

## **Ken Hodges**

### **BACKGROUND ON THE CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The 2010 Census Advisory Committee (CAC) provides advisory input to the Census Bureau on the design of the 2010 census, the American Community Survey, and related programs. Committee members represent a range of census stakeholders, and APDU's seat on the Committee provides a channel for APDU members to comment from the data user perspective.

Ken Hodges is your APDU representative on the 2010 Census Advisory Committee, and Bill O'Hare is your alternate representative. Both attended the May 7-8 meeting, and this report summarizes that meeting. Contact Ken [khodges@claritas.com](mailto:khodges@claritas.com) or Bill [wohare@aecf.org](mailto:wohare@aecf.org) with comments, questions, or suggestions.

### **MAY 7-8, 2009 MEETING OF THE 2010 CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

#### **Day One**

##### **Introductory and Welcoming Remarks**

Nancy Gordon, the Census Bureau's designated federal official, noted that Marc Morial (National Urban League) is the committee's new Chair, and Arturo Vargas (National Association of Latino Elected Officials) is the new Vice Chair. Gordon thanked outgoing Chair and Vice Chair Mark Neuman and Lee Adams for their service, and announced that the fall meeting of the 2010 CAC will be November 5-6.

Acting Census Bureau Director Tom Mesenbourg introduced Rick Wade, Senior Advisor to Commerce Secretary Gary Locke. Wade expressed appreciation for the work of the Census Bureau, and praised Chair Marc Morial for the experience and understanding he brings to the CAC, as former Mayor of New Orleans and CEO of the National Urban League. Morial expressed appreciation for the remarks, and spoke of the importance of the census, and the hard work that it requires. He stressed that advisory committees are not perfunctory, and need to provide candid feedback in order to be effective.

##### **Census Bureau Update**

Tom Mesenbourg (Census Bureau Acting Director) commended the Census staff for a great effort in putting the census back on track following the challenges of the past year. He described Secretary Locke's attendance at the March 30 partnership kickoff meeting (his first day on the job and the morning after a redeye flight). Mesenbourg also described the nomination of Rebecca Blank as the new Commerce Undersecretary for Economic Affairs, and Robert Groves as the next Census Director.

Mesenbourg noted that the 2010 census is less than a year away, and expressed confidence that they have the funding needed for a successful census. Noting that the recession was a boon to hiring, he described address canvassing as progressing well, with handheld computers performing well. Turning to the communications campaign,

Mesenbourg noted the completion of focus groups, and the recent meeting at which contractor DraftFCB presented preliminary messaging to the Joint Advisory Advertising Review Panel (JAARP). The JAARP response (a vote of “no confidence” in DraftFCB) makes it clear that messaging needs to be improved, but Mesenbourg expressed confidence that we will have an effective campaign, integrated with an expanded partnership program.

### **Decennial Census Program Update**

Arnold Jackson (Associate Director for Decennial Census) noted the mix of excitement and apprehension as the 2010 census is underway. Address canvassing is well ahead of schedule thanks to a high quality staff, working longer hours, and with less turnover than expected. The handheld computers are said to be working well, and Jackson said he senses excitement and positive buzz about the census as he travels the country. He is convinced that we are on the road to a successful census.

Jackson stressed that the communications campaign will be only as good as the integration with the partnership program, which is larger and more ambitious than the 2000 effort. Later, a number of CAC reps expressed concern that the meeting presentations and discussions left them unsure that the communications and partnership efforts are sufficiently integrated.

Jackson reported that the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) results are being incorporated in address canvassing, but also described a late fall LUCA appeals process. Ken Hodges (Association of Public Data Users) asked for clarification, and Jackson explained that LUCA addresses are in the address canvassing database, and the appeals process is available to local governments where canvassing does not confirm addresses supplied by LUCA.

The 2010 census faces many challenges. Among these, Jackson pointed to the need to account for changes since 2000 (such as the economic crisis), connecting with young mobile and wired populations, establishing trust with skeptical populations, and integrating the major components of the census operation.

### **Field Directorate Update**

Marilia Matos (Associate Director for Field Operations) described the recent and upcoming opening of census offices, and detailed the successful recruiting effort for address canvassing. The goal was to recruit 700,000 applicants for 140,000 jobs, but given the economy, the canvassers were selected from 1.2 million applicants.

Address canvassing launched March 30, and is already 84 percent complete – compared with the target of 48 percent by this date. Once the Master Address File is updated, it is the basis for mailing census forms, but also for the identification of “other living quarters,” which are followed up on as part of the identification of group quarters. Matos also reported that the National Processing Center is finalizing the kits for use in opening offices, recruiting, and conducting nonresponse follow up. And in December, they will begin early work for the census coverage measurement operations.

### **Demographic Program Update**

Howard Hogan (Associate Director for Demographic Programs) passed around a copy of *Tricking the Tallyman*, a children's book about the 1790 census that he thought reps might find of interest. He then described how his group has the enviable task of working on census content, and determining how to edit and publish the data – from both the census and census surveys.

Hogan described some of their recent and upcoming work, as they prepare for the massive amounts of data to be released in 2010, including 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year ACS estimates and decennial data. New for 2010, the census redistricting file will include counts of both occupied and vacant housing units. There will also be a Summary File 1, which will be refreshed when metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas are updated. Hogan noted that they are asking users about their need for an advanced query system – a system for automated custom tabulations that was offered for a period after the 2000 census. They need to determine the demand for such a system, and the features users would most want to see. Interested users should contact Louisa Miller at [Louisa.F.Miller@census.gov](mailto:Louisa.F.Miller@census.gov).

Before the census counts are finalized, the Census Bureau will conduct a Count Review Program, an early review of the census counts for small areas, with the objective of identifying major errors when there is still time to correct them. Special attention will be paid to the early group quarters counts, in an effort to prevent a recurrence of the 2000 census errors in the geocoding of these populations.

Hogan finished by describing the Alternate Questionnaire Experiment, in which some households will receive 2010 census questionnaires with alternative ways of asking the race and ethnicity questions. The objective is to assess the impact of alternative wording on response. Households that do not return an alternative form will receive the alternative form in the replacement mailing, but if they still do not respond, they will be administered the standard questions in nonresponse follow up (NRFU). Hogan said it is not feasible to burden the NRFU process with the alternative questions. He noted further that no one question will “win.” Rather, the objective is to gather information that will guide the design of future questions.

### **Open Question and Answer Session**

The morning agenda wrapped with an extended question and answer session.

Don Bradley (Housing Statistics Users Group) asked about the identification of informal housing units with no address – such as conversions. Marilia Matos (Census Bureau) explained that in areas where this is prevalent, canvassers receive special training based on the knowledge of local experts. She noted that often residents are willing to report the existence of such units, but that other strategies are sometimes needed (such as identifying extra doorbells). Dan Weinberg (Assistant Director for Decennial Census Programs) added that even if such units have no address, they get a housing unit description, so they will be on the list for non-response follow up.

Clark Bensen (POLIDATA) asked if there will be changes in the suppression of 2010 data compared with 2000. No major differences are known, and because most content is now provided by the ACS, Susan Schechter took the opportunity to describe the recent *Federal Register* notice on 5-year ACS products, which notes some limitations on dissemination. The complete answer is complicated, so the Census Bureau promised to report back on any significant changes in suppression relative to 2000.

Elizabeth Jones (American Farm Bureau Federation) asked if any Census 2010 advertising would be directed to rural populations. Burton Reist (Assistant to the Associate Director for Communications) explained that rural areas are reached largely through the general ads, but assured that rural areas are very much on their mind. Jones recommended advertising through local (small town) papers and media, and Marilia Matos (Census Bureau) encouraged Jones to provide a list of such channels. Matos also noted that the partnership program is a key to outreach in rural areas.

Howard Silver (Consortium of Social Science Associations) asked about suggestions that the mailing of bilingual forms be extended to languages other than Spanish. Acting Director Mesenbourg said they have considered the option, but the logistics are daunting. The most common language, other than English and Spanish, is Chinese, and they do not have a good enough idea of which areas would need Chinese language forms.

Ilene Jacobs (California Rural Legal Assistance) expressed concern that the Alternative Questionnaire Test will cover only mail return respondents, who will be less representative of hard to count populations. Howard Hogan (Census Bureau) acknowledged the point, but said it is not feasible to gather alternative information in the NRFU process. He also explained that the census is only part of a larger test, and that other components would better cover the hard to count populations.

Jacobs also asked if there had been progress in getting a waiver on the requirement that census workers be US citizens (as had been done for 2000). Arnold Jackson (Census Bureau) said they are not seeking such a waiver for 2010, and Marilia Matos (Census Bureau) described the specific restriction on hiring Mexican citizens because that country declined to sign the Rio Treaty. Jacobs asserted that the Department of Commerce has the authority to issue such a waiver, and Chair Marc Morial asked for confirmation that Commerce has such authority.

Ed Spar (Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics) asked about the status of the Advance Query System, and if the Census Bureau could provide more information so users could better provide feedback. Arnold Jackson (Census Bureau) indicated the Bureau's willingness to do this, and responded positively to Spar's invitation to present on the topic at a future COPAFS meeting.

Terry Ao (Asian American Justice Center) expressed concern that the Census 2010 advance letters are in English only, and do not provide "in language" instructions on how to obtain census forms in non-English languages. Ao noted that such instructions were

provided in the 2000 census advance letter. Frank Vitrano (Census Bureau) recalled that the 2000 message had little impact, as most households that requested alternative language forms either sent a completed English form anyway, or ended up in nonresponse follow up. Acting Director Mesenbourg added that most requests in 2000 were for Spanish language forms, and that many of these households will receive the bilingual English/Spanish form in the targeted 2010 mailing.

Vice Chair Arturo Vargas asked about Census plans to recode people who reported as same sex “married” to same sex “partners.” It has been reported that the recoding is required by the 1996 federal Defense of Marriage Act, and Vargas asked if that interpretation could be revisited. Howard Hogan (Census Bureau) maintained that the recoding is actually based on data quality concerns, as research suggests that about 340,000 couples will identify as married, while the actual number in legally recognized marriages is much smaller. Many are arrangements such as civil unions, and there is evidence that significant numbers reflect errors in the reporting of sex. Hogan agreed that same sex marriage is an important phenomenon that needs to be measured, and measured well, but they consider the current rules best for 2010.

Vargas then asked about plans for counting persons displaced by foreclosures. Frank Vitrano (Census Bureau) noted that foreclosures will increase the number of vacant units, as well as persons doubling up in households and living in group quarters (including the homeless). Procedures are in place for counting such populations, but they will be challenged to capture the increased numbers resulting from the current economy.

Chair Marc Morial asked the Census Bureau to specify which populations are deemed hard to count. Some CAC reps found the Bureau’s response to this seemingly simple question to be curiously indirect – pointing to things like the 2010 census planning database and “hard to count” scores, but not identifying specific populations. When pressed to identify which groups had the lowest mail response rates in 2000, the Bureau indicated populations including renters and young black males, but cautioned that there is a difference between mail response and being counted. Acting Director Mesenbourg said they could provide additional information to the CAC on this question.

Morial also asked about plans for counting Hurricane Katrina evacuees – those living involuntarily outside of the Gulf Coast because their neighborhoods have not been rebuilt. Howard Hogan referred to the census residence rules, which count people at their current usual residence, and noted the practical obstacles to counting people at previous Gulf Coast addresses – addresses that might no longer exist.

Tim McNeill (National Conference of Black Mayors) raised the issue of counting prison populations where they come from rather than where they are incarcerated. The argument is that funds should be distributed to the low income communities of color to which many prisoners may return, rather than the predominantly rural, white communities where they are incarcerated. The debate is ongoing, and CAC reps had received a mailing on it from an organization called the Prison Policy Initiative. Howard Hogan (Census Bureau) again cited the census residence rules, which call for counting

people at their current, rather than past or anticipated residence. Morial argued that the Census Bureau needs to revisit this rule because of its impact on funds distribution, and McNeill commented that the Department of Justice has the data needed to locate prison populations to pre-incarceration communities. Concern was expressed that counting people at places other than current residence is a slippery slope, and Jackie Byers (National Association of Counties) noted that she has constituents on both sides of this debate. She also suggested that funds distribution be considered a separate issue – that the census could count people where they live, while funds distribution (if so legislated) could be based on counts adjusted to reflect pre-incarceration residence.

Byers also pointed out that there is only one more CAC meeting scheduled before the census, and asked if there are opportunities for us to meet more frequently before then. CAC Chair Morial agreed that additional meetings are important.

### **American Community Survey Program Update**

Susan Schechter (Chief, American Community Survey Office) presented quickly, to get us back on schedule. She reviewed some of the recent ACS releases, and the *Federal Register* notice on proposals for the 5-year data products. They received about 25 comments on these proposals, many from the transportation community because the most severe restrictions on 5-year ACS data are applied to the journey to work data. The Census Bureau is reviewing the comments now, and working toward final specifications. Schechter also described current and future Methods Panel tests, including one on an Internet response option for the ACS, and tests of potential new questions, including computer usage and parental place of birth. She also described the recent data user training and outreach efforts, and in response to a question, acknowledged the need for better outreach to groups with which they are not already well connected. The ACS discussion was cut off so we could move on, but many of the questions related to issues that had been covered in previous ACS presentations.

### **2010 Census Communications Panel**

#### Copy Testing with Universal Learning by Audience

This session was highly anticipated following reports that the Joint Advisory Advertising Review Panel (JAARP – a panel of advisory committee reps) was so unimpressed with preliminary 2010 Census ads as to issue a vote of no confidence in DraftFCB, the campaign’s prime contractor. Among the concerns are that the messaging fails to reflect current realities, such as the economic recession, and does not sufficiently emphasize the confidentiality assurance.

Jeff Tarakajian (DraftFCB) introduced the “team” including reps from DraftFCB and subcontractors, who spoke briefly on the targeting of specific populations. He assured the CAC that they take the JAARP comments seriously, and are working hard to address them. He stressed that the “creatives” presented to the JAARP were works in progress – presented at an early stage so changes could be made based on feedback.

Vita Harris (DraftFCB) noted the importance of the confidentiality message, and described the development of “universal” messages, as well as those nuanced for specific

populations, such as immigrants. With respect to current realities, Tarakajian noted that focus groups conducted during the economic crisis had not commented on insensitivity to the new economic realities. However, he said again that DraftFCB is committed to providing a more complete response to the JAARP concerns.

An extensive Q&A session gave CAC reps the opportunity to articulate their concerns, and DraftFCB the opportunity to reiterate its pledge to respond. Vice Chair Arturo Vargas expanded on the concerns, citing, for example, an over reliance on Spanish language messages to reach the Hispanic population – even though many consume media in English. Striking a more positive tone, Helen Samhan (American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee) acknowledged the challenge faced by the subcontractor charged with targeting the combined Russian, Polish and Arabic populations, and said she was more impressed than she had expected by the Arab language messages.

CAC Chair Marc Morial asked for clarity on the committee’s role in these matters, and Burton Reist (Census Bureau) responded that the creatives were shown to JAARP so they could raise concerns, and DraftFCB could respond to them. When Morial sought confirmation that the JAARP will have the opportunity to review revised creatives, discussion turned to timing, as the ads have to go into production soon. Timing is tight for the first wave of ads, but there might be more time to review a second wave that is planned because of the availability of recovery act funding. Morial asked again about the role of the CAC, and Vargas commented that lacking the opportunity to see revised messages, he was not sure what the role would be. Burton Reist (Census Bureau) suggested that DraftFCB’s response to the JAARP would not provide for an extensive review of revised ads, but an explanation of how the JAARP concerns are being addressed.

Complaining that the CAC role was still unclear, Morial said the committee does not want to hear that it is too late to review revised messages, as that it serves no one if the campaign goes forward with this level of dissatisfaction and frustration. He asked DraftFCB how an opportunity for feedback on revised messages can be provided, while working within the tight timelines. Tarakajian (DraftFCB) stressed that filming must begin by August (with messaging set well before then), but that the schedule leaves some time for revisiting some of this. He suggested that DraftFCB could put together a webinar to provide a better idea of how the JAARP concerns are being addressed in revised messages. Jeri Green (Chief, Advisory Committee Office, Census Bureau) agreed to work with DraftFCB on this option, which appealed to many of the CAC reps.

#### Overall Media Approach and Mass Communications Plan

Rich Gagnon (DraftFCB) described the overall media approach and mass communication plan, and said the census campaign will be one of the most visible in March 2010 – on par with McDonalds, Wal-Mart and GEICO, and ahead of Budweiser and Nike.

Gagnon presented on the different advertising approaches to be taken in targeting the different clusters of respondents. For example, the group called “Head Noddors” has no major barriers to census response, but needs to overcome apathy, so there will be an

emphasis on frequent reminders. In contrast, the “Cynical Fifth” will be targeted with emotional messaging to overcome cynicism about the census.

The mass communication base plan is designed to reach and motivate everyone who consumes English language media. Thousands of media outlets are being considered as are major events, such as the Super Bowl, Winter Olympics, and NCAA basketball tournament. Less traditional options might include soap opera characters filling out the census, and brief mentions on talk and game shows. Radio is seen as a good way to leverage trusted voices, and young audiences will be reached through Internet sites, with messages perhaps linked to highly watched online videos. A highly aggressive outdoor effort is envisioned, and other options might include a NASCAR partnership, and messages with Netflix mailings.

Discussion turned to partnerships, with issues including the use of communications and logos, and the need for partnership tool kits. Ken Hodges (APDU) recalled that in 2000, the census was said to save \$25 million for each percent increase in the mail response rate, and asked if there was an updated figure for 2010. Burton Reist (Census Bureau) reported that the 2010 saving (per percentage point increase in mail response) is estimated at \$85 million to \$95 million.

### **2010 Census Communications Campaign Independent Evaluation**

#### National Opinion Research Center (NORC)

Chet Bowie (National Opinion Research Center) described the census coverage evaluations they will conduct for the 2010 communications campaign. The work is independent, and will be completed with independent NORC staff.

The evaluations will measure the contribution of the different components of the communications campaign relative to its three major objectives – increasing mail response, reducing differential undercount, and increasing cooperation with enumerators. Further objectives are to measure changing attitudes and beliefs about the census, how people understand census messages, and the most and least recalled aspects of the paid media campaign. A key objective is to measure return on investment – the extent to which the campaign boosted mail response, and how much money was saved. Bowie noted that isolating the campaign’s contributions by race, ethnicity and cluster will be a challenge due to the confounding effects of word of mouth and other exposure to promotional materials and activities.

The evaluations involve household surveys with several design improvements over the 2000 census evaluations. Rupa Datta (NORC) provided an overview of the survey design that involves three waves of data collection. A first wave will sample 3,000 households before the census (fall 2009), a second wave will sample 3,000 households during the campaign (winter 2010), and a third wave will sample 4,200 households during nonresponse follow up. .

Responding households will be asked about their experience with census communications, but experimental designs will be elusive, as one cannot prevent



respondents from being exposed to selected parts of the campaign. Bowie noted that this is where longitudinal panels will help reveal what respondents have learned over time. Ed Spar (COPAFS) asked about the length of the questionnaire, and the impact on response. Bowie responded that the 25 minute response time was believed to be feasible, and explained that the objective is to interview a set number of responses in each group, rather than achieving a high response rate.

#### Status of CPEX Evaluations and Experiments

Joan Hill (Census Bureau) described the 2010 census experiments, including the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (the AQE describe earlier by Howard Hogan), as well as tests investigating the effect of question changes for 2010, questions on residence elsewhere, and race and Hispanic origin strategies. Specific changes being tested include the effect of removing the word “race” from the race question, and dropping “Negro” from the Black or African American response category. Hill also described a Race/Ethnicity Qualitative Study, which will conduct focus groups to explore the factors respondents consider when self-identifying race and origin.

Jennifer Reichert (Census Bureau) reported that census coverage measurement tests will be completed by the end of 2012. Research topics include address frame accuracy (before and after the census), targeted address canvassing (can canvassing focus on growth areas to reduce costs?), and the use of data mining techniques. Tests also will evaluate the identification of small multi-unit structures, MAF maintenance, group quarters coverage, improvements to de-duplication across long distances, and the possible use of administrative records in non-response follow up. The lengthy and ambitious list continued with tests of field operations, the language program, census/ACS comparisons, and the public’s privacy/confidentiality concerns.

#### **Day Two**

Recently appointed CAC Chair Marc Morial had another commitment, so Vice Chair Arturo Vargas chaired Day Two of the meeting.

First on the agenda was the public comment period. Sue Phillips from the National Coalition for the Homeless spoke on the importance of counting that population. Specific concerns include the confidentiality of sites where the homeless gather, and that enumerators be drawn from populations that have experienced homelessness. And with many households now doubling up in a single housing unit, Phillips criticized the present rules that do not recognize these as two separate households. Phillips distributed a paper describing the efforts to count the homeless population in previous censuses.

A few CAC reps had observed address canvassing in their area, and there was discussion of the requirement that those observing census field operations must take the oath for “special sworn status.” Ken Hodges (APDU) asked if it was possible for CAC reps to be sworn in that day, and before the meeting was adjourned, many reps completed the paperwork, and were sworn in. Your APDU rep later observed address canvassing in urban and rural areas of upstate New York. Initial impressions are that the rural address

list was surprisingly good, GPS map spotting in urban areas was surprisingly unstable, and there seemed to be a push, almost a rush, to complete canvassing many weeks ahead of schedule.

### **REAC Update**

Bernard Miller, Chair of the Census Advisory Committee on the African American Population gave a brief update from the Race and Ethnic Advisory Committees (REAC). Miller reported the REAC's concern with the FBI's capacity to process the background checks and fingerprinting required for the temporary census workforce. In response, Arnold Jackson (Census Bureau) noted that the process went well for address canvassing. He acknowledged that the workload for NRFU will be much larger, but expressed confidence that the FBI will handle the task smoothly. When asked if the FBI had given the Census Bureau assurances that they could handle the increased volume, Jackson replied that the FBI had assured that they were aware of the large volume of finger printing and checks that they will have to complete.

Miller reported that the REACs are concerned with promotion and outreach to hard to count communities, and have requested a briefing on how the stimulus funds will be spent. They have also asked for a briefing on the counting of prisoners, and how to count in communities hard hit by the recession. And of course, there are concerns with DraftFCB and the communications campaign.

In response to a question, Miller confirmed that the REACs are concerned with the ICE plans to continue raids on unauthorized immigrant populations (such raids were suspended in 2000), and the negative impact on the cooperation of fearful populations.

### **National Processing Center: An Introduction**

David Hackbarth (Chief, National Processing Center) presented on the Census Bureau's processing facility at Jeffersonville, IN. The size is impressive – a core staff of 2,100 (over 5,000 in a census year) on an 80 acre campus with 1 million square feet of processing space. Core services include mail processing, data capture, geographic operations, and telephone centers (engaged mostly in outbound interviewing and bilingual support).

The assembly of kits is another key operation, and they will prepare 5.5 million kits for field enumerators, including over 6 billion pages of printed material. Kit assembly was manual in 2000, but has been automated for 2010.

Jeffersonville is one of three paper data capture centers, and they expect to process 65 million 2010 census questionnaires. They will also be involved in the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment, and Service-Based Enumeration – which involves counting of shelters. And for the first time, the census will target people traveling with circuses and carnivals – giving them the option of claiming a usual place of residence or being counted with the circus or carnival.

### **Plans for Coverage Follow-up in the 2010 Census**

Robin Pennington (Census Bureau, Decennial Statistical Studies Division) described plans for 2010 census coverage follow up. In 2000, the Census Bureau made telephone calls to about 2.5 million households where coverage was a concern – for example, due to discrepancies in the number of people listed versus the number with data reported. The 2010 efforts will expand on 2000 and have two approaches. The first approach (“get it right the first time”) focuses on instructions to help respondents correctly identify and report data for all persons who should be counted at that address. The second “fix it later,” is geared to detecting possible coverage problems (such as missed persons or erroneous enumerations), and following up to make corrections.

With many households now having only cell phones, Jungmiwha Bullock (Association of MultiEthnic Americans) asked about the adequacy of telephone follow up. Pennington acknowledged the cell phone reality, but reported that tests suggest that telephone follow up is more cost effective, and about as complete as personal visits. One reason is that, by definition, coverage follow up involves households that have responded to the census, and most have provided a phone number (as requested) where they can be contacted. Frank Vitrano (Census Bureau) added that putting all of the program’s finite funds into telephone follow up yields more corrections than an approach that combines telephone and field follow up.

### **Update on Plans for Census Coverage Measurement**

Pat Cantwell (Census Bureau, Decennial Statistical Studies Division) described plans for measuring the coverage of the 2010 census (in addition to the national level Demographic Analysis measures). He reviewed the measures from the 1980, 1990, and 2000 censuses – which involved surveys taken after the census, and providing the potential for producing adjusted census counts.

In 2000, the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation had problems establishing a person’s census day residence, under-estimated persons counted more than once, and thereby overstated the census undercount. For 2010, the goal is to measure the components of coverage error (not just net error), and use the results to improve the coverage of future censuses. Key objectives are to improve the determination of census day residence, and the ability to detect and correct for duplicates.

Specifically, the 2010 coverage evaluation will produce estimates of net coverage error, estimates of the components of error (omissions and erroneous enumerations), and separate estimates of these components by characteristics, such as age and sex. The geographic levels for which estimates will be produced is still being determined, but it will not include small areas. Cantwell described some details of the 2010 design, and noted that the timing of the 2010 effort would be generally later than 2000.

Noting the lack of references to differential undercount at this meeting, Vice Chair Arturo Vargas asked, and Cantwell confirmed, that differential undercount will be a focus in 2010. Vargas also asked why coverage measurement was later than 2000, and it was

agreed that this was in part because the 2010 measures do not have to produce adjusted census counts in time for use in redistricting.

### **Committee Discussion**

Time was short, but the meeting moved to committee discussion on issues of concern.

There was broad support for a recommendation that the Census Bureau reconsider the plan to recode couples identifying as same sex married to same sex partners. There were also calls to add a CAC rep from the gay/lesbian community, but this recommendation was revised to a call for the Census Bureau to consider adding CAC representatives from organizations reflecting a broader cross-section of diverse census stakeholders and partners. The recommendations were discussed and passed by voice vote.

Another concern was that the advance census letter does not have in-language instructions on how to request a census form in a non-English language. Arnold Jackson (Census Bureau) reminded the committee that there are operational obstacles and costs to adding such instructions, and argued that it would be of little benefit. The Census Bureau reminded the committee that the most common non-English language—Spanish—will be largely covered by the mailing of bilingual questionnaires, and that of households requesting a non-English questionnaire in 2000, most either returned an English questionnaire, or required follow up.

There was concern that the committee did not have sufficient details on the issue, so Vice Chair Vargas suggested that the Census Bureau provide such information (within 10 days). Specifically, there is interest in the research behind the decision to not have in language messages on the pre-census letter and on the census form. The Census Bureau agreed to provide additional detail.

At this point, it was time to adjourn, and designated federal official Nancy Gordon noted that CAC meetings are not permitted to run significantly overtime. In the closing minutes, there were renewed calls for additional CAC meetings (or conference calls), and Joan Naymark (US Chamber of Commerce) recommended that we move toward processes similar to those used by the other advisory committees – including advance discussion of the agenda, and greater advance preparation by reps. Jeri Green (Chief, Advisory Committee Office) agreed to provide information on how the other advisory committees operate, and to work with the CAC on this objective.

At this point, the meeting was adjourned.