



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Economics and Statistics Administration**  
**U.S. Census Bureau**  
Washington, DC 20233-0001  
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

OCT 26 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR: Ditas Katague  
Chair  
National Advisory Committee on Racial, Ethnic and Other  
Populations

From: John H. Thompson  
Director

Subject: U.S. Census Bureau Responses to National Advisory Committee  
on Racial, Ethnic and Other Populations Recommendations

The U.S. Census Bureau thanks the National Advisory Committee on Racial, Ethnic and Other Populations for its recommendations from the Administrative Records, Internet, and Hard to Count Working Group.

Your expert advice is critical to identifying new strategies for improved census operations, survey and data collection methods, including determining cost efficient ways to increase census participation.

Attachment:

Census Responses to the NAC Recommendations from the Administrative Records, Internet and Hard to Count Working Group

## FINAL REPORT

### National Advisory Committee on Racial, Ethnic, and Other Populations

#### Administrative Records, Internet, and Hard to Count Population Working Group

**SUMMARY:** The purpose of the Administrative Records, Internet and Hard to Count (HTC) Population Working Group was to explore how plans for the 2020 Census may impact hard-to-count populations. Specifically, the working group focused on how the use of administrative records and third party data as well the utilization of the internet will impact the enumeration of these groups. The HTC Working Group reviewed interim findings from 2020 research and testing projects using administrative records and third party data and findings from research and testing using the internet as a mode for data collection. After reviewing these documents and presentations from the Census Bureau, the HTC Working Group sought additional information from the Pew Research Center regarding patterns of inequality in internet access and mobile phone usage. The working group then discussed the problems in reaching hard-to-count groups, and potential solutions to better enumerate the hard-to-count population through administrative records and the internet. Finally, the working group came up with recommendations toward this end, including identifying topics for further research.

This report contains the following sections:

1. Issue
2. Process
3. Key Findings
4. Recommendations

### **1. ISSUE**

The Census Bureau is devising strategies to reduce the cost of the design and implementation of the 2020 Census while at the same time maintaining high quality results. A substantial additional cost for the Census Bureau involves households that do not respond to the mail-out questionnaire and therefore require Nonresponse Follow-up (NRFU) operations, including enumerators who knock on doors often multiple times to get a response. In order to reduce this excess cost, the Census Bureau is investigating the use of administrative records and third party data. As defined in the “Administrative Records and Third Party Data Use in the 2020 Census Working Group Report,” administrative data “refers to any information collected by federal or state agencies for the purpose of administering programs or providing services” and third party data refers to, “private, or commercial, data” that is “collected by third parties, which were acquired by the Census Bureau.” By matching households with such records, the Census Bureau can better exclude vacant households and determine which households require enumeration and NRFU outreach. Such data can also be used to improve address ranges and provide household contact information, to target specific demographics for sampling, and to assist in editing/imputing household information where data is missing.

The first task of the HTC Working Group was to review how the use of this administrative and third party data could impact groups that have been considered hard-to-count in the traditional paper-based mail-in questionnaire. Groups that have typically been harder to reach and/or enumerate include:

- racial and ethnic minorities
- persons who do not speak English fluently
- lower income persons
- homeless persons
- undocumented immigrants
- young mobile persons
- children
- persons who are angry at and/or distrust the government
- LGBTQ persons

This is not an exhaustive list, and hard-to-count persons exist across and within each category above, but these represent the groups that have proven difficult to fully count. Thus, our task was to evaluate how the proposed reliance on administrative records and third party data could impact the enumeration of these groups.

In addition to working to improve Census enumeration with these data sources, the Census Bureau is also researching how to enhance response by using internet modes. The HTC Working Group was charged with evaluating how hard-to-count groups such as those listed above might be affected by reliance on internet (including mobile phone technology) to collect household data via the 2020 Census.

## **2. PROCESS**

The HTC Working Group had 14 conference calls between January 2015 and April 2016. We also met in person during a lunch and/or pre-NAC conference meetings in Spring 2015, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016. Our process during these calls and meetings involved three steps:

- 1) Information Gathering- We heard presentations from Census Bureau staff who reported on issues and testing of administrative records matching, use of third party data, and testing of internet modes of data collection. We sought out more information on internet inequalities from the Pew Research Center.
- 2) Summarizing the Data- Working Group members summarized how specific hard-to-count groups may be affected by reliance on these data sources and internet use. To do this we used a google document “matrix” with boxes for each group that was then filled out by members.

- 3) Devising Recommendations – Working Group members worked via a conference call and in person at the May 2016 meeting to come up with recommendations.

Below we have listed our working group members and a table that includes the details of our calls and meetings.

**Working Group Members:**

Dowling	Julie	Associate Professor, Department of Latina/Latino Studies University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign
<b>NAC Working Group Members</b>		
Akee	Randall	Assistant Professor, Department of Public Policy University of California, Los Angeles
Amaya	Gilberto	Specialist, International Development
Fitisemanu	Jacob	Outreach coordinator for the Utah Department of Health Office of Health Disparities
Gore	Carol	Vice Chair of NAC President and Chief Executive Officer, Cook Inlet Housing Authority (CIHA)
Harris	Kathleen	Professor of Sociology and faculty fellow at the Carolina Population Center University of North Carolina
Katague	Ditas	Chair of NAC Chief of Staff to California Public Utilities Commissioner
Marlow	Yolande	Executive director of the Supreme Court Committee on Minority Concerns
Maury	Meghan	Federal policy counsel for the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in Washington, DC
Medrano	Pauline	Former Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Dallas, Texas
Michaels	Stuart	Senior research scientist at the Academic Research Centers at NORC
Moua	Mee	President and Executive Director, Asian Americans Advancing Justice – AAJC
Rodriguez Lonebear	Desi	Member of Northern Cheyenne Tribe
Taualii	Maile	Assistant Professor, Department of Public Health Sciences University of Hawaii, Honolulu
<b>Census Staff and Subject Matter Experts</b>		
Bates	Nancy	Senior Researcher for Survey Methodology
Bentley	Michael	Chief, Census Experiments Branch
Chapin	MaryAnn	Program Manager for Nonresponse and Coverage Operations
Horwitz	Rachel	Census Experiments Branch
Hunter Childs	Jennifer	Team lead for Privacy and Confidentiality Center for Survey Measurement
Ingold	Jane	Team Lead for Optimizing Self-Response
Mule	Tom	Team lead for Administrative Records Modeling
Rastogi Porter	Sonya	Assistant Center Chief for Research, Center for Administrative Records Research & Applications

**Details on Working Groups Calls, Meetings, and Documents/Sources:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Activities and Notes</b>
1/30/15	First Conference Call	Discussed the scope of work, administrative issues, FACA guidelines, and schedule with the working group.
1/30/15	Materials distributed following first call	Working Group members were sent links to the prior final reports submitted by the Administrative Records and Third Party Data (ARTPD) working group and other working groups on Census website. The power point presentation by the ARTPD was also sent to the group.
2/4/15	Materials distributed for February call	The following documents were sent to working group: "Defining Hard-To-Survey Populations" by Roger Tourandau; "Using a Geographic Segmentation to Understand, Predict, and Plan for Census and Survey Mail Nonresponse" by Nancy Bates and Mary Mulry; "The US Census Bureau Mail Return Rate Challenge: Crowdsourcing to Develop a Hard-to Count Score" by Chandra Erdman and Nancy Bates; "A Brief Review of Coverage, Ethnographic Studies, and Changing Census Bureau Operations since the 1970s" by Jennifer Hunter Childs
2/26/15	Conference call-- Who are traditionally the Hard to Count?  Census Presenters: Nancy Bates and Jennifer Hunter Childs	Both Nancy Bates and Jennifer Hunter Childs presented detailed information on the demographics of the hard to count.
3/19/15	Conference call-- 2010 Census Operations to Capture the Hard to Count, 2020 Research and Testing Operational Plans  Census Presenters: Robin Pennington with Sarah Heimel, and Elizabeth Poehler	Robin Pennington presented on Non-Response Follow-up (NURFU) operations from 2010.
3/26/15	Lunch Meeting at NAC	A lunchtime working group meeting was held at the NAC. We went over the basics of the working group and several new members joined.

4/13/15	<p>Conference call-- We had a call to orient all the new members.</p>	<p>Since new members joined after the NAC meeting, we had Nancy Bates and Jennifer Hunter Childs present on the traditionally hard to count population again. They gave the same presentation they gave during our February monthly call.</p>
4/28/16	<p>Conference Call-- Coverage and Quality of Administrative Records related to the Hard to Count</p> <p>Census presenters: Sonya Rastogi Porter and Brian Clark</p>	<p>Both Brian Clark and Sonya Rastogi Porter presented on the quality and coverage of administrative records.</p>
5/28/15	<p>Conference Call-- How the Census Bureau is researching the use of administrative records and third-party data during the NRFU Operation in the 2015 Census Test.</p> <p>Census Presenter: Tom Mule</p>	<p>Tom Mule presented on NRFU Operation in the 2015 Census Test with a focus on how administrative records are being used when addresses do not self-respond to the initial census mailing attempts.</p>
6/22/15	<p>Conference Call-- Internet Test Plans</p> <p>Presenters: Rachel Horwitz and Michael Bentley</p>	<p>Rachel Horwitz and Michael Bentley covered information about the Internet data collection mode and respondents that use mobile devices to answer survey questions.</p>
7/28/15	<p>Conference Call-- Follow-up call on NRFU Operation in the 2015 Census Test</p> <p>Census Presenter: Tom Mule</p>	<p>Tom Mule presented additional information on the NRFU Operations in 2015 Census Test.</p>
8/20/15	<p>Conference Call-- Working Group Members discussion on next steps</p>	<p>This call focused on gaps in information and possible additional speakers. We decided on getting more information on internet inequalities.</p>

9/18/15	Materials were distributed for the call on internet inequalities	<p>The following links to documents were sent to the working group:</p> <p>“America’s Internet Access 2000-2015,” Pew Research Center, 2015:  <a href="http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/06/26/americans-internet-access-2000-2015/">http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/06/26/americans-internet-access-2000-2015/</a></p> <p>“Mapping the Digital Divide” — Council of Economic Advisors Issues Brief, July 2015:  <a href="https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/wh_digital_divide_issue_brief.pdf">https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/wh_digital_divide_issue_brief.pdf</a></p> <p>“15% of Americans don’t use the internet. Who are they?” July 2015:  <a href="http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/07/28/15-of-americans-dont-use-the-internet-who-are-they/">http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/07/28/15-of-americans-dont-use-the-internet-who-are-they/</a></p> <p>“Who is not online and why?” 2013: <a href="http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/09/25/whos-not-online-and-why/">http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/09/25/whos-not-online-and-why/</a></p> <p>“Exploring the Digital Nation: Embracing the Mobile Internet” — Report prepared by US Department Of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration, October 2014:  <a href="http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring_the_digital_nation_embracing_the_mobile_internet_10162014.pdf">http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring_the_digital_nation_embracing_the_mobile_internet_10162014.pdf</a></p>
9/22/15	Conference Call-- Internet Inequalities  Presenter: Lee Rainie, Pew Research Center	Outside expert Lee Rainie from Pew Research Center presented to us about the digital divide and internet/phone inequalities.
10/7/15	Meeting the day before the NAC	Census and NAC working group members met Wednesday afternoon before the start of NAC to finalize the presentation. We also developed our plan to create a "matrix" that describes issues and proposed solutions related to each population group.
10/27/15	Conference Call-- Follow-up on matrix	We discussed dividing up the work, with members taking on different sections of the matrix to complete.
12/3/15	Conference Call-- Additional follow-up on matrix	We went over gaps in the matrix and set a date for completion.
2/2/16	Conference Call-- Reviewed Timeline	We reviewed our timeline for completion and planned our next call.
4/7/16	Conference Call-- Brainstorming Session	We had a brainstorming session on solutions for administrative records and internet.
5/21/16	Materials distributed for NAC pre-meeting of the working group	The presentation with recommendations included and draft of the report were circulated to working group.
5/25/16	Meeting the day before the NAC	Working group members met to go over the report, presentation, and recommendations the day before the NAC meeting. We worked on final revisions for the presentation to the NAC.
5/27/16	NAC VOTE	NAC voted on all recommendations, making a few revisions before voting to approve all recommendations as they are currently listed in the report.

### 3. KEY FINDINGS

From the presentations from the Census Bureau and documents shared with us, we learned that it is more difficult to match administrative records with persons who are:

- children
- homeless
- lower income
- lower education
- not English-speaking (immigrants)
- do not have a social security number (undocumented immigrants)
- racial/ethnic minorities - all were lower than whites, “Some Other Race” is the lowest

From the presentations by the Census Bureau and the Pew Research Center, we learned that persons are less likely to have internet access at home and are less likely to have a smart phone if they are:

- homeless
- lower income
- lower education
- older
- live in rural areas
- persons with disabilities
- primarily Spanish-speaking
- Latino, Black, or American Indian/Alaska Native (note: Asians had highest percent usage above whites, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander not included as a category in data we examined.)

***\*\*Given what we have learned, it appears that vulnerable hard-to-count populations will continue to be hard to enumerate even with advances in uses of internet technology and administrative data matching. \*\****

Below we have detailed some specific information on concerns and issues pertaining to each group that we discussed. **This list and the detail provided for each group are certainly not exhaustive.** Indeed, a full-length report could be written on each group individually. The information here is just to provide a brief overview of the basic related concerns regarding these populations that we discussed. Here, we cover just the basics of potential barriers to being counted by the Census and being matched in administrative records, as well as the internet access that each population has as this may impact reliance on internet modes of data collection.

## **AFRICAN AMERICANS**

African Americans have a lengthy history of discrimination and unequal treatment in this country and this can lead to distrust of the government and hence apprehension about responding to federal questionnaires. Lower income African Americans in economically disadvantaged areas may be particularly vulnerable to an undercount. Enumerators may not always have the cultural sensitivity needed to gain the trust of these individuals and may themselves be fearful of low-income African American neighborhoods.

Also, a substantial proportion of African Americans are housed in juvenile and adult correctional facilities and county jails. Populations in jails and juvenile institutions tend to be fluid. African American homeless juveniles and adults also pose challenges to enumeration.

African Americans and other racial/ethnic minorities were more difficult to match to administrative records. And due to lower than average income, African Americans were also less likely to have internet access at home.

## **LATINOS**

Latinos also have faced significant discrimination in the US that may lead to distrust and anxiety about filling out their census forms. Moreover, a significant proportion of Latinos are immigrants and therefore more likely to be Spanish-speaking. Undocumented immigrants may also fear identifying themselves on the census due to fears of deportation. Also for both US-born and immigrant Latinos, lower average income means they are less likely to have smart phone or internet at home.

Importantly, the "Other race" group (which is 97% Latino) was least likely to be matched in administrative records data. Also immigrants and those who are undocumented (lacking a social security number) are hard to match. This means Latinos at greater risk for being missed when administrative records are used.

## **ASIANS**

Like Latinos, a large percentage of Asians are foreign-born (60%) which means that Asians may also face similar issues of fears of the government and language barriers (3/4 speak a language other than English at home; 35% of population is LEP). Some Asian immigrants are from countries that do not have a census system or have used such a system to harm community members; this may heighten distrust. They are also likely to live in "unconventional" households (with extended family, etc.), which may pose challenges to enumeration.

Administrative records data can be limited for various Asian groups with little detailed national origin data. Many datasets report out Asian Americans as part of an "Other" category (i.e., cannot distinguish who actually is Asian). Some administrative records might have collected "Asian" responses even if they report them out as "other," detailed data is not included. Third party data is even worse for Asian Americans.

Aggregate Asian data shows that Asian Americans have decent access to broadband internet access. But specific Asian national origin groups have different access to broadband. It is likely that certain segments will have a harder time accessing the survey via the internet. This is particularly true for the older segment of our population, who are likely to have language barrier issues coupled with technology issues.

### **AMERICAN INDIANS, ALASKA NATIVES**

American Indians have also faced significant discrimination and thus may be more likely to distrust the government. Poor maps as well as individuals living in unconventional structures (illegal conversion of apartments; seemingly abandoned buildings) may pose challenges to enumeration. There are very different issues in rural as compared to urban populations for these groups. In rural areas, issues are similar to other small, remote locations in general. In urban areas, issues are similar to other urban poor. Lack of English proficiency for some groups may also be an issue in reaching these communities

AIAN groups were particularly difficult to match to administrative records. There are possibilities for administrative record matching with the Indian Health Service and other administrative data such as IRS records, social security, etc. But, non-tax filers will not be in IRS data.

Overall, according to Census data, 58.2 % of American Indians use the internet which is low compared to the average White household. Some remote locations have little internet access. This is similar to issues for rural areas in general. Cell phone coverage may be equally poor in some areas as well.

### **NATIVE HAWAIIANS, OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS**

Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders may be difficult to enumerate for a number of reasons including mistrust of the US government, negative perceptions of such “paperwork/forms,” and inadequate explanations of why the census is necessary and what will be done with the data. The NHOPI community also includes many with limited English proficiency, multi-family and multi-generational households. Some groups may be mobile/transient populations, and legal status issues exist for some.

Currently, 87% have a computer and 75% have internet with broadband subscription. There is also broad use of mobile devices over desktop/laptop computers in these populations.

### **LOW-INCOME**

Low income persons had a 64% average Census 2000 return rate. There are many issues that may be at play in this lower response, including housing instability. Administrative records data matching for this group may face potential gaps for individuals who do not

file taxes or have W-2s. Other databases may be needed such as Social Security disability.

Only, 78% of households with less than \$30,000 use the internet. This is about 10% below that of the next highest group \$30,000-\$50,000 and almost 20% lower than the next group in the \$50,000-70,000 group. There has been an increase in use over the 2000s for the lowest income group, however, it still trails behind the other higher income groups by a large amount at all points in time.

### **HOMELESS**

Persons without stable housing pose a particular challenge for enumeration. This may be amplified as the Census Bureau incorporates the use of administrative records and internet as homeless individuals are less represented on both fronts. Homeless people are unlikely to be represented in most administrative records because they are not regularly interacting with systems like health care, tax returns, etc.

Many homeless youth are provided with cell phones through city programs (but accessing data is sometimes problematic); many homeless people access Internet through local public libraries and community centers.

Access to internet is spotty for the homeless, and when access is available, many homeless people have other priorities such as accessing employment, checking email, etc. In other words, it is not that this population completely lacks access, it is that they are not going to waste their short time on the Internet to take the Census. Incentive programs could be initiated to encourage participation.

### **UNDOCUMENTED**

As detailed the descriptions of issues facing many of the racial/ethnic groups above, legal status is a key issue in many communities with larger immigrant populations. Not only are these persons difficult to match via administrative records due to lack of social security numbers, but they are also fearful of filling out their census forms because they are afraid detention and deportation if located by the government. They are also more likely to be lower income, and therefore have less internet resources. The lower access to matching records, lower internet access at home, and fear of filling out the census makes this group very vulnerable to be undercounted. This could disproportionately impact counts of the Latino and Asian populations in particular.

### **“CYNICAL FIFTH”/ANGRY WITH GOVERNMENT**

The "cynical fifth" is a descriptor of a segment of the U.S. population that represents almost 20% of the population. This descriptor was developed as part of a study carried out by the Census Bureau in 2009 based on a survey of attitudes and beliefs toward the Census in preparation for media outreach campaigns for the 2010 Census. This group

distinguished itself by a relatively high level of knowledge and familiarity with the Census coupled with a high level of skepticism and mistrust about the Census.

Interestingly they were found to be demographically similar to the population as a whole, that is, they could be found in every demographic group. This group is defined more by their attitudes than their social characteristics. They are likely to be hard to count because they are likely to be resistant to participation in the Census. They are also likely difficult to identify via administrative records. Our committee's interest in this group grew out of a discussion of certain more classically hard to count groups such as ethnic groups in Hawaii and other American Indian groups who may be alienated and skeptical about governmental institutions. Many Latinos, for example, are becoming increasingly disillusioned with US immigration policy and the high level of detentions and deportations that disproportionately impact their communities leading many to distrust the government. However, we also recognized that there may be other segments of the population that are members of majority racial groups who may also be resistant and opposed to the government.

Given the apparent distribution of the "cynical fifth" throughout the population defined in traditional social and demographic measures, it is hard to imagine administrative records that could be used to target and reach them. Moreover, we do not have data on their specific internet access or usage.

### **LGBTQ**

Some groups are difficult to enumerate because the survey itself does not ask questions that clearly define them. Such is the case with the LGBTQ community, the current census does not ask for information on one's sexual orientation or status as transgender or genderqueer. Researchers utilizing census data to enumerate LGBTQ households must rely on reporting "same-sex partner" households, since the only data gathered about orientation is the gender of one's partner.

In terms of administrative records, sexual orientation and gender identity/expression (SOGIE) data is captured in few federal administrative records systems. However, SOGIE questions are increasingly being added into medical records. From the standpoint of determining household composition, best access might be: IRS, SNAP, TANF, where we know there is an overrepresentation of LGBTQ people. Even same-sex relationship data is rare in administrative records. If administrative records are used to approximate households, it is VERY likely that same-sex couples will not be counted as in a relationship because administrative records do not record that information.

With regard to internet, some studies show high levels of access, but use of different websites than non-LGBTQ community. Internet use by low-income LGBTQ people is often through LGBT community centers.

## **YOUNG AND MOBILE**

Young and mobile individuals have been traditionally difficult to enumerate due to frequent moves and/or housing instability. Young persons who have not established an independent household residence may be harder to access via administrative records. However, young persons have higher than average rates of internet and smart phone usage leading to greater likelihood they could be reached with internet modes of data collection. This, of course, varies by socio-economic status and race/ethnicity, as lower income and/or racial minority young and mobile persons may still pose challenges to enumerate as they may face barriers in access.

## **GROUP QUARTERS**

According to the Census, “Group Quarters (GQ) are places where people live or stay, in a group living arrangement, which are owned or managed by an entity or organization providing housing and/or services for the residents. This is not a typical household-type living arrangement. These services may include custodial or medical care as well as other types of assistance, and residency is commonly restricted to those receiving these services.” Some examples of group quarters living situations include correctional facilities, nursing homes, military housing, and college residence halls. Since the Census relies on household data, enumerating people in group quarters may be challenging. This is particularly the case if persons may be counted in two locations, such as a college student who lives at school, but may also be listed as a household member at his/her parents’ home.

Administrative records may be difficult to match for persons in group living situations where household members are typically not related to each other. With regard to internet access, access for some group living situations may be quite high (colleges) but in others may be very limited.

In concluding our findings section, based on the information we gathering and our discussions, there are many concerns about the ability to reach hard to count groups with the use of administrative records and internet data collection modes. We have developed recommendations for solutions and have listed these in the next section, as they were voted on and approved in the May 2016 NAC meeting.

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS VOTED ON AND APPROVED BY NAC

The following recommendation (in bold) were voted on and approved on May 27, 2016.

- 1) **Further Research: There are lower administrative records matches for many of the most vulnerable groups as detailed in this report, including all racial/ethnic minority groups. Our first recommendation is an affirmation of the need for more research on better ways to enhance coverage for these groups.**

*WG Explanation: As was detailed by the previous working group on Administrative Records and Third Party data, we find these records work well in matching records for the White and higher income populations but racial/ethnic minorities, lower income persons, and other HTC populations are likely to be missed. It is imperative that more research be done to work to remedy this.*

##### **Census Bureau Response:**

After providing everyone an opportunity to respond by Internet, telephone, or by paper, and only where we have high-quality administrative records from trusted sources, will we use administrative records as the response data for a nonresponding address. The Census Bureau is acquiring and researching the use of data sources that could provide coverage of hard-to-count populations including Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; Women, Infants, and Children; and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families data. Where high-quality administrative records are not available from trusted sources, we will continue in-person attempts to reach nonresponding addresses until the case is resolved.

- 2) **Exploring Other Datasets: There are a number of datasets that might prove useful in collecting data for HTC groups. We recommend that the Census Bureau work with local community groups and local organizations to identify these datasets. We have also identified a number of possible sources listed below.**

- Tribal data, including tribal data from local housing organizations
- Many people experiencing homelessness are recorded in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS); young people are similarly recorded in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Management Information System (RHYMIS).
- There are limited records wherein same-sex relationships are being reported (health care records, for example). These may be accessed to locate data for same-sex couple households.
- Investigate state department of labor records for income and other demographic administrative data
- Investigate use of per capita payments to identify records for lower income and other HTC groups
- Investigate administrative records including public utility data for low-income households, and low income utility programs (i.e. Lifeline, low income energy assistance programs)
- Investigate the use of Department of Education data

### Census Bureau Response:

The Census Bureau is in the process of acquiring and researching the use of tribal data and utility data, and we will conduct research on the feasibility of acquiring the additional datasets the working group suggested.

- 3) **Explore How Other Census Datasets Can Better Count HTC Groups: Include individuals in different kinds of shelters and other non-household data in the American Community Survey (ACS). Without this data, some HTC populations may be missed and funding that is conditional on ACS data may not get to the communities that need it the most.**

### Census Bureau Response:

The following Group Quarter (GQ) types are eligible for sampling in the American Community Survey (ACS). Also listed below are the GQ types that are out of scope for the ACS. As you can see from this list, the only shelters (noted in red) included in the ACS are the Emergency and Transitional Shelters (GQ type 701). The shelters that are out of scope for the ACS may open/close or move, often making them difficult to include in the sampling process, therefore making them difficult to include in the ACS. The ACS sampling is conducted several months before the start of the data collection year. The ACS collects data from GQs that comprise roughly 97 percent of the total GQ population. However, please compare this figure with caution because currently the primary focus of the ACS is the total GQ population, and the weighting schema comes from the Decennial Programs-controlled seven major GQ types. Hence, the ACS is slightly skewed to match the Decennial Programs at 100 percent.

### ACS GQ Types (and Type Codes)

Federal Detention Centers (101)  
Federal Prisons (102)  
State Prisons (103)  
Local Jails and Other Municipal Confinement Facilities (104)  
Correctional Residential Facilities (105)  
Military Disciplinary Barracks and Jails (106)  
Group Homes for Juveniles (noncorrectional) (201)  
Residential Treatment Centers for Juveniles (noncorrectional) (202)  
Correctional Facilities Intended for Juveniles (203)  
Nursing Facilities/Skilled Nursing Facilities (301)  
Mental (Psychiatric) Hospitals and Psychiatric Units in Other Hospitals (401)  
Hospitals with Patients Who Have No Usual Home Elsewhere (402)  
In-Patient Hospice Facilities (403)  
Military Treatment Facilities with Assigned Patients (404)  
Residential Schools for People with Disabilities (405)  
College/University Student Housing (501)  
Military Barracks and Dormitories (nondisciplinary) (601)  
Military Ships (602)  
**Emergency and Transitional Shelters (with Sleeping Facilities) for People Experiencing Homelessness (701)**

Group Homes Intended for Adults (noncorrectional) (801)  
Residential Treatment Centers for Adults (noncorrectional) (802)  
Workers' Group Living Quarters and Job Corps Centers (901)

**Group Quarters Out of Scope for ACS Data Collection**

Maritime/Merchant Vessels (900)  
Soup Kitchens (702)  
Domestic Violence Shelters (703)  
Regularly Scheduled Mobile Food Vans (704)  
Targeted Nonsheltered Outdoor Locations (706)  
Religious Group Quarters (902)  
Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters (903)

Residents sampled for ACS GQ data collection are asked the same demographic, social, and economic questions that are asked of residents in the household population (**excluding** the housing questions, such as type of heating, plumbing, etc.). The GQ residents are asked one housing question, and that is the receipt of food stamps. Residents living in institutional GQ types, such as correctional facilities, are not asked questions like how they travel to work. However, residents in noninstitutional GQ types, such as emergency and transitional shelters, are asked all ACS GQ questionnaire items during data collection.

- 4) Reaffirmation of Need to Follow “Decision Tree” Outlined by Administrative Records and Third Party Data Working Group: As the Census Bureau continues exploration of use of these data sources, we recommend that the Census meticulously examine the sources of these data, how they were obtained, possible consent and privacy concerns, and the overall quality of the data.**

*WG Explanation: As was detailed by the previous working group on Administrative Records and Third Party data, we support the use of the proposed “decision tree” that incorporates an analysis of whether the data source’s “reputation and data stewardship practices align with those of the Census Bureau.” The Census should weigh the costs and benefits of each data source, including attention to how data was collected, quality, coverage, and issues related to privacy and public trust.*

**Census Bureau Response:**

The Census Bureau has established and follows strict procedures, based on industry standards and best practices, for ingesting, processing, storing, securing, accessing, and analyzing external administrative records and third-party data sources before use in research, planning, and production activities. For the 2020 Census, we will use high-quality administrative records and third-party data from trusted sources in several census processes. This includes well-known federal sources, such as data from the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and the U.S. Postal Service. State benefits data, such as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

(SNAP); Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); and Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program data, are also being considered. The Census Bureau will determine the final set of administrative records and third-party data sources to be used to support the 2020 Census by September 2018.

**5) Internet Outreach Solutions: Given the inequalities in internet access, the HTC Working Group recommends attention be given to creative ways to reach HTC groups by providing them with internet access to complete the online form. We have identified a number of suggestions towards this end:**

- Using mobile vans with internet
- Using local community centers with internet
- Making the Census page the home page at libraries and community centers
- Incentive programs where time on a library or community center computer is extended (for 15 minutes, for example) if you fill out the Census
- Wifi hotspots with power stations for people to charge their phone while taking the Census on their phone
- Develop relationships with David Bohnett cyber centers nationwide to increase reaching LGBTQ and homeless. This report has more information about internet access through centers:  
<https://www.lgbtmap.org/file/2014-lgbt-community-center-survey-report-cybercenter-program.pdf>
- Using Facebook to reach populations
- Developing an application that can be downloaded to a phone

**Census Bureau Response:**

These are excellent suggestions. The Census Bureau will explore all available options with an eye toward ensuring data remains confidential and the privacy of participants is not compromised.

**6) Offering Additional Language Options: In order to reach HTC groups who have high numbers of immigrants and persons with limited English, we recommend that the internet interfaces include as many languages as possible. Online forms could potentially include many more languages than the printed version.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

The Census Bureau is monitoring language needs across the nation and assessing the feasibility of translating, cognitively testing, and programming multiple non-English languages on the Internet instrument. During the 2016 Census Test, Chinese and Korean were added to the Internet instrument (Spanish was already available) with plans to deploy additional non-English languages for the 2018 End-to-End Census Test. The Census Bureau can ensure the final list of non-English languages on the Internet instrument in 2020 covers a high percentage of Limited English Proficiency populations.

**7) Prioritizing Language Minority Communities with a High Incidence of Limited English Proficiency: When choosing languages for translation, we recommend the Census Bureau consider not just the number of speakers, but smaller language communities that can only respond in their own language.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

For the 2010 Census, the Census Bureau was able to send a census form in the native language of 93.9 percent of all adults in the U.S. When including adults bilingual in English (those who spoke English “very well”), the number who received a form in a language in which they were fully proficient rose to 97.8 percent.

The communications campaign promotional materials (in 28 languages) reached 98.3 percent of adults in their native tongue, and 99.4 percent of all adults when considering those bilingual in English. (Paid campaign originally covered 14 languages. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funding allowed the addition of 14 languages. Total languages covered by the paid campaign was 28 languages.)

The questionnaire assistance guides, in 59 languages, raised the total reach of our campaign to 99.7 percent of all adults (99.2 percent in their native tongue).

The Census Bureau field partnership staff linguistic capabilities raised the grand total reach of our campaign to at least 99.8 percent of all adults in the U.S., 99.3 percent of whom we reached in their native tongue. (See Appendix A: 2010 Census Language Program graphic)

While the Census Bureau is still determining the process by which to choose languages for translation in support of the 2020 Census, the process used to determine languages for the 2010 Census Communications Campaign paid media effort can be discussed.

Initially, each communications contractor partner agency, comprising Team Census, provided a point-of-view on the needs of additional languages to reach the audiences they represent.

The recommendation to add audiences/languages to the 2010 Integrated Communications Campaign’s paid media effort was based on a mix of the following factors:

- The size of the population reliant on in-language communications (i.e., linguistic isolation);
- The availability of media channels to reach the audience with in-language communications;
- Estimated production and media costs to reach the audience; and
- Factors that support the need to reach an audience through a “trusted voice.”

To determine a “reliant on in-language communications” measure, we looked at American Community Survey data from 2005 to 2007 for sizes of linguistically isolated populations by language group. (When these language groups were ranked by the size of their linguistically isolated populations, the paid media campaign’s original 14 languages were among the top 20.)

Next, the partner agencies provided the number of media vehicles by media type for each language. This enabled Team Census to eliminate language groups that lack media vehicles to reach them.

Team Census also provided cost estimates for reaching each in-language group, with TV and non-TV options, as appropriate. This enabled them to analyze the “costs per contact,” by dividing the production and total costs by audience by the population size. This provided yet another filter for analysis. Documentation for this recommendation included an extensive data chart providing, for each language group: 2007 ACS data (population speaking each language and linguistic isolation by language), media vehicle availability by media channel, recommended geographic reach, cost estimates for media and production with both TV and non-TV options and a “cost per contact” calculation. The written document accompanying this extensive data chart included support for the need of a “trusted voice,” where applicable.

The Census Bureau provided the final approval of the recommended language list after review of all documentation, as well as the contractor’s Point of View (POV).

Additionally, the Census Bureau is currently working with the NAC language working group to explore optimal ways of providing language assistance to a wide range of Limited English Proficiency populations. This will include language assistance guides for completing both the Internet and paper questionnaires.

- 8) Targeting HTC Communities Through Mapping: For example, in order to best target HTC groups with limited English, we recommend the Census Bureau provide data mapping by language so that areas with LEP individuals are highlighted and can be specifically targeted.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

The Census Bureau has defined requirements for an application to display selected variables from the planning database within a map interface down to census tracts. This application is intended for not only the general public, but specifically for partnership specialists and regional staff to help them plan resources and activities around areas with expected lower response rates. As this application moves forward in development, the Census Bureau will look at ways to integrate more data on language in addition to the information already selected for inclusion from the planning database. Furthermore, this application could serve as a model for something specifically to map characteristics that can then be used to improve response in HTC communities across surveys.

- 9) Community Partnership and Outreach Solutions: In order to reach these HTC groups, we recommend that the effort to reach these groups be the priority for of the partnership and communications contract. Hiring strategies should prioritize local community contacts and stakeholders, specifically neighborhood-level advocates.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

The goal of the Community Partnership and Engagement Program (CPEP) is to motivate diverse communities toward greater participation in the 2020 Census, provide outreach to populations with historically low response rates and undercounts, and to deliver messages through trusted community leaders.

For the 2010 Census, the field partnership staff provided linguistic capabilities in approximately 101 languages. This was significant and raised the grand total reach of the campaign to at least 99.8 percent of all adults in the U.S., 99.3 percent of whom we reached in their native tongue, when combined with all other aspects of the 2010 Census Language Program. (See Appendix A: 2010 Census Language Program graphic)

One of the main recruiting strategies for the 2020 Census is to work with the local community contacts, stakeholders, respected community leaders, and grassroots level programs to help with all recruiting efforts. This will be supplemented by the use of national and local broadcast media, digital advertising, and social media outreach.

- 10) Continued Need For Non-Internet Modes: The lack of administrative records coverage and lower internet access also necessitates that mail-out surveys and enumerators are still highly important for these group. We recommend continued commitment to traditional paper questionnaire modes, and aggressive outreach to continue to target HTC groups using the resources saved through the reduction in costs from increases in internet response.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

The Census Bureau agrees about the importance of reaching hard-to-count (HTC) populations. The Census Bureau is committed to maximizing response across all demographic and socioeconomic groups, particularly for traditionally HTC groups, in order to have a complete and accurate count of everyone.

The Census Bureau is very mindful that not all populations have the same Internet access and connectivity, and is actively engaged in research to determine the best ways to optimize response rates for all groups and geographic areas and how best to reach those that do not have access to the Internet. As such, the Census Bureau is taking steps to ensure that all households have the opportunity to respond to the census so that everyone is counted. Some of those methods, besides the use of the Internet response option, include the use of paper questionnaires, providing telephone assistance and an option to provide census responses over the telephone, and

broad communications outreach and partnerships support at local levels to generate awareness about the census and motivate people to respond.

For geographic areas with relatively higher concentrations of households less likely to use the Internet (about 20 percent of the country), a paper questionnaire will be sent in the first mailing. For all other areas, any household that does not respond online after multiple contacts will be provided a paper questionnaire to complete and return.

**11) NAC Input: We recommend that the NAC have a continuing advisory role in working with Census to ensure HTC groups receive critical attention as the Census moves forward with plans for incorporating internet modes and the use of administrative records and third party data.**

**Census Bureau Response:**

The Census Bureau agrees and accepts that recommendation.

# 2010 CENSUS LANGUAGE PROGRAM

\* Percent of all adults either in their native tongue, or in English for those who are bilingual.

