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Redistricting Timeline
Criteria Adopted for Congressional Districts
Overview of Data Releases to Date and Upcoming
Comparing Census Results for the Same Geographic Unit
Data:
  - Population Totals
  - Race Distribution
The Count Question Resolution Process
April 1, 2011 - Census figures available: triggers congressional and legislative redistricting DONE

90 days from receipt of census figures - Final plan for congressional districts must be filed with Secretary of State

Calendar 2011-2012 - begin legislative redistricting: must hold 1 public hearing

Session 2013 10th Legislative Day - Commission must submit plan for legislative redistricting. Within 30 days the Legislature must return the plan with recommendations, within 30 days the plan is filed with the Secretary of State, becomes law, and Commission is dissolved. Budget needed for maintenance and support of system.
**Mandatory Criteria**

1. Population Equality

- Senate: 989,415 total residents ÷ 50 senate seats = 19,788 per senate district

- House: 989,415 total residents ÷ 100 house seats = 9,894 per house district
2. Compact and Contiguous Districts

3. Protection of Minority Voting Rights to participate in the political process

3. Race cannot be the predominant factor to which traditional discretionary criteria are subordinated

(Continued)
### Discretionary Criteria

1. **Follow the Lines of Political Units**

2. **Follow the Geographic Boundaries**
   - Census uses the bureau’s own geography – Tiger/Line Files
   - Data by state, county, cities and towns, Census Designated Places (CDP), school districts, and reservations

3. **Keep Communities of Interest Intact**
   
   Census data by age, gender, race, ethnicity, language, urban vs. rural area, income, employment, occupation, poverty status, education, veteran’s status, and household and family relationships
Compiled from the Census 2010 Survey – 10 Questions

Data at all Geographic Levels

- Redistricting Data Released March 2011
  - # of Residents Total
  - # 18 and older, Race of Residents
  - Hispanic or Latino Origin
  - Housing Units by Occupancy Status (occupied or vacant)

- Local Profiles - JUST RELEASED May 12, 2011!
  - Age and Gender Distributions
  - Detailed Race
  - Household Relationship and Type
  - Group Quarters Population
  - Housing Tenure (whether the housing occupant owns or rents)
Compiled from the American Community Survey – 60+ Questions

- ACS provides socio-economic data – education, housing characteristics, employment, income, veteran status, disabilities, health insurance, etc.
- Replaced the prior Census Long Form – SAMPLE SURVEY NOT A CENSUS.

ALL RESULTS NOW AVAILABLE

- Areas below 20,000: 5-year Estimates (2005 - 2009)
- Areas with a population 20,000+: 3-Year Estimates (2007 - 2009)
- Areas with a population 65,000+: 1-Year Estimates (2009)
CENSUS 2010 AND THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY (ACS) RELEASES TO DATE

CENSUS 2010 STATE PRODUCTS STILL TO COME

- **SUMMER 2011 – DETAILED TABLES**
  - Population counts for 63 race categories and Hispanic or Latino - Tract and Block levels
  - Some detailed race and housing characteristics at the tract level
  - American Indian Tribal Affiliation at the Tract Level

- **December 2011- April 2012 (SF2 and ACS 2010)**
  - All population and housing characteristics for many detailed race, Hispanic or Latino categories, and American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes
Census 2010 and The American Community Survey (ACS) Comparing Census Results for the Same Geographic Unit

GEOGRAPHIC BRIDGE CENSUS 2000 to CENSUS 2010

- State, Counties, Reservations:
  - No significant boundary changes
  - Data directly comparable 🎉

- CDPs, Cities and Towns, School Districts, Tract-to-Tract, and Block-to-Block:
  - Significant boundary changes in some areas
  - Data not uniformly directly comparable 😞
  - Solution “Unknown” – Will try using relationship files to be able to compare the same geographic units? CEIC exploring the potential....
Comparing Census Results for the Same Geography

Some Block Boundaries Coincide to Previous Census Block Boundaries

**Census 2000 Blocks**

**Census 2010 Blocks**
However **Most** MT block boundaries changed and potentially all the numbering.

Census 2000 Blocks

Census 2010 Blocks
CENSUS 2010 AND THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY
COMPARING CENSUS RESULTS FOR THE SAME GEOGRAPHIC UNIT

Example of Boundary Changes
DATA: MT POPULATION TRENDS

Some General Patterns:

- Population is aging
  - Median age rose to 39.8 in 2010 from 37.5 in 2000. (The median age was 29 in the 1980 Census results)
  - 14.6% are 65 years of age or older. By 2030, 25% will be 65 or older.
  - More diversity – 60.9% increase in foreign-born residents
- Metro Areas and Large Counties gained population. Rural areas lost population
- Average Household Size continues to decline
  - Average household size decreased to 2.4 in 2010 from 2.6 in 2000. (The average household size in 1980 was 2.7)
Montana gained 87,220 residents from 2000 to 2010

State was fifth on the list to gain another Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current # of Representatives</th>
<th>Seats if the cutoff was 450 seats instead of 435 for total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>436th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>437th Would have retained a seat which was lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>438th Would have retained a seat which was lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>439th Would have retained a seat which was lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>440th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>441st Would have retained a seat which was lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>442nd Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>443rd Would have retained one of two seats lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>444th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>445th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>446th Would have retained a seat which was lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>447th Would have gained another new seat - Gained 4 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>448th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>449th Would have gained a new seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>450th Would have gained another new seat - Gained 2 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Population by Senate District
### Senate Districts with Considerable Population Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th># Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
<th>% Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 35</td>
<td>8,099</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 34</td>
<td>7,527</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 3</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 32</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 5</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 23</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 49</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 24</td>
<td>4,372</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Districts with Considerable Population Increases

Missoula Area Legislative Districts
Click on a district to identify its legislators:

Billings Area Legislative Districts
Click on a district to identify its legislators:
### Senate Districts with Considerable Population Decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th># Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
<th>% Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 18</td>
<td>(1,596)</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 12</td>
<td>(1316)</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 17</td>
<td>(1,135)</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE DISTRICT 15</td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Districts with Considerable Population Decreases

Great Falls Area Legislative Districts
Click on a district to identify its legislators:
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Change in Population by House District

Census 2010: MONTANA
Population Percent Change By Montana House District Census 2000 to Census 2010

Percent Change
-12.5 to -5.9
-5.8 to -0.1
0.0 to 9.7
9.8 to 28.6
28.7 to 61.0

Montana Percent Change: 9.7
Note: Geographically small districts in areas of higher population density are not visible at this map scale.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, PL 94-171, 2011

May 2011 - Population Change by House Dist 2010.rvp

Map by: Census & Economic Information Center
Montana Department of Commerce
301 S. Park Ave, Helena MT 59601
(406) 444-2740 email: ceic@mt.gov
http://ceic.mt.gov
## House Districts with Considerable Population Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th># Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
<th>% Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 69</td>
<td>8,099</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 67</td>
<td>7,527</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 46</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 98</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 64</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 10</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 6</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
House Districts with Considerable Population Increases

Bozeman - Belgrade Area Legislative Districts

Missoula Area Legislative Districts

Click on a district to identify its legislators:
## Population Trends

### House Districts with Considerable Population Decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th># Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
<th>% Change Census 2000 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 36</td>
<td>(1,152)</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 24</td>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 34</td>
<td>(719)</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE DISTRICT 29</td>
<td>(717)</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Population Trends

House Districts with Considerable Population Decreases
# Race Trends

## Distribution of Montana Population by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2010 Census % of Total Population</th>
<th>2000 Census % of Total Population</th>
<th>2010 Census #</th>
<th>2000 Census #</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2010</th>
<th># Change 2000 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>884,961</td>
<td>817,229</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>67,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Alone</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>62,555</td>
<td>56,068</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>24,976</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>9,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Distribution of Montana Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2010 Census % of Total Population</th>
<th>2000 Census % of Total Population</th>
<th>2010 Census #</th>
<th>2000 Census #</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2010</th>
<th># Change 2000 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>960,850</td>
<td>884,114</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>76,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>28,565</td>
<td>18,081</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>10,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aging of Montana’s Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
<th>2000 Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age - All</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2.3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age - Male</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>2.2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age - Female</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.5 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Count Question Resolution

Time Frame:
- Issues can be submitted: June 2011 – June 2013
- Issues should be resolved by end of 2013.

Impact:
Changes WILL:
- Be official census counts
- Affect federal funding and program eligibility
- Affect state revenue sharing
- Be reflected in annual population estimates
- Be suitable for all official purposes
- Be published in an “Errata” document
Impact:

Changes WILL NOT:

- Affect redistricting files or any other census products published online or by other means (aside from Errata document)
- Be available by age, race, sex, or other characteristics
Types of Correctible Errors:

- Boundary errors
- Processing errors - number of housing units / group quarters identified during the census process “but erroneously included as duplicates or excluded due to processing errors”
  - Corrections will “add or delete specific living quarters and people associated with them.”
- Geocoding errors (e.g. living quarters assigned to wrong block)
TO ACCESS THE DATA

- Visit the Montana or U.S. Census websites
- Go to the CEIC website: www.ceic.mt.gov
- Go to the Census Bureau’s website: www.census.gov
Census & Economic Information Center
Montana Department of Commerce
(406) 841-2740
mcraigle@mt.gov
www.ceic.mt.gov

PowerPoint presentation available on CEIC’s web site at www.ceic.mt.gov
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS...

2005-2009 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimate and 2009 1 Year Estimate

Census 2000 Summary File 3, 2002;