

**“Taking the Pulse of American Households During COVID-19”
June 10, 2020**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. Today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Participants are on a listen-only mode for the duration, I'm sorry, until the question-and-answer portion of today's conference. At that time you may press star 1 to ask a question. I would now like to turn the conference over to your host, Tori Velkoff. Thank you. You may begin.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you. Good afternoon and thank you for joining us today. I'm Tori Velkoff, the Associate Director for demographic programs here at the Census Bureau and I'm really honored to help moderate today's webinar. The Household Pulse Survey is one of two new experimental surveys that the Census Bureau launched in April -- designed to collect weekly measures that could track in real-time how individuals are experiencing the significant changes to American life as the result of the pandemic.

The Household Pulse Survey was coordinated with five other federal government agencies including the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Center for Health Statistics, HUD, the National Center for Education Statistics, and USDA's Economic Research Service. Today you get to hear directly from both the Census Bureau and our federal partners and learn more about how they contributed to the development of this survey and how they're using the weekly data we report.

It's with great pleasure that I introduce our panel. First up we'll have an overview of the survey from Jenny Hunter Childs who is an Assistant Center Chief in our Center for Behavioral Science Methods, and Jason Fields, Senior Researcher for Demographic Programs in our Social, Economic, and Housing

Statistics Division.

Following Jenny and Jason's overview, we'll get to hear directly from our federal partners. First up we'll hear from Chris Chapman who is the Associate Commissioner for the Sample Surveys Division at the National Center for Education Statistics. Next, we'll hear from Stephen Blumberg who is the Director of the Division of Health Interview Statistics at the National Center for Health Statistics. After Stephen, we'll hear from Christian Gregory who is a Research Agricultural Economist from USDA's Economic Research Service. And finally, we'll hear from Shawn Bucholtz, Director of the Housing and Demographic Analysis Division at the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

After the presentations, we'll be happy to take your questions. Thank you to all the esteemed speakers for joining us today. And with that, I'm going to pass the presentation over to Jenny.

Jennifer Hunter Childs: Thanks, Tori. I'll take the next slide, Cass. Thank you. So good afternoon. I'm going to be telling you a little bit about an overview of the Household Pulse Survey. So as Tori mentioned, the goal of the survey was to quickly and efficiently deploy a survey that could measure the impacts -- the social and economic impacts -- of the COVID-19 pandemic on the population.

We wanted to be able to do something quickly without as much wait time as our typical data collections, knowing that we would be up and running fast and doing things in an experimental way and very different way from our typical methods.

So I came into this conversation on March 23 -- that our goal was to do something like this. And the timeline was as soon as possible. So we wanted

to deploy a survey as soon as possible knowing that most of the country had already been shut down for ten days at that point. And so we wanted to get something into the field as quickly as possible.

So the Census Bureau set up a team that quickly worked along with our federal partners -- the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Center for Health Statistics, Housing and Urban Development, National Center for Education Statistics, the Office of Management and Budget, and the USDA Economic Research Service. So this was a very fast-moving collaboration between all of the partner agencies.

So we developed an experimental rapid response survey with the idea that this is a proof of concept and should there be other disasters, other national emergencies. This is something that we would hope, a methodology we would hope to be able to refine, to be able to put into play should other circumstances warrant it. Next slide, please.

So the platform that we had that we were currently using for research and development purposes was Qualtrics. So Qualtrics is FedRAMP Moderate authorized. So it operates in the gov cloud and the Census Bureau had a current authority to operate Qualtrics, to do data collection within Qualtrics at the time of this need. So we were able to take advantage of that to put something in the field quickly.

We chose the method of contact to be email and text invitations. This is something that's experimental and we had not done before but it was necessary because our National Processing Center was shut down so we could not mail any invitations so the only way that we would be able to contact respondents in a timely manner at this point in time was to use this electronic forms of contact.

So the frames that we used for this, we used an email and a cell phone frame - - so two frames that are attached to the master address file – to the Census Bureau's master address file. These emails and phone numbers come from a variety of sources. So they come from respondent contacts, so respondents in any survey that the Census collects a respondent could provide contact information which would go into the contact frames. It also comes from third-party vendors. And I believe this effort originated with interviewers, field interviewers contacting respondents to fill out surveys. And it has adapted into a collection of contact information that we maintain.

So there's a little information on that on the screen. The phone frame contains over a billion phone and address pairs. The phone frame contains a phone and address pair for over 88% of the addresses in the country. Three-quarters of the phones were acquired in the past 2 years. We've been doing it for longer than that but about three quarters of those are newer contact pieces. The email frame contains over 686 million well-formed email and address pairs. And (inaudible) has pairs for about 80% of the addresses in the country.

So this is not complete coverage but it is substantial coverage. And two-thirds of the email addresses were acquired in the past two years. So this is the, the frames that we had that we started out with in order to field this data collection. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So the questionnaire content (inaudible) you'll hear a lot more about this later on as our partners speak but other federal partner agencies when they could took questions from existing surveys. Often they had to be modified to acknowledge the event that was going on that was unlike anything that has happened before. But in most or all cases we started with questions that existed in other places.

For expert review, because we didn't have time to do full pre-testing, we conducted an expert review in English and Spanish and we conducted an expert review of all the contact scripts which means all of the emails and all of the text message scripts that were going out. So this was done pretty thoroughly within the Center for Behavioral Science Methods Research.

And then as the survey started fielding we were able to accomplish some web probing -- so a qualitative methodology to get at information on how respondents are understanding the questions. We were able to do this quickly working with (BLS) and (NCHS). We have an affinity panel so people who have opted-in to do research with the Census Bureau -- so these are typically more educated data users, but it's nonetheless a panel that we can use to do some quick and dirty testing, I would say.

And so we were able to send out a web probing questionnaire and conduct some text analytics and evaluation and make modifications based on what we learned during the web probing to improve the questionnaire as we were in the field. So think of this as a constantly evolving, constantly getting better proof of concept.

We have embedded a couple of experiments. The first one on how to access the Spanish translation whether to use the native having Qualtrics instrument detect the web browser language and directing the person that way versus having a toggle. We have another experiment that's queued up to go about how to invite somebody into a bilingual survey. So the survey is fielded in English and Spanish. So how to access it in this email and text message contact vehicle, we have some experiments planned on that.

And we also have a few other experiments that have kind of come up in the

meantime. So because this is a proof of concept and we don't have answers to all these questions, we're taking the opportunity to experiment when we can so we can make better data-driven decisions. Next slide, please.

So you'll also see more about content overall. So I'm not going to talk for very long on this slide. So in general, there's basic demographics, questions on employment, food security questions, health questions, housing questions, and education questions. And I'll let the subject matter experts talk more about those. Next slide, please. One more.

So soft launch and full implementation -- so on April 23rd, which is exactly one month after the initial decision that we were going to try to do this, we launched the survey. So it was a soft launch because we didn't have all our tech systems up and running. So we could invite one email address per MAF ID. So we were able to invite the best email address per MAF ID in that first week. We collected data on a Tuesday...Thursday through Tuesday data collection.

This will be the cadence because of the need to download the collected data and then upload an input file for later data collection because there is a longitudinal component to this study. So our cadence is collecting data Thursday through Tuesday and then doing the input and output file on Wednesday and then collecting data again the next Thursday.

So the first week was only using one email address per MAF ID. We got a pretty low response. We only got about 18,000 responses. But the next week we used the same sample and ironed a few things out. So we worked with the major email providers to ensure the survey was not going to spam because it was such a large data collection despite that Qualtrics does this as a matter of practice coming from a government URL and the increase in capacity from

where they were before and taking on this survey caused a few problems with spam filters. So we were able to work through that on our second week.

We added additional day in processing right there to accommodate some of these problems. So we had a Friday through Tuesday data collection. The remaining sampled email addresses were entered in this week - 1B we've called it. And then we also implemented the Spanish translation and a bilingual email invitation in week 1B.

So May 8th started week two. So this is the second sample week. It was a Friday through Tuesday data collection also. We implemented a soft launch for texting. So this May 8th is the first time we used text contacts. And we did this only for contacts that did not have an email address on file for us. So (inaudible) a way of introducing text slowly.

And then May 8th was also when we had the second interview (inaudible) completed the interview in the first week of sample. So this is our second longitudinal week with May 8.

So May 14 we were fully up and running with our full longitudinal. So each once a case response or end sample for three weeks and we were using our full text and email implementation strategy starting the week of May 14 -- so the week that included May 14.

Jason. I believe that the next slide is yours.

Jason Fields: Yes, thank you very much, Jenny. So basically with the schedule that Jenny outlined, we are - the most recent data we came out of the field collecting it ended June 2nd. It was released today. All of the weighted response rates here with the exception of the initial one represent just one week's data collection.

We expected response rates somewhere between 3 and 5% probably we were hoping closer to 5%. But these are in the range of what we expected. The total interviews collected range as you can see from about 42,000 to 132,000, 133,000. Next slide, please.

As I said, our release plans, our first data release was on May 20. It included the data from weeks 1A and 1B and week 2. This really represented just an incredibly quick response. Just to put it in context again for you we didn't have anything on the table to do this until March 23. By April 9 we were programming an instrument. By April 23 we were collecting data and we released it less than three weeks later with the data being processed, cleared for public release and dissemination platform and tools put in place.

For the dissemination, we have static tables. In the first release, we only had national-level tables. The second and continuing releases we've added national, state, and tables for the 15 largest metro areas.

An interactive tool was developed from scratch and includes indicators for each of the major domains. And includes data for national and state level. And then the 15 largest metros were added the following week.

Starting two weeks ago we really started releasing public use files. And they lagged the data about a week. And that's so that we can get them processed and released and make sure that the other agencies have access to them. But they are full public use microdata files. And our ongoing plan is to release those each Wednesday and continuing to lag by about a week. So the data released today in the tables were collected May 28 through June 2. And the public use file represents the data collection from the prior week.

And at this point partner agencies are also putting their own takes on the data up on their websites. There's a link for the NCHS website which has a very nice set of pages and interactive tools again for accessing the data and focusing on the mental health, health insurance, and health access. Next, please.

This is just a screenshot of last week's version of the data tool. It is showing week three data. You can see that in the - this is kind of the framework of the design. There's a map with flyovers that you can do to show each of the different topics which include loss of employment income by the adult or someone in the household, food sufficiency, delayed access to medical care, housing insecurity, and educational changes. A summary of the weeks is shown in the top right. And in the bottom, you'll have all of the states listed and you can filter by state or nation. Okay. Next, please. Yes.

So one of the, I mean, really I guess important things as far as you know, I'm concerned and you know, the Census Bureau is, when you start to look at the things you hear anecdotally, there were you know, and the things that you see in the news, the incredible number of people claiming you know, filing unemployment claims well it's showing up in these data too.

This table I've just shown each week's percentages of adults who were in a household where they or someone in their household lost employment income by the presence of children. And you can see from this chart for each week the loss of employment income in the households with children is staggering. It's you know, 53 to 55%. And for each week it's significantly higher than the loss of employment income in households without children. Next, please.

One of the other really important things with this survey is the ability to you know, go into the state level, go into the 15 metro levels. This slide focuses on

the loss of employment income since March 13 -- since the official start date for our measures. And it shows the wide variation in the experience of loss of employment income by large metro areas. You can see in about the middle the United States on average 48% of adults have themselves or someone in their household lost employment income. In the non-metro areas -- that's the second from the bottom line -- it's only 45.8%.

We are very fortunate in the Washington DC metro area to have the lowest and you know, of course, some of that is driven by the presence of the federal government in the Washington DC area as well as the ability to telework. So there's lots of different factors that go into all of these and different levels of shut down due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Next slide, please.

So we're going to let the other agencies talk about all of the other topics. I just wanted to give you a highlight of some of the details with employment income. The data are available as I said from the other agencies as well. But on the Census Bureau's web page there is Household Survey, Household Pulse Survey main page, access to the data tool, the data tables, and the downloadable microdata are all available from that location. And the technical documentation with source and accuracy statements, background information, questionnaires, PDFs of the questionnaires are all available there. And information for the survey respondents is also available from the Census Bureau's main page.

And I think that's the last one. There's a contact us slide. Yes. And you can send those to the household pulse team through census.survey.feedback@census.gov. And we're going to turn it over to Chris Chapman from the National Center for Education Statistics.

Chris Chapman: Great. Thank you, Jason. Good afternoon everybody. My name as Jason just

mentioned is Chris Chapman. I'm the Associate Commissioner for the Sample Surveys Division at the National Center for Education Statistics or NCES for short. NCES is one of the four institutes making up the US Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences and we do most of the statistical work related to the Department. Next slide, please.

Over the next few minutes, I want to provide information about how the education items were ultimately selected for the current version of the Pulse survey, how to interpret information from these education items that you see in the data tables that Jason was providing links to, and then plans for future education items for the Pulse survey. Next slide.

Okay. So first, how did we select the items that we did? Well, we needed items or questions that would make sense for a general household member respondent using relatively short recall periods -- again we were asking about last week experiences -- that would make sense in the context of studying expected new stresses on households that they might be experiencing specific to pandemic problems so that our items would fit in with the rest of the focus and the (inaudible) item sets that are in the survey, would make sense in terms of common remote education challenges, and that would provide information that would be difficult to otherwise obtain real time is one of the main strengths of the Pulse survey itself.

And then also wanted to make sure we were collecting information on education topics that could be affected by policy. Next slide.

Chris Chapman: So we decided to focus on experiences with educating children in the grades K-12 for the initial Pulse collections. Clearly there were other content

domains that we could have looked at and we did consider. So you know, the COVID-19 shutdowns of our institutions in the post-secondary education field, you know, clearly maybe the short (inaudible) education folks in post-secondary education. But for the pulse survey -- at least the initial couple collections of it -- we didn't go down that path primarily because households typically have much less interactions with the education of post-secondary students than they do with children in grades K-12.

And fewer households have members who are in post-secondary education. So the impact is less than the focus on K-12 education (inaudible).

We also (inaudible) think through or talk a little bit about the extensive problems that are occurring because of preschool education disruptions, but there again we decided not to make that the initial focus because preschool is not consistently part of all Education systems across the country. And we also have data showing that large proportions of pre-kindergarten children are already being cared for solely at home. So the impact of (inaudible) COVID-19 disruptions are somewhat mitigated. Again, they're serious but the households are already used to educating and caring for children at home. So next slide, please.

So with these parameters in mind, then we developed items to gather information about the education of students in grades K-12. And we specifically sought to capture information about how education services are being provided by the children's public or private school including whether educational services were just completely suspended -- whether basically the schools ended the school year early in response as opposed to establishing remote education opportunities.

We also wanted to make sure we had a reasonable understanding of access to

technology needed to support interactive remote learning. And here we focused in on access to computers to children in grades K-12 in the household and access to the internet for these same children. Then we also wanted to get a good understanding of the role that schools themselves were playing in terms of providing these technologies for the students.

Then we wanted to get a better understanding of how much interactive contact children who were actually getting remote education were having with their teachers during the week. So we have some questions in there about hours of FaceTime with the teachers. And then we closed out the section gathering information about how much time family members overall were spending in educational activities with these children during the week. Next slide.

Jennifer and Jason talked about how the sample was derived and how the contacts are being made with respondents. And that's important to keep in mind when interpreting the results from the education items. Basically the data (inaudible) designed to be representative of adults ages 18 and older living in households in the United States.

And so generally speaking then, the education items about K-12 education provide information about the percentage of adults in households with children in grades K-12. And it's important to keep this in mind when you're looking at the results. You know, I've seen some articles talking about (inaudible) experiences and things like that. And this is really a little different from (inaudible) interpretation or a child-level interpretation.

You know, specifically in terms of the household issue we know that about 30% of households have children under the age of 18. And you'll see in the Pulse survey that we've got about 38% of adults reported living with children under the age of 18. So you need to keep that sort of reference frame in mind

when looking at the (inaudible).

So the next survey or the next slide, I'm sorry, will highlight and help explain how to interpret some of these results. So here we see that 75% of adults are living with students in grades K-12 who report that those students are using online resources for distance learning activities. And we also see that the reported student use of online resources, the coursework varied quite a bit by the educational attainment of the adult.

And we see that among adults who have less than a high school education that only about 58% of them report that children in their households who are in K-12 are actually accessing and using online education resources during the shutdown of the school. And then we see that this increases as the educational attainment of the adult increases up to almost 90% of adults with a bachelor's degree or higher. Next slide, please.

When we see similar results when we consider children being able to access the internet for school work. So here we see again that a little over 70% of adults living with students in grades K-12 report that those students can access the internet as needed when they're engaged in education activities. And again we see, you know, pretty steep disparity between adults with less than a high school education at 55% and adults with a bachelor's degree or higher reporting at 82%. There is a little bit of a difference in terms of internet access compared to by using remote education resources in terms of the difference between those with just a high school credential and those with some college. We don't really see a difference in terms of internet access that we saw in terms of (inaudible) on the previous slide. Next slide, please.

Going forward, if the Pulse survey continues through summer and maybe into the fall, we'll want to shift the focus of the content of the education items. So

you know, currently we're collecting data from adults in terms of the education of K-12 students in their households during what would be the end of the 2019-20 school year for most students.

So as we move into summer and then the fall, you know, we'd want to change focus. We might go back and revisit the idea of collecting information about post-secondary education experiences, again given the significant changes that have been made, you know, at the university and college level.

We might also shift focus to understanding preparations for the upcoming school year and what adults know about school reopening plans for (inaudible) 2020 for the students living in their households. We might also take a look at the educational activities children may engage in (inaudible). So we've got some large content-area decisions to make and we're just starting to really delve into item development across them. Next slide, please.

So that was a brief overview of how we selected the education items for the Pulse survey, how to interpret the results from the education items that we have in the pulse survey, and then where we think we might look to change content of the education items in the survey as we go through the end of the school year and the summer.

And you see there's my email address. So if you've got questions that come to mind about those items after the webinar today, please don't hesitate to send me a note. I'm happy to talk. And with that, I'm going to hand over the presentation to Stephen Blumberg. Thank you.

Stephen Blumberg: Thanks, Chris. Hi everyone. My name is Stephen Blumberg. And I'm the Director of the Division of Health Interview Statistics at the National Center for Health Statistics. Next slide.

Many of you, you know, probably already know about NCHS. But for those of you who don't, NCHS it's one of the centers in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and one of the 13 principal federal statistical agencies. We're the federal statistical agency tasked with monitoring the nation's health -- so identifying health problems, risk factors, disease patterns, looking across time and populations, and ultimately disseminating those findings to inform actions and policies. Next slide.

We do this primarily by collecting and analyzing data from several major data systems. The one that's been in the news most lately is the national vital statistics system. That's the one that uses data from death certificates to produce provisional COVID-19 death counts. But the one that's most similar to the pulse survey that we're talking about today is the National Health Interview Survey, which is the survey that I direct.

The NHIS is the oldest ongoing health survey in the United States -- second oldest in the world. We've been in the field continuously since 1957. Ever since it started, it has used in-person household interviews to collect data on various aspects of health, healthcare, and health behaviors. The HIS is considered a gold standard data collection because we are cautious, disciplined, deliberative -- you know, we get high response rates and high data quality but we are slow. And that makes the NHIS completely impractical for rapid surveillance of the COVID pandemic.

Therefore, you know, we were thrilled to have the opportunity to work with the Census Bureau on the Household Pulse Survey and to add health-related content to that survey. So you know, my thanks to the Census Bureau. Next slide.

So turning to that health-related survey content, the health content that we included in the survey is focused on three topic areas: mental health -- specifically anxiety and depression, on reduced access to care as a result of the coronavirus pandemic, and then also health insurance -- not just coverage but type. So for my presentation here today I'm going to go through each of these in turn. So next slide. Next slide, please. ...just my screen froze.

Cassandra Logan: I see mental health. What do you see?

Stephen Blumberg: No, I don't see mental health. But that's okay. We can keep going. For some reason, my screen froze. Anyway, so the Household Pulse Survey includes two questions on symptoms of major depressive disorder and two questions on symptoms of generalized anxiety disorder. These are clinically validated measures and they were selected for that reason.

But they were also selected because they are included on the National Health Interview Survey in 2019, and that provides us with a baseline pre-COVID estimates against which to compare the Pulse estimates. So more on that in just a minute but turning back to these questions first.

So the depression questions ask about the frequency of the two core symptoms of major depression -- that is depressed mood and anhedonia, which is the inability to feel pleasure. And together those two items make up what's known as the PHQ2. Now, the PHQ2 is usually asked with a 14-day time window. So usually it's asked you know, over the past two weeks how often have you been bothered by these symptoms. But because the Pulse survey is a weekly survey, we shortened that window to seven days.

Now, the anxiety questions make up the GAD scale. And they ask about the frequency of the two core symptoms of generalized anxiety disorder -- that is

excessive nervousness and uncontrollable worry. Next slide.

The answer choices are not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day. Each answer choice is associated with a value. You sum the two values for each scale to get a scale score. And for the purposes of our analyses, adults with scores of three or greater are considered to have symptoms of anxiety disorder or symptoms of depressive disorder.

Now you know, if you think about it that means that these are adults who generally are experiencing at least one of these symptoms more than half the days over the past seven days.

When the PHQ2 and the GAD2 are asked using that two-week time window, scores of three or greater have been shown in normal, non-pandemic times to be associated with diagnoses of major depressive disorder or generalized anxiety disorder. So the PHQ2 and the GAD2 are used by primary care doctors, for example, to screen for anxiety and depression. And the clinical recommendation then is generally to refer patients for further diagnostic evaluation if that score is three or greater.

So now that we've talked about where these numbers come from, the next slide shows the results that we published this morning. Based on the most recent Pulse data -- that is the data from May 28th through June 2nd -- 30% of adults in the US have symptoms of anxiety disorder, 25% have symptoms of depressive disorder, and more than a third have symptoms of one or both of these disorders.

Advance one more. Here are the numbers from the National Health Interview Survey for the first six months of 2019 and what you can see is that the current estimates are more than three times higher for every measure. Next

slide.

Looking at age differences here we see that half of all young adults aged 18 to 29 report experiencing symptoms so frequently that in any other time it would suggest that they are likely to have major depressive disorder and/or generalized anxiety disorder. Now, just to be clear I'm not saying that half of all young adults have a mental health disorder. But half are experiencing symptoms of anxiety and depression more than half the days in the past seven days.

The prevalence of such symptoms decreases with age. We don't usually see such a steep gradient by age. There have been news articles published recently that speculate on why we're seeing that young adults have the highest frequencies of these feelings. But you know, unfortunately, the Pulse Survey does not provide us with any definitive answers. Next slide.

Moving on to these other results, women are more likely than men to report frequent symptoms of anxiety or depression. And adults with lower levels of education are also more likely to report such symptoms. Next slide.

And in the most recent data, we see that non-Hispanic Black adults were significantly more likely to report frequent symptoms of anxiety or depression than were non-Hispanic White adults. Hispanic adults and adults of other or multiple races also had prevalence rates that were higher than non-Hispanic White adults.

Now, we do not usually see differences between White adults, Black adults, and Hispanic adults on these measures. But I should note that these most recent Pulse data were collected in the first week following the death of George Floyd. For Black adults, the Household Pulse Survey data showed that

there was a statistically significant increase in the prevalence of frequent anxiety and/or depression when compared to the week before George Floyd's death. Next slide.

All of these numbers are available on the NCHS website along with state maps and graphs of trends over time. We've collaborated with the Census Bureau on these releases and with their help and, you know, with the outstanding work of my own team at NCHS we've been able to update our website at the same time that the Census Bureau releases their tables of results each week.

Now, I know I'm running out of time but let's turn briefly to the other health-related content areas on the Pulse survey -- reduced access to care and health insurance coverage. So NCHS included questions about the impact of the coronavirus pandemic on unmet needs for care, looking at who delayed getting medical care in the last four weeks and who needed medical care at any time in the last four weeks for something other than Coronavirus but did not get it because of the Coronavirus pandemic.

There are obviously many reasons people may not get medical care, but some of the reasons you know, that could have been caused by the pandemic include canceled appointments, cutbacks in transportation options, fear of going to the emergency room or even an altruistic desire to not be a burden on the healthcare system during this time. Next slide.

The most recent data show that 45% of adults had delayed or did not get needed care in the past four weeks. That's you know, a much higher level of unmet need than we usually see. You know, of course we don't have data from other pandemics to compare against. But the National Health Interview Survey does ask about unmet needs due to cost, which is typically the primary

reason that people delay or don't get needed care.

So if you advance one more, you'll see what that looks like in the National Health Interview Survey in first, you know, in 2018 fewer than 9% of adults had delayed care due to cost. Fewer than 6% did not get care due to cost, you know. And that was asking about delayed or foregone care in the previous 12 months. So 45% is substantially higher. Next slide.

Looking at age differences we see something like an inverted U shape. Middle-aged adults were more likely to have delayed or not gotten needed care relative to younger or older adults. Next, women were more likely than men to have an unmet need due to the Coronavirus. Adults with more education were more likely to have had an unmet need due to the Coronavirus pandemic. Next slide. The non-Hispanic white adults and adults with other or multiple races were more likely to have had an unmet need.

And then finally next slide turning to health insurance, there is concern that the impact of the coronavirus on employment could have an adverse impact on private health insurance coverage and then in turn on uninsurance rates. So on the Pulse survey, we included the same health insurance question that is included on the American Community Survey, asking about people's current coverage. This slide does show those answer choices there.

And on the next slide, here are the most recent results -- 13.2% uninsured.

If you advance one, here they are compared with 2019 data from the National Health Interview Survey. The NHIS, you know, asks about insurance coverage in a different, more comprehensive way. And we define private health insurance a little differently. So these are not really directly comparable. But in general, we're not seeing an increase in uninsurance either

relative to 2019 or week to week in the Pulse survey. Next slide.

The demographic differences are consistent with long-term differences in uninsurance rates. So young adults are more likely than older adults to be uninsured. Next slide. Men are more likely to be uninsured than women. Adults with less education are more likely to be uninsured than adults with higher levels of education. And the next slide, Hispanic adults are the most likely to be uninsured followed by non-Hispanic Black adults, and then non-Hispanic White and Asian adults are the least likely to be uninsured. Next slide.

So this is my final slide. You know, again all of these results can be found on the NCHS Website along with tables and graphs and state maps. The URL here at the top is for the main COVID page on the NCHS website. From there you can get to any of the health care access and mental health results. And you know, thanks again to the Census Bureau for this survey, for letting NCHS be a part of it and for giving me the time here to present the health results so far. Thank you.

And now I will turn it over to Christian Gregory.

Christian Gregory: Can everyone hear me? So my name...

((Crosstalk))

Christian Gregory: ...is - great, thanks. My name is Christian Gregory and I am the Food Assistance Branch Chief in the Food Economics Division of the Economic Research Service. And today, what I'd like to talk about are some of our contributions to and our preliminary results from the Census Household Pulse Survey.

And I do want to echo the thanks that everyone else has offered to the Census Bureau for their professionalism and their rigor and their dedication to this survey. It's been a monumental effort and they've been extremely helpful to us. And so we're very grateful to that, to them. So next slide, please.

So the ERS mission is to anticipate trends in agriculture and food, the environment, rural America. And we conduct high-quality economic research with the purpose of enhancing public and private decision-making. So we are one of the principal statistical agencies but we also spend a good amount of our time doing economic research at ERS. Next slide, please.

So our contributions to the survey are really you could put them in a couple of baskets. One of them is to gauge food insufficiency. And this is like something that we are tasked with monitoring food insecurity -- and I'll talk about that in a moment, the difference between those two -- the reasons one might not have enough food that one wants or the kinds of food that one wants, whether one received free meals and where, food at home spending and food away from home spending. And then finally confidence about food sufficiency in the coming four weeks.

Today I want to talk in particular about food insufficiency and some of the things that we are - some of the insights we have been already able to gain from the Household Pulse Survey. As I mentioned to some people before, this survey is really very rich and offers us many, many, many, many perspectives to see food insufficiency and the ways that households manage in the context of the COVID pandemic. So next slide, please.

So as I said I'm going to talk a little bit about this item because it's the one we get the most questions about. And the reason for that is that one of ERS's

primary tasks in the food economics division is to monitor and provide surveillance on what we call food insecurity. Now, food insecurity as I'll say in a moment is different from food insufficiency but it gets at the degree to which a household has experienced disruptions either in the quantity or quality of food that they are able to access for reasons of household resources.

The food insufficiency item asks in the last seven days to characterize the food eaten in one's home. And so, one choice is enough and the kinds of food we want to eat. Another choice, choice number two, is enough but not always the kinds we want to eat. The third choice is sometimes not enough to eat. And then fourth is often not enough to eat.

And so the taxonomy that we're using and that I'll use throughout this presentation has persons that respond with response one have full food sufficiency. If they give response two they have marginal food sufficiency, response three they have low food sufficiency, and response four they have very low food sufficiency. And we count any person, any respondent who gives response three or four as having a food insufficiency. Next slide, please.

So I'll just say a thing or two about food insecurity to distinguish it from food insufficiency. So food insecurity is based on a series of questions that are administered in many federal data collections including NHIS and in the monthly CPS in the December food security supplement. And the items actually don't ask, you know, they don't ask directly are you food insecure. The idea is that we ask about conditions, behaviors, or attitudes that we know are correlated with food insecurity and then we get at this unobserved thing called food insecurity by looking at people's responses to those questions.

Now, one thing is this food insecurity module gives us a lot of detail. The items range in severity from just worrying about food to disruptions in diet

quality or variety to actual disruptions in intake. The reference period for the food insecurity module is usually 12 months or 30 days. For example, in the NHIS it's 30 days. The ten-item module in (inaudible) is the 18 item module with a 12-month reference period.

We get more details in the food insecurity module about the characteristics of the food hardship experienced. So if a household is food insecure, the households were at times unable to acquire adequate food for one or more household members because of resource constraints. For very low food security, the households were food insecure to the extent that eating patterns of one or more members were disrupted and/or their food intake reduced.

Now, by contrast the food insufficiency item is a single item. We do get a little bit of the detail that we get from the food insecurity module. This item actually comes from the December CPS. It's used as a screener for households who have incomes above 185% of the poverty line to see if they should go into the full food security module. The reference period as opposed to the food security module is the last seven days.

And food insufficiency is actually in terms of the characteristics of food insufficiency it is a much more - you could say it is a more severe condition than food insecurity because food insufficiency indicates that the household did not have enough calories, essentially did not have enough food to eat. So it's actually more like very low food insecurity than it is just general food insecurity. Food insufficiency is closer conceptually to very low food security. Next slide, please.

So next slide. For what follows -- thank you -- for what follows I had laid out the time period so I wouldn't have to keep saying the dates. So I put them in the slides. And I can just say week one, week two and week three. So, you

know, the results that I'm going to show you here come from week one, week two and week three of the household pulse survey. And what we see is that on a national level the food insufficiency rate went up in week one from 9.8% to in week two 10.6% to excuse me in week three 10.7%. The differences between the first and second and the first and third weeks are statistically significant.

Next slide.

Cassandra Logan: What do you see?

Christian Gregory: I see food insufficiency initial results.

Cassandra Logan: I see food sufficiency results for states. Is it up now?

Christian Gregory: Okay. No I can pull it out in my slide deck. So one of the other things that the -- here it is -- this household pulse survey offers us is the opportunity to look at differences across states. Now one of the reasons this is important is that states differ in their administration of food assistance programs. And as I'll say more at the end one of the things we're looking forward to is maybe collecting some information on household participation in those programs. But there are also other differences in the ways that states deal with food supply issues that might become relevant.

And so this is just a list of states in the first column there. Those states have above national average food insufficiency and then the second column they have below national average food insufficiency. And then once again that's for week one, week two and week three.

Next slide. And so the week to week differences show that these are the states

for which there was an increase from week one to week two and then week one to week three and the states for which there was a decrease. And we can see from week one to week three that there are more states that increased than from week one to week two.

Next slide please. So this is one of the very important things that we are looking further into because we know that minority communities have been disproportionately affected by the COVID outbreak. So we wanted to also examine food insufficiency rates among by race ethnicity. So there are statistically significant increases from week one to week two for black non-Hispanics and from week one to week three for black non-Hispanics and for white non-Hispanics. And all others if I didn't mention them or they're not mentioned in the bullet point the increases or changes are not statistically significant.

Next slide please. So another important component of understanding food sufficiency has to do with employment. And so we are able to look because of the items that are on the - excuse me on the household pulse survey at the employment status of adults in the household. And from week one to week two there are significant increases in food insufficiency for households currently with an unemployed adult and for households with an adult that anticipates being unemployed in the next four weeks.

Next slide please. So this is one of the questions that we are very interested in. We actually ask why the households are food insufficient. And this is important in this particular context because there have been anecdotal reports and some statistics that show their supply bottleneck that could actually lead to people not - local stores not having enough food or people not having the kinds of food that they would prefer.

So these results are for food insufficient households. And we know - we actually observe from week one to week three the mobility and transportation reasons for not having enough food actually declined. And from week one to week two and from week one to week three the reason that there are store stock issues as the reason for food insufficiency also declined.

I will also say that we observed actually an increase in store stock issues over some weeks for persons who report marginal food insufficiency which is kind of what we'd expect because persons who stated they're marginally food insufficient reports they have enough food but not always the kinds of food that they want. So this would be someone who has to buy product A instead of product B because of shortages in their store.

Next slide please. So we also ask about food spending. And we ask households to give an amount that they spend on food at home and food away from home during these weeks.

Next slide please. So one of the issues is that there is an abundance of food spending data out there. And so our analysts at ERS have been working very hard to kind of disentangle some of the differences in these data collections to make meaningful comparisons. So each of these bars represents different collections the household pulse survey being on the far left, the CES - the Consumer Expenditure Survey being the next and then NHANES, FCBS the Flexible Consumer Behavioral Survey in the third column and then the CPS, food security supplement from December of 2018 in the fourth column.

Now the levels are certainly different on all of these. One of the things to notice also is that in the household pulse survey these are results from weeks one to three combined. The fraction of spending on food away from home is about the same as in NHANES and in the CPS.

Next slide please. So these are just some notes on the last slide. And our analysts have been working hard as I said to be able to make meaningful comparisons between these data collections so that we can really pull out the insights that the household pulse survey has for us. We also have other data at ERS' disposal the food expenditures series that shows that food away from home fell in March 2020 by 51%.

Next slide please. So research we're working on... food spending and food sufficiency... we have been in dialogue with (Jason) and the team at Census about adding a question that would get at food sufficiency for households with children. We want to know more about the reasons for insufficiency so we're working on that. And on the places people get free food and food insufficiency status.

Finally going forward we're also going to be interested in trying to collect data on participation in food assistance programs particularly SNAP because we know at this time the food and nutrition service has - there are many flexibilities in the administration of SNAP which have made it a much more robust resource for many households. So we're going to be looking into that.

Next slide please. So these are the names and email addresses of all the people on our Pulse team. I want to again thank the team at the Census who have been incredibly helpful to us. And we are really, really grateful to be able to participate in designing this survey with them. And we look forward to going forward so thank you very much and I'll turn it over to Shawn I believe.

Shawn Bucholtz: All right thanks Christian. Thanks everyone for tuning in today to the COVID-19 Pulse Survey Webinar. My name is Shawn Bucholtz. I am HUDs Chief Statistical Official and the Director of Housing and Demographic

Analysis Division.

Next slide please. My presentation will focus on two housing questions HUD contributed to the Pulse Survey. The first question asks whether households made their last month's rent or mortgage payment on time. And the second question asks whether households have confidence they will make their next month's mortgage or rent payment on time.

A couple important points about these questions. We did not define what it meant to be on time nor did we define which month is considered the last month or the next month. We leave it up to the respondents to consider what those terms mean to them. HUD feels these two housing questions are important for at least a few reasons.

First, for mortgage holders and renters failing to make a payment on time can be a stressful event. And we know stress can contribute to a decline in people's mental and physical health. Moreover missing one mortgage or rent payment can lead to missing future mortgage or rent payments as households try to catch up with missed payments. For some renters missing multiple rent payments can eventually lead to eviction.

The second reason these questions are important to HUD is the health of the housing finance system. COVID-19 has caused a dramatic spike in the mortgage delinquency rates for homeowners. Moreover nearly 60% of all rental apartments and rental homes throughout the nation have an underlying mortgage on the rental property. As such late rent payments can impact the ability of landlords to make their own mortgage payments. And as many of you are likely aware the federal government is heavily involved in the mortgage industry and taxpayers may bear some of the costs of mortgage defaults.

Next slide please. I want to begin my story by talking about households who have a mortgage. As I mentioned in the last slide a key question asked of all households with a mortgage is whether they made their last month's mortgage payment on time. It's important to note that if a household reported their mortgage payment was deferred, I treat that answer as though it was a late mortgage payment.

When we look across the five weeks of the Pulse Survey we say that between 10 and 11% of households with a mortgage reported not making their last month's mortgage payment on time. And as of week five of the Pulse Survey there does not appear to be much of a trend in that number.

Next slide please. So my next few slides are going to present some statistics that reflect averages across all five weeks of the survey. And I'm doing that because as demonstrated in the last slide the share of households not paying their last mortgage payment on time was pretty stable across the five weeks of the survey.

Okay. So across the five weeks of the survey about 11% of households with a mortgage report not making their last mortgage payment on time. It's helpful to note that households that could have had their mortgage payment deferred they could have made a partial payment or they could have made a full payment albeit a little bit late or they could have made no payment whatsoever. Whatever that household story may be the fact remains that they report their last mortgage payment was late. In contrast 89% of households with a mortgage report making their last mortgage payment on time.

Next slide please. One way we can disaggregate those late mortgage payment numbers is by whether the household reported a loss of income due to

COVID-19. This slide does that. And I think it's held a few important stories. I first want to direct your attention to the black box on the bottom left which shows that of the 11% of households with a mortgage who did not make their last mortgage payment on time three of those 11% did not experience a loss of household income due to COVID-19. So that number 3% is roughly in line with what the pre-COVID-19 mortgage delinquency rate was meaning that this 3% is an expected number in a normally functioning economy.

In the red box we show that 8 out of the 11% of households who did not make their last mortgage payment on time did in fact suffer a loss of income due to COVID-19. One possible way to interpret this 8% number is this reflects the amount of late mortgage payments that can be said to be due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Moving to the right side of the screen the aqua colored box on the diagram shows that for the 89% of households who paid their mortgage on time, 54% did not suffer a loss of income. But in contrast 35 of those 89% did suffer a loss of income. So for that 35% it could perhaps be inferred that their loss of income was not severe enough to impact their ability to pay their mortgage on time. But it could equally be inferred that those households had savings to mitigate the loss of income or that the household paid their mortgage on time but reduced spending in other areas. We're not quite sure what the reason there could be.

Next slide please. So in the prior slide we disaggregated late payment status by loss of income. In this slide we disaggregate late payment status by the household's confidence in making their next mortgage payment on time. So starting on the left side of the diagram for the 11% of households who did not make their last mortgage payment on time only 1% have a high degree of confidence in making their next mortgage payment on time and that's the far

left green box.

An additional 2% say they have a moderate degree of confidence in making their next mortgage payment on time. So that means of the 11% of households who did not make their last mortgage payment on time 8% have little or no confidence in making their next mortgage payment on time. To me that is a troubling number and it suggests that mortgage delinquency rates will persist for at least another month.

But for me what could be perhaps even more troubling is the confidence levels for those 89% of households with a mortgage who did make their last mortgage payment on time. Sixty-five of those 89% who made their last mortgage payment on time have a high degree of confidence they'll make their next mortgage payment on time. And an additional 16% have a moderate degree of confidence they will make their next mortgage payment on time.

However 8% of those have a little or no confidence they will make their next mortgage payment on time. And when we combine these two red boxes together we see that 16% of all households with a mortgage report having little or no confidence that they will make their next mortgage payment on time. That 16% is a large number and certainly a reason for concern. To put that 16% number into context at the height of the great recession in mid-2009 just over 10% of households were delinquent in their mortgage payment. Sixteen is quite a bit higher than that.

Before I move onto talking about renters I want to make a few important points about these late mortgage payment numbers. First in the pulse survey I've shown that 11% of the mortgage holders report they were late with their last mortgage payment. And that number is in line with data from the mortgage industry which shows that approximately 9% of mortgage holders

have had their mortgage payment deferred which is referred to as forbearance. And another couple of percent are currently late with their payments but have not entered a deference or forbearance agreement.

Second, industry data which comes from Black Knight and McDash show that 46% of mortgage holders who had their mortgage payment deferred in April actually ended up making their April mortgage payment albeit just later in the month. But when we look at the May numbers we see a decrease. We see only 22% of the mortgage holders who had their May mortgage payment deferred actually ended up making their May payment. So that tells - the industry data tells us that mortgage holders are having an increasingly difficult time keeping up with their mortgage payments.

The last point I want to make about the late mortgage payments. The COVID-19 pulse survey is an invaluable data source for understanding this late mortgage payment issue. And in my opinion is now the best leading indicator of potential mortgage delinquency rates. And because the COVID-19 pulse survey data is being collected and published weekly, it's a highly valuable complement to the data that's collected by the industry.

Next slide please. I'm now going to shift my focus and talk about renter households. As previously mentioned a key question asked of all renter households is whether they made their last month's rent payment on time. And please note that for renter households who reported that their last month's payment was deferred by their landlord I consider those to be late payment.

When we look across the five weeks of the pulse survey we see that between 16 and 19% of renter households reported not making their last month's rent payment on time. The weekly results suggest the possibility of a slight downward trend throughout the month of May. But I'll reserve judgment on

the existence of a trend until a few weeks of June data are available and we can observe a similar trend.

So my next few slides are going to present some statistics that reflect the average across all five weeks of the survey. Next slide please. Okay so across the five weeks of the survey 17% of renter households report not making their last rent payment on time. In contrast 83% of renter households report making their last rent payment on time so 17 and 83.

Next slide please. Like we did with the mortgage holders we can also disaggregate our renter households late payment numbers by whether the household reported a loss of income due to COVID-19. And this slide presents those numbers. And I think it tells a few important stories. I first want to direct your attention to the black box on the left which shows that of the 17% of renter households who did not make their last payment on time, 4 of those 17% did not experience a loss of household income due to COVID-19. And in the red box we show that 13 out of the 17% of renter households who did not make their last rent payment on time did in fact suffer a loss of income due to COVID-19.

Moving over to the right side the aqua colored box on the right side of the diagram shows that for the 83% of renter households who paid their last month's rent payment on time 44% did not suffer a loss of income. But in contrast 39% did suffer a loss of income. And for those 39% it could perhaps be inferred that their loss of income was not severe enough to impact their ability to pay rent but it could equally be inferred that the household either had enough savings to mitigate the loss of income or they adjusted their spending in order to be able to make their rent payment on time.

Next slide please. Just like we did with the households of mortgages in this

slide we disaggregate renter households late payment status by their confidence in making their next rent payment on time. So starting on the left side of the diagram for the 17% of renter households who did not pay their last rent payment on time only 1% have a high degree of confidence in making their next rent payment on time as shown in the green box. And 3% say they have a moderate degree of confidence in making their next rent payment on time which is shown in the yellow box.

So that means that of the 17% of households who did not make their last rent payment on time 13% have little or no confidence in making their next rent payment on time. That is a troubling number to me. And it suggests that rental payment delinquency rates will persist for at least another month. Perhaps though, what I think might be a little more troubling is the confidence levels for those 83% of renters who did make their last rent payment on time. So 43 out of those 83% have a high degree of confidence of making their next rent payment on time. And an additional 22% report having a moderate degree of confidence they will make their next rent payment on time.

However 18 out of those 83% report having little or no confidence they will make their next rent payment on time. That is a big, big number. And when we combine the two red boxes together we see that 31% of all renter households report having little or no confidence they will make their next rent payment on time.

So a few more points about the COVID-19 pulse data and the industry data. First of all data from the National Multi-Family Housing Council suggests about 20% of renters did not pay their May rent by the sixth day of May. And those industry numbers are fairly consistent with the pulse survey estimates of late rental payments.

The COVID-19 pulse household survey is truly an invaluable data source for understanding the issue of late rental payments because it is the only rental payment data source that covers all types of rental properties including small rental properties. Industry data tends to focus only on large multi-family rental properties. So that makes the COVID-19 pulse survey a highly valuable complement to the industry data.

Next slide please. So to recap the main findings for mortgage holder households 11% of mortgage holder households did not make their last mortgage payment on time as averaged across the five weeks of the survey. And 16% of mortgage holder households have little or no confidence of making their next mortgage payment on time. For renter households 17% of the renter households did not make their last rent payment on time. And 31% of renter households have little or no confidence of making their next rent payment on time.

So that's the end of my presentation. I want to thank the Census Bureau for putting out the Pulse Survey data. They've been a fantastic partner to work with. And on a personal note I want to urge you all who are listening on the webinar to express your support for the COVID-19 pulse survey. The data that the Census Bureau is collecting is of tremendous value to understanding the impact of COVID-19 on the physical, mental and financial health and wellbeing of the American people.

And as we go down the path to economic recovery we truly need the COVID-19 pulse survey to help us understand where additional economic recovery may be needed. And how we are doing on the economic recovery.

So thank you for your participation and I'll turn it back over to Tori Velkoff.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you Shawn and thank you to all of our speakers. The results you shared were really very informative. And it's very interesting for me to hear our federal partners talk about their data from the Pulse Survey. And I have to say that I know that I've enjoyed this great collaboration we've had with each of our partners.

So just before we turn it over for questions I wanted to remind people that we are recording this webinar. And it will be available on the Census Academy and we'll share it on social media. And it usually takes a week or two to get the transcripts ready so stay tuned for that. And operator at this time we'd like to take some questions from over the phone.

Coordinator: Thank you. If you would like to ask a question please press Star 1 from your phone and unmute your line. Speak your name clearly when prompted by the system. If you would like to withdraw your question please press Star 2. Again if you would like to ask a question please press Star 1 and unmute your line and speak your name clearly when prompted. Please standby for questions on the phone.

Tori Velkoff: Okay and while we're waiting for questions from the phone let me just say there's been a few questions that have come in through the email asking about data disaggregated by sex or whether we're putting out standard errors. And I would say to anyone who's listening please visit our Web site. We are putting data out disaggregated by all sorts of characteristics and we are putting out standard errors. So there's a plug to go look at the Household Pulse Survey data on the Census Bureau web site or any of our partners' web sites.

Okay while we wait I'll go through some more of the questions that we've received over the Internet. So, let's see. Somebody would ask us just to discuss in as much detail as possible the limitations of the subgroup data. So I

think they're talking about demographic subgroups. And what examples do the researchers here think would be appropriate and inappropriate conclusions to be drawn from the data. So Stephen or (Shawn), or, would you like to take that question?

Stephen Blumberg: This is Stephen. I mean I can answer from the perspective of what we've looked at (inaudible) our measures. And that is that using the criteria that we use at the National Center for Health Statistics to determine when an estimate is too unreliable to report we have found some state estimates to get close to or beyond that threshold. But in terms of demographic subgroup estimates they've been quite reliable.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you Stephen.

Shawn Bucholtz: This is Shawn Bucholtz. I'll echo a similar sentiment. Our subgroup analysis at HUD has focused mostly on renters and mostly on lower income renters. So we've been doing analysis at the national and at the states and big metro area levels. We find that if we don't use all the income categories but we roll up a few of the income categories and establish a cut off that the estimates look good, the standard errors look good and that we're able to feel confident about the state level estimates.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you Shawn. Operator, do we have any questions.

Coordinator: We do. Our first question, your line is now open.

(Caller 1): Hello. Yes could you give any advice regarding using this data set given the low response rate? Can we use it as though it had a full response or should we take any other considerations into factoring as we report out on these data?

Tori Velkoff): Jason why don't you take a crack at that.

Jason Fields: Yes sure. So you're absolutely right. It has a very low response rate and we did expect that it would be a low response rate. One of the things that you can I think take comfort in is in the ability that our weights and our sampling frame are very robust. And four estimates that are within the bounds of the waiting controls, the estimates are absolutely spot on. And for the off...the other variables that are not part of the waiting controls, once the controls are used for race, sex, age, Hispanic origin and educational attainment, the other estimates do fall in line although there is more variability than you would see in a larger - a survey with a higher response rate.

I think it's important if you are able to and you use the microdata be sure you use the replicate weights. They are available and easy to merge on. And for the detailed tables with this week's release there are companion tables for every one of them that include standard errors. And you can generate confidence intervals at the 90 or 95 or 99% confidence interval rate at whatever you'd like. Does that answer your question?

(Caller 1): Absolutely. Can you just confirm what weights, what variables were used in the sampling frame? You said race, sex, age, educational attainment.

Jason Fields: Right. So age, sex, race, Hispanic origin and then we control to the number of adults, population 18 and over and then there's a ranking by educational attainment that aligns with the ACS - the American Community Survey.

(Caller 1): Thank you for your answer.

Jason Fields: Yes and I would encourage you also to take a look at the source and accuracy statements that are up on the Web site. They include all of the details on

calculating variances and data quality - the measures around data quality.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you (Jason). Operator do we have another question on the phone?

Coordinator: Our next question, your line is open.

(Caller 2): Hi. The question I had was just actually answered. We're just trying to get detail on the usage of replicate weights and assignments for independent analysis of the microdata. So I will yield whatever time is left, thank you.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you.

Coordinator: And next, your line is open.

(Caller 3): Hi, my question was also answered I'm sorry. So I yield my time, thanks.

Coordinator: And next, your line is open.

(Caller 4): Yes you asked for people to advocate for the use of the Pulse Survey. And who would you like us to contact to do that?

Tori Velkoff: (Shawn) I'll let you answer that since you asked people to advocate for the use of it.

Shawn Bucholtz: I like to see I think a forceful way to advocate for the value of the survey and to build a user base for the survey is to use social media. I really love being on twitter. People post different ways in which they're cutting the data, different conclusions in which they're drawing from the data. And I think doing that just has a way of building up momentum and support for the survey that hopefully finds its way to members of Congress and those in the

administration who will make the decision about the future of the survey.

(Caller 4): Thank you. Is this information also being passed onto members of the Congress?

Tori Velkoff: This is Tori Velkoff. We have done one briefing with one staffer but the data are definitely available on our Web site so members of Congress can access them with no problem.

(Caller 4): Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question, your line is open.

(Caller 5): My question has to do with the micro-level data. In the survey questionnaire I know that you asked about both race and ethnicity. But in the public data set we only can identify subgroups by racial background but not the ethnic background. So how can we access that data, one, and, two, I was curious as to why the survey had yet to include a question on nativity so that we can distinguish between the immigrant population and the U.S. born population which is so crucial on multiple levels because of the inequality by migration status.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you for that question. I think (Jason) that's probably...

Jason Fields: Yes sure. Okay so to two points. The first is regarding the detailed race and Hispanic origin items. Those questions are as you noted they are collected in much more detail than the public use file has. You are able to work with the Census Bureau. And through the Federal Statistical Research Data Center network work on projects with internal data.

At the moment those data are not on the public use file as another level of data protection for the population. And to ensure that with the sample size and the amount of information that we have that we don't put anybody's privacy at risk. That's why there's collapsing on those variables.

In terms of the nativity status that is something that we considered at the onset. However we were most focused on making sure that we got the substantive content in with a respondent burden level that was low enough to really ensure that we would get folks participating in the survey. And we didn't want it to come across any way other than we were focusing on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However I will tell you that the nativity question is on our list to consider for adding with the addition of other requests.

(Caller 5): I just wanted to underscore that I would strongly support such an addition given the fact that again one out of eight of the U.S. population is of immigrant background. And if you were to count the children who live in those households we're talking about one out of four. And the concentration among Hispanics and Asians are significantly higher than one out of four. And if you're thinking about adding items on education, on health, I can't see how you could not add a question that's so basic, like, immigration which is actually about demographics. It's not about substantive kind of differences or anything. But the background of people who are coming from different kind of backgrounds. Thank you.

Jason Fields: Yes.

Tori Velkoff: I have a question here for Stephen Blumberg. Stephen are you ready for this? It says given the millions of Americans lost their job during the COVID crisis and health insurance is often tied to one's job, do you have any further

thoughts on the lack of change in the insurance coverage numbers from the pulse survey? Perhaps the majority of job losses were not coverage health insurance or companies stepped up and provided Cobra for those let go. Any thoughts Stephen?

Stephen Blumberg: Well I think that the question writer has answered some of the possibilities. There are certainly other possibilities that are related to that and that is that health insurance coverage may continue for a period of time following the loss of a job. There's also the possibility that the person who (inaudible) the job was not the member of the household providing the health insurance coverage for the household in households, you know, for instance with multiple income earners. Those are just some possibilities. But, you know, we don't have answers.

Tori Velkoff: Thanks Stephen. Operator do we have another question?

Coordinator: We do, your line is open.

(Caller 6): My question is what are the prospects for seeing the survey continued beyond 90 days? And once again sort of related to this aspect of how can we support that?

Tori Velkoff: So I can answer that. This is (Tori). We have an FRN up right now requesting that we go beyond the 90 days. So you could respond to that FRN if you would like to. We are also working with other - yes so we are working with other federal agencies to see if they have content that they would like to have on the household pulse survey in the future.

(Caller 6): Thank you.

Coordinator: And next, your line's open.

(Caller 7): Thank you very much to the Census Bureau and the other agencies. This is really good data and we appreciate it. There was some discussion in one or more of the presentations about average responses across multiple weeks. We are particularly interested in state level data. And of course at that level many of the response numbers are low. So we're trying to learn what we can do with the available numbers.

Is there any guidance? I don't know whether they have any guidance on the Web site or any guidance you can provide in terms of when and how state level data can be analyzed with averages of multiple weeks related to that? Is it logical to conclude that even where response rates are low if there are consistent - if there's some consistency in responses across multiple weeks does that increase the confidence in those numbers?

Tori Velkoff: Thanks for that question. I think Jason Fields can take a crack at it.

Jason Fields: Yes. So right now as it is currently we are producing state level and metro area level estimates for all states plus the District of Columbia and the 15 largest MSAs. Of course as I'm sure you know as soon as you get down into a smaller geography you run into the risk that there's going to be more variance and more variability in the estimates and that is of course the case here.

We have been talking about different ways to use the data across weeks and combine them. There's some statistical complications with doing that in that there are some respondents from one week that if they responded one week they're asked to participate in the next week. So there's repeated observations. The coverage from week to week is the same. So there's not a geographic issue with combining across weeks.

I think that there are different things that you can do and think about in terms of normalizing weights and doing some statistical accounting for sampling and accounting for the (inaudible) sample that a case may be. So the answer is a qualified yes. We are, like, I said our statistical method's area has been talking about it and working on, you know, what are our official recommendations in terms of combining and collapsing, you know, combining across weeks into a stacked data set. But that's something that I think you want to do. You want to be careful about it.

I'm not exactly sure what to tell you in terms of how the replicate weights would work in that scenario. I think that's a consideration. You might have to do your collapsing after you do your variance estimation or something. And one other point. So and the survey is not designed for below the state level. So no counties or sub state geography except for the 15 metros. Did I answer your question?

(Caller 7): Probably as best you can right now, yes.

Jason Fields: Okay.

(Caller 7): Thank you. We look to follow up with whomever would be the appropriate person to follow up with.

Jason Fields: Yes absolutely.

Coordinator: Next, your line is now open.

(Caller 8): Yes thank you for very informative information here nationally. My question deals with the food insufficiency and how it relates to people who are

impacted by the food deserts that we have in our country both urban as well as rural.

Tori Velkoff: Okay, Christian, would you like to answer that?

Christian: I'm not sure that I'm understanding there's a question there. I mean obviously access to food is correlated with or reduced access to food is correlated with food insufficiency, would be correlated with food insufficiency. To date we have not done anything below the state level. And that maps to our food access geographies. We'd be willing to entertain that in the future. But as (Jason) just said the survey is not designed for sub state geographies. So we would have to get some kind of - I'm not exactly sure how that would even work.

But maybe you have a more specific question that I could answer.

(Caller 8): Well that was pretty much when you dig down into the data I know what you're saying is more on a state level for the figures that we're looking at. But to your point the lack of availability impacts what you're talking about as far as the food insufficiency. And I was wanting to find out if you had dug down deep enough into that aspect as to the sub class to the reason, base cause, at least to that food insufficiency.

Christian: So I showed some results that looked at food insufficiency and some of - a small part of the (inaudible) people who responded they were food insufficient (inaudible) about 10% said that it was actually supply constraints. Like their store didn't have what they wanted. But most of the respondents who said that they were food insufficient I believe let me look at my slide deck one more time. Most of them did say they can't afford food or they couldn't afford that.

So that certainly comports with what we understand as what it means to be food insufficient. That actually resource constraints really impact your ability to have enough food. So yes food deserts would certainly be consistent with that.

(Caller 8): All right (inaudible) as far as the impact because there are areas in the country of course that are exacerbated as a result of having to travel more than an hour or so albeit rural or urban to procure food stores.

Christian: Right thank you. We will - we are definitely going to be looking into that in future weeks.

(Caller 8): Thank you.

Tori Velkoff: Okay we had a question about what languages the survey was available in. The instrument is available in English and Spanish only. Operator do we have any other questions from the phone?

Coordinator: Moving onto the next, your line is open.

(Caller 9): Hi thank you. So my question is about the disclosure avoidance practices that you use. Your Web site states that it has been approved for disclosure avoidance. And so my question is it differential privacy? If it is are you going to publish the error associated with the differential privacy on top of the traditional (inaudible) errors? Thank you.

Tori Velkoff: Thank you for that question. (Jason) would you like to answer the question?

Jason Fields: Sure. So for the Household Pulse Survey we are not using differential privacy. So the data are protected with geographical constraints and top codes. And we

review every week's data to ensure that there are no at risk issues. So I think in the long run we would have certainly been looking at differential privacy. The timeline for us to get this up and running and processed at this point precluded that.

(Caller 9): Thank you. Okay I have another question. I know my colleague has a question. I don't know if she got on the line. So I'll just ask on her behalf. So we wonder if mobility can be derived from the data you collect. We're interested if people were moving during the pandemic. I know you did not ask that question directly. But from the data you already have and from the sampling frame information do you think this is something that you can derive and possibly publish?

Jason Fields: So I would tell you that the answer is probably not and here's why. There are - we do have the master address file sampling frame where we selected the records. So that's an address. And we do ask the respondent to update the address as they're completing the interview.

The reason why that's not really mobility is because there is error potentially in the linkage between the phone numbers and the email addresses with the MAF. So it might not be at the correct address because the record source where the email address came from was two years old and maybe you did move but it was two years ago or maybe it was erroneously linked to a different address because somebody with a similar name lived at that other address.

So I think that, we've talked about it. You would like to be able to call that a mobility measure but it really isn't. The new address is asked in the survey so that we can ensure that our weighting controls align with the populations in the states that people are reporting from. And so it's more about weighting and

population estimates than it is about mobility.

(Caller 9): Okay so the main reason you cannot do it is because you're not sure how good the original address is.

Jason Fields: Well we're not sure - we're sure that the address on the MAF is a good address. But we're not sure that the person that we have connected with actually moved from that address to the current address in the timeframe that we're talking about or that their email and phone was just linked to that other address.

(Caller 9): Thank you.

Coordinator: The last question we have in queue, your line is open.

(Caller 10): Hi yes. I'm just trying to find out if all of the comparisons that were made in this webinar had been - were statistically significant. In particular I'm curious about the comparison of the 16% mortgage holders that were concerned about future payments versus the 10% that was mentioned from the 2010 recession. Were those actually significantly different or how does the standard error look for that? I haven't had a chance to actually look at those values.

Tori Velkoff: Shawn would you like to answer that?

Shawn Bucholtz: Sure good question. I did not for purposes of this presentation go forward and calculate standard errors. So I don't know if the 16% number is statistically - the difference between the 16% number and the 10% number is statistically significant. Although I know that the 10% number itself comes from administrative mortgage records. So there shouldn't be any confidence interval around the 10% number.

(Caller 10): Great, thank you.

Tori Velkoff: And that was the last question operator?

Coordinator: ...has rejoined the queue, your line is open. If you could check the mute function on your phone we're not hearing a response. And with that we have no one in queue.

Tori Velkoff: Okay thank you. And I'm going to wrap this up. I want to thank all the speakers for joining us. It was very interesting and I'm glad that we had a lot of people watching this. Again it will be available on our Web site in the Census Academy. And with that I'm going to say thank you to everyone and goodbye.

Coordinator: Thank you for your participation in today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

END