 seats, the apportionment calculation divided the remaining 385 seats among the 50 states.

## Choosing the Apportionment Method

Based on the official 1990 census apportionment population counts, the average size of a congressional district was 572,466 persons (obtained by dividing the apportionment population of the 50 states by 435 , then rounding to the nearest whole number). Generally, the assignment of seats for whole shares is not an issue, no matter what apportionment method is used. The problem lies in the fractional remainders. For example, Montana, with a 1990 population of 803,655 , qualified to receive 1.40 seats ( 803,655 divided by 572,466 ). Should Montana's allotment have been rounded up to two seats or down to one? Finding a method that would solve the problem of fractional remainders adequately has been a concern of the U.S. Congress over the decades. In 1941, Congress enacted legislation for a permanent apportionment law using the method of equal proportions. It was used in the 1940 census and in every census since.

The method of equal proportions handles the fractional remainders of shares for rounding up or down by utilizing the geometric mean between whole numbers. The geometric mean between two numbers is obtained by multiplying the two numbers together, then taking the square root of their product. The geometric mean between 1 and 2 is 1.4142 (the square root of $1 \times 2$ ). Using this method, Montana would be entitled to one seat since its ideal quota (1.40) falls slightly below the geometric mean.

To achieve the fairest representation possible, size differences among all the congressional districts must be minimized. Of the five apportionment methods used since the 1790 census, the equal proportions method is designed to make the proportional differences in the average size of congressional district between any two states as small as possible. The method of equal proportions is the only technique which: 1) minimizes the deviation between the most and the least populous congressional districts, and 2) minimizes each districts's variance from the national average size of congressional district (calculated by dividing the apportionment population by 435).

## Calculating the Apportionment Using the Method of Equal Proportions

The manner in which congressional seats are allocated by the method of equal proportions appears complex, but the arithmetic is fairly basic. In general, the method of equal proportions computes "priority values," based on each state's apportionment population. The priority values are calculated by dividing the population of each state by the geometric mean of its current and next seats. The priority values are then ranked and used to assign members in the House starting with the $51^{\text {st }}$ seat. Congressional seats are allocated one-by-one until all 435 seats have been filled. A discussion of the three major steps is shown below.

## Step 1: Generate a List of Multipliers

Because every state starts with a single seat, priority ranking starts with each state's second seat. A state's rankings are not determined solely by its population, but also according to the geometric mean of its current and next seat in the round. The geometric mean for any state's second seat is the square root of $n(n-1)$, where $n$ is the number of seats. So the geometric mean for a state's second seat is 1.4142-the square root of $(2 \times 1)$. The geometric mean for any state's third seat would be 2.4495 -the square root of ( $3 \times 2$ )-and so on. To keep the calculations simpler, the geometric means are first converted into their reciprocals (the number divided into 1) so they can be multiplied rather than divided. For example, the reciprocal of 1.4142 is .70710678. (Multiplying any number by .70710678 will produce the same result as dividing that number by 1.4142.)

The reciprocals of the geometric means are the multipliers. The multipliers generally are computed for 60 seats to make sure the states with the largest number of seats are covered. Then the multipliers are assembled into a list corresponding to seats 1 to 60 .

## Step 2: Calculate a List of Priority Values

In Step 2, the appropriate multiplier for each seat is applied to a state's population to determine a list of priority values. For example, the priority value for California's second seat in 1990 was computed as follows:
$.70710678 \times 29,839,250$ (California's 1990 population) $=21,099,536$ (the priority value for California's second seat)

California's second seat became the 51st seat assigned. Priority values for California's remaining seats were calculated in similar fashion until the priority value for California's $52^{\text {nd }}$ seat was computed. It was necessary to go to 52 because this was California's ideal quota $(29,839,250$ divided by $572,466=52.1)$. The process is then repeated for all the states.

## Step 3: Assign Seats in Ranked Order

After priority values have been calculated for each state for its total anticipated seats, the priority values are ranked in descending order, starting with the $51^{\text {st }}$ seat. Seats are then allocated one at time until the last seat has been filled. It takes 385 rounds before the $435^{\text {th }}$ seat has been filled ( 435 minus the first 50 which are automatically assigned). It would have taken 384 rounds if Puerto Rico had been included in the 1990 census apportionment.

NOTE FOR Cheryl Landman Decennial Planning Division

From:


Subject: 1990 Congressional Apportionment Based on Adjusted Counts

Attached is a table showing the 1990 Congressional apportionment based on the adjusted census counts and including the overseas counts. The apportionment is shown in the fifth column, labeled REP90AT.

There were changes for four states from the apportionment based on the enumerated counts and the overseas population:
Arizona
California
Pennsylvania
Wisconsin
up one seat to 7
up one seat to 53
down one seat to 20
down one seat to 8

All other states were unchanged from the apportioment transmitted in December 1990.
cc:
POP> Sehneider, Fulton, Speaker, POPDIVFile, Chron


## Congressional District Counts From Census '90

The 1990 census revealed that the average congressional district population for the 102 nd Congress was 570,352 , an increase of about 50,000 since the 1980 census. Eight States gained 19 congressional seats based on the 1990 census apportionment and 13 States lost 19 seats (see chart). You can get a list of congressional district population totals from the Public Information Office (301-7634040).

The population counts yielding the results in this article as well as all other releases of 1990 census data are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct the 1990 census counts and will publish corrected P.L. 94-171 redistricting counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991. Other data
releases based on 1990 census data issued prior to July 15,1991 will also be corrected and re-released over the summer.
State governments will redraw congressional district boundaries in time for the November 1992 elections to the 103rd Congress. Each of the 21 States shown in the chart will need redistricting, and the remaining States with more than one district will need some boundary changes to equalize their population per district based on the ' 90 census.

California's 37th Congressional District had the largest population of any district with nearly 980,000 persons. This represents an 86-percent increase over its 1980 population of about 526,000 . A total of 31 districts with more than 700,000 population were concentrated among 6 States -8 in

## '90 Census Data on Floppy Diskettes

We have decided to release extracts from the Public Law 94-171 data on diskettes. Included are total population and voting-age population by race and Hispanic origin. Also included are counts of housing units. The three extracts include -

## Counties (\$250) <br> O Minor civil divisions in New England (\$150) <br> - Places (\$700)

"We did this in response to user demand," observes Marie Pees of our Population Division. Marie, creator of the diskette packages, further notes, "Many people work only with counties or places and don't need all the geographic detail found on the tapes. For counties and MCD's, we added metropolitan codes; people can therefore produce totals for metro areas.,
You can get these data in ASCII format, on either $51 / 4$ - or $31 / 2$-inch diskettes for IBM-compatible microcomputers. Send orders to the Statistical Information Office, Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233 (301-763-2826). Make checks payable to "Commerce-Census.'

## States Gaining and Losing Congressional Seats

| Arizona | +1 | Kentucky | -1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| California | +7 | Louisiana | -1 |
| Florida | +4 | Massachusetts | -1 |
| Georgia | +1 | Michigan | -2 |
| North Carolina | +1 | Montana | -1 |
| Texas | +3 | New Jersey | -1 |
| Virginia | +1 | New York | -3 |
| Washington | +1 | Ohio | -2 |
| lllinois | -2 | Pennsylvania | -2 |
| lowa | -1 | West Virginia | -1 |
| Kansas | -1 |  |  |

California, 9 in Florida, 6 in Texas, 4 in Georgia, 3 in Arizona, and 1 in Virginia.
Montana's 2nd Congressional District had the lowest 1990 population, with about 382,000 persons. Other districts with low population were in Michigan (13th, 395,000); Illinois (1st, 413,000); Montana (1st, 417,000); and West Virginia (4th, 421,000). Altogether there were 14 districts with 10 percent or more population loss from 1980 to 1990.

To obtain the State-by-State listings of congressional district population counts, along with the 1980 counts and percent changes, request press release CB91-182 from our Public Information Office (301-7634040).

For more information on the congressional district counts, contact Don Starsinic of our Population Division (301-763-7722). To find out more about reapportionment, request our publication Strength In Numbers from Customer Services.

Population and Housing Counts by Division and State: 1990 Census

| Division and State | Total persons | Persons in group quarters | Total housing units | Households (occupied housing units) | Vacant housing units | Percent vacant | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Persons } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { household } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 6,697,744 | 102,263,678 | 91,947,410 | 10,316,268 | 10.1 | 2.63 |
| New England: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 37,169 | 587,045 | 465,312 | 121,733 | 20.7 | 2.56 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 32,151 | 503,904 | 411,186 | 92,718 | 18.4 | 2.62 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 21,642 | 271,214 | 210,650 | 60,564 | 22.3 | 2.57 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 214,307 | 2,472,711 | 2,247,110 | 225,601 | 9.1 | 2.58 |
| Rhode Island | 1,003,464 | 38,595 | 414,572 | 377,977 | 36,595 | 8.8 | 2.55 |
| Connecticut Middle Atlantic: | 3,287,116 | 101,167 | 1,320,850 | 1,230,479 | 90,371 | 6.8 | 2.59 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 545,265 | 7,226,891 | 6,639,322 | 587,569 | 8.1 | 2.63 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 171,368 | 3,075,310 | 2,794,711 | 280,599 | 9.1 | 2.70 |
| Pennsylvania East North Central: | 11,881,643 | 348,424 | 4,938,140 | 4,495,966 | 442,174 | 9.0 | 2.57 |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 261,451 | 4,371,945 | 4,087,546 | 284,399 | 6.5 | 2.59 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 161,992 | 2,246,046 | 2,065,355 | 180,691 | 8.0 | 2.61 |
| Illinois | 11,430,602 | 286,956 | 4,506,275 | 4,202,240 | 304,035 | 6.7 | 2.65 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 211,692 | 3,847,926 | 3,419,331 | 428,595 | 11.1 | 2.66 |
| Wisconsin West North Central: | 4,891,769 | 133,598 | 2,055,774 | 1,822,118 | 233,656 | 11.4 | 2.61 |
| Minnesota | 4,375,099 | 117,621 | 1,848,445 | 1,647,853 | 200,592 | 10.9 | 2.58 |
| lowa | 2,776,755 | 99,520 | 1,143,669 | 1,064,325 | 79,344 | 6.9 | 2.52 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 145,397 | 2,199,129 | 1,961,206 | 237,923 | 10.8 | 2.54 |
| North Dakota | 638,800 | 24,234 | 276,340 | 240,878 | 35,462 | 12.8 | 2.55 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 25,841 | 292,436 | 259,034 | 33,402 | 11.4 | 2.59 |
| Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 47,553 | 660,621 | 602,363 | 58,258 | 8.8 | 2.54 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 82,765 | 1,044,112 | 944,726 | 99,386 | 9.5 | 2.53 |
| South Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 20,071 | 289,919 | 247,497 | 42,422 | 14.6 | 2.61 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 113,856 | 1,891,917 | 1,748,991 | 142,926 | 7.6 | 2.67 |
| District of Columbia | 606,900 | 41,717 | 278,489 | 249,634 | 28,855 | 10.4 | 2.26 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 209,300 | 2,496,334 | 2,291,830 | 204,504 | 8.2 | 2.61 |
| West Virginia | 1,793,477 | 36,911 | 781,295 | 688,557 | 92,738 | 11.9 | 2.55 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 224,470 | 2,818,193 | 2,517,026 | 301,167 | 10.7 | 2.54 |
| South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 116,543 | 1,424,155 | 1,258,044 | 166,111 | 11.7 | 2.68 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 173,633 | 2,638,418 | 2,366,615 | 271,803 | 10.3 | 2.66 |
| Florida East South Central: | 12,937,926 | 307,461 | 6,100,262 | 5,134,869 | 965,393 | 15.8 | 2.46 |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 101,176 | 1,506,845 | 1,379,782 | 127,063 | 8.4 | 2.60 |
| Tennessee | 4,877,185 | 129,129 | 2,026,067 | 1,853,725 | 172,342 | 8.5 | 2.56 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 92,402 | 1,670,379 | 1,506,790 | 163,589 | 9.8 | 2.62 |
| Mississippi West South Central: | 2,573,216 | 69,717 | 1,010,423 | 911,374 | 99,049 | 9.8 | 2.75 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 58,332 | 1,000,667 | 891,179 | 109,488 | 10.9 | 2.57 |
| Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 112,578 | 1,716,241 | 1,499,269 | 216,972 | 12.6 | 2.74 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 93,677 | 1,406,499 | 1,206,135 | 200,364 | 14.2 | 2.53 |
| Texas Mountain: | 16,986,510 | 393,447 | 7,008,999 | 6,070,937 | 938,062 | 13.4 | 2.73 |
| Montana | 799,065 | 23,747 | 361,155 | 306,163 | 54,992 | 15.2 | 2.53 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 21,490 | 413,327 | 360,723 | 52,604 | 12.7 | 2.73 |
| Wyoming | 453,588 | 10,240 | 203,411 | 168,839 | 34,572 | 17.0 | 2.63 |
| Jolorado | 3,294,394 | 79,472 | 1,477,349 | 1,282,489 | 194,860 | 13.2 | 2.51 |
| Jew Mexico | 1,515,069 | 28,807 | 632,058 | 542,709 | 89,349 | 14.1 | 2.74 |
| rizona | 3,665,228 | 80,683 | 1,659,430 | 1,368,843 | 290,587 | 17.5 | 2.62 |
| 'tah | 1,722,850 | 29,048 | 598,388 | 537,273 | 61,115 | 10.2 | 3.15 |
| evada | 1,201,833 | 24,200 | 518,858 | 466,297 | 52,561 | 10.1 | 2.53 |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 'ashington | 4,866,692 | 120,531 | 2,032,378 | 1,872,431 | 159,947 | 7.9 | 2.53 |
| egon | 2,842,321 | 66,205 | 1,193,567 | 1,103,313 | 90,254 | 7.6 | 2.52 |
| :lifornia | 29,760,021 | 751,860 | 11,182,882 | 10,381,206 | 801,676 | 7.2 | 2.79 |
| ıska | 550,043 | 20,701 | 232,608 | 188,915 | 43,693 | 18.8 | 2.80 |
| Naii | 1,108,229 | 37,632 | 389,810 | 356,267 | 33,543 | 8.6 | 3.01 |

[^5]$$
C P H-L-5
$$ Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts.
The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

1990 POPULATION CENSUS, APPORTIONMENT, AND AVERAGE POPULATION PER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, 103 rd CONGRESS 572,466


[^6]Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, 1990 AND 1980

| State | $1990$Census | $\begin{gathered} 1980 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 226,542,203 | 22,167,670 | 9.8 |  |  |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,894,025 | 146,562 | 3.8 | 22 | 33 |
| Alaska | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 | 50 | 2 |
| Arizona | 3,665,228 | 2,716,546 | 948,682 | 34.9 | 24 | 3 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,357 | 64,368 | 2.8 | 33 | 34 |
| California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,764 | 6,092,257 | 25.7 | 1 | 5 |
| Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,735 | 404,659 | 14.0 | 26 | 14 |
| Cornecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,564 | 179,552 | 5.8 | 27 | 26 |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 | 46 | 17 |
| Dist. of Columbia | 606,900 | 638,432 | -31,532 | -4.9 | 48 | 50 |
| florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,961 | 3,190,965 | 32.7 | 4 | 4 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,462,982 | 1,015,234 | 18.6 | 11 | 8 |
| Hawai | 1,108,229 | 964,691 | 143,538 | 14.9 | 41 | 13 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 944,127 | 62,622 | 6.6 | 42 | 23 |
| Illinois | 11,430,602 | 11,427,409 | 3,193 | 0.0 | 6 | 46 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,214 | 53,945 | 1.0 | 14 | 38 |
| Iowa | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 | 30 | 49 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,364,236 | 113,338 | 4.8 | 32 | 29 |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,660,324 | 24,972 | 0.7 | 23 | 40 |
| Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 4,206,116 | 13,857 | 0.3 | 21 | 44 |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,125,043 | 102,885 | 9.1 | 38 | 20 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,933 | 564,535 | 13.4 | 19 | 15 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,093 | 279,332 | 4.9 | 13 | 28 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 9,262,044 | 33,253 | 0.4 | 8 | 43 |
| Minnesota | 4,375,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 | 20 | 22 |
| Mississippi .. | 2,573,216 | 2,520,770 | 52,446 | 2.1 | 31 | 36 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,766 | 200,307 | 4.1 | 15 | 30 |
| Montana | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 | 44 | 37 |
| Mebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8,560 | 0.5 | 36 | 41 |
| Nevada | 1,201,833 | 800,508 | 401,325 | 50.1 | 39 | 1 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 | 40 | 6 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 7,365,011 | 365,177 | 5.0 | 9 | 27 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,303,302 | 211,767 | 16.2 | 37 | 11 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558, 165 | 432,290 | 2.5 | 2 | 35 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,880,095 | 748,542 | 12.7 | 10 | 16 |
| North Dakota | 638,800 | 652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 | 47 | 47 |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,603 | 49,512 | 0.5 | 7 | 42 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 3,025,487 | 120,098 | 4.0 | 28 | 31 |
| Oregon | 2,842,321 | 2,633,156 | 209,165 | 7.9 | 29 | 21 |
| Pernsyivania | 11,881,643 | 11,864,720 | 16,923 | 0.1 | 5 | 45 |
| Rhode Island | 1,003,484 | 947,154 | 56,310 | 5.9 | 43 | 25 |

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, 1990 AND 1980

| State | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1980 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 3,120,729 | 365,974 | 11.7 | 25 | 18 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 | 45 | 39 |
| Temessee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,023 | 286,162 | 6.2 | 17 | 24 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,225,513 | 2,760,997 | 19.4 | 3 | 7 |
| Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 261,813 | 17.9 | 35 | 9 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 | 49 | 19 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 5,346,797 | 840,561 | 15.7 | 12 | 12 |
| Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,353 | 734,339 | 17.8 | 18 | 10 |
| West Virginia | 1,793,477 | 1,950,186 | -156,709 | -8.0 | 34 | 51 |
| Hisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,642 | 186,127 | 4.0 | 16 | 32 |
| Hyoming | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 | 51 | 48 |

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, BY REGION AND DIVISION, 1990 AND 1980

| Region, division and State | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | Change, | 1980-90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Percent |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 226,542,203 | 22,167,670 | 9.8 |
| Northeast | 50,809,229 | 49,136,816 | 1,672,413 | 3.4 |
| New England | 13,206,943 | 12,348,920 | 858,023 | 6.9 |
| Middle Atlantic | 37,602,286 | 36,787,896 | 814,390 | 2.2 |
| Midwest | 59,668,632 | 58,867,002 | 801,630 | 1.4 |
| East North Central | 42,008,942 | 41,682,912 | 326,030 | 0.8 |
| West North Central | 17,659,690 | 17,184,090 | 475,600 | 2.8 |
| South | 85,445,930 | 75,367,068 | 10,078,862 | 13.4 |
| South Atlantic | 43,566,853 | 36,957,453 | 6,609,400 | 17.9 |
| East South Central | 15,176,284 | 14,666,142 | 510,142 | 3.5 |
| West South Central | 26,702,793 | 23,743,473 | 2,959,320 | 12.5 |
| West | 52,786,082 | 43,171,317 | 9,614,765 | 22.3 |
| Mountain | 13,658,776 | 11,371,502 | 2,287,274 | 20.1 |
| Pacific | 39,127,306 | 31,799,815 | 7,327,491 | 23.0 |
| New England: |  |  |  |  |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,125,043 | 102,885 | 9.1 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,093 | 279,332 | 4.9 |
| Rhode Island | 1,003,464 | 947,154 | 56,310 | 5.9 |
| Connecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,564 | 179,552 | 5.8 |
| Middle Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558,165 | 432,290 | 2.5 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 7,365,011 | 365,177 | 5.0 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,881,643 | 11,864,720 | 16,923 | 0.1 |
| East North Central: |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,603 | 49,512 | 0.5 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,214 | 53,945 | 1.0 |
| Illinois | 11,430,602 | 11,427,409 | 3,193 | 0.0 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 9,262,044 | 33,253 | 0.4 |
| Wisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,642 | 186,127 | 4.0 |
| West North Central: |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 4,375,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 |
| Iowa | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,766 | 200,307 | 4.1 |
| North Dakota | 638,800 | 652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 |
| Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8,560 | 0.5 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,364,236 | 113,338 | 4.8 |

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division, ST1B

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible sorrection for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, BY REGION AND DIVISION, 1990 AND 1980

|  |  |  | Change, | 1980-90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region, division and State | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \\ & \text { census } \end{aligned}$ | Number | Percent |
| South Atlantic: |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,933 | 564,535 | 13.4 |
| Dist. of Columbia | 606,900 | 638,432 | -31,532 | -4.9 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 5,346,797 | 840,561 | 15.7 |
| West Virginia | 1,793,477 | 1,950,186 | -156,709 | -8.0 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,880,095 | 748,542 | 12.7 |
| South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 3,120,729 | 365,974 | 11.7 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,462,982 | 1,015,234 | 18.6 |
| Florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,961 | 3,190,965 | 32.7 |
| East South Central: |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,660,324 | 24,972 | 0.7 |
| Tennessee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,023 | 286,162 | 6.2 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,894,025 | 146,562 | 3.8 |
| Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 2,520,770 | 52,446 | 2.1 |
| West South Central: |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,357 | 64,368 | 2.8 |
| Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 4,206,116 | 13,857 | 0.3 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 3,025,487 | 120,098 | 4.0 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,225,513 | 2,760,997 | 19.4 |
| Mountain: |  |  |  |  |
| Montana | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 944,127 | 62,622 | 6.6 |
| Wyoming | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 |
| Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,735 | 404,659 | 14.0 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,303,302 | 211,767 | 16.2 |
| Arizona | 3,665,228 | 2,716,546 | 948,682 | 34.9 |
| Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 261,813 | 17.9 |
| Nevada | 1,201,833 | 800,508 | 401,325 | 50.1 |
| Pacific: |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,353 | 734,339 | 17.8 |
| Oregon | 2,842,321 | 2,633,156 | 209,165 | 7.9 |
| California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,764 | 6,092,257 | 25.7 |
| Alaska | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 |
| Hawaii ....... | 1,108,229 | 964,691 | 143,538 | 14.9 |

Hote: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF States, 1990 and 1980, by 1990 size rank

| State | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 226,542,203 | 22,167,670 | 9.8 |  |  |
| California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,764 | 6,092,257 | 25.7 | 1 | 5 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558,165 | 432,290 | 2.5 | 2 | 35 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,225,513 | 2,760,997 | 19.4 | 3 | 7 |
| Florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,961 | 3,190,965 | 32.7 | 4 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,881,643 | 11,864,720 | 16,923 | 0.1 | 5 | 45 |
| $1 l l i n o i s$ | 11,430,602 | 11,427,409 | 3,193 | 0.0 | 6 | 46 |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,603 | 49,512 | 0.5 | 7 | 42 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 9,262,044 | 33,253 | 0.4 | 8 | 43 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 7,365,011 | 365,177 | 5.0 | 9 | 27 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,880,095 | 748,542 | 12.7 | 10 | 16 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,462,982 | 1,015,234 | 18.6 | 11 | 8 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 5,346,797 | 840,561 | 15.7 | 12 | 12 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,093 | 279,332 | 4.9 | 13 | 28 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,214 | 53,945 | 1.0 | 14 | 38 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,766 | 200,307 | 4.1 | 15 | 30 |
| Misconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,642 | 186,127 | 4.0 | 16 | 32 |
| Temressee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,023 | 286,162 | 6.2 | 17 | 24 |
| Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,353 | 734,339 | 17.8 | 18 | 10 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,933 | 564,535 | 13.4 | 19 | 15 |
| Minnesota .... | 4,373,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 | 20 | 22 |
| Lovisiana | 4,219,973 | 4,206,116 | 13,857 | 0.3 | 21 | 44 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,894,025 | 146,562 | 3.8 | 22 | 33 |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,660,324 | 24,972 | 0.7 | 23 | 40 |
| Arizona . | 3,665,228 | 2,716,546 | 948,682 | 34.9 | 24 | 3 |
| South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 3,120,729 | 365,974 | 11.7 | 25 | 18 |
| Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,735 | 404,659 | 14.0 | 26 | 14 |
| Comecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,564 | 179,552 | 5.8 | 27 | 26 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 3,025,487 | 120,098 | 4.0 | 28 | 31 |
| Oregon ..... | 2,842,321 | 2,633,156 | 209,165 | 7.9 | 29 | 21 |
| lowa .. | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 | 30 | 49 |
| Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 2,520,770 | 52,446 | 2.1 | 31 | 36 |
| Kanses | 2,477,574 | 2,364,236 | 113,338 | 4.8 | 32 | 29 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,357 | 64,368 | 2.8 | 33 | 34 |
| Hest Virginia | 1,793,477 | 1,950,186 | -156,709 | -8.0 | 34 | 51 |
| Utah.. | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 261,813 | 17.9 | 35 | 9 |
| Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8,560 | 0.5 | 36 | 41 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,303,302 | 211,767 | 16.2 | 37 | 11 |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,125,043 | 102,885 | 9.1 | 38 | 20 |
| Nevada . ...... | 1,201,833 | 800,508 | 401,325 | 50.1 | 39 | 1 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 | 40 | 6 |

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, 1990 AND 1980, By MUMERIC CHANGE, $1980-90$

| State | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1980 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 226,542,203 | 22,167,670 | 9.8 |  |  |
| California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,764 | 6,092,257 | 25.7 | 1 | 5 |
| Florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,961 | 3,190,965 | 32.7 | 4 | 4 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,225,513 | 2,760,997 | 19.4 | 3 | 7 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,462,982 | 1,015,234 | 18.6 | 11 | 8 |
| Arizona. | 3,665,228 | 2,716,546 | 948,682 | 34.9 | 24 | 3 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 5,346,797 | 840,561 | 15.7 | 12 | 12 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,880,095 | 748,542 | 12.7 | 10 | 16 |
| Hashington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,353 | 734,339 | 17.8 | 18 | 10 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,933 | 564,535 | 13.4 | 19 | 15 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558,165 | 432,290 | 2.5 | 2 | 35 |
| Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,735 | 404,659 | 14.0 | 26 | 14 |
| Neveda | 1,201,833 | 800,508 | 401,325 | 50.1 | 39 | 1 |
| South Carotina | 3,486,703 | 3,120,729 | 365,974 | 11.7 | 25 | 18 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 7,365,011 | 365,177 | 5.0 | 9 | 27 |
| Mimesota .... | 4,373,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 | 20 | 22 |
| Ternessee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,023 | 286,162 | 6.2 | 17 | 24 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,093 | 279,332 | 4.9 | 13 | 28 |
| Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 261,813 | 17.9 | 35 | 9 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,303,302 | 211,767 | 16.2 | 37 | 11 |
| Oregon ........ | 2,842,321 | 2,633,156 | 209,165 | 7.9 | 29 | 21 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,766 | 200,307 | 4.1 | 15 | 30 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 | 40 | 6 |
| Wisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,642 | 186,127 | 4.0 | 16 | 32 |
| Comecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,564 | 179,552 | 5.8 | 27 | 26 |
| Alaska | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 | 50 | 2 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,894,025 | 146,562 | 3.8 | 22 | 33 |
| Hawai i | 1,108,229 | 964,691 | 143,538 | 14.9 | 41 | 13 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 3,025,487 | 120,098 | 4.0 | 28 | 31 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,364,236 | 113,338 | 4.8 | 32 | 29 |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,125,043 | 102,885 | 9.1 | 38 | 20 |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 | 46 | 17 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,357 | 64,368 | 2.8 | 33 | 34 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 944, 127 | 62,622 | 6.6 | 42 | 23 |
| Rhode Island | 1,003,464 | 947,154 | 56,310 | 5.9 | 43 | 25 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,214 | 53,945 | 1.0 | 14 | 38 |
| Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 2,520,770 | 52,446 | 2.1 | 31 | 36 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 | 49 | 19 |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,603 | 49,512 | 0.5 | 7 | 42 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 9,262,044 | 33,253 | 0.4 | 8 | 43 |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,660,324 | 24,972 | 0.7 | 23 | 40 |

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Comerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, 1990 ANO 1980, BY MUNERIC CHANGE, 1980-90

| State | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | .....-.-.....- |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| Pernsylvania ............. | 11,881,643 | 11,864,720 | 16,923 | 0.1 | 5 | 45 |
| Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 4,206,116 | 13,857 | 0.3 | 21 | 44 |
| Montana ................... | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 | 44 | 37 |
| Webraska ................. | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8,560 | 0.5 | 36 | 41 |
| South Dakota . | 6\%,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 | 45 | 39 |
| Illinois ................. | 11,430,602 | 11,427,409 | 3,193 | 0.0 | 6 | 46 |
| Morth Dakota | 638,800 | 652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 | 47 | 47 |
| Wyoming .................. | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 | 51 | 48 |
| Dist. of Columbia ....... | 606,900 | 638,432 | -31,532 | -4.9 | 48 | 50 |
| lowa | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 | 30 | 49 |
| Hest Virginia ............ | 1,793,477 | 1,950,186 | -156,709 | -8.0 | 34 | 51 |

Note: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Population of states, 1990 and 1980, by 1990 SIze rank

| State | 1990 Census | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \\ & \text { Census } \end{aligned}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| Hawai i | 1,108,229 | 964,691 | 143,538 | 14.9 | 41 | 13 |
| Idaho ....................... | 1,006,749 | 944,127 | 62,622 | 6.6 | 42 | 23 |
| Rhode Island ................ | 1,003,464 | 947,154 | 56,310 | 5.9 | 43 | 25 |
| Montana ...................... | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 | 44 | 37 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 | 45 | 39 |
| Delaware ..................... | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 | 46 | 17 |
| North Dakota ................ | 638,800 | 652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 | 47 | 47 |
| Dist. of Columbia ........... | 606,900 | 638,432 | -31,532 | -4.9 | 48 | 50 |
| Vermort ...................... | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 | 49 | 19 |
| Alaska ...................... | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 | 50 | 2 |
| Hyoming ..................... | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 | 51 | 48 |

NOTE: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

POPULATION OF STATES, 1990 and 1980, RanKED by PERCENT CHANGE, 1980-90

| State | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1980 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 226,542,203 | 22,167,670 | 9.8 |  |  |
| Nevada | 1,201,833 | 800,508 | 401,325 | 50.1 | 39 | 1 |
| Alaska | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 | 50 | 2 |
| Arizona | 3,665,228 | 2,716,546 | 948,682 | 34.9 | 24 | 3 |
| Florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,961 | 3,190,965 | 32.7 | 4 | 4 |
| California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,764 | 6,092,257 | 25.7 | 1 | 5 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 | 40 | 6 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,225,513 | 2,760,997 | 19.4 | 3 | 7 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,462,982 | 1,015,234 | 18.6 | 11 | 8 |
| Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 261,813 | 17.9 | 35 | 9 |
| Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,353 | 734,339 | 17.8 | 18 | 10 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,303,302 | 211,767 | 16.2 | 37 | 11 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 5,346,797 | 840,561 | 15.7 | 12 | 12 |
| Hamai i | 1,108,229 | 964,691 | 143,538 | 14.9 | 41 | 13 |
| Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,735 | 404,659 | 14.0 | 26 | 14 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,933 | 564,535 | 13.4 | 19 | 15 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,880,095 | 748,542 | 12.7 | 10 | 16 |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 | 46 | 17 |
| South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 3,120,729 | 365,974 | 11.7 | 25 | 18 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 | 49 | 19 |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,125,043 | 102,885 | 9.1 | 38 | 20 |
| Oregon | 2,842,321 | 2,633,156 | 209,165 | 7.9 | 29 | 21 |
| Mimesota | 4,375,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 | 20 | 22 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 944,127 | 62,622 | 6.6 | 42 | 23 |
| Tennessee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,023 | 286,162 | 6.2 | 17 | 24 |
| Rhode Isiand | 1,003,464 | 947,154 | 56,310 | 5.9 | 43 | 25 |
| Connecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,564 | 179,552 | 5.8 | 27 | 26 |
| New Jersey | 7,730,188 | 7,365,011 | 365,177 | 5.0 | 9 | 27 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,093 | 279,332 | 4.9 | 13 | 28 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,364,236 | 113,338 | 4.8 | 32 | 29 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,766 | 200,307 | 4.1 | 15 | 30 |
| Oklahome | 3,145,585 | 3,025,487 | 120,098 | 4.0 | 28 | 31 |
| Uisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,642 | 186,127 | 4.0 | 16 | 32 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,894,025 | 146,562 | 3.8 | 22 | 33 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,357 | 64,368 | 2.8 | 33 | 34 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558, 165 | 432,290 | 2.5 | 2 | 35 |
| Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 2,520,770 | 52,446 | 2.1 | 31 | 36 |
| Montana | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 | 44 | 37 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,214 | 53,945 | 1.0 | 14 | 38 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 | 45 | 39 |
| Kentucky ... | 3,685,296 | 3,660,324 | 24,972 | 0.7 | 23 | 40 |

NTE: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
population of states, 1990 and 1980, ranked by percent change, 1980-90

| State | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1980 \\ \text { Census } \end{gathered}$ | Change, 1980-90 |  | 1990 Rank |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Population | Pct. Change |
| Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8,560 | 0.5 | 36 | 41 |
| Onio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,603 | 49,512 | 0.5 | 7 | 42 |
| Michigan ..................... | 9,295,297 | 9,262,044 | 33,253 | 0.4 | 8 | 43 |
| Louisiane | 4,219,973 | 4,206,116 | 13,857 | 0.3 | 21 | 44 |
| Pernsylvania ................ | 11,881,643 | 11,864,720 | 16,923 | 0.1 | 5 | 45 |
| 111 inois | 11,430,602 | 11,427,409 | 3,193 | 0.0 | 6 | 46 |
| North Dakota | 638,800 | 652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 | 47 | 47 |
| yyoming ...................... | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 | 51 | 48 |
| !owa .......................... | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 | 30 | 49 |
| Dist. of Columbia ............ | 606,900 | 638,432 | -31,532 | -4.9 | 48 | 50 |
| Hest Virginia ................ | 1,793,477 | 1,950,186 | -156,709 | -8.0 | 34 | 51 |



Number 1 - March 1991
This is the first in a series of profiles on results of the 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than
July 15, 1991.

## The U.S. population grew about 10 percent from 1980 to 1990.

The resident population of the United States as of April 1, 1990, was 248.7 million persons. This is 9.8 percent above the 1980 census count of 226.5 million (figure 1).

The growth rate for the 1980-90 decade is the second lowest in census history. The rate exceeded only the 7.3-percent increase of the Depression decade of the 1930's, when the rate of childbearing dropped close to two births per woman and net immigration from abroad was negligible. In contrast, the growth rate reached 18.5 percent in the 1950's, which included the peak of the post-World War II baby boom (1946-64) and a rate of childbearing averaging over three births per woman.

Despite an increase in net immigration since the 1950's, the growth rate has been lower subsequently. The decline is due primarily to the drop
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in the rate of childbearing, which averaged about two births per woman during the past two decades.

The numerical growth in the 1980-90 decade was 22.2 million. The numerical growth also exceeded 20 million in the three preceding decades, with a peak figure of 28.0 million in the 1950 's.

## Population growth exceeded 30 percent per decade early in the Nation's history.

The population growth rate exceeded 30 percent in each decade from 1790 to 1860 and remained above 20 percent in each decade from 1860 to 1910, before dropping to 7.3 percent in the 1930 's. The decrease is due primarily to the long-term decline in the average rate of childbearing from about seven births per woman at the beginning of the 19th century. The effect of declining fertility on the growth rate was offset in part by declining mortality, and by large-scale immigration during most
of the period from the 1840's to the 1920's.
The South and West continue to grow most rapidly.

The West had the highest growth rate ( 22.3 percent) among the four census regions of the United States during the 1980's (p. 4). This was down slightly from the 1970's ( 23.9 percent), but still more than twice the national rate. The South's growth rate fell more sharply ( 20.0 percent to 13.4 percent), but remained above the national rate. The growth rate rose in the Northeast ( 0.2 percent to 3.4 percent) and fell in the Midwest ( 4.0 percent to 1.4 percent). These two regions had growth rates far below the national rate in both the 1970's and 1980's.

The differences in growth rates among the regions in the 1980's reflect differences in migration among States and immigration, and in rates of natural increase (birth rates minus death rates). There was net migration into the South

Figure 1.
Population and Percent Change From Preceding Census for the United States: 1790 to 1990
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and West, negligible net migration for the Northeast, and net migration out of the Midwest. The rate of natural increase was highest in the West and lowest in the Northeast.

The South and West together accounted for 89 percent of national population growth in the 1980's and 90 percent in the 1970's. Their combined share of the national population increased from 48.0 percent in 1970 to 52.3 percent in 1980 and to 55.6 percent in 1990.

Since 1900, the West's share of national population has increased most rapidly among the four regions, while the Midwest's portion has declined most sharply. The South's share reached its lowest level in 1930 and 1960 ( 30.7 percent) and has increased in each decade since 1960. The Northeast's portion reached its 20th-century peak in 1910 and 1920 ( 28.0 percent) before declining in each subsequent decade.

## Percent Share of Population

|  | 1900 | 1990 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Northeast | 27.6 | 20.4 |
| Midwest | 34.6 | 24.0 |
| South | 32.2 | 34.4 |
| West | 5.7 | 21.2 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 |

The list of the five most rapidly growing States has changed little in the past 50 years.

The five States with the highest percent increases in population during the 1980-90 decade were Nevada (50.1), Alaska (36.9), Arizona (34.8), Florida (32.7), and California (25.7) (figure 2). The top five States in the 1970's were Nevada (63.8), Arizona (53.1), Florida (43.5), Wyoming (41.3), and Utah (37.9).

During the past five decades (the 1940's through the 1980's), five States have dominated the list of most rapidly growing States. Arizona, Florida, and Nevada were included in each decade, while Alaska and California missed only in the 1970's. Nevada had the highest growth rate in each of the last three decades.

The only Northeastern or Midwestern States with growth rates above the national figure during the 1980's were New Hampshire ( 20.5 percent) and Vermont (10.0 percent), while Maine's growth rate was slightly lower ( 9.2 percent). These three were the only Northeastern or Midwestern States with growth rates above the national rate in the 1970's.

Four States lost population during the 1980's after increases in the 1970's: Iowa, North Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming. New York and Rhode Island
gained population in the 1980's after losses in the 1970's. The District of Columbia lost population in both decades.

Only two States had growth rates that were below the national rate in the 1970's and above it in the 1980's: Delaware and Maryland.

## California, Florida, and Texas accounted for most of population growth during the 1980's.

The combined population growth in California ( 6.1 million), Florida ( 3.2 million), and Texas ( 2.8 million) in the 1980-90 decade totaled 12.0 million, or 54 percent of the $22.2-$ million national population increase (figure 3). This is the first time in the Nation's 200-year census history that as few as three States accounted for over half of the national population growth.

California's numerical growth of 6.1 million and its 27 percent share of U.S. population growth during the 1980's are record highs for a single State. Its population of 29.8 million in 1990 was larger than that of the 21 least populous States combined, and its 12.0 percent share of U.S. population was the highest in one State since 1860 when New York had 12.3 percent.

Figure 2.
Percent Change in Population for States: 1980 to 1990


## Nineteen seats will shift in the U.S. House of Representatives

As a result of population changes from 1980 to 1990, eight States will have more representatives in the 103rd Congress, which will convene in January 1993.1 The largest gains will be in California ( +7 ), Florida ( +4 ), and Texas $(+3)$, while five other States will each gain one seat. Thirteen States will have fewer representatives. The largest losses will be in New York ( -3 ), and in Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania ( -2 each). Eight other States will each lose one seat (figure 4).

Following the 1980 census, reapportionment shifted 17 seats. The largest gains were in Florida $(+4)$, Texas $(+3)$, and California ( +2 ), and the largest losses were in New York ( -5 ) and in Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania ( -2 each).

After the 1980 census, the South and West together gained all 17 shifted seats. In the upcoming reapportionment, the net increase of 7 seats in the South reflects a gain of 10 seats and a loss of 1 seat each in Kentucky, Louisiana, and West Virginia. The net increase of 8 seats in the West

[^7]Figure 3.
Percent Distribution of U.S. Population Growth for Selected Areas, by Decade: 1900 to 1990


## Source of the Data

The 1990 census data included here are from Bureau of the Census press releases

CB 90-232 (Dec. 26, 1990) and CB 91-07 (Jan. 7, 1991). Data for 1790-1980 are from 1980 Census of Population, Number of Inhabitants, United States Summary (PC80-1-A1), issued 1983.

For information about the publication program for the 1990 Census of Population and Housing and the wide range of data products issued by the Census Bureau, contact Customer Services, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233
(301-763-4100).

Figure 4.
Congressional Representation in 1990 and Changes Since 1980 for States


Population: 1900 to 1990
(Data are for 1990 areas of States. Percent change and rank based on unrounded numbers)

| United States <br> Regions and Divisions States | Population (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  | Change in population |  |  |  |  |  | Rank in population ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number (in thousands) |  |  | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1990{ }^{1}$ | 1980 | 1970 | 1960 | 1950 | 1900 | $\begin{array}{r} 1980 \\ 10 \\ 1990 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1970 \\ 10 \\ 1980 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1960 \\ \text { to } \\ 1970 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1980 \\ \text { to } \\ 1990 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 1970 \\ \text { to } \\ 1980 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1960 \\ \text { to } \\ 1970 \end{array}$ | 1990 | 1980 | 1950 | 1900 |
| United States . | 248710 | 226546 | 203302 | 179323 | 151326 | 76212 | 22164 | 23244 | 23979 | 9.8 | 11.4 | 13.4 | (X) | (X) | (X) | (X) |
| REGIONS AND DIVISIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast | 50809 | 49135 | 49061 | 44678 | 39478 | 21047 | 1674 | 75 | 4383 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 9.8 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| New England | 13207 | 12348 | 11847 | 10509 | 9314 | 5592 | 858 | 501 | 1338 | 7.0 | 4.2 | 12.7 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| Middle Atlantic | 37602 | 36787 | 37213 | 34168 | 30164 | 15455 | 815 | -426 | 3045 | 2.2 | -1.1 | 8.9 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Midwest | 59669 | 58866 | 56590 | 51619 | 44461 | 26333 | 803 | 2275 | 4971 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 9.6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| East North Central | 42009 | 41682 | 40263 | 36225 | 30399 | 15986 | 327 | 1419 | 4038 | 0.8 | 3.5 | 11.1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| West North Central | 17660 | 17183 | 16328 | 15394 | 14061 | 10347 | 476 | 856 | 933 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| South | 85446 | 75372 | 62813 | 54973 | 47197 | 24524 | 10074 | 12559 | 7840 | 13.4 | 20.0 | 14.3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| South Atiantic | 43567 | 36959 | 30679 | 25972 | 21182 | 10443 | 6608 | 6280 | 4707 | 17.9 | 20.5 | 18.1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| East South Central. | 15176 | 14666 | 12808 | 12050 | 11477 | 7548 | 510 | 1858 | 758 | 3.5 | 14.5 | 6.3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 |
| West South Central | 26703 | 23747 | 19326 | 16951 | 14538 | 6532 | 2956 | 4421 | 2375 | 12.4 | 22.9 | 14.0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| West | 52786 | 43172 | 34838 | 28053 | 20190 | 4309 | 9614 | 8334 | 6785 | 22.3 | 23.9 | 24.2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Mountain | 13659 | 11373 | 8290 | 6855 | 5075 | 1675 | 2286 | 3083 | 1435 | 20.1 | 37.2 | 20.9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Pacific | 39127 | 31800 | 26548 | 21198 | 15115 | 2634 | 7328 | 5251 | 5350 | 23.0 | 19.8 | 25.2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| States |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New England |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine | 1228 | 1125 | 994 | 969 | 914 | 694 | 103 | 131 | 24 | 9.2 | 13.2 | 2.5 | 38 | 38 | 35 | 31 |
| New Hampshire | 1109 | 921 | 738 | 607 | 533 | 412 | 189 | 183 | 131 | 20.5 | 24.8 | 21.5 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 37 |
| Vermont. . . . . | 563 | 511 | 445 | 390 | 378 | 344 | 51 | 67 | 55 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 48 | 48 | 46 | 39 |
| Massachusetts | 6016 | 5737 | 5689 | 5149 | 4691 | 2805 | 279 | 48 | 541 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 10.5 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7 |
| Rhode Island | 1003 | 947 | 950 | 859 | 792 | 429 | 56 | -3 | 90 | 5.9 | -0.3 | 10.5 | 43 | 40 | 36 | 35 |
| Connecticut | 3287 | 3108 | 3032 | 2535 | 2007 | 908 | 180 | 75 | 497 | 5.8 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 27 | 25 | 28 | 29 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York. | 17990 | 17558 | 18  <br> 7  <br> 7 171 <br> 1  | 16782 | 14830 | $\begin{array}{ll}7 & 269 \\ 1 & 884\end{array}$ | 432 | -683 | 1459 | 2.5 | -3.7 | 8.7 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| New Jersey Pennsylvania | 7730 11882 | 7365 11864 | 78171 11801 | 6067 11319 | 4835 10498 | 1 1 6 6 384 | 365 18 | 194 63 | 11 +481 | 5.0 | 2.7 0.5 | 88.2 4.3 | 9 | 9 4 | 8 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio. | 10847 | 10798 | 10657 | 9706 | 7947 | 4158 | 49 | 140 | 951 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Indiana | 5544 | 5490 | 5195 | 4662 | 3934 | 2516 | 54 | 295 | 533 | 1.0 | 5.7 | 11.4 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 8 |
| lllinois. | 11431 | 11427 | 11110 | 10081 | 8712 | 4822 | 4 | 316 | 1029 | - | 2.8 | 10.2 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Michigan. | 9295 | 9262 | 8882 | 7823 | 6372 | 2421 | 33 | 380 | 1059 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 13.5 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| Wisconsin. | 4892 | 4706 | 4418 | 3952 | 3435 | 2069 | 186 | 288 | 466 | 4.0 | 6.5 | 11.8 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 13 |
| West North Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 4375 | 4076 | 3806 | 3414 | 2982 | 1751 | 299 | 270 | 392 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 11.5 | 20 | 21 | 18 | 19 |
| lowa. | 2777 | 2914 | 2825 | 2758 | 2621 | 2232 | -137 | 88 | 68 | -4.7 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 30 | 27 | 22 | 10 |
| Missouri | 5117 | 4917 | 4678 | 4320 | 3955 | 3107 | 200 | 239 | 358 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 8.3 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 5 |
| North Dakota | 639 | 653 | 618 | 632 | 620 | 319 | -14 | 35 | -15 | -2.1 | 5.7 | -2.3 | 47 | 46 | 41 | 40 |
| South Dakota | 696 | 691 | 666 | 681 | 653 | 402 | 5 | 25 | -14 | 0.8 | 3.7 | -2.1 | 45 | 45 | 40 | 38 |
| Nebraska | 1578 | 1570 | 1. 485 | 1411 | 1326 | 1066 | 9 | 84 | 74 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 36 | 35 | 33 | 27 |
| Kansas. | 2478 | 2364 | 2249 | 2179 | 1905 | 1470 | 114 | 115 | 70 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware | 666 | 594 | 548 | 446 | 318 | 185 | 72 | 46 | 102 | 12.1 | 8.4 | 22.8 | 46 | 47 | 47 | 44 |
| Maryland | 4781 | 4217 | 3924 | 3101 | 2343 | 1188 | 564 | 293 | 823 | 13.4 | 7.5 | 26.5 | 19 | 18 | 24 | 26 |
| District of Columbia | 607 | 638 | 757 | 764 | 802 | 279 | -31 | -118 | -7 | -4.9 | -15.6 | -1.0 | ${ }^{3}$ ) | ${ }^{3}$ ) | ${ }^{3}$ ) | ${ }^{3}$ ) |
| Virginia. | 6187 | 5347 | 4651 | 3967 | 3319 | 1854 | 841 | 695 | 684 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 17.3 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 |
| West Virginia | 1793 | 1950 | 1744 | 1860 | 2006 | 959 | -156 | 205 | -116 | -8.0 | 11.8 | -6.2 | 34 | 34 | 29 | 28 |
| North Carolina | 6629 | 5882 | 5084 | 4556 | 4062 | 1894 | 747 | 797 | 528 | 12.7 | 15.7 | 11.6 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 15 |
| South Carolina | 3487 | 3122 | 2591 | 2383 | 2117 | 1340 | 365 | 531 | 208 | 11.7 | 20.5 | 8.7 | 25 | 24 | 27 | 24 |
| Georgia | 6478 | 5463 | 4588 | 3943 | 3445 | 2216 | 1015 | 875 | 645 | 18.6 | 19.1 | 16.4 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 11 |
| Florida | 12938 | 9746 | 6791 | 4952 | 2771 | 529 | 3192 | 2955 | 1840 | 32.7 | 43.5 | 37.2 | 4 | 7 | 20 | 33 |
| East South Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | 3685 | 3661 | 3221 | 3038 | 2945 | 2147 | 25 | 440 | 183 | 0.7 | 13.7 | 6.0 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 12 |
| Tennessee | 4877 | 4591 | 3926 | 3567 | 3292 | 2021 | 286 | 665 | 359 | 6.2 | 16.9 | 10.1 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 14 |
| Alabama. | 4041 | 3894 | 3444 | 3267 | 3062 | 1829 | 147 | 450 | 178 | 3.8 | 13.1 | 5.4 | 22 | 22 | 17 | 18 |
| Mississippi | 2573 | 2521 | 2217 | 2178 | 2179 | 1551 | 53 | 304 | 39 | 2.1 | 13.7 | 1.8 | 31 | 31 | 26 | 20 |
| West South Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 2351 | 2286 | 1923 | 1786 | 1910 | 1312 | 64 | 363 | 137 | 2.8 | 18.9 | 7.7 | 33 | 33 | 30 | 25 |
| Louisiana | 4220 | 4206 | 3645 | 3257 | 2684 | 1382 | 14 | 561 | 388 | 0.3 | 15.4 | 11.9 | 21 | 19 | 21 | 23 |
| Oklahoma. | 3146 | 3025 | 2559 | 2328 | 2233 | 790 | 120 | 466 | 231 | 4.0 | 18.2 | 9.9 | 28 | 26 | 25 | 30 |
| Texas. | 16987 | 14229 | 11199 | 9580 | 7711 | 3049 | 2757 | 3031 | 1619 | 19.4 | 27.1 | 16.9 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| Mountain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana. | 799 | 787 | 694 | 675 | 591 | 243 | 12 | 92 | 20 | 1.6 | 13.3 | 2.9 | 44 | 44 | 42 | 42 |
| Idaho. | 1007 | 944 | 713 | 667 | 589 | 162 | 63 | 231 | 46 | 6.7 | 32.4 | 6.9 | 42 | 41 | 43 | 45 |
| Wyoming | 454 | 470 | 332 | 330 | 291 | 93 | -16 | 137 | 2 | -3.4 | 41.3 | 0.7 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 48 |
| Colorado | 3294 | 2890 | 2210 | 1754 | 1325 | 540 | 404 | 680 | 456 | 14.0 | 30.8 | 26.0 | 26 | 28 | 34 | 32 |
| New Mexico | 1515 | 1303 | 1017 | 951 | 681 | 195 | 212 | 286 | 66 | 16.3 | 28.1 | 6.9 | 37 | 37 | 39 | 43 |
| Arizona. | 3665 | 2718 | 1775 | 1302 | 750 | 123 | 947 | 943 | 473 | 34.8 | 53.1 | 36.3 | 24 | 29 | 37 | 47 |
| Utah | 1723 | 1461 | 1059 | 891 | 689 | 277 | 262 | 402 | 169 | 17.9 | 37.9 | 18.9 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 41 |
| Nevada. | 1202 | 800 | 489 | 285 | 160 | 42 | 401 | 312 | 203 | 50.1 | 63.8 | 71.3 | 39 | 43 | 49 | 50 |
| Pacific |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington | 4867 | 4132 | 3413 | 2853 | 2379 | 518 | 735 | 719 | 560 | 17.8 | 21.1 | 19.6 | 18 | 20 | 23 | 34 |
| Oregon. | 2842 | 2633 | 2092 | 1769 | 1521 | 414 | 209 | 542 | 323 | 7.9 | 25.9 | 18.3 | 29 | 30 | 32 | 36 |
| California | 29760 | 23668 | 19971 | 15717 | 10586 | 1485 | 6092 | 3697 | 4254 | 25.7 | 18.5 | 27.1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 |
| Alaska | 550 | 402 | 303 | 226 | 129 | 64 | 148 | 99 | 76 | 36.9 | 32.8 | 33.8 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 49 |
| Hawaii | 1108 | 965 | 770 | 633 | 500 | 154 | 144 | 195 | 137 | 14.9 | 25.3 | 21.7 | 41 | 39 | 45 | 46 |

(X) Not applicable. -Represents zero.
${ }^{1}$ The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991. ${ }^{2}$ The 4 regions, 9 divisions, and 50 States are ranked separately.
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CENSUS BUREAU COMPLETES DISTRIBUTION OF

## 1990 REDISTRICTING TABULATIONS TO STATES

The Commerce Department's Census Bureau today completed distributing final 1990 census population counts to the governors and state legislatures for use in congressional, state, and local redistricting.

Alaska, on March 8, was the last state to receive its counts in a distribution that started on Jan. 15. The bureau finished its task, called for under Public Law 94-171, 24 days before the legal deadline of April 1, 1991.

The redistricting tabulations show total population counts and persons age 18 years and over for all races; Whites; Blacks; Asians or Pacific Islanders; American Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts; and combined other races. The same counts also are shown for persons
(more)


#### Abstract

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.


of Hispanic origin and for persons not of Hispanic origin by race. Housing unit counts also are included in the data.

All states and the District of Columbia received these data for the following geographic areas: state, county, minor civil division, place, census tract, block group, block, and, where applicable, American Indian and Alaska Native areas. States that participated in the Census Bureau's Voting District Program also received these data for each specified voting district.

States also were provided maps showing boundary information for the geographic areas presented in the tabulations.

The 1990 census redistricting numbers are available for purchase on summary computer tape, tape cartridge, compact discread only memory (CD-ROM), and in several different printouts. The housing unit counts are available on computer tape, CD-ROM, and on selected versions of the printouts. No printed reports will be issued from the redistricting data files.

Copies of the materials sent to the state governments are available from the bureau's Data User Services Division, Customer Services Office, 301-763-4100, or by writing to Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.

The attached tables provide population counts by race and Hispanic origin for the nation and states.

Table 1. Resident Population Distribution for the United States by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1990 and 1980

| UNITED STATES | 1990 |  | 1980 |  | Number | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Change |  |
| Total Population.... | 248,709,873 | 100.0 | 226,545,805 | 100.0 | 22,164,068 | 9.8 |
| White. | 199,686,070 | 80.3 | 188,371,622 | 83.1 | 11,314,448 | 6.0 |
| Black. | 29,986,060 | 12.1 | 26,495,025 | 11.7 | 3,491,035 | 13.2 |
| American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut......... | 1,959,234 | 0.8 | 1,420,400 | 0.6 | 538,834 | 37.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander. $\qquad$ | 7,273,662 | 2.9 | 3,500,439* | 1.5 | 3,773,223 | 107.8 |
| Other Race | 9,804,847 | 3.9 | 6,758,319 | 3.0 | 3,046,528 | 45.1 |
| Hispanic Origin**........ | 22,354,059 | 9.0 | 14,608,673 | 6.4 | 7,745,386 | 53.0 |

* The 1980 number for Asians or Pacific Islanders shown in this table are not entirely comparable with the 1990 counts. The 1980 count of $3,500,439$ of Asians or Pacific Islanders based on 100 -percent tabulations includes only the nine specific Asian or Pacific groups listed separately in the 1980 race item. The 1980 total Asian or Pacific Islander population of $3,726,440$ from sample tabulations is comparable to the 1990 .count; these figures include groups not listed separately in the race item on the 1980 census form.
** Persons of Hispanic origin can be of any race.

The population couats set forth herein are subject to possible correction FOR UNDERCOUNT OR OVERCOUNT. THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IS CONSIDERING WHETHER TO CORRECT THESE COUNTS AND WILL PUBLISH CORRECTED COUNTS, If ANY, NOT LATER THAN JULY 15, 1991.

Mote: The 1990 population counts set forth herein re subject to possible correction for undercount or avercounts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is considerine whe to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if ary, not leter than July 15. 1991.

Table 2. Resident Population Distribution for the United States, Regions, and States, by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1990

| United States <br> Region <br> State | Total | White | Black | American Indian Eskimo, or Aleut | Asian or Pacific Islander | Other Race | Hispanic Origin* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 199,686,070 | 29,986,060 | 1,959,234 | 7,273,662 | 9,804,847 | 22,354,059 |
| Northeast | 50,809,229 | 42,068,904 | 5,613,222 | 125,148 | 1,335,375 | 1,666,580 | 3,754,389 |
| Connecticut | 3,287,116 | 2,859,353 | 274,269 | 6,654 | 50,698 | 96,142 | 213,116 |
| Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,208,360 | 5,138 | 5,998 | 6,683 | 1,749 | 6,829 |
| Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,405,374 | 300,130 | 12,241 | 143,392 | 155,288 | 287,549 |
| New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 1,087,433 | 7.198 | 2,134 | 9,343 | 3,144 | 11,333 |
| Ne:d Jersey | 7,730,188 | 6,130,465 | 1,036,825 | 14,970 | 272,521 | 275,407 | 739.861 |
| New York | 17,990,455 | 13,385,255 | 2,859,055 | 62,651 | 693,760 | 989,734 | 2,214,026 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,881,643 | 10,520,201 | 1,089,795 | 14,733 | 137,438 | 119,476 | 232,262 |
| Rhode Istand | 1,003,464 | 917,375 | 38,861 | 4,071 | 18,325 | 24,832 | 45,752 |
| Vermont | 562,758 | 555,088 | 1,951 | 1,696 | 3,215 | 808 | 3,661 |
| Midwest | 59,668,632 | 52,017,957 | 5,715,940 | 337,899 | 768,069 | 828,767 | 1,726,509 |
| lllinois | 11,430,602 | 8,952,978 | 1,694,273 | 21,836 | 285,311 | 476,204 | 904,446 |
| Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,020,700 | 432,092 | 12,720 | 37,617 | 41,030 | 98,788 |
| Iowa | 2,776,755 | 2,683,090 | 48,090 | 7,349 | 25,476 | 12,750 | 32,647 |
| Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,231,986 | 143,076 | 21,965 | 31,750 | 48,797 | 93,670 |
| Michigan | 9,295,297 | 7,756,086 | 1,291,706 | 55,638 | 104,983 | 86,884 | 201,596 |
| Minnesota | 4,375,099 | 4,130,395 | 94,944 | 49,909 | 77,886 | 21,965 | 53,884 |
| Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,486,228 | 548,208 | 19,835 | 41,277 | 21,525 | 61,702 |
| Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,480,558 | 57,404 | 12,410 | 12,422 | 15,591 | 36,969 |
| North Dakota | 638,800 | 604,142 | 3,524 | 25,917 | 3,462 | 1,755 | 4,665 |
| Ohio | 10,847,115 | 9,521,756 | 1,154,826 | 20,358 | 91,179 | 58,996 | 139,696 |
| South Dakota | 696,004 | 637,515 | 3,258 | 50,575 | 3,123 | 1,533 | 5,252 |
| Wisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,512,523 | 244,539 | 39,387 | 53,583 | 41,737 | 93.194 |
| South | 85,445,930 | 65,582,199 | 15,828,888 | 562,731 | 1,122,248 | 2,349,864 | 6,767,021 |
| Alabama | 4,040,587 | 2,975,797 | 1,020,705 | 16,506 | 21,797 | 5,782 | 24.629 |
| Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 1,944,744 | 373,912 | 12,773 | 12,530 | 6,766 | 19,876 |
| District of Columbia | 606,900 | 179,667 | 399,604 | 1,466 | 11,214 | 14,949 | 32,710 |
| Delaware | 666,168 | 535,094 | 112,460 | 2,019 | 9,057 | 7,538 | 15,820 |
| Florida | 12,937,926 | 10,749,285 | 1,759,534 | 36,335 | 154,302 | 238,470 | 1,574,143 |
| Georgia | 6,478,216 | 4,600,148 | 1,746,565 | 13,348 | 75,781 | 42,374 | 108,922 |
| Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,391,832 | 262,907 | 5,769 | 17,812 | 6,976 | 21.984 |
| Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 2,839,138 | 1,299,281 | 18,541 | 41,099 | 21,914 | 93,044 |
| Maryland | 4,781,468 | 3,393,964 | 1,189,899 | 12,972 | 139,719 | 44,914 | 125,102 |
| Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 1,633,461 | 915,057 | 8,525 . ${ }^{*}$ | 13,016 | 3,157 | 15,931 |
| North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,008,491 | 1,456,323 | 80, 155 | 52,166 | 31,502 | 76.726 |
| Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 2,583,512 | 233,801 | 252,420 | 33,563 | 42,289 | 86.160 |
| South Carolina | 3,485,703 | 2,406,974 | 1,039,884 | 8,246 | 22,382 | 9,217 | 30.551 |
| Tennessee | 4,877,185 | 4,048,068 | 778,035 | 10,039 | 31,839 | 9,204 | 32,741 |
| Texas | 16,986,510 | 12,774,762 | 2,021,632 | 65,877 | 319,459 | 1,804,780 | 4,339,905 |
| Virginia | 6,187,358 | 4,791,739 | 1,162,994 | 15,282 | 159,053 | 58,290 | 160,288 |
| West Virginia | 1,793,477 | 1,725,523 | 56,295 | 2,458 | 7.459 | 1,742 | 8,489 |
| West | 52,786,082 | 40,017,010 | 2,828,010 | 933,456 | 4,047,970 | 4,959,636 | 10,106,140 |
| Alaska | 550,043 | 415,492 | 22.451 | 85.698 | 19,728 | 6.674 | 17,803 |
| Arizona | 3,665,228 | 2,963,186 | 110,524 | 203,527 | 55,206 | 332,785 | 688,338 |
| California | 29,760,021 | 20,524,327 | 2,208,801 | 242,164 | 2,845,659 | 3,939,070 | 7,687,938 |
| colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,905,474 | 133,146 | 27,776 | 59,862 | 168,136 | 424,302 |
| Hawaii | 1,108,229 | 369.616 | 27,195 | 5,099 | 685,236 | 21,083 | 81,390 |
| Idaho | 1,006,749 | 950,451 | 3,370 | 13,780 | 9.365 | 29,783 | 52,927 |
| Montana | 799,065 | 741,111 | 2,381 | 47,679 | 4,259 | 3,635 | 12.174 |
| Nevada | 1,201,833 | 1,012,695 | 78,711 | 19,637 | 38,127 | 52,603 | 124.419 |
| New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,146,028 | 30,210 | 134,355 | 14.124 | 190,352 | 579,224 |
| Oregon | 2,842,321 | 2,636,787 | 46,178 | 38,496 | 69,269 | 51,591 | 112.707 |
| Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,615,845 | 11,576 | 24,283 | 33,371 | 37,775 | 84,597 |
| Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,308,937 | 149,801 | 81,483 | 210,958 | 115.513 | 214,570 |
| Wyom: 9 | 453,588 | 427,061 | 3,606 | 9.479 | 2,806 | 10,636 | 25,751 |

[^8]Mote: The 1990 population couics set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts. The U.S. Depertment of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later thon July 15, 1991.

Table 3. Percent Distribution of the Resident Population by Race and Hispanic Origin, for the United States, Regions, and States: 1990

| United States Region State | Total | White | Black | American Indian Eskimo, or Aleut | Asian or Pacific Islander | Other Race | Hispanic Origin * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 100.0\% | 80.3\% | 12.1\% | 0.8\% | 2.9\% | 3.9\% | 9.0\% |
| Northeast | 100.0\% | 82.8\% | 11.0\% | 0.2\% | 2.6x | 3.3\% | 7.4\% |
| Connecticut | 100.0\% | 87.0\% | 8.3\% | 0.2\% | 1.5\% | 2.9\% | 6.5\% |
| Maine | 100.0\% | 98.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.6\% |
| Massachusetts | 100.0\% | 89.8\% | 5.0\% | 0.2\% | 2.4\% | 2.6\% | 4.8\% |
| New Hampshire | 100.0\% | 98.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% | 1.0\% |
| New Jersey | 100.0\% | 79.3\% | 13.4\% | 0.2\% | 3.5\% | 3.6\% | 9.6\% |
| New York | 100.0\% | 74.4\% | 15.9\% | 0.3\% | 3.9\% | 5.5\% | 12.3\% |
| Pennsylvania | 100.0\% | 88.5\% | 9.2\% | 0.1\% | 1.2\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% |
| Rhode Island | 100.0\% | 91.4\% | 3.9\% | 0.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 4.6\% |
| Vermont | 100.0\% | 98.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% | $0.7 \%$ |
| Midwest | 100.0\% | 87.2\% | 9.6\% | 0.6\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 2.9\% |
| 11 inois | 100.0\% | 78.3\% | 14.8\% | 0.2\% | 2.5\% | 4.2\% | 7.9\% |
| Indiana | 100.0\% | 90.6\% | 7.8\% | 0.2\% | $0.7 \%$ | 0.7\% | 1.8\% |
| lowa | 100.0\% | 96.6\% | 1.7\% | 0.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.5\% | 1.2\% |
| Kansas | 100.0\% | 90.1\% | 5.8\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 2.0\% | 3.8\% |
| Michigan | 100.0\% | 83.4\% | 13.9\% | 0.6\% | 1.1\% | 0.9\% | 2.2\% |
| Minnesota | 100.0\% | 94.4\% | 2.2\% | 1.1\% | 1.8\% | 0.5\% | 1.2\% |
| Missouri | 100.0\% | 87.7\% | 10.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 0.4\% | 1.2\% |
| Nebraska | 100.0\% | 93.8\% | 3.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 1.0\% | 2.3\% |
| North Dakota | 100.0\% | 94.6\% | 0.6\% | 4.1\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% |
| Ohio | 100.0\% | 87.8\% | 10.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 1.3\% |
| South Dakota | 100.0\% | 91.6\% | 0.5\% | 7.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.8\% |
| Wisconsin | 100.0\% | 92.2\% | 5.0\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.9\% | 1.9\% |
| South | 100.0\% | 76.8\% | 18.5\% | $0.7 \%$ | 1.3\% | 2.8\% | 7.9\% |
| Alabama | 100.0\% | 73.6\% | 25.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.6\% |
| Arkansas | 100.0\% | 82.7\% | 15.9\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.8\% |
| District of Columbia | 100.0\% | 29.6\% | 65.8\% | 0.2\% | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 5.4\% |
| Delaware | 100.0\% | 80.3\% | 16.9\% | 0.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 2.4\% |
| florida | 100.0\% | 83.1\% | 13.6\% | 0.3\% | 1.2\% | 1.8\% | 12.2\% |
| Georgia | 100.0\% | 71.0\% | 27.0\% | 0.2\% | 1.2\% | 0.7\% | 8.7\% |
| Kentucky | 100.0\% | 92.0\% | 7.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% |
| Louisiana | 100.0\% | 67.3\% | 30.8\% | 0.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 2.2\% |
| Maryland | 100.0\% | 71.0\% | 24.9\% | 0.3\% | 2.9\% | 0.9\% | 2.6\% |
| Mississippi | 100.0\% | 63.5\% | 35.6\% | 0.3\% | m 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.6\% |
| North Carolina | 100.0\% | 75.6\% | 22.0\% | 1.2\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 1.2\% |
| Oklahoma | 100.0\% | 82.1\% | 7.4\% | 8.0\% | 1.1\% | 1.3\% | 2.7\% |
| South Carolina | 100.0\% | 69.0\% | 29.8\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.9\% |
| Tennessee | 100.0\% | 83.0\% | 16.0\% | 0.2\% | $0.7 \%$ | 0.2\% | 0.7\% |
| Texas | 100.0\% | 75.2\% | 11.9\% | 0.4\% | - $1.9 \%$ | 10.6\% | 25.5\% |
| Virginia | 100.0\% | 77.4\% | 18.8\% | 0.2\% | 2.6\% | 0.9\% | 2.6\% |
| West Virginia | 100.0\% | 96.2\% | 3.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.5\% |
| Hest | 100.0\% | 75.8\% | 5.4\% | 1.8\% | 7.7\% | 9.4\% | 19.1\% |
| Alaska | 100.0\% |  | $4.1 \%$ |  | 3.6\% |  | 3.2\% |
| Arizona | 100.0\% | 80.8\% | 3.0\% | 5.6\% | 1.5\% | 9.1\% | 18.8\% |
| California | 100.0\% | 69.0\% | 7.4\% | 0.8\% | 9.6\% | 13.2\% | 25.8\% |
| colorado | 100.0\% | 88.2\% | 4.0\% | 0.8\% | 1.8\% | 5.1\% | 12.9\% |
| Hawaii | 100.0\% | 33.4\% | 2.5\% | 0.5\% | 61.8\% | 1.9\% | 7.3\% |
| Idaho | 100.0\% | 94.4\% | 0.3\% | 1.42 | 0.9\% | 3.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Montana | 100.0\% | 92.7\% | 0.3\% | 6.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 1.5\% |
| Nevada | 100.0\% | 84.3\% | 6.6\% | 1.6\% | 3.2\% | 4.4\% | 10.4\% |
| New Mexico | 100.0\% | 75.6\% | 2.0\% | 8.9\% | 0.9\% | 12.6\% | 38.2\% |
| Oregon | 100.0\% | 92.8\% | 1.6\% | 1.4\% | 2.4\% | 1.8\% | 4.0\% |
| Utah | 100.0\% | 93.8\% | $0.7 \%$ | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.2\% | 4.9\% |
| Washington | 100.0\% | 88.5\% | 3.12 | 1.7\% | 4.3\% | 2.4\% | 4.4\% |
| Wyoming | 100.0\% | 94.2\% | 0.8\% | 2.1\% | 0.6\% | 2.3\% | 5.7\% |

[^9]Mote: The 1990 populstion counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcounts.
The U.S. Deportment of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will pablish corrected counts, if any. not later than July 15, 1991.

Table 4. Percent Distribution of the Resident Population by Region and State by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1990

| United States Region State | Total | White | Black | American Indian Eskimo, or Aleut | Asian or Pacific Islander | Other Race | Hispanic Origin * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Northeast | 20.4\% | 21.1\% | 18.7\% | 6.4\% | 18.4\% | 17.0\% | 16.8\% |
| Connecticut | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | $0.7 \%$ | 1.0\% | 1.0\% |
| Maine | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Massachusetts | 2.4\% | 2.7\% | 1.0\% | 0.6\% | 2.0\% | 1.6\% | 1.3\% |
| New Hampshire | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| New Jersey | 3.1\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 0.8\% | 3.7\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% |
| New York | 7.2\% | $6.7 \%$ | 9.5\% | 3.2\% | 9.5\% | 10.1\% | 9.9\% |
| Pennsylvania | 4.8\% | 5.3\% | 3.6\% | 0.8\% | 1.9\% | 1.2\% | 1.0\% |
| Rhode Island | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Vermont | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Midwest | 24.0\% | 26.0\% | 19.1\% | 17.2\% | 10.6\% | 8.5\% | 7.7\% |
| 11 linois | 4.6\% | 4.5\% | 5.7\% | 1.1\% | 3.9\%. | 4.9\% | 4.0\% |
| Indiana | 2.2\% | 2.5\% | 1.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| lowa | 1.1\% | 1.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Karsas | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% |
| Michigan | 3.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% | 2.8\% | 1.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.9\% |
| Minnesota | 1.8\% | 2.1\% | 0.3\% | 2.5\% | 1.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| Missouri | 2.1\% | 2.2\% | 1.8\% | 1.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Nebraska | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| North Dakota | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Ohio | 4.4\% | 4.8\% | 3.9\% | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| South Dakota | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Hisconsin | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 0.8\% | 2.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| South | 34.4\% | 32.8\% | 52.8\% | 28.7\% | 15.4\% | 24.0\% | 30.3\% |
| Alabama | 1.6\% | 1.5\% | 3.4\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Arkansas | 0.9\% | 1.0\% | 1.2\% | $0.7 \%$ | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| District of Columbia | 0.2\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% |
| Delaware | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Florida | 5.2\% | 5.4\% | 5.9\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% | 2.4\% | 7.0\% |
| Georgia | 2.6\% | 2.3\% | 5.8\% | 0.7\% | 1.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% |
| Kentucky | 1.5\% | 1.7\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Lovisiana | 1.7\% | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% |
| Maryland | 1.9\% | 1.7\% | 4.0\% | 0.7\% | 1.9\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% |
| Mississippi | 1.0\% | 0.8\% | 3.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| North Carolina | 2.7\% | 2.5\% | 4.9\% | 4.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% |
| Oklahoma | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | $0.8 \%$ | 12.9\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| South Carolina | 1.4\% | 1.2\% | 3.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Tennessee | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Texas | 6.8\% | 6.4\% | 6.7\% | 3.4\% | 4.4\% | 18.4\% | 19.4\% |
| Virginia | 2.5\% | 2.4\% | 3.9\% | 0.8\% | 2.2\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% |
| West Virginia | 0.7\% | 0.9\%, | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| West | 21.2\% | 20.0\% | 9.4\% | 47.6\% | 55.7\% | 50.6\% | 45.2\% |
| Alaska | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | $0.1 \%$ | 4.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Arizona | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | $0.4 \%$ | 10.4\% | 0.8\% | 3.4\% | 3.1\% |
| California | 12.0\% | 10.3\% | 7.4\% | 12.4\% | 39.1\% | 40.2\% | 34.4\% |
| Colorado | 1.3\% | 1.5\% | $0.4 \%$ | 1.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.7\% | 1.9\% |
| Hawaii | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 9.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% |
| Idaho | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.78 | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Montana | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 2.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Nevada | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% |
| New Mexico | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | $0.1 \%$ | 6.9\% | 0.2\% | 1.9\% | 2.6\% |
| Oregon | 1.1\% | 1.3\% | 0.2\% | 2.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% |
| Utah | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 1.2\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| Washington | 2.0\% | 2.2\% | 0.5\% | 4.2\% | 2.9\% | 1.2\% | 1.0\% |
| Hyoming | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |

[^10]Table 5. Total Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980

| 1990 Total Population Rank | State | 1990 Total Population | 1980 Total Population | Number Change 1980 to 1990 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { Change } \\ & 1980 \text { to } \\ & 1990 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\sim$ |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
| 1 | California | 29,760,021 | 23,667,902 | 6,092,119 | 25.7 |
| 2 | New York | 17,990,455 | 17,558,072 | 432,383 | 2.5 |
| 3 | Texas | 16,986,510 | 14,229,191 | 2,757,319 | 19.4 |
| 4 | Florida | 12,937,926 | 9,746,324 | 3,191,602 | 32.7 |
| 5 | Pennsylvania | 11,881,643 | 11,863,895 | $\therefore 17,748$ | 0.1 |
| 6 | Illinois | 11,430,602 | 11,426,518 | 4,084 | 0.0 |
| 7 | Ohio | 10,847,115 | 10,797,630 | 49,485 | 0.5 |
| 8 M | Michigan | 9,295,297 | 9,262,078 | 33,219 | 0.4 |
| 9 N | New Jersey | 7.730,188 | 7,364,823 | 365,365 | 5.0 |
| 10 N | North Carolina | 6,628,637 | 5,881,766 | 746,871 | 12.7 |
| 11 | Georgia | 6,478,216 | 5,463,105 | 1,015,111 | 18.6 |
| 12 V | Virginia | $6.187,358$ | 5,346,818 | 840,540 | 15.7 |
| 13 M | Massachusetts | 6,016,425 | 5,737,037 | 279,388 | 4.9 |
| 14 | Indiana | 5,544,159 | 5,490,224 | 53,935 | 1.0 |
| 15 M | Missouri | 5,117,073 | 4,916,686 | 200,387 | 4.1 |
| 16 b | Wisconsin | 4,891,769 | 4,705,767 | 186,002 | 4.0 |
| 17 | Tennessee | 4,877,185 | 4,591,120 | 286,065 | 6.2 |
| 18 | Washington | 4,866,692 | 4,132,156 | 734,536 | 17.8 |
| 19 M | Maryland | 4,781,468 | 4,216,975 | 564,493 | 13.4 |
| 20 M | Minnesota | 4,375,099 | 4,075,970 | 299,129 | 7.3 |
| 21 L | Louisiana | 4,219,973 | 4,205,900 | 14,073 | 0.3 |
| 22 A | Alabama | 4,040,587 | 3,893,888 | 146.699 | 3.8 |
| 23 K | Kentucky | 3,685,296 | 3,660,777 | 24,519 | 0.7 |
| 24 A | Arizona | 3,665,228 | 2,718,215 | 947,013 | 34.8 |
| 25 S | South Carolina | 3,486,703 | 3,121,820 | 364,883 | 11.7 |
| 26 C | Colorado | 3,294,394 | 2,889,964 | 404,430 | 14.0 |
| 27 C | Connecticut | 3,287,116 | 3,107,576 | 179.540 | 5.8 |
| 28 Ok | Oklahoma | 3,145,585 | 3,025,290 | 120,295 | 4.0 |
| 29 O | Oregon | 2,842,321 | 2,633,105 | 209,216 | 7.9 |
| 30 I | I owa | 2,776,755 | 2,913,808 | -137,053 | -4.7 |
| 31 M | Mississippi | 2,573,216 | 2,520,638 | 52,578 | 2.1 |
| 32 K | Kansas | 2,477,574 | 2,363,679 | 113,895 | 4.8 |
| 33 A | Arkansas | 2,350,725 | 2,286,435 | 64,290 | 2.8 |
| $34 \quad$ W | West Virginia | 1,793,477 | 1,949,644 | -156,167 | -8.0 |
| 35 U | Utah | 1,722,850 | 1,461,037 | 269.813 | 17.9 |
| 36 N | Nebraska | 1,578,385 | 1,569,825 | 8.560 | 0.5 |
| 37 N | New Mexico | 1,515,069 | 1,302,894 | 212,175 | 16.3 |
| 38 M | Maine | 1,227,928 | 1,124,660 | 103,268 | 9.2 |
| 39 N | Nevada | 1,201,833 | 800,493 | 401,340 | 50.1 |
| 40 N | New Hampshire | 1,109,252 | 920,610 | 188,642 | 20.5 |
| 41 H | Hawaij | 1,108,229 | 964,694 | 143,538 | 14.9 |
| 42 1 | Idaho | 1,006,749 | 943,935 | 62,814 | 6.7 |
| 43 R | Rhode Is land | 1,003,464 | 947,154 | 56,310 | -4.9 |
| 44 M | Montana | 799,065 | 786,690 | 12,375 | 1.6 |
| 45 S | South Dakota | 696,004 | 690,768 | 5,236 | 0.8 |
| 46 D | Delaware | 666,168 | 594,338 | 71,830 | 12.1 |
| 47 N | North Dakota | 638,800 | .652,717 | -13,917 | -2.1 |
| 48 D | District of Columbia | 606,900 | 638,333 | -31,433 | -4.9 |
| 49 V | Vermont | 562,758 | 511,456 | 51,302 | 10.0 |
| 50 A | Alaska | 550,043 | 401,851 | 148,192 | 36.9 |
| 51 W | Wyoming | 453,588 | 469,557 | -15,969 | -3.4 |

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not tater than July 15. 1991.

Table 6. White Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980

| 1990 White Population Rank | State | 1990 White Population | 1990 Percent of State Population | 1980 White Population | 1980 Percent of State Population | Number Change 1980 to 1990 | Percent Change 1980 to 1990 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | 20,524,327 | 69.0 | 18,030,893 | 76.2 | 2,493,434 | 13.8 |
| 2 | New York | 13,385,255 | \%74.4 | 13,960,868 | 79.5 | -575,613 | -4.1 |
| 3 | Texas | 12,774,762 | 75.2 | 11,198,441 | 78.7 | 1,576,321 | 14.1 |
| 4 | Florida | 10,749,285 | 83.1 | 8,184,513 | 84.0 | 2,564,772 | 31.3 |
| 5 | Pennsylvania | 10,520,201 | 88.5 | 10,652,320 | 89.8 | -132,119 | -1.2 |
| 6 | Ohio | 9,521.756 | 87.8 | 9,597,458 | 88.9 | -75,702 | -0.8 |
| 7 | lllinois | 8,952,978 | 78.3 | 9,233,327 | 80.8 | -280,349 | -3.0 |
| 8 | Michigan | 7,756,086 | 83.4 | 7,872,241 | 85.0 | -116,155 | -1.5 |
| 9 | New Jersey | 6,130,465 | 79.3 | 6,127,467 | 83.2 | 2,998 | 0.0 |
| 10 | Massachusetts | 5,405,374 | 89.8 | 5,362,836 | 93.5 | 42,538 | 0.8 |
| 11 | Indiana | 5,020,700 | 90.6 | 5,004,394 | 91.2 | 16,306 | 0.3 |
| 12 | North Carolina | 5,008,491 | 75.6 | 4,457,507 | 75.8 | 550,984 | 12.4 |
| 13 | Virginia | 4,791,739 | 77.4 | 4,229,798 | 79.1 | 561,941 | 13.3 |
| 14 | Georgia | 4,600,148 | 71.0 | 3,947,135 | 72.3 | 653,013 | 16.5 |
| 15 | Wisconsin | 4,512,523 | 92.2 | 4,443,035 | 94.4 | 69.488 | 1.6 |
| 16 | Missouri | 4,486,228 | 87.7 | 4,345,521 | 88.4 | 140,707 | 3.2 |
| 17 | Hashington | 4,308,937 | 88.5 | 3,779,170 | 91.5 | 529,767 | 14.0 |
| 18 | Minnesota | 4,130,395 | 94.4 | 3,935,770 | 96.6 | 194,625 | 4.9 |
| 19 | Tennessee | 4,048,068 | 83.0 | 3,835,452 | 83.5 | 212,616 | 5.5 |
| 20 | Maryland | 3,393,964 | 71.0 | 3,158,838 | 74.9 | 235,126 | 7.4 |
| 21 | Kentucky | 3,391,832 | 92.0 | 3,379,006 | 92.3 | 12,826 | 0.4 |
| 22 | Alabama | 2,975,797 | 73.6 | 2,872,621 | 73.8 | 103,176 | 3.6 |
| 23 | Arizona | 2,963,186 | 80.8 | 2,240,761 | 82.4 | 722,425 | 32.2 |
| 24 | Colorado | 2,905,474 | - 88.2 | 2,571,498 | 89.0 | 333,976 | 13.0 |
| 25 | Connecticut | 2,859,353 | 87.0 | 2,799,420 | 90.1 | 59,933 | 2.1 |
| 26 | Louisiana | 2,839,138 | 67.3 | 2,912,172 | 69.2 | -73,034 | -2.5 |
| 27 | Iowa | 2,683,090 | 96.6 | 2,839,225 | 97.4 | -156,135 | -5.5 |
| 28 | Oregon | 2,636,787 | 92.8 | 2,490,610 | 94.6 | 146,177 | 5.9 |
| 29 | Oklahoma | 2,583,512 | 82.1 | 2,597,791 | 85.9 | -14,279 | -0.5 |
| 30 | South Carolina | 2,406,974 | 69.0 | 2,147,224 | 68.8 | 259,750 | 12.1 |
| 31 | Kansas | 2,231,986 | 90.1 | 2,168,221 | 91.7 | 63,765 | 2.9 |
| 32 | Arkansas | 1,944,744 | 82.7 | 1,890,322 | 82.7 | 54,422 | 2.9 |
| 33 | West Virginia | 1,725,523 | 96.2 | 1,874,751 | 96.2 | -149,228 | -8.0 |
| 34 | Mississippi | 1,633,461 | +63.5 | 1,615,190 | 64.1 | 18,271 | 1.1 |
| 35 | Utah | 1,615,845 | +93.8 | 1,382,550 | 94.6 | 233,295 | 16.9 |
| 36 | Nebraska | 1,480,558 | - 93.8 | 1,490,381 | 94.9 | -9,823 | -0.7 |
| 37 | Maine | 1,208,360 | $\begin{array}{r} \\ \hline 98.4\end{array}$ | 1,109,850 | 98.7 | 98,510 | 8.9 |
| 38 | New Mexico | 1,146,028 | 75.6 | 977,587 | 75.0 | 168,441 | 17.2 |
| 39 | New Hampshire | 1,087,433 | 98.0 | 910,099 | 98.9 | 177,334 | $\therefore 19.5$ |
| 40 | Nevada | 1,012,695 | 84.3 | 700,345 | 87.5 | 312,350 | -44.6 |
| 41 | Idaho | 950,451 | 94.4 | 901,641 | 95.5 | 48,810 | 5.4 |
| 42 | Rhode Island | 917,375 | 91.4 | 896,692 | 94.7 | 20,683 | 2.3 |
| 43 | Montana | 741,111 | 92.7 | 740,148 | 94.1 | 963 | 0.1 |
| 44 | South Dakota | 637,515 | 91.6 | 639,669 | 92.6 | -2,154 | -0.3 |
| 45 | North Dakota | 604, 142 | 94.6 | 625,557 | -1 95.8 | -21,415 | -3.4 |
| 46 | Vermont | 555,088 | 98.6 | 506,736 | 99.1 | 48,352 | 9.5 |
| 47 | Delaware | 535,094 | 80.3 | 487,817 | 82.1 | 47,277 | 9.7 |
| 48 | Wyoming | 427.061 | 94.2 | 446,488 | 95.1 | -19,427 | -4.4 |
| 49 | Alaska | 415,492 | 75.5 | 309,728 | 77.1 | 105,764 | 34.1 |
| 50 | Hawaii | 369,616 | 33.4 | 318,770 | 33.0 | 50,846 | 16.0 |
| 51 | District of Columbia | 179,667 | 29.6 | 171.768 | 26.9 \% | 7,899 | 4.6 |

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Table 7. Black Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980

| 1990 Black Population Rank | State | 1990 Black Population | 1990 Percent of state Population | 1980 Btack Population | 1980 Percent of State Population | Number Change 1980 to 1990 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percert } \\ & \text { Change } \\ & 1980 \text { to } \\ & 1990 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | 2,859,055 | 15.9 | 2,402,006 | 13.7 | 457,049 | 19.0 |
| 2 | California | 2,208,801 | 7.4 | 1,819,281 | 7.7 | 389,520 | 21.4 |
| 3 | Texas | 2,021,632 | 11.9 | 1,710,175 | 12.0 | 311.457 | 18.2 |
| 4 | Florida | 1,759,534 | 13.6 | 1,342,688 | 13.8 | 416,846 | 31.0 |
| 5 | Georgia | 1,746,565 | 27.0 | 1,465,181 | 26.8 | 281,384 | 19.2 |
| 6 | $l l l i n o i s$ | 1,694,273 | 14.8 | 1,675,398 | 14.7 | 18,875 | 1.1 |
| 7 | North Carolina | 1,456,323 | 22.0 | 1,318,857 | 22.4 | 137,466 | 10.4 |
| 8 | Louisiana | 1,299,281 | 30.8 | 1,238,241 | 29.4 | 61,040 | 4.9 |
| 9 | Michigan | 1,291,706 | 13.9 | 1,199,023 | 12.9 | 92,683 | 7.7 |
| 10 | Maryland | 1,189,899 | 24.9 | 958,150 | 22.7 | 231,749 | 24.2 |
| 11 | Virginia | 1,162,994 | 18.8 | 1,008,668 | 18.9 | 154,326 | 15.3 |
| 12 | Ohio | 1,154,826 | 10.6 | 1,076,748 | 10.0 | 78,078 | 7.3 |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | 1,089,795 | 9.2 | 1,046,810 | 8.8 | 42,985 | 4.1 |
| 14 | South Carolina | 1,039,884 | 29.8 | 948,623 | 30.4 | 91.261 | 9.6 |
| 15 | New Jersey | 1,036,825 | 13.4 | 925,066 | 12.6 | 111.759 | 12.1 |
| 16 | Alabama | 1,020,705 | 25.3 | 996,335 | 25.6 | 24,370 | 2.4 |
| 17 | Mississippi | 915,057 | 35.6 | 887,206 | 35.2 | 27,851 | 3.1 |
| 18 | Tennessee | 778,035 | 16.0 | 725,942 | 15.8 | 52,093 | 7.2 |
| 19 | Missouri | 548,208 | 10.7 | 514,276 | 10.5 | 33,932 | 6.6 |
| 20 | Indiana | 432,092 | 7.8 | 414,785 | 7.6 | 17,307 | 4.2 |
| 21 | District of Columbis | 399,604 | 65.8 | 448,906 | 70.3 | -49,302 | -11.0 |
| 22 | Arkansas | 373,912 | 15.9 | 373,768 | 16.3 | 144 | 0.0 |
| 23 | Massachusetts | 300, 130 | 5.0 | 221,279 | 3.9 | 78,851 | 35.6 |
| 24 | Connecticut | 274,269 | 8.3 | 217,433 | 7.0 | 56,836 | 26.1 |
| 25 | Kentucky | 262,907 | 7.1 | 259,477 | 7.1 | 3,430 | 1.3 |
| 26 | Wisconsin | 244,539 | 5.0 | 182,592 | 3.9 | 61,947 | 33.9 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 233,801 | 7.4 | 204,674 | 6.8 | 29.127 | 14.2 |
| 28 | Washington | 149,801 | 3.1 | 105,574 | 2.6 | 44,227 | 41.9 |
| 29 | Kansas | 143,076 | 5.8 | 126,127 | 5.3 | 16,949 | 13.4 |
| 30 | Colorado | 133,146 | 4.0 | 101.703 | 3.5 | 31,443 | 30.9 |
| 31 | Delaware | 112,460 | 16.9 | 95,845 | 16.1 | 16,615 | 17.3 |
| 32 | Arizona | 110,524 | 3.0 | - 74,977 | 2.8 | 35,547 | 47.4 |
| 33 | Minnesota | 94,944 | 2.2 | - 53,344 | 1.3 | 41,600 | 78.0 |
| 34 | Nevada | 78,771 | 6.6 | 50,999 | 6.4 | 27,772 | 54.5 |
| 35 | Nebraska | 57,404 | 3.6 | 48,390 | 3.1 | 9.014 | 18.6 |
| 36 | West Virginia | 56,295 | - 3.1 | 65,051 | 3.3 | -8,756 | -13.5 |
| 37 | lowa | 48,090 | 1.7 | 41,700 | 1.4 | 6,390 | 15.3 |
| 38 | Oregon | 46,178 | 1.6 | 37,060 | 1.4 | 9,118 | 24.6 |
| 39 | Rhode Island | 38,861 | 3.9 | 27,584 | 2.9 | 11.277 | 40.9 |
| 40 | New Mexico | 30,210 | 2.0 | 24,020 | 1.8 | 6,190 | 25.8 |
| 41 | Hawaii | 27,195 | - 2.5 | 17,364 | 1.8 | 9,831 | 56.6 |
| 42 | Alaska | 22,451 | $\cdots 4.1$ | 13,643 | 3.4 | 8,808 | 64.6 |
| 43 | Utah | 11,576 | 0.7. | 9,225 | 0.6 | 2,351 | 25.5 |
| 44 | Hew Hampshire | 7.198 | 0.6 | 3,990 | 0.4 | 3,208 | 80.4 |
| 45 | Maine | 5,138 | 0.4 | 3,128 | $\therefore 0.3$ | 2,010 | 64.3 |
| 46 | Wyoming | 3,606 | 0.8 | 3,364 | $\cdots \quad 0.7$ | 242 | 7.2 |
| 47 | North Dakota | 3,524 | 0.6 | 2,568 | 0.4 | 956 | 37.2 |
| 48 | 1 daho | 3,370 | 0.3 | 2,716 | 0.3 | 654 | 24.1 |
| 49 | South Dakota | 3,258 | 0.5 | 2,144 | 0.3 | 1,114 | 52.0 |
| 50 | Montana | 2,381 | 0.3 | 1.786 | - 0.2 | 595 | 33.3 |
| 51 | Vermont | 1,951 | 0.3 | 1,135 | 0.2 | 816 | 71.9 |

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than july 15, 1991.

Table 8. American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980


The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Table 9. Asian or Pacific Islander Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980

| 1990 Asian or Pacific Islander Population Rank | State Pacif | 90 Asian or fic Islander Population | $1990$ <br> Percent of State Population | 1980 Asian or Pacific Islander Population* | 1980 Percent of State Population | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nunber } \\ & \text { Change } \\ & 1980 \text { to } \\ & 1990 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ \text { Change } \\ 1980 \text { to } \\ 1990 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | California | 2,845,659 | 9.6 | 1,253,818 | $\therefore 5.3$ | 1,591,841 | 127.0 |
| 2 | New York | 693,760 | 3.9 | 310,526 | 1.8 | 383,234 | 123.4 |
| 3 | Hawai | 685,236 | 61.8 | 583,252 | 60.5 | 101,984 | 17.5 |
| 4 | Texas | 319,459 | 1.9 | 120,313 | 0.8 | 199,146 | 165.5 |
| 5 | Illinois | 285,311 | 2.5 | 159,653 | 1.4 | 125,658 | 78.7 |
| 6 | New Jersey | 272,521 | 3.5 | 103,848 | 1.4 | 168,673 | 162.4 |
| 7 | Washington | 210,958 | 4.3 | 102,537 | 2.5 | 108,421 | 105.7 |
| 8 | Virginia | 159,053 | 2.6 | 66,209 | 1.2 | 92,844 | 140.2 |
| 9 | Florida | 154,302 | 1.2 | 56,740 | 0.6 | 97,562 | 171.9 |
| 10 | Massachusetts "\% | 143,392 | 2.4 | 49,501 | 0.9 | 93,891. | 189.7 |
| 11 | Maryland | 139,719 | 2.9 | 64,278 | 1.5 | 75,441 | 117.4 |
| 12 | Pennsylvania | 137,438 | 1.2 | 64,379 | 0.5 | 73.059 | 113.5 |
| 13 | Michigan | 104,983 | 1.1 | 56,790 | 0.6 | 48,193 | 84.9 |
| 14 | Ohio | 91.179 | 0.8 | 47,820 | 0.4 | 43,359 | 90.7 |
| 15 | Minnesota | 77.886 | 1.8 | 26,536 | 0.7 | 51,350 | 193.5 |
| 16 | Georgia | 75,781 | 1.2 | 24,457 | 0.4 | 51,224 | 208.6 |
| 17 | Oregon | 69,269 | 2.4 | 34,775 | 1.3 | 34,494 | 99.2 |
| 18 | Colorado | 59.862 | 1.8 | 29,916 | 1.0 | 29,946 | 100.1 |
| 19 | Arizona | 55,206 | 1.5 | 22,032 | 0.8 | 33,174 | 150.6 |
| 20 | Wisconsin | 53,583 | 1.1 | 18,164 | 0.4 | 35,419 | 195.0 |
| 21 | North Carolina | 52,166 | 0.8 | 21,176 | 0.4 | 30,990 | 146.3 |
| 22 | Connecticut | 50,698 | 1.5 | 18,970 | 0.6 | 31,728 | 167.3 |
| 23 | Missouri | 41,277 | 0.8 | 23,096 | 0.5 | 18,181 | 78.7 |
| 24 | Louisiana | 41.099 | 1.0 | 23,779 | 0.6 | 17,320 | 72.8 |
| 25 | Nevada | 38,127 | 3.2 | 14,164 | 1.8 | - 23,963 | 169.2 |
| 26 | Indiana | 37,617 | 0.7 | 20,557 | 0.4 | 17,060 | 83.0 |
| 27 | Oklahoma | 33,563 | 1.1 | 17,275 | 0.6 | 16,288 | 94.3 |
| 28 | Utah | 33,371 | 1.9 | 15,076 | 1.0 | 18,295 | 121.4 |
| 29 | Tennessee | 31.839 | 0.7 | 13,963 | 0.3 | 17,876 | 128.0 |
| 30 | Kansas | 31,750 | 1.3 | 15,078 | 0.6 | 16,672 | 110.6 |
| 31 | Iowa | 25,476 | 0.9 | 11,577 | 0.4 | 13.899 | 120.1 |
| 32 | South Carolina | 22,382 | 0.6 | 11,834 | 0.4 | 10,548 | 89.1 |
| 33 | Alabama . | 21,797 | 0.5 | 9,734 | 0.2 | 12,063 | 123.9 |
| 34 | Alaska | 19,728 | 3.6 | 8,054 | 2.0 | 11,674 | 144.9 |
| 35 | Rhode Island | 18,325 | 1.8 | 5,303 | 0.6 | 13,022 | 245.6 |
| 36 | Kentucky | 17,812 | 0.5 | 9.970 | 0.3 | 7.842 | 78.7 |
| 37 | New Nexico | 14,124 | 0.9 | 6,825 | 0.5 | 7.299 | 106.9 |
| 38 | Mississippi | 13,016 | 0.5 | 7.412 | 0.3 | 5,604 | 75.6 |
| 39 | Arkansas | 12,530 | 0.5 | 6,740 | 0.3 | 5,790 | 85.9 |
| 40 | Nebraska | 12,422 | 0.8 | 7,002 | 0.4 | 5,420 | 77.4 |
| 41 | District of Columbia | 11,214 | 1.8 | 6,636 | 1.0 | 4,578 | 120.3 |
| 42 | Idaho | 9,365 | 0.9 | 5,948 | 0.6 | 3.417 | 57.4 |
| 43 N | New Hampshire | 9,343 | 0.8 | 2,929 | 0.3 | 6,414 | 219.0 |
| 44 | Delware | 9,057 | 1.4 | 4.112 | 0.7 | 4,945 | 120.3 |
| 45 | West Virginia | 7,459 | 0.4 | 5,194 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 0.3 | 2,265 | 43.6 |
| 46 | Maine | 6,683 | 0.5 | 2,947 | 0.3 | 3.736 | 126.8 |
| 47 | Montana | 4,259 | 0.5 | 2,503 | 0.3 | 1,756 | 70.2 |
| 48 | North Dakota | 3,462 | 0.5 | 1,979 | 0.3 | 1,483 | 74.9 |
| 49 | Vermont | 3,215 | 0.6 | 1,355 | 0.3 | 1,860 | 137.3 |
| 50 S | South Dakota | 3,123 | 0.4 | 1,738 | 0.3 | 1,385 | 79.7 |
| 51 | Wyoming | 2,806 | 0.6 | 1.969 | 0.4 | 837 | 42.5 |

* The 1980 numbers for Asians or Pacific Islanders shown in this table are not entirely comparable with the 1990 counts. The 1980 count of $3,500,439$ of Asians or Pacific Islanders based on 100 -percent tabulations includes only the nine specific Asian or Pacific groups listed separately in the 1980 race item. The 1980 total Asian or Pacific islander population of $3,726,440$ from sample tabulations is comparable to the 1990 count; these figures include groups not listed separately in the race item on the 1980 census form.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount.
The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than july 15, 1991.

Table 10: Hispanic Origin Resident Population by State: 1990 and 1980


* Persons of hispanic origin can be of any race.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

CONFIDENTIAL

POPULATION TO LOSE OR GAIN A CONGRESSIONAL SEAT IF ALL OTHER STATES ARE UNCHANGED


Apporationnient Population STATE NUMBER SEAT INDEX 1990 POP PR VAL.

| WASHINGTON | 435 | 9 | 0.11785113 | $4,887,941$ | 576049.4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MASSACHUSETTS | 436 | 11 | 0.09534626 | $6,029,051$ | 574847.5 |

To Lose:
INDIANA 424
MINNESOTA
PENNSYLVANIA
NORTH CAROLINA
CALIFORNIA 428
TEXAS 429
MISSISSIPPI 430
WISCONSIN
FLORIDA
TENNESEE
OKLAHOMA
WASHINGTON 435
To Gain:
MASSACHUSETTS
NEW JERSEY
NEW YORK
KENTUCKY
CALIFORNIA
MONTANA
ARIZONA
GEORGIA
LOUISIANA
MICHIGAN
MARYLAND
ILLINOIS
TEXAS
OHIO

1990 who divs
Massachusetts
Washington

## $\begin{array}{lll}435 & 11 & 0.095346259\end{array}$

4866692573545.15484867527
-1033
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}436 & 9 & 0.11785113 & 4866692 & 573545.1548 & 4867527 & 835\end{array}$

1970 w/ ovs
Oklahoma
Oregon
$435 \quad 6 \quad 0.182574186$
$436 \quad 5 \quad 0.223606798$
2585486472042.99352585204 -282
$2110810471991.45912111040 \quad 230$

1970 w/o ovs
Connecticut Oregon
$435 \quad 7 \quad 0.15430335$
$3032217467881.2623 \quad 3030705 \quad-1512$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}436 & 5 & 0.223606798 & 2091385 & 467647.8971 & 2092429 & 1044\end{array}$


1999 est Michigan Texas California Indiana
Colorado Montana

Georgia Illinois
California
Mississippi
Wisconsin

| 430 | 16 | 0.064549722 | 9863775 | 636703.9384 | 9660123 | -203652 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 431 | 32 | 0.031750032 | 20044141 | 636402.1132 | 19639610 | -404531 |
| 432 | 53 | 0.019048483 | 33145121 | 631643.272 | 32735323 | -409798 |
| 433 | 10 | 0.105409255 | 5942901 | 626436.769 | 5915593 | -27308 |
| 434 | 7 | 0.15430335 | 4056133 | 625874.9098 | 4041119 | -15014 |
| 435 | 2 | 0.707106781 | 882779 | 624219.0172 | 881844.5 | -934 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 436 | 13 | 0.080064077 | 7788240 | 623558.2463 | 7796493 | 8253 |
| 437 | 20 | 0.051298918 | 12128370 | 622172.2533 | 12168269 | 39899 |
| 438 | 54 | 0.018692405 | 33145121 | 619562.03 | 33394259 | 249138 |
| 439 | 5 | 0.223606798 | 2768619 | 619082.0288 | 2791592 | 22973 |
| 440 | 9 | 0.11785113 | 5250446 | 618770.9951 | 5296674 | 46228 |


| ST | NAME | POPULATION Ine ( overseas | $\begin{array}{r} 1980 \\ \text { SEATS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1990 \\ \text { SEATS } \end{array}$ | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | ALABAMA | 4062608 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 02 | ALASKA | 551947 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 04 | ARIZONA | 3677985 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| 05 | ARKANSAS | 2362239 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 06 | CALIFORNIA | 29839250 | 45 | 52 | 7 |
| 08 | COLORADO | 3307912 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 09 | CONNECTICUT | 3295669 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 10 | DELAWARE | 668696 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 12 | FLORIDA | 13003362 | 19 | 23 | 4 |
| 13 | GEORGIA | 6508419 | 10 | 11 | 1 |
| 15 | HAWAII | 1115274 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 16 | IDAHO | 1011986 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 17 | ILLINOIS | 11466682 | 22 | 20 | -2 |
| 18 | INDIANA | 5564228 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 19 | IOWA | 2787424 | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| 20 | KANSAS | 2485600 | 5 | 4 | -1 |
| 21 | KENTUCKY | 3698969 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| 22 | LOUISIANA | 4238216 | 8 | 7 | -1 |
| 23 | MAINE | 1233223 |  | 2 | 0 |
| 24 | MARYLAND | 4798622 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 25 | MASSACHUSETTS | 6029051 | 11 | 10 | -1 |
| 26 | MICHIGAN | 9328784 | 18 | 16 | -2 |
| 27 | MINNESOTA | 4387029 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 28 | MISSISSIPPI | 2586443 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 29 | MISSOURI | 5137804 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 30 | MONTANA | 803655 | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| 31 | NEBRASKA | 1584617 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 32 | NEVADA | 1206152 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 33 | NEW HAMPSHIRE | 1113915 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 34 | NEW JERSEY | 7748634 | 14 | 13 | -1 |
| 35 | NEW MEXICO | 1521779 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 36 | NEW YORK | 18044505 | 34 | 31 | -3 |
| 37 | NORTH CAROLINA | 6657630 | 11 | 12 | 1 |
| 38 | NORTH DAKOTA | 641364 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 39 | OHIO | 10887325 | 21 | 19 | -2 |
| 40 | OKLAHOMA | 3157604 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 41 | OREGON | 2853733 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 42 | PENNSYLVANIA | 11924710 | 23 | 21 | -2 |
| 44 | RHODE ISLAND | 1005984 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 45 | SOUTH CAROLINA | 3505707 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 46 | SOUTH DAKOTA | 699999 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 47 | tennessee | 4896641 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 48 | TEXAS | 17059805 | 27 | 30 | 3 |
| 49 | UTAH | 1727784 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 50 | VERMONT | 564964 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 51 | VIRGINIA | 6216568 | 10 | 11 | 1 |
| 53 | WASHINGTON | 4887941 | 8 | 9 | 1 |
| 54 | WEST VIRGINIA | 1801625 | 4 | 3 | -1 |
| 55 | WISCONSIN | 4906745 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 56 | WYOMING | 455975 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | US TOTAL | 249022783 | 435 |  |  |

1990 apportionment APPTABQZ
DATE: 12/17/90 PAGE 1 SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY SEQ ST SEAT P RIORITY SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY

51 CA 181823
52 NY 155114 53 CA 086944 54 TX 956402 55 FL 882693
56 CA 772385
57 PA
727739
58 IL 703918 59 OH 650316 60 NY 647678
61 TX 488479
62 CA 476248 63 MI 379610
64 NJ 369765
65 CA 349848 66 FL 317974
67 NY 262100 68 TX 204934 69 PA 012057
70 NC 007491 71 IL 994077
72 CA 971815
73 GA 949222
74 OH 941089 75 VA 933052
76 MA 929768
77 NY 852431 78 CA 760602 79 IN 730045 80 TX 678004

2210995357104 PA 263 VA 79592373
2127593916105 GA 264 CO 49549119
3121818224106 TX 265 PA 139547409 2120631036107 KY 266 CT 49513777
291947653108 AZ 267 LA 59476939
$4 \quad 86138494109 \mathrm{CA}$ 268 OH 129476200
284320432110 IL 269 CA 329473971 281081685111 VA 270 MO 69380304 276985012112 SC 271 MA 79303028
373666380113 MA 272 NY $20 \quad 9256636$
$369646360 \quad 114 \mathrm{OH}$ 273 TX 199224887
$566722591 \quad 115$ NY 274 CA 339182394
265964463116 CA 275 IL 139180694 254791116117 FL 276 NJ 999131853
$6 \quad 54478767118$ CO 277 OK 49115217 $353086001 \quad 119$ СT 278 AL 59084268 452089998120 TX 279 FL 158973173 449247414121 IN 280 WI 68958450 348682423122 NJ $\begin{array}{ccc}281 \text { TN } & 6 & 8940002 \\ 28 & 47076552 & 1230 \mathrm{OK}\end{array}$ 282 WA 68924118
346812532124 CA 283 CA 348908231 746042964125 PA 284 NC 88896632 $246021471 \quad 126 \mathrm{NY}$ 285 MI 118894646
$\begin{array}{lll}3 & 44447317 & 127 \text { MO }\end{array}$ 286 PA 148839183 243957773128 IL 287 NY 218804816 242631828129 MI 288 MD 68761045 540348739130 CA 289 TX 208751496 $8 \quad 39874374 \quad 131$ OR $290 \mathrm{ME} 2 \quad 8720203$ 239345033132 TX 291 OH $13 \quad 8716837$ 538146883133 FL 292 GA 88697241
$\begin{array}{lll}5 & 26664462 & 157 \mathrm{CA}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}316 & \text { MO } & 7 & 7927804 \\ 3 & 26570508 & 158 & \text { MI }\end{array}$ 317 IL $15 \quad 7912763$ $\begin{array}{llll}7 & 26323852 & 159 & \mathrm{OH}\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{cccc}318 & \mathrm{HI} & 2 & 7886178 \\ 2 & 26155660 & 160 \mathrm{AR}\end{array}$ 319 FL 17788444 $\begin{array}{ccc}2 & 26007281 & 161 \mathrm{AL} \\ 320 & \mathrm{NH} & 2 \\ 7876568\end{array}$ $12 \quad 25971734162$ TX 321 NC 97846092 $\begin{array}{cccc}5 & 25640280 & 163 \mathrm{CA} \\ 322 & \mathrm{SC} & 5 & 7838999\end{array}$ $3 \quad 25379032 \quad 164$ IN 323 CA 397751109
224789092165 PA 324 LA 67737888

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
3 & 24613497 & 166 \mathrm{NY} \\
702507367
\end{array}
$$

$$
325 \mathrm{PA} 16 \quad 7697367
$$

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
5 & 24344799 & 167 & \text { FL } \\
326 & \mathrm{NY} & 24 & 7680252
\end{array}
$$

$$
8 \quad 24112984 \quad 168 \mathrm{IL}
$$

$$
327 \mathrm{GA} \quad 9 \quad 7670245
$$

$$
13 \quad 23890521 \quad 169 \mathrm{CA}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
328 & \mathrm{TX} & 23 & 7584008 \\
6 & 23740782 & 170 & \mathrm{KY}
\end{array}
$$

$$
329 \mathrm{WI} 7 \quad 7571272
$$

$$
2 \quad 23390470 \quad 171 \mathrm{AZ}
$$

$$
330 \mathrm{TN} 7 \quad 7555681
$$

$2 \quad 23303899 \quad 172$ NC 331 CA $40 \quad 7554844$ $\begin{array}{cccc}8 & 22797123 & 173 \mathrm{TX} \\ 332 & \mathrm{WA} & 7 & 7542257\end{array}$

$$
3 \quad 22715865 \quad 174 \mathrm{MO}
$$

$$
333 \mathrm{OH} \quad 15 \quad 7512969
$$

$$
422368379175 \mathrm{CA}
$$

$$
334 \mathrm{MI} 13 \quad 7469005
$$

$$
2 \quad 22327632 \quad 176 \mathrm{GA}
$$

$$
335 \text { MS } 4 \quad 7466418
$$

$$
14 \quad 22118324 \quad 177 \mathrm{OH}
$$

$$
336 \text { IN } \quad 8 \quad 7435512
$$

$$
6 \quad 21771442 \quad 178 \mathrm{NY}
$$

$$
337 \mathrm{FL} \quad 18 \quad 7433528
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
9 & 21265653 \quad 179 \mathrm{MI}
\end{array}
$$

$$
338 \mathrm{AL} \quad G \quad 7417273
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
3 & 20974996 & 180 \mathrm{SC}
\end{array}
$$

$$
339 \mathrm{MD} 77404435
$$

$$
620935201 \quad 181 \mathrm{WI}
$$

$$
340 \text { IL } 16 \quad 7401711
$$

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
5 & 20859795 & 182 \mathrm{NJ}
\end{array}
$$

$$
341 \mathrm{CO} \quad 5 \quad 7396716
$$

$$
15 \quad 20591041 \quad 183 \mathrm{TN}
$$

$$
342 \mathrm{NJ} 11 \quad 7388032
$$

220178939184 WA 343 CT 57369340 920105173185 PA 344 CA $41 \quad 7368277$ $\begin{array}{ccc}7 & 20064624 & 186 \text { VA } \\ 345 & \text { NY } & 25 \\ 7 & 766639\end{array}$
$18 \quad 17057965 \quad 210 \mathrm{CA} \quad 25 \quad 12$
$\begin{array}{llllll}6 & 17031951 & 211 & \text { NC } & 6 & 12\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}7 & 16799508 & 212 & \text { IL } & 10 & 12\end{array}$
$216703552 \quad 213 \mathrm{NJ} \quad 711$
$\begin{array}{lllll}3 & 16585527 & 214 & G A & 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}11 & 16265886 & 215 & \mathrm{TX} & 15 & 11\end{array}$
$1916135220 \quad 216$ AL 411
$4 \quad 16062542 \quad 217 \mathrm{CA} \quad 26 \quad 11$
$\begin{array}{lllll}8 & 15935064 & 218 & \text { OR } & 311\end{array}$
$1215705726 \quad 219$ NY 1611
$9 \quad 15324609 \quad 220$ MO $5 \quad 11$
$8 \quad 15322998 \quad 221$ OH $10 \quad 11$
$\begin{array}{lllll}20 & 15307213 & 222 & \text { IA } & 311\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}3 & 15100977 & 223 & \text { PA } & 11\end{array}$
$315015310 \quad 224$ VA 611
$\begin{array}{llllll}5 & 14886913 & 225 & \mathrm{FL} & 12 & 11\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}.12 & 14848655 & 226 & C A & 27\end{array} 11$
$4 \quad 14831562 \quad 227 \mathrm{NE} \quad 2 \quad 11$
$\begin{array}{lll}21 & 14560062 & 228\end{array} \mathrm{TX} \quad 16 \quad 11$
$\begin{array}{llll}5 & 14553267 & 229 & \text { MA } \\ 6 & 11\end{array}$
$8 \quad 14548800 \quad 230 \mathrm{MI} \quad 9 \quad 10$
$1314447167 \quad 231$ WI 510
$\begin{array}{lll}7 & 14394627 & 232 \\ \mathrm{TN} & 5 & 10\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}3 & 14311988 & 233 & \text { NY } & 17 & 10\end{array}$
$4 \quad 14164552 \quad 234$ IL $11 \quad 10$
$614147005 \quad 235 \mathrm{WA} 510$
$4 \quad 14135385 \quad 236 \mathrm{CA} \quad 28 \quad 10$
$4 \quad 14110270 \quad 237 \mathrm{NM} \quad 2 \quad 10$
$9 \quad 14053406 \quad 238 \mathrm{MD} \quad 5 \quad 10$
$\begin{array}{llllll}5 & 13900668 & 239 & \text { KY } & 4 & 10\end{array}$

81 MI 617428 82 FL 559109 83 MO 471524 84 CA 411022 85 WI 380657 86 TN 379128 87 WA 354548 88 PA 344027 89 MD 315358 90 IL 272947 91 NY 158844 92 NJ 147419 93 CA 120104 94 OH 116455 95 TX 042709 96 MN 980466 97 LA 833402 98 FL 809695 99 AL 784675 100 CA 757351 101 NY 752442 102 NC 643800 103 MI 638733
mel overrseas
$3 \quad 38084600134 \mathrm{WI}$ $293 \mathrm{CA} 35 \quad 8649966$ 294 IN 78585791 236329760136 WA 295 NV 28528782 $9 \quad 35165894 \quad 137 \mathrm{OH}$ 296 IL 148499670 234695926138 IA 297 CA 368406257 $234624480 \quad 139$ MD 298 NY 228395064 234562962140 CA 299 FL $16 \quad 8393634$ $\begin{array}{cccc}4 & 34423672 & 141 \mathrm{NC} \\ 300 & \text { TX } & 21 & 8324332\end{array}$ 233931381142 NY 301 VA 88307238 $4 \quad 33101459 \quad 143 \mathrm{GA}$ $\begin{array}{ccc}302 & \text { KY } & 5 \\ 6 & 32941146 \\ 304 & 144\end{array}$ 303 OR 48238017 $3 \quad 31633665 \quad 145$ MS 304 PA 158228832 $10 \quad 31453332 \quad 146 \mathrm{CA}$ $305 \mathrm{AZ} \quad 5 \quad 8224224$ $\begin{array}{cccc}4 & 31429000 & 147 \mathrm{TX} \\ 306 & \mathrm{CA} & 37 & 8175904\end{array}$ 631146800148 VA $307 \mathrm{NJ} 10 \quad 8167778$ 231020979149 MN $\begin{array}{ccr}308 & \mathrm{MI} & 12 \\ 2 & 8119664 \\ 2996712 & 150 \mathrm{IL}\end{array}$ 309 OH 148070222 529076401151 KS $310 \mathrm{MA} \quad 8 \quad 805665$ $2 \quad 28726976152 \mathrm{MA}$ 311 IA 48046600 1128450608153 FL 312 NY 238021761 $7 \quad 27843277 \quad 154 \mathrm{NJ}$ 313 MN 68009582 $\begin{array}{cccc}3 & 27179660 & 155 & \text { LA } \\ 314 & \text { CA } & 38 & 7957842\end{array}$ $4 \quad 26929879 \quad 156$ NY 315 TX 227936940

| 3 | 20031702 | 187 CA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 346 WV | 3 | 7355103 | $\begin{array}{cccc}3 & 19990452 & 188 \mathrm{MD} \\ 347 & \mathrm{VA} & 9 & 7326296\end{array}$ | 3 | 19954935 | 189 FL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 348 | TX | 24 |
| 261136 |  |  | $\begin{array}{clll}6 & 19877445 & 190 \mathrm{TX} \\ 349 & \mathrm{PA} & 17 & 7230418 \\ 2 & 1971 \mathrm{CO} 4 & 191 & \text { IL }\end{array}$ 350 CA $42 \quad 7190701$ $\begin{array}{lll}3 & 19590292192 \text { CO }\end{array}$ 351 KS 47175309 $16 \quad 19261153 \quad 193 \mathrm{MA}$ 352 ID $2 \quad 7155822$ $\begin{array}{ccc}4 & 19218922 & 194 \mathrm{CT} \\ 353 & \mathrm{RI} & 2 \\ 7 & 7113381\end{array}$ 1019020579195 NY 354 MA 97105305 $\begin{array}{cccc}4 & 18788187 & 196 \mathrm{CA} \\ 355 \mathrm{NY} & 26 & 7077638\end{array}$ $7 \quad 18400228 \quad 197$ OK 356 OK 57060617 218288914198 OH 357 UT $3 \quad 7053648$ 1718092704199 WV 358 FL 197031413 $10 \quad 17982614 \quad 200 \mathrm{CA}$ 359 OH 167027738 417945686201 MN 360 CA 437021486 361 NC 107017758 717693475203 PA 362 TX 256964636 217575846204 MI 363 IL 176952698 $4 \quad 17404371 \quad 205 \mathrm{NY}$ $\begin{array}{cccc}364 & \text { MI } & 14 & 6914955 \\ 8 & 17376473 & 206 \text { IN }\end{array}$ 365 MO $3 \quad 6865679$ $517326472 \quad 207 \mathrm{FL}$ 366 GA $10 \quad 6860476$ $\begin{array}{llr}3 & 17302444 & 208 \\ 367 & \text { LA } \\ 11 & 172047 & 6860050 \\ 11 & 209 & \text { UT }\end{array}$ 368 AR 46819196

$22 \quad 13882476 \quad 240 \mathrm{AZ} \quad 4 \quad 10$
$\begin{array}{rrrrrr}22 & 13882476 & 240 \mathrm{AZ} & 4 & 10 \\ 4 & 13852428 & 241 \mathrm{MS} & 3 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}10 & 13706747 & 242 & \text { CA } & 29 & 10\end{array}$ $13 \quad 13658776 \quad 243$ FL 1310 $\begin{array}{llllll}9 & 13513614 & 244 & \text { OH } & 11 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}3 & 13504494 & 245 & \text { PA } \\ 12 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rrrrrr}5 & 13481368 & 246 & \mathrm{NJ} & 8 & 10 \\ 3 & 13454512 & 247 & \mathrm{TX} & 17 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}14 & 13375477 & 248 & \text { NY } & 18 & 10\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}23 & 13265164 & 249 & \text { NC } & 7 \\ 10\end{array}$
$3 \quad 12890864 \quad 250$ IN 610
$912830836 \quad 251$ KS 310

| 2 | 12739412 | 252 | SC | 4 | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24 | 12700430 | 253 | CA | 30 | 10 |
| 4 | 12664262 | 254 | GA | 7 | 10 |


| 14 | 12645569 | 255 | IL | 12 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | 12569748 | 256 | MI | 10 | 9 |


| 8 | 12466112 | 257 MN | 5 | 9 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 15 | 12451893 | 258 CA | 31 | 9 |
| -5 | 12441992 | 259 NY | 19 | 9 |
| 11 | 12398219 | 260 TX | 18 | 9 |
| 4 | 12234676 | 261 AR | 3 | 9 |
| 2 | 12217278 | 262 FL | 14 | 9 |

DATE: $12 / 17 / 90 \quad$ PAGE 2
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY

| 369 | PA | 18 | 6816904 | 422 | OH | 19 | 5887191 | 475 | NY | 35 | 5230840 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 370 | NY | 27 | 6810460 | 423 | IL | 20 | 5882284 | 476 | GA | 13 | 5210906 |
| 371 | MN | 7 | 6769333 | 424 | IN | 10 | 5865211 | 477 | OR | 6 | 5210180 |
| 372 | KY | 6 | 6753362 | 425 | MN | 8 | 5862414 | 478 | WV | 4 | 5200843 |
| 373 | NJ | 12 | 6744320 | 426 | PA | 21 | 5818662 | 479 | CA | 58 | 5189630 |
| 374 | AZ | 6 | 6715051 | 427 | NC | 12 | 5794723 | 480 | WI | 10 | 5172163 |
| 375 | CA | 45 | 6705873 | 428 | CA | 52 | 5794302 | 481 | MN | 9 | 5170163 |
| 376 | TX | 26 | 6691407 | 429 | TX | 30 | 5783817 | 482 | TN | 10 | 5161513 |
| 377 | FL | 20 | 6670584 | 430 | MS | 5 | 5783462 | 483 | WA | 10 | 5152342 |
| 378 | OH | 17 | 6601411 | 431 | WI | 9 | 5782654 | 484 | CO | 7 | 5104219 |
| 379 | NY | 28 | 6562724 | 432 | FL | 23 | 5780699 | 485 | CA | 59 | 5100912 |
| 380 | CA | 46 | 6558473 | 433 | TN | 9 | 5770747 | 486 | FL | 26 | 5100339 |
| 381 | IN | 9 | 6557506 | 434 | OK | 6 | 5764970 | 487 | IL | 23 | 5097562 |
| 382 | WI | 8 | 6556914 | 435 | WA | 9 | 5760494 | 488 | TX | 34 | 5093046 |
| 383 | IL | 18 | 6555066 | 436 | MA | 11 | 5748474 | 489 | IA | 6 | 5089117 |
| 384 | VA | 10 | 6552838 | 437 | NJ | 14 | 5743670 | 490 | CT | 7 | 5085328 |
| 385 | TN | 8 | 6543412 | 438 | NY | 32 | 5729136 | 491 | NY | 36 | 5083464 |
| 386 | LA | 7 | 6539710 | 439 | KY | 7 | 5707633 | 492 | PA | 24 | 5075494 |
| 387 | WA | 8 | 6531786 | 440 | CA | 53 | 5683924 | 493 | OH | 22 | 5065242 |
| 388 | NE | 3 | 6469172 | 441 | MT | 2 | 5682699 | 494 | MD | 10 | 5058192 |
| 389 | PA | 19 | 6448145 | 442 | AZ | 7 | 5675254 | 495 | MI | 19 | 5044429 |
| 390 | TX | 27 | 6438809 | 443 | GA | 12 | 5664852 | 496 | ME | 3 | 5034612 |
| 391 | MI | 15 | 6437473 | 444 | LA | 8 | 5663554 | 497 | CA | 60 | 5015178 |
| 392 | CA | 47 | 6417414 | 445 | MI | 17 | 5656406 | 498 | NJ | 16 | 5001722 |
| 393 | MD | 8 | 6412428 | 446 | MD | 9 | 5655230 | 499 | LA | 9 | 4994785 |
| 394 | SC | 6 | 6400516 | 447 | IL | 21 | 5595167 | 500 | UT | 4 | 4987683 |
| 395 | OR | 5 | 6381141 | 448 | TX | 31 | 5594130 |  |  |  |  |
| 396 | MA | 10 | 6355178 | 449 | OH | 20 | 5585080 |  |  |  |  |
| 397 | NC | 11 | 6347801 | 450 | CA | 54 | 5577672 |  |  |  |  |
| 398 | FL | 21 | 6344990 | 451 | KS | 5 | 5557970 |  |  |  |  |
| 399 | NY | 29 | 6332380 | 452 | NY | 33 | 5552812 |  |  |  |  |
| 400 | CA | 48 | 6282296 | 453 | PA | 22 | 5547877 |  |  |  |  |
| 401 | AL | 7 | 6268741 | 454 | FL | 24 | 5534599 |  |  |  |  |
| 402 | IA | 5 | 6232869 | 455 | CA | 55 | 5475323 |  |  |  |  |
| 403 | OH | 18 | 6223870 | 456 | AL | 8 | 5428888 |  |  |  |  |
| 404 | NM | 3 | 6212637 | 457 | TX | 32 | 5416493 |  |  |  |  |
| 405 | GA | 11 | 6205534 | 458 | MO | 10 | 5415721 |  |  |  |  |
| 406 | TX | 28 | 6204592 | 459 | VA | 12 | 5410828 |  |  |  |  |
| 407 | NJ | 13 | 6203873 | 460 | SC | 7 | 5409424 |  |  |  |  |
| 408 | IL | 19 | 6200472 | 461 | NY | 34 | 5387019 |  |  |  |  |
| 409 | CA | 49 | 6152749 | 462 | CA | 56 | 5376660 |  |  |  |  |
| 410 | NY | 30 | 6117661 | 463 | NJ | 15 | 5347066 |  |  |  |  |
| 411 | PA | 20 | 6117247 | 464 | IL | 22 | 5334783 |  |  |  |  |
| 412 | MO | 9 | 6054960 | 465 | MI | 18 | 5332911 |  |  |  |  |
| 413 | FL | 22 | 6049712 | 466 | NC | 13 | 5330370 |  |  |  |  |
| 414 | CO | 6 | 6039393 | 467 | OH | 21 | 5312470 |  |  |  |  |
| 415 | CA | 50 | 6028439 | 468 | FL | 25 | 5308500 |  |  |  |  |
| 416 | MI | 16 | 6021704 | 469 | IN | 11 | 5305283 |  |  |  |  |
| 417 | CT | 6 | 6017041 | 470 | PA | 23 | 5301180 |  |  |  |  |
| 418 | TX | 29 | 5986818 | 471 | AR | 5 | 5282127 |  |  |  |  |
| 419 | VA | 11 | 5927265 | 472 | CA | 57 | 5281190 |  |  |  |  |
| 420 | NY | 31 | 5917026 | 473 | TX | 33 | 5249792 |  |  |  |  |
| 421 | CA | 51 | 5909052 | 474 | MA | 12 | 5247615 |  |  |  |  |

1990, APPORTIONMENT COUNTS
Arpatate
Resident POPULATION EQUAL PROPORTIONS


DATE: $12 / 17 / 90$ PAGE 1
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY RIORITY

51 CA 149478 52 NY 102180 53 CA 048913
54 TX 927940
55 FL 827550 56 CA 721807
57 PA 672842
58 IL 664170
59 ОН 612789
60 NY 603726 61 TX 442123
62 CA 433863 63 MI 336054 64 NJ 328702
65 CA 296518 66 FL 261019
67 NY 232197
68 TX 160867
69 PA 984439
70 NC 964745
71 IL 954613
72 CA 938328
73 GA 908316
74 OH 905717
75 VA 898651
76 MA 882254
77 NY 823616 78 CA 713155 79 IN 691687 80 TX 638533

2210435123104 PA 263 VA 79547301 2127211725105 GA 264 PA 139512928 3121494773106 TX 265 CO 49510096 2120112762107 KY 266 CT $4 \quad 9489086$ 291484951108 AZ 267 CA 329448816
485909779109 CA 268 OH 129441202 284015902110 IL 269 LA 59436146 280826560111 VA 270 MO $6 \quad 9342454$ 276700684112 SC 271 MA 79283546 373445722113 MA 272 NY $20 \quad 9228909$
369347134114 OH 273 TX 199185253
$566545429 \quad 115 \mathrm{NY}$ 274 CA $33 \quad 9158013$ 265727674116 CA 275 IL 139151806 254660683117 FL 276 NJ $9 \quad 9110114$ 654334115118 CO 277 OK 49080522 352818860119 CT 278 AL 59035027 $4 \quad 51933969 \quad 120$ TX 279 WI 68891107 $449035830 \quad 121$ IN 280 FL 158928018 348506603122 NJ $\begin{array}{clr}281 \text { TN } & 6 & 8904481 \\ 2 & 46871541 & 123 \text { OK }\end{array}$ 282 WA $6 \quad 8885323$ 346665236124 CA 283 CA 348884578 745920711125 PA $\begin{array}{cccc}284 & \text { MI } & 11 & 8862718 \\ 2 & 45807904 & 126 & \text { NY }\end{array}$ 285 NC 88857889 127 MO 286 PA 148807260 243751227128 IL $287 \mathrm{NY} 21 \quad 8778442$ $\begin{array}{cccc}2 & 42542548 & 129 \mathrm{MI} \\ 288 & \mathrm{MD} & 6 & 8729726\end{array}$ $5 \quad 40227880 \quad 130 \mathrm{CA}$ 289 TX $20 \quad 8713896$ 839768500131 OR 290 OH $13 \quad 8684643$ $2 \quad 39203124 \quad 132 \mathrm{TX}$ 291 ME 28682762 $537982991 \quad 133 \mathrm{WI}$ 292 GA 8865680
$\begin{array}{lll}5 & 26568161 & 157 \mathrm{CA}\end{array}$ 316 MO 77895815 $\begin{array}{cccc}3 & 26447205 & 158 \mathrm{MI} \\ 317 & \mathrm{IL} & 15 & 7887865\end{array}$ $7 \quad 26210755 \quad 159 \mathrm{OH}$ 318 FL 177844770 $\begin{array}{llr}2 & 26058977 & 160 \text { AR } \\ 319 & \mathrm{NH} & 2 \\ 7843596\end{array}$ 225917075161 AL 320 HI 27836362 $12 \quad 25902774162 \mathrm{TX}$ $\begin{array}{ccc}321 & \text { NC } & 9 \\ 5 & 25559603 & 7811924 \\ 3 & 163 & \text { CA }\end{array}$ $322 \mathrm{SC} 5 \quad 7796505$ $3 \quad 25259782164$ IN 323 CA 397730529 2.24654713165 PA 324 LA 67704581 166 NY 7669567 167 IL 7657247 168 CA 7634651 $13 \quad 23827087169 \mathrm{FL}$ 328 TX 237551424 $\begin{array}{rrr}6 & 23621313 & 170 \mathrm{KY} \\ 329 & \mathrm{WI} & 7 \\ 2 & 7548164\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rrr}2 & 23294883 & 171 \mathrm{AZ} \\ 330 & \mathrm{CA} & 40 \\ 7534785\end{array}$ 330 CA $40 \quad 7534785$ $2 \quad 23243420 \quad 172$ NC 331 TN 77525660 $8 \quad 22699178 \quad 173$ TX 332 WA 77509469 174 MO 333 OH $15 \quad 7485221$ $4 \quad 22315130 \quad 175 \mathrm{CA}$

334 MI 137442194 176 OH | 335 | MS | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | 72059595 | 777 | $\begin{array}{ccc}14 & 22059595 & 177 \\ 336 & \text { IN } & 8 \\ 7408694\end{array}$ $6 \quad 21692313178$ NY $337 \mathrm{FL} 18 \quad 7396121$ $931201955 \quad 179 \mathrm{MI}$ $\begin{array}{lll}3 & 20890362 & 180 \\ 3 & \text { SC }\end{array}$ 339 MD 77377966 620869328181 WI 340 AL 67377069 182 NJ 341 NJ 117370445 $15 \quad 20536367 \quad 183 \mathrm{TN}$ 342 CO 57366489 220098244184 WA 343 CT 57350215 920018794185 PA 344 CA $41 \quad 7348713$ 319970563186 CA 345 NY $25 \quad 7344573$

| 18 | 17012673 | 210 | CA | 25 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 16970813 | 211 | NC | 6 | 12 |
| 7 | 16737463 | 212 | IL | 10 | 12 |
| 2 | 16622136 | 213 | NJ | 7 | 11 |
| 3 | 16495627 | 214 | GA | 6 | 11 |
| 11 | 16196001 | 215 | TX | 15 | 11 |
| 19 | 16092377 | 216 | CA | 26 | 11 |
| 4 | 16004608 | 217 | AL | 4 | 11 |
| 8 | 15877513 | 218 | NY | 16 | 11 |
| 12 | 15658682 | 219 | OR | 3 | 11 |
| 8 | 15274784 | 220 | мо | 5 | 11 |
| 20 | 15266569 | 221 | OH | 10 | 11 |
| 9 | 15247492 | 222 | IA | 3 | 11 |
| 3 | 15045157 | 223 | PA | 11 | 11 |
| 3 | 14963230 | 224 | VA | 6 | 11 |
| 5 | 14822083 | 225 | FL | 12 | 11 |
| . 12 | 14784860 | 226 | CA | 27 | 11 |
| 4 | 14771717 | 227 | NE | 2 | 11 |
| 21 | 14521402 | 228 | MA | 6 | 10 |
| 8 | 14495067 | 229 | TX | 16 | 10 |
| 5 | 14485731 | 230 | MI | 9 | 10 |
| 13 | 14403892 | 231 | WI | 5 | 10 |
| 7 | 14342955 | 232 | NY | 17 | 10 |
| 3 | 14234405 | 233 | TN | 5 | 10 |
| 4 | 14121320 | 234 | IL | 11 | 10 |
| 6 | 14113328 | 235 | WA | 5 | 10 |
| 4 | 14079220 | 236 | CA | 28 | 10 |
| 4 | 14048929 | 237 | NM | 2 | 10 |
| 9 | 14002651 | 238 | MD | 5 | 10 |
| 22 | 13845615 | 239 | KY | 4 | 10 |

81 MI 580602 82 FL 505110 83 MO 443720 84 CA 358632 85 WI 342318 86 TN 341643 87 WA 329898 88 PA 299585 89 MD 284460 90 IL 228209 91 NY 122203 92 NJ 114653 93 CA 089594 94 OH 065244 95 TX 996105 96 MN 949062 97 LA 798104 98 FL 783019 99 AL 758695 100 CA 728125 101 NY 710542 102 NC 596794 103 MI 590229
$3 \quad 37947890 \quad 134 \mathrm{FL}$ $293 \mathrm{CA} 35 \quad 8626998$ $437348575 \quad 135 \mathrm{TN}$ 294 IN 78554823 $236183170 \quad 136$ WA 295 NV 28498242 $9 \quad 35072521 \quad 137 \mathrm{OH}$ 296 IL 148472926 234590030138 IA 297 CA $36 \quad 8383936$ $2 \quad 34486905 \quad 139 \mathrm{MD}$ 298 NY 228369917 $\begin{array}{cccc}2 & 34412709 & 140 \mathrm{CA} \\ 299 & \mathrm{FL} & 16 & 8351395\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{clr}299 & \mathrm{FL} & 16 \\ 4 & 342991395 \\ 30 & 141 \mathrm{NC}\end{array}$
 301 VA $8 \quad 8268205$ $302 \mathrm{KY} 5 \quad 8240572$ 632845926144 PA $\begin{array}{lll}303 & \text { OR } & 4 \\ 3 & 31558359 & 805074 \\ 3 & 145 & \text { MS }\end{array}$ 304 PA $15 \quad 8199113$ $10 \quad 31369817 \quad 146$ CA 305 AZ 58195699 431312923147 TX $306 \mathrm{CA} 37 \quad 8154195$ $\begin{array}{lll}6 & 31012982 & 148 \mathrm{VA} \\ 307 & \mathrm{NJ} & 10 \\ 8148334\end{array}$ $230936621 \quad 149 \mathrm{MN}$ 308 MI 128090518 229839715150 IL $\begin{array}{lllr}309 & \mathrm{OH} & 14 & 8040417 \\ 5 & 28930082 & 151\end{array}$ 310 MA 88039786 228571264152 MA 311 IA 48015801 $\begin{array}{cccc}11 & 28375066 & 153 \mathrm{FL} \\ 312 & \mathrm{NY} & 23 & 7997732\end{array}$ $7 \quad 27759876 \quad 154 \mathrm{NJ}$ 313 MN 67987801 327061296155 LA 314 CA 387936712 $4 \quad 26833211 \quad 156 \mathrm{NY}$ 315 TX 227902840

$7 \quad 19963654 \quad 187 \mathrm{VA}$ 346 WV 37321839 | 3 | 19911024 | 188 MD |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 347 | VA | 9 |
| 3 | 198868186 | 189 FL |
| 348 | TX | 24 |
| 6 | 79299940 |  |
| 349 | PA | 17 | $\begin{array}{rlr}2 & 19634623 & 191 \mathrm{IL} \\ 350 & \mathrm{CA} & 42 \\ 3 & 7171609 \\ 351 & \mathrm{KS} & 4 \\ 19202 & 7152 \mathrm{MA} \\ 16 & 19210011 & 193 \mathrm{CO} \\ 352 & \mathrm{ID} & 2 \\ 4 & 7118790 \\ 35135226 & 194 \mathrm{CT} \\ 35 \mathrm{RI} & 2 & 7095562 \\ 10 & 18963605 & 195 \mathrm{NY} \\ 354 & \mathrm{MA} & 9 \\ 4 & 7090425 \\ 18700998 & 196 \mathrm{CA}\end{array}$ 355 NY $26 \quad 7056438$ $\begin{array}{rrrr}7 & 18333774 & 1970 \mathrm{OK} \\ 356 & \text { OK } & 5 & 7033742\end{array}$ $2 \quad 18195385,198 \mathrm{OH}$ 357 UT 37033505 1718044664199 WV 358 CA 437002842 1017905354200 CA 359 OH $16 \quad 7001783$ $\begin{array}{cccr}4 & 17861364 & 201 \mathrm{MN} \\ 360 & \mathrm{FL} & 19 & 6996030\end{array}$ $317861266 \quad 202$ TX 361 NC 106987197 717637803203 PA 362 TX 256934714

$217519093 \quad 204 \mathrm{MI}$ 363 IL 176930821 417367923205 NY 364 MI 146890133 $\begin{array}{ccr}8 & 17289031 & 206 \text { IN } \\ 365 & \mathrm{CA} & 44 \\ 5841835\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llr}5 & 17285226 & 207 \\ 366 & \text { MO } & 8 \\ 6837976\end{array}$ $317227967 \quad 208$ UT 367 GA 106828639 $11 \quad 17153225 \quad 209 \mathrm{LA}$

| 5 | 13835353 | 240 AZ | 4 | 10 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 4 | 13802909 | 241 MS | 3 | 10 |  |
| 10 | 13637772 | 242 CA | 29 | 10 |  |
| 13 | 13600093 | 243 FL | 13 | 10 |  |
| 9 | 13471094 | 244 OH | 11 | 10 |  |
| 5 | 13453135 | 245 PA | 12 | 10 |  |
| 3 | 13449307 | 246 NJ | 8 | 10 |  |
| 3 | 13419594 | 247 | TX | 17 | 10 |
| 14 | 13335413 | 248 | NY | 18 | 10 |
| 23 | 13229942 | 249 NC | 7 | 10 |  |
| 3 | 12841797 | 250 | IN | 6 | 10 |
| 9 | 12783448 | 251 KS | 3 | 10 |  |
| 2 | 12681797 | 252 CA | 30 | 10 |  |
| 24 | 12666708 | 253 SC | 4 | 10 |  |
| 4 | 12629823 | 254 GA | 7 | 9 |  |
| 14 | 12591239 | 255 | IL | 12 | 9 |
| 10 | 12524352 | 256 | MI | 10 | 9 |
| 8 | 12421363 | 257 MN | 5 | 9 |  |
| 15 | 12414595 | 258 CA | 31 | 9 |  |
| 5 | 12397116 | 259 NY | 19 | 9 |  |
| 11 | 12335828 | 260 TX | 18 | 9 |  |
| 2 | 12182389 | 261 AR | 3 | 9 |  |
| 4 | 12182013 | 262 FL | 14 | 9 |  |

## 1990. APPORTIONMENT Resident

DATE: 12/17/90 PAGE 2
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY
SEQ ST SEAT PRIORITY
369 NY
370 AR

371 MN
27

372 KY
373 NJ
374 AZ
375 CA
376 TX
377 FL
378 OH
379 NY 380 CA
381 WI 382 IL
383 IN 9

384 VA
385 TN 386 LA 387 WA
388 NE $\begin{array}{lll}389 \mathrm{PA} & 19 \\ 390 & \mathrm{MI} & 15\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}391 & \text { TX } & 27 \\ 392 & \text { CA } & 47\end{array}$ 393 MD 394 SC 395 OR 5 $\begin{array}{lll}396 & \text { MA } & 10 \\ 397 & \text { NC } & 11\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}398 & \text { NY } & 29 \\ 399 & \text { FL } & 21 \\ 400 & \text { CA } & 48\end{array}$ 401 AL 7 $\begin{array}{rrr}402 & \text { IA } & 5 \\ 403 & \text { OH } & 18\end{array}$ 404 NJ
405 NM 3
406 IL 19 407 TX 28 408 GA $\quad 11$ 410 NY 30

| 411 | PA | 20 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 412 | MO | 9 |

413 FL 22

| 414 CO | 6 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 415 | CA | 50 |

416 CT 6
417 MI 16
418 TX 295961097
$\begin{array}{llll}419 & \text { VA } & 11 & 5899414 \\ 420 & \text { NY } & 31 & 5899302\end{array}$
421 CA 515893362
6790060

| 422 | OH | 19 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 423 | IL | 20 |
| 424 | MN | 8 |
| 425 | IN | 10 |
| 426 | PA | 21 |
| 427 | CA | 52 |
| 428 | NC | 12 |
| 429 | WI | 9 |
| 430 | TX | 30 |
| 431 | MS | 5 |
| 432 | FL | 23 |
| 433 | TN | 9 |
| 434 | OK | 6 |
| 435 | MA | 11 |
| 436 | WA | 9 |
| 437 | NJ | 14 |
| 438 | NY | 32 |
| 439 | KY | 7 |
| 440 | CA | 53 |

5865448
5863775
5846472
5844057
5797648
5778917
5769488
5765005
5758967
5753886
5751609
5747818
5743026
5736436
5735452
5729997
5711975
5686535
5668832
5650243
5639176
5638563
5636102
5635014
5577562
5570096
5564453
5562862
5540024
5536179
5527841
5506748
5460785
5399461
5393869
5393222
5385404
5380100
5370883
5362384
5334337
5317997
5313768
5307157
5292850
5286148
5282034
5281886
5267467
5256381
5236526
5227237

EQUAL PROPORTIONS 2
SEQ
T SEAT PRIORITY

| 475 | NY | 35 | 5215172 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 476 | OR | 6 | 5189344 |
| 477 | GA | 13 | 5186724 |
| 478 | WV | 4 | 5177322 |
| 79 | CA | 58 | 5175851 |
| 480 | WI | 10 | 5156377 |
| 481 | MN | 9 | 5156104 |
| 482 | TN | 10 | 5141004 |
| 483 | WA | 10 | 5129944 |
| 484 | CA | 59 | 5087368 |
| 485 | CO | 7 | 5083361 |
| 486 | IL | 23 | 5081522 |
| 487 | FL | 26 | 5074673 |
| 488 | CT | 7 | 5072130 |
| 489 | TX | 34 | 5071165 |
| 490 | IA | 6 | 5069638 |
| 491 | NY | 36 | 5068237 |
| 492 | PA | 24 | 5057164 |
| 493 | OH | 22 | 5046535 |
| 494 | MD | 10 | 5040110 |
| 495 | MI | 19 | 5026321 |
| 496 | ME | 3 | 5012995 |
| 497 | CA | 60 | 5001862 |
| 498 | NJ | 16 | 4989815 |
| 499 | UT | 4 | 4973439 |
| 500 | LA | 9 | 497328 |

With overpeas

OAFE-4Z2790
——AGE
PAGE
$-4$ 4 $+$
$\qquad$ EQUAL PROPORTIONS
ORITY SER SF SEAF-PRIQRITM DATE: $12 / 17 / 90$ PAGE 1.





PAGE

UNITED STATES

| ALABAMA | (01) | 4040587 | 1670397 | 92192 | 163589 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALASKA 2 | (02) | 550043 | 232616 | 20597 | 43693 |
| ARIZONA | (04) | 3665228 | 1659474 | 80133 | 290587 |
| ARKANSAS | (05) | 2350725 | 1000679 | 58174 | 109488 |
| CALIFORNIA | (06) | 29760021 | 11184777 | 725991 | 801676 |
| COLORADO / | (08) | 3294394 | 1477378 | 79105 | 194860 |
| CONNECTICUT | (09) | 3287116 | 1320884 | 100778 | 90371 |
| DELAWARE | (10) | 666168 | 289925 | 20000 | 42422 |
| D.C. | (11) | 606900 | 278528 | 41205 | 28855 |
| FLORIDA | (12) | 12937926 | 6100405 | 305667 | 965393 |
| GEORGIA | (13) | 6478216 | 2638464 | 173076 | 271803 |
| HAWAII | (15) | 1108229 | 389869 | 36774 | 33543 |
| IDAHO | (16) | 1006749 | 413338 | 21350 | 52604 |
| ILLINOIS | (17) | 11430602 | 4506428 | 285092 | 304035 |
| INDIANA | (18) | 5544159 | 2246096 | 161410 | 180691 |
| IOWA | (19) | 2776755 | 1143697 | 99195 | 79344 |
| KANSAS | (20) | 2477574 | 1044125 | 82588 | 99386 |
| KENTUCKY | (21) | 3685296 | 1506867 | 100927 | 127063 |
| LOUISIANA | (22) | 4219973 | 1716252 | 112447 | 216972 |
| MAINE | (23) | 1227928 | 587054 | 37064 | 121733 |
| MARYLAND | (24) | 4781468 | 1891955 | 113407 | 142926 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | (25) | 6016425 | 2472784 | 213432 | 225601 |
| MICHIGAN | (26) | 9295297 | 3848128 | 209239 | 428595 |
| MINNNESOTA | (27) | 4375099 | 1848505 | 116852 | 200592 |
| MISSISSIPPI | (28) | 2573216 | 1010433 | 69600 | 99049 |
| MISSOURI | (29) | 5117073 | 2199168 | 144893 | 237923 |
| MONTANA | (30) | 799065 | 361159 | 23705 | 54992 |
| NEBRASKA | (31) | 1578385 | 660628 | 47464 | 58258 |
| NEVADA | (32) | 1201833 | 518880 | 23939 | 52561 |
| NEW HAMP SHIRE | (33) | 1109252 | 503919 | 31966 | 92718 |
| NEW JERSEY | (34) | 7730188 | 3075405 | 170164 | 280599 |
| NEW MEXICO | (35) | 1515069 | 632067 | 28695 | 89349 |
| NEW YORK | (36) | 17990455 | 7227264 | 540800 | 587569 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | (37) | 6628637 | 2818226 | 224076 | 301167 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | (38) | 638800 | 276344 | 24182 | 35462 |
| OHIO | (39) | 10847115 | 4372073 | 259946 | 284399 |
| OKLAHOMA | (40) | 3145585 | 1406511 | 93519 | 200364 |
| OREGON | (41) | 2842321 | 1193622 | 65507 | 90254 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | (42) | 11881643 | 4938295 | 346523 | 442174 |
| RHODE ISLAND 4 | 7 44 ) | 1003464 | 414583 | 38448 | 36595 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | (45) | 3486703 | 1424170 | 116365 | 166111 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | (46) | 696004 | 292437 | 25827 | 33402 |
| TENNESSEE | (47) | 4877185 | 2026108 | 128636 | 172342 |
| TEXAS | (48) | 16986510 | 7009168 | 391365 | 938062 |
| UTAH | (49) | 1722850 | 598404 | 28860 | 61115 |
| VERMONT | (50) | 562758 | 271224 | 21526 | 60564 |
| VIRGINIA | (51) | 6187358 | 2496394 | 208556 | 204504 |
| WASHINGTON | (53) | 4866692 | 2032473 | 119389 | 159947 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | (54) | 1793477 | 781298 | 36869 | 92738 |
| WISCONSIN | (55) | 4891769 | 2055825 | 133006 | 233656 |
| WYOMING | (56) | 453588 | 203412 | 10224 | 34572 |

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS WASHINGTON, DC. 20230 

## ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION <br> BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Public Information Office 301-763-4040

U.S. POPULATION UP NEARLY TWO-THIRDS IN 40 YEARS; NEVADA, CALIFORNIA LEAD 40-YEAR PERIOD GROWTH

The Census Bureau announced the 1990 census showed the U.S. population grew 64.4 percent since the first post World War II census in 1950.

Nevada recorded the greatest percentage growth in the 40 -year period ( 650.8 percent) as well as in the 1980-1990 period (50.4 percent).

In numerical growth, California led the nation with 6,091,459 persons in the $1980-1990$ period and with 19,173,798 persons in the $1950-1990$ period, the bureau said.

The 1990 census put the total resident U.S. population, which excludes U.S. military and federal employees stationed overseas, at 248,709,873.

In general, gains or losses by states in the 1980-1990 period are a continuation of trends in the 1950-1990 period.

In the 40 -year period, 19 states exceeded the United States' rate of population growth ( 64.4 percent) and 31 states and the District of Columbia fell below the four decade rate of growth.

In the last decade, 19 states also exceeded the U.S. resident population growth rate of 9.8 percent and 31 states and the District of Columbia trailed. Only Idaho and Oregon, among the states that have exceeded the U.S. growth rate for the period 1950-1990, fell below the national average in the last decade. Among states that have had a 40 -year growth rate below the national average, only North Carolina and Vermont exceeded the United States average growth percentage during the last decade.
-X
Per durigit gohrson (P10), released between Gin 8-Gon15,1991

Table 1
Post World War II Censuses-Resident Population Change By State (000's)-1950-1990


|  | 1950 Census | 1990 Census | Number Gain/Loss | Percentage Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohio | 7,946,627 | 10,847,115 | + 2,900,488 | $+36.50 \%$ |
| Oclahama | 2,233,351 | 3,145,585 | + 912,234 | $+40.85 \%$ |
| Oregon | 1,521,341 | 2,842,321 | $+1,320,980$ | + 86.83\% |
| Permsylvamia | 10,498,012 | 11,881,643 | + 1,383,631 | +.13.18\% |
| Rhode Island | 791,896 | 1,003,464 | +-211,568 | $+26.72 \%$ |
| South Carolina | 2,117,027 | 3,486,703 | +1,369,676 | + 64.70\% |
| South Dakota | 652,740 | 696,004 | + 43,264 | + 6.63\% |
| Temmessee | 3,291,718 | 4,877,185 | + 1,585,467 | + 48.17\% |
| Texas | 7,711,194 | 16,986,510 | + 9,275,316 | +120.28\% |
| Utah | 688,862 | 1,722,850 | +1,033,988 | +150.10\% |
| Vermont | 377,747 | 562,758 | $+185,011$ | $+48.98 \%$ |
| Vinginia | 3,318,680 | 6,187,358 | + 2,868,678 | + 86.44\% |
| Washington | 2,378,963 | 4,866,692 | + 2,487,729 | +104.57\% |
| West Virginia | 2,005,552 | 1,793,477 | - 212,075 | - 10.57\% |
| Wisconsin | 3,434,575 | 4,891,769 | + 1,457,194 | + 42.43\% |
| Hyaming | 290,529 | 453,588 | + 163,059 | + 56.12\% |

1 NOIE: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The U.S. Department of Coumerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Resident Population Change Ranking by Regions 1950 to 1990

| NORTHEAST | 28.70\% | SOUH | 81.04\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Hampshire | 108.02\% | Florida | 366.85\% |
|  |  | Texas | 120.28\% |
| UNITED STAIES | 64.35\% | Delamare | $109.43 \%$ |
|  |  | Maryland | 104.07\% |
| Camecticut | $63.76 \%$ | Ceorgia | 88.07\% |
| New Jersey | 59.87\% | Virginia | 86.44\% |
| Vermant | 48.98\% |  |  |
| Maine | 34.38\% | SOUIH | 81.04\% |
| NORIHEAST | 28.70\% | South Carolina | 64.70\% |
| Massachusetts | $28.27 \%$ | UNITIED STAIES | 64.35\% |
| Rhode Island | 26.72\% |  |  |
| New York | 21.31\% | North Carolina | 63.19\% |
| Pennsylvania | 13.18\% | Louisiana | 57.26\% |
|  |  | Termessee | 48.17\% |
|  |  | Oklahama | 40.85\% |
|  |  | Alabama | 31.97\% |
|  |  | Kentucky | 25.15\% |
| MIDWEST | 34.21\% | Arkansas | $23.11 \%$ |
|  |  | Mississippi | 18.10\% |
|  |  | West Virginia | -10.57\% |
| UNIITED STATES | 64.35\% | District of Columia | -24.34\% |
| Minnesota | 46.69\% |  |  |
| Michigan | 45.88\% | Hest | 169.85\% |
| Wiscansin | 42.43\% |  |  |
| Indiana | 40.92\% | Nevada | 650.76\% |
| Ohio | 36.50\% | Arizana | 388.97\% |
|  |  | Alaska | 327.57\% |
| MITWIEST | 34.21\% | California | 181.12\% |
| Illinois | 31.20\% | WEST | 169.85\% |
| Kansas | 30.04\% |  |  |
| Missouri | 29.39\% | Utah | 150.10\% |
| Nebraska | 19.08\% | Colcrado | 148.62\% |
| South Dakota | 6.63\% | New Mexico | $122.42 \%$ |
| Iowa | 5.94\% | Hamaii | 121.74\% |
| North Dakota | 3.09\% | Mashington | 104.57\% |
|  |  | Oregon | 86.83\% |
|  |  | Idaho | 71.03\% |
|  |  | UNITED SIAIES | 64.35\% |
|  |  | Wyoming Montana | $\begin{aligned} & 56.12 \% \\ & 35.20 \% \end{aligned}$ |

Resident Population Change by State-1980-1990

|  | 1980 census | 1990 Resident population ${ }^{1}$ | Numerical Difference | Percentage Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 226,504,825 | 248,709,873 | +22,205,048 | + 9.80\% |
| Northeast | 49,136,667 | 50,809,229 | +1,672,562 | + 3.40\% |
| Cornectiaut | 3,107,576 | 3,287,116 | + 179,540 | +5.78\% |
| Maine | 1,124,660 | 1,227,928 | + 103,268 | + 9.18\% |
| Massachusetts | 5,737,037 | 6,016,425 | + 279,388 | + 4.87\% |
| New Hampshire | 920,610 | 1,109,252 | + 188,642 | +20.49\% |
| New Jersey | 7,364,158 | 7,730,188 | + 366,030 | + 4.97\% |
| New York | 17,557,288 | 17,990,455 | + 433,167 | + 2.47\% |
| Permsylvania | 11,866,728 | 11,881,643 | + 14,915 | + $0.13 \%$ |
| Phode Island | 947,154 | 1,003,464 | + 56,310 | + 5.95\% |
| Vermont | 511,456 | 562,758 | + 51,302 | +10.03\% |
| Midwest | 58,853,804 | 59,668,632 | + 814,828 | + $1.38 \%$ |
| Illinois | 11,418,461 | 11,430,602 | + 12,141 | +0.11\% |
| Indiana | 5,490,179 | 5,544,159 | + 53,980 | +0.98\% |
| Iowa | 2,913,387 | 2,776,755 | - 136,632 | - $4.69 \%$ |
| Kansas | 2,363,208 | 2,477,574 | + 114,366 | + 4.84\% |
| Michigan | 9,258,344 | 9,295,297 | + 36,953 | + 0.40\% |
| Minnesota | 4,077,148 | 4,375,099 | + 297,951 | + 7.31\% |
| Missouri | 4,917,444 | 5,117,073 | + 199,629 | +4.06\% |
| Nebraska | 1,570,006 | 1,578,385 | + 8,379 | + 0.538 |
| North Dakota | 652,695 | 638,800 | - 13,895 | - 2.138 |
| Chio | 10,797,419 | 10,847,115 | + 49,696 | + $0.46 \%$ |
| South Dakota | 690,178 | 696,004 | + 5,826 | + 0.84\% |
| Wisconsin | 4,705,335 | 4,891,769 | + 186,434 | + 3.96\% |
| South | 75,349,155 | 85,445,930 | +10,096,775 | +13.40\% |
| Alabama | 3,890,061 | 4,040,587 | + 150,526 | + 3.87\% |
| Arkansas | 2,285,513 | 2,350,725 | + 65,212 | + 2.85\% |
| Delaware | 595,225 | 666,168 | + 70,943 | +11.92\% |
| District of Columbia | 637,651 | 606,900 | - 30,751 | - 4.82\% |
| Florida | 9,739,992 | 12,937,926 | + 3,197,934 | +32.83\% |
| Geargia | 5,464,265 | 6,478,216 | + 1,013,951 | +18.56\% |
| Kentucky | 3,661,433 | 3,685,296 | + 23,863 | + 0.65\% |
| Louisiana | 4,203,972 | 4,219,973 | + 16,001 | +0.38\% |
| Maryland | 4,216,446 | 4,781,468 | + 565,022 | +13.408 |
| Mississippi | 2,520,638 | 2,573,216 | + 52,578 | + 2.09\% |
| North Carolina | 5,874,429 | 6,628,637 | + 754,208 | +12.84\% |
| Oklahama | 3,025,266 | 3,145,585 | + 120,319 | + 3.98\% |
| South Carolina | 3,119,208 | 3,486,703 | + 367,495 | +11.78\% |
| Tennessee | 4,590,750 | 4,877,185 | + 286,435 | + 6.24\% |
| Texas | 14,228,383 | 16,986,510 | + 2,758,127 | +19.38\% |
| Virginia | 5,346,279 | 6,187,358 | + 841,079 | +15.73\% |
| West Virginia | 1,949,644 | 1,793,477 | - 156,167 | - 8.01\% |

U.S. Growth $+9,80 \%$

| NOPTHFAST ( $+3.40 \%$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New Hampshire | +20.49\% |
| Vermant | +10.03\% |
| UNITED STAIES | +9.80\% |
| Maine | + 9.18\% |
| Rtode Island | + 5.95\% |
| Comecticut | + 5.78\% |
| New Jersey | + 4.97\% |
| Massachusetts | + 4.87\% |
| NORIHEAST | + 3.40\% |
| New York | + 2.47\% |
| Pernsylvania | + 0.13\% |
| MIDWEST ( $+1.38 \%$ ) |  |
| UNIIED SIAIES | + 9.80\% |
| Minnesota | + $7.31 \%$ |
| Kansas | + 4.84\% |
| Missouri | + 4.06\% |
| Wisconsin | + 3.96\% |
| MIDWEST | +1.38\% |
| Indiana | + 0.98\% |
| South Dakota | + $0.84 \%$ |
| Nebraska | + 0.53\% |
| Ohio | + 0.46\% |
| Michigan | + 0.40\% |
| Illinois | + 0.11\% |
| North Dakota | - 2.138 |
| Iowa | - 4.69\% |

SOUH (+13.40\%)

| Florida | $\mathbf{+ 3 2 . 8 3 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Texas | +19.38\% |
| Georgia | +18.56\% |
| Virginia | +15.73\% |
| Maryland | +13.40\% |


| SOUIH | $+13.40 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| North Carolina | $+12.84 \%$ |
| Delaware | $+11.92 \%$ |
| South Carolina | $+11.78 \%$ |
| UNLTED SIATES | $+9.80 \%$ |


| Termessee | $+6.24 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oklahama | $+3.98 \%$ |
| Alabama | $+3.87 \%$ |
| Arkansas | $+2.85 \%$ |
| Mississippi | $+2.09 \%$ |
| Kentucky | $+0.65 \%$ |
| Louisiana | $+0.38 \%$ |
| District |  |
| of Columbia | $-4.82 \%$ |
| West Virginia | $-8.01 \%$ |

WFST ( $+22.29 \%$ )

| Nevada | +50.38\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | +37.35\% |
| Arizana | +34.86\% |
| California | +25.74\% |
| WIEST | +22.29\% |
| Utah | +17.92\% |
| Washington | +17.83\% |
| New Mexico | +16.55\% |
| Hamaii | +14.84\% |
| Colorado | +14.04\% |
| UNITED SIANES | + 9.80\% |
| Oregon | + 7.96\% |
| Idaho | + 6.65\% |
| Montana | + $1.57 \%$ |
| Wyaming | - 3.66\% |

Table 5
1990 Cansus Population by State-Pesidential and Ovenseas

|  | Final Resident Population $\%$ of Residential ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Overseas population \% of Overseas |  | Total population $\%$ of Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States |  | $\begin{aligned} & 248,709,873 \\ & 248,70,862 \end{aligned}$ | (100.0\%) | $\begin{aligned} & 922,819 \\ & 922,819 \end{aligned}$ | (100.0\%) | $\begin{aligned} & 249,632,692 \\ & 249,022,772 \end{aligned}$ | (100.0\%) |
| Alabama |  | 4,040,587 | (1.62\%) | 22,021 | (2.39\%) | 4,062,608 | (1.638) |
| Alaska |  | 550,043 | (0.22\%) | 1,904 | (0.21\%) | 551,947 | (0.22\%) |
| Arizona |  | 3,665,228 | (1.47\%) | 12,757 | (1.38\%) | 3,677,985 | (1.47\%) |
| Arkansas |  | 2,350,725 | (0.94\%) $\times$ | 11,514 | (1.25\%) | 2,362,239 | (0.95\%) |
| California |  | 29,760,021 | (11.97\%) | 79,229 | (8.59\%) | 29,839,250 | (11.95\%) |
| Colorado |  | 3,294,394 | (1.32\%) | 13,518 | (1.46\%) | 3,307,912 | (1.33\%) |
| comnecticut |  | 3,287,116 | (1.32\%) | 8,553 | (0.938) | 3,295,669 | (1.32\%) |
| Delaware | v | 666,168 | (0.27\%) | 2,528 | (0.27\%) | 668,696 | (0.27\%) |
| District of Columbia |  | 606,900 | (0.24\%) | 3,009 | (0.33\%) | 609,909 | (0.246) |
| Florida |  | 12,937,926 | (5.20\%) | 65,436 | (7.09\%) | 13,003,362 | (5.218) |
| Geargia |  | 6,478,216 | (2.60\%) | 30,203 | (3.27\%) | 6,508,419 | (2.61\%) |
| Hawaii | - | 1,108,229 | (0.45\%) | 7,045 | (0.76\%) | 1,115,274 | (0.45\%) |
| Idaho |  | 1,006,749 | (0.40\%) | 5,237 | (0.57\%) | 1,011,986 | (0.41\%) |
| Illinois |  | 11,430,602 | (4.60\%) | 36,080 | (3.91\%) | 11,466,682 | (4.59\%) |
| Indiana |  | 5,544,159 | (2.23\%) | 20,069 | (2.17\%) | 5,564,228 | (2.23\%) |
| Iowa |  | 2,776,755 | (1.12\%) | 10,669 | (1.16\%) | 2,787,424 | (1.12\%) |
| Kansas |  | 2,477,574 | (1.00\%) | 8,026 | (0.87\%) | 2,485,600 | (1.00\%) |
| Kentucky |  | 3,685,296 | (1.48\%) | 13,673 | (1.48\%) | 3,698,969 | (1.48\%) |
| Iouisiana | $v$ | 4,219,973 | (1.70\%) | 18,243 | (1.98\%) | 4,238,216 | (1.70\%) |
| Maine |  | 1,227,928 | (0.49\%) | 5,295 | (0.57\%) | 1,233,223 | (0.49\%) |
| Maryland |  | 4,781,468 | (1.92\%) | 17,154 | (1.86\%) | 4,798,622 | (1.92\%) |
| Massactursetts |  | 6,016,425 | (2.42\%) / | 12,626 | (1.37\%) | 6,029,051 | (2.42\%) |
| Michigan |  | 9,295,297 | (3.748) | 33,487 | (3.63\%) | 9,328,784 | (3.74\%) |
| Minnesota |  | 4,375,099 | (1.76\%) | 11,930 | (1.298) | 4,387,029 | (1.76\%) |
| Mississippi |  | 2,573,216 | (1.03\%) | 13,227 | (1.43\%) | 2,586,443 | (1.04\%) |
| Missouri | * | 5,117,073 | (2.06\%) | 20,731 | (2.25\%) | 5,137,804 | (2.06\%) |
| Montana | v | 799,065 | (0.32\%) | 4,590 | (0.50\%) | 803,655 | (0.32\%) |
| Nebraska |  | 1,578,385 | (0.63\%) | 6,232 | (0.68\%) | 1,584,617 | (0.63\%) |
| Nevada |  | 1,201,833 | (0.48\%) | 4,319 | (0.47\%) | 1,206,152 | (0.48\%) |
| New Hampshire |  | 1,109,252 | (0.45\%) | 4,663 | (0.51\%) | 1,113,915 | (0.45\%) |
| New Jersey |  | 7,730,188 | (3.11\%) | 18,446 | (2.00\%) | 7,748,634 | (3.10\%) |
| New Mexico |  | 1,515,069 | (0.61\%) | 6,710 | (0.73\%) | 1,521,779 | (0.61\%) |
| New York |  | 17,990,455 | (7.238) | 54,050 | (5.86\%) | 18,044,505 | (7.23\%) |
| North Carolina |  | 6,628,637 | (2.67\%) | 28,993 | (3.14\%) | 6,657,630 | (2.67\%) |
| North Dakota |  | 638,800 | (0.26\%) | 2,564 | (0.28\%) | 641,364 | (0.26\%) |


${ }^{2}$ NOIE: The 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overoount. The U.S. Department of Camerce is oansidering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Overseas Counts by Federal Agency


Attachment A

## APPORTIONMENT

## A. Section Index

1. Delivery of apportionment counts
2. Availability of resident population counts
3. Apportionment counts for other geographic areas
4. Overseas population in apportionment
5. Informing public officials on apportionment counts
6. Final apportionment counts
7. Census Advisory members contacted
8. Homeless in apportionment counts

## B. Questions

1. How were the apportionment numbers delivered to the President? All at once or on a flow basis?
a. The apportionment population counts and the number of representatives by state were transmitted at one time to the President on December 26, 1990. Copies of this information can be obtained from Census Bureau's Customer Services or the Public Information Office.
2. When will the resident population counts be available to the public?
a. We released these data in a press release on January 4, 1991. A copy of the press release is available through Census Bureau's Customer Services or the Public Information Office.
3. Will there be any apportionment counts released for other geographic areas besides state (i.e. city or county totals)?

0 a. No, apportionment data are required for states only. The first release of population counts for each governmental unit by state are available now as part of the "Thank You America Program", and can be obtained from the Census Bureau's Customer Services.
4. Was the overseas population total shown in the apportionment total for each state?
a. Yes, the apportionment counts include military, and civilian employees as well as dependents overseas plus the population enumerated in the census. The counts were combined for the apportionment population for each state.
5. How are the governors informed about the apportionment counts? Congress? State legislatures?
a. The president transmits the information to the clerk of the House of Representatives, who, in turn, notifies the Governor of each state how many representatives the state is entitled to in the next Congress.
6. Are these the final counts for apportionment? If not, what is the procedure for correcting them?
a. These are the final apportionment counts unless the Secretary of Commerce makes a decision to adjust the census. The decision, will be made no later than July 15, 1991. If there is an adjustment, the Census Bureau will provide revised apportionment counts by July 15, 1991.
7. Who is contacting the Census Advisory members about the apportionment counts?
a. On December 28, 1990, the Bureau sent to all Census Advisory Committee members the press release containing the apportionment counts.
8. Are the homeless included in the apportionment counts?
a. Yes, the homeless are included in the apportionment counts.

## Package presided to whits the ?

THE SECRETARY OF OMER Washington. D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$, I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each state as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections ia and ib. Under Section ia, you are to send this information to the 102nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a stipulation and order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or state redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the census Burealnwill publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 199).

## sincerely.



Robert A. Mosbacher
Enclosure
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1990 CENSUS POPULATION FOR THE UNITED STATES IS 249,632,692; REAPPORTIONMENT WILL SHIFT 19 SEATS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The population of the United States counted in the 1990 census is $249,632,692$, an increase of 10.21 percent since the 1980 census of 226,504,825.

The figures were transmitted to the President by Commerce Secretary Robert A. Mosbacher upon their receipt from Commerce Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Michael R. Darby and Census Director Barbara Everitt Bryant. Figures also were provided on final population counts for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The secretary also transmitted the official apportionment of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the 50 states. The apportionment population includes the population of the 50 states plus the overseas military and other overseas federal workers and dependents not in the United States on April 1, 1990. The population of the District of Columbia is not included in the apportionment population.

## (more)

A total of 19 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives will be shifted as a result of the 1990 census. Eight states will increase their representation in the 103rd Congress, which will convene in January 1993. California will gain seven seats for a total of 52 , Florida will gain four seats to 23 , and Texas will gain three seats for a total of 30 . Arizona (6), Georgia (11), North Carolina (12), Virginia (11), and Washington (9) each gain one seat.

Thirteen states will have less representation in the 103rd Congress. New York (31) will lose three seats. Illinois (20), Michigan (16), Ohio (19), and Pennsylvania (21) will each lose two seats. Iowa (5), Kansas (4), Kentucky (6), Louisiana (7), Massachusetts (10), Montana (1), New Jersey (13), and West Virginia (3) each will lose one seat.

An attached table lists the official 1990 census population for the United States and the number of representatives each state will be entitled to elect to the 103rd Congress, which is scheduled to commence in January, 1993.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount and overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
-X-

Dec. 26, 1990


United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, by STATE
NOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Comerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{9}$ 249,632,692

| STATE | APPORTIONMENT <br> POPULATION |
| :--- | :--- |



[^11]

## 1990 Census Apportionment

| ABSTRACT OF SECRETARIAL CORRESPONDENCE |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TO: $X$ Secretary | $\square$ Deputy Secretary $\quad \square$ Counsellor ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Control No: |
| Through: | Under secretary for Economic affairs Wichacl $R$ Oon <br> Michael R. Darby |
| From: | Barbara Everitt Bryant Director, Bureau of the census Baibana Eoerill Bryan' |
| Prepared by: | C. Jones/Census/US EA/763-5180 CS |
| Subject: | Transmittal of 1990 Apportionment Population Counts and ts Apportionment from the Secretary of Comerce to the Presic |
| Outgoing: | The President |
| Background: | By December 31, 1990 you must transmit to the President a statement showing the apportionment population for each st as of April 1, 1990, in accordance with provisions of Title 13, United states Code, Section $141(b)$ and Titie 2, United States Code, Sections 2 a and 2 b . |
|  | The attached statement provides the 1990 census apportionn population for each of the fifty states. Your statement a shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United State Code, Sections $2 a$ and $2 b$. |
|  | In accordance with the stipulation and Order in The city New York, et al. $Y$. United States Department of commerce. |
|  | et al. (lawsuit seeking statistical adjustment of 1990 census), the transmittal letter and apportionment |
|  | figures include a statement that the population counts are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount |
|  | Under the Stipulation and Order, you are to consider the question of adjustment in accordance with quidelines |
|  | published by the Department. If you make a decision to |
|  | adjust the 1990 census, the Census Bureau will publish |
|  | corrected 1990 decennial census population data not later |
|  | than July 15, 1991. it cannot be determined at this time, |
|  | the apportionment or state redistricting. |

Attachment

| SUANAME : organization (Pinase typr) | PREPARED 8Y | CLEARED BY | CLEARED $8 Y$ | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEBryant Dir./Census | Ch.C./EA |  |  |  |  |  |
| INITLALS \& DATE | $\begin{aligned} & B E B \\ & 12 / 26 / 90 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary

## THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator
Barbara Everitt Bryant Baitoana Eurrit Bryout
Director, Bureau of the census
1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section $141(b)$, I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2a and 2b.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The united states Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

MOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Depertment of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if eny, not later than July 15, 1991.
TOTAL POPULATION' $269,632,692$

State | apporitionemit |
| :--- |
| populition |

MUMBER OF
REPRESEWTATIVES
MSED CN THE
1990 CEWSUS

Change from 1980 APPORTIOMNENT

| UWITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,763 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alsbema | 4,062,608 |
| Alaske | 551,947 |
| Arizoma | 3,677,905 |
| Arkarses | 2,362,239 |
| California | 29,339,250 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 |
| Connecticut | 3,295,669 |
| Dolamare | 668,6\% |
| Floride | 13,003,362 |
| Georgit | 6,508,419 |
| Kawai i | 1,115,276 |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 |
| lllinois | 11,466,682 |
| Indiana | 5,564.228 |
| lowa | 2,787,424 |
| Kensas | 2,485,600 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 |
| Moine | 1,233,223 |
| Marylend | 4,798,622 |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 |
| Michigan | 9,328,744 |
| Minesota | 4,387,029 |
| Mississippi | 2,586,643 |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 |
| Montana | 803,655 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 |
| New Hampshire | 1,113,915 |
| New Jersey | 7,748,634 |
| New Mexico | 1,521,779 |
| New York | 18,044,505 |
| Morsh Carotine | 6,657,630 |
| North Dakota | 641,364 |
| Onio | 10,887,325 |
| Oklahoma | 3,157,604 |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 |
| Pernsylvenis | 11,924,710 |
| Rhode Island | 1,005,924 |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 |
| South Dakota | 699,999 |
| Tennessee | 4,896,661 |
| Texas | 17,059,805 |
| Utah | 1,727,744 |
| Vermont | 564,9\%4 |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 |
| Veshington | 6,887,941 |
| West Virginia | 1,801,625 |
| Wisconsin | 4,906,745 |
| Uyoming | 455,975 |



1 lotal population includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 2ist decemial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of militery and Federal civilien employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the Distriet of Colubia.

Speaker of the House

## Transmittal From President to Congress

Pursuant to Title 2, United States Code, Section 2a. (a), I am transmitting the statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.


The Census PIO office and others at Census have received numerous inquires in the last two days about the recent history of Census/Commerce press events surrounding the release of apportionment numbers. For the purposes of historical integrity, and to correct the misunderstanding that no events or releases occured, here is a summary by PIO Chief Maury Cagle who was present on both ocassions:
"December 31, 1980: There was a big event, planned well in advance, held in the lobby at Commerce. Director Barabba handed over the results of the 1980 Census to Sec. Phil Klutznick in front of the Population Clock, which was a fixture for many years in the lobby before they refurbished it. There were several hundred people there--press and dignataries.
There was a lot of media coverage of the numbers.
December 26, 1990; Office of u/sec could not make up its mind about how to publicly release the figures. At 12:02 pm, it was decided to hold a 1 pm news conference. I had 58 minutes to finalize the news release, make 100 copies, obtain a car and get to DOC. Event was held in room 4830. Room was full---which holds about 50 reporters and seven/eight cameras. Group was kept waiting until 1:15, when U/Sec Darby and Director Bryant came into room. There still was a lot of media coverage in spite of the badly managed event."

Based upon press inquiries Census has been receiving during the last few weeks, we expect intense interest in the release of the first numbes from the Decennial Census.


KIMBALL W. BRACE PRESIDENT

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
December 26, 1990
CONTACT: Kimball Brace, Doug Chapin
(202) 789-2004

## ELECIION DATA SERVICES, INC. RELEASES COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF CENSUS BUREAUS APPORTIONMENT FIGURES

Election Data Services, Inc. (EDS, Inc.) today released a report containing a comprehensive analysis of the statewide apportionment population figures announced today by the United States Census Bureau.

The report shows the following:

- Washington, a surprise gainer after the post-census local review counts, barely held on to that new 9th seat, receiving the 435th and last seat apportioned. Massachusetts, on the other hand, came in 436th and thus just missed keeping its 11th seat. Here are the states "on the edge":


## "Last Five"

431: Wisconsin 9th ( +0 from ' 80 )
432: Florida 23rd ( +4 )
433: Tennessee 9th $(+0)$
434: Oklahoma 6ti $(+0)$
435: Washington 9th $(+1)$

## "Next Five"

436: Massachusetts 11th (would have been +0 )
437: New Jersey 14th $(+0)$
438: New York 31st (-2)
439: Kentucky 7th ( +0 )
440: California 53rd $(+8)$

- In all, apportionment affects 21 states, with a total of 19 seats changing hands - with no change from EDS, Inc.'s apportionment estimates following the August release of postcensus local review counts;
- The hotly-debated issue of including overseas military personnel for apportionment purposes must remain for another day, as the Bureau released a nationwide figure of 922,819 without breaking out state-by-state "home of record" totals for allocation of overseas personnel.

With regard to the figures on the whole, the report shows:

- The Bureau's apportionment numbers increase the country's population by $1.54 \%$ over the post-census local review counts released in August 1990 but fall just below the Bureau's February 1990 estimates;
- All 50 states showed increases from the post-census local review. California led the way in raw increase, adding over half a million people between August and today, while the District of Columbia led the percentage gain with a boost of over $\psi \%$;
(nexr, please)
- Compared to 1980 , there are wide variations between states, with 46 states greater than the 1980 count and the remainder -- plus the District of Columbia -- below;
- Subtracting the total overseas personnel figure from the nationwide apportionment total and dividing by 435 seats, we see that the average Congressional district will contain 571,747 people, compared to a 1980 average of just over 520,000 . Note, however, that district sizes for individual states cannot be calculated until military personnel can subtracted from each state's total.

Election Data Services, Inc. is a Washington, DC political consulting firm specializing in reapportionment, redistricting, election administration and the Census. For further information on these or any other related issues please call (202) 789-2004.
$\checkmark$

| ELECTION DATA SERVICES, Inc. | CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT | Date: $12 / 26 / 90$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1522 K Street NW Suite \#320 | REAPPORTIONMENT PROGRAM | Time: $15: 39: 31$ |
| Washington, DC 20005-1202 |  | Page: 12.0 |
| (202) $789-2004$ |  |  |

Source data: Census Population released 12-26-90
Number of districts $=435$

|  | \#CDs | Difference from 1980 Census Populations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 7 |  |
| Alaska | 1 |  |
| Arizona | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 4 |  |
| Callfornia | 52 | +7 |
| colorado | 6 |  |
| Connecticut | 6 |  |
| Delaware | 1 |  |
| Florida | 23 | +4 |
| Georgia | 11 | +1 |
| Hawail | 2 |  |
| Idaho | 2 |  |
| lltinois | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 10 |  |
| I Owa | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 2 |  |
| Maryland | 8 |  |
| Massachusetts | 10 | $-1$ |
| Michigan | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 8 |  |
| Mississippi | 5 |  |
| Missouri | 9 |  |
| Montana | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 3 |  |
| Nevada | 2 |  |
| New Hampshire | 2 |  |
| New Jersey | 13 | -1 |
| New Mexico | 3 |  |
| New York | 31 | -3 |
| North Carolina | 12 | +1 |
| North Dakota | 1 |  |
| Ohio | 19 | -2 |
| Oklahoma | 6 |  |
| Oregon | 5 |  |
| Pennsylvania | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Island | 2 |  |
| South Carolina | 6 |  |
| South Dakota | 1 |  |
| Tennessee | 9 |  |
| Texas | 30 | +3 |
| Utah | 3 |  |
| Vermont | 1 |  |
| Virginia | 11 | +1 |
| Washington | 9 | +1 |
| West Virginia | 3 | -1 |
| Wiscons in | 9 |  |
| Wyoming | 1 |  |

Difference
from 1980 Census Populations
$+1$
+7
$+4$
-2
-1
$-1$
$-1$
-2
$-1$
$-1$
-3
-2
-2
$+1$
-1

Wiscons in

# 1990 Census MATERIALS FROM THE CENSUS BUREAU'S WEBSITE ON APPORTIONMENT 

http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment.html

## U.S. CENSUS BUREAU wWw.census.gov

## U.S. Census Bureau

## - Apportionment Data

Apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives (Source of items 1 through 4: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, "Population and Housing Unit Counts," CPH-2-1.)

The letters PDF or symbol indicate a document is in the Portable Document Format (PDF). To view file you will need the $\operatorname{Adobe}(R)$ Acrobat $(R)$ Reader which is available for free from the Adobe web site.

1. A brief summary of the apportionment population, number of representatives, and the method of apportionment used throughout the history of the census.


Tables

1. Apportionment and Apportionment Population Based on the 1990 Census (Data are shown for the United States and States. Table A in CPH-2-1.)

2. Population Base for Apportionment and the Number of Representatives Apportioned: 1790-1990 (Data are shown for the United States. Table B in CPH-2-1.)

3. Apportionment of Membership of the House of Representatives: 1789-1990 (Data are shown for the United States, Regions, Divisions, and States. Table 3 in

CPH-2-1.)

2. Computing Apportionment
3. Census 2000 and the Congressional Apportionment
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# APPORTIONMENT OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 

## INTRODUCTION

The primary reason for the establishment of the decennial census of population is set forth in Article 1, Section 2, of the Constitution. The Constitution provides for an enumeration of the population to serve as the basis for the apportionment of members of the U.S. House of Representatives among the States, with the provision that each State must have at least one Representative. An apportionment has been made on the basis of each census from 1790 to 1990, except following the census of 1920.

Calculation of a Congressional apportionment requires three factors-the apportionment population of each State, the number of Representatives to be allocated among the States, and a method to use for the calculation.

## APPORTIONMENT POPULATION

The apportionment population base always has included those persons who have established a residence in the United States. The first Census Act of 1790 established the concept of "usual residence" which has been applied in that and each subsequent census. (See appendix D for further discussion on "Enumeration and Residence Rules" for the 1990 census). Prior to 1870 , the population base included the total free population of the States, three-fifths of the number of slaves, and excluded American Indians not taxed.

The 14th Amendment, ratified in 1868, removed the fractional count of the number of slaves from the procedure. In 1940, it was determined that there were no longer any American Indians who should be classed as "not taxed" (39 Op. Att'y. Gen. 518 (1940)).

In 1970 and 1990, certain segments of the overseas population (U.S. Armed Forces personnel, civilian U.S. Federal employees, and dependents of both groups) were allocated to their home States and included in the populations of those States for apportionment purposes only. These segments of the overseas population were not distributed to the political subdivisions of the States, nor included in other 1970 or 1990 census data products.

The 1990 apportionment population counts by State are presented in table $A$ of this text. These counts were transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce to the President on December 26, 1990, and from the President to the Congress on January 3, 1991. The population base for the apportionment of each census is shown in table B of this text. Laws related to the census are codified in the United States Code, Title 13.

## NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Constitution set the number of Representatives at 65 from 1787 until the first enumeration in 1790 . The first apportionment, based on the 1790 census, resulted in 105 members. From 1800 through 1840, the number of Representatives was determined by the ratio of the number of persons each was to represent ("fixed ratio"), although the way to handle fractional remainders changed. Therefore, the number of Representatives changed with that ratio, as well as with population growth and the admission of new States.

For the 1850 census and later apportionments, the number of seats was determined prior to the final apportionment ("fixed house size"); and thus, the ratio of persons each was to represent was the result of the calculations. In 1911, the House size was fixed at 433 with provision for the addition of one seat each for Arizona and New Mexico when they became States (U.S. Statutes at Large, 37 Stat 13, 14 (1911). The House size, 435 members, has been unchanged since, except for a temporary increase to 437 at the time of admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States. The representation by State resulting from each apportionment is shown in table 3.

## METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT

It is impossible to attain absolute mathematical equality in terms of the number of persons per Representative, or in the share each person has in a Representative, when seats are to be apportioned among States of varying population size and when there must be an whole number of Representatives per State. Proportional voting (fractional seats) has never been attempted in the U.S. House of Representatives. Laws concerning the method of apportionment are codified in the United States Code, Title 2.

Since the first apportionment following the 1790 census, there have been five basic methods used to apportion the House of Representatives.

1790 to 1830 -The "Jefferson method" of greatest divisors (fixed ratio with rejected fractional remainders). Under this method, a ratio of persons to Representatives was selected; the population of each State was divided by that number of persons. The resulting whole number of the quotient was the number of Representatives each State received. Fractional remainders were not considered, no matter how large. Thus a State with a quotient of 3.99 received three

Representatives, the same number as a State with a quotient of 3.01. The size of the House of Representatives was not predetermined, but resulted from the calculation.

1840-The "Webster method" of major fractions (fixed ratio with retained major fractional remainders). This method was applied in the same way as the Jefferson method, except if a fractional remainder were greater than one-half; another seat would be assigned. Thus a State with a quotient of 3.51 received four Representatives, while a State with a quotient of 3.49 received three. In this method also, the size of the House of Representatives was not predetermined but resulted from the calculation.

1850-1900-The "Vinton" or "Hamilton" method established a predetermined number of Representatives for each apportionment, and divided the population of each State by a ratio determined by dividing the apportionment population of the United States by the total number of Representatives. The resulting whole number was assigned to each State, with an additional seat assigned, one at a time, to the States with the largest fractional remainders, up to the predetermined size of the House of Representatives. This method was subject to the "Alabama paradox," in which a State could receive fewer representatives if the size of the House of Representatives was increased.

1910, 1930-The method of major fractions assigned seats similarly to the Webster method of 1840 by rounding fractional remainders using the arithmetic mean. The ratio was selected so that the result would be the predetermined size of the House of Representatives. In 1910, the House size was fixed at 433 with provision for the addition of one seat each for Arizona and New Mexico when they became States.

1940-1990-The "Hill" method of equal proportions assigns seats similarly to the Jefferson and Webster method, except it rounds fractional remainders of the quotient of the State population divided by the ratio differently. With this method an additional seat is assigned if the fraction exceeds the difference obtained by subtracting the integer part of the quotient from the geometric mean of this integer and the next consecutive integer. For example, a State with a quotient of 3.48 receives four Representatives, while a State with a quotient of 3.45 receives three Representatives, since $.48>\sqrt{3 \times 4}-3>.45$. The size of the House of Representatives remained fixed at 435 (except when Alaska and Hawaii became States, there was a temporary addition of one seat for each until the apportionment following the 1960 census).

Following the 1990 census, two lawsuits concerning apportionment issues were filed in Federal Courts. The U.S. Supreme Court held that the method of equal proportions was constitutional; that the Congress had properly exercised its apportionment authority; and that the inclusion of U.S. Federal military and civilian personnel, and their dependents, in the apportionment populations of the States was constitutional. These cases were United States Department of Commerce v. Montana 112 S.Ct. 1415 (1992) and Franklin v. Massachusetts 112 S.Ct. 2767 (1992).

Additional information about apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives may be obtained from the Chief, Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233-3400.

Table A. Apportionment and Apportionment Population Based on the 1990 Census

| States | Size of State delegation | Apportionment population | Resident population | United States population abroad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 435 | '249,022,783 | 248,709,873 | 922,819 |
| Alabama | 7 | 4,062,608 | 4,040,587 | 22,021 |
| Alaska | 1 | 551,947 | 550,043 | 1,904 |
| Arizona | 6 | 3,677,985 | 3,665,228 | 12,757 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 2,362,239 | 2,350,725 | 11,514 |
| California | 52 | 29,839,250 | 29,760,021 | 79,229 |
| Colorado | 6 | 3,307,912 | 3,294,394 | 13,518 |
| Connecticut | 6 | 3,295,669 | 3,287,116 | 8,553 |
| Delaware | 1 | 668,696 | 666,168 | 2,528 |
| District of Columbia | $\ldots$ | ... | 606,900 | 3,009 |
| Florida | 23 | 13,003,362 | 12,937,926 | 65,436 |
| Georgia | 11 | 6,508,419 | 6,478,216 | 30,203 |
| Hawaii | 2 | 1,15,274 | 1,108,229 | 7,045 |
| Idaho. | 2 | 1,011,986 | 1,006,749 | 5,237 |
| llinois | 20 | 11,466,682 | 11,430,602 | 36,080 |
| Indiana | 10 | 5,564,228 | 5,544,159 | 20,069 |
| lowa | 5 | 2,787,424 | 2,776,755 | 10,669 |
| Kansas | 4 | 2,485,600 | 2,477,574 | 8,026 |
| Kentucky | 6 | 3,698,969 | 3,685,296 | 13,673 |
| Louisiana | 7 | 4,238,216 | 4,219,973 | 18,243 |
| Maine | 2 | 1,233,223 | 1,227,928 | 5,295 |
| Maryland | 8 | 4,798,622 | 4,781,468 | 17,154 |
| Massachusetts | 10 | 6,029,051 | 6,016,425 | 12,626 |
| Michigan | 16 | 9,328,784 | 9,295,297 | 33,487 |
| Minnesota | 8 | 4,387,029 | 4,375,099 | 11,930 |
| Mississippi | 5 | 2,586,443 | 2,573,216 | 13,227 |
| Missouri | 9 | 5,137,804 | 5,117,073 | 20,731 |
| Montana | 1 | 803,655 | 799,065 | 4,590 |
| Nebraska | 3 | 1,584,617 | 1,578,385 | 6,232 |
| Nevada | 2 | 1,206,152 | 1,201,833 | 4,319 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 1,113,915 | 1,109,252 | 4,663 |
| New Jersey | 13 | 7,748,634 | 7,730,188 | 18,446 |
| New Mexico | 3 | 1,521,779 | 1,515,069 | 6,710 |
| New York | 31 | 18,044,505 | 17,990,455 | 54,050 |
| North Carolina | 12 | 6,657,630 | 6,628,637 | 28,993 |
| North Dakota | 1 | 641,364 | 638,800 | 2,564 |
| Ohio | 19 | 10,887,325 | 10,847,115 | 40,210 |
| Oklahoma | 6 | 3,157,604 | 3,145,585 | 12,019 |
| Oregon | 5 | 2,853,733 | 2,842,321 | 11,412 |
| Pennsylvania | 21 | 11,924,710 | 11,881,643 | 43,067 |
| Rhode island | 2 | 1,005,984 | 1,003,464 | 2,520 |
| South Carolina | 6 | 3,505,707 | 3,486,703 | 19,004 |
| South Dakota | 1 | 699,999 | 696,004 | 3,995 |
| Tennessee | 9 | 4,896,641 | 4,877,185 | 19,456 |
| Texas | 30 | 17,059,805 | 16,986,510 | 73,295 |
| Utah | 3 | 1,727,784 | 1,722,850 | 4,934 |
| Vermont | 1 | 564,964 | 562,758 | 2,206 |
| Virginia | 11 | 6,216,568 | 6,187,358 | 29,210 |
| Washington | 9 | 4,887,941 | 4,866,692 | 21,249 |
| West Virginia | 3 | 1,801,625 | 1,793,477 | 8,148 |
| Wisconsin | 9 | 4,906,745 | 4,891,769 | 14,976 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 455,975 | 453,588 | 2,387 |

${ }^{1}$ The apportionment population does not include the resident or the overseas population for the District of Columbia.

Table B. Population Base for Apportionment and the Number of Representatives Apportioned: 1790 to 1990

${ }^{1}$ Excludes the population of District of Columbia; the population of the territories; prior to 1940, the number of American Indians not taxed; and, prior to 1870, two-fifths of the slave population. In 1990 and 1970, includes selected segments of Americans abroad.
${ }^{2}$ This figure is the actual number of Representatives apportioned at the beginning of each decade.
${ }^{3}$ Ratio of resident population to Representative in 1990 is 570,352 .
${ }^{4}$ Ratio of resident population to Representative in 1970 is 465,468 .
${ }^{5}$ No apportionment was made on the basis of the 1920 census.
${ }^{6}$ Amended by act of May 30, 1872.
${ }^{7}$ Amended by act of March 4, 1862.
${ }^{8}$ Amended by act of July 30, 1852.
${ }^{9}$ The minimum ratio of population to Representative, as stated in Article 1, Section 2 of the United States Constitution.

Table 3. Apportionment of Membership of the House of Representatives: 1789 to 1990
 definitions of terns and meanings of symbols, see text]


Table 3. Apportionment of Membership of the House of Representatives: 1789 to 1990 -Con.
 definitions of terms and meanings of symbols, see text]


## U.S. Census Bureau

## COMPUTING APPORTIONMENT

Article 1, Section 2, of the United States Constitution states:
"Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers...The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct."

Therein lies the primary mandate of the U.S. census, apportionment of the House of Representatives. Since that first census in 1790, five methods of apportionment have been used. The current method used, the Method of Equal Proportions, was adopted in 1941 following the census of 1940. This method assigns seats in the House of Representatives according to a "priority" value. The priority value is determined by multiplying the population of a State by a "multiplier." For example, following the 1990 census, each of the 50 states was given one seat out of the current total of 435 . The next, or 51 st seat, went to the State with the highest priority value and thus became that State's second seat. This continued until all 435 seats had been assigned to a state. This is how it is done.

## Equal Proportions Method

P-represents a State's total population
n - represents the number of seats a State would have if it gained a seat (because all states automatically received one seat the next seat gained is "seat two," and the next "seat three," and the next "seat four," and so on.)

The multiplier equals (1 divided by (the square root of $n(n-1)$ ) [which is called the reciprocal of the geometric mean]. Computing these values is quite easy using a PC and a good spreadsheet package.

```
Thus the formula for calculating the multiplier for the second
seat is:
    (1 divided by the square root of 2(2-1))
                            or
    1/1.414213562 or 0.70710678
the multiplier for the third seat is:
    (1 divided by the square root of 3(3-1))
                            or
    1/2.449489743 or 0.40824829
the multiplier for the fourth seat is:
    (1 divided by the square root of 4(4-1))
    1/3.464101615 or 0.288675134
```

```
Continue until an appropriate number of multipliers
have been calculated.
```

Once the "multipliers" have been calculated, the next step is to multiply this figure by the population total for each of the 50 States (the District of Columbia is not included in these calculations). The resulting numbers are the priority values. Make sure you compute enough multipliers to cover the largest amount of seats in the House of Representative that any one state stands to gain. Multipliers and priority values must be calculated for the largest number of seats assigned to a state. For example, if the largest number of seats assigned to a state is 50 , multipliers and priority values must be calculated for the 50 th seat. If you are using a PC, compute multipliers for seats 2 through 60 . This will assure you have enough multipliers for apportionment.

Once you've calculated priority values for each State for the total anticipated seats, the next step is to rank and number the resulting priority values starting with seat 51 until all 435 seats have been assigned (remember, each State automatically received one seat). Next, tally the number of seats for each state to arrive at the total number of seats in the House of Representative apportioned to each state.

- For your ease of use, below are multipliers for seats 2 through 60

Apportionment: Table of Multipliers using the Method of Equal Proportions


| 31 | 0.0327912918 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32 | 0.0317500318 |
| 33 | 0.0307728727 |
| 34 | 0.0298540717 |
| 35 | 0.0289885518 |
| 36 | 0.0281718085 |
| 37 | 0.0273998312 |
| 38 | 0.0266690374 |
| 39 | 0.0259762167 |
| 40 | 0.0253184842 |
| 41 | 0.0246932399 |
| 42 | 0.0240981346 |
| 43 | 0.0235310403 |
| 44 | 0.0229900245 |
| 45 | 0.0224733287 |
| 46 | 0.0219793491 |
| 47 | 0.0215066197 |
| 48 | 0.0210537980 |
| 49 | 0.0206196525 |
| 50 | 0.0202030509 |
| 51 | 0.0198029509 |
| 52 | 0.0194183909 |
| 53 | 0.0190484829 |
| 54 | 0.0186924051 |
| 55 | 0.0183493961 |
| 56 | 0.0180187493 |
| 57 | 0.0176998081 |
| 58 | 0.0173919619 |
| 59 | 0.0170946415 |
| 60 | 0.0168073161 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division Maintained By: Laura K. Yax (Population Division)

Last Revised: March 23, 1999 at 08:25:10 AM
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December 27, 1990
1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS
DPLD TO DIR MEMORANDUM NO. 90-152
MEMORANDUM FOR Charles D. Jones $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Associate Director for } \\ \text { Decennial Census }\end{array}\right)^{0}$
From:
Susan M. Miskurad Chief, Decennial Planning Division

Subject:
1990 Apportionment Logistics--For the Record

I am providing these notes for historical purposes. They summarize the events of December 26, 1990, the day the apportionment data based on the 1990 decennial census were delivered to the White House. This documentation is based solely on my point of view in two roles: one, as Chief of the Decennial Planning Division which independently verified the apportionment calculations and provided the Director, Barbara Everitt Bryant, with the official transmittal including the apportionment table; and under the circumstance of Acting for you in which role $I$ accompanied Dr. Bryant to the Department of Commerce for the delivery of the data and was present at the press conference.

Decennial census staff had begun to prepare for the delivery of the counts early in the year. This included drafting and clearing the transmittal package, designing the table to be attached, and defining responsibilities for calculating and verifying the apportionment tables, including counts of overseas military persons, Federal civilian employees, and their dependents. The details of this preparation are well documented elsewhere.

While we had been scheduled to calculate and deliver the data on December 27 (see the Executive State of the Census report for the previous week), the data had become available on December 24, and it was decided early in the morning of December 26 to proceed with the delivery. The Decennial Planning Division delivered the overseas counts to the Population Division and both divisions proceeded to calculate the apportionment. Several persons (Jim Dinwiddie, Pat Berman, John Thompson, Paula Schneider, and I) compiled a short of set of questions and answers based on your suggestions earlier that morning. We had been requested to provide the transmittal to Dr. Bryant by 1 p.m. but were several minutes late in doing so. There were several reasons for this: a change that day in the letter from Secretary Mosbacher to the President; the introduction of a need to provide supplementary tables with historical data on state counts; and other unanticipated requests.

Media, Congressional, and other contacts were independently prepared and implemented mostly at the Department of Commerce.

Approximately at 1:10, my staff and I delivered the transmittal to Dr. Bryant. After signing and/or reviewing the transmittal and related materials, Dr. Bryant and I proceeded to Dr. Darby's office; from there Dr. Bryant, Dr. Darby, and I (acting for you) provided the package to the General Counsel's office. There occurred further review of the materials and compilation of the package to be delivered by the General Counsel to the White House. The delivery was accomplished by approximately 2:40 p.m.

The press conference was very well attended. A background package, and subsequently the release itself, were distributed prior to a question-and-answer period by Dr. Darby and Dr. Bryant at about 3:15. The press conference ended about 3:45.

I am attaching various materials referred to in this chronology. This memorandum should be kept in the Decennial Planning Division files for reference in planning analogous activities for the Year 2000 census. Planning for the next census should include compiling whatever documentation is available on how this has been done in previous censuses.

Attachments

```
cc: P. Schneider (POP)
    R. Speaker
    J. Thompson
    R. Bair
    P. Berman
    J. Dinwiddie
    A. Stephenson
    E. Wagner
    C. Landman
```



Public Information Office 301-763-4040

For Immediate Release
CB 90-232

1990 CENSUS POPULATION FOR THE UNITED STATES IS 249,632,692; REAPPORTIONMENT WILL SHIFT 19 SEATS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The population of the United States counted in the 1990 census is $249,632,692$, an increase of 10.21 percent since the 1980 census of 226,504,825.

The figures were transmitted to the President by Commerce Secretary Robert A. Mosbacher upon their receipt from Commerce Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Michael R. Darby and Census Director Barbara Everitt Bryant. Figures also were provided on final population counts for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The secretary also transmitted the official apportionment of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the 50 states. The apportionment population includes the population of the 50 states plus the overseas military and other overseas federal workers and dependents not in the United States on April 1, 1990. The population of the District of Columbia is not included in the apportionment population.

> (more)

Census Bureau press releases also are available on their release date through the Bureau's online information service, CENDATA ${ }^{\text {m }}$. For information, phone (301) 763-2074.

1990 population and number of represemtatives, gy state
MOTE: The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Comerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later then Jyly 15, 1991.

TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692
STATE $\quad$ APPORTIONMENT

| MUNBER OF | CHANGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- |
| REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
| BASED ON THE | APPORTIONMENT |
| 1990 CENSUS |  |



1 Total population includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decemial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.
Apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives-
1990 Census of Population


# FACt SHEET <br> Census Fact Sheet 

- The total population of the United States counted in the 1990 census is 249,632,692.
- The resident population of the United States (excluding federal military and civilian employees and dependents overseas) counted in the 1990 census is $248,709,873$, an increase of 9.8 percent from the 1980 resident population of $226,545,805$.
- The Census Bureau last winter had projected a resident population of $250,172,000$ based on the 1980 census, recorded deaths and births, and estimates of net legal and illegal immigration.
- The new apportionment of the House of Representatives is in accord with previously published expectations.
- The average size of a congressional district will be 572,466 people.
o We believe that the 1990 census has been a very full, fair, and accurate process, characterized by transparency and openness. As a result, although the total population counted is somewhat higher than a number of observers had expected, the population shares among the states were in accord with expectations.
o Questions on possible adjustments for undercount or overcount should be referred to Under Secretary Michael Darby or Deputy Under Secretary Mark Plant.

| TO: $\square$ Secretary $\quad \square$ Deputy Secretary $\quad \square$ Counsellor | Control No: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Data: December 26, 1990

Through:

From:

Prepared by:
C. Jones/Census/US EA/763-5180

Barbara Everitt Bryant Director, Bureau of the Census
Michael R. Darby Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Michael R. Soul Transmittal of 1990 Apportionment Population Counts and the Apportionment from the Secretary of Commerce to the President The President

By December 31, 1990 you must transmit to the President a statement showing the apportionment population for each state as of April 1, 1990, in accordance with provisions of Title 13, United States Code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$ and Title 2, United States Code, Sections. ia and ib.

The attached statement provides the 1990 census apportionment population for each of the fifty states. Your statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2 a and 2 b .

In accordance with the Stipulation and Order in The City of New York, et al. v. United States Department of Commerce. et al. (lawsuit seeking statistical adjustment of 1990 census), the transmittal letter and apportionment figures include a statement that the population counts are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. Under the stipulation and Order, you are to consider the question of adjustment in accordance with guidelines published by the Department. If you make a decision to adjust the 1990 census, the Census Bureau will publish corrected 1990 decennial census population data not later than July 15, 1991. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

Attachment

|  <br> ORGANIZATION <br> (Please type) | PREPARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY | CLEARED BY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dir./Census |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ch.C./EA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  <br> DATE | BEG <br> $12 / 26 / 90$ |  |  |  |  |

```
The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. }2050
```

Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section $141(\mathrm{~b})$, I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2 a and 2 b . Under Section 2 a , you are to send this information to the 102 nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population and number of representatives to which each state is entitled may be subject to change. Pursuant to a Stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or State redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Bureau will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Mosbacher
Enclosure

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990
MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary

THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator


Barbara Everitt Bryant Banboua Eusrill Bryant
Director, Bureau of the Census
1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section 141 (b), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections ia and Lb.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

```
United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
```

1990 POPULATION AND MUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE
NOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and wilt publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.
tOtal population ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692

| STATE | APPORTIONMENT <br> POPULATION |
| :--- | :--- |


| MUABER OF | CHANGE FROM |
| :--- | :--- |
| REPRESENTATIVES | 1980 |
| BASED ON THE | APPORTIONMENT |
| 1990 CENSUS |  |


| UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,783 | 435 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Al abame | 4,062,608 | 7 | - |
| Alaske | 551,947 | 1 | - |
| Arizono | 3,677,985 | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,362,239 | 4 | - |
| California | 29,839,250 | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 | 6 | - |
| Connecticut | 3,295,669 | 6 | - |
| Delaware | 668,696 | 1 | - |
| Florida | 13,003,362 | 23 | +4 |
| Georgia | 6,508,419 | 11 | +1 |
| Hawaii | 1,115,274 | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 | 2 | - |
| $1 l l i n o i s$ | 11,466,682 | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,564,228 | 10 | - |
| lowa | 2,787,424 | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 2,485,600 | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiena | 4,238,216 | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 | 2 | - |
| Maryland | 4,798,622 | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 4,387,029 | 8 | - |
| Mississippl | 2,586,443 | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 | 9 | - |
| Montana | 803,655 | 1 | -1 |
| Mebraska | 1,584,617 | 3 | - |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 | 2 | - |
| New Hempshire | 1,113,915 | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 7,748,634 | 13 | -1 |
| Mew Mexico | 1,521,779 | 3 | - |
| New York | 18,044,505 | 31 | -3 |
| North Carolina | 6,657,630 | 12 | +1 |
| North Dakota | 641,364 | 1 | - |
| Onio | 10,887,325 | 19 | -2 |
| Okl thoma | 3,157,604 | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 | 5 | - |
| Pennsylvania | 11,924,710 | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Istand | 1,005,984 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699,999 | 1 | - |
| Tennessee | 4,896,641 | 9 | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 | 30 | +3 |
| Utah | 1.727,74 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,964 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 | 11 | +1 |
| Weshington | 4,887,941 | 9 | +1 |
| West Virginie | 1,801,625 | 3 | -1 |
| Wisconsin | 4,906,745 | 9 | - |
| Wyomine | 455,975 | 1 | - |

1 Total population includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21 st decennial census under Title 13. United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.

## Package pruned to whats the (e)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990


The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear Mr. President:
In accordance with Title 13, United States Code, Section 141(b), I am transmitting a statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, tabulated from the 1990 Decennial Census. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, using the existing size of the House of Representatives and the Method of Equal Proportions, as required by Title 2, United States Code, Sections ia and ib. Under Section ia, you are to send this information to the 102nd Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

As noted on the enclosed statement, the apportionment population may be subject to change. Pursuant to a stipulation and Order agreed to in litigation, I will consider the question of whether to adjust statistically the results of the 1990 Decennial Census to account for possible overcounts or undercounts of the population. My decision will be made in accordance with guidelines developed by the Department of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on March 15, 1990. It cannot be determined at this time, what effect, if any, a statistical adjustment will have on the apportionment or state redistricting.

If I decide that decennial census results should be adjusted statistically, the Census Burealu-wil publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.


Robert A. Mosbacher
Enclosure

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economice and Statistics Administration Washington, D.C. 20230

December 26, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Secretary

THROUGH:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Michael R. Darby Under Secretary and Administrator Director, Bureau of the Census

1990 Apportionment Population Counts

In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section 141 (b), I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1990, as ascertained by the Twenty-first Decennial Census of the United States. The statement also shows the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled using the apportionment population. The Census Bureau prepared these calculations using the existing size of the House of Representatives ( 435 Members) and the Method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, United States Code, Sections 2a and 2b.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census

## 1990 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE

WOTE:The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692

| state | APPORTIONMENT POPULATION |  | MUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES BASED ON THE 1990 CENSUS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHANGE FRON } \\ & 1980 \\ & \text { APPORTIONMENT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UNITED STATES TOTAL ${ }^{2}$ | 249,022,783 |  | 435 |  |
| Al abema | 4,062,608 |  | 7 | - |
| Alaska | 551,947 |  | 1 | - |
| Arizone | 3,677,985 |  | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,362,239 |  | 4 | - |
| California | 29,839,250 |  | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307,912 | 13 | 6 | - |
| Connecticut | 3,295,669 |  | 6 | - |
| Delamare | 668,696 |  | 1 | - |
| Florida | 13,003,362 |  | 23 | $+4$ |
| Georgia | 6,508,419 |  | 11 | +1 |
| Hawail | 1,115,274 |  | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 |  | 2 | - |
| Illinois | 11,466,682 |  | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,564,228 |  | 10 | - |
| Iowa | 2,787,424 |  | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 2,485,600 |  | 4:- | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 |  | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 |  | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 |  | 2 | - |
| Maryland | 4,798,622 |  | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 |  | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 |  | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesota | 4,387,029 |  | 8 | - |
| Mississippi | 2,586,443 |  | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 |  | 9 | - |
| Montana | 803,655 |  | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 |  | 3 | - |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 |  | 2 | - |
| New Hampshire | 1,113,915 |  | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 7,748,634 |  | 13 | -1 |
| New Mexico | 1,521,779 |  | 3 |  |
| New York | 18,044,505 |  | 31 | -3 |
| North Carolina | 6,657,630 |  | 12 | +1 |
| North Dakota | 641,364 |  | 1 | - |
| Ohio | 10,887,325 |  | 19 | -2 |
| Oklahoma | 3,157,604 |  | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,853,733 |  | 5 | - |
| Pernsylvania | 11.924.710 |  | 21 | -2 |
| Rhode Istand | 1,005,984 |  | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 |  | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699.999 |  | 1 | - . |
| Tennessee | 4,896,641 |  | 9 | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 |  | 30 | +3 |
| Utah | 1,727,784 |  | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,964 |  | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 |  | 11 | +1 |
| Washington | 4,887,941 |  | 9 | +1 |
| West Virginia | 1,801,625 |  | 3 | -1 |
| Hisconsin | 4,906,745 |  | 9 | - |
| Wyoming | 455,975 |  | 1 | - $L^{\circ}$ |

1 Total population includes emmerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decemial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.

President of the Senate

Speaker of the House
Transmittal From President to Congress
Pursuant to Title 2, United States Code, Section 2a. (a), I am transmitting the statement showing the apportionment population for each State as of April 1, 1990, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled.

The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than July 15, 1991.

## Codification

R.s. 19 derfved from act July 25, 1868, ch. 245. 3 . 19tats $2440^{\circ}$
$+$
820 mitted

## Codrpication

Section, ect Aus. 8. 1911, ch. 5, 58 1. 2. 37 Stat. 13. 14. fixed the composition of the Elouse of Representatives at 435 Members, to be apportioned to the States therein enumerated. For provisions dealing with reapportionment of Representatives and manner of election. etc., see sections 2a and 26 of this titie.


Toy ruch state shall be entitled, in the Eighty-third Congress and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under this section or subsequent statute, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement required by subsection (a) of this section, no State to receive less than one Member. It shall be the duty of the Clert of the House of Representatives, within fifteen calendar days after the receipt of such statement, to send to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under this section. In case of a vacancy in the office of Clerk, or of his absence or inabllity to discharge this duty. then such duty shall devolve upon the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; and in case of vacancies in the offices of both the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms, or the absence or inability of both to act, such duty shail devolve upon the Doorteeper of the House of Representatives.
(c) Until a State is redistricted in the manner provided by the law thereof after any apportionment, the Representatives to which such State is entitled under such apportionment shall be elected in the following manner: (1) If there is no change in the number of Representatives, they shall be elected from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State. and if any of them are elected from the State at large they shall continue to be so elected; (2) If there is an increase in the number of Representatives, such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected from the State at large and the other Representatives from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State; (3) if there is a decrease in the number of Representatives but the number of districts in such State is equal to such decreased number of

Representatives, they shall be elected from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State; (4) if there is a decrease in the number of Representatives but the number of districts in such State is less than such number of Representatives, the number of Representatives by which such number of districts is exceeded shall be elected from the State at large and the other Representatives from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State; or (5) if there is a decrease in the number of Representatives and the number of districts in such State exceeds such decreased number of Representatives, they shall be elected from the State at larse.
(June 18, 1929. ch. 28, 22. 46 Stat. 26; Apr. 25. 1940 , ch. 152. 85 1. 2. 54 Stat. 162; Nov. 15, 1941. ch. $470,81,55$ Stat. 761.$)$

## Amerbments

1941-Act Nov. 15, 1941. provided for reapportionment based upon the seventeenth and subsequent decennial censuses.
1940-Act Apr. 25, 1940, provided for reapportionment based upon the sixteenth decennial census.

Constitutional Provisions
Apportionment of Representatives among the several States, see Const. Art. 1. 12, cl. 3, and Amend. XIV. 12.

## Temporary Increass in Membershit

Representation of States of Alaska and Hawaii in the House of Representatives as not affecting the basis of apportionment established by this section. see section 9 of Pub. L. 85-508, July 7. 1958. 72 Stat. 338. set out as a note preceding section 21 of Title 48. Territories and Insular Possessions, and section 8 of Pub. L. 86-3, Mar. 18. 1959, 73 Stat. 4. set out as a note preceding section 491 of Title 48.

## Section Reverred to im Other Sections

This section is referred to in sections $2 b$. $2 c$ of this title.

5 2b. Number of Representatives from each State in 78th and subsequent Congresses

Each State shall be entitled, in the Seventyeighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or section $2 a$ of this title. to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member.
(Nov. 15, 1941, ch. 470.5 2(a). 55 Stat. 762.)

## Certificates to Exbcutives of States

Section $2(b)$ of act Nov. 15, 1941, which required the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 days of Nov. 15, 1941, to send a new certificate of the entitlement of a State to Representatives. if such a certificate had been sent prior to Nov. 15. 1941, under the provisions of section $2 a$ of this titie, was omitted.

8 2c. Number of Congreasional Districta; number of Representatives from esch District
In each Stste entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an ap-

Two activities will tell us about the coverage of the 1990 census. Both of these will be done in 1991 to serve as input into the secretary's decision whether or not to adjust the actual enumeration to improve accuracy. The deadline for this decision is July 15.

First, demographic analysis. Demographic analysis is not complete. It is being refined using records still to come from 1990 Medicare, 1990 estimates being made of undocumented aliens and research to correct prior demographic analyses going back as far as 1940. The preliminary demographic analysis estimate of 253 million is preliminary, not a solid number. Along with refining the estimate, we will complete the development of error intervals to assess the accuracy of the 1990 demographic estimates of net coverage for race, sex, and age groups. Formal release of estimates of coverage for 1990 will include error ranges for the estimates.

Second, analyses of the post-enumeration survey. The Census Bureau is conducting a post-enumeration survey of about 150,000 households to be analyzed by 116 post-stratum groups based on census division geography, place type, race, Hispanic origin and tenure (renter/owner). A number of analyses will determine how good the post-enumeration survey is as a tool for adjustment to improve accuracy of the census.
(1) Dupaud by $D_{n}$. Bryant with menvichanges
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QUESTION
What is the undercount?

ANSWER
We don't know yet. Work continues on programs to evaluate the accuracy of these counts.

BACKGROUND

1. We have produced (and released) an estimate of the totai resident population based on demographic analysis. The point estimate is 253.4 million persons, with a small range around that (and using various detailed assumptions that can be explained by POP). The comparable resident population figure from the census, including the District of Columbia, but excluding the overseas counts, is 248.7. This yields a national undercount estimate of 1.85\%.
2. The comparable estimate of the national undercount for 1980 is $1.4 \%$.
3. Our planning number of 250 million was just that: a planning number. It was derived using 1980 counts and estimates of births, deaths, immigration, emigration, and so on.
4. By April, based on demographic analyses, we will have national estimates of coverage rates by Race, Age, and Sex.
5. By July 15, the Secretary of Commerce will make a decision on adjustment, and we will have state and other sub-national estimates (using PES and demographic analyses) of coverage rates by Race, Age, Sex, and Origin.
2) Prepaned ly f Demuddic based a deccussuonswich Thompson, Ineskema

Would the apportionment be different if the overseas counts were excluded?

## ANSWER

Any different set of numbers might produce a different apportionment. But, the official and therefore only apportionment does include the overseas counts.

BACKGROUND
The apportionment would be different if we excluded the overseas counts. DPLD understands you have this display.

QUESTION
What lawsuits have been filed over these results? Can you comment on the validity of those suits?

## ANSWER

Several lawsuits have been filed. As a party to those lawsuits, I cannot comment on their substance or validity. For details, please contact the Department of Justice.

Question: When will race and Hispanic origin data be available?

Answer: January through March on a state-by-state basis

Background: From late January through March, we will be releasing on a state-by-state basis as mandated by Public Law 94-171, the Redistricting Program, the following data--

1. Total Population
2. Counts of the Population by Race
-White
-Black
-Asian and Pacific Islander
-American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut -Other
3. Total Hispanic Origin
4. Cross tabulation of data for persons not of Hispanic origin by race
5. Items 1-4 will be tabulated for all persons and persons 18 years old and over

Data will be shown for the following geographic areas for all states and the District of Columbia-

1. State
2. County
3. Place
4. Minor civil division/census county division
5. Tracts/Blocks
6. Block Groups
7. Blocks

## QUESTION

Your overseas counts totaled fewer than 1 million persons. Why is this figure considerably lower than the pre-census estimates?

## ANSWER

Preliminary estimates of the overseas population were drawn in mid-1989 from the personnel records of Federal agencies. These estimates differed from the final counts primarily because they did not coincide with the scope of the census.

The overseas estimates included about 180,000 U. S. Navy personnel aboard ships that were berthed at home ports on census Day; these personnel were counted in the census. Similarly, the estimates included Federally employed residents of the U. S. commonwealths and territories and Panamanian citizens working for the Panama Canal Commission.

## BACKGROUND

> Preliminary estimates of 1.2 to 1.6 million overseas personnel for the Defense Department were cited in a commerce Department press release dated August 1,1989 , at which time we were negotiating to assist DOD in conducting an overseas census. The census was cancelled for lack of funding, and we agreed to accept administrative-record data for use in the apportionment and expanded the scope to the whole Federal sector. The personnel records of Federal agencies have been deficient in several respects:
o Lacking standardization. Some agencies could not generate home-state data; some could not report on dependents; some (with relatively few personnel) conducted internal surveys to gather the counts; some provided partial counts; and one (Peace Corps) declined to participate while another (FEMA) allowed its personnel to decline. DOD was able to provide home-state data from administrative records for its military personnel, but not for its civilian component.

- Coverage deficiencies. To collect the required information for its civilian personnel, DOD conducted a survey during the autumn of 1990. The response rate to this survey was 20 percent, meaning that perhaps over 100,000 overseas personnel/dependents are missing from DOD's submission. We did not receive counts from the covert agencies or from similar components of the Armed Forces.

The DOD accounts for 98 percent of the reported overseas total, and 91 percent of the military personnel were assigned a home state on the basis of home of record, 8 percent on the basis of legal residence. The two largest non-DOD agencies-State Department and Panama Canal Commission--included dependents in their counts.

United States Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
1990 population and mumber of representatives, by state
NOTE: The population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The United States Department of Commerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, not later than Jyly 15, 1991.

TOTAL POPULATION ${ }^{1}$ 249,632,692

| State | - APPORTIONMENT PGPURATION | MUABER OF REPRESENTATIVES BASED OM THE 1990 CENSUS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHANGE FROM } \\ & \text { 1980 } \\ & \text { APPORTIONMENT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UnITED states rotal ${ }^{2}$ | 269,022,783 | 435 |  |
| Alabana | 4,062,608 | 7 | * |
| Alaska | 551.947 | 1 | - |
| Arizona | 3,677,985 | 6 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,362,239 | 6 |  |
| California | 29,859,250 | 52 | +7 |
| Colorado | 3,307.912 | 6 | - |
| Correcticut | 3,295,669 | 6 | - |
| Delamare | 668,696 | 1 | - |
| florida | 13,003,362 | 23 | $+4$ |
| Georgia | 6,500,619 | 11 | $+1$ |
| Hawaii | 1,115,274 | 2 | - |
| Idaho | 1,011,986 | 2 | - |
| lllinois | 11,466,682 | 20 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,564,228 | 10 | - |
| Iowa | 2,787,424 | 5 | -1 |
| Kansas | 2,485,600 | 4 | -1 |
| Kentucky | 3,698,969 | 6 | -1 |
| Louisiana | 4,238,216 | 7 | -1 |
| Maine | 1,233,223 | 2 | - |
| Maryland | 4,798,622 | 8 | - |
| Massachusetts | 6,029,051 | 10 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,328,784 | 16 | -2 |
| Minnesot: | 4,387,029 | 8 | - |
| Mississippi | 2,586,443 | 5 | - |
| Missouri | 5,137,804 | 9 | - |
| Montana | 803,655 | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 1,584,617 | 3 | - |
| Nevada | 1,206,152 | 2 | - |
| New Hampshire | 1,113,915 | 2 | - |
| New Jersey | 7.748,634 | 13 | -1 |
| New Hexico | 1,521.779 | 3 | - |
| New York | 18,044,505 | 31 | -3 |
| Morth Carolina | 6,657,630 | 12 | +1 |
| Morth Dakota | 661,366 | 1 | - |
| Ohio | 10,887,325 | 19 | -2 |
| Okl ahoma | 3,157,604 | 6 | - |
| Oregon | 2,053,753 | 5 | - |
| Pernsylvania | 11,926,710 | 21 | -2 |
| Rhoole Island | 1,005,904 | 2 | - |
| South Carolina | 3,505,707 | 6 | - |
| South Dakota | 699,999 | 1 | - |
| Temnessee | 4,896,641 | 9 - - | - |
| Texas | 17,059,805 | 30 | +3 |
| Ueh | 1,727,784 | 3 | - |
| Vermont | 564,966 | 1 | - |
| Virginia | 6,216,568 | 11 | +1 |
| Washington | 4,887,941 | 9 | +1 |
| West Virginia | 1,801,625 | 3 | -1 |
| Wisconsin | 4,906,745 | 9 | - |
| Wyoming | 455.975 | 1 | - |

1 Total population includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21 st decernial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the $\mathbf{5 0}$ States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

2 Total population, not including the District of Columbia.
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- The total population of the United States conf ed in the 1990 census is 249,632,692.
- The resident population of the United States (excluding federal military and civilian employees and dependents overseas) counted in the 1990 census is $248,709,873$, an increase of 9.8 percent from the 1980 resident population of $226,545,805$.
- The Census Bureau last winter had projected a resident population of $250,172,000$ based on the 1980 census, recorded deaths and births, and estimates of net legal and illegal immigration.
- The new apportionment of the House of Representatives is in accord with previously published expectations.
- The average size of a congressional district will be 572,466 people.
- We believe that the 1990 census has been a very full, fair, and accurate process, characterized by transparency and openness. As a result, although the total population counted is somewhat higher than a number of observers had expected, the population shares among the states were in accord with expectations.
- Questions on possible adjustments for undercount or overcount should be referred to Under Secretary Michael Darby or Deputy Under Secretary Mark Plant.


## QUESTION

Your overseas counts totaled fewer than 1 million persons. Why is this figure considerably lower than the pre-census estimates?

ANSWER
Preliminary estimates of the overseas population were drawn in mid-1989 from the personnel records of Federal agencies. These estimates differed from the final counts primarily because they did not coincide with the scope of the census.

The overseas estimates included about 180,000 U. S. Navy personnel aboard ships that were berthed at home ports on Census Day; these personnel were counted in the census. Similarly, the estimates included Federally employed residents of the U. S. commonwealths and territories and Panamanian citizens working for the Panama Canal Commission.

## BACKGROUND

Preliminary estimates of 1.2 to 1.6 million overseas personnel for the Defense Department were cited in a Commerce Department press release dated August 1, 1989, at which time we were negotiating to assist DOD in conducting an overseas census. The census was cancelled for lack of funding, and we agreed to accept administrative-record data for use in the apportionment and expanded the scope to the whole Federal sector. The personnel records of Federal agencies have been deficient in several respects:

- Lacking standardization. Some agencies could not generate home-state data; some could not report on dependents; some (with relatively few personnel) conducted internal surveys to gather the counts; some provided partial counts; and one (Peace Corps) declined to participate while another (FEMA) allowed its personnel to decline. DOD was able to provide home-state data from administrative records for its military personnel, but not for its civilian component.
o Coverage deficiencies. To collect the required information for its civilian personnel, DOD conducted a survey during the autumn of 1990. The response rate to this survey was 20 percent, meaning that perhaps over 100,000 overseas personnel/dependents are missing from DOD's submission. did not receive counts from the covert agencies or from similar components of the Armed Forces.

The DOD accounts for 98 percent of the reported overseas total, and 91 percent of the military personnel were assigned a home state on the basis of home of record, 8 percent on the basis of legal residence. The two largest non-DOD agencies--State Department and Panama Canal Commission--included dependents in their counts.


October 29, 1990
NOTE FOR Marie Pees
ATT: Janet Wysocki
From: Bob Speaker
Subject: Apportionment Program
I would like to have available no later than December 6 a program for computing Congressional apportionment on the DEC system. The program should have the following features:

1. The program should allow the entry of a 60 character name associated with the specific apportionment population (for example, "1990 Census Apportionment, "R"Apportionment Based on 1978 Population Estimates, (p-26, No. $478^{\prime \prime}$ ).
2. The program should accept as input a U.S. pboulation (the 50 states, excluding the Distict of Columbia), the FIPS code for each state and the population for each state. The program should verify the state code entered against an internal list of FIPS state codes and sum the state populations and verify that sum against the U.S. population entered. There should be a default value of 50 states and their FIPS codes. The program should allow for a variable number of states by entry of the number of states and the the FIPS code of the additional state at the beginning of the "run."
3. The program should compute sufficient priority values to permit the apportionment of a House of Representatives of 500 (five hundred) members. The number of calculations for each state may be approximated by dividing the U.S. population by 500, then dividing that "average size of congressional district" into the population of each state. This will result in a/ "quota," the approximate number of seats each state would be entered to in a House of 500 members. Each quota should be increased by 2 (two) in order to ensure proper calamation of the actual apportionment. It must be remembered that each state receives one seat automatically.
4. The program should calculate the apportionment by means of the "Method of Equal Proportions." The actual calculation should be applied as a multiplication. The multipliers may de calculated by the program as the reciprocal of the geometric means of sucessive numbers, entered arirecty into the progrem-fxom the attached linger The apportionment is derived by multipling each state population by the multipliers (the reciprocal of the geometric means of sucessive numbers to
 llemellirlation (also to Six decimals), called "priority values" are then ranked, largest to smallest.
5. The program should display the results of the apportionment in two tables --
a. the first a listing in the order of assignment of each seat, starting with the 51st and progressing through the 500th. This table may be shown in two or three error columns per page in order to conserve space. The table should have the "title" as specified in 1. above, and be shown in the following format -


Priority Value
b. Emelsecond a listing of the states in alphabetic order (FIPS state code) with the population, the number of seats currently held in the Congress (the 101st Congress), the apportioned number of splats and the change between the current and the dNpextignedgy The table should have the "title" as specified in 1. above, be in the following format-

$$
\text { State Population } \begin{aligned}
& \text { Current } \\
& \text { Seats }
\end{aligned} \begin{aligned}
& \text { Apportioned } \\
& \text { Seats }
\end{aligned} \quad \text { Change }
$$

In addition, there should be two analytical tables prepared as follows:
a. a table showing the population needed to gain a seat for the states ranked as the 436 th through the 445 th seats. This population may be obtained by determining the priority value of the 435 th seat, adding 000000 to that number, and dividing this into the multiplier d for the seat f assigned to the states ranked 436 th through 445 th. The result is the population required for each of the 436 th through 445 th state to gain the 435 th seat. The results of these calculations should be displayed in a table with the title as specified in 1 . above and be in the following format-

| State | Last | Next | Population |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | assigned | assigned | needed to |
| seat | seat | gain |  |


b. a table showing the population needed to lose a seat for the states ranked as the 426 th through the 435 th seats. This population may be obtained by determining the priority value of the 436 th seat, substracting 000001 and dividing this into the multiplier for the seats assigned to the states ranked 426 th through 435 th . The result is the population required for each of the states ranked 426 th through 435 th to lose a seat to the state ranked 436 th . The results of these calculations should be displayed in a table with the title as specified in 1. above and be in the following format-

State Last Last Population
assigned assigned needed to
seat seat minus lose last one seat
cc:
R. Johnson, J. Costanzo, R. Prevost, R. Speaker

| $435^{\text {II }}$ | $45678901^{2}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $436^{\text {Th }}$ | 45678900 |
|  | $8-899$ |
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Bureau of the Census

```
1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS
DPLD TO DIR MEMORANDUM NO. 90-104
```

MEMORANDUM FOR C. L. Kincannon
Deputy Director
Through:

From:
Charles D. Jones Associate Director for Decennial Census

Susan M. Miskura Chief, Decennfal ${ }^{\text {Planning }}$ Division

Subject: Apportionment Logistics Overview

The attached overview defines the logistics of delivering the 1990 apportionment counts to the Department of Commerce and the President of the United States by December 31,1990 , as required by law. It includes the methodology, work flow, requirements and schedule to complete this operation. Responsible divisions have reviewed and provided comments on earlier draft versions of the overview.

Work on this operation is in progress. The Population Division has drafted the letters to transmit the population counts and apportionment to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and to the President. We are working with the Correspondence Management Staff to clear them through the necessary channels.

If you have questions about this overview, please contact Cheryl Landman on 763-3938.

Attachment
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\text { cc: } & \begin{array}{ll}\text { B. Bryant } & \text { (DIR) } \\ \text { B. Benton } & \\ \text { C. Parker } & \\ \text { G. Cranford } & \\ \text { W. Butz } & \text { M. Cagle }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { (HHES) } \\ \text { R. Groves }\end{array} & \text { G. Wilkinson }\end{array}\right)$

## APPORTIONMENT LOGISTICS OVERVIEW

## INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the provisions of Title 13, United States Code, Section 141(b) (Attachment 1), the Secretary of Commerce will deliver to the President of the United States by December 31, 1990, the population of each state and the District of Columbia as of April 1, 1990, as determined by the 1990 decennial census of the United States. The Secretary also will deliver the number of representatives to which each state is entitled under the existing size of the House of Representatives using the method of Equal Proportions as provided for in Title 2, Sections 2a and 2b, United States Code (Attachment 2).

The Bureau of the Census (BOC) will certify the 1990 census population counts and calculate the apportionment counts that are the basis of representation in the House of Representatives for the 103rd through the 107th Congresses (1993-2002). This prompts the following series of activities.

- The BOC will transmit the population counts and apportionment to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce (DOC).
o The DOC will transmit the population counts and apportionment to the President of the United States.
- The DOC will conduct a news conference to announce the population counts and apportionment results.
o The BOC will issue a news release to announce the population counts and apportionment results.

This overview describes the requirements, responsibilities, and timing to complete each of these activities. A detailed schedule of events is provided in Attachment 3.

## TRANSMIT POPULATION COUNTS AND APPORTIONMENT

After the Population Division (POP) certifies the population counts for all States and calculates the apportionment, the BOC will transmit this information by letter to the Secretary of the DOC. The POP expects to complete count certification by Thursday, December 27, 1990, and transmission to the DOC on December 28, 1990.

The POP, working with the Decennial Planning Division (DPLD), will prepare and clear the transmittal letter to the DOC in September. (Attachment 4 is a copy of the 1980 transmittal letter.) The 1990 letter will include statements about the possible 1990 count adjustment and the inclusion of U.S. military
and civilian personnel serving overseas (and their dependents living with them).

Upon receipt of the apportionment information from the BOC, the DOC will immediately transmit this information by letter (Attachment 5 is a copy of the 1980 transmittal letter without counts) to the President of the United States. This transmittal also will include a statement about the possible adjustment of 1990 census counts and the inclusion of U.S. military and civilian personnel serving overseas (and their dependents living with them). This is planned for Friday, December 28, 1990. (It is legally required by December 31, 1990.) The POP, working with the DPLD, will prepare and clear through the DOC, the transmittal letter to the President in October.

## NEWS CONFERENCE

The BOC Public Information Office (PIO) is responsible for organizing the news conference to announce the 1990 census population counts, apportionment results, and demographic trends such as greatest population shifts, largest state, and so forth. The BOC Director and the Secretary of the DOC will make statements concerning the information. The Director's office will prepare and clear the statements through the DOC in October. (Note that 1990 census data that will be needed to complete the statements will be certified in December.)

The PIO will prepare and distribute at the news conference information kits containing copies of the statements and a general news release (discussed in the following section).

The news conference will occur immediately following transmittal of the apportionment information from the DOC to the President; this is expected Friday, December 28. Since the exact time is not known, the PIO will work with the DOC Under Secretary's office to have priority rights to the DOC auditorium on short notice over a range of possible times. Once the date and time are decided, PIO will contact the wire service day books for listing the event. (This will notify most of the Washington area media outlets.) Additionally, PIO will inform media representatives who closely follow the work of the BOC.

To control the event, news media representatives will be admitted through a single entrance to sign in and receive their information kits. The kits will be embargoed until completion of the news conference.

## NEWS RELEASE

The news release will highlight the official 1990 population counts, percent and number changes from 1980, use of the counts, listing of the apportionment, resident, and overseas counts by
state and the District of Columbia, number of Congressional representatives based on the counts, change from the 1980 apportionment, and so forth. It will include statements about the possible adjustment of census counts and the inclusion of U.S. military and civilian personnel serving overseas. (Attachment 6 is a copy of the 1980 press release.)

The PIO is responsible for drafting and clearing the news release through the DOC in October. Due to the embargoed nature of the material, the release will be duplicated in PIO, rather than sending it to DOC for printing.

The PIO will include it in the information kits distributed at the news conference and will hand-deliver copies to the DOC newsroom for general media distribution following the news conference. The PIO will send one copy to the Jeffersonville Processing office to print and distribute to the PIO's census general mailing list in early January 1991.
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## SUBCHAPTER I-MANUFACTURES, MINERAL INDOSTRIES, AND OTHER BUSINESSES

§131. Collection and publication; five-jear periods
The Secretary shall take, compile, and publish cansuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by lav to be filed with, and are compiled and published by, a designated regulatory body), in the year 1964, then in the gear 1968, and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof. (Ang. 31, 1954, ch. 1158, 68 Stat. 1019, amended Aug. 28, 1957, Pub. L_ 85-207, 88,71 Stat. 482; Aug. 31, 1964, Pub. L. $88-532,78$ Stat. 737.)
§132. Controlling law ; effect on other agencies
To the extent that the provisions of this subchapter or subchinpter IV of this chapter confiict with any other provision of this title or other law, pertaining to the Secretary or the Department of Commerce,
the protisions of this title shall control; but nothing in this title shall be deemed to revoke or impair the authority of any other Federal agency with respect to the collection or release of infonnation. (Aug. 31, 1054, ch. 1158, 68 Stat. 1019.)

## SUBCHAPTER II-POPULATION, HOUSING, AGRICITTURE, IRRIGATION, DRAINAGE, AND UNEMPLOYMENT

## §141. Population and other census information

(a) The Secretary shall, in the year 1880 and every 10 years therenfter. take $n$ dereninial census of population as of the first day of Ipril of such jent, which date shall be known as the "decennial census date". in surh form and content as he mar determine, including the use of sampling procedures and special surveys. In connection with any such rensus, the Seciptary is authorized to obtain such otber census infomuation as necessary.
(b) The talmiation of tatal population by States under subsection (a) of this section as required for the apportionment of Representa. tives in Congress among the several States shall he ommpleted mithin 3 months after the census date and reported by the Secretary to the President of the Thited States
(r) The offieres or publie bodies having initial resnonsibility for the levisintive apportinnment or districting of each State may, not later than 3 years lefore the drcennial census date, subnit to the Secretary a plan illentifying the gememnhic areas for which specific tabulations of population are desired. Fach such plan shall be derelnperl in acrortinnce with criteria established by the Secretary, whirh he shall furnish to surh officers or public bodies not later than April 1 of the fourth year preceding the decennial censns date. Surh criteria shall include requirements which assure that such plan shall be derelnome in a nompartisan manner. Shonld the Sereetner find that a plan sutmitted by such officers or problic borlies does not meet the criteria established by him. he sliall consult to the extent necessary with such offirers or public bodies in order to achiere the alterations in such plan that he deems necessary to bring it into arcord with soch eriterin. Any isames rith iespect to such plan remaining unresolred aftre such ransultation shall be resolved by the Serretary. and in all cases he shall have final nuthority for determining the geographic format nf such plan. Tabulations of populntion for the areas identified in anr pian approved by the Secretary shall be completed by him as experitinusly as possible after the clecennial census date and reported to the Governor of the Sinte involved and to the officers or public bodies having responsibility for legislative apportionment or districting of such State, except that such tabulations of population of each State renuesting a tabulation plan, and basic tabulations of population of each other State. shall. in anv prent. be completed, renorted. and tmansmitipd to each respective State within one year after the decennial census date.
(d) Without regned to subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section. the Secretary. in the year 198: and every 10 years thereafter, shall enndurt $n$ mid-derade cencus of pmpulation in such form and content at he may determi:.i, ju:chading the use of sampling procedures and

## TITLE 2-THE CONGRESS

| Chap. 1. | Election of Senators and Representa. tives $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Organization of Congre |
| 3. | Compensation and Allowances of Members. $\qquad$ |
| 1. | Officers and Employees of Senate and House of Representatives. $\qquad$ |
| 5. | Library of Congress |
| 6. | Congressional and Committee Proce- <br> dure: Investigations $\qquad$ |
| i. | Contested Elections (Repesied). |
| 8. | Federal Corrupt Practices (Repealed). |
| SA. | Regulation of Lobbying |
| 9. | Offlee of Legislative Counsel |
| 9A. | Oflice of the Law Revision Counsel |
| 9B. | Legislative Classification Onlice |
| 9 C | Oflice of the Parilamentarian of the House of Representatives $\qquad$ |
| 9 D. | Office of Senate Legal Counsel |
| 10. | Classification of Employees of House of Representatives $\qquad$ |
| 10A. | Payroll Administration in House of Representatives $\qquad$ |
| 11. | Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries $\qquad$ |
| 12. | Contested Elections. |
| 13. | Soint Committee on Congressional Operstions $\qquad$ |
| 14. | Federal Election Campaigna |
| 15. | Offlice of Technolony Asseasmet |
| 16. | Congressional Mailing Standards |
| 17. | Congressional Budget Office. |
| 17A. | Congressional Budget and Fiscal Operations $\qquad$ |
| 17B. | Impoundment Control |
| 18. | Legislative Personnel Financial Disclosure Requirements $\qquad$ |
| 19. | Congresslonal Awand Program |

## CHAPTER 1-ELECIION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

| Sec. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Time lor election of Sentors. |
| I2 | Election to be certified by governor. |
| 1 b . | Countersimature of certificate of election. |
| 2. | Omitted. |
| 21. | Reapportionment of Representatives: time and manner, existing decennial census fig. ures as basis: stalement by President: duty of clerk. |
| 25. | Number of Representativen from each State In 78th and subsequent Congresses. |
| 2 c | Number of Congressional Districts: number of Representatives from each District. |
| 3. 4. | Omitied. |
| 5. | Nominstions for Representatues at large. |
| 8. | Reduction of representation. |



The flirst section of Amendment XX to the Constitution provides in part: ... - the terms of Senstors and Representatives (shall end) at noon on the 3d day of January, of the yearl in which such lerms would have ended if this article had not been pratified: and the terms of their successors shall then begin."

Cross Remernactes
Tine for election of Senators, see Const. Art. I. i4. cl. 1.

Vacancies In the Senate, see Const. Amend. XVII.
S ia. Election to be certified by governor
It shall be the duty of the executive of the State from which any Senator has been chosen to certify his election, under the seal of the State. to the President of the Senste of the United Ststes.
(R.S. 18.)

## Comifration

R.S. 18 derived from act July 25. 1888, ch. 245. 13. 14 BLet. 244.

Section Retenned to in Othen Sections
This section is referred to in section ib of this title.
81b. Counternignature of certificate of election
The certificate mentioned in section is of this title shall be countersigned by the secretary of state of the State.
(R.S. 1 19.)

## Codification

R.S. 19 derived from act July 25, 1868, ch. 245, $\$ 3$. 14 Stat 244.

## 82. Omitted

## Codification

Section, set Aug. 8, 1911. ch. 5, 15 1, 2, 37 SLat. 13, 14. fixed the composition of the House of Representatives at 435 Members, to be apportioned to the States therein enumerated. For provisions dealing with reapportlomment of Representatives and manner of election. etc., see sections $2 a$ and $2 b$ of this title.
82. Reapportionment of Repreacatativen; time and manner existing decennial census figures as begio; statement by President; duty of clerk
(a) On the first day, or within one week thereafter, of the first regular session of the Eighty-second Congress and of each filth Congress thereafter, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, as ascertained under the seventeenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled under an apportionment of the then existing number of Representatives by the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member.
(b) Each:State shall be entitled, in the Elghty-third Congress and in each Congress thereafter untul the taking effect of a reapportionment under this section or subsequent statute, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement required by subsection (a) of this section, no State to receive less than one Member. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within fifteen calendar days after the receipt of such statement, to send to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under enis section. In case of a vacancy in the office of Clerk, or of his absence or inability to discharge this duty. then such duty shall devolve upon the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; and in case of vacancies in the offices of both the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms, or the absence or inability of both to act, such duty shall de. volve upon the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.
(c) Untll a State is redistricted in the manner provided by the law thereol after any apportionment. the Representatives to which such State is entitled under such apportionment shall be elected in the following manner: (1) If there is no change in the number of Representatives they shall be elected from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State. and if any of them are elected from the Staie at large they shall continue to be so elected; (2) If there is an Increase in the number of Representatlves, such additional Representative or Representatives shall be elected from the State at large and the other Representatives from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State: (3) is there is a decrease in the number of Representatives but the number of districts in such State is equal to such decreased number of

Representatives. they shall be elected fom the districts then prescribed by the law of such State; (4) if there is a decrease in the number of Representatives but the number of districts in such State is less than such number of Representatives, the number of Representatives by which such number of districts is exceeded shall be elected from the State at large and the other Representatives from the districts then prescribed by the law of such State; or (5) if there is a decrease in the number of Representatives and the number of districts in such State exceeds such decreased number of Representatives, they shall be elected from the State at large.
(June 18, 1929, ch. 28, \$22, 46 Stat. 26; Apr. 25. 1940, ch. 152, $881.2,54$ Stat. 162; Nov. 15, 1941. ch. $470 . \$ 1,55$ Stat. 761.)

## AmTNDMENTS

1941-Act Nov. 15. 1941, provided for reapportionment based upon the seventeenth and subsequent decennial censuses.
1940-Act Apr. 25. 1940, provided for reapportion. ment based upon the sixteenth decennial ce.sus.

## Constitutional Provisions

Apportionment of Representatives among the several States, see Const. Art. I. §2. cl. 3. and Amend. XIV. $\$ 2$.

## Temporary Incrense in Membirship

Representation of States of Alaska and Hawall in the House of Representalives as not affecting the basis of apportionment established by this section, see section 9 of Pub. L. 85-508, July 7. 1958. 72 SLaL. 339. set out as a note preceding section 21 of Tltle 48 . Ter. ritories and Insular Possessions, and section 8 of Pub. L. 85-3. Mar. 18. 1959. 73 Stat. 4, set out 25 a note pre. ceding section 491 of Title 48.

Siction Reftrrkd to in Other Sections
This section is referred to in sections $2 b, 2 c$ of this title.

## \$2b. Number of Representatives from each Slate in isth and subsequent Congressea

Each State shall be entitled, in the Seventyeighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or section 2 a of this title, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8. 1941. based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member.
(Nov. 15, 1941, ch. 470. \& 2(a), 55 Stat. 762.)
Ceatificates to Exfoctityes of States
Section 2(b) of act Nov. 15. 1941, which required the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 days of Nov. 15. 1941. to send a new certuficate of the entitlement of a State to Representatives, if such a ceruificate had been sent prior to Nov. 15. 1941. under the provisions of section 22 of this title, was omitted.
§2c. Number of Congressional Districts: number of Repreyentatives from each Diytrict
In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress or in any subsequent Congress thereafter to more than one Representative under an ap-
portionment made pursuant to the provisions of section $2 a(a)$ of this title, there shall be es. tablished by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled. and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that a State which is entitled to more than one Representative and which has in all previous elections elected its Representatives at Large may elect its Representatives at Large to the Ninety-first Congress).
(Pub. L 90-198. Dec. 14, 1967, 81 Stat. 581.)

## 58 3. 4. Omitted

## Codimeation

Section 3. act Aug. B. 1911, ch. 5, \$3, 37 Stat. 14. which related to election by districts. explred by its own limitation upon the enactment of the Reappor. tionment Act of June 18, 1929. ch. 28. 122,46 Stat. 21 (section 2 a of this title). It was not restated in act June 18. 1929. providing for reapportionment under the Fyfteenth Census. and hence it aras not applicable :hereto. See Hood v. Brown 1932 (53 S. Ct. 1. 287 U.S. 1. 77 L. Ed. 131 .

Section 4. act Aug. 8. 1911. ch. 5. \&4. 37 Stat. 14. which related to additional Representatives at large. expired by its own limitation upon the enactment of the Reapportionment Act of June 18. 1929. ch. 28, \$22. 46 Stat. 21 (section 23 of this illie). It was not restated in act June 18. 1929. providing for reapportion. ment uncer the Fifteenth Consus, and hence it was not applicable thereto. See Wood v. Brown 1932 (53 S. Ct. 1. 287 U.S. 1. 77 L. Ed 131).

## \$5. Nominationa for Representatives at large

Candidates for Representative or Representatlves to be elected at large in any State shall be nominated in the same manner as candidates for governor, unless otherwise provided by the laws of such State.
(Aug. B. 1911, ch. 5. §5. 37 Stat. 14.)

## 96. Reduction of representetion

Should any State deny or abridge the right of any of the male inhabitants thereof, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States. to vote at any election named in the amendment to the Constitution, article 14. section 2. except for participation in the rebellion or other crime. the number of Representa. tives apportioned to such State shall be reduced in the proportion ouich the number of such male citizens shall have to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

## (R.S. 122.)

## Coomention

R.S. 122 derived from act Feb. 2. 1872, ch. 11. 86. 17 Stal 29.

## 87. Time of election

The Tuesday next after the $15 t$ Monday in November, in every even numbered year. is established as the day for the election, in each of the States and Territories of the United States. of Representatives and Dejegates to the Congress commencing on the 3 d day of January next thereatter.
(R.S. § 25: Mar. 3. 1875. ch. 130, 86, 18 Stat. 400 : June 5, 1934, ch. 390, \& 2,48 Stat. 879.)

## Codification

R.S. 125 dertved from act Feb. 2. 1872. ch. 11. 13. 17 Stat. 28.
The second sentence of this section. which was based on section 6 of the act Mar. 3. 1875 and made this sec. tion inapplicable to any State that had not yet changed its day of election and whose constitution required an amendment to change the day of election of its State officers, was omitted.

## Amentomiats

1934-Act June 5. 1934, substituted "3d day of Janu. ary" for "fourth day of March".

## Constitutional Provisions

The first section of Amendment $X X$ to the Constitution provides: "The terms of Senators and Representa. tives (shall end) at noon on the 3d day of January. of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratifled: and the terms of their successors shall then begin."

## Cross Reperences

Time for election of Representatives, see Const. Art. 1. 14. cl. 1.

## §8. Vacanciea

The time for holding elections in any State, District, or Territory for a Representatlve or Delegate to fill a vacancy, whether such vacancy is caused by a fallure to elect at the time prescribed by law, or by the death. resignation. or incapacity of a person elected. may be prescribed by the laws of the several States and Territortes respectively.
(R.S. 826.)

## Codincatton:

R.S. 128 derived from act Feb. 2, 1872, ch. 11. 14. 17 Stat. 28.

## Constitutional Provisions

Vacancles in the House of Representatives, see Const. Art. 1. \$2, cl. 4.

## 59. Voting for Representatives

All votes for Representatives in Congress must be by written or printed ballot. or voting machine the use of which has been duly authorized by the State law, and all votes recelved or recorded contrary to thls section shall be of no effect.
(R.S. 827: Feb. 14. 1899. ch. 154. 30 Stat. 836.)

## Codimeation

R.S. $\$ 27$ derived from acts Feb. 28. 1871, ch. 99. 19 , 16 SLat. 440, and May 30, 1872, ch. 239, 17 Stat 192.

## CHAPTER 2-ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

| Sec | Oath of Senators. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22. | Oath of President of Senate. |
| 23. | Presiding officer of Senste may adralnister ouths. |
| 24. | Secretary of Senate or assistant secretary may administer ostha. |
| 25. | Oath of Speaker, Members, and Delegstes. |
| 25. | Delegste to House of Representatives from District of Columbia. |

## APPORTIONMENT LOGISTICS SCHEDULE

Event

Draft and prepare final transmittal letter to DOC

Clear through BOC final transmittal letter to DOC

Draft and prepare final transmittal letter to President

Clear through BOC final transmittal letter to President

Clear through DOC final transmittal letter to President

Draft and prepare final news conference statement for BOC Director

Clear final news conference statement for BOC Director

Draft and prepare final news conference statement for DOC Secretary

Clear final news conference statement for DOC Secretary

Certify counts for apportionment/ calculate apportionment

Transmit letter/apportionment counts to DOC/President

Conduct news conference
Issue news release
Draft and prepare final news release

Clear final news release

DIR

PIO
PIO
Resp.
Div.

POP

DPLD

POP

DPLD
Begun
09/14/90
$0917 / 90$
$10 / 30 / 90$

DIR

DIR

DIR
09/03/90
10/04/90

10/05/90
$10 / 30 / 90$

09/03/90
10/04/90
10/05/90
10/30/90

POP

POP
PIO
PIO

Start
Complete

Begun
Complete

09/14/90

Complete
Begun

09/03/90
10/04/90
$10 / 30 / 90$
10/05/90

12/24/90
12/27/90

12/28/90
12/28/90
12/28/90
12/28/90
12/28/90
01/04/91

# NOTE: 1990 TRANSMITTAL WILL include a statement about POSSIBLE COUNT ADJUSTMENT. 

$0: 0: 1980$
Honorable Philip M. Klutznick Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
Dear Mr. Secretary:
In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section 141(b) and title 2, United States Code, sections 2 a and 2 b , I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of each State and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1980, as ascertained by the Twentieth Decennial Census of the United States, and the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under the existing size of the House. This statement furnishes the information which the statute requires to be transmitted by the President to the 97 th Congress in the first week of its first regular session. These population data represent the processed census counts; however, they may be subject to adjustment as the result of pending litigation.

The total population of each State is comprised solely of the resident population. The apportionment of Representatives for the 435 seats in the House shown in the statement is in accordance with the method of equal proportions, as prescribed in title 2, United States Code.

Sincerely,


VINCENT P. BARABBA
Director
Bureau of the Census
Enclosure

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census
1980 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES BY STATE

| State | Resident Population used as the basis for apportionment (1) | Number of Representatives based on 1980 census (2) | Change from 1970 apportionment (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States 1/ | 226,504,825 | 435 |  |
| Alabama | 3,890,061 | 7 |  |
| Alaska | 400,481 | 1 |  |
| Arizona | 2,717,866 | 5 | +1 |
| Arkansas | 2,285,513 | 4 |  |
| California | 23,668,562 | 45 | +2 |
| Colorado | 2,888,834 | 6 | +1 |
| Connecticut | 3,107,576 | 6 |  |
| Delaware | 595,225 | 1 |  |
| District of Columbia 2/ | ia 2/ 637,651 | -- |  |
| Florida - | - 9,739,992 | 19 | +4 |
| Georgia | 5,464,265 | 10 |  |
| Hawaif | 965,000 | 2 |  |
| Idaho | 943,935 | 2 |  |
| Illinois | 11,418,461 | 22 | -2 |
| Indiana | 5,490,179 | 10 | -1 |
| Iowa | 2,913,387 | 6 |  |
| Kansas | 2,363,208 | 5 |  |
| Kentucky | 3,661,433 | 7 |  |
| Louisiana | 4,203,972 | 8 |  |
| Maine | 1,124,660 | 2 |  |
| Maryland | 4,216,446 | - 8 |  |
| Massachusetts | 5,737,037 | - 11 | -1 |
| Michigan | 9,258,344 | 18 | -1 |
| Minnesota | 4,077,148 | 8 |  |
| Mississippi | 2,520,638 | 5 |  |
| Missouri | 4,917,444 | 9 | -1 |
| Montana | 786,690 | 2 |  |
| Nebraska | 1,570,006 | 3 |  |
| Nevada | 799,184 | 2 | +1 |
| New Hampshire | 920,610 | 2 |  |


| State | Resident Population used as the basis for apportionment (1) | - Number of Representatives based on 1980 census <br> (2) | Change from 1970 apportionment (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Jersey | 7,364,158 | 14 | -1 |
| Hew Mexico | 1,299,968 | 3 | +1 |
| Hew York | 17,557,288 | 34 | -5 |
| Worth Carolina | 5,874,429 | 11 |  |
| North Dakota | 652,695 | 1 |  |
| Ohio | 10,797,419 | 21 | -2 |
| Oklahoma | 3,025,266 | 6 |  |
| Oregon | 2,632,663 | 5 | +1 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,866,728 | 23 | -2 |
| Rhodé Island | 947,154 | 2 |  |
| South Carolina | 3,119,208 | 6 |  |
| South Dakota | 690,178 | 1 | -1 |
| Tennessee | 4,590,750 | 9 | +1 |
| Texas | 14,228,383 | 27 | +3 |
| Utah | 1,461,037 | 3 | +1 |
| Vermont | 511,456 |  |  |
| Virginia | 5,346,279 | 10 |  |
| Kashington | 4,130,163 | 8 | +1 |
| hest Virginia | 1,949,644 | 4 |  |
| Kisconsin hyoming | $4,705,335$ 470,816 | 9 |  |

1/ Includes the District of Columbia. The total excluding the District of Columbia is $225,867,174$.

2/ Excluded in determination of apportionment.

## Authenticated:



## 31 DEC 1380

Dミar Mr. President:
There is transmitted herewith a report from the Director of the Bureau of the Census showing the population of each state and the District of Columbia on Rpril 1, 1980, as ascertained by the Twentieth Decennial Census of the United States, and the number of Representatives to which each state is entitied under an apportionment of the existing number of Representatives by the method of equal proportions prescribed by law.

This report was prepared in accordance with the provisions of title 13 , United States Code, section 141(b), and title 2, United States Code, sections 2 a and 2 b .

The report of the Director of the Census Bureau is submitted at this time in compliance with the law requiring that the Secretary of Commerce transmit to you by January 1 the tabulation of the total population by states. These population data represent the processed census counts; however, they may be subject to adjustment as the result of pending litigation. The law also provides that you transmit this information to the 97 th Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

Respectfully,
PHILIP. M. KLUTZNICK

Secretary of Commerce
Enclosures
The President
The White House riashington, D.C. 20500
cc:Exec. Sec (3)
Ch Econ.
Freije
CMS-Rm. 2428-3. Census

BUREAU OF
THE CENSUS

1980 CENSUS POPULATION COUNT FOR U.S. IS $226,504,825$;
REAPPORTIONMENT WOULD SHIFT 17 SEATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The population total of the United States counted in the 1980 census is $226,504,825$.

The figure was received today by Secretary of Commerce Philip M. Klutznick from the Director of the Census Bureau, Vincent $P$. Barabba, who also provided the Secretary with final population counts for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The Secretary is required by. law to deliver final counts to the President by Dec. 31,. 1980.

The new population count is 11.4 percent greater than the 1970 population count of 203,302,031.

These counts determine the apportionment of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the states, since the Constitution requires a census every 10 years to assure that each state's population is equitably represented in the House. The utilization of these figures may be affected by the outcome of litigation now under appeal.

An attached table lists the final 1980 census population totals for the U.S., the District of Columbia, and the 50 states; the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled on the basis of the new counts; and the changes in House seats since the 1970 reapportionment.

The 1990 census must count every person at his or her "usual residence." This means the place where the person lives and sleeps most of the time.
1a. List on the numbered lines below the name of each person living here on Sunday, April 1, including all persons staying here who have no other home. If EVERYONE at this address is staying here temporarily and usually lives somewhere else, follow the instructions given in question 1 b below.

## Include

- Everyone who usually lives here such as fannily members, housemates and roommates, foater children, roomers, boarders, and live-in employees
- Persons who are temportarly away on a business trip, on vacation, or in a general hospltal
- College students who stay here whille attending college
- Persons in the Armed Forces who live here
- Newhorn babies still in the hospttal
- Children in boarding schools below the college level
- Persons who stay here most of the week while working even $t$ they have a home somewhere else
- Persons wth no other home who are stayting here on Aprll 1


## Do NOT include

- Persons who usually live somewhere else
- Persons who are away in an institution such as a prison, mental hospital, or a nursing home
- College students who live somewhere else while attending colliege
- Persons in the Armed Forces who live somewhere else
- Persons who stay somewhere else most of the
week while working

Pinnt last name, first name, and middie initial for each person. Begin on tine 1 wth the household member (or one of the household members) in whose name this house or apartment is owned, being bought, or rented. If there is no such person, start on tine 1 with any adut household member.

| LAST | Frast | NTHLL | LAST | FIRST | NTINL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | 9 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| 6 |  |  | 12 |  |  |

1b. If EVERYONE is staying here only temporarily and usually lives somewhere else, list the name of each person on the numbered lines above, fill this circle $\longrightarrow 0$ and print their usual adiress below. DO NOT PRINT THE ADDRESS LISTED ON THE FRONT COVER.

| Howse number | Street ox road/Rural route and box number | Apartment number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cxy | Stata | ZTP Code |

[^12]February 13, 1990
1990 Apportionment Procedures
Basis of representation in the House of Representatives for the 103 rd through the 108th Congresses (1993-2002) and Electoral Colleges of 1992, 1996, and 2000.

Certification of State Counts
Source -- data capture file, counts certified by Population Division - "No alternative source of the apportionment population is available. The statutory deadline must be met."

Schedule.
Certification of state counts -- no later than Thursday, December 27, 1990. Allows for transmittal through the Department to the President on no later than Friday, December 28, with press conference scheduled for Friday, December 28.

Apportionment Computation
method -- equal proportions, Title 2, USC
number -- 435 since 1910 (with allowance for AZ and

NM), Title 2, USC
Transmittal to the President
Transmittal to the Secretary
Transmittal to the President
Press Conference
Announce population counts, apportionment results, greatest gains, continued shift to West and South, etc.

Announce other relevant information -- largest state,
greatest growth, etc.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Bureau of the Census

Tune 26. 1980

| MEMORANDUM EOR Susan M. Miskura |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Chief. Decennial Planning Division |
| From: |  |
|  | Saula J. Schneider |
| Subject: Population |  |

I am attaching to this memorandum the contingency plan for the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { IV.3.5. - - P.I. } 94-171 \text { Counts } \\
& \text { IV. 3.6. -- Apportionment Counts }
\end{aligned}
$$

This version incorporates comments included in your memorandum of June 20, 1989.

We understand that DPLD will distribute the contingency plan to the appropriate persons.

Please refer any questions to Robert Speaker, 763-7962.
Attachment
ce: M. Turner
(DIRS)
C. Talbert
K. Newman
(BUD)
A. Jackson
(DOD)
D. Dalzell
D. Stoudt
B. Stark
J. Dinwiddie (DPLD)
R. Marx (GEO)
P. Schneider (POP)
P. Fulton
M. Pees
T. Ingold
J. Costanzo
R. Johnson
S. MacDougall
R. Speaker

Pop. Div.Files
Chron
POP: RSpeaker:kj:6/26/89

## 1990 CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR APPORTIONMENT AND P.L.94-171 COUNTS

While most decennial census operations, processes, and products have targeted end dates, apportionment and the P.L.94-171 counts have statutory deadines. December 31, 1990 and March 31, 1991, respectively. For this reason. it is especially important that contingency plans be developed to provide for the delivery of the data required to fulfill these statutory requirements. This discussion will treat apportionment and P.L.94-171 products separately because of differences in the point in the processing that they are derived, the level of characteristics necessary, and the geographic detail required.

Each census process and operation discussed below is to occur on a "flow basis." Therefore, it can be assumed that not all states or all subareas of a state would be of concern to this contingency plan. Those areas that had not completed a process would be subject to this plan; those that had completed the process would not be.

The final outcome of congressional action and law suits and their effect on the apportionment counts cannot be foreseen at this time. The decisions on these issues and how each would be implemented could have a considerable impact on the timely availability of apportionment counts.

## APPORTIONMENT

Historical background.-- Under provisions of Title 13, U.S.C., the Census Bureau must supply to the President within nine months of Census Day (i.e., before January 1, 1991) a population count for each state on which the Congressional apportionment is to be based. In a ministerial role the Census Bureau also computes the apportionment in accordance with the method specified in Title 2 , U.S.C. In the past, this transmittal has been in the form of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to the President. The Commerce Department and the Census Bureau have also presented this information to the public in a press conference following the transmittal, but before the expiration of the statutory time period.

Current plans for 1990.-- Population counts, for apportionment will be available at the point in time that the data capture file has been finalized. This file will be considered complete when all field operations have been completed, all census forms captured, and all population have been reviewed and certified by Population Division. This is expected to occur on or before December 27, 1990. The plan is to derive the apportionment counts from the final data capture file.

Specifically, what is required to produce final official population counts for apportionment includes:

Field operations--
All household and special questionnaires (Individual Census Report, Military Census Report, Shipboard Census Report) processed through the data capture operations (check-in, edit, search/match, filming or keypunching).

Headquarters processing--
All data received and data capture file organization and integration processing complete.
All population counts certified as final by Population Division.

Contingency Plan

1. Statement of objective/purpose

The objective of this plan is to briefly describe the measures to deal with potential problems that could delay the population counts for states which will serve as the basis for the apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 103rd through 108th Congresses (1993-2002) and of members of the Electoral College for the Presidential elections of 1992, 1996, and 2000.
2. Recommendation/summary of the plan

Additional resources (such as overtime and leased computer time) to produce counts for review. Train backup staff from Population and other divisions using a prepared training package to supplement those doing review.
3. Assumptions
A. No alternative source of the apportionment population is available. The statutory deadline must be met.
B. The Census Bureau must calculate an apportionment only after the population counts for states have been certified as official.
C. Management Information System will track progress so actions can be taken in a timely manner.
4. List of potential problems/failures in order of importance

For the apportionment counts to be transmitted on schedule assumes: that the local review operations will be completed by the end of November 1990, data capture files for states will be available on a flow basis in November and December 1990 ; that Population Division's count review operation will review counts from the data capture files on a flow basis from August to December 1990; and that any problems
discovered can be resolved by December 27, 1990. The counts must be finalized by December 27, 1990, in order to allow for final preparation and delivery of the transmittal before December 31. It again should be emphasized that each of these operations is planned to occur on a flow basis before the "latest dates," so it can be assumed that not all subareas for all states would be affected by unforeseen circumstances.

Any and all problems which might affect the schedule for the finalization of the apportionment counts are equally important. Specific events which might occur near the end of the process are the failure to prepare the data capture file within the timeframe, or the inability of Population Division's count review system to resolve suspected count problems and to certify the counts within the time frame. Collection geography recognizes state boundaries, so no contingency would be needed for any failure in the preparation of the P.L. 94-171 geographic reference file.

If any contingency must be implemented, resources (analysts, programmers, computer time) assigned to other activities would be reduced which would have the effect of delaying those activities. Additional analysts would be made available from Population and Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division; the reassignment of analysts could affect the production of decennial census, current survey, and/or current estimates products. The source of additional programmers is not known at this time; therefore the potential impact on other operations cannot be evaluated.
5. Contingency plans for specific operations
A. Data Capture File (latest start date is early November 1990)

Corrective action to be applied

1. More resources - add required personnel and equipment in order to complete the operation (e.g., overtime; personnel from other divisions; lease computer time).
B. Certification Operations (Count Review) (latest start date is early November 1990)

Corrective action to be applied

1. More resources - add required.personnel and equipment in order to complete the operation (e.g., backups in various divisions will be trained and ready).

## PUBLIC LAW 94-171 MATERIALS

Historical background.-- Under provisions of Title 13, U.S.C., the Bureau of the Census is required to supply to each gtate total population counts for small areas to be used for drawing of legislative district boundaries. These data must be delivered within one year of the census date, i.e., before April $1,1991$. In 1980, the Census Bureau also supplied population data (including counts for major race groups and for Spanish origin) to all states, summarized to voting districts identified by 23 states, as well as to standard census geographic levels.

Again, P.L. 94-171 and related commitments require at minimum the production of total population counts summarized to voting districts identified by the state and/or to standard census geography. In addition, although not required by P.L. 94-171, but through commitments to users of the P.L. 94-171 products, data were also made available by voting districts and/or standard census geography for major race groups and Hispanic origin for the total population and the population 18 years old and over.

Plans for 1990.-- Under provisions of Title 13, U.S.C., the Bureau of the Census is required to supply to each state total population counts for small areas to be used for drawing of legislative district boundaries. In addition, for 1990, the Census Bureau also will supply population counts by major race groups and Hispanic origin for the total population and 18 years old or over, summarized to voting districts identified by the states, as well as to standard census geography. In addition, total housing unit counts (although not required by P.L. 94-171) are to be shown on the computer tape to make that file a more widely usable product. Anything less than these products and content require a contingency plan.

The materials will be delivered in a number of media--computer tape, paper listings, and microfiche. Tape and listings are required by the March 31, 1991 deadline; microfiche is not. The data will be accompanied by paper maps depicting the areas summarized in the data products. The materials will be issued on a flow basis as they are available, with priorities established to conform as much as possible with state statutory, constitutional, or court imposed redistricting deadlines.

In addition to the operations and procedures required for the apportionment counts as described above, the full data for P.L. 94-171 products are planned to undergo edit and allocation procedures, creation of the edited detail file, application of P.L. 94-171 geographic reference file, data acceptance through the examination of editals and analyzers by Population (POP) and Housing and Household Economic Statistics Divisions (HHES), the creation of the summaries in the required data and geographic formats by Decennial Operations Division (DOD), review and approval of these products by GEO, POP, and HHES, and release to the states by Data User Services Division (DUSD).

## Contingency plan

1. Statement of objective/purpose

The objective of this plan is to identify possible solutions to problems which may cause a delay in the release of the P.L. 94-171 products.
2. Recommendation/summary of the plan

General approach -- Additional resources (such as overtime and leased computer time) to produce counts for review. Train backup staff from Population and other divisions using a prepared training package to supplement those doing review.

If any contingency must be implemented, resources (analysts, programmers, computer time) assigned to other activities would be reduced which would have the effect of delaying those activities. Additional analysts would be made available from Population and Housing and Household Economic Statistics Divisions; the reassignment of analysts could affect the production of decennial census, current survey, and/or current estimates products. The source of additional programmers is not known at this time; therefore the potential impact on other operations cannot be evaluated.
3. Assumptions
A. No alternative source of the P.L. 94-171 product is available. The statutory deadline must be met.
B. The Census Bureau must prepare P.L. 94-171 products only after the product review for states has been completed.
C. Management Information System will track progress so actions can be taken in a timely manner.
4. List of potential problems/failures in order of importance
A. Edited detail file not complete

Edit and allocations procedures not complete so that final race and Hispanic origin data and housing unit counts are not available.
B. Data acceptance procedures not complete Editals review not complete Analyzer review not complete Product review not complete
C. Geographic Reference Files not complete Final 1990 block splits not in system
D. P.I. 94-171 tabulation system not operational
E. Map delivery system not complete
F. Delivery system failure
5. Contingency back-up plans
A. Edited Detail File not complete

1. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements.
2. Supply required additional resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation (e.g., overtime; personnel from other divisions; lease computer time).
3. Supply states with total population counts from the Data Capture File. Race, Hispanic origin, age and housing unit data would not be available until the edits and allocations were complete. This would result in two deliveries to the affected states: population counts first, with housing unit counts and population characteristics later. The impact on states would be that they would have three alternatives: one, redistrict using only total counts for redistricting; two, redistrict using total counts and evaluating the districts when the race, Hispanic origin, and age data become available; and three, delay the redistricting process until the race, Hispanic origin, and age data become available.
B. Data acceptance implementation not complete
4. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements.
5. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation (e.g., overtime; personnel from other divisions; lease computer time).
6. Institute changes in the planned data review operations, conducting only those reviews which are possible to complete in the time available. Review operations would be dropped in reverse order to that in which they are scheduled (last operation, first dropped). Thus, product review would be the first operation dropped, followed by review of the P.L. portion of the $100 \%$ analyzer, the full $100 \%$ analyzer, and editals.
C. Geographic reference files not complete
7. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements.
8. Supply required additional resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation (e.g., overtime; personnel from other divisions; lease computer time).
9. Supply states with available data (from the DCF, or the Edited Detail File) in the most current
geography. Deliver data in final P.L. 94-171
geography when available. The impact on the states would be that they would have to use for redistricting geographic areas that were not the final P.L. 94-171 file geographic areas until the final P.L. 94-171 geographic reference files were complete, at which time they could use the final P.L 94-171 areas for redistricting, unless the states delayed their redistricting until the final P.L.94171 geographic reference files were complete.
D. P.L. 94-171 tabulation system not operational
10. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements.
11. A separate tabulation system for P.L. 94-171 has been established as part of the 1990 tabulation and publication system.
12. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation (e.g., overtime; personnel from other divisions; Fease computer time).
E. Map delivery system not operational
13. Deliver maps in priority sequence based on state redistricting requirements.
14. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation, such as programming staff to complete software development, production staff in the Regional Census Centers (RCCs), large-format photocopiers in the RCCs or Data Preparation Divisions.
15. Provide states with copies of postcensus local review maps in lieu of P.L. 94-171 maps (the maps would not include a few boundary corrections resulting in some inconsistencies between the maps and the data). The P.L. 94-171 maps would be provided as soon as available.
F. Delivery system failure
16. Provide internal Bureau backup for tape copying contractor.
17. Provide for overnight delivery by commercial carriers or by census personnel.


Please control the imitation caused buy This - and get the plow revised to DPCD's liming. Chalbit up to their lace of brouledge in this area. Tharbs.
( Please get this done with the minimum of discushion suñe we all hove other things tor hours on)
Thanks for your concern. I have reinsed the plain to reflect as literally wo sosinke their comments Only took aniler and a half! There was NO discussion.
 ) fond torstall some future ones

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233

June 20, 1989
1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS
DPLD TO POP MEMORANDUM NO. 89-15

MEMORANDUM FOR Paula J. Schneider Chief, Population Division<br>From:<br>Susan M. Miskura Chief, Decennial Planning Division<br>Subject: Comments on Revised Contingency Plan for Apportionment Counts and P.L. 94-171 Counts

We have reviewed your revised plan based on the discussion at the March 10, 1989 Program Design and Policy Meeting (PDPM), and have the following general comments. Additional specific comments are shown on the attached copy of your draft.

Regarding the apportionment counts, the main points of the PDPM discussion were that 1) there are no alternative counts to the certified DCF results, and 2) that our contingency planning should focus on identifying potential problems; monitoring progress; and having additional resources (computer time, programmers, and trained count review staff) available if needed.

Your draft does make the first point and does provide information about the potential problems. It should, however, provide more detail about how we will monitor progress on key steps (primarily through the MIS) and what steps we can/should take either to avoid or to be prepared for delays. For example, at the meeting we discussed the fact that there were staff in several divisions (but mostly in POP) who were (or easily could be) trained to help out on the count review if needed.

Similar comments apply to the P.L. 94-171 counts, although as mentioned at the meeting, it would not be as easy to find/train additional staff. This point needs to be made (perhaps with some discussion of why this is the case and what could be done about it - for example, prepare a manual/training package just in case).

Insofar as implementing these contingencies will significantly reduce resources (programmers; analysts; computer time) currently assigned to other activities, the plan should mention this and, to the extent possible, describe what effects this will have on those activities.

Another part of the PDPM discussion had to do with a description of what is required by P.L. 94-171 versus other laws/agreements (for example, that P.L. 94-171 only requires total population counts). More details on this would be helpful, perhaps by way of discussing the impacts of optional data/timing under the first three (A-C) detailed contingency plans.

Another general comment is that each of the first five (A-E) detailed contingency plans have, as the third step, establishing priorities based on when various states need the data. That should be the first step. In fact we should establish those priorities now and use them in formulating the MIS schedule.

Please call Jim Dinwiddie if you have any questions on these comments.

Attachment

| cc: | R.Marx | (GEO) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M.Turner | (DIR) |
|  | C.Talbert | " |
|  | A.Jackson | (DOD) |
|  | D. Stoudt | (D) |
|  | P. Fulton | (POP) |
|  | J.Ingold |  |
|  | J. Costanzo | " |
|  | R.Johnson | " |
|  | S.MacDougall | " |
|  | R.Speaker | " |
|  | DPLD Senior | ff |
|  | C. Landman | (DPLD) |
|  | B.Starr | " |
|  | V.Vazquez | " |
|  | S.Walker | " |
|  | PIB Master F |  |

April 4. 1989

1990 CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR APPORTIONMENT AND P.L.94-171 COUNTS

While most decennial census operations, processes, and products have targeted end dates, apportionment and the P.L.94-171 counts have statutory deadlines. December 31, 1990 and March 31. 1991. respectively. For this reason. it is especially important that contingency plans be developed to provide for the delivery of the data required to fulfill these statutory requirements. This discussion will treat apportionment and P.L.94-171 products separately because of differences in the point in the processing that they are derived. the level of characteristics necessary. and the geographic detail required.

Each census process and operation discussed below is to occur on a "flow basis." Therefore, it can be assumed that not all states or all subareas of a state would be of concern to this contingency plan. Those areas that had not completed a process would be subject to this plan: those that had completed the process would not be.

## APPORTIONMENT

Historical background.-- Under provisions of Title 13, U.S.C., the Census Bureau must supply to the President within nine months of Census Day (i.e. before January 1, 1991) a population count for each state on which the Congressional apportionment is to be based. In a ministerial role the Census Bureau also computes the apportionment in accordance with the method specified in Title 2 , U.S.C. In the past, this transmittal has been in the form of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to the President. The Commerce Department and the Census Bureau have also presented this information to the public in a press conference following the transmittal, but before the expiration of the statutory time period.

Current plans for 1990.-- Population counts for apportionment will be available at the point in time that the data capture file has been finalized. This file will be considered complete when all field operations have been completed, all census forms captured, and all population and housing unit counts have been reviewed and certified by Population and Housing and Household Economic Statistics Divisions. This is expected to occur in late December 1990. The plan is to derive the apportionment counts from the final data capture file.

The final outcome of congressional action and law suits and their effect on the apportionment counts cannot be foreseen at this time. The major areas of possible change and therefore concern are undercount adjustment. Americans overseas, and undocumented
implemented could have a considerable impact on the timely availability of apportionment counts.

Specifically, what is required to produce final official population counts for apportionment includes:

Field operations--
All household and special questionnaires (Individual Census Report. Military Census Report. Shipboard Census Report) processed through the data capture operations (check-in, edit. search/match, filming or keypunching)

Headquarters processing--
All data received and data capture file organization and integration processing complete All population counts certified as final by Population Division

## Contingency Plan

1. Statement of objective/purpose

The objective of this plan is to briefly describenthe source population counts for states which will serve as the basis for the apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 103rd through 108th Congresses (1993-2002) and of members of the Electoral College for the Presidential elections of 1992, 1996, and 2000.
2. Recommendation/summary of the plan
[No alternative source of the apportionment population is available. The statutory deadline must be met.] Additional resolved 5 (such as overtime $\xi$ leased computer time) to produce counts for review. Trained
3. Assumptions backup staff to supplarent those dong review.
B. The Census Bureau must calculate an apportionment only AFTER the population counts for states have been certified as official. Torelease apportionment counts before all scheduled operations were complete would require us to assess if the missing data would have an impact on the apportionment. Given the sensitivity of the apportionment formula to small differences in the populations of states (one person could make a difference in the allocation of a seat, we would be open to questions of impropriety if we were to make that judgement as an operational consideration. To release? apportionment counts that were not final and were later doff found to be incorrect to the point of affecting the apportionment would cause unknown disruptions in the political and governmental arenas, and considerable embarrassment to the Census Bureau.
C. MLS will troche pigrais in a timely mono met.

4. List of potential problems/failures in order of importance

Any and all problems which might affect the schedule for the finalization of the apportionment counts are equally important. Specific events which might occur near the end of the process are the failure to prepare the data capture file within the timeframe, or the inability of Population Division's count review system to resolve suspected count problems and to certify the counts within the time frame. Collection geography recognizes state boundaries, so no contingency would be needed for any failure in the preparation of the tabulation geographic reference file.
5. Contingency plans for specific operations
A. Data Capture File (latest start date is early November 1990)

Corrective action to be applied

1. More resources - add required personnel and equipment in order to complete the operation.
B. Certification Operations (Count Review) (latest start date is early November 1990)

Corrective action to be applied

1. More resources - add required personnel and equipment in order to complete the operation.


Historical background. --Under provisions of Title 13, U.S.C., the Bureau of the Census must supply to each state population counts for small areas to be used for drawing of legislative district boundaries. These data must be delivered within one year of the census date, i.e., before April 1, 1991. In 1980, the Census Bureau also supplied population data (including counts for major
race groups and for Spanish origin) to all states, summarized to voting districts identified by 23 states, as well as to standard census geographic levels.

Plans for 1990. --Population counts by major race groups and Hispanic origin for the total population and 18 years old or over (and total housing units on tape only) will be supplied to each state, summarized to voting districts identified by most states. as well as to standard census geography. The materials will be delivered in a number of media-computer tape, paper listings. and microfiche. Tape and listings are required by the March 31, 1991 deadline; microfiche is not. The data will be accompanied by paper maps depicting the areas summarized in the data products. The materials will be issued on a flow basis as they are available, with priorities established to conform as much as possible with state statutory, constitutional, or court imposed redistricting deadlines.

In addition to the operations and procedures required for the apportionment counts as described above, the full data for P.L. 94-171 products are planned to undergo edit and allocation procedures. creation of the edited detail file, application of P.L. 94-171 geographic reference file, data acceptance through the examination of editals and analyzers by Population (POP) and Housing and Household Economics Statistics Division (HHES), the creation of the summaries in the required data and geographic formats by Decennial Operations Division (DOD), review and approval of these products by GEO, POP, and HHES, and release to the states by Data User Services Division (DUSD).

## Contingency plan

1. Statement of objective/purpose

The objective of this plan is to identify problems which may cause a delay in the release of the P.L. 94-171 products. (It is also the objective of this plan to explore alternative means of supplying population counts for states and small areas that can serve as the basis for the redrawing of legislative districts.)
2. Recommendation/summary of the plan

Dependent upon circumstances; see item 5 , below.
3. Assumptions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Describe gercial } \\
\text { appuaile-additi.. }
\end{array} \\
& \text { appuater chivas. } \\
& \text { cowputenctiral transl backup }
\end{aligned}
$$

A range of assumptions is being made elsewhere about the disasters that might happen during the field collection and processing office operations. The discussion here will be limited to factors immediately precedent and related to the production of final $100 \%$ edited detail files for each state. the data acceptance operations, and the production of the specific PL 94-171 products.

- No artenative sones
- To only after product review


As stated above. PL 94-171 and related commitments require at minn the production of population counts by major race groups and Hispanic origin for the total population and the population 18 years old and over, summarized to voting districts identified by the state and/or to standard census geography. Anything less than these products and content require a contingency plan. In addition total housing unit counts are to be shown on the computer tape to make that file a more widely useable product. (though not requcee by 94-171)?
List of potential problems/failures in order of importance
A. Edited detail file not complete

Edit and allocations procedures not complete so that final race and Hispanic origin data and housing unit counts are not available.
B. Data acceptance procedures not complete

Editals review not complete
Analyzer review not complete
Product review not complete
C. Geographic Reference Files not complete Final 1990 block splits not in system
D. PL 94-171 tabulation system not operational
E. Map delivery system not complete
F. Delivery system failure
5. Contingency back-up plans
A. Edited Detail File not complete

1. Supply required additional resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation.
2. Supply states with total population counts from the Data Capture File. Race, Hispanic origin, age and housing unit data would not be available until the edits and allocations were complete. Make two deliveries to the affected states; population counts first, with housing unit counts and population characteristics later.
3. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements. [chon (dn't this be step 41 Th do it now?]
B. Data acceptance implementation complete cot orate true
4. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation.
5. Institute changes in the planned data review Operations. conducting only those reviews which are possible to complete in the time available. Review
operations would be dropped in reverse order to that in which they are scheduled llast operation. first dropped). Thus, product review would be the first operation dropped, followed by review of the P.L. portion of the $100 \%$ analyzer, the full $100 \%$ analyzer. and editals.
6. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements. [should le step 41]
C. Geographic reference files not complete
7. Supply required additional resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation.
8. Supply states with available data (from the DCF, or the Edited Detail Filel in the most current geography. Deliver data in final PL 94-171 geography when available.
9. Establish priorities reflecting state delivery requirements. [shop 1]
D. PL 94-171 tabulation system not operational
10. A separate tabulation system for PL 94-171 has been established as part of the 1990 tabulation and publication system. (So work on fler T/P y tem delin'timpact?)
11. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to 3. Esmplete the operation. requirements. [step 1]
E. Map delivery system not operational
12. Supply required resources (personnel or equipment) to complete the operation, such as programming staff to complete software development, production staff in the Regional Census Centers (RCCs), large-format photocopiers in the RCCs or Data Preparation Divisions.
13. Provide states with copies of postcensus local review maps in lieu of PL 94-171 maps (the maps
 would not include a few boundary corrections resulting in some inconsistencies between the maps and the data). The PL 94-171, would be provided as soon as available.
14. Deliver maps in priority sequence based on state redistricting requirements. [stop 1]
F. Delivery system failure
15. Provide internal Bureau backup for tape copying contractor. Will we setup to do now?
16. Provide for overnight delivery by commercial carriers or by census personnel.

| NOTE FOR | The Record |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Bob Speaker <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> $763-7962$ |

Subject: Apportionment and "Adjustment"

I talked with David Huckabee at Congressional Research Service on January 16. He mentioned that he and other CRS staff had been discussing possible scenarios that might occur following the receipt of an apportionment in January 1991, accompanied by the statement that a decision on adjustment is outstanding and might result in changes in the population count. Any change in the population counts might also change the apportionment. It is supposed that there might be some action taken in the Congress to delay the implementation of the apportionment until after the adjustment issue has been decided. There may be other scenarios developed.
[This should have no affect on the PL 94-171 schedule since its primary purpose is for redrawing state legislative districts. Many states have requirements to complete that work by summer of 1991. Congressional redistricting may not have to be completed until the Congressional primaries (April-June 1992).]
C. Jones (DIR)
M. Turner
M. Neuman (OCA)
S. Miskura (DPLD)
P. Schneider (POP)

Pop.Div.Files
Chron

Congressional Briefing Notes
Residence Rules
December 7, 1987

## Introduction

The U.S. Constitution mandates a census every 10 years for the purpose of apportioning Representatives to Congress among the states.

This constitutional mandate is found in a few words of Article 1 , Section 2, of the U.S. Constitution.
"Representatives...shall be apportioned among the several states...according to their respective numbers...The actual enumeration shall be in such manner as they (the Congress) shall by law direct."

So, apportionment is based on counts of persons in each state obtained during the decennial census.

Which persons are counted in each state is based on principles or criteria we call "residence rules."

Will talk about these rules, in general, and, specifically, how they apply to the counts of military overseas and undocumented immigrants.

First, a word about Apportionment and Redistricting.

## Apportionment

As you know, apportionment determines how many Representatives each state gets, and reapportionment is done after each census.

Title 13 (U.S. Code) assigns the responsibility to conduct the census to the Secretary of Commerce who delegates this authority to the Census Bureau.

Using a method that Congress has chosen, the Census Bureau does the mathematical calculation of the apportionment based upon the results of that census.

After each census, once the new number of representatives for each state has been defined, each state carries out its respective Redistricting program. They redefine the congressional districts based on the number of representatives they have been apportioned. In delineating these district boundaries, they also use the most recent census counts.

The Census Bureau became directly involved with supplying counts for redistricting when, in December of 1975, Congress passed Public Law 94-171.

This law directed the Census Bureau to issue by April 1, 1976 (and every 10 years thereafter.), a set of technical criteria for States to follow in specifying the small geographic areas for which they wished to receive the population tabulations.

That law also directed that prior to each census, the states supply to the Census Bureau the boundaries of small geographic areas they plan to use.

Then, the Census Bureau must transmit population figures for these small areas to all Governors and state legislatures one year after the census date (next is April 1, 1991).

## Usual Residence

How many people are counted in each state or geographic area is based on the concept of "usual residence." The Census Act of 1790 covering the first decennial census established the concept of "usual residence" as the guiding principle. The words of that law appear on this overhead, and also are attached to the fact sheet.
"every person whose usual place of abode shall be in any family...shall be returned as of such family... and the name of every person, who shall be an inhabitant of every district, but without a settled place of residence shall be inserted...in that division where he or she shall be.... and every person occasionally absent at the time of the enumeration as belonging to that place in which he usually resides in the United States."

These words guide censustakers in this country to this day in determining the "Usual residence" of the people that we count. "Usual Residence" is defined as where a person lives and sleeps most of the time.

If a person's usual residence is in the United States we count them; otherwise we do not. Applying this concept to undocumented immigrants explains why we do count them in the census, and applying this concept to the military overseas explains why we do not count them.

This "usual residence" is not necessarily the same as the person's legal residence, voting residence, or the place where he or she can be found on Census Day. Because of these kinds of situations, the Census Bureau must determine a set of rules to follow for the census. These rules, called "residence rules," have been reviewed by congress and the courts on various occasions.

For example, under these rules:

1. Americans who are temporarily abroad on vacations, business trips, and the like are counted at their usual residence in the United States.
2. Immigrants, regardless of legal status, who have a usual residence in the United States are included.

On the other hand, some persons are specifically excluded from the census count:

1. Citizens of foreign countries temporarily visiting or travelling in the United states are not enumerated in the census because they have not established a residence.
2. Those Americans who are overseas for an extended period (in the Armed Forces, working at civilian jobs, studying in foreign universities, and so forth) are not included, because they are considered to have a "usual residence" outside of the United States.

Issue 1 -- Overseas military included in apportionment counts
With this background about the census and the residence rules, let me turn to the specific issue of including the overseas military in apportionment counts.
a. Census Bureau philosophy

As follows from the usual residence concept, overseas military are considered to have a "usual residence" outside the United States. Therefore, we do not plan to count them in the census for the purposes of reapportionment, although we will get counts of them in 1990 from the administrative records of the Dept. of Defense.
b. Historical precedent

The only departure from this practice was in the census of 1970. Only in that census were overseas military included in the state apportionment counts.

This action was the result of direction received from Congress, based on their interest due to the large number of military living outside the country because of Vietnam.

Inclusion of the overseas military population in the apportionment counts could cause a change in the allocation of Congressional seats. In fact, in 1970, one of the most vocal proponents of including the overseas population in the apportionment counts was a Congressman from Connecticut.
As in turned out, after this was done and the allocation of seats was calculated, a Congressional seat was Shifted from Connecticut to Oklanoma.
c. Quality concerns

That situation points out one of the concerns about including the overseas military population in the apportionment counts in 1990.

There is considerable concern that the state overseas military personnel report as home of record in the United States, if any, is often not a usual residence. We understand that in many instances, the home of record is selected for a perceived benefit or some other reason. According to a report issued by the GAO just last month, the reported state home of record is concentrated disproportionately in a few states.

In addition, many do not report a home of record at all. It is estimated that lo\% of overseas military do not report a home of record.

Because of this, we have serious concerns about the quality of the counts that would result if we were to include the overseas military in the apportionment counts. However, if so directed, we could take the counts of the overseas military using the administrative records of the Dept. of Defense and allocate this population to states based on home of record for apportionment purposes.

Issue 2 -- Overseas military included in redistricting counts
Including the overseas military in the counts for state redistricting, on the other hand, is another matter.

Even in 1970, when the Census Bureau allocated the military overseas to states to include them in apportionment, it did not include this population in the substate counts used for redistricting.

Thus the within-state redistricting process used different numbers as its base than the between-state reapportionment.

In order to allocate this population to locations below the state level, the Census Bureau would need exact street addresses. We are not certain of the quality of this detailed data, even if available from the Dept. of Defense administrative records. It would be very difficult to take even exact street addresses and determine where they belong at the level of the very small geographic areas used for redistricting. Not only would the accuracy of this assignment be questionable, but the timing of the operations necessary to carry it would might jeopardize meeting our deadlines for determining the new apportionment allocations.

In summary, we would have serious concerns that the operations could be done with acceptable quality on the time schedule required.

Issue 3 - Ondocumented immigrants included in the apportionment counts

Turning our attention now to a very different issue, I would like now to address the topic of the inclusion of undocumented immigrants in the apportionment counts.

For every census since the first one in 1790, the decennial census has included everyone reporting a usual residence in the United States regardless of legal status. Undocumented immigrants that live in the United States fall into this category.

The propriety of this approach was addressed in a suit brought against the Census Bureau in 1979 by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).
(U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) et al., v. Philip M. Klutznick, Secretary of Commerce et al., Civil Action No. 79-3269, February 26, 1980.).

Even though the suit was decided on procedural grounds, rather than the merits, the United states District Court did address the substantive issue of whether or not undocumented immigrants should be included in the census. The court noted QUOTE "It (the Constitution) requires the counting of the 'whole number of persons' for apportionment purposes, and while illegal aliens were not a component of the population at the time the Constitution was adopted, they are clearly 'persons'."UNQUOTE

Throughout the 20 th century, Congress and the Courts have, on a number of occasions considered excluding undocumented immigrants from apportionment counts. Each time they have rejected the idea as contrary to the lst and l4th Amendments of the Constitution.

We do not know how many undocumented immigrants are included in the counts, because respondents are not asked their immigration status, but recent estimates put the number of undocumented immigrants included in the 1980 census at about 2 million.
(Jeffrey S. Passel and Karen A. Woodrow, "Geographic Distribution of Undocumented Immigrants: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 Census by State," International Migration Review, 18 (February 1984): 642-671.)

If the Census Bureau were directed to exclude undocumented immigrants from the apportionment counts, there are no satisfactory ways to do it. All methods have operational problems and quality concerns.

In order to exclude undocumented immigrants counted in the census from apportionment counts we would have to determine the legal status of every person. For most persons, this means they would have to identify themselves, since much of the census is based on self-response.

This would cause problems that could jeopardize our ability to take the census.

Asking about legal status could result in the misperception that the information we collect is used for enforcement. This effect could seriously threaten cooperation even among legal residents.

The answers obtained from such an inquiry would be questionable at best. Indeed, many respondents simply would not be willing or able to answer honestly or accurately.

We face similar problems if we direct undocumented immigrants simply to exclude themselves. Legal residents may find this a convenient way to excuse themselves from participating, leading to a large undercount among legal residents.

Other hypothetical approaches that have been suggested involved estimating components of the resident alien population and using these estimates to make changes to counts obtained in the census.

There are many serious concerns about such procedures.

1. One is the lack of an appropriate information source to develop the estimates. The are no sources available that would allow us to accurately estimate the number of legal aliens. For the 1980 census, we had information from INS from data on Alien Registration that they were collecting yearly at that time. We were able to use that information in evaluating the 1980 census because those data had been collected for some years, and their accuracy could be estimated by looking at changes in the records over a period of time. But the INS stopped collecting those data in 1981. Even if the system were reinstituted by 1990 , it would be subject to a degree of error we would have no good way of evaluating.
2. This situation would lead to the possibility that the resulting estimates would contain errors serious enough to affect the allocation of Congressional seats. Even at the national level, the accuracy of the data would be highly questionable, and the relative unreliability of the data at the state would be even greater.
3. There could also be a problem with the timing of the census results. The estimates cannot be developed until the census is complete, thus jeopardizing the delivery of apportionment and redistricting counts.

In summary, substantial changes in census processing and design would be required to exclude undocumented immigrants. In addition, some alternatives could include new and untested data collection efforts, including potential changes to the census questionnaire.

A requirement to exclude undocumented immigrants in any fashion would jeopardize completion of the census in the current time frame required by law.

The overall coverage and accuracy of the census would almost surely suffer substantially.

Any of the methods would be likely to have significant errors. Also, public perception of the uses of census data would be adversely affected: If this were to happen, public cooperation, which is absolutely essential to assuring a successful census and useful results for use throughout the 1990's, might deteriorate throughout the country.
o Since the first census in 1790, the census traditionally has included all persons who usually reside in the United States at the time of the census. Defining the usual residence is not always obvious, especially when people have more than one perceived usual residence. The Census Bureau must determine a set of rules to follow.

- For the census, the Census Bureau develops a set of rules covering special situations. These rules are called "residence rules." The residence rules define who should be counted and, for those that are covered, where they are counted. The Congress and the courts have reviewed these rules on occasion.
o For 1990, concerns have arisen over both the basic usual residence concept and the rules we established.


## Issue 1: Including Military Overseas In the Apportionment Counts

o In virtually every decennial census since 1790, the counts used for apportionment have not included the U.S. military living overseas. The 1970 census was an exception.
o Even though not used for apportionment, we have determined a count of military overseas through the administrative records of the Department of Defense.

0 There is concern that the state reported by overseas military personnel as home of record in the United States, if any, is often not a usual residence. We understand that in many instances, the home of record is selected for a perceived benefit (e.g., lower or no state income tax) or some other reason.
o In spite of quality concerns, it is possible to obtain counts for this population by state using the administrative records of the Department of Defense (DOD) and allocate this population to states, based on home of record, for apportionment purposes.

## Issue 2. Including Military Overseas in the Redistricting Counts

o In 1970, when the Census Bureau allocated the military overseas to states to include them in the apportionment counts, it did not include this population in the substate counts used for redistricting.
o In order to allocate this population to locations below the state level, the Census Bureau would need exact street addresses. Even if this information is available from DOD administrative records, there would be timing and operational problems in performing the allocation. We have serious concerns that the operations could not be done with acceptable quality on the time schedule required.

Issue 3. Including Undocumented Immigrants in the Apportionment Counts
o For every census since the first one in 1790, the decennial census has included all residents, regardless of legal status.
o The most recent review of this issue by a court occurred in connection with the 1980 census. Although decided on procedural grounds, the U.S. District Court did address the issue. The opinion in Federation for American Immigration Reform V. Klutznick says: "It [the Constitution] requires the counting of the 'whole number of persons' for apportionment purposes, and while illegal aliens were not a component of the population at the time the Constitution was adopted, they are clearly 'persons'." D.C.D.C. (1980) 486 F. Supp. 564
o There is not an acceptable method to exclude undocumented immigrants from the apportionment counts even if the Census Bureau were directed to do so. One seemingly plausible approach would be to determine the legal status of every person. This causes both perceptual and operational problems that could jeopardize our ability to take the census. Asking about legal status could result in the misperception that the information we collect is used for enforcement. This could seriously threaten cooperation even among legal residents. The answers obtained from such an inquiry would be questionable at best. Indeed, many respondents simply would not be willing or able to answer honestly or accurately. We would be asking respondents to make a legal determination, a process that normally follows a judicial procedure. We face similar problems if we direct undocumented immigrants simply to exclude themselves. Legal residents may find this a convenient way to excuse themselves from participating. Because the Census Bureau could not distinguish the legal and illegal resident nonparticipants, there could be a large undercount among legal residents.
o Another hypothetical procedure might be to estimate the number of undocumented inmigrants from a separate information source and subtract them from the census totals. Concerns with possible alternatives for making these estimates include the lack of an appropriate information source, timing (the estimates could not be developed until the census is complete, thus delaying delivery of apportionment and redistricting counts); and the possibility that the resulting estimates would contain errors serious enough to affect the allocation of Congressional seats.
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LEGAL MANDATES

## ARTICLE 1, BECTION 2

## UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

"Representatives...shall be apportioned among the several states....according to their respective numbers... The actual enumeration shall be in such manner as they (the Congress) shall by law direct"

FIRST CENSUS ACT DF MARCH 1, 1790
"Every person whose usual place of abode shall be in any family....shall be returned as of such family... and the name of every person, who shall be an inhabitant of every district, but without a settled place of residence shall be inserted...in that division where he or she shall be..., and every person occasionally absent at the time of the enumeration as belonging to that place in which he usually resides in the United States."

Titles 2 and 13 , which include:

1. A letter of transmittal from the Director of the Census Bureau to the Secretary of Commerce
2. A letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Commerce to the President.
3. A statement by the Director of the Census Eureau to be delivered at a press conference.
4. A statement by the Secretary of Commerce to be delivered at a press conference.
5. A press release for distribution at the press conference.

Copies of the 1980 version of these materials are attached. The Public Information Office and the Population Division hold major responsibility for developing the corresponding materials for 1990. Draft materials will be prepared in advance of the census, but will not, of course, be finalized until close to the end of calendar 1990 because of unknowns in the population base and the actual population counts and apportionment results.

## TIME SCHEDULE

The computer program for computing the apportionment will be rewritten by December 31, 1987.

Staff to manually compute the apportionment will be trained by December 31, 1989.

Draft materials for the transmittal of the final population counts and the apportionment to the President will be prepared by December 31, 1989.

| ce: | C. Landman (DPLD) | A. Jackson (DOD) | P. Fulton (POP) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | J. Gorman (PIO) | D. Dalzell | J. Costanzo |
|  | G. Wilkenson | D. Stoudt | R. Speaker |

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Bureau of the Census <br> Washington, D.C. 20233 <br> - OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

```
DEC 31 1980
```

Honorable Philip M. Klutznick
Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
Dear Mr. Secretary:
In accordance with the provisions of title 13, United States Code, section 141(b) and title 2, United States Code, sections Ra and Db, I transmit herewith a statement showing the population of each State and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1980, as ascertained by the Twentieth Decennial Census of the United States, and the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under the existing size of the House. This statement furnishes the information which the statute requires to be transmitted by the President to the 97 th Congress in the first week of its first regular session. These population data represent the processed census counts; however, they may be subject to adjustment as the result of pending litigation.

The total population of each State is comprised solely of the resident population. The apportionment of Representatives for the 435 seats in the House shown in the statement is in accordance with the method of equal proportions, as prescribed in title 2, United States Code.

Sincerely,


VINCENT P. BARABBA
Director
Bureau of the Census
Enclosure

## 31 DEC 1980

DEar Mr. President:
There is transmitted herewith a report from the Director of the Bureau of the Census showing the population of each state and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1980, as ascertained by the Twentieth Decennial Census of the United States, and the number of Representatives to which each state is entitied under an apportionment of the existing number of Representatives by the method of equal proportions prescribed by law.

This report was prepared in accordance with the provisions of titie 13, United States Code, section 141(b), and title 2, United States Code, sections $2 a$ and $2 b$.

The report of the Director of the Census Bureau is submitted at this time in compliance with the law requiring that the Secretary of Commerce transmit to you by January 1 the tabulation of the total population by states. These population data represent the processed census counts; however, they may be subject to adjustment as the result of pending litigation. The law also provides that you transmit this information to the 97 th Congress during the first week of its first regular session.

Respectfully,
PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK

Secretary of Commerce
Enclosures
The President
The White House
Hashington, D.C. 20500
cc:Exec. Sec (3)
Ch Econ.
Freije
CMS-Rm. 2428-3, Census

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census
1980 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES BY STATE


STATEMENT BY VINCENT P. BARABBA, DIRECTOR, THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS AT A NEWS CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C. Dec. 31, 1980

Mr. Secretary, I take pleasure in conveying to you the offtcial counts of the population of the United States, and for each of the States, from the 1980 decenntal census.

These are the figures that the Census Bureau has used to determine the number of seats that each. State will receive in the Unfted States House of Representatives for the decade of the. 1980's. They are required by the constitution. for this purpose and mark the 20 th time, spanning a period of 190 years, that a census has been carried out to perform this function.

Under the formula used for this apportionment, a method approved by the Congress, we have calculated a change of 17 seats In the House since the apportionment following the census of 1970. The changes essentially rapresent major shifts in the population during the past decade.

These results also mark, the beginning of a statistical harvest that the Nation will reap from the 1980 census, an effort that proves once again that the overwhelming majority of the country's residents are willing to participate in one of the most I mportant exercises of our free society.

This eensus of all the people is the only source of data. that can provide a detalled statistical portraft of the economic and social characteristics of America at all geographic levels. over the next two or three years, data users everywhere w 111 have the opportuntty to utilize these statistics in carrying out theip responsfbilities, whether in government or in the private sector. In presenting these numbers to you, I would like to say a word about the quality of this census. We can say wfthout qualification that this has been by far the most accurate census ever taken, a census that comes as close as possible to reflecting the actual number of citizens in this country. For this reason, as we fndicated to you earlier, we do not believe that the Nation would be better served by any kind of adjustment of these offictal census numbers.

However, in the years ahead, as we develop the ablifty to detarmine what areas may have been undercounted by the census, as small as those numbers may be, we would make adjustments to reflect these findings to the population estimates that are the basts. for distributing federal funds. We also recognize that because of pending litigation, we may later be required to make widespread adjustments before all the numbers are considered final.

Mr. Secretary, the United States Census Bureau is proud to present to you this first and very important set of population counts from the 20 th decennial census.

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS memomoca 



STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE PEIIIP M. KIUTZNICK ON DEIIVERY OF 1980 CENSUS FIGURES

Mr. Barabba, on behalf of the President of the United States, I accept these figures from the 1980 Census. I will see that they are conveyed to the President in accordance with the requirements under Federal law.

I join the Director in calling this effort the most successfui decennial census in modern times.

It was a tremendous and unprecedented undertaking. Within a period of three months, 300,000 census employees, many with different language skills needed for the assignment, were employed and trained in the techniques required to reach and enumerate members of the diverse ethnic groups within our population. More than 400 temporary offices were established to assemble the data.

So to all those involved-to the Chief Economist, Courtenay Slater, to Director Vince Barabba, to the expert professionals within the Census Bureau, to the thousands of temporary employeesI want to express the Nation's deepest gratitude. The assignment was carried out with a dedication that was in the highest tradition of service to our country.

Indeed, I understand from Mr. Barabba that the final processing of the count was not complete until Sunday, December 28 at 4:58 p.m. That Sunday, I'm told, was only one of many spent by Census workers preparing for this important day.

I also want to congratulate the American people. They completed and returned their census forms in numbers that exceeded the Census Bureau's most optimistic projections. And those who were contacted by the enumerators also cooperated to a high degree.

The 1970 Census counted more than 203 million people. An evaluation of these reswits led the Bureau of the Census to estimate that there had been an undercount of approximately 5 million people.

Prior to the Census just completed, the Bureau estimated the population to be 226 million. The actual count was $226,504,825$, which stands as testimony to the improved techriques employed in this effort and to the dedication of the Census workers.

Of course, no one can say that this or any coont is perfect, and we recognize that some jurisdictions have differences with the results in their areas. The courts are the appropriate place for the adjudication of these differences. We believe the ultimate decisions reached by the courts will be helpful for future censuses.

Again, Mr. Barabba, I commend you and your dedicated staff for a magnificent achievement, one that pioneered many new techniques in census taking, and one that gave the United States the most accurate count of its people ever taken. We are all grateful for the tremendous time, energy, effort and professional skill that you devoted to this undertaking.

## ABSTRACT OF SECRETARIAL CORRESPONDENCE

| Ti: $X$ The Secretary |  | The Depury Secretary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Date:

## 3 1' DEC 1980

From: Chief Economist for the Department of Commerce
Prepared by: VPBarabba, Director, Bureau of the Census
Outgoing to: The President of the United States
Subject: Transmittal of Apportionment Counts

The attached correspondence encloses the statement to be used this week in transmitting the population of each State and the District of Columbia on April 1, 1980, as ascertained by the Twentieth Decennial Census of the United States, and the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under the existing size of the House. This statement furnishes the information which the statute requires to be transmitted by the President to the 97 th Congress in the first week of its first regular session.

These population data will represent the processed census counts; however, they may be subject to adjustment as the result of pending litigation. The Supreme Court has issued a stay of the Court Order in Detroit pending appeal, and all necessary steps are being taken to seek comparable legal relief in New York to clear the way for the release of apportionment counts.

Attachment

Control No. $\qquad$

| SURNAME AND ORGANIZATION (tryoa) | Prepared or | CLEARED ${ }^{\text {ar }}$ | cleareo br | CLEAREO ${ }^{\text {ar }}$ | CLEARED BY | cleariobr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VPBarabbá <br> Dir/Census | PCFreije DAGC/EA | * |  |  |  |
| INITIALS AND DATE |  | $\begin{aligned} & y / 2 \\ & 1,24100 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |

1980 CENSUS POPULATION COUNT FOR U.S. IS $226,504,825$;
REAPPORTIONMENT WOULD SHIFT 17 SEATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The population total of the United States counted in the 1980 census is $226,504,825$.

The figure was received today by Secretary of Commerce Philip M. Klutznick from the Director of the Census Bureau, Vincent P. Barabba, who also provided the Secretary with final population counts for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The Secretary is required by law to deliver final counts to the President by Dec. $31,1980$.

The new population count is 11.4 percent greater than the 1970 population count of $203,302,031$.

These counts determine the apportionment of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the states, since the Constitution requires a census every 10 years to assure that each state's population is equitably represented in the House. The utilization of these figures may be affected by the outcome of litigation now under appeal.

An attached table lists the final 1980 census population totals for the U.S., the District of Columbia, and the 50 states; the number of Representatives to which each state is entitled on the basis of the new counts; and the changes in House seats since the 1970 reapportionment.

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE <br> Bureau of the Census 1980 POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES BY STATE

## State

> Resident Population used as the basis for apportionment (1)

Number of Representatives based on 1980 census (2)

## Change from 1970 apportionment <br> (3)

United States 1/ $226,504,825 \quad 435$
Alabama $\quad 3,890,061 \quad 7$
Alaska
Arizona
400,481
1
Arkansas
2,717,866
5
$+1$
California
2,285,513
4
$23,668,562 \quad 45$
$+2$
Colorado $2,888,834 \quad 6$
$+1$
Connecticut 3,107,576
6
Delaware 595,225
District of Columbia 2/ 637,651
Florida
9,739,992
Georgia $5,464,265 \quad 10$
Hawaif $\quad 965,000$
2
Idaho
943,935
Illinois
Indiana
$11,418,461$
2
5,490,179
22
$-2$

Iowa
Kansas
2,913,387
6
Kentucky
2,363,208
5
Louisiana
3,661,433
7

Maine
4,203,972
8
1,124,660
2
Maryland
4,216,446
8
Massachusetts
5,737,037
11
$-1$
Michigan
9,258,344
18
4,077,148
2,520,638
8
Mississippi
Missouri $4,917,444 \quad 9$
Montana
Nebraska
786,690
Hevada
1,570,006
799,184
$+1$
New Hampshire
920,610
2

State

Resident Population used as the basis for apportionment (1)

Number of
Representatives based on 1980 census (2)

Change from 1970 apportionment
(3)

Hew Jersey
7,364,158
1,299,968
17,557,288
5,874,429
652,695
10,797, 419
3,025,266
2,632,663
11,866,728
947,154
3,119,208
South Carolina
. 690,178
4,590,750
14,228,383
1,461,037
511,456
6,346,279
4,130,163
1,949,644
4,705,335
470,816
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohto
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island

South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

14
3

$$
+1
$$

34

$$
-1
$$

$$
-5
$$

11

21
$-2$
$+1$
5
23
$-2$
2
6
1
$-1$
$+1$
$+3$
$+1$
27
3

1/ Includes the District of Columbia. The total excluding the District of Columbia is $225,867,174$.
2) Excluded in determination of apportionment.

Authenticated:


VINCENT P. BARABBA
Director
Bureau of the Census

## Calculating an Apportionment

Three components are needed in order to compute an apportionment:

1. The population base - the census obtains a count of the apportionment population for each of the 50 states. (The population of the District of Columbia is not included in these computations.)
2. The size of the body (the number of representatives) to be divided among the 50 states - the current size of the House of Representatives is 435 members and has not altered since the apportionment following the 1910 census (except for a temporary increase in 1959 when Alaska and Hawaii became states).
3. A method to use for the calculation - the method is designated by Congress. For the past five decades, it has been the method of "equal proportions."

The method of equal proportions uses a priority list in order to identify how the seats in the House of Representatives will be divided among the 50 states. Since the Constitution requires that each state be assigned at least one representative, we really only apportion 385 seats. The priority values are determined by multiplying each of the state populations by a set of multipliers. The multipliers are the reciprocals of the geometric means of successive numbers, i.e., $2=0.70710678$, $3=0.40824829$, etc.

Thus, the formula for the priority values is:


$$
\text { Where } \begin{aligned}
P= & \text { the state population } \\
n= & \text { the number of seats a state would have if } \\
& \text { it gained a seat. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Listed below are the first five multipliers that correspond to a states claim to the second through sixth representatives. As the number of representatives increases, the size of the multiplier decreases.

## Number of Representatives

2
3
4
5
6

Multiplier
.70710678
.40824829
.28867513
. 22360680
. 18257419

In order to assign the 51st seat, the population of each state is multiplied by . 70710678 (the multiplier that corresponds to a 2nd representative). These priority values are then ranked from highest to lowest. The state with the highest priority value (i.e., the largest population) is assigned the 51st seat. In 1980, that state was California. In order to assign the 52nd seat, the population of California is then multiplied by .40824829 (the multiplier corresponding to 3 representatives) to obtain a different priority value, while the priority values for the remaining states stay the same. These priority values are then ranked again and the state with the highest priority value is awarded the 52nd seat. In 1980, the state that had the next highest priority value was New York. We continue in this fashion until the 385 seats ( 435 total) have been allocated.

Listed below are the first 10 seats awarded on the basis of the equal proportions method in 1980.

| Seat | State | 1980 <br> Population | Seat <br> Number | Multiplier | Priority <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 | California | $23,668,562$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $16,736,200$ |
| 52 | New York | $17,557,288$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $12,414,877$ |
| 53 | Texas | $14,228,383$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $10,060,986$ |
| 54 | California | $23,668,562$ | 3 | 0.40824829 | $9,662,650$ |
| 55 | Pennsylvania | $11,866,728$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $8,391,044$ |
| 56 | Illinois | $11,418,461$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $8,074,071$ |
| 57 | Ohio | $10,797,419$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $7,634,928$ |
| 58 | New York | $17,557,288$ | 3 | 0.40824829 | $7,167,733$ |
| 59 | Florida | $9,739,992$ | 2 | 0.70710678 | $6,887,214$ |
| 60 | California | $23,668,562$ | 4 | 0.28867513 | $6,832,525$ |

TABIS OR MULITPLIERS FOR FIVE METHODS OF APPGRTIOMTETI

| H | Smalleat Divisors $\frac{1}{x-1}$ <br> (1) | Barricnic Mean $\frac{2 x-1}{2 x(x-1)}$ <br> (2) | Brual Proporticns $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x(x-1)}}$ <br> (3) | mjor Freotions $\frac{2}{2 x-1}$ <br> (4) | areatect pivisors $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \hline x \\ (5) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1.00000000 | 75000000 | 70710678 | 66666667 | 50000000 |
| 3 | 50000000 | 41666667 | 40824829 | 40000000 | 33333333 |
| 4 | . 3333333 | 29166667 | 28867513 | 28571429 | 25000000 |
| 5 | 25000000 | 22500000 | 22360680 | 22222222 | 20000000 |
| 6 | 20000000 | 18333333 | 18257419 | 18181818 | 16066667 |
| 7 | 16666667 | 15476190 | 15430335 | 15384615 | 14885714 |
| 8 | 14285714 | 13392857 | 13363062 | 13333333 | 12500000 |
| 9 | 13500000 | 11805556 | 11785113 | 11764706 | 11111111 |
| 10 | 11111111 | 10555556 | 10540926 | 10526316 | 1000000 |
| 11 | 10000000 | 09545455 | 9534626 | 9523810 | 9090909 |
| 12 | 9090909 | 08712121 | 8703883 | 8695652 | 8333333 |
| 13 | 835333 | 08012801 | 8006408 | 8000000 | 7692308 |
| 14 | 7692308 | 07417582 | 7412493 | 7407407 | 7142857 |
| 15 | 7142857 | 06904762 | 6900656 | 6896552 | 6066667 |
| 15 | 6606667 | 06458333 | 6454972 | 6451613 | $6 \% 50000$ |
| 17 | \%250000 | 06060176 | 6063391 | 6060606 | 5882353 |
| 18 | 5882353 | 05718954 | 5716620 | 5714286 | 555.5556 |
| 19 | 5-555.55\% | 05409357 | 5407381 | 5405405 | 5663158 |
| 20 | 5263158 | 05131579 | 5129892 | 5128205 | 5000000 |
| 21 | 5000000 | 04880952 | 4879500 | 4878049 | 4761905 |
| 22 | 4761905 | 04653680 | 4652421 | 4651163 | 4545455 |
| 23 | 4545455 | 04446640 | 4445542 | 4444444 | 4347826 |
| 24 | 4347826 | $0425 \% 246$ | 4256283 | 4255319 | 4166667 |
| 25 | 4106667 | 04083333 | 4087483 | 4081633 | 4000000 |
| 26 | 40.00000 | 03923077 | 3928323 | 3921569 | 3846154 |
| 27 | 3845154 | 03774929. | 3774257 | 3773585 | 3703704 |
| 28 | 3703704 | 03637566 | 3636965 | 3636364 | 3571429 |
| 29 | 3571459 | 03509852 | 3509312 | 3508772 | 3448276 |
| 30 | 3448276 | 03390805 | 3390318 | 3389831 | 3333333 |
| 31 | 3335333 | 03279570 | 3279129 | $3 \square 78689$ | 362580.6 |
| 32 | 3225806 | 03175403 | 3175003 | 3174603 | 3125000 |
| 33 | 3125000 | 03077652 | 3077287 | 3076923 | 3030303 |
| 34 | 3030303 | 02985740 | 2985407 | 2985075 | 2941176 |
| 35 | 2941176 | 02899160 | 2898855 | 2898551 | 2857144 |
| 36 | 2857143 | 02817460 | 2817181 | 2816901 | 2977778 |
| 37 | 7777778 | 02740240 | 2739983 | 7739726 | 2702703 |
| 38 | 2702703 | 02667141 | 2666904 | 2666667 | 2631579 |
| 39 | 2631579 | 02597841 | 25976\%2 | 2597403 | 2564103 |
| 40 | 2564103 | 02532051 | 2531848 | 2531646 | 2500000 |
| 41 | 2500000 | 02469512 | 2469324 | 2469136 | 2439024 |
| 42 | 2439024 | 02409988 | 2409813 | 2409639 | 2380952 |
| 43 | 238095\% | 02353267 | 2353104 | 2352941 | 2325581 |
| 44 | 2325581 | 02299154 | 2299002 | 2298851 | <272727 |
| 45 | 2272727 | 02247475 | 2247333 | 2247191 | दहरदनट2 |
| 46 | 2222222 | 02198068 | 2197935 | 2197802 | 2173913 |
| 47 | 2173913 | 02150786 | 2150662 | 2150538 | <127660 |
| 48 | 2127660 | 02105496 | 2105380 | 2105263 | 2083333 |
| 49 | 2003-33 | 02062075 | 2061965 | द061856 | C04081\% |
| 50 | 2040816 | 02020408 | 2020305 | ¢020202 | 2000000 |
| 51 | 2000000 | 01980392 | 1980295 | 1980198 | 1960784 |
| 52 | 1960784 | 01941931 | 1941839 | 1941748 | 1923077 |
| 53 | 1.92.30.77 | 01904935 | 1904848 | 1904762 | 1886793 |
| 54 | 1886793 | 01869322 | 1869240 | 1869159 | 1.851852 |
| 55 | 1851852 | 01835017 | 1834940 | 1834862 | 181818 |
| 56 | 1818182 | 01801948 | 1801875 | 1801802 | 1785714 |
| 57 | 1785714 | 01770050 | 1769981 | 1769912 | 1754386 |
| 58 | 1.754386 | $0173926 \%$ | 1739196 | 1739130 | 1724138 |
| 59 | 1724138 | 01709527 | 1709464 | 1709402 | 1694915 |
| 60 | 1694915 | 01680791 | 1680732 | 1680672 | 1666667 |


[^0]:    1 Total population includes emmerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decennial census under Title 13, United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

[^1]:    :as:

[^2]:    1 Total popilation includes enumerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decemial census under fitle 13 . United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

    2 Total population, not including the District of Cotumbia.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ The apportionment population does not include the resident or the overseas population for the District of Columbia.

[^4]:    Excludes the population of District of Columbia; the population of the territories; prior to 1940, the number of American Indians not taxed; and, prior to 1870 , two-fifths of the slave population. In 1990 and 1970, includes selected segments of Americans abroad.

    T This figure is the actual number of Representatives apportioned at the beginning of each decade.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ratio of resident population to Representative in 1990 is 570,352 .
    ${ }^{4}$ Ratio of resident population to Representative in 1970 is 465,468 .
    ${ }^{5}$ No apportionment was made on the basis of the 1920 census.
    ${ }^{5}$ Amended by act of May 30, 1872.
    ${ }^{7}$ Amended by act of March 4, 1862.
    ${ }^{8}$ Amended by act of July 30, 1852.
    ${ }^{9}$ The minimum ratio of population to Representative, as stated in Article 1, Section 2 of the United States Constitution.
    

[^5]:    e 1990 population counts set forth herein are subject to possible correction for undercount or overcount. The U.S. Department ;ommerce is considering whether to correct these counts and will publish corrected counts, if any, no later than July $15,1991$.

[^6]:    Negative values in parenthesis except for percents. U.S. average C.D. population excludes D.C.

[^7]:    1The 1990 census apportionment populations was 249.0 million. This number includes 0.9 million overseas military and Federal civilian employees and their dependents and excludes the District of Columbia.

[^8]:    * Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

[^9]:    * Persons of Hispanic origin can be of any race.

[^10]:    * Persons of Hispanic origin can be of any race.

[^11]:    1 Total population inctudes emmerations for the resident population as collected in the 21st decennial census under Title 13. United States Code, for the 50 States and the District of Columbia and counts of military and federal civilian employees and their dependents overseas as reported by various Federal agencies.

[^12]:    NOW PLEASE OPEN THE FLAP TO PAGE 2 AND ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS FOR THE FIRST 7 PEOPLE LISTED. USE A BLACK LEAD PENCIL ONLY.

