

FERREL GUILLORY

Director
guillory@unc.edu

ANDREW HOLTON

Associate Director
holton@unc.edu

JENNIFER WEAVER

Assistant Director for Research
jennifer_weaver@unc.edu

THAD BEYLE

Associate Director
beyle@email.unc.edu

HODDING CARTER, III

Leadership Fellow
hoddincarter@unc.edu

D. LEROY TOWNS

Research Fellow
dltowns@email.unc.edu

THE PROGRAM ON PUBLIC LIFE

is a non-partisan organization devoted to serving the people of North Carolina and the South by informing the public agenda and nurturing leadership.

To receive an electronic version or to subscribe to the printed version, send your name and e-mail address to southnow@unc.edu.

The Program on Public Life is part of the Center for the Study of the American South at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The Program on Public Life wishes to recognize its funders that provide support for the publication of Data-Net, as well as the research, white papers and convening through which the program seeks to connect scholars at UNC-Chapel Hill with public policy makers and opinion leaders:

Progress Energy

Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation

Triangle Community Foundation

Legislative Electoral Trends

FERREL GUILLORY, Director,
Program on Public Life

Analyses of North Carolina politics usually, and not surprisingly, focus on the outcome of races for governor and other statewide elections. So it was in our earlier issue this year that NC Data-Net examined the “tide-changing” nature of the 2008 elections.

But you cannot get a full picture of North Carolina politics without attention to the elected representatives of the people known collectively as the General Assembly. So in this issue, we look back at the 2008 legislative elections and look ahead to the redistricting that follows the 2010 Census.

We look back in three ways:

1) Drawing on the data base of campaign finance reports compiled over the years by UNC political scientist Thad Beyle, we maintain our long-standing practice in Data-Net of reporting on spending in legislative races. Andrew Holton, associate director of the UNC Program on Public Life, Lewis McCorkle, an undergraduate at UNC-Chapel Hill who was an intern this summer at the program, and Justin Martin, who recently received a PhD in journalism and mass communication, ploughed through the candidates’ campaign reports. Jennifer Weaver, the program’s assistant director for research, provided the commentary and editing. Indeed, she served as general editor of this issue.

2) Lewis McCorkle also used the legislative election results reported by the state Board of Elections to point out that voter participation varies considerably from district to district. Of course, a goodly number of legislators ran unopposed. Still, even in competitive races between a Democrat and a Republican, some races had thousands of voters more than other races.

3) Data-Net looks ahead by presenting an extensive chart, with commentary, showing how population growth and shifts are likely to influence the redrawing of legislative districts in the wake of the 2010 Census. The process of metropolitanization will give more representation to Wake and neighboring counties, and to Mecklenburg and its adjoining counties.

For the redistricting analysis, we are grateful for the assistance of Gerry Cohen, director of the Legislative Drafting Division. His dry title masks the fact that Gerry has long served the legislature as a keeper of institutional memory and is also an expert on the redistricting process. He writes a regular online blog on the legislative process and, from time to time, redistricting:
<http://ncbilldrafting.wordpress.com/>

Here are online links to the sources for this issue of Data-Net: North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management: <http://www.osbm.state.nc.us/>; State Board of Elections: <http://www.sboe.state.nc.us/>; U.S. Census Bureau: www.census.gov. ☒

Campaign Spending: Fall 2008

The more things change, the more they stay the same. So the saying goes, and also tells the story of campaign spending in North Carolina state races, in which Democrats continue to dominate. This issue of Data-net examines campaign spending in the 2008 state-level races. The major trends are:

➤ Spending in presidential election years increased from \$26,445,400 in 2004 to \$27,800,202 in 2008, an increase of 5.12%.

➤ Though the Republicans experienced increases in spending in the 1994 and 1996 House races, those remain anomalies as the Democrats have outspent Republicans by healthy margins in every state House and Senate election year since.

✎ In 2008 Democrats spent \$9,781,326 in Senate races to the GOP's \$5,467,161, and spent \$8,273,992 in House races to the GOP's \$4,277,722.

✎ Republican spending has increased, but still adds up to only about 36-38% of total spending.

✎ Fifty victorious House candidates, and 21 Senate victorious candidates (71 out of 170), had no opposition by a major party candidate in 2008. This number is down somewhat from 2004, when slightly more than half of General Assembly members were elected in unopposed races.

✎ Out of 120 House races there were only 50 that were competitive and both candidates reported a campaign spending total (as of July 31, 2009). Of these 50 races, 45 were won by the candidate spending the most money. Out of the 50 Senate races there were only 17 that were competitive and both candidates reported spending totals (as of July 31, 2009). Of these 17 races, 16 were won by the candidate raising the most money.

✎ Marc Basnight far outspent all other candidates for the General Assembly, with \$1,775,379 in reported expenditures.

Democrats Continue to Outspend Republicans

The money game continues to be controlled by the Democrats in state elections. Of the \$27,800,202 spent in the 2008 election cycle, \$18,055,319 — 65% — was spent by Democrats, while Republicans spent \$9,744,833, or 35%. In the Senate, Democrats spent \$9,781,326 to the Republicans' \$5,467,161, or 64.1% to 35.9%. The spending gap was not much closer in the House, with Republicans spending only \$4,277,722, or 34%, to the Democrats' \$8,273,992, or 66%. Total Senate spending increased by almost \$2 million from the 2004 election cycle, whereas total House race spending decreased by about \$565,000.

Leadership Matters

House Speaker Joe Hackney and Senate Pro Tem Marc Basnight far out-spent all other candidates, Democrat or Republican. Neither of these members are in competitive districts — both ran unopposed. Their position as leaders in their respective chambers makes them powerful fundraising machines, and in turn they are able to spend money to help get fellow Democrats elected. In Senator Basnight's case, \$1,336,000 of his campaign expenses were spent on other candidates. Speaker Hackney used \$744,072 of his total spending on other candidates. These two powerful positions in the General Assembly create a rising spending tide to float all boats in the party.

Top Spenders: House races

Another way to look at the Democratic Party's spending advantage is to look at the top spenders in competitive races.¹ The Democrats spending the most in competitive races spent \$1,974,590,41 to the Republicans' \$1,210,852.83. Among the top spenders in competitive races listed in the table below, Rep. Randy Stewart spent the most on his campaign — \$382,283.27. The next highest spender was House Majority Leader Rep. Hugh Holliman, who spent \$354,570.59. The ten highest spending Democratic candidates in contested races had expenses ranging from \$217,183.93 to \$382,283.27. On the Democratic side, House Speaker Joe Hackney was the top Democratic spender overall at \$914,176, but ran unopposed. All of the highest spending Democrats won their races.

The top spender on the Republican side was Rep. David Lewis, who spent \$232,027.89. Following Lewis was House Minority Leader Rep. Paul Stam at \$196,613.08. The highest spenders in contested races had expenses ranging

Expenditures from Both Houses, Presidential Election Years

Year	# of Districts*	Dem \$ [#]	%	Rep \$	%	Total
1992	140	3,914,831.00	63.7	2,232,595.00	36.3	6,147,426.00
1996	140	8,688,804.00	53.1	7,675,244.00	46.9	16,364,049.00
2000	140	15,655,436.00	70	6,715,266.00	30	22,370,929.00
2004	170	16,802,936.00	63.5	9,607,873.00	36.3	26,445,400.00
2008	170	18,055,319.00	65	9,744,883.75	35	27,800,202.75

*The number of districts was 140 until the state converted to single-member districts in 2002.
#All dollar amounts prior to 2004 have been adjusted for inflation to 2004 dollars for all tables.

from \$85,227.83 to \$232,027.89. Several Republican House members in uncontested races spent as much as or more than those listed in the table. These are: Rep. Harold Brubaker, District 78 (\$274,979.12), Rep. Jerry Dockham, District 80 (\$273,155.92), Rep. Ruth Samuelson, District 104 (\$101,183.33), and Rep. Daniel McComas, District 19 (\$93,042.90). All but one of the highest spending Republicans won their races. In District 116, Tim Moffitt lost to Rep. Jane Whilden. Though Moffitt was one of the top Republican spenders, his opponent nevertheless spent more on her campaign and won the race.

Democrats with the Highest Campaign Spending — Competitive House Races

District	Candidates	Winner's Party	Total Spent
25	Stewart (v. Bullock)	Dem	382,283.27
81	Holliman (v. Brown)	Dem	354,570.59
44	Dickson (v. Huddleston)	Dem	332,164.96
41	Harrell (v. Gossage)	Dem	318,841.38
51	Love (v. Shook)	Dem	306,295.39
116	Whilden (v. Moffitt)	Dem	267,361.39
93	Tarleton (v. Soucek)	Dem	252,333.71
88	Warren (v. Hollo)	Dem	251,703.07
69	Gibson (v. Barker)	Dem	230,291.34
10	Braxton (v. LaRoque)	Dem	217,183.93

Note: House Speaker Joe Hackney spent the most on any House campaign, by far (\$914,176.52), but was excluded from this list because he had no opponent.

Republicans with the Highest Campaign Spending — Competitive House Races

District	Candidates	Winner's Party	Total Spent
53	Lewis (v. Tart)	Rep	232,027.89
37	Stam (v. Ridpath)	Rep	196,613.08
74	Folwell (v. Boyles)	Rep	160,813.33
82	Barnhart (v. Troutman)	Rep	134,205.10
95	Mills (v. Ober)	Rep	124,075.31
116	(Whilden v.) Moffitt	Dem	122,693.09
36	Dollar (v. Swanstrom)	Rep	113,114.42
85	Gillespie (v. Aldridge)	Rep	107,176.15
83	Johnson (v. Richards)	Rep	95,719.96
26	Daughtry (v. Garner)	Rep	85,227.83

Note: Harold J. Brubaker (district 78), Jerry Dockham (district 80), and Ruth Samuelson (district 104) were also top Republican spenders, but were excluded because they had no opponents.

¹ These tables show expenditures for the top spenders for races in which there were candidates from both major political parties. Several candidates raised more money than those listed in the tables, but ran unopposed. Those candidates are discussed elsewhere in the text.

Democrats with the highest campaign spending— competitive Senate races

District	Candidates	Winner's Party	Total Spent
9	Boseman (v. Lee)	Dem	871,539.45
8	Soles, Jr. (v. Fennell)	Dem	839,495.59
43	Hoyle (v. Harrington)	Dem	739,153.97
46	Melton (v. Clary)	Rep	672,059.04
24	Foriest (v. Gunn, Jr.)	Dem	638,355.05
47	Queen (v. Presnell)	Dem	575,202.44
16	Stein (v. Alexander, Jr.)	Dem	486,957.75
5	Davis (v. Pate Jr.)	Dem	449,181.61
12	Carroll (v. Rouzer)	Rep	211,064.67
45	Goss (v. Butler)	Dem	187,209.43

Note: Marc Basnight (District 1), Linda Garrou (District 32), Clark Jenkins (District 3), and A.B. Swindell (District 11) were all top spenders but were excluded from the list because they had no opponents.

While all ten of the highest spending Democrats spent over \$200,000 in contested races, only one of their Republican counterparts spent above \$200,000.

Senate spending

Among those Senate candidates spending the most money in competitive campaigns, the Democrats also enjoy a distinct advantage, spending \$5,670,219 to the Republicans' \$3,081,682. Eight of the top 10 highest-spending candidates in both major parties were in the same races. The most expensive races are also the most competitive in the Senate. The Democratic candidate won 6 of these 8 races, meaning the Republicans spent a great deal of money on unsuccessful races. The candidate spending the most money won in all eight of these races.

The highest spending Democrat in competitive Senate races was Sen. Julia Boseman, who spent \$871,539.45, followed by Sen. R.C. Soles at \$839,495.59. The Democratic Senate candidates spending the most money in competitive races ranged from \$187,209.43 to \$871,539.45. There were four candidates who were top spenders running in unopposed races. As discussed above, first among these was Senate Pro Tem Marc Basnight, (District 1) who spent

Republicans with the highest campaign spending— competitive Senate races

District	Candidates	Winner's party	Total spent
15	Hunt (v. Mintz)	Rep	813,281.54
24	Gunn, Jr. (v. Foriest)	Dem	386,358.64
12	Rouzer (v. Carroll)	Rep	365,547.14
46	Clary (v. Melton)	Rep	290,334.11
9	Lee (v. Boseman)	Dem	250,075.73
5	Pate, Jr. (v. Davis)	Dem	240,294.11
16	Alexander, Jr (v. Stein)	Dem	225,085.76
2	Preston (v. Muse)	Rep	181,489.29
8	Fennell (v. Soles, Jr.)	Dem	178,961.32
43	Harrington (v. Hoyle)	Dem	150,255.33

Note: Bob Rucho (District 39), Phil Berger (District 26), Tom Apodaca (District 48), and Fletcher Hartsell (District 36) were all top spenders but were excluded from the list because they had no opponents.

\$1,79,375. In addition to Sen. Basnight were: Sen. Linda Garrou, District 32 (\$210,428.41), Sen. Clark Jenkins, District 3 (\$214,512.10), and Sen. A.B. Swindell, District 11 (\$197,468.11). The highest spending Democrats won eight out of the ten races they spent the most money on. In District 46 Keith Melton lost to Sen. Debbie Clary, despite spending more money. In District 12, Kay Carroll lost to Sen. David Rouzer.

The Republican spending the most money in a competitive race was Sen. Neal Hunt, who totaled \$813,281.54 in expenditures. Hunt was far ahead in the Republican pack for spending, with the second highest spender — Rick Gunn, Jr. — spending \$386,358.64. The range for the highest spending races for Republicans was from \$150,255.33 to \$813,281.54. Other top spending Republicans who were not included in the table because they were in noncompetitive races were: Sen. Bob Rucho, District 39 (\$452,862.98), Sen. Phil Berger, District 26 (\$240,714.71), Sen. Tom Apodaca, District 48 (\$224,638.56), and Sen. Fletcher Hartsell, District 36 (\$205,631.33). In contrast to the Democrats, Republicans lost six of the ten races they spent the most money on. In District 24, Rick Gunn, Jr lost to Sen. Tony Foriest,

State House Expenditures, Presidential Election Years

Year	# of Districts	Dem \$	%	Rep \$	%	Total
1992	98	2,187,598.00	59.5	1,486,059.00	40.5	3,673,657.00
1996	98	3,875,368.00	42.3	5,295,812.00	57.7	9,171,180.00
2000	98	8,102,401.00	62.5	4,855,496.00	37.5	12,957,897.00
2004	120	7,597,603.00	57.9	5,520,071.00	42.1	13,117,674.00
2008	120	8,273,992.75	66	4,277,722.75	34	12,551,715.50

State Senate Expenditures, Presidential Election Years

Year	# of Districts	Dem \$	%	Rep \$	%	Total
1992	42	1,727,233	69.8	746,536.00	30.2	2,473,769.00
1996	42	4,183,436.00	66.9	2,379,432.00	33.1	7,192,868.00
2000	42	7,553,035.00	80.2	1,859,770.00	19.8	9,412,805.00
2004	50	9,205,333.00	69.1	4,087,802.00	30.9	13,325,163.00
2008	50	9,781,326.00	64.1	5,467,161.00	35.9	15,248,487.00

in District 9, Michael Lee lost to Sen. Julia Boseman, in District 5, Louis Pate lost to Sen. Don Davis, in District 16, John Alexander lost to Sen. Josh Stein, in District 8, Bettie Fennell lost to Sen. R.C. Soles, and in District 43, Kathy Harrington lost to Sen. David Hoyle. The Republican was outspent in each of those losing efforts.

While eight of the ten highest spending Democratic candidates in competitive races spent over \$400,000, only one of the top spending Republican candidates did so. ☒

A word about the data

The campaign finance data presented in these tables is accurate to the best of our knowledge here at the Program on Public Life. The data is gleaned from campaign finance reports submitted to the North Carolina State Board of Elections. The process of campaign finance reporting is ongoing, and this is the most up to date data available according to the Board of Elections web site.

Turnout 2008

LEWIS McCORKLE

The number of votes cast for offices in the 2008 elections declined as one went down the ballot. Thus, the election fit a long-standing pattern: More citizens vote for candidates for President and Governor at the top of the ballot than vote for state senators and representatives and other officials in the lower part of the ballot.

In the elections for seats in the General Assembly, the number of votes swings widely from district to district in both House and Senate, even though districts are drawn to have a standard number of voters. Some seats, of course, are uncontested, and draw fewer voters. Still, even in contested elections, legislators come to the General Assembly with substantial variation in their base of actual voters.

Here are findings from a review of turnout in the 2008 elections, with special attention to legislative elections:

➤ Overall, 4.35 million votes were cast in North Carolina. In the presidential race, President Barack Obama won by 13,292 votes out of 4.26 million cast. In the governor's race, Gov. Bev Perdue won by 140,551 out of 4.22 million cast. There were also 95,457 more third party voters in the Governor's race than in the Presidential race.

➤ More than half a million more votes were cast in the governor's race than in the 50 state Senate races combined, and in the 120 state House races combined. State Senate races had almost 33,000 more votes than the state House races.

➤ Democrats hold a majority of seats in both the state House and Senate. In the elections, House Democrats maintained a 68-52 majority, while Republicans gained a seat in the state Senate, where the Democratic majority is 30-20.

➤ In votes cast, Republican candidates fared much better overall in state Senate races than they did in state House races. Democrats received 377,390 more votes than Republicans in state House races. Yet in state Senate races, Democrats had only a 162,864 advantage over Republicans.

➤ Under the one person-one vote requirement, House and Senate districts must have roughly the same population. Following the 2000 Census, the formula resulted in House districts of 67,089 people and Senate districts of 160,986. (Of course, population growth and shifts have altered the current population over the past eight years.) In state House elections, voter participation ranged from a high of 63,000 to below 35,000 in several contested races. In state Senate elections, turnout ranged from 107,000 to fewer than 75,000 votes in some contested races.

➤ The highest participation in a Senate race — 107,650 votes cast — came in District 15 in Wake County, where Republican state Sen. Neal Hunt defeated Democrat Chris Mintz. Variations can be illustrated with these pairings: Republican Sen. Fletcher Hartsell won District 36 where 88,099 votes were cast, while Republican Debby Clary won District 46 where 71,397 votes were cast. Democrat Bob Atwater won District 18 where 96,979 votes were cast, while Democrat Bill Purcell won District 25 where voters cast 70,279 ballots.

➤ With 63,100 votes cast, District 40 in Wake County led the participation rankings in the state House; Republican Marilyn Avila represents the district. Meanwhile, Republican David Lewis won a contested race in District 53, where 30,566 votes were cast. Democrat Ty Harrell won District 41 in a race that attracted 57,524 votes, while Democrat Jimmy Love won District 51 where 32,495 ballots were cast.

Note: Lewis McCorkle is an undergraduate student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill who had a summer internship in the Program on Public Life.

Votes cast in elections

NC President		NC Governor	
Democrats	2,123,390	Purdue (D)	2,121,320
Republicans	2,109,698	McCrorry (R)	1,980,769
Independents	25,419	Munger (I)	120,876
TOTAL	4,258,507	TOTAL	4,222,965

NC House		NC Senate	
Democrats	2,009,025	Democrats	1,921,994
Republicans	1,631,635	Republicans	1,759,130
Independents	48,041	Independents	40,959
TOTAL	3,688,701	TOTAL	3,722,083

Top 10 Senate Turnout

Editor's note: Sen. Vernon Malone (S.D. 14) deceased 4/18/2009 and replaced by Dan Blue (resigned from H.D. 33), Cary Allred (H.D. 64) resigned 6/1/2009, Linda Coleman (H.D. 39) resigned 1/11/2009, Bonner Stiller (H.D. 17) resigned 6/15/2009.

District 15		District 18	
Chris Mintz (D)	46,175	Bob Atwater (D)	66,916
Neal Hunt (R)	56,873	Roger Gerber (R)	56,873
Janice Mackay (I)	4,602	TOTAL	96,979
TOTAL	107,650	County - Chatham, Durham, Lee	
County - Wake			

District 40		District 16	
Malcolm Graham (D)	66,307	Josh Stein (D)	58,357
Edward Mulheren (R)	32,711	John M. Alexander, Jr. (R)	37,586
TOTAL	99,018	TOTAL	95,943
County - Mecklenburg		County - Wake	

District 8		District 17	
R.C. Soles, Jr. (D)	47,905	Richard Stevens (R)	75,311
Bettie Fennell (R)	45,093	Brian Irving (I)	17,441
Rachel Joiner Merrill (Lib)	5,454	TOTAL	92,752
TOTAL	98,452	County - Wake	
County - Brunswick, Columbus, Pender			

District 9		District 38	
Julia Boseman (D)	50,516	Charlie Smith Dannelly (D)	67,755
Michael Lee (R)	47,244	James R. Soder (R)	22,056
TOTAL	97,760	C. Travis Wheat (L)	2,588
County - New Hanover		TOTAL	92,399
		County - Mecklenburg	

District 14		District 36	
Vernon Malone (D)	67,823	Charles Paxton (D)	38,047
Carol Bennett (R)	56,873	Fletcher Hartsell, Jr. (R)	50,052
TOTAL	97,658	TOTAL	88,099
County - Wake		County - Cabarrus, Iredell	

➤ Wake County accounted for four of the top-ten Senate districts, and five of the top-ten House districts. ☒

Top 10 House Turnout

District 40		District 41		District 99		District 115	
Stan Morse (D)	27,336	Ty Harrell (D)	30,929	Nick Mackey (D)	28,106	Bruce Goforth (D)	27,795
Marilyn Avila (R)	35,764	Bryan Gossage (R)	26,595	Dempsey Miller (R)	14,925	Paul Purdue (R)	13,429
TOTAL	63,100	TOTAL	57,524	TOTAL	43,031	TOTAL	41,224
County - Wake		County - Wake		County - Mecklenburg		County - Buncombe	
District 37		District 39		District 36			
Ed Ridpath (D)	27,503	Linda Coleman (D)	29,290	Al Swanstrom (D)	20,872		
Paul Stam (R)	32,172	Duane Cutlip (R)	16,306	Nelson Dollar (R)	21,862		
TOTAL	59,675	TOTAL	45,596	TOTAL	42,734		
County - Wake		County - Wake		County - Wake			
District 68		District 17		District 52			
C. Michael Cognac (D)	20,767	Vernon Ward (D)	17,186	Betty Mangum (D)	14,355		
Curtis Blackwood (R)	38,071	Bonner L. Stiller (R)	28,009	James L. Boles, Jr. (R)	27,727		
TOTAL	58,838	TOTAL	45,195	TOTAL	42,082		
County - Union		County - Brunswick		County - Moore			

Redistricting: Just Down the Road

FERREL GUILLORY and LEWIS McCORKLE

The state legislators elected in 2010 will have the job of drawing new congressional and legislative district lines in mid-2011. In addition to the economic recession that weighed so heavily on state budgeting in the recent legislative session, this political reality creates the context of both Democratic and Republican strategy and decision making in the General Assembly and in their preparations for next year's campaigns.

Another reality will also shape redistricting: both the growth and shifting of our state's population. Through this decade, the metropolitanization of North Carolina intensified. As a result, the prospect is for Wake and Mecklenburg counties, as well as for neighboring counties in their regions, to gain additional seats in the state House and Senate.

With the assistance of Gerry Cohen, director of the Legislative Drafting Division, we have sought to present a preview assessment of how population change will influence redistricting. The accompanying chart provides a look at population for each county (from the 2000 Census count to the 2010 projection), and a statistical rendering of the extent to which each county is likely to see its share of the total legislative representation increase or decrease.

In 2011, of course, the General Assembly will use the population data gathered in next year's decennial Census. The data we present here come from the Census Bureau's projections; they provide a way to begin assembling analysis and discussion.

In the process of redistricting, legislators will inevitably consider the interests of incumbents and of their political parties. But they also must adhere to the rules embedded in laws and court cases. The U.S. Supreme Court has required, under the one-person, one-vote ruling, that each legislator represent about the same number of constituents. The Voting Rights Act, along with subsequent court rulings, several involving North Carolina cases, spells out requirements for assuring that minority citizens can elect representatives of their choosing. And a more recent state Supreme Court ruling says legislators must contain whole districts within county boundaries, unless they have to cross county lines to meet other legal requirements.

Overall, the state's population in 2010 is projected to be nearly 9.6 million persons, a growth of 19 percent over the 8 million persons counted in 2000.

After the 2000 Census, the state's 50 Senate districts had an "ideal" population of about 161,000, and the 120 House districts were drawn to have about 67,000 persons each. In 2010, Senate districts will grow to encompass a population of more than 191,000 and House districts of nearly 80,000.

Most counties will show population growth over the 10-year period. Counties whose population rose by more than 19% will gain representation — either a whole seat or a larger fraction of a seat. Counties that lost population or even gained less than the statewide average will lose representation. Consider these findings:

➤ Wake County has grown by nearly 50 percent. Thus, as the accompanying chart shows, it will qualify for 11.73 House seats and 4.89 Senate seats. Wake is likely to gain two House seats and one Senate seat. Neighboring Durham (23 percent growth) and Johnston (43 percent) are also positioned to gain representation, either full seats or greater voting influence in districts.

➤ Mecklenburg County has grown 31 percent, while nearby Union has grown 70 percent and Cabarrus 40 percent. Mecklenburg qualifies for at least one and perhaps two House seats, while Union and Cabarrus also are positioned to gain legislative strength. Indeed, as this metro area illustrates, some legislative battles may arise within metro areas over how to assign voters between core counties and their suburbs.

➤ The counties in the Triad have gained in population, but all at a lower rate than the state as a whole. Therefore, Guilford, Forsyth and their neighboring counties will face the prospect of attempting to hold their own current legislative representation.

➤ The metro area centered around Wilmington also appears positioned to gain representation: Brunswick has grown by 50 percent, Pender 34 percent and New Hanover 23 percent. While Cumberland County appears to have lost ground in its legislative share, nearby Harnett and Hoke counties have both gained. ☒

COUNTY	Population 2000	Projection 2010	change	2000 Senate Seats	2010 Senate Seats	Senate change	2000 House seats	2010 House seats	House change
ALAMANCE	130,794	152,772	16.8%	0.81	0.80	-0.01	1.95	1.915	-0.04
ALEXANDER	33,612	37,624	11.9%	0.21	0.20	-0.01	0.50	0.47	-0.03
ALLEGHANY	10,680	11,242	5.3%	0.07	0.06	-0.01	0.16	0.14	-0.02
ANSON	25,275	25,289	0.1%	0.16	0.13	-0.02	0.38	0.32	-0.06
ASHE	24,384	26,705	9.5%	0.15	0.14	-0.01	0.36	0.33	-0.03
AVERY	17,167	18,341	6.8%	0.11	0.10	-0.01	0.26	0.23	-0.03
BEAUFORT	44,958	46,877	4.3%	0.28	0.24	-0.03	0.67	0.59	-0.08
BERTIE	19,757	20,152	2.0%	0.12	0.11	-0.02	0.29	0.25	-0.04
BLADEN	32,278	32,234	-0.1%	0.20	0.17	-0.03	0.48	0.40	-0.08
BRUNSWICK	73,141	110,293	50.8%	0.45	0.58	0.12	1.09	1.38	0.29
BUNCOMBE	206,289	234,080	13.5%	1.28	1.22	-0.06	3.08	2.93	-0.14
BURKE	89,145	91,401	2.5%	0.55	0.48	-0.08	1.33	1.15	-0.18
CABARRUS	131,063	183,566	40.1%	0.81	0.96	0.14	1.95	2.30	0.35
CALDWELL	77,708	81,496	4.9%	0.48	0.43	-0.06	1.16	1.02	-0.14
CAMDEN	6,885	9,919	44.1%	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.10	0.12	0.02
CARTERET	59,383	64,144	8.0%	0.37	0.34	-0.03	0.89	0.80	-0.08
CASWELL	23,501	23,210	-1.2%	0.15	0.12	-0.02	0.35	0.29	-0.06
CATAWBA	141,677	159,173	12.3%	0.88	0.83	-0.05	2.113	2.00	-0.12
CHATHAM	49,329	64,047	29.8%	0.31	0.33	0.03	0.74	0.80	0.07
CHEROKEE	24,298	27,578	13.5%	0.15	0.14	-0.01	0.36	0.35	-0.02
CHOWAN	14,150	14,763	4.3%	0.09	0.08	-0.01	0.21	0.19	-0.03
CLAY	8,775	10,765	22.7%	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.00
CLEVELAND	96,278	99,767	3.6%	0.60	0.52	-0.08	1.44	1.25	-0.19
COLUMBUS	54,749	55,430	1.2%	0.34	0.29	-0.05	0.82	0.69	-0.12
CRAVEN	91,523	99,211	8.4%	0.57	0.52	-0.05	1.36	1.24	-0.12
CUMBERLAND	302,967	323,472	6.8%	1.88	1.69	-0.19	4.52	4.05	-0.46
CURRITUCK	18,190	23,179	27.4%	0.11	0.12	0.01	0.27	0.29	0.02
DARE	29,967	33,073	10.4%	0.19	0.17	-0.01	0.45	0.41	-0.03
DAVIDSON	147,250	163,571	11.1%	0.91	0.85	-0.06	2.20	2.05	-0.15
DAVIE	34,835	42,390	21.7%	0.22	0.22	0.00	0.52	0.53	0.01
DUPLIN	49,063	54,539	11.2%	0.30	0.28	-0.02	0.73	0.68	-0.05
DURHAM	223,314	274,516	22.9%	1.39	1.43	0.05	3.33	3.44	0.11
EDGECOMBE	55,606	51,552	-7.3%	0.35	0.27	-0.08	0.83	0.65	-0.18
FORSYTH	306,063	355,352	16.1%	1.902	1.86	-0.05	4.56	4.45	-0.11
FRANKLIN	47,260	60,085	27.1%	0.29	0.31	0.02	0.70	0.75	0.05
GASTON	190,316	214,033	12.5%	1.18	1.12	-0.06	2.84	2.68	-0.16
GATES	10,516	11,828	12.5%	0.07	0.06	0.00	0.16	0.15	-0.01
GRAHAM	7,993	8,178	2.3%	0.05	0.04	-0.01	0.12	0.10	-0.02
GRANVILLE	48,498	57,259	18.1%	0.30	0.30	0.00	0.72	0.72	-0.01
GREENE	18,974	21,510	13.4%	0.12	0.11	-0.01	0.28	0.27	-0.01
GUILFORD	421,048	485,222	15.2%	2.62	2.53	-0.08	6.28	6.08	-0.20
HALIFAX	57,370	55,053	-4.0%	0.36	0.29	-0.07	0.86	0.69	-0.17
HARNETT	91,025	116,342	27.8%	0.57	0.61	0.04	1.36	1.46	0.10
HAYWOOD	54,034	57,711	6.8%	0.34	0.30	-0.03	0.81	0.72	-0.08

COUNTY	Population 2000	Projection 2010	change	2000 Senate Seats	2010 Senate Seats	Senate change	2000 House seats	2010 House seats	House change
HENDERSON	89,214	107,402	20.4%	0.55	0.56	0.01	1.33	1.35	0.02
HERTFORD	22,977	23,663	3.0%	0.14	0.12	-0.02	0.34	0.30	-0.05
HOKE	33,646	46,762	39.0%	0.21	0.24	0.04	0.50	0.59	0.08
HYDE	5,826	5,448	-6.5%	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.09	0.07	-0.02
IREDELL	122,660	162,619	32.6%	0.76	0.85	0.09	1.83	2.04	0.21
JACKSON	33,120	38,104	15.0%	0.21	0.20	-0.01	0.49	0.48	-0.02
JOHNSTON	121,900	174,876	43.5%	0.76	0.91	0.16	1.82	2.19	0.37
JONES	10,419	10,312	-1.0%	0.06	0.05	-0.01	0.16	0.13	-0.03
LEE	49,208	59,906	21.7%	0.31	0.31	0.01	0.73	0.75	0.02
LENOIR	59,598	57,384	-3.7%	0.37	0.30	-0.07	0.89	0.72	-0.17
LINCOLN	63,780	78,583	23.2%	0.40	0.41	0.01	0.95	0.99	0.03
MACON	29,811	35,464	19.0%	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.44	0.44	0.00
MADISON	19,635	21,322	8.6%	0.12	0.11	-0.01	0.29	0.27	-0.03
MARTIN	25,546	23,694	-7.2%	0.16	0.12	-0.03	0.38	0.30	-0.08
MCDOWELL	42,151	45,739	8.5%	0.26	0.24	-0.02	0.63	0.57	-0.06
MECKLENBURG	695,370	911,252	31.0%	4.32	4.76	0.44	10.37	11.42	1.05
MITCHELL	15,687	16,074	2.5%	0.10	0.08	-0.01	0.23	0.20	-0.03
MONTGOMERY	26,822	27,898	4.0%	0.17	0.15	-0.02	0.40	0.35	-0.05
MOORE	74,770	88,503	18.4%	0.46	0.46	0.00	1.12	1.11	-0.01
NASH	87,385	96,432	10.4%	0.54	0.50	-0.04	1.30	1.21	-0.09
NEW HANOVER	160,327	197,548	23.2%	1.00	1.03	0.04	2.39	2.48	0.09
NORTHAMPTON	22,086	21,045	-4.7%	0.14	0.11	-0.03	0.33	0.26	-0.07
ONSLow	150,355	182,023	21.1%	0.93	0.95	0.02	2.24	2.28	0.04
ORANGE	115,537	132,994	15.1%	0.72	0.69	-0.02	1.72	1.67	-0.06
PAMLICO	12,934	12,871	-0.5%	0.08	0.07	-0.01	0.19	0.16	-0.03
PASQUOTANK	34,897	41,529	19.0%	0.22	0.22	0.00	0.52	0.52	0.00
PENDER	41,082	55,188	34.3%	0.26	0.29	0.03	0.61	0.69	0.08
PERQUIMANS	11,368	13,461	18.4%	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.17	0.17	0.00
PERSON	35,623	37,723	5.9%	0.22	0.20	-0.02	0.53	0.47	-0.06
PITT	133,719	163,103	22.0%	0.83	0.85	0.02	1.99	2.04	0.05
POLK	18,324	19,054	4.0%	0.11	0.10	-0.01	0.27	0.24	-0.03
RANDOLPH	130,471	144,822	11.0%	0.81	0.76	-0.05	1.95	1.82	-0.13
RICHMOND	46,564	47,065	1.1%	0.29	0.25	-0.04	0.69	0.59	-0.10
ROBESON	123,241	132,880	7.8%	0.77	0.69	-0.07	1.84	1.67	-0.17
ROCKINGHAM	91,928	92,115	0.2%	0.57	0.48	-0.09	1.37	1.15	-0.22
ROWAN	130,340	143,236	9.9%	0.81	0.75	-0.06	1.94	1.80	-0.15
RUTHERFORD	62,901	64,997	3.3%	0.39	0.34	-0.05	0.94	0.81	-0.12
SAMPSON	60,161	67,493	12.2%	0.37	0.35	-0.02	0.90	0.85	-0.05
SCOTLAND	35,998	37,763	4.9%	0.22	0.20	-0.03	0.54	0.47	-0.06
STANLY	58,100	60,850	4.7%	0.36	0.32	-0.04	0.87	0.76	-0.10
STOKES	44,711	47,355	5.9%	0.28	0.25	-0.03	0.67	0.59	-0.07
SURRY	71,216	74,225	4.2%	0.44	0.39	-0.05	1.06	0.930	-0.13
SWAIN	12,968	14,307	10.3%	0.08	0.07	-0.01	0.19	0.18	-0.01
TRANSYLVANIA	29,334	31,665	7.9%	0.18	0.17	-0.02	0.44	0.40	-0.04

southnow@unc.edu

Chapel Hill, NC, 27599-9127

CB# 3365

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
The Center for the Study of the American South

PROGRAM ON PUBLIC LIFE

data-net
North Carolina

THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL



COUNTY	Population 2000	Projection 2010	change	2000 Senate Seats	2010 Senate Seats	Senate change	2000 House seats	2010 House seats	House change
TYRRELL	4,149	4,297	3.6%	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.05	-0.01
UNION	123,772	210,069	69.7%	0.77	1.10	0.33	1.85	2.63	0.79
VANCE	42,954	43,560	1.4%	0.27	0.23	-0.04	0.64	0.55	-0.09
WAKE	627,866	935,933	49.1%	3.90	4.89	0.99	9.36	11.73	2.37
WARREN	19,972	19,879	-0.5%	0.12	0.10	-0.02	0.30	0.25	-0.05
WASHINGTON	13,723	13,082	-4.7%	0.09	0.07	-0.02	0.20	0.16	-0.04
WATAUGA	42,693	46,481	8.9%	0.27	0.24	-0.02	0.64	0.58	-0.05
WAYNE	113,329	116,760	3.0%	0.70	0.61	-0.09	1.69	1.46	-0.23
WILKES	65,632	67,936	3.5%	0.41	0.35	-0.05	0.98	0.85	-0.13
WILSON	73,811	81,097	9.9%	0.46	0.42	-0.04	1.10	1.02	-0.08
YADKIN	36,348	38,947	7.2%	0.23	0.20	-0.02	0.54	0.49	-0.05
YANCEY	17,774	18,910	6.4%	0.11	0.10	-0.01	0.27	0.24	-0.03
NORTH CAROLINA	8,046,813	9,572,644	19.0%	50	50	0.00	120.00	120.00	0.00
ideal House seat	67057	79772							
ideal Senate seat	160936	191453							