AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

HALFWAY TO THE 2010 CENSUS: THE COUNTDOWN AND COMPONENTS TO A SUCCESSFUL DECENNIAL CENSUS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 19, 2005

Serial No. 109–80

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

23–945 PDF WASHINGTON : 2005

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

TOM DAVIS, Virginia, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida
JON C. PORTER, Nevada
KENNY MARCHANT, Texas
LYNN A. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
PATRICK T. MCHENRY, North Carolina
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DIANE E. WATSON, California
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

MELISSA WOJCIAK, *Staff Director*
DAVID MARIN, *Deputy Staff Director/Communications Director*
ROB BORDEN, *Parliamentarian*
TERESA AUSTIN, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL BARNETT, *Minority Chief of Staff/Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina

WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York

EX OFFICIO

TOM DAVIS, Virginia

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

JOHN CUADERES, *Staff Director*
URSULA WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Professional Staff Member*
JULIANA FRENCH, *Clerk*
ADAM BORDES, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on April 19, 2005	1
Statement of:	
Cooper, Kathleen, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Charles Louis Kincannon, Director, U.S. Census Bureau	14
Cooper, Kathleen	14
Kincannon, Charles Louis	21
Naymark, Joan, director, research and planning, Target Corp., testifying on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Andrew Reamer, deputy director, urban markets initiative, Brookings Institution; and Jacqueline Byers, director of research, National Association of Counties	36
Byers, Jacqueline	59
Naymark, Joan	36
Reamer, Andrew	51
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Byers, Jacqueline, director of research, National Association of Counties, prepared statement of	61
Clay, Hon. Wm. Lacy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri , prepared statement of	78
Cooper, Kathleen, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, prepared statement of	17
Kincannon, Charles Louis, Director, U.S. Census Bureau, prepared statement of	23
Maloney, Hon. Carolyn B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	9
Naymark, Joan, director, research and planning, Target Corp., testifying on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, prepared statement of	39
Reamer, Andrew, deputy director, urban markets initiative, Brookings Institution, prepared statement of	53
Turner, Hon. Michael R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, prepared statement of	4

HALFWAY TO THE 2010 CENSUS: THE COUNTDOWN AND COMPONENTS TO A SUCCESSFUL DECENNIAL CENSUS

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 2005

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael R. Turner (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Turner, Dent, and Maloney.

Staff present: John Cuaderes, staff director; Ursula Wojciechowski, professional staff member; Juliana French, clerk; Neil Siefring, legislative director for Representative Turner; Erin Maguire, legislative correspondent for Representative Dent; Jim Moore, counsel for Committee on Government Reform; John Heroux, counsel; Adam Bordes and David McMillen, minority professional staff members; and Cecelia Morton, minority office manager.

Mr. TURNER. Good morning. We call to order the meeting on the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census of the Government Reform Committee. Our hearing topic today is Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census.

Census day is April 1, 2010, and we have just passed the midway point. The enumeration of all American residents will require the greatest peacetime mobilization of temporary workers for a Federal agency since the 2000 census. Having jurisdiction over the census matters, the subcommittee called today's hearing to review the Census Bureau's preparations for the decennial census.

Today, we will examine the three main components that are key to the upcoming census: the America Community Survey [ACS]; the master address file [MAF], and the topologically integrated geographic encoding and referencing [TIGER], enhancement program; and the short-form-only census. It is important for Congress and the American public to understand the role and value of each of these components for the implementation of a successful census.

The first component is the modern short-form census which asks only seven questions. It will be mailed to every known residence and will provide the national head count. The short form will be complimented by the second component of the census, the American Community Survey, the replacement of the decennial long

form, which was fully implemented at the beginning of this year. A quarter million American Community Surveys will continue to be mailed out monthly, providing more timely characteristic data necessary for policy decisions regarding government programs such as community block grants, school lunch programs and highway planning.

The MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program is the third component critical to the success of the 2010 census. The MAF program is designed to be a complete and current list of all addresses. The TIGER portion is a digital data base that serves to upgrade and improve street location information, bringing that information into alignment with Global Positioning System coordinates.

In addition to examining these three census components, the subcommittee will also seek lessons learned from prior censuses.

The census has been administered every 10 years since the Revolutionary War. The Constitutionally mandated enumeration of residents is politically important in that it directly affects the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress, the redistribution of tax dollars for programs and services, redrawing State legislative districts, and public policy and business decisions. Considering that, we must ensure that every effort is being made to achieve the most accurate enumeration.

The 1990 census fell short of expectations primarily because of costs. The census greatly exceeded its budget. In contrast, the 2000 census is considered a success. This traditional census was done on time and within budget on account of better management, less employee turnover, and on emphasis of counting actual people.

Although the 2000 census was an improvement over the 1990 census, it was still expensive, used too much paper, and was, in some cases, inefficient. Having learned valuable lessons from both of those censuses, I am eager to hear from our first panel what the Census Bureau has already accomplished, what efforts are currently underway, and what more is planned for the next 5 years to make certain that we get the most accurate census count on time and within budget.

On our first panel, we welcome remarks from the Honorable Kathleen Cooper, Under Secretary of Economic Affairs at the Department of Commerce, and the Honorable Charles Louis Kincannon, Director of the Census Bureau.

Our second panel of witnesses consists of representatives of the stakeholder community who will share their views on the significance of an accurate census as it pertains to data collection and related subjects.

First, we will hear from Ms. Joan Naymark, director of research and planning for Target Corp., on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Second, we will hear from Dr. Andrew Reamer, the deputy director of the urban markets initiative at the Brookings Institute. Finally, we will hear from Ms. Jacqueline Byers, director of research at the National Association of Counties.

I look forward to the expert testimony our distinguished panel of leaders will provide us today. And we thank you for your time today, and we welcome you.

At this time, I will yield to Mrs. Maloney and ask if she has an opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Michael R. Turner follows:]

TOM DAVIS, VIRGINIA
CHAIRMAN

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, CONNECTICUT
DAN BURTON, INDIANA
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, FLORIDA
JOHN M. MCHUGH, NEW YORK
JOHN L. MICA, FLORIDA
GIL GUTKNECHT, MINNESOTA
MARK E. SOUDER, INDIANA
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, OHIO
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, PENNSYLVANIA
CHRIS CANNON, UTAH
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., TENNESSEE
CANDICE MILLER, MICHIGAN
MICHAEL R. TURNER, OHIO
DARRELL ISSA, CALIFORNIA
VIRGINIA BROWN-WAITE, FLORIDA
JON C. PORTER, NEVADA
KENNY MARCHANT, TEXAS
LYNN A. WESTMORELAND, GEORGIA
PATRICK T. MCHENRY, NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLES W. DENT, PENNSYLVANIA
VIRGINIA FOXX, NORTH CAROLINA

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

MAJORITY (202) 225-5074
FACSIMILE (202) 225-3974
MINORITY (202) 225-5051
TTY (202) 225-6852

http://reform.house.gov

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

TOM LANTOS, CALIFORNIA
MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, PENNSYLVANIA
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, OHIO
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS
WM. LACY CLAY, MISSOURI
DIANE E. WATSON, CALIFORNIA
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, MASSACHUSETTS
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, MARYLAND
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, CALIFORNIA
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, MARYLAND
BRIAN HIGGINS, NEW YORK
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BERNARD SANDERS, VERMONT,
INDEPENDENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS
Congressman Michael R. Turner, Chairman

OVERSIGHT HEARING
STATEMENT BY MICHAEL R. TURNER, CHAIRMAN

Hearing topic: ***"Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census."***

Tuesday, April 19, 2005
10:00 a.m.
Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building

OPENING STATEMENT

Welcome to the new Subcommittee's first oversight hearing on census entitled "Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census."

Census Day is April 1, 2010 and we have just passed the midway point. The enumeration of all American residents will require the greatest peacetime mobilization of temporary workers for a federal agency since the 2000 Census. Having jurisdiction over all Census matters, the Subcommittee called today's hearing to review the Census Bureau's preparations for the decennial census. Today, we will examine the three main components that are key to the upcoming census: the American Community Survey (ACS), the Master Address File (MAF) and Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER)® Enhancement Program, and the short-form only census. It is important for Congress and the American public to understand the role and value of each of these components for the implementation of a successful census.

The first component is the modern short-form census, which asks only seven questions. It will be mailed to every known residence and will provide the national headcount. The short-form will be complimented by the second component of the census – the American Community Survey, the replacement of the decennial long-form, which was fully implemented at the beginning of this year. A quarter million American Community Surveys are mailed out monthly, providing more timely characteristic data necessary for policy decisions regarding government programs such as community block grants, school lunch programs, and highway planning. The MAF/TIGER® Enhancement program is the third component critical to the success of the 2010 Census. The MAF is designed to be a complete and current list of all addresses. The TIGER portion is a digital database that serves to update and improve street location information, bringing that information into alignment with Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates.

In addition to examining these three census components, the Subcommittee will also seek lessons learned from prior censuses. The census has been administered every 10 years since the Revolutionary War. The constitutionally mandated enumeration of residents is important in that it directly affects the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress, the redistribution of tax dollars for programs and services, redrawing state legislative districts, and public policy and business decisions. Considering that, we must ensure that every effort is being made to achieve the most accurate enumeration. The 1990 Census fell short of expectations primarily because of cost overruns, which led to questionable counts. In contrast, the 2000 Census is considered a success. This traditional census was done on time and within budget primarily because of better management, less employee turnover, and an emphasis on counting actual people.

Although the 2000 Census was an improvement over the 1990 Census, it was still expensive, used too much paper, and was in some cases inefficient. For the sake of the 2010 Census, I hope that the Census Bureau has learned valuable lessons from the both those censuses. Along those lines, I am eager to hear from our first panel what the Census Bureau has already accomplished, what efforts are currently underway, and what more is planned for the next five years to make certain that we get the most accurate census that is on time and within budget. On our first panel, we welcome remarks from the Honorable Kathleen Cooper, Undersecretary of Economic Affairs at the Department of Commerce and the Honorable Charles Louis Kincannon, Director of the Census Bureau.

Our second panel of witnesses consists of representatives of the stakeholder community who will share their views on the significance of an accurate census as it pertains to data collection and related subjects. First, we will hear from Ms. Joan Gentili Naymark, Director of Research and Planning for Target Corporation, on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Second, we will hear from Dr. Andrew Reamer, the Deputy Director of the Urban Markets Initiative at the Brookings Institution. Finally, we will hear from Ms. Jacqueline Byers, Director of Research at the National Association of Counties.

I look forward to the expert testimony our distinguished panel of leaders will provide today. Thank you all for your time today and welcome.

#####

Mrs. MALONEY. I do have an opening statement, and I understand that Ranking Member Clay is on his way, but I will begin right now and certainly thank you, Mr. Turner, and note that his daughter, Carolyn, is here writing about the census for her school, so that is great.

I am pleased to see the subcommittee paying attention to the census early in the session. Many believe that work on the 2010 census is just beginning, but the truth is really just the opposite. By the end of this Congress, the Census Bureau will have made most of the important decisions on how the 2010 census will be conducted. Our opportunity to review and comment without causing major disruption will have passed. As we saw in the last census, congressional intervention in the design of the census during the last 2 years prior to the census is very, very costly. As a result of those changes and poor budgeting by Congress, the 2000 census was funded as an emergency. I hope we do not find ourselves in the same situation to 2010. The funding request in 2010 for the census will be somewhere between $6 and $10 billion, and we should be preparing to pay that bill today.

Including funds appropriated for 2005, Congress has already spent approximately $750 million on the 2010 census. Those costs have been in three areas: The American Community Survey, improving the census maps and geographic software, and in basic planning.

The American Community Survey is nearing full completion. In the last Congress, both the House and Senate could not find the full $165 million necessary for the full implementation. Thanks to the vocal support of many of the individuals and organizations in the audience today, the Senate was convinced to go along with the House mark of $145 million. However, almost full funding is not good enough. If Congress will not commit to full funding for the American Community Survey, we should just plain kill it and begin planning for another long survey form in 2010. So getting the funding is tremendously important.

Let me be clear, I have supported the American Community Survey for nearly 10 years now. I believe in it, and I believe it should go forward. However, partial funding will result in numbers that are less accurate. Those numbers will be used to distribute billions of dollars in Federal funds. That distribution will be less fair if the numbers are less accurate.

When planning for the 2000 census begun, Congress asked the Census Bureau to design a census that would be more accurate and less expensive; we've got neither. According to GAO, the plans for the 2010 census promised that the real dollar cost per household will increase almost 50 percent. The Census Bureau is making few comments on how accurate it will be and are even less forthcoming of what we will know about the accuracy of the 2010 census.

The procedures for measuring the accuracy of the 2000 census were well known long before the census. The methodology was openly debated in professional associations and in Congress. We are still waiting to hear how accuracy in the 2010 census will be measured. I believe the Census Bureau should immediately present to Congress a fully developed plan for how it intends to measure accuracy in the 2010 census.

As GAO has pointed out, there is considerable technical work remaining to be done before the American Community Survey can adequately replace the long form and shoulder the burden of distributing Federal funds. One of those hurdles is the accuracy of the annual estimates that are used to control the ACS's numbers. Last year, New York City challenged the 2003 estimate for the city and won. The Census Bureau increased the estimate for Brooklyn and Queens, adding more than 29,000 people to the city's population.

Just last week, the Census Bureau released the 2004 county estimates. Those estimates rely in part on data from the IRS but fail to take into account the dynamics of the New York City low-income population. New York will again challenge those estimates, and I am sure that the city will once again prevail.

The issue is not just that the estimates for New York City are wrong. New York City has one of the finest demographers in the country, working to make sure that the Census Bureau gets it right. Hundreds of cities across the country will be disadvantaged because they don't have the skilled staff to challenge the Census Bureau. The ACS and the public will suffer from those inaccuracies.

One of the ways communities can work to make sure they get the best census count possible is the Local Update of Census Addresses [LUCA] program. Congress passed legislation in 1994 to allow local officials to view the confidential address lists and make corrections. Unfortunately, for most cities, that process was cumbersome and confusing. Again, New York City took full advantage of the program because of its excellent staff. Most other cities did not fare as well. The Census Bureau should be working now with local governments to help them prepare for the 2010 LUCA. Instead, it appears that the 2010 address list will be just like 2000, cumbersome, confusing and full of errors.

I would like the Census Bureau to provide the committee detailed plans on what it is going to do in 2006 to assist local governments to prepare for reviewing the 2010 address list. That work should begin in 2006, and the plan should be before Congress right now.

We all agree that the census is vitally important to the public and its government. It's the one thing that we all participate in. That is why we will spend nearly $12 billion on the 2010 census. If we are going to get full value for our money, we need greater transparency, more public review and debate, and we need the information now.

I would like to close on what I consider a very discouraging note. The Census Bureau has disbanded the Decennial Census Advisory Committee and has put in place the 2010 Census Advisory Committee. The charters for these two committees are nearly identical. It appears that the purpose of this change is simply to change the membership of this committee. This does not reflect well on the Census Bureau and does not inspire confidence that the advisory committee process will be a meaningful one for the census as it was leading up to the 2000 census.

I, again, want to thank Chairman Turner for holding this hearing. There is a great deal of work to be done in the next year, and

I am very glad that the committee is focusing on this very important issue and moving the process forward. So I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Carolyn B. Maloney follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CAROLYN B. MALONEY

AT THE FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS HEARING

APRIL 19, 2005

Thank you, Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing. I am pleased to see the subcommittee paying attention to the census early in this session. Many believe that work on the 2010 census is just beginning, but the truth is just the opposite. By the end of this Congress, the Census Bureau will have made most of the important decisions on how the 2010 census will be conducted. Our opportunity to review and comment without causing major disruption will have passed. As we saw in the last census, Congressional intervention in the design of the census during the last two years prior to the census is very costly. As a result of those changes, and poor budgeting by Congress, the 2000 census was funded as an emergency. I hope we do not find ourselves in the same situation in 2010. The funding request in 2010 for the census will be somewhere between 6 and 10 billion dollars. We should be preparing to pay that bill today.

Including funds appropriated for 2005, Congress has already spent approximately 750 million dollars on the 2010 census. Those costs have been in three areas: the American Community Survey; improving the

census maps and geographic software; and in basic planning. The American Community Survey is nearing full implementation. In the last Congress, both the House and the Senate could not find the full $165 million necessary for full implementation. Thanks to the vocal support of many of the individuals and organizations in the audience today, the Senate was convinced to go along with the House mark of $145 million. However, almost full funding is not good enough. If Congress will not commit to full funding for the American Community Survey, we should kill it and begin planning for a long form in 2010.

Let me be clear. I have supported the American Community Survey for nearly 10 years now. I believe it should go forward. However, partial funding will result in numbers that are less accurate. Those numbers will be used to distribute billions of dollars in federal funds. That distribution will be less fair if the numbers are less accurate.

When planning for the 2000 census began, Congress asked the Census Bureau to design a census that would be more accurate and less expensive. We got neither. According to GAO, the plans for the 2010 census promise that the real dollar cost per household will increase almost 50 percent. The Census Bureau is making few comments on how accurate it will be, and is even less forthcoming on what we will know about the accuracy of the 2010 census.

The procedures for measuring the accuracy of the 2000 census were well known long before the census. The methodology was openly debated in professional associations and in Congress. We are still waiting to hear how accuracy in the 2010 census will be measured. I believe the Census Bureau should present to Congress immediately, a fully developed plan for how it intends to measure accuracy in the 2010 census.

As GAO has pointed out, there is considerable technical work remaining to be done before the American Community survey can adequately replace the long form and shoulder the burden of distributing federal funds. One of those hurdles is the accuracy of the annual estimates that are used to control the ACS numbers. Last year, New York City challenged the 2003 estimate for the City and won. The Census Bureau increased the estimate for Brooklyn and Queens adding more than 29,000 persons to the city's population. Just last week, the Census Bureau released the 2004 county estimates. Those estimates rely in part on data from the IRS, but fail to take into account the dynamics of the New York City low-income population. New York will again challenge those estimates, and I am sure will prevail again.

The issue is not just that the estimates for New York are wrong. New York city has one of the finest demographers in the country working to make sure the Census Bureau gets it right. Hundreds of communities around the country will be disadvantaged because they do not have the skilled staff to challenge the Census Bureau. The ACS and the public will suffer from those inaccuracies.

One of the ways communities can work to make sure they get the best census count possible is the local update of census addresses or LUCA. Congress passed legislation in 1994 to allow local officials to view the confidential census address list and make corrections. Unfortunately, for most cities, that process was cumbersome and confusing. Again, New York City took full advantage of the program because of its excellent staff. Most other cities did not fare as well. The Census Bureau should be working now with local governments the help them prepare for the 2010 LUCA. Instead, it appears that the 2010 address list will be just like 2000 -- cumbersome, confusing, and full of errors. I would like the Census Bureau to provide the Committee detailed plans on what it is going to do in 2006 to assist local governments prepare for reviewing the 2010 address list. That work should begin in 2006, and the plans should be before Congress now.

We all agree that the census is vitally important to the public and its government. That is why we will spend nearly 12 billion dollars on the 2010 census. If we are going to get full value for our money, we need greater transparency and more public review.

I would like to close on what I consider a very discouraging note. The Census Bureau has disbanded the Decennial Census Advisory Committee and put in its place the 2010 Census Advisory Committee. The charters for these two committees are nearly identical. It appears that the purpose of this change is simply to change the membership of the committee. This does not reflect well on the Census Bureau, and does not inspire confidence that the Advisory Committee process will be a meaningful one for this census as it was leading up to the 2000 census.

Thank you again Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing. There is a great deal of work to be done in the next year. I am glad to see that we are getting started.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney.

We will now start with the witnesses. Each witness has kindly prepared written testimony which will be included in the hearing of this record. Witnesses will notice that there is a timer with a light at the witness table. The green light indicates that you should begin your prepared remarks, and the red light indicates that time has expired.

It is the policy of this committee that all witnesses be sworn in, so if you would please rise and raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. TURNER. Let the record show that all the witnesses have responded in the affirmative, and we will begin this panel with Honorable Kathleen Cooper, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce.

STATEMENTS OF KATHLEEN COOPER, UNDER SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE; AND CHARLES LOUIS KINCANNON, DIRECTOR, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN COOPER

Ms. COOPER. Good morning, Chairman Turner and Mrs. Maloney.

As you mentioned, I serve as Under Secretary for Economic Affairs at the Commerce Department. My responsibilities include advising the Secretary of Commerce on economic policy, and exercising managerial direction over the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Census Bureau.

I want to thank you, Chairman Turner, and this subcommittee for your support. Your predecessor, Representative Adam Putnum, Chairman Tom Davis of the full committee, and Chairman Frank Wolf also have been key architects in the direction of the 2010 census.

Those in Congress who may not be aware, as this group is, of the cyclical nature of the census often see the period between censuses as an opportunity to shift scarce fiscal resources to other projects. Planning, testing and preparation needs to occur now for a successful count in 2010.

According to Article I, Section II of the Constitution, an enumeration of the inhabitants of the United States is the responsibility of the Congress. It is notable, perhaps for the Federalism Subcommittee, that the Framers did not put this responsibility under the powers of the executive branch, nor did they reserve it to the States. The Congress has delegated census-taking work to the Bureau.

Essentially, the Census Bureau is your data collector and statistical contractor. The 2010 census represents a sea change in how we count our population. It also reflects our dedication to improving census procedures as our population and technology evolve.

In 1790, U.S. Marshals travelled door to door on horseback to determine the number of residents in the original 13 States. In 2010, hundreds of thousands of enumerators will follow maps drawn with Global Positioning Satellite technology. In 1830, printed forms were

used for the first time, replacing the Marshal's notebook. In 2010, enumerators will enter data in a handheld computer.

Over the years, more and different questions have been included in the census. In 1840, questions on agriculture, mining and fishing were added. In 1940, the Bureau determined that only a sample of the population needed to complete the aptly named long form to understand the changing characteristics of our population.

Importantly, the census will be taken in 2010 by short form only; that's because the American Community Survey is up and running, resulting in two important deliverables. First, with the American Community Survey in place, every household will receive a short form questionnaire in 2010. The short form has a much higher response. All of our census taking, manpower and resources can be dedicated to obtaining an accurate count of every person on April 1, 2010.

Second, by having a continuous American Community Survey, Congress and the American people will have information on characteristics about our population every year. When city planners in Dayton need to consider a new bus route, they can refer to ACS data on commute times to work. Language needs in St. Louis schools can be considered based on new ACS data, not information from 2000. This year will see rich, long-form quality data for communities 250,000 or larger. Next year, we will have data for towns of 65,000. And in 2010, we will see ACS data for the smallest towns and neighborhoods.

Long form data provided a once-a-decade snapshot, the ACS is a moving video image. Ultimately, the result will be increased accuracy in the 2010 enumeration.

In April 2010, you will see the maximum capacity of census resources focused on finding and counting people. I hope and believe accuracy will be improved and the undercount narrowed.

The American Community Survey questionnaire is very similar in content to the long form used in the census 2000. All the questions are responsive to a law, a statute or a court order. The Census Bureau has worked many years with Congress and other Federal agencies to ensure that answers provide the data to meet statutory requirements. Unfortunately, the Census Bureau has been ridiculed in the past for asking questions some believe to be intrusive, for instance, does this house, apartment or mobile home have complete plumbing facilities? But the Departments of Health and Human Services and Housing and Urban Development use these answers to determine public health policy and the condition of housing in remote areas and in low-income neighborhoods. We ask every question for a reason; every answer is needed.

A quarter of a million surveys are going out each month nationwide. Surveys touch every congressional district in the country, and the results will too.

Census staff has made an impressive effort to alert congressional district offices to the benefits of ACS data. We hope your offices and those of your colleagues will encourage constituents to complete the ACS.

Let me stress for a moment the confidentiality aspect of census taking. The answers provided on the ACS are confidential; the privacy of your constituents is protected.

Census employees swear an oath to protect the data and the privacy of respondents. I have observed that they take that promise very, very seriously. And if they do not, penalties, including fines and Federal prison time, are severe. Census professionals know well that the quality of their products depends on respondent cooperation, and cooperation depends on trust. We are going to protect that trust.

We thank Congress for its support and look forward to continuing our work with you to ensure a successful 2010 count. And I will be happy to take your questions at the appropriate time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Cooper follows:]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Under Secretary for Economic Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20230

Commerce Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Kathleen B. Cooper
Before the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
Tuesday, April 19, 2005

"Halfway to the 2010 Census:
The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census"

Good morning Chairman Turner, Mr. Clay, and members of the Subcommittee. I am Kathleen Cooper -- Commerce Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. My responsibilities include advising the Secretary of Commerce on economic policy and exercising managerial direction over the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the Census Bureau.

First, let me take a moment to thank you Chairman Turner and this subcommittee for your past support and for the support we will request in the future. Your predecessor, Representative Adam Putnam, Chairman Tom Davis of the full committee, and Chairman Frank Wolf also have been key architects in the direction of the 2010 census.

Those in Congress who may not be aware of the cyclical nature of the census often see the period between censuses as an opportunity to shift scarce fiscal resources to other projects. While members view the decennial census as a vital mission, some may perceive it as several years down the road and, therefore, not critical to fully fund in interim years. The fact is planning, testing, and preparation needs to occur now and each year through 2010 to ensure a successful enumeration and compilation.

Members of this committee, former Chairman Putnam and Chairmen Davis and Wolf understand the funding cycle and have worked to ensure adequate funding for census preparations.

According to Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, an enumeration of the inhabitants of the United States is the responsibility of the Congress. It is notable, perhaps for the Federalism subcommittee, that the framers did not put this responsibility in Article II under the powers of the executive branch. Nor did they reserve it to the states.

The Congress has delegated census-taking work to the Bureau. Essentially, the Census Bureau is your data collector and statistical contractor. And pleased to be so.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this hearing and provide a description, at this important mid-decade milestone, as to how our work is going.

The 2010 Census represents a sea change in how we count our population.

It also reflects our dedication to improving census procedures as our population and technology evolve. The evolution of census taking and the revolutionary procedures for

the next census are designed -- and will be implemented -- with improved accuracy as the goal.

In 1790, U.S. Marshals traveled door-to-door on horseback to determine the number of residents in the original 13 states and territories. In 2010, hundreds of thousands of enumerators will follow maps drawn with global positioning satellite technology in what will likely be the largest peacetime mobilization of the decade.

As the Marshals knew and as enumerators know today, good, up-to-date maps are essential for an accurate census.

The term MAF/TIGER may not mean much to those outside the Bureau but it is very important the count. MAF stands for Master Address File and it is the address book enumerators will follow. TIGER stands for Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Reference system, which is the "road map".

In 1830, printed forms were used for the first time in census taking, replacing a marshal's notebook. In 2010, enumerators will enter data in a handheld computer. This small palm-sized device is a far cry from the enormous UNIVAC computer that tabulated data in 1950.

Over the years, more and different questions have been included in the census. In 1840, questions on agriculture, mining and fishing were added. This precursor to the every-five-year economic census also changed over the years. In 1940, the Bureau determined that only a sample of the population needed to complete the aptly named "long form" in order to understand the changing characteristics of our population. Importantly, the census will be taken in 2010 by a short form only.

Improvements are ongoing thanks to FY 2005 appropriations. Another 610 counties will be added to the enhanced MAF/TIGER File and important planning and testing continues, including a national mailout test in 2005.

And, of course, the American Community Survey is up and running which results in two important deliverables.

First, with the American Community Survey in place, every household will receive a short-form questionnaire in 2010. As you can imagine, the short form has a much higher response rate than the long form. All of our census-taking manpower and resources can be dedicated to obtaining an accurate count of every person on April 1, 2010.

Second, by having a continuous American Community Survey, Congress and the American people will have valuable and timely information on important characteristics about our population every year. When city planners in Dayton need to know where a new bus route is needed, they can refer to ACS data on commute times to work. Language needs in St. Louis schools can be considered based on new ACS data, not information from 2000.

Every August, the American Community Survey data will be released about the previous year--only eight months after the data collection period ends. What an improvement over the decennial model that produced data only once a decade, and two years after the data were collected.

This year we will see rich, long-form quality data for communities 250,000 or larger. Next year, cities and towns with populations of at least 65,000 will have data on their characteristics. And so on until the summer of 2010, when we will see ACS data for every community in the United States right down to the tract and block-group level.

The long form served us well from 1940 through the 2000 census, but its time has passed. Long-form data provided a wonderful, once-a-decade snapshot. The ACS is a moving video image, continually updated to provide much needed data about our nation in today's fast-moving world.

Ultimately, the result will be increased accuracy for the 2010 enumeration. By removing the long form from the count, we also remove the labor-intensive follow up demanded by the long form. In April of 2010, you will see the maximum capacity of census resources focused on finding and counting people. I hope -- and believe -- that accuracy will be improved and the undercount narrowed.

The American Community Survey questionnaire is very similar in content to the long form used in Census 2000. All the questions are responsive to a law, statute, or court order.

The Census Bureau has worked many years with Congress and other Federal agencies to ensure that the answers to those questions will provide the data to meet the statutory requirements established by Congress. Unfortunately, the Census Bureau has been ridiculed in the past for asking questions some believe to be intrusive, for instance: "does this house, apartment, or mobile home have complete plumbing facilities?"

The Departments of Health and Human Services and Housing and Urban Development use these answers to determine public health policy and the condition of housing in remote areas and in low-income neighborhoods. And let's not forget how local water and sewage authorities need this information to increase their capacities to ensure water pressure to the new 1,000-unit housing development and shopping center that was just built on what had been farmland in Ohio or a ranch in South Texas.

We ask every question for a reason. Every answer is needed.

ACS is a most vital innovation to the 2010 census. But to be successful, people must respond. It only takes about 20 minutes. A quarter of a million surveys are going out each month nationwide – that's three million per year. Surveys touch every county and Congressional district in the country and the results will too. Census staff has made an impressive effort to alert Congressional district offices to the benefits of the ACS data.

We hope your offices and those of your colleagues will encourage constituents to complete this mandatory collection form.

ACS will make the 2010 census better and will help community leaders make more informed decisions.

Let me stress for a moment the confidentiality aspect of census taking. The answers provided on the ACS are confidential. The privacy of every one of your constituents is protected. Census employees swear an oath to protect the data and the privacy of respondents. I have observed that they take that promise very seriously.

And, if they do not, penalties – including fines and federal prison time – are severe.

Census professionals know well that the quality of their products depends on respondent cooperation. And cooperation depends on trust. We are going to protect that trust.

The Administration supports the three pillars of the re-engineered 2010 census: the American Community Survey, the short-form only count, and better mapping thanks to MAF/TIGER.

We thank Congress for its support and we look forward to continuing our work with you to ensure a successful 2010 count.

I would be happy to take your questions at the appropriate time.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.
Mr. Kincannon.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES LOUIS KINCANNON

Mr. KINCANNON. Good morning, and thank you, Chairman Turner and Mrs. Maloney and other members of the subcommittee for arranging this opportunity where the Census Bureau can update the Congress on plans for the 2010 decennial census program and progress so far.

I want to assure the committee that our primary goal is an accurate decennial census. In 2010, we will meet this goal through the reengineered census process, a process that will deliver more timely data, reduce overall risk and contain costs.

The process includes three integrated components: the American Community Survey; the MAF/TIGER Enhancement program; and the 2010 census, which will be a short-form-only enumeration.

Today, I can assure you we are moving to take advantage of important technological and operational opportunities. Moreover, I am pleased to report that we are on schedule and on budget as we proceed with the 2010 decennial census program.

The American Community Survey is the greatest revolution in decennial census taking in 20 years. The American Community Survey replaces the long form of the census, and it will deliver data to governments in increasing geographic detail between next summer and the summer of 2010.

The American Community Survey, with the support of Congress, was fully implemented this year. We are very pleased to report that we have been able to keep up with this quadrupled workload. The work is on schedule and on budget. In the first monthly sample, I am pleased to report that we have received a 97 percent response rate, which is a very substantial achievement. This demonstrates the payoff for a well-conceived and supported testing program. The American Community Survey will provide more timely data for States and local communities, and it will allow the Census Bureau to focus its efforts in 2010 on the core Constitutional responsibility to conduct an accurate enumeration of every person living in America.

However, this endeavor also depends on the MAF/TIGER enhancement program. The census, after all, has two principle requirements: to count every person living in America once and only once, and to count every person with a correct address. Ensuring accuracy of the addresses is the only guarantee for a fair distribution of resources and political power as they are distributed according to geographies, States and cities, tracks and blocks.

MAF/TIGER tells us where people live and gives us a reasonable means of organizing our work. Moreover, the TIGER system is used by the U.S. Geological Survey for the National Map by commercial of companies for products such as Map Quest, and by State, local and tribal governments to improve their local GIS files.

Important objectives of the enhancement program include realigning the TIGER map in order to take advantage of GPS tables, modernizing the processing system and expanding geographic partnerships with State, local and tribal governments. We have contracted with the Harris Corp. to realign the roads and features of

all the U.S. counties by 2008. Since 2003, the Harris Corp. has completed the realignment for more than 1,000 counties, with approximately 2,300 to go. We are on schedule to achieve this objective.

We need to modernize the MAF/TIGER processing system, replacing the home-grown system developed more than 25 years ago with a modern Oracle-based system. This will provide more flexible integration with other operations and a more customer-friendly product for users.

As we proceed, we are mindful that the TIGER system is a national treasure. We are working to expand partnerships that will benefit stakeholders in the exchange of geospatial information. This is an extensive effort, and we believe it will contribute to an accurate decennial census enumeration. And thanks to the American Community Survey, the 2010 census will be a short-form-only enumeration, meaning that we will focus our efforts on the quality of the count and census coverage.

We began researching and testing for the 2010 census early in the decade, far earlier than for any previous census. The testing program began in 2003 with a national mail out. In 2004, we conducted census tests in Queens and three counties in southwest Georgia. We successfully tested the use of handheld computers, like this device that I have, to conduct field data collection. We also tested new methods for improving coverage. We are conducting another national mail out test this year, focusing on improving the completeness and accuracy of reporting on the short form. We will conduct a replacement mailing for non-responding households, and for the first time, we will mail a bilingual questionnaire in selected areas. We believe these efforts will improve the accuracy of responses as well as coverage.

We will take the results of the research that we have conducted so far into the field of 2006 as we conduct test censuses in a portion of Travis County, TX, and the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota. One important goal of this testing program is to enable us to conduct a true dress rehearsal in 2008. We only get one chance to take the census, and we do not want to be forced to use untested procedures during the 2010 census, as that increases the risk of failures.

In conclusion, we believe reducing the risk associated with the census is an investment in the Nation's future and one worth making. Congress has supported this investment thus far, and we ask for your continued support in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity. And I remain available to answer questions if you have them. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kincannon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF

CHARLES LOUIS KINCANNON
DIRECTOR
US CENSUS BUREAU

"Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census"

Before the House Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
US House of Representatives

19 April 2005

Good morning. On behalf of the US Census Bureau, I want to thank Chairman Turner, Ranking Member Clay, and the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census for the opportunity to provide the Congress with an update on our progress on the 2010 decennial program. I was pleased and heartened the Congress chose to recognize the vital relationship between federalism and the census. This relationship was established in the US Constitution in Article 1, Section 2, and the nation's first census was conducted in 1790, making the census one of the nation's oldest civic engagements. The Census Bureau is proud of and humbled by this tradition. Our efforts to reach every community, every neighborhood, every street, every household, and every person living in America honor this tradition, as they serve to extend the promise for the fair distribution of power and resources, and the recognition of the importance of the diversity of this nation.

I want to assure the committee, our primary goal is an accurate decennial census. In 2010, we will meet this goal through the reengineered census process — a process that will deliver more timely data, reduce overall risk, and contain costs. The reengineered 2010 decennial program comprises three integrated components: the American Community Survey, which will provide timely, accurate data for states, towns, and even neighborhoods; the Master Address File (MAF) and TIGER Enhancement Program, which will serve our nation by updating and modernizing the maps by which we collect and disseminate census data; and the 2010 Census, a short-form only census, which includes a rigorous research and testing program.[1] Each component of the 2010 decennial census program is designed to promote the success of the other components, and to serve the constitutional requirement for an accurate census.

[1] *Master Address File* and *TIGER (Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Reference)* system. These combined programs constitute the "address list" and "road map" by which the census is conducted.

As we look forward, it is worth considering the context of the first census and the great and hopeful challenge accepted on our behalf by the framers in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787. This first census bears important meaning on every census. As we accept the challenge of counting every person in America in 2010, we are sustained by the knowledge that this challenge was foreseen and embraced at the beginning of our nation's history.

We know why an *actual enumeration* was chosen as the method for apportioning power within the House of Representatives. The enumeration was chosen as a means of systematically apportioning power and representation as the nation's population inevitably grew and changed. According to James Madison's diary, as the delegates debated the original distribution of power, George Mason spoke about the need to establish a procedure to justify power with the passage of time and to recognize a fundamental right of the people for fair representation. "He did not object to the conjectural ratio which was to prevail in the outset; but considered a Revision from time to time according to some permanent & precise standard as essential to [sic] fair representation as required in the 1st branch. According to the present population of America, the Northern part of it had a right to preponderate, and he would not deny it. But he wished it not to preponderate hereafter when the reason no longer continued."[2]

We also know what was intended for the census by the manner in which the first census was conducted. The instructions of the first census act are replete with the injunction that the marshals should record *every person* living in the United States. And, we know the rough, unmapped wilderness of the new nation did not deter them. The marshals not only went to Charleston, Philadelphia, and New York, but to the area "Between Norridge-Wock and Seven Mile Brook" in the territory of Maine, as well as the burgeoning communities on the western frontiers. The first census not only revealed the need to reapportion congress, it also revealed the true wealth of the nation: its people. The first census exposed the vast potential of a young nation, and helped open opportunities by illustrating the presence of new communities outside those original boundaries of the colonies.

Thus, with the experience of the first census, we acknowledge two abiding principles: the necessity to apportion fair representation in an ever-changing population, and the importance of recognition and inclusion for communities throughout this country. We have, in every census since, attempted to reach every person living in America, because the census is not only a national imperative, but also a valuable asset for every community.

There is an old adage, *knowledge is power* — and the census is an important source of knowledge and information. Census data empower citizens at every level and generate activity within the nation's social and economic spheres. Acknowledging this fact is a critical part of planning each census. We recognize the demands for high-quality data are ever increasing, and that in many instances only the census can satisfy these demands because it is the only consistent, comprehensive, detailed source of information for small communities and small geographies throughout the United States. With each census, we have a mandate to focus our efforts to meet the ever-changing challenge to reach every street and every household in America.

[2] James Madison, *The Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 Which Framed the Constitution of the United States of America*, International Edition, ed. Gaillard Hunt and James Brown Scott (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1970) 231-232.

With each census, this challenge grows and changes. The 1990s witnessed unprecedented growth in the Latino community; an increasing reluctance to answer surveys; social changes affecting residency, such as two-residence households and increasingly complex custody arrangements; and an environment of changing technological capabilities. Each of these challenges and opportunities dramatically affected Census 2000. The 2000 Census, despite its success, was a high-risk endeavor. In fact, at this point in the last decade, the Census Bureau was pursuing a controversial plan that was ultimately overturned in the courts, and was just conducting the first major test for the census. The Census Bureau learned a great deal from the experience of Census 2000, as we do after every census. After each census, the Census Bureau conducts thorough and extensive evaluations, examining all aspects from planning and research to coverage measurement, from enumerator training to data quality, from data processing to data dissemination. As we plan the next census, we consider the lessons learned and assess new opportunities. Following the Census 2000, both the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Commerce Inspector General strongly emphasized the need for increased planning and testing — something which the Census Bureau also acknowledged.

Today, I assure you, we understood the lessons of Census 2000, and we are working to take advantage of important technological and operational opportunities we missed in the past as well as exploring new opportunities. The 2010 decennial census reengineering process is intended to deliver a more accurate census. Moreover, if properly tested, it will also deliver more timely data and reduce overall risk. We believe this process will save taxpayer dollars relative to repeating the design and operation of the 2000 census, by allowing the Census Bureau to conduct early testing. Our goal is to capitalize on important technological advancements expected to save time and money while improving the accuracy of critical field operations. We intend to meet our goals, and at this juncture — approximately five years from Census Day — I am pleased to report we are on schedule and on budget, as we proceed with the American Community Survey, the MAF/TIGER Enhancement, and the 2010 Census.

The American Community Survey

With the American Community Survey, we are experiencing the greatest evolution in the decennial census in over 60 years. The American Community Survey replaces the long form of the census, an important and crucial step in realizing a short-form only census. With a three-million-household-sample every year, the American Community Survey will deliver data to governments with populations of 65,000 or more beginning next year. As the survey continues, we will publish long-form type data for places of 20,000 or more in 2008, and for all other areas, including census tracts, in 2010, and every year thereafter.

The American Community Survey, with the support of the Congress, was fully implemented this year. We began sending questionnaires throughout the country, increasing the sample to approximately 250,000 households per month. This makes the American Community Survey the largest continuous data collection activity at the Census Bureau, and one of the largest on-going surveys in the world. We are very pleased to report that because of Congress' support throughout the testing of the program, we have been able to keep up with the increased workload — a workload that has tripled (and in some instances quadrupled) in the case of field operations, as well as other activities such as the call centers. More importantly, the work proceeds on schedule and on budget, demonstrating the importance of a well-conceived and supported testing program.

The American Community Survey is an important evolution providing timely data for states and local communities, replacing the old system that delivered data once a decade. These data are required to carry out an array of Federal mandates. At the same time, the American Community Survey will allow the Census Bureau to focus its efforts in 2010 on the core, constitutional responsibility to conduct an accurate enumeration of every person living in America. However, this endeavor also depends on another component of the reengineered 2010 decennial census program: the MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program.

MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program

The census must fulfill two principal requirements: 1) count every person living in America, once and only once, and 2) count every person at the correct address. Each address corresponds to specific geographies: a census block, census tract, place, county, and state. Ensuring the accuracy of the addresses is the only guarantee for the fair distribution of power and resources, as they are distributed according to geographies — states, cities, towns, census tracts, and blocks. MAF/TIGER is the map for a successful census. It tells us where people are living, and not only furnishes us with a list of households to contact, but also provides a reasonable means of organizing our workload and the non-response follow-up operations. Moreover, the TIGER system — which is literally a national road map — is a national resource. It is used not only by the decennial census, but also for many other applications, both public and private. It is used by the US Geological Survey (USGS) for the National Map; by commercial companies for products such as MapQuest; and by state, local, and tribal governments to improve local GIS files.

With the MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program, we are working with the private and public sectors to modernize and enhance the capabilities of the nation's road map. Important objectives of the enhancement program include, realigning the TIGER map in order to take advantage of GPS capabilities, modernizing the processing system, and expanding geographic partnerships. We are working with the Harris Corporation to realign all the US counties by 2008, in time for field operations to conduct Pre-Census Address Canvassing Operations. We want field representatives to work with accurate maps. Since 2003, the Harris Corporation has completed the realignment for more than 1000 counties, with approximately 2300 to go. We are on schedule.

We want to modernize the MAF/TIGER processing system, replacing the homegrown system developed more than 25 years ago before the information and technology revolution, with a Commercial-Off-the-Shelf system. This will provide a more flexible integration with other operations, and a more customer-friendly product for other users. As we proceed, however, we are mindful that the TIGER system is a national resource; we are working on partnerships that will benefit all partners in the exchange of geospatial information. This means we are working with local governments, as well as other agencies and the private sector, to coordinate, improve, and modernize MAF/TIGER.

The 2010 Census

This is an extensive effort, and we believe it is the basis for an accurate census that will result in the fair distribution of power and resources. The decennial census enumeration is the foundation for the nation's data infrastructure; it is the principal denominator for our population statistics. Thanks to the American Community Survey, the 2010 Census will be a short-form only census, meaning we will focus our efforts on the quality of the count and census coverage. To ensure success, we are not only using lessons learned from the past, we are reaching forward to the future.

The Census Bureau began research and testing for the 2010 Census early in the decade -- in fact, far earlier than for any previous census. The testing program began in 2003 with a national mailout test. We conducted a census test in 2004 in Queens Borough in New York City and in southwest Georgia, successfully utilizing new technologies and training enumerators in a short time to successfully make use of the handheld computer devices. We are conducting another national mailout test this year, focusing on improving the completeness and accuracy of reporting on the short form (particularly for the questions on Hispanic origin and race, as well as coverage improvements). We will conduct a second mailing, and for the first time, offer a bilingual questionnaire with English and Spanish integrated onto one form. In addition, we are closely examining the residency rules, and looking for better methods to ensure complete household coverage.

We believe these efforts will improve not only the accuracy of the responses, but also coverage. We will take these experiences and the research we have conducted thus far into the field in 2006, as we conduct census tests in Travis County, Texas and the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota. We selected these sites because their characteristics will allow us to answer specific research questions and meet test objectives. One important goal of this testing program is to enable us to conduct a true dress rehearsal in 2008, so that we will be able to test the new operations and procedures collectively under census conditions. This is important because we will learn whether the procedures, many tested separately in different environments, will work together when they are used throughout the country. We only get one chance to take the census; without a true rehearsal, we may be forced to conduct untried procedures during the 2010 Census, increasing the risks associated with the census.

In conclusion, we believe reducing the risk associated with the census is an investment in the nation's future, and one worth making. Congress has supported this investment thus far, and we are asking for your continued support, as the 2010 decennial census program matures. Over the decade, Congress will authorize the distribution of more than two trillion taxpayer dollars based on census data. The cost of a reengineered census program is less than one-half of one percent of that amount. Moreover, the current Life Cycle indicates the reengineered census will provide overall cost savings, as compared to conducting a traditional census without the American Community Survey and the other enhancements. Support for the American Community Survey and MAF/TIGER does more than encourage the success of the census; these important resources will empower citizens at every level and generate activity throughout the nation's social and economic spheres. Supporting the ongoing and aggressive research program associated with the decennial census supports the accuracy of the count. The value of your support in this respect is incalculable, as the census forms the foundation of the nation's data infrastructure, and the data become the basis for both public and private decision-making throughout the nation. The census supports the hopes and ambitions of communities. The census provides information — factual evidence — that helps all branches of government, including state and local governments, as well as the private sector, to answer the needs of this country. It is one of our nation's most honorable and humbling traditions — it is the tradition that honors our nation's most vital asset, its people.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity, and I hope my testimony was informative. I would be happy to answer your questions and concerns.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you both.

I want to recognize Mr. Dent from Pennsylvania, who has joined us.

And I want to thank Mrs. Maloney for recognizing my daughter Carolyn who is with us. I have both of my daughters in town with me today, and my daughter Jessica, who is 13, as I was leaving for this hearing, telling her that I was going to a hearing on the census, I thought I would ask her what is a census, and she said, "That's when you count all the people on the planet." Now recognizing that your job is smaller than that, but still incredibly challenging and daunting, I appreciate your dedication to it. It is incredibly important for the number of reasons that you set forth and in my opening statement, specifically the allocation of dollars, the apportionment for representation.

You talked about the processes that you are moving forward with in your preparation for 2010. In the past, there has been a significant amount of discussion concerning techniques, including sampling. So, for the record, does the census plan currently on using sampling to supplement its numbers for purposes of apportionment?

Mr. KINCANNON. No, Mr. Chairman. Our plans are not to do that. The reason is, in the first instance for apportionment, the law prohibits that. A law passed in 1975, I can't give you the citation, but it prohibits use of sample-based estimates for apportionment.

But we have worked on the question of using sample and modeling-based estimates to change census results in an effort to make them more complete for 30 years. And in the 2000 census, the Census Bureau worked for almost 3 years on trying to make a procedure that would work in improving the quality of results for the major census products. We were unsuccessful in that regard.

Before I was named director, the Census Bureau made a decision that it was not feasible to use the figures in the process that we had in 2000 to provide adjusted figures for redistricting. And in fact, as we continued to work on those estimates, we learned that would have been a severe error. It was even more off as a measure of results than we had thought when the decision had to be made about redistricting.

We continued to work until the winter of 2002/2003 to see if we could use the results to improve the quality of inter-census demographic estimates, the estimates program that Mrs. Maloney was commenting on, and our conclusion was that we could not. The difficulty of using sample and model-based estimates to provide better figures for small areas does not seem feasible to the professional staff at the Census Bureau at this stage. So we have not requested money and are not intending to try that kind of process in 2010.

Ms. COOPER. If I might just, if I may, add to that point. The director has given very good and useful answers to the question, but I arrived in May 2001, and I remember vividly the hard work done by the census professionals for many, many months trying to see if they could make the process that they had developed in advance work. And they simply could not. It is not a viable option, and that is the reason that we are not asking for money and do not plan to adjust in 2010. And from all that I hear from the statistical community, they support that decision.

Mr. TURNER. Well, I think it is important to acknowledge that your answers, if I am correct, are that the decision is based on career professionals and scientific processes in rejecting looking at sampling as a process for adjusting your numbers. Is that correct?

Mr. KINCANNON. That is absolutely correct. I took my office, director, on March 20, 2002, so earlier decisions in work had gone on ahead of that time. But from that point on, I was involved in many of the professional staff meetings where the results were drawn together and judgments were made about its quality. I asked questions, but that was a process run by and settled by the professional statisticians, the dozen or 15 who had worked consistently on this for years. So yes, that is a professional staff decision.

Ms. COOPER. Absolutely.

Mr. TURNER. My next question, Ms. Cooper, I am going to start with you because it directly impacts the director, Kincannon, and I also appreciate his thoughts on this. It relates to the census director's position and whether or not the position should be appointed for a set term.

Ms. Cooper, do you have thoughts as to benefits that we might see from that.

Ms. COOPER. I think that is an idea that has come around before, and I think it is a worthy idea, something that I am sure people have thought about a number of times. BLS clearly has a fixed term, and I see some benefit to having some continuity. So I think it is something that is worthy of debate and consideration.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Director Kincannon.

Mr. KINCANNON. Mr. Chairman, I was deputy director at the time of the end of the Reagan administration and the taking of office of President Bush's father's administration, and it took a long time to get a new census director identified, nominated and confirmed. So the burden in the last year before the census of 1990 fell entirely on me, and I can tell you there are two jobs there. So continuity and having someone in place to do that work is an important consideration.

On the other hand, having a head of the Census Bureau with such a scientific task but nonetheless intentionally and Constitutionally a political purpose means that the President ought to have someone in that office who is trusted by the administration. So I think the Congress would have to weigh those issues, because I think that they pull in different directions, and determine which is the best way to have it. And be sure to put on the shoes of the other side when you take that decision.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

I, first of all, want to welcome both of our participants and thank you for your testimony.

Undersecretary Cooper, one of the most innovative statistical programs in the Federal Government in the last 20 years is the Longitudinal Household Employment Data [LEHD] program. And the Census Bureau should be very proud in the role it has played in assisting Dr. Julia Lane and her colleagues in making this project so successful. One of the things that makes this project so

unique is that it takes existing data from the States and the Federal Government and creates new information that is more valuable than either data set alone. So far, Congress has not provided the funds to make this program fully operational. What is the administration doing to assure that Congress gives due consideration to the request for this program in the 2006 budget because it is, by all estimates, an extremely valuable program?

Ms. COOPER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Maloney, for that question, and I agree completely with your assessment, that it is one of the most innovative programs in a long time. I am very hopeful that, in fact, in the 2006 budget that the Congress will approve some funding for the LEHD.

I think the main——

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, has Congress sent over a request asking for it?

Ms. COOPER. Well, it is in the budget. It is in the budget at a certain level, and census has been working, over the last couple of years, to try to develop this program so that it can indeed work and explain it to a number of people, both up through the Commerce Department. And then I am sure that there are some special activities to explain it on the part of direct census professionals. But this is one of the programs and ideas that I certainly talk about on a regular basis when I am out in the country because I think it can be very helpful for us longer term.

Mrs. MALONEY. OK. Well, I hope you will keep your eye on it.

Director Kincannon, as I mentioned in my statement, I would like the Census Bureau to provide the committee with detailed plans on what it will do in 2006 to help local governments prepare for the Address Correction Program. When can we expect to see those plans? Will they be here at the end of April? At the end of May? When can we see those plans?

Mr. KINCANNON. We produced a preliminary plan for how we were going to use LUCA in the 2010 census 2 years ago, I believe, and we can certainly provide that to the subcommittee and will do so.

Our finding was that we did not believe it will be cost-effective to do this before the national update of all addresses in 2009. So we plan to carry out a pilot LUCA program in the dress rehearsal in 2008, but LUCA itself will not be implemented until after we have the updated addresses before the census.

Mrs. MALONEY. So we will have a dress rehearsal in 2008, but continuing on the line of the address list program, can you tell me what will be done to test the local update in the 2006 census test? Are you going to do anything in the 2006 census test to test the addresses?

Mr. KINCANNON. No. We won't be testing that in 2006. These are tests of partial areas, and we don't think that is particularly productive. And we can report on our plans in more detail if you would like.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, we would appreciate it.

The Gooden Center at the New York University has been conducting research on the inequity caused by counting prisoners at the prisons rather than at the residence. A lot of people argue you should count where they are going to live after being released. Is

the Census Bureau considering any changes in how it counts prisoners in the 2010 census?

Mr. KINCANNON. No, Mrs. Maloney, we are not planning any changes. Since 1790, we have counted people according to their usual place of residence. What that has meant for a number of decades is a simple concept of where people sleep and live most of the time. Prisoners sleep and live mostly in prisons, and that's where we count them. This policy of usual residences was upheld——

Mrs. MALONEY. Is that how they are going to be treated in the ACS also, prisoners——

Mr. KINCANNON. Yes, that's correct. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia upheld this specific policy and specifically with regard to prisoners in 1992.

Mr. TURNER. Director, will you explain to the committee how you will be measuring errors in the 2010 census? I am especially interested in how you will fulfill your promise to measure gross errors, and I would like to know when and how this methodology will be submitted for external review.

Mr. KINCANNON. We have commissioned a panel of the National Academy of Sciences to help us study the best ways to try to measure error, gross and net, and we expect a report I believe in the summer of 2006.

Mrs. MALONEY. My time is up. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney.

Mr. Dent.

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Director Kincannon, my observations have been, there are two types of people, those who want to be found and those who don't, and there seems to be a larger number in that latter category than any of us would like.

In your testimony, you've talked a little of coverage, and it is encouraging to note that you are going to be conducting surveying in English and Spanish to help with coverage. What are you doing beyond bilingual surveys, to improve coverage for the 2010 census?

Mr. KINCANNON. Well, there are a number of very important steps being taken to do that. First of all, although we plan to mail bilingual questionnaires in English and Spanish to selected areas—and we will do our final testing of that over the next 2 years—we do have both translated questionnaires in five or six other languages; we did in 2000, and we will have a similar program in 2010.

We are also going to test mailing language guides in a number of languages, along with the English language questionnaire, in other areas where there are many sets of people who speak other languages, perhaps, in their home. There are many neighborhoods in our cities and in rural areas also where that would be helpful.

We are looking very closely at what we call residence rules, where people are intending to be counted, to try to resolve in the respondents' minds how they should report if they have seasonal residences and so forth. That is a source of duplication in some instances, and certainly of confusion.

Mr. DENT. Just a followup to that. How do you account for duplication? I'm in Pennsylvania, I have a lot of folks who spend a good part of the year down south in Florida or South Carolina. How do

you account for people like that, just subtract for duplicates in general, beyond the seasonal residents in a given State?

Mr. KINCANNON. Well, in theory, we rely on trying to convey an understanding that respondents should report themselves where they usually live most of the time. Some people may divide their time exactly half and half, but that's rare, I think. Our success in communicating that concept to respondents is not always perfect, and it is confusing to them. So we are doing cognitive studies of the way we explain that intention, and we are conducting detailed tests in field circumstances to see if we can improve on the model in the way we communicate that.

We also examine duplication in the course of evaluating the coverage of the census. We did that in 2000, and we will do that in 2010. But after the fact, it is sometimes difficult to resolve issues of duplication. You can tell for sure there is a duplicate, but you cannot tell for sure which case was right. And a year or more after the census date, it is very difficult to followup constructively and ask people to say, where were you on this date?

Mr. DENT. And how do you account for people who may not be citizens of the United States, who may be here illegally or might be here on a visa legally? How do you account for those folks in the census?

Mr. KINCANNON. We don't deal with the question of legality or authorized presence in the United States. We count people who are resident here most of the time.

Mr. DENT. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. We will go to a second round of questions just to see if anybody has anything now they want to conclude with. And Ms. Cooper, I wanted to ask you a question about ACS.

Today, we are talking mostly about how the census is going to be done and how it will be improved and what it is for a tool. And I would like to ask a couple of questions about its use and the importance of this data being correct.

Really, we have two groups that benefit from the census in their planning; we look at business in our economy, local governments, and issues of infrastructure. And I wondered if you could talk about those two as stakeholders on the local level with our local governments, businesses, and our community plan.

Ms. COOPER. Absolutely. Thank you for that question.

I spent virtually all of my career before coming to government in 2001 in the private sector, and I can assure you that businesses certainly—which is where I spent my time—use this data for very important decisions. They use it to determine where to locate, where their best market would be, where to hire employees, and what sorts of products to produce. So it is very important that they have this data and have it on a timely basis. We have remembered certainly having to look back and using very old data in the past if we get to the middle part of the decade, and that is one of the most important advantages of ACS. So I am very hopeful that this will be helpful to companies as we go forward.

And I think it is also true, though I have less firsthand knowledge than you of State and local governments and how they can use this data for planning. And here, again, the importance of its coming every year rather than once a decade is crucial. There are

a couple of examples that I've heard about that I would like to share with you.

Fulton County, PA, which is a sparsely populated rural area—as you know, Mr. Dent—has used ACS data to develop employment and a training services system, a rural transportation system, and a help line for facilities to address health care and child care needs.

Another example is Springfield, MA. Community leaders and public safety officials have used it to develop youth violence prevention programs for teens.

Final example, Bronx County, NY. ACS data has been used to identify and develop intervention strategies for juvenile diabetes in special populations.

I think these are just three examples out of many, that are out there, and once State governments and local governments get used to this data, know about its availability, they will use it ever more, community-based organizations, transportation planners and so on. And I think that's the reason why we have had so much support, not only from the business community, the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Home Builders, Target Federated Department stores, but also from a number of other government and local government organizations, including the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Conference of State Legislators. There are a number of others.

So I see, going forward, this data being extremely useful for all stakeholders, many American businesses and State and local government, to better plan for their futures and make this economy even stronger than it is.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Director Kincannon, I have two questions for you. You spoke about the 1990 census, and I think one of the things that people identify in the 1990 census, when they speak of it critically, is the issue of high turnover in staff. And certainly your census success is impacted by the enumerators who are working on the project. What work are you doing as you are moving forward to look at the 2010? Because people generally believe in 2000 there was a much more stable team that actually performed the census. What are your planning processes, and what are you looking toward 2010 for stability in staff?

Mr. KINCANNON. Well, we certainly hope to continue a very important thing that was done in 2000. The Congress provided and approved differential pay rates that were meaningful in different areas of the country so that we could compete. We were even successful in recruiting very good staff in New York City because we had competitive wages to pay. That's a big factor. It's a simple principle, but it's very important, and we hope to continue that.

I would not at all underestimate the significance of having a short-form-only census. That means our job of training is far simpler, and the rigors of doing the job are far less difficult than trying to followup on the long form. And I think those factors alone will reduce turnover in 2010.

Mr. TURNER. Director, Mrs. Maloney spoke of the 2010 Advisory Group as opposed to the Decennial Advisory Group. And I am not really familiar with the differences there, so perhaps you could give

us some comments on why you've made this move, the differences and what you hope to accomplish.

Mr. KINCANNON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do that.

The Decennial Census Advisory Committee was chartered quite a number of years ago, before the 2000 census. It originally had 25 members; membership grew over a period of time to about 40, I think. It was a large group, where it was sometimes difficult to have an effective collective discussion. A number of members—and the members of that committee are organizations, not individuals. The organization then sends a representative. Some organizations were not faithful in their attendance sometimes not coming at all and sometimes not sending a consistent person, which is, I'm afraid, a very important part of the ingredient.

After the 2000 census, it was decided to continue that committee because we had something quite marvel going on in the preparation for the ACS. And I think that was a correct decision at the time. My desire, now, was to have a streamlined committee with 20 members of people who are going to attend and participate constructively, perhaps to get some different groups involved in the process and also to make clear that this was to focus on the 2010 census. I think it is useful to draw a line around a particular census and focus attention on that and have some concentrated attention in that way.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Turner.

You raised the issue of a term appointment for the Census Bureau Director, and I have championed this position since before the 2000 census. The director made the point that there is an advantage to having a director that is trusted by the administration—whomever the administration is—and that is just the point of my bill. The Census Bureau director should be first committed to the professional responsibilities of the office and, second, to the political agenda of an administration. If by some decision the majority decides to pass my bill, I really want to underscore that it must be done in a way that there is no partisan advantage attached, and I just wanted to clarify my position on that.

I would like to ask the director, what information would be available to the public about error in the census measured for small geographic areas like census tracks or counties? Will you make that information available in 2006 and 2008?

Mr. KINCANNON. Well, Congresswoman, we expect that we will have a detailed plan developed after the report from the National Academy of Sciences in the summer of 2006. I don't know whether we will produce error rates by tract or by county. It may depend more on the population size of an area than on a particular boundary. But it is premature for us to say what we can do until we have received this recommendation. We are committed and attempt to carry out a program of evaluation of coverage at a level where it can be useful to us and to the public.

Mrs. MALONEY. The Census Bureau director has repeatedly said that it will measure and report errors of omission and of duplication in the 2010 census. However, when the Census Bureau dis-

cusses how it will evaluate the 2010 census, it says it will be evaluated based on net error. And as you know, net error allows people of substantial means who are counted twice—because of the reasons cited earlier, living in two places—to substitute for the poor and disenfranchised who are missed in the census. And why are you willing to count those errors but not be evaluated on the basis of your ability to avoid them? In other words, I think you should let us see the information on double counts and omissions so that we can evaluate better and maybe come up with better solutions on how to get better counts as opposed to a net count.

Mr. KINCANNON. I believe that we have committed a good effort to measure gross errors as well as net errors in 2010. In 2000, the survey, the program, both of sampling and modeling, was designed to measure net error. That is what we had always focused on. There was a view that there had probably been duplicates in the past, but we did not have a measure of the degree of duplication as robust as we had in 2000. And so we see that the efforts, the well intentioned certainly, efforts to improve the coverage of the census may have resulted in duplications. It is also a product of different living patterns and that sort of thing.

But our commitment is that we intend to have an evaluation process that focuses on both net and gross error.

Mrs. MALONEY. Good. And that will be made available to the committee to process?

Mr. KINCANNON. Yes, when we have that, yes.

Mrs. MALONEY. That's great. And what will be done in the 2006 census test to determine the errors of omission and duplication, and how will those errors be reported to the public? Will you just issue a report to Congress? Are you going to issue a public report? How are you going to report this?

Mr. KINCANNON. It will be a part of our evaluation program. It would not be necessarily the model that we would follow in 2010 because we would not have the benefit of the academy's report and our own final decisions on that, but there will be evaluations of aspect of coverage, and those will be reported publicly.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, my time is up, and I thank the chairman. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Dent, any further questions?

Mr. DENT. Just one last question.

Mr. Kincannon, what is the status of the plans to use handheld computers to conduct your field surveys for field interviewing work in the 2010 census?

Mr. KINCANNON. Mr. Dent, we tested this in the test censuses in Queens and southwest Georgia in 2004. This was the model that was used, it would not be the model that's used ultimately. But we did learn that we could hire and train enumerators to use this device in finding their assignments, in taking down answers and in relaying those electronically for data processing. So that was a very important step forward, and we want to make sure of the degree to which we can automate functions. Even automating only those functions would be an improvement in efficiency, cost savings and, in every way, a step forward. And to the extent we can carry it forward to other processes, we want to do that as well. We will test

that again in 2006, and then we will settle on what we are going to do and rehearse that in 2008.

Mr. DENT. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. I want to thank both of you for your testimony and your comments today and would ask if there is anything else that you would like to add to your comments or in response to your comments today?

Ms. COOPER. No, thank you.

Mr. KINCANNON. No, thank you.

Mr. TURNER. In that case, we will thank you both.

And we will turn to our second panel, which will include Ms. Joan Naymark, director of research and planning, Target Corp., testifying on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Andrew Reamer, deputy director, urban markets initiative, Brookings Institution; Ms. Jacqueline Byers, director of research, National Association of Counties.

As you are taking your seats, I will acknowledge that, as with our first panel, that you each have provided written testimony that will be included in the record of this hearing. Witnesses will notice that there are lights on the table that are timers. The green light indicates that you should begin your prepared remarks, and the red light indicates that your time has expired. It is the policy of this committee, as I stated previously, for our witnesses to be sworn in before they testify. And if you are all situated, if you would please rise and raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. TURNER. Please let the record show that all witnesses have responded in the affirmative.

And we will begin with Ms. Naymark.

STATEMENTS OF JOAN NAYMARK, DIRECTOR, RESEARCH AND PLANNING, TARGET CORP., TESTIFYING ON BEHALF OF THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; ANDREW REAMER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, URBAN MARKETS INITIATIVE, BROOKINGS INSTITUTION; AND JACQUELINE BYERS, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

STATEMENT OF JOAN NAYMARK

Ms. NAYMARK. Chairman Turner, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Dent, I am happy to be here today. I am Joan Gentili Naymark, director of research and planning for Target Corp., the Nation's second largest general merchandise retailer.

On behalf of Target, I represent the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation. I represent the Chamber on the Decennial Census Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce. I am motivated by a desire to support the most accurate census ever in 2010. I believe that partnerships with the business community will help support that goal.

I will address three points: first, why business cares; second, to reiterate our continued support; and, third, to stress that an accurate master address list is critical for the 2010 short-form-only census, as are strong partnerships and the American Community Survey.

First, why does business care? The business community and all other data users across the Nation need an accurate 2010 census, an annual American Community Survey [ACS], long-form data for planning, operational, and financial purposes that together strengthen the American economy and benefit the Nation as a whole. Data users need high-quality data comparable over time for small areas below the county and city level.

Let me share some examples from my company.

Target Corp. uses census data to determine capital spending on new stores and remodeling, make decisions about merchandise, marketing, and advertising, plan our work force, and support our community giving program. Our new store-site decisions are made for over 20 years. Each store costs nearly 20 million to construct, and sometimes much more than that, and creates 200 to 500 jobs. A wrong decision is not easily corrected. Building in the right location brings jobs, goods and services, and economic stability to local communities. Smaller stores, restaurants, and services follow us and depend on our research to be right.

Business must understand local communities. In Queens and urban Chicago, data on housing stock and living patterns inform our store-planning decisions such as the size and number of fitting rooms and parking spaces and the demand for megapacks of paper towels, bicycles, or patio furniture. Accurate race and ethnicity data identify opportunities for multicultural and bilingual signing. These decisions affect not only our bottom line, but are the economic anchor of most communities. Wrong decisions based on faulty data could lead to bad financial decisions or perceived lack of respect for the local area. Business failures hurt entire communities.

Socioeconomic data previously collected on the census long form now depend on the ACS. These data are critical to estimate market potential and consumer demand. We have high expectations for greater insight and efficiency from ACS data, but without an accurate decennial foundation, the benchmarks, estimates and data quality are at risk.

Second, I want to assure you that the business community will continue to support enumeration activities. Target ran a census notice in our weekly newspaper circular, which you can take a look at after the hearing. We provided assistance, guides, and language in hard-to-enumerate areas. We set up kiosks in all of our stores across the country. And we printed census bags promoting the census message. We also provided information to our thousands of employees and nearly 100,000 school partners.

Such partnerships were key success factors for the 2000 census, helping achieve high mailback response rates, and breaking down barriers with the difficult-to-enumerate populations.

I urge your enthusiastic support of a 2010 partnership program that equals or exceeds the scope of the 2000 program. It must be broad-based, with meaningful two-way communication, and start early to be effective, especially with growing privacy concerns of Americans.

Last, the master address file is among the most important requirement for an accurate census because the enumeration is based on a housing unit model identifying where people live and then

counting who lives there. Housing duplicates and inaccurate digit maps appear to be problematic in 2000. And failure to accurately include multiple housing units, especially in cities, contributes to the undercount.

Economic and demographic trends and high housing transportation costs are leaning to interesting applications of housing; higher-density units are occurring at the edges and in urban areas; demographic surges are occurring with the baby boom and echo boom and new immigrants, and these will pose large issues for the 2010 count.

In closing, we urge Congress to support a successful 2010 census by committing the necessary support and funding for a comprehensive address file. Strong partnerships and a long-term commitment to the ACS will benefit our economic infrastructure and support efforts in both the public and private sectors to improve the quality of life for all Americans. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Naymark follows:]

Statement of

Joan Gentili Naymark
Director, Research and Planning
Target Corporation

before the
Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
Oversight Hearing

Committee on Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives

Hearing Topic: "Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census"
Tuesday April 19, 2005
Room 2154 Rayburn House Office Building

Thank you for the opportunity to be part of this hearing on "Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census." My name is Joan Gentili Naymark. I am Director of Research and Planning for Target Corporation, the nation's second largest general merchandise retailer. On behalf of Target, I represent the United States Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million organizations of every size, sector, and region, on the Census Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce since the 1990s. I participated in pre-2000 census planning, supported the 2000 enumeration, and have listened intently to the post-census evaluation discussions about what worked and what needs improvement. I am an active member of the Advisory Committee in the 2010 planning process. I come to you today offering a strong endorsement for an accurate 2010 Census. I am motivated by a deep desire to achieve the most accurate census ever in 2010, and I believe that partnerships with the business community, including Target, will support that goal.

My remarks will address three points.

1) First, why business cares. The business community needs an accurate 2010 short form Census and annual American Community Survey long form data for a multitude of planning, operational, and financial purposes. The census is an important part of our country's economic infrastructure. A poor enumeration would have adverse financial and operational consequences.
2) Second, to reiterate our continued support. Business and Industry actively supported and assisted with the 2000 census and will do so again for the 2010 census. Our partnership and support are important components of an accurate enumeration.
3) Third, to stress that the Master Address File is among the most important requirements for an accurate census. While each census depends on professional expertise, careful planning and research, broad-based partnerships, and commitment to timely funding and comprehensive support, the lack of a comprehensive, up-to-date address list would be a critical missing factor. For that reason, it deserves your special attention.

Now to address my first point:

1) Why does business care about an accurate census? Although my professional experience is in the retail sector, my views reflect those of the broader community of business and industry, including housing and mortgage banking, health care, communications, services, hospitality, transportation, marketing, and manufacturing.

Collectively, these sectors drive trillions of dollars in economic activity through capital investment, movement of goods, provision of goods and services, job and housing growth, and community development and stability.

Broadly speaking, I represent census data users within the business community. We need high quality data for small geographic areas in order to make strategically and financially sound decisions. We need data to be comparable over time and across geography, for small geographic units below the county and city level. Let me share some examples about why these data are important to businesses on a daily basis.

Tracking population and demographic trends allows wise business planning and investment decisions. Target Corporation uses census data to select locations for new stores, to determine capital spending on remodeling and infrastructure, to make decisions so that merchandise, marketing, and advertising match the neighborhoods in which the stores operate, to plan our work force, and to support community giving.

Target's new store site location decisions are made for the long-term -- 20+ years. Each store costs nearly $20 million to construct and creates more than 200 jobs. A wrong decision is not easily corrected. A store cannot be picked up and moved. Building in the right location with the proper level of investment for the long term brings jobs, goods and services, and economic stability to local communities. Smaller retail stores, restaurants, and services depend on the research of large retailers and developers, co-locating next to larger stores in shopping centers. Target's first store, located in Roseville, Minnesota,

opened in 1962, more than 40 years ago. This year, armed with high quality 2000 census data, we made the decision to tear down the original building and construct a new, larger Roseville store to serve our guests for another 20 years. Without the accuracy and depth of census data, that multi-million dollar decision would have been difficult, if not impossible. There are many local benefits of the Roseville new store decision, including hundreds employed at the store, Target's community giving, sales and property taxes paid, local school contributions, and thousands of guests served.

Evaluations of the 2000 census showed a lower net undercount than in 1990, which was the first census since scientific evaluations began to be less accurate than the census before it. The 1990 census also resulted in the highest differential undercount of racial and ethnic minorities ever recorded. The business sector realized immense benefit from the more accurate 2000 census. With careful analysis, we were able to make decisions to override plans based on the flawed 1990 census results. A high undercount appears as a smaller population in data tables, which results in fewer store openings -- an "opportunity cost" in economic terms. The difference between the high undercount of the 1990 census and the more accurate count of the 2000 census identified where investment opportunities had indeed been missed. We carefully evaluated urban neighborhood data to identify whether the change represented "real" population growth in the 1990s or if the numbers simply reflected a correction of the 1990 count. An important lessen to be learned from this historical tracking is that census accuracy matters most at smaller levels of geography – counties, cities, congressional districts, neighborhoods, and even the block level.

Accurate census counts, as well as data on race and ethnicity, household size and composition, age, and tenure are key for accurate estimates and projections throughout the decade. Target confidently opens stores in a wide range of settings – suburbs, urban areas, edge cities, and rural America. To serve all of these communities well, we must understand their differences to correctly tailor products and services to meet the needs of their residents. In Queens and urban Chicago, data on ethnicity, housing stock, home ownership, and household living patterns inform store planning decisions, including the size and number of fitting rooms, the number of parking spaces, and the demand for megapacks of papers towels or bicycles and patio furniture. Without reliable neighborhood level data, identifying which older neighborhoods are transitioning to young families is difficult. Our guests rightly expect that Target offers the right merchandise in the right quantities for their shopping experience. We can predict with confidence at which locations home décor and bedding plants will sell well, based on census data on the age and mix of the population and housing stock, including factors such as apartments or single family homes, owners or renters, seasonal or year-round housing, and family life-cycle stage. Each neighborhood has different wants and needs when it comes to fixing up their homes and gardens. Neighborhoods change and so must our stores and offerings.

Accurate census data on race and ethnicity identify opportunities for multi-cultural merchandise and bilingual signing in areas with large and growing Latino and Asian

populations. A wrong decision based on faulty data could lead to bad financial decisions or perceived lack of respect for the local area, offending guests.

Socioeconomic data collected from the long form in prior censuses will now be dependent on the American Community Survey (ACS). These data are critical for business planning for market potential and consumer segments based on household income, education, occupation, and home value. The annual collection of accurate small area socioeconomic and demographic data through the ACS is an innovation of the highest order with immense promise. The entire business community has high expectations for greater insight and efficiency from the ACS data. However, without an accurate decennial census count as a foundation, ACS benchmarks and sampling estimates are at risk, with negative outcomes for ACS data quality.

2) **Business Community Support.** The second point of my remarks is to assure you that the business community has and will actively support accurate decennial census enumeration activities. Target Corporation joined other businesses and organizations to publicize the census in 2000. Target included a census advertisement in our weekly newspaper circular and worked with Local Census Offices to provide language assistance guides in stores located in hard-to-enumerate areas. Target printed notices in employee newsletters, reaching thousands of team members, and provided information on the Census in the Schools program to nearly 100,000 school partners.

Why does business support an accurate census? The census is the largest national peacetime activity and the foundation of our democratic system of governance. Private sector contributions help get it right.

A key success factor for the 2000 census was the Partnership Program. While partnerships existed in prior decades, the 2000 program had more depth and substance than before and resulted from careful planning through the 1990s. Partnerships with business, state and local governments, non-profits, community organizations, the media, schools, and others were part of the tool-kit of success. They effectively generated interest and knowledge in the census and supported the important Paid Advertising program. Strong partnerships helped achieve high early mail-back response rates, which are the most cost effective and accurate of all responses. Partner organizations helped break down barriers for traditionally difficult-to-enumerate populations. Familiar local organizations reached out in the community with the strong message, "Census participation is important. Do this for our community."

I urge your enthusiastic support of a 2010 Partnership Program that is equal to or exceeds the scope of the 2000 census partnership program. It must be broad-based with meaningful two-way communication, and it must start early in order to be effective. With growing privacy concerns by Americans, partnerships will play a critical role in breaking down barriers to participation by the general population, even among those who had no concerns in prior enumerations. The General Accounting Office reported in February 2002 that, while initial mail response rates in 2000 looked promising, public

cooperation (that is, the percent of occupied households that mailed back a questionnaire) actually declined slightly in 2000 from the 1990 rate. This means that a broad range of partnerships will be even more essential to ensuring an accurate census in 2010. The Census Bureau will benefit from listening to and seeking the advice of local partners, much as we at Target headquarters learn when we listen to our guests and the store leadership teams who live and work in the community. Local partners have important insight that will help the Census Bureau successfully enumerate every American.

3) 2010 Census operational and design issues. It is now 2005 -- a critical time for planning the 2010 Census. I speak from the perspective of a long-time member of the Decennial Census Advisory Committee. I have followed census research and development, planning, and preparations closely. This short form only census should enhance response rates, improve processing logistics, and create an easier environment in which to gain public participation. However, all components of a successful census require your highest level of support and funding during the crucial planning and preparation phases. A census that is not well planned and thoroughly tested will cost far more in terms of both money and accuracy down the road. Activities are now underway to rigorously test the questionnaire to ensure reliable, valid responses, to ensure an excellent field operation using technological innovations and efficiencies, and to secure pre-enumeration partnerships to create an atmosphere of trust.

Now, for my third point: While I am not an expert in all of the technical aspects of the census, I would like to specifically address the Address File, the under- and over-count,

and long form data collected in the American Community Survey as keys to an accurate count from the perspective of the business community.

The Address List. Census enumeration is based on a housing unit model. This model identifies where people live and then counts the people who live there. For this to occur, two things must hold. The address list must be comprehensive and accurate, and people must identify with a primary residence.

The Master Address File/TIGER improvements are a fundamental element of success for an accurate 2010 census. Housing duplicates and inaccurate digital maps (TIGER) appeared to be problematic in 2000, contributing to the substantial overcount. At the same time, failure to accurately include multiple-unit housing units, especially in cities, contributes to the undercount and remains a source of concern for 2010.

Identifying new housing developments and the correct number of units within a structure on Census Day have always been challenges for the talented Census Bureau professionals. America's housing stock grows in both traditional and non-traditional ways. Housing and transportation costs are soaring, leading to rapidly growing edge city developments and higher density urban/suburban housing. Zoning codes are accommodating changes for higher density and affordable housing, such as allowing housing units above commercial buildings and in high density mixed use developments.

Existing housing stock is also being used at higher density. With affordable worker housing increasingly scarce in many metro areas, some creative uses of existing housing are occurring. Single family homes are divided to accommodate multiple households at a single address. Some families live together in one home, including many new Americans who view this as transition housing. Collaborating with local governments and organizations is essential for the creation of a comprehensive, accurate address list which identifies all units. Governments, service providers, and community advocates have excellent local knowledge of new and alternative housing and living arrangements which should be leveraged to reduce the undercount.

Over-count and under-count. In addition to economic reasons for housing market changes, there are also demographic surges which will be challenges for the 2010 census. The largest generations of Americans -- the Baby Boom, the Echo Boom, and recently arrived Americans -- will pose special challenges for the 2010 census. The peak of the Baby Boom generation will have turned 50 years old by 2010. Some will be empty-nested, some will retire, others will be snowbirds with second residences. Which address is their census address? The leading edge of the Echo Boom will have graduated from high school in 2010. These young people will be in college or establishing their own independent households. Where will they be counted?

Double counting those with second residences and college students away from home are perennial issues for the Census count, but in 2010 there will be more of them than ever. The potential for a large undercount also exists, as the largest generation of new

Americans, those who arrived in the 1990s, may live in less traditional housing and household structures in a wider range of geographic locations. These families may be missed by traditional address lists or may have joint occupancy and not be as easily identified.

Long Form Data: Socioeconomic data collected on the new American Community Survey will be benchmarked to census and annual population estimates. The quality of the ACS data depends on the quality of the underlying 2010 Census. There is no viable alternative for the information collected in the census and the American Community Survey. The Census Bureau alone is positioned to ensure that we know as much about Wilmington, Ohio as we do about St. Louis, Missouri. A privately run organization could not replicate the conditions and infrastructure required to collect accurate, comparable data for neighborhoods of all sizes across the country. Congress must commit to the American Community Survey over the long term, with adequate sample size, field staff, and outreach efforts, to ensure accurate, comprehensive data throughout the decade. The benefit goes beyond more timely – and, therefore, more accurate – data at the community level; the Census Bureau can now focus its efforts in 2010 on the constitutional purpose of the census – to count and locate the population accurately as the basis for fair representation in our democracy.

In closing, we urge Congress to support a successful, accurate 2010 census by committing the necessary support and funding, now and in the remaining years leading up to the count. It will benefit our economic infrastructure and support efforts in both the public

and private sectors, working in partnership, to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Thank you. I would be happy to answer any questions from members of the subcommittee.

Mr. TURNER. Dr. Reamer.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW REAMER

Mr. REAMER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dent, Mrs. Maloney. I'm Andrew Reamer, deputy director of the urban markets initiative of the Brookings Institution, and I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on the components of a successful decennial census, and will focus my remarks on the role of the American Community Survey.

By way of background, UMI's mission is to stimulate greater public and private investment in urban communities through improving the availability, the accessibility, and the accuracy of data on these communities. Better data will lead to better understanding of investment opportunities and more effective investment decisions.

From UMI's perspective, we believe that the ACS is a highly essential and necessary data set. More than any other data set collected by the Federal Government, the ACS will enable investors to obtain a complete current understanding of detailed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the Nation's metropolitan areas, central cities, and, as of 2010, its neighborhoods.

With the availability of the ACS, we expect to see businesses and entrepreneurs use data to identify untapped market opportunities and better understand the size and the nature of the labor force available to staff those new and expanded businesses. We expect to see local governments, metropolitan planning councils, and community organizations use ACS data to determine the need for and impacts of programs in transportation, health, education, work force development, community, and economic development, and in many other realms. We expect to see a multitude of Federal agencies use the ACS to determine the geographic allocation of billions of dollars' of Federal programs and services in similar realms.

Historically, public and private investors in urban areas have relied on detailed data derived from the decennial long form. For instance, as an economic development consultant in 1993, I used long-form data to identify the need for a Hispanic supermarket in a commercial district in Boston. My client and the city of Boston read the feasibility study, rounded up partners and capital, quit his job, and started a highly successful new venture. Two months ago, America's Food Basket opened up its third store, a 21,000 square foot facility, and is planning a fourth. Such is the long-term impact of good data.

However, I picked a good year to do the feasibility study, just a few months after the census data were released. In most years, the available long-form data are out of date. In fact, the once-a-decade release of long-form data has meant the Nation's investors almost always suffer from a lack of reliable detailed neighborhood data on which to base decisions and measure results. Consequently, hundreds of billions of dollars of public and private investment decisions are made in a state of statistical uncertainty.

The ACS addresses these concerns head on. By being collected continuously and published annually and quickly, the ACS will provide urban investors with far more current data on which to base decisions. For regional analysts, the preliminary version of the ACS

has well proved its worth. In the last 4 years I have created a set of annual indicators on the characteristics of working poor families by State, and this would not have been possible without the ACS.

So, in summary, UMI believes a full-scale implementation of the ACS will provide economic benefits to the Nation many times the cost to the Federal Government. At the same time, we recognize that there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed. I lay out these challenges in my written testimony, and I will summarize them in the form of three recommendations.

The first, echoing Mrs. Maloney, is that the ACS budget program must be allocated budgets that are stable and sufficient from year to year.

The second recommendation is that the Census Bureau should manage an ongoing rigorous effort to evaluate the reliability of the ACS and implement methodological changes as necessary. I want to particularly emphasize a look at the reliability of the intercensal population counts on which the numbers and the ACS rely. Those are the control figures that the ACS uses.

The third recommendation is that the Census Bureau build a strong and ongoing partnership with States and local governments in three dimensions. The first is, as others have said, updating the master address file not just once a decade but, ideally, on an ongoing basis. The second dimension would be encouraging working with States and local governments, as census did in 2000, to promote public participation in the ACS. And the third is to provide guidance to State and local analysts regarding effective uses of the ACS. The ACL will be coming out in forms that are a little unfamiliar to people who have used long-form data, and so the census guidance on this will be helpful to analysts in State and local government, as well as in the private sector.

On behalf of UMI and the Brookings Institution, I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide observations on the value and the challenges facing the ACS, and I am pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Reamer follows:]

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
URBAN MARKETS INITIATIVE
METROPOLITAN POLICY PROGRAM
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036-2188
Tel: 202-797-6131 Fax: 202-797-2965
www.brookings.edu/metro

Andrew Reamer
Deputy Director, Urban Markets Initiative, The Brookings Institution
Testimony before the House Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
"Halfway to the 2010 Census: The Countdown and Components to a Successful Decennial Census"
April 19, 2005

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, good morning. I am Andrew Reamer, Deputy Director of the Urban Markets Initiative (UMI) in the Metropolitan Policy Program of the Brookings Institution. I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee on the topic of the components to a successful Decennial Census. I will focus my remarks on the importance of the full and successful implementation of the American Community Survey (ACS) and the challenges faced in achieving such implementation.

By way of background, UMI is funded by Living Cities, a partnership of foundations, financial institutions, nonprofit organizations, and federal agencies that have committed $500 million in this decade to improving the vitality of America's cities and urban communities. UMI's mission is to stimulate greater private and public investment in urban communities through improving the demographic, social, and economic data available on these communities. Accurate, accessible data leads to better understanding of investment opportunities and needs, which in turns leads to greater and more effective investments. The full power of the marketplace is unleashed as a result, and urban communities become more connected to the economic mainstream.

From this perspective, UMI believes that the ACS is a ***highly essential and necessary dataset***. Far more than any other single dataset collected by the federal government, the fully implemented ACS will enable private and public investors to obtain a complete, up-to-date understanding of highly detailed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the nation's metropolitan areas, central cities and other places, and, as of 2010, city neighborhoods and rural areas. This availability of ACS data will lead to more appropriate and effective private and public sector investments:

- We expect to see businesses and entrepreneurs use ACS data (such as age, income, race and ethnicity, language, and housing costs) to identify untapped market opportunities.
- We expect to see businesses and entrepreneurs use ACS data (such as occupation, industry, and educational attainment) to better understand the size and nature of the available labor force.
- We expect to see local governments, metropolitan planning councils, and community-based organizations use ACS data (such as housing, journey-to-work, immigration status, geographic mobility, and those previously mentioned) to help determine the need for, the design of, and the impacts of programs in realms such as transportation, health, education, workforce development, community and economic development, housing, and social services.
- We expect to see community colleges use ACS data (such as age, school enrollment, and occupation) to better target potential students.
- And we expect to see a multitude of federal agencies use the ACS to determine the geographic allocation of billions of dollars for programs and services in education, housing and community development, health-care, elderly services, job training, and others. In fact, every question in the ACS is tied to use by a federal agency.

Historically, public and private investors in urban areas have relied on detailed data derived from the Decennial Census "long form," received by one in six American households. For instance, as an economic development consultant in 1993, I used "long form" data to identify the need for a new Hispanic supermarket in Boston's Upham's Corner commercial district. My client in the City of Boston read the feasibility study, rounded up partners and capital, quit his job, and started a highly successful new venture. Two months ago, America's Food Basket opened up its third store, a 21,000 square foot facility, and is planning a fourth. Such is the long-term economic impact of good data.

However, I picked a good year for the initial feasibility study, just a few months after the Census data's release; in most years, the available "long form" data are out of date. In fact, the once-a-decade release of "long form" data has meant that the nation's public and private investors almost always suffer from a lack of reliable detailed neighborhood data on which to base decisions and measures results. As a result, hundreds of billions of dollars of private and public investment decisions are made in a state of statistical uncertainty. That uncertainty leads investors to hesitate, to

say no when they should say yes, or vice versa, and to fail to make necessary adjustments as circumstances change. America loses wealth and jobs as a result.

The ACS addresses these concerns, head on. By being collected continuously and published annually and quickly (in the succeeding calendar year), the ACS will provide urban investors with far more current data on which to base decisions. These data will not be perfect, nor will they be perfectly up-to-date. While the ACS is based on a very large annual sample, 3 million households, this is a fifth the size of the "long form" sample. Data for metropolitan areas will be most reliable; data for areas of under 20,000 (such as census tracts) will be annually published as five-year rolling averages. Even so, compared to "long form" data that can be as much as twelve years old, the timely release of a five-year rolling average represents a vast improvement.

For regional analysts, the ACS has already well proved its worth. Since 2000, the Census Bureau has been carrying out the ACS on a "quarter-size" basis (750,000 households annually), which allows for the publication of data for areas of 250,000 or more. Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program, which used Census 2000 to produce a series of authoritative data guides to 23 of the nation's largest cities, regularly relies on the ACS in its metro area analyses. For four years, I have used the ACS to prepare an annual series of indicators that measures the presence and characteristics of America's low-income working families, by state. These indicators are used to frame discussions of state workforce, education, and economic development policies and programs, and would not have been possible without the ACS.[1]

UMI strongly believes that the full-scale implementation of the ACS will provide economic benefits to the nation many multiples of the cost to the federal government. We highly commend the Census Bureau's leadership and staff for their recognition of the nation's need for better data and for their commitment, technical creativity, and hard work in moving the ACS from concept to reality. And we highly commend Congress, the President, and the Office of Management and Budget for their strong support for the development and implementation of the ACS.

[1] These indicators are produced for the Working Poor Families Project. For examples of ACS-based state-level indicators, see the Project's recent national report, "Working Hard, Falling Short: America's Working Families and the Pursuit of Economic Security," available at http://www.aecf.org/initiatives/fes/workingpoor/workingpoor/working_hard_new.pdf.

At the same time, UMI recognizes that for ACS implementation to be a success, the federal government must address a number of challenges. First, the ACS program must be allocated budgets that are sufficient and stable from year to year. Without such budgets, the ability of the Census Bureau to produce accurate data, for small areas in particular, will be compromised; moreover, the public's return on the millions of federal dollars invested to date will be jeopardized. Consequently, UMI strongly urges that the President's annual budget request funding for the full-scale implementation of the ACS, and that Congress annually approve such a budget.

Second, the design, collection, and analysis of the ACS pose a number of demanding methodological challenges. These include developing a survey that is clear to respondents and meets the needs of a diverse array of users; maintaining a comprehensive, current nationwide address list from which to draw the sample; developing accurate intercensal population totals with which to weight the sample in states and localities; and publishing the data in ways most valuable to analysts. UMI believes that Congress and OMB should encourage and support the Census Bureau in creating a rigorous, ongoing effort to evaluate the reliability and usefulness of the ACS and, in light of findings, to determine and implement appropriate methodological changes.

In particular, UMI strongly believes that Congress should support and encourage the Census Bureau to maintain a comprehensive, accurate Master Address File (MAF)—the value and reliability of the ACS depends on such a MAF. For Census 2000, the Census Bureau created the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) program through which localities could work to improve MAF accuracy. While LUCA experienced implementation problems, it clearly had an impact. Local governments representing two-thirds of the households in the MAF participated in LUCA; 2.1 million new addresses were added to the MAF, adding 3.6 percent new addresses to the total. LUCA showed that the MAF is particularly problematic in areas with much new construction and those with many older multi-unit buildings. For instance, fast-growing Delaware County, Ohio used LUCA to increase its Census address list by 39 percent. In a concerted multi-year effort involving 15 staff, New York City was able to add 370,000 addresses. One impact of greater population due to a more accurate address list is an adjusted inflow of federal funds. Monroe County (Rochester), New York estimates that "finding" 13,400 addresses resulted in an additional $29.5 million funds in annual federal aid.

At present, the timing of LUCA is linked to the Decennial Census. UMI believes that Congress should fund and the Census Bureau should implement a LUCA process that matches the continuous nature of the ACS. Not doing so increases the potential for problems with intercensal population

counts and sampling frames. Moreover, a continuously updated address list will improve the count of the population for the 2010 census. The Census Bureau developed LUCA in response to the Census Address Improvement List Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-430); Congress should consider providing guidance to the Bureau through revising the underlying law.

The third set of challenges facing the ACS are institutional in nature. One challenge involves addressing citizens' privacy concerns. In the past, a number of "long form" recipients have declined to respond on grounds that the questions were invasive, despite laws requiring participation and providing stiff penalties to any Census staff who violate confidentiality. Low initial response rates greatly increase the cost and jeopardize the reliability of the survey. For Census 2000, the Census Bureau created partnerships with state and local governments and nonprofits to communicate the reasons for participating in the Census, including obligation, trust, and the incentive of benefits to the community (such as greater federal funds). For the ACS to be a success, UMI believes that the Census Bureau needs to create a similar type of partnership program, one appropriate to the continuing nature of the ACS.

Another institutional challenge concerns the limited ability of many local governments to participate in LUCA due to lack of resources and capacity. If a local government does not participate in LUCA, the likelihood of inaccuracies in the local count increases significantly. Therefore, UMI strongly encourages the Census Bureau to create a LUCA program that operates as a mutually beneficial partnership with state and local governments. UMI agrees with the findings of the National Research Working Group on LUCA that such a partnership should have two dimensions. Census should provide local governments with necessary training and guidance on the development of local resources for address updating, and it should encourage coordination among state, regional, and local governments in the LUCA process. Evidence strongly suggests that LUCA participation is greatly enhanced when a smaller local government (such as a town) can work with a larger one (such as a county or state).[2]

For solid methodological reasons, ACS data will be published in formats quite different than "long form" data (and most all federal data). These changes pose a challenge to private and public sector data analysts. For one, each ACS data element will be published, not as a point estimate (that is, as one number), but rather as a 90-percent confidence interval, with a lower bound, upper bound, and

mid-point. (The confidence interval offers 90 percent certainty that the true number falls between the lower and upper bounds). In addition, for areas under 65,000, ACS data will be published as three- or five-year averages. A large number of analysts will need substantial assistance in understanding how to appropriately use these types of statistics. UMI strongly encourages the Census Bureau to actively provide the necessary guidance. Building the capacity of data users will increase the likelihood that ACS data will be used properly and effectively, to the nation's economic benefit.

On behalf of UMI and the Brookings Institution, I thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity to provide observations on the value and challenges of the ACS. The potential economic benefits of a fully and well implemented ACS are substantial. I very much hope that you find my perceptions and recommendations useful in helping the ACS reach that potential. I am pleased to answer any questions you might have.

[2] The Working Group on LUCA produced "Assessment of the 2000 Census LUCA Program," prepared for the Committee on National Statistics and published by the National Research Council in September 2001.

Mr. TURNER. Ms. Byers.

STATEMENT OF JACQUELINE BYERS

Ms. BYERS. Chairman Turner, Mrs. Maloney, and Mr. Dent, my name is Jacqueline Byers, and I am the director of research at the National Association of Counties. Thank you for the invitation to testify on the importance of the census to county governments.

As old line Census Bureau folks say, the 2010 census will be my fourth census, and I am pleased to share with you what I have learned about its use by county officials throughout the Nation.

Every county in the country uses census data every day. It is the only controlled and reliable population baseline and demographic data available on a national basis. This data is used to plan classrooms, curriculum, and the number of teachers. It is used to attract businesses and economic development, to determine how long it takes for residents to get to their jobs, where they are going to work, and how much money they make. All of this information is necessary for a county to plan effectively for the future.

In addition, census data is used to allocate the Federal funds that most local governments receive. Since county governments are the level of government closest to the people and are charged with direct-service delivery in many areas, it is vitally important that the data used to allocate Federal funds that help fund this service delivery system is current and correct.

There are three points I would like to make today. The first is NACo's continuing support of the American Community Survey. We would like to express our thanks to Congress for seeing that this vital program was properly funded in the current budget. The American Community Survey will provide the most current demographic data possible to all counties. The biggest task involved in the complete implementation of ACS is education and outreach. This means educating the public so that they will respond to this new kind of survey and educating local officials so that they know of its availability and value.

The second point is the importance of the master address file and TIGER programs. Capturing the new address and map information is a continuous process, not one that can be completed in the 18 months prior to census day. With the expansion of the ACS, the continuing update and resulting improved accuracy is more important than ever.

The third point I would like to speak to is the 2010 short-form census. NACo has supported the ACS because it provides much more current demographic data about counties throughout the decade, and because it created the possibility of an all short-form census. However, it is important to realize that outreach and education about why you should respond to the census is still just as vital as it was for the 2000 census when historic outreach efforts were conducted. The partnership activities and the mobilization of stakeholder organizations that was accomplished for 2000 need to be replicated for 2010, because the very people who are often missed in the census are the most likely to require additional governmental services. Funding and support for the partnership activities including involvement of stakeholder groups, schools, local,

State, and national level organizations, continue to be a necessary part of preparing for the 2010 census.

We strongly urge that the Census Bureau receives the appropriate allocations so they can do what they do best.

This concludes my testimony. I look forward to any questions that you may have.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Byers follows:]

STATEMENT OF

JACQUELINE J. BYERS

DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS

ON BEHALF OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

April 19, 2005
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Chairman Turner, Ranking Member Clay, and members of the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census.

My name is Jacqueline Byers. I am the Director of Research at the National Association of Counties. The National Association of Counties is the only national organization that represents county governments in the United States. From its headquarters on Capitol Hill, NACo is a full service organization that provides legislative advocacy, research, financial products and services, and technical assistance to member counties across the country.

Thank you for the invitation to testify on the importance of the Census to county governments. As old line Census Bureau folks say, "the 2010 Census will be my fourth census" and I am pleased to share with you what I have learned about its use by county officials throughout the nation. I also want to express my appreciation for these hearings and the opportunity for stakeholders like NACo to express their opinion.

I am here today to talk about the importance of Census activities to county governments. These activities currently include the American Community Survey, the MAF/Tiger File preparation and the 2010 short form census plans.

Every county in the country uses census data everyday. It is the only controlled and reliable population baseline and demographic data available on a national basis. This data is used to plan school classrooms, curriculum and the number of teachers. It is used to construct roads, bridges, and major highways. It is used to attract businesses and economic development. It is used to plan programs for people with special needs, to develop daycare centers, to build libraries and stock them. It is used to determine the housing stock and value in each community and what is needed to address the growing population. It is used to determine how long it takes for residents to get to their jobs, where they are going to work and how much money they make. All of this information is necessary for a county to plan effectively for the future.

In addition to the local use of this information, use of it by federal entitlement programs and in allocation formulas for federal funds is equally important. Most local governments receive federal funds. In 2003, federal

grant funds and other direct payments to state and county governments equaled nearly $900 billion. Since county governments are the level of government closest to the people and are charged with direct service delivery in many areas, it is vitally important that data that is used to allocate federal funds that help fund this service delivery system is current and correct.

There are three points I would like to make today.

The first is NACo's continuing support of the American Community Survey. We would like to express our thanks to Congress for seeing that this vital program was properly funded in the current budget. The American Community Survey will provide the most current demographic data possible to all counties. This data will be much more current than the previous census data, which by the end of each decade was sorely outdated, but in some cases, still the best information around. The demographics of our counties are changing constantly. In order to find out who we are and what we are becoming and to plan for these changes, nothing the government has ever produced will work as well as the ACS data. The biggest task involved in the complete implementation of the ACS is education and outreach. This means educating the public so that they will respond to this new kind of survey, and educating local officials so that they know of its availability and value.

One activity that the Census Bureau takes seriously is outreach. The recently published handbook for State and Local Officials on the ACS does an excellent job of presenting the how, why and when of this new survey. It also explains why each question is asked, citing either federal legislation, administrative regulation or court decision. I clearly remember being asked to brief congressional staff during the last census because they were receiving so many inquiries about the reasons for including certain questions on the 2000 Census. An early educational process and outreach should improve awareness.

The second point is the importance of the Master Address File and Tiger programs. The only way any of these census programs can work is to have good, clear geographic information. As a former member of the Decennial Census Advisory Committee I frequently voiced how important it is to constantly update the MAF. As counties across the nation experienced phenomenal growth during the 1990s that has continued into this decade,

capturing the new address and map information is a continuous process, not one that can be completed in the 18 months prior to census day. As TIGER has been developed, it has become a vital tool to connect individual addresses to geographic entities such as roads, rivers and legal boundaries. Continuous support and funding of both of these programs throughout the decades between censuses is important in order to maintain accurate files. With the expansion of the ACS the continuing update and resulting improved accuracy is more important than ever.

The third point I would like to speak to is the 2010 short form census. NACo has supported the ACS not only because it provides much more current demographic data about counties throughout the decade, but also because it created the possibility of an all short form census. As you know, in the past, approximately 16 percent of all households, or about 1 out of 7, received the long form census. One of the difficulties in getting these forms returned was the length of the form and the information requested. By no longer having the long form that excuse for non-response no longer exists.

However, it is important to realize that outreach and education about the why you should respond to the census is still just as vital as it was for the 2000 census when historic outreach efforts were conducted. As the demographics of our nation are changing, educating the newcomers, and some naysayers too, about why response is necessary will be just as important in 2010 as it has been in the past. The partnership activities and the mobilization of stakeholder organizations that was accomplished for 2000 need to be replicated for 2010. Even though excellent progress was made in getting to the hard to count populations in 2000, more needs to be done. The very people who are often missed in a census are the most likely to require services from county governments. People who need additional education, additional affordable housing, additional healthcare and other social services are likely to fail to respond. Some of these hard to count people are new to this country and come from environments where you do not fill out personal information about yourself and send it back to the government. Partnerships with the people who are gatekeepers to these communities and can reach out to the hard to count and the undercounted will go a long way to creating the confidence people need to complete their census forms. Funding and support for the partnership activities, including involvement of stakeholder groups, schools and local, state and national level organizations, continue to be a necessary part of preparing for the 2010 census. NACo recognizes that no other organization in the United States can

do the massive job of counting our people and finding out where they live and who they are. We strongly urge that the Census Bureau receives the appropriate allocations so that they can do what they do best.

That concludes my testimony. I thank you for the opportunity to discuss this important issue and look forward to any questions that you and other members of the committee may have.

Mr. TURNER. I thank each of you for participating today and for the information that you bring to us on the important work of the census.

I have a two-part question for you that I am going to direct to Ms. Byers and Ms. Naymark. And then, Dr. Reamer, I would like your comments when they are finished.

The two parts of the questions are, if you could talk about information from the ACS that you see that is most helpful from your perspectives, both business and then government, and if you have thoughts of what we are missing? What would be helpful that we are not currently addressing in information that we are looking toward?

And then, Dr. Reamer, I would appreciate your thoughts globally on the matter.

Ms. Naymark.

Ms. NAYMARK. What information is the most important, and what are we missing on the American Communities Survey?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, please.

Ms. NAYMARK. The private sector makes extensive use of the demographic and economic data that's available for planning purposes. We do that along with all the public and nonprofit sectors as well.

The most important information from the American Communities Survey is not necessarily a particular item or any item that's missing, but at the geographic level at which it's available. We are still in that data void until 2010 when we will be able to get the census track level information. And we are very eagerly looking forward to the point after 2010 when we will start to receive the information on an annual basis. Population estimates, short-form characteristics, age, sex, race, relationship to household head, housing stock are critically important for us. Long-form data items are critically important for us, but I would say that they rank third in priority to the annual estimates of population and short-form information. The market information on income, education, transportation, length of residence are taken in combination in a wholistic approach, depending on the application that we are interested in, but it's the getting of the information at a small level that we can aggregate to trade areas or tracks, market areas that are critically important for us. And we are grateful to have all of the information that is available in there.

I would not suggest to add anything at this point. I am just delighted that it is all on there and will be available annually. Thank you.

Mr. TURNER. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. I think the information that the counties receive about who we are and what we are becoming—and that is our basic demographic information about age, race, education, economics—is very helpful, because we have seen a huge influx of immigrants. We have seen a lot of in-migration and out-migration of people from various communities for various reasons, some for lack of economic development, some pursuing economic development and an opportunity for employment.

If there's anything that we would ask for, it would be additional information about housing. There is quite a bit of information

about housing, but housing is starting to become a very big issue, especially affordable housing, for counties across the Nation. So anything that could help us with that and help us fulfill our roles in providing housing for our residents would be very helpful to us.

Mr. TURNER. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. I think the most important figure is actually the total number of people. And beyond that, the combination of demographic characteristics of age, sex, race, with socioeconomic characteristics, income, educational attainment, I think, are the most used, certainly in investment decisions. Planners use the data about how people get to work, which is very important as well. And in terms of data that might be additionally useful, one source would be the ACS, which is now going to be carried out in parallel with the current population survey, which is the survey that the Bureau of Labor Statistics uses to measure unemployment every month. So I would be interested in knowing more about how the two surveys will be run in parallel and could support each other. I don't know much about that, so I am just posing that as information I would like to know about. And that might involve some adjustment in the ACS questionnaire. I don't know.

Mr. TURNER. When the first panel spoke of the partnership program for 2010—and you all have suggested that the partnership program was a key success factor in the 2000 census—in your opinion, how is the partnership program for 2010 developing, and how might each of your organizations participate or assist in that process?

Ms. Naymark.

Ms. NAYMARK. The partnership program in 2000 was a key success factor. I joined the Decennial Advisory Committee in the mid-nineties, and it was just getting kicked off, along with the other components of the 2000 plan. Its goals were clearly stated and differentiated from the other parts of the programs, such as paid advertising, and yet they all came together to support the core message. It was broad-based and inclusive. It reached out and welcomed all levels of government, for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. I think those were all key components of its success.

It's 2005, and the ACS is just underway, and we are delighted about that. But I think adding the ACS will add another level of complexity to the partnership program. It is a little bit early to start making actual plans. I am not aware at this point of what the partnership program will look like in my role on the advisory committee, in the old advisory committee. I am hoping to rejoin that committee. But I think that it will become a high priority over the next couple of years to develop that plan, the integration, with outreach to the local level for American Community Survey once the program is in that particular community, and I think partnerships will play an even more critical role to break down the barriers, bring out the count, and have local communities embrace what's happening.

In the context of working with the Bureau, I am wondering if the current restructuring of the Decennial Advisory Committee that's currently underway may alter some of the longstanding relationships with stakeholders. I will be interested to see how the outreach and continuity program with those prior members will con-

tinue. I think they were important stakeholders sitting at the table, understanding what was happening with the Bureau's plans, and it will be important to continue to have them be members for partners in 2010 as well.

Mr. REAMER. Brookings as an institution, and myself personally, were not involved in the Census 2000 Partnership Program, and we are not a membership organization, so we wouldn't be involved in the partnership program for the ACS in 2010. So I really can't comment.

Mr. TURNER. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. I think one of the biggest things that contributed to the success of the 2000 census was the outreach and the partnership program that was conducted. One of the things that we recognize—and I think many other people in this room recognize—that many of our newer residents in this country find it completely foreign to take a piece of paper and fill it out with a lot of information about themselves and then turn it in to the government. That is not the reality that they lived in in their former countries. So to be able to penetrate into these communities and get the gatekeepers to these communities, you have to involve the stakeholder groups, you have to involve the community-based organizations, you have to involve maybe the priest that is speaking in the church or the school teachers that are teaching in the schools. All of that partnership and outreach was done and achieved very successful results in 2000.

I have, as Ms. Naymark said, not heard anything at all about the partnership activities that are going to be conducted in 2010. I had the privilege of being invited to do a keynote speech at several kickoffs for big local government activities that were done in connection with the census prior to the 2000 census. And I was very pleased to see the mobilization, the local contribution of funds, the local efforts that were going on. All of this was led by activities that were initiated by the Census Bureau and their partnership coordinators, and I would think that kind of effort would necessarily have to be replicated for 2010.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I really want to thank all of you for your testimony and for your support for a successful census. But I would like to start with a question that I would like each of you to answer. As you know, the cost of the 2010 census is extremely high; $72 per household compared to $13 per household in 1970. And those are in real dollars. So I would like each of you to tell me how important each of the following measures are in evaluating the census. And I would like to start probably with Mrs. Naymark, since she started first, and just go down the line.

The first is the small area accuracy. How important do you see that as measuring and evaluating the census, the small area accuracy?

Ms. NAYMARK. I think small area accuracy is critically important. All of the larger numbers buildup from the smaller numbers. It must be consistent, unbiased information that can be trusted; can't have overestimates in some geographies and underestimates in an-

other. And I think to not provide adequate funding or support for accuracy at a small level would just create higher costs later on.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

Mr. Reamer. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. Highly important, because most retail and service businesses, their market areas are quite small. So to analyze the investment opportunities for those businesses, you need a high level of accuracy.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. Well, housing patterns are the things that are captured most correctly at the small-area level. And in order for counties to plan accurately and to capture all of the nuances of the changing population, it is absolutely important that the accuracy is maintained at the small area.

Mrs. MALONEY. Would each of you comment on the number of omissions and duplications for both population counts and for housing units? How important are they as measuring for evaluation and the census omissions and duplications for population counts and housing units?

Ms. NAYMARK. I am glad you are not asking me to choose between A or B, because these are critically important as well. If the housing units are not correctly counted, there are lots of new density and zoning changes to accommodate work force housing and gated communities; there are lots of different things happening in the American housing structure. You need to have that in order to achieve the accuracy level. I do think there tends to be a bias toward undercount in the urban areas where you may miss housing units and the people living within the areas. That leads to underinvestment, lots of issues. Overcounting in the fringe suburbs may lead to overinvestments and market saturation, which doesn't help anyone. There's lots of practical implications. So all of these are critical.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. I will echo those remarks and expand on them a bit by saying that, in urban areas, the undercount often happens around multiunit buildings where there is a miscount. And then in suburban areas and fast-growing areas, it is just difficult to keep up with the count. And so it is very important to keep evaluating the accuracy of these things and finding ways to lower the level of inaccuracy.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. The missing of or the omission of housing units is absolutely devastating to county governments. We find that it creates the biggest problem because the houses that are notoriously missed have high-density population, with many children. And as we are trying to staff schools, prepare classrooms, and hire teachers, you hear the horror stories of brand-new school buildings opening up with portables in the back yard already. That's the reality of missing kids. And largely this exists because of missing housing units. And that omission is glaring for counties.

Duplication is on the other end of the schematic. Generally, the duplication occurs in the wealthier areas, because everybody is very conscientious about reporting, and the husband and the wife

are both responding, and that sort of skews our data notoriously because it could raise our per-capita income and give a false reality about what the economic situation is in our communities.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Naymark, could you comment on the net error at the national level? How important is that, the net error at the national level, in evaluating the census?

Ms. NAYMARK. In business, you need to measure and audit your results. You need to understand in order to make the application. I think at the national level we need to know the overcount, the undercount. I think it's just critically important in order to have confidence in the data below the national level.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. Yes. It's a measure of the confidence we all can have in the census, I think. So it's important to track that and to try to rectify it if it's too high.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. They have said it all.

Mrs. MALONEY. I have several others, but my time is up. So I can continue later.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Dent.

Mr. DENT. No questions.

Mr. TURNER. Mrs. Maloney, if you would like to continue.

Mrs. MALONEY. OK. The national mailback rush rate, how important is that to the Chamber of Commerce?

Ms. NAYMARK. Again, I think it's one of those measurements of the implementation, the components of the census that require additional help; the higher and earlier the response rate, the less costly it will be. Partnerships would be an important member. Paid advertising, I think, was extremely successful last time in getting early back response rates.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. I agree.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. I had the opportunity to write a column for our county newspaper during the mail-back response period last year, and referred many of our counties to a Web site that was being maintained by census. And I actually challenged our counties to check that Web site frequently to find out how other counties were doing in their mailback response, trying to set up some contests between our counties to encourage it. It is absolutely important. And I was very proud to see some of our counties actually responding to that challenge.

But to put it bluntly, it's absolutely the most important thing to get an awareness of the census is to have a good mailback response rate.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you very much. I would love to see your article.

Ms. Naymark, how important to business is the Black/non-Black undercount differential as measured by demographic analysis? Is that an important evaluating tool in the census?

Ms. NAYMARK. The differential undercount at the Black level? Extremely important. We missed opportunities after the 1990 census because of the differential undercount and then greater undercount in urban areas. We came back and evaluated after the

2000 county and realized there was more there than we thought. And we had to do a careful analysis between the two censuses to see if there had been growth between, or if it was simply an adjustment of a count.

Target is very active in our urban corridors, and we need to have good information. The differential undercount leads us to make inaccurate decisions about merchandising and content and distance, etc. It needs to be corrected.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. Again, for urban investment decisions, it is very important.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. Well, for governmental service delivery, it's vitally important. I remember Maynard Jackson, when he was mayor of Atlanta, arguing that the undercount showed—hit him disproportionately. He knew he had about 39,000 more people, because he was feeding them, clothing them, and housing them every day. So it is very important, especially in our urbanized counties.

Mrs. MALONEY. You have a lot of experience from having been through four censuses. It's incredible.

And my final one that I would like the panel to evaluate for accuracy and evaluating the census is the use of new technology for nonresponse followup. How important was that, or is that, do you think?

Ms. NAYMARK. I don't have technical expertise. I am excited by the use of technology and innovation. I am delighted at what I see the Bureau doing. I think it would be important. I am a paper person. I get nervous about not having a record to go back and followup and check on. But I'm sure that there must be electronic ways of verifying the electronic records as well. I am just pleased with what I see them doing.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. Anything that will raise the productivity and lower the cost of the census I think is valuable, and it's exciting to see the experiments of new technology.

Mrs. MALONEY. Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. I had the opportunity to travel with the nonresponse enumerator in southeast Washington and do some housing. And it was amazing to watch this woman—who I would imagine had about a high school education—be able to work very effectively on this computer. And she was showing me exactly how to do things. She was very proud of it, and she would go into the places and sit down and pull it out and say, OK, we've got to put your information into the computer. So it worked very effectively for her. And it also, I think, maintained the level of accuracy that, if there was a paper copy, it might not have been there if she had been able to introduce more subjectivity into the situation.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you very much.

Ms. Naymark, I was thrilled with your presentation of all of the things that Target was doing to draw attention to the 2010 census. And this display of corporate, I would call citizenship or partnership, is something that this committee and Congress should be paying attention to. And what do you believe the Census Bureau should be doing in the 2010 census in order to get more corpora-

tions and independent businesses and so forth to be active in the 2010 census as Target was so active in 2000? You did a fantastic job, and I'm glad you brought all of the examples. But how can we get more businesses involved? How did Target get involved? How did it happen, and how can we make more people come in and help us with it?

Ms. NAYMARK. Thank you for your commendation. We are very proud at Target of being involved in our communities. We have been for decades. We give $2 million a week back to our communities. So supporting such an important civic activity as the decennial census was really a no-brainer for us. As with most things, personal involvement, my interest from my demography background was what drew me in. But I think my greatest surprise for the 2000 census was how extensive business support was and had been for prior censuses.

I think the Bureau understands how to reach out to business. I think working through business organizations, using what they did before, and certainly through government contacts with businesses were effective, will continue to be effective. Leverage the existing businesses.

I was surprised that I wasn't asked to do a little bit more outreach to business communities, but I also was surprised to see that they had a very strong program set up for specifically outreach to business. It wasn't necessarily coordinated. I don't know if that was really a good use of Census Bureau funds for the 2000 census. It clearly worked. We did our own thing. 7-Eleven did their own thing. Wal-Mart did their own thing. Businesses around the country all pitched in; they understood the importance of this. I don't know if it needs to be fixed. I think anything that can get business involved would be important.

Mrs. MALONEY. Did the Chamber of Commerce play a coordinating role in getting business involved?

Ms. NAYMARK. I worked with the Chamber, and I believe that they worked within their network across the country as well. But I primarily worked on behalf of Target at this point in time.

Mrs. MALONEY. My time is up, but I do have some more questions for another round.

Mr. TURNER. One of the things that I think is important for us to know is, are we on track for the 2010 census? We have talked about how the census works, the information that it provides, opportunities for ensuring that the count is correct. But I would like to ask each of you your opinion as to whether or not you think we're on track for the 2010 census—if you see any warning signs or anything currently that we need to be concerned with as to whether or not we will be successful.

Ms. Naymark.

Ms. NAYMARK. As I said a little earlier, I am delighted that the American Community Survey is out in the field. I think that needed to be addressed and concluded before many parts of the 2010 census could begin planning. And now I think we are officially at the point where we know what the short-form census will look like, we know what needs to be done.

There is a lot of good information and innovation from past discoveries; the reconstituted Decennial Advisory Committee will be

ready to be in working groups and understand what the plan will be to react from the user and stakeholder community. And I believe that we are on track.

I don't have specific knowledge; I can't say to you exactly what the plans are at this point, other than what the framework of what we heard this morning from the director. I don't have any reason for concern, but I do think it's time to pick up the pace and particularly understand how to integrate the American Community Survey data with the outreach and partnership program, with the data program, the accuracy, the estimates, etc.

Mr. TURNER. Dr. Reamer.

Mr. REAMER. At Brookings, our focus has been on the American Community Survey. And we are very pleased to see that's been fully implemented, went into full implementation as of January. We were disappointed to see that Congress wasn't able to allocate funds to do the full ACS and left out money for group quarters. So we are hopeful that—we would see the ACS as being fully on track if money were allocated, the full amount, in the next fiscal year.

We would like to see also some improvements made on the intercensal population counts because we think that will lead to a more accurate ACS. And, as mentioned earlier, I think a continuous update of the master address file would also be helpful as well. As I said, our focus has been on the ACS, so I'm not familiar with the details of the other components of the 2010 census so I can't comment on that.

Ms. BYERS. I think the biggest step in the right direction is to all short-form census for 2010, and I think that was the absolute correct move. ACS outreach and partnership efforts I think are absolutely important, and the continuous update of the master address file. That's one of our biggest challenges at county levels because of the continual growth and development. And we see it right here. Just in the last week we have seen the top 10 fastest-growing counties in this country released. And in order to keep abreast of that and try to capture that information, it has to be done in a continuous basis. It can't be done in the last 18 months prior to the mailout of the census.

Mr. TURNER. I would like Dr. Reamer's and Ms. Byers's thoughts on the issue of how the census data is used. We are making a huge national investment in this data base and in the information. Ms. Naymark spoke as to how businesses use it in making decisions for their investment. On the State and local level, my sense is that we can do a better job in utilizing this information for investment of public dollars, and our committee is going to look at that issue and hold hearings in the future as to what the census data tells us, how it can be utilized in decisionmaking.

What do we need to do to do a better job of educating people on the State and local level and decisionmaking processes, and how this data can be used so we can make certain that our public dollar investments are wisely spent? Ms. Byers.

Ms. BYERS. Well, I think the very quick answer to that is that there is somebody in every county government and every city government in the country who recognizes the value of the census data already. I think what you are talking about is a broader outreach to our elected officials and other people who are not aware of it.

Census data is absolutely important to every decision that's made at the local government. No place else in the world can local governments get the kind of data on a uniformed basis across counties, across cities, that the Census Bureau provides.

I think it is the biggest thing that we can do, and the step has already been made because there is an outstanding publication on the census Web site right now, the State and local handbook that refers them to ACS. Now, I stumbled on it on the Web site. I think promoting that information and getting it in the hands of all of our local officials so that they can educate themselves about the absolute value is important. Our planners know; our community and economic development directors know; our human resources people know. These folks already know the value of census because they use that data every single day. By I agree with you, it needs to be in outreach to the elected officials.

Mr. REAMER. I had a jarring experience this weekend. I bumped into a colleague who just stepped down from heading a planning department for a medium-sized city. And I hadn't really talked to him since I had been at Brookings. And he said, what are you doing? And I explained. And he said, you know, the issue with the census data is it only comes out once every 10 years. And I'm going, "Well, have you heard of the American Community Survey?" And here is the head of a planning department who had not, and I was shocked.

But that speaks to the notion that there is still a need to reach even the upper-level planners. I think the lower-level ones do know. And to then start setting up processes by which those officials and their elected leaders are basing decisions and basing annual assessments of local conditions on these new data.

And as I said in my testimony also, these data will be different than what were previously released. We are going to see 5-year rolling averages for neighborhoods. In past years in the long form you got a point estimate for a neighborhood, for this is the education level, this is the income level, and so forth. The way the ACS works is you don't get enough households in a census track until you do this for 5 years.

So teaching planners how to use 5-year rolling averages, teaching planners how to look at there is another innovation here of the Census Bureau is going to be providing confidence intervals. They are saying these are estimates, and people in the past have taken the number and taken that as the gospel truth. So the Bureau is coming out with there is a 90 percent chance that the actual number will be between this upper and lower bound.

And so planners need to learn how to work with this notion of a confidence interval. This is new stuff for a lot of people, and so I think that the Bureau can provide assistance that I think is needed.

Mr. TURNER. Concluding questions for Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

Dr. Reamer, would you explain to the committee why the accuracy of the intercensal estimates is important for the quality of the American Community Survey?

Mr. REAMER. My understanding is the American Community Survey is sent out to a sample, and in the basis of that you get

a sense of a distribution of certain characteristics within a population; what percent of people have a high school degree, what percent of people earn above a certain level, and so forth. And you get percentages. But to translate those percentages into estimates regarding numbers, you need a total population count so you can say, you know, there are 1,000 people here, you know, 30 percent have a high school degree; that means 300 have a high school degree. So the numbers are important that way. They are the controls by which the ACS figures are weighted.

Mrs. MALONEY. And, Dr. Reamer, today we have talked quite a bit about the census master address file. And can you explain to the committee why an accurate master address file is so important?

Mr. REAMER. Well, for two reasons. One is that the master address file is the universe of households in the country. So it's the file from which the ACS sample is drawn. And the census 2000 forms go out to all those addresses. So the accuracy of the master address file dictates the validity of the sample and the comprehensiveness of the 2010 census. Also, the master address file, if it were updated on a regular basis, would inform, improve, the intercensal population estimates.

Mrs. MALONEY. So updating is very important.

Mr. REAMER. Yes.

Mrs. MALONEY. And, Dr. Reamer, there are a number of commercial firms that sell data similar to that produced by the census. Claritas is one of those companies that I'm aware of. And can you explain how these companies use census data and how their products differ? Are you familiar with that at all?

Mr. REAMER. A bit. Not as much as some others. But basically Claritas, you mentioned, has built a whole business around taking long-form data and doing what the ACS is doing now, filling in each year with estimates based on other data sources. And so in many, many businesses and governments use Claritas data to do analysis because they are adding value to the traditional census data. So there is a big business around that.

I assume that they will take an added value to the ACS as well.

Mrs. MALONEY. And, Ms. Byers, what role did NACo play in helping communities participate in the 2000 LUCA program? And has your organization been contacted by the Census Bureau to help prepare for the 2010 LUCA program?

Ms. BYERS. Well, NACo played a very positive and, we hope, large role in preparation for the LUCA updates in 2000. We wrote several columns. We worked closely with our State associations to educate individuals, and we worked with the regional offices around the country to help pull together governmental groups. And we supported strongly the creation of local census groups in cities, counties, and regions to work on this together.

We also asked and were able to review any of the correspondence that was going out from the Census Bureau so that we could eliminate a little of the gobbledygook to make it a little bit more intelligible to our local officials. So that was what we did do.

So far, we have not been approached. NACo has had a seat on the Decennial Census Advisory Committee since its creation. We anticipate that if we are invited to participate in the newly con-

structed advisory committee, that we will be asked again to help them with this process.

Mrs. MALONEY. And, Ms. Naymark, why is the accuracy of small-error data from the census or from the ACS so important to your company, and, I would say, other companies? Why is it so important to you? You mentioned earlier it was important to you.

Ms. NAYMARK. I will tie it in to the question that you asked just a moment ago about the outside data companies, Claritas and other data vendors. The accuracy of their estimates is based on the accuracy of the census itself. We often will be looking at subcounty or small-city areas down to 5,000; census tracks smaller geographic units. And we must understand the differences, the dividing lines, when a neighborhood starts to transition, when you are moving from an urban to—along the urban continuum to a fringe area, and to be able to track and identify the turnover that's occurring from an older to a younger neighborhood.

Many new Americans are joining our outlying suburban areas. There is lots of new patterns of migration streams, etc., that would be extremely difficult to track.

Right now the data vendors take 2000 census information and they build models and extrapolate and trend. But they will be the first to tell you that by 2005, you know, it's 5 years later. And so the integration of the American Community Survey data for short and long-form information will be absolutely critical, as they are the primary delivery agent to the business community, these value-added processors. They just make it easier to grab the information and rearrange it in the ways that business needs it in a very speedy fashion. So accuracy is key.

Mrs. MALONEY. And, Mr. Chairman, from the line of your questioning today, I am very, very pleased to hear that you are interested in my bill, but it's a little late to pass this bill for the 2010 census. The Census Bureau has already taken off the table the possibility of correcting the errors in the census, and I believe this puts a partisan stain on this census that cannot be removed. Even the GAO has said that there was no basis for that decision.

And I would be happy to work with you to produce a bill that has no partisan implications. And, again, I thank you for moving forward with an oversight hearing this early. I think it's important. The census is important. Our panelists have pointed out how it's so important to the businesses and the governments and the people of our country, and it's important that we get it as accurate as possible. So I thank you.

And now we want to hear from Carolyn, if she has a complete report. It's great you were here, Carolyn.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mrs. Maloney, for recognizing my daughter again.

I want to give you each an opportunity if you would like to put anything else on the record in closing. Do you have any closing remarks for us today?

Ms. NAYMARK. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today. I think it's wonderful that there are a couple of hearings scheduled on key components of the 2010 census. I am glad people are paying attention. The stakeholder community is ready, eager, willing to support an accurate program. And thank you very much.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

I want to thank each of you for taking your time to share with us the important issues of your work with respect to the census, and those who spoke on panel I. I appreciate your willingness to share your knowledge, experiences, and thoughts with us today.

And contrary to Mrs. Maloney's comments, I think the record today reflects that there is not any partisan aspect of what we reviewed today in the preparation of the 2010 census that will lessen or have any impact upon our successes.

There is a lot involved in planning the 2010 census, and I am pleased to see that the Bureau is making every effort to assure that this decennial census is the most successful yet. I am encouraged by the implementation of the American Community Survey and its promise to provide characteristic data with the short-form census, and it will provide the best population enumeration.

Also, I am pleased to hear that the MAF/TIGER portion of the decennial is ahead of schedule and will allow for a better layout of this Nation for the purposes of mapping and data collection. However, we are not out of the woods yet. Clearly, obstacles remain. But I am confident that by working together we can ensure that the 2010 census is the best census ever.

Again, I want to express my thanks to our witnesses for their time today. In the event that we may have additional questions that we do not have time for today, the record will remain open for 2 weeks for submitted questions and answers. I want to thank you all for attending. And this committee will continue its efforts in looking at the census and the usefulness of it as a tool both for State and local governments and for businesses and economic decisions.

Thank you so much. We will be adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[The prepared statement of Hon. Wm. Lacy Clay and additional information submitted for the hearing record follow:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WM. LACY CLAY APRIL 19, 2005

Thank you, Mr. Chairman for calling this hearing on the census. I would like to welcome Director Kincannon and Undersecretary Cooper. I have been a strong supporter of the American Community Survey since the Director came to St. Louis and met with local officials to explain the potential for that survey. I am pleased to have been a part of the efforts to bring those plans into reality. The Census Bureau in now collecting data in every county in the United States, and this effort will make the 2010 census less complex.

Now that we have the American Community Survey underway, the hard work begins. There are nearly a thousand municipal governments in Missouri. Seven of them have a population of less that 65,000. When the 2005 ACS data are released in the summer of 2006, only those seven will get data. The others will have to wait. Another 22 local governments will get three year averages when they are released in the summer of 2008. Most of the municipal governments in Missouri won't see data for their community until the summer of 2010, if the Census Bureau releases those data in the middle of conducting the census.

I hope the Under Secretary and the Director will help us explain to those 900 community leaders why they have to wait.

The story is very similar for counties in Missouri. There are 115 counties in Missouri, but only 14 of those will get annual data from the ACS. Another 39 will get three year averages. Over half of the counties will have to wait until 2010. Those county leaders will be asking us why they have to wait, and we had better have a good answer for them. (Ohio -- 38/45/5)

These local governments are also important players in making the census address list more accurate. Congress passed legislation to bring those officials into the process, but it didn't work very well in the last census. Most of these small municipal governments lacked the resources and the expertise necessary to participate at the level demanded by the Census Bureau last time around. We need to work together to make sure that these local governments know about and understand the local update program in time to plan for it. In fact, we should be talking to them right now about what needs in order to get ready for working with the Census Bureau on the address list.

I am looking forward to learning more today about the plans for the 2010 census. The undercount of African Americans remains a serious problem, and I hope we will learn more today about how the Census Bureau is going to measure that undercount, and what will be done in 2010 to reduce it.

Again, thank you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing, and I look forward to working with you to make sure that local governments are full partners in the census process.

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

MAY 12 2005

The Honorable Michael R. Turner, Chairman
Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
Committee on Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6143

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter of April 25, 2005, regarding your follow-up questions from our April 19, 2005, oversight hearing on preparations for the 2010 Census.

Enclosed is our reply to your various questions. If you have any additional questions, please have a member of your staff contact our Congressional Affairs Office on (301) 763-6100.

Sincerely,

Charles Louis Kincannon
Director

Enclosure

Responses to April 25, 2005, Questions from Chairman Michael R. Turner, Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, Committee on Government Reform

1. **What are your biggest challenges for 2010 and what are you doing to address them?**

   Our reengineering effort encompasses some of the greatest evolutions in the decennial census in over half a century. Thanks to continued support from the Administration, the Congress, and other stakeholders, and thanks to years of dedicated effort by U.S. Census Bureau staff, we already have overcome many challenges that we faced at the outset of these efforts in 2001:

   - We have been able to fully launch the American Community Survey (ACS), which means we can collect and publish census long-form data every year rather than just once each decade.

   - We are on schedule to complete the realignment of our TIGER database with GPS coordinates by mid-2008, and to complete other components of our MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program.

   - We have completed two major tests, and planned two more, of major improvements to the way we will conduct the actual enumeration of the Nation in 2010.

   One of the most important, but also most challenging, efforts still before us involves major changes to our business process for data collection. Automating field data collection—the largest and most expensive components of the decennial census—offers tremendous opportunities to reduce work load and the complexity of field operations, thereby increasing efficiency and reducing both costs and operational risk. At the same time, automating field data collection is a monumental task that involves the development and integration of a wide range of information technology (IT) systems.

   By contracting with industry, the Census Bureau expects to mitigate the complexity of this effort. The selected contractor will design, develop, test, deploy, implement, maintain, secure, support, and then de-install and, as appropriate, dispose of the systems, telecommunications, and IT infrastructure required for the management, control, and conduct of all field data collection and evaluation operations for the 2010 Census and the dress rehearsal of those operations in 2008. Ultimately, the success of the contract and contractor will be measured by their ability to implement these requirements in a way that supports and enhances the Census Bureau's ability to meet legal deadlines, improve operations, maintain and improve coverage for all population groups and geographic levels, contain costs, and mitigate risks for the 2010 Census. Managing these contracts effectively will be a major challenge as well.

2. **You are doing a lot of work on planning for 2010 including extensive testing. Would it be safe to say that if by some chance the Census was told to go in a different direction then all this testing and planning would be "wasted." Would you agree that a properly planned Census needs to have decisions made today and any last minute decisions could result in a failed Census?**

   We agree with both of these conclusions. Although some of the development and testing work we have completed might be applicable to a different design, much of it would not. Major changes in design from this point forward would leave us very little time to develop and test new design elements before 2010, so we would have to conduct the 2010 Census with a much higher risk of operational failure, and almost certainly at much higher cost.

3. **What kind of cooperation are you getting from state and local governments as you prepare for the 2010 Census?**

   In order to keep states informed of our 2010 Census planning, the Census Redistricting Data Office, in compliance with Public Law 94-171, corresponds with the legislative leadership, Secretary of State and the Governor's office of each state on a regular basis. Most recently, the Census Bureau has established a cooperative effort to assist the states in preparing for the 2010 Census Redistricting Data Program. In support of our census planning, the officially designated bipartisan state liaison is coordinating a meeting in each state capital. At these state-hosted meetings, many areas of state and local government will hear the Census Bureau present information about the 2010 Decennial Census Program. Agenda items will include providing the time line for the Census Redistricting Data Program, the ACS, geographic partnership efforts, and 2010 Census planning. Attendees will include state election directors, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) specialists, planners, county clerks and recorders, as well as legislative leaders and executive staff. The Census Bureau plans to participate in meetings in all 50 states and the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico within the next year. In an early showing of cooperation, nine states already have submitted their Phase 1 legislative district plans for purposes of 2010 Census tabulations.

   For our MAF/TIGER Enhancements Program, the Census Bureau has been provided GIS source data by tribal, state, and local governments to improve the positional accuracy of roads in the TIGER database for 1, 712 counties. For more than 70 percent of these counties, these data have been found to meet the Census Bureau's accuracy requirements.

4. **Outreach in 2000 was important. What advertising or other publicity are you conducting for 2010? And do you think the Census Bureau needs to "think outside the box" for ways to increase your mail response rate?**

   We are conducting research on components of an integrated communications plan to determine what outreach, promotion, partnership, and publicity strategies we will use for the 2010 Census. We expect this program to be at least as extensive as the successful one we implemented for Census 2000.

   A high mail return rate is crucial to the success of the census—operationally, budgetarily, and also in terms of data quality. Many components of our testing and development program are looking at ways to increase mail response in 2010. One of the most promising methods involves mailing a second questionnaire to households that do not respond to the initial mailout. We know from our research that this can increase mail response significantly (perhaps by as much as 8 to 10 percentage points). However, there are a number of operational and logistical hurdles that must be overcome to quickly implement a replacement mailing only for nonresponding households. We believe that improved technology and advances in the printing industry will make this feasible for the 2010 Census, so we are exploring these methods vigorously.

   We also are researching ways to identify areas of the country with a high concentration of non-English-speaking households, and testing different ways to make forms and promotional materials available in languages other than English. For example, in our 2005 National Census Test, we are studying the use of a bilingual form (English and Spanish) that can be mailed out in areas that have a high concentration of households that speak Spanish.

   In addition, we are testing improvements to the design of the questionnaires so that they will be easier to understand and complete. We also are testing the feasibility of more actively encouraging people to respond on the Internet.

5. **Tell us about your efforts with MAF/TIGER. Where are we on the Master Address File program? What is the status of your efforts to realign the TIGER database with GPS coordinates? Will you have the results you desire in time for the 2008 dress rehearsal?**

   The MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program is on schedule. We will complete the realignment (with GPS coordinates) of the TIGER database on schedule by mid-2008. The counties that will be included in the 2008 Dress Rehearsal will be completed in time for the first field operations in 2007. The MAF continues to be updated semiannually from the U.S. Postal Service's Delivery Sequence File, from ACS field operations, and from the Community Address Update System operations.

6. **What are the goals for the 2005 National Census Test? What are the goals for the 2006 Census tests in Travis County, Texas and Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota?**

2005 National Census Test Goals

- Improving completeness and accuracy of reporting for short form items, (particularly for the questions on Hispanic origin and race) through the use of improved wording, instructions, examples, and forms design.

- Improving coverage accuracy through the use of better residence rules instructions (e.g., who to include as a household member). We also will study two different presentations of the coverage questions that we use to help us identify missed persons or duplicate enumerations during the census.

- Improving questionnaire response rates by increasing the feasibility of mailing replacement questionnaires.

- Increasing self-response by offering bilingual questionnaires during the initial and replacement questionnaire mailout.

- Increasing self-response and reducing respondent errors by designing questionnaires that are easier for respondents to complete correctly.

- Developing a space-saving design that allows us to make optimal use of the limited "real estate" on the short form without compromising data quality.

2006 Census Test Goals

- Develop and test American Indian and Alaska Native enumeration methods.
- Test coverage improvement methods (such as residence rules presentations).
- Test census coverage measurement.
- Additional studies of hand-held computers and other field automation.
- Language Program (for example, mailout of bilingual questionnaire).
- Mailing strategy and timing.
- Special place/group quarters enumeration.

7. **What steps are you taking to control the costs of the 2010 decennial program?**

All the factors that have led to increasingly higher costs for each decennial census since 1970 will continue—inflation, increased work load, interest in coverage accuracy, resistance to answering surveys, increased diversity that makes it more difficult to reach everyone. No matter what design is chosen, the 2010 Census will be costly. For the 2010 Decennial Program, compared to the cost of the previous census (2000), the percentage increase in estimated life-cycle costs will be the lowest in the last four decades. This pattern also holds when comparing unit costs. Thus, while

achieving the significant benefits to our Nation from the annual release of long-form data by the ACS, and the improvements to our MAF/TIGER databases, the reengineered 2010 Decennial Census Program also will be significantly less costly than historical trends would project.

Significant savings will result from:

- Not having to collect long form data in the 2010 Census.
- Restructuring our field data collection process to use GPS-equipped Hand-Held Computers.
- Reducing Nonresponse Follow-up work loads by sending a second mailing of questionnaires to households that do not respond to the initial mailout and from removing late mail returns from the Nonresponse Follow-up work load.

Cost containment is one of the four key goals for this reengineering effort, and, when it was launched in 2001, we estimated it would save over $400 million compared to repeating the Census 2000 approach. More recently, we have estimated that reverting now to the Census 2000 approach would cost over $1 billion more than continuing with our reengineered approach.

8. Do you plan to have a Partnership program, which involves businesses in the promotion and outreach efforts of the decennial census, again in 2010? What testing have you been conducting to improve this program?

Yes, we plan to have a Partnership Program in 2010. As in 2000, we expect the Partnership Program will involve small businesses and major corporations. This includes establishing partnerships with Fortune 500 companies, as well as companies that produce products and provide services to underserved populations.

The Census Bureau has conducted a series of focus groups comprised of Census 2000 partners. We have researched improvements to our outreach in rural areas. We have researched who the influencers are in this population group to determine how we can best inform, educate, and motivate participation and, thus, improve the response rate in this geographic area.

Leaders in the Faith-based community have historically been key partners in our outreach efforts and major influencers in the community. We have convened Faith-based leaders from 2000 in focus groups to draw from their experiences as to how we can strengthen the partnership and outreach efforts for 2010.

In 2000, state, local, and tribal government partners established Complete Count Committees (CCC) that were responsible for developing and implementing local targeted plans of action to promote the census. Plans are underway to conduct focus

groups comprised of representatives from the CCC to give the Census Bureau input on how to strengthen the program for 2010.

9. You mentioned the ACS is experiencing 97 percent response rate. To what do you credit that response rate?

We are very proud of our 97 percent weighted response rate. We attribute this excellent response rate for the first month of data collection for the full ACS sample to a number of factors:

- We have been conducting a national ACS samples for four years, so we already have quite a bit of experience with it in the field.
- We have an experienced field infrastructure in place, and these experienced current survey staff are training, mentoring, and supervising the new field representatives for ACS.
- The ACS is a one-time survey (not longitudinal), so there is not a longer term commitment on a respondent's part.
- The interviewers do a good job of explaining how responding will help local communities.
- Because it is part of the decennial census, response to the ACS is mandatory.

10. The Census Bureau collects more personal data than any other entity. What is the Bureau doing to protect our citizens' privacy?

The U.S. Census Bureau's mission is to meet America's data needs by producing accurate, relevant statistics about the Nation's economy and people. We recognize, however, that it is their information that we collect to produce these statistics and that we are legally and ethically obligated to respect their privacy and protect their confidentiality.

Federal law protects the information we collect, and we have developed policies and statistical safeguards to help us follow the law and further ensure the confidentiality of each respondent's information.

The Census Bureau is bound by Title 13 of the United States Code. These laws not only provide authority for the work we do, but also provide strong protection for the information we collect from individuals and businesses. In addition, other federal laws, including the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act and the Privacy Act, reinforce these protections.

- It is against the law to disclose or publish any information that identifies an individual or business.

- Personal information we collect cannot be used against an individual by anyone, including a government agency or court.

- Every person with access to personal information is sworn for life to protect the confidentiality of those data.

- If anyone violates this law, it is a federal crime—they will face severe penalties, including a federal prison sentence of up to five years, a fine of up to $250,000, or both.

Statistical methods also are used before data products are released so that we do not identify individuals or businesses. These methods include extensive review and analysis of all our data products, as well as disclosure-avoidance methodologies, such as data suppression, swapping, and addition of noise.

We believe a partnership of trust exists between respondents and the Census Bureau. We recognize they have entrusted their information to us, and our highest priority is to maintain that trust. Data Stewardship is the formal process we use to care for respondent information—from the beginning, when they answer a survey, to the end, when we release statistical data products. Data Stewardship goes beyond the law to ensure that any decisions we make will fulfill our ethical obligations to respect privacy and protect the confidentiality of this information.

- We collect information only for statistical purposes, and it is never used to identify individuals. Before participating, we inform respondents about why we conduct surveys or censuses, why we ask specific questions, and the purposes for which we will use the information.

- We use the information only to produce timely, relevant statistics about the population and the economy of the United States.

- If a survey is voluntary, we respect the respondent's right to refuse to answer specific questions or participate in the survey. If the survey is mandatory, we inform them and provide proof of this legal authority.

- We only collect information in accordance with the federal protections for research participants.

- We ensure that every person with access to respondent information is sworn for life to protect confidentiality.

- We use the most current technology, statistical methodology, and physical security procedures at our disposal to protect respondents' information.

- To respond to a survey or census via the Internet, respondents provide us personally identifiable information. For each survey and census, we provide an explanation to respondents about the confidentiality of the data and the laws that protect those data (e.g., Title 13, United States Code, Section 9 (a)).

- To protect privacy, in the remote chance that respondent survey or census responses are intercepted, all Web data submissions are encrypted.

11. Are you on schedule for acquisition of handheld computers for field data automation collection? When do you expect to seek bids on these contracts?

Yes, this effort is on schedule. We recently released the presolicitation notice and a draft request for proposals for the Field Data Collection Automation contract. The final Request for Proposals is on schedule for release in June.

12. **What is your budget for acquiring these half million handheld computers? Are you budgeting for durability features or "total cost of ownership" issues? Do you have the fiscal resources to purchase equipment that is rugged enough to withstand breakage, which would lower the cost of replacements and repairs?**

While we have preliminary planning estimates for the costs associated with the Field Data Collection Automation contract (which includes the devices), we will have much more reliable estimates over the next two months, as we begin to receive vendors' cost estimates in response to the presolicitation request. Final costs will not be known until spring 2006, when the contract is awarded. Our plans for field automation encompass consideration of both durability and "total cost of ownership" issues.

Submission for the RECORD
Hearing before the House Government Reform Committee Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census
April 19, 2005

Submission in response to request from Representative Carolyn Maloney (NY-14) to Witness C. Louis Kincannon, Director, U.S. Census Bureau, for copy of Census Bureau plan for Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA).

2010 Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) Proposal

1. LUCA Program Background

This document is a work in progress concerning plans and proposals for the 2010 Census LUCA program. The document describes objectives and challenges the LUCA program must address, ideas for potential program components, and technical and operational issues that must be studied and resolved. These efforts are part of, and must be integrated with, our overall planning, development, and testing program for a reengineered 2010 Decennial Census Program.

The Census Bureau expects to develop the final implementation plan for the 2010 Census LUCA program by early next year, and implement a LUCA program based on most components of that plan as part of the 2008 Dress Rehearsal. Our current schedule also calls for sending advance notification and information about the final 2010 Census LUCA program to tribal, state, and local governments beginning in Fall 2006. All of these efforts are, of course, subject to appropriations for FY 2006 and later years.

The U.S. Census Bureau's Geography Division maintains the address list used to support the conduct of the Decennial Census and other methods used to enumerate and survey the population of the United States of America, Puerto Rico and the Island Areas.

Developing and maintaining the Master Address File and supporting systems is one of the largest endeavors undertaken by a civilian government agency. This effort requires not only the diligent efforts of the Census Bureau's permanent and temporary work force, but has traditionally relied on partnerships with local, tribal, and state governments as well as associations and similar groups representing the interests of these governments.

The Census Bureau's partnership capabilities with local and tribal governments were strengthened with the enactment of the Census Address List Improvement Act of 1994, Public Law 103-430, which was approved on October 31, 1994. The Act expanded the methods the Census Bureau could use to exchange information with local and tribal governments to support its overall address list improvement efforts. The Act was designed to improve the accuracy of address lists for Census Bureau censuses and household surveys through this partnership, and as such, the Act's provisions are directed to several areas:

- The publication by the Secretary of Commerce of standards for content and structure of address information that States and local units of general purpose governments might submit for developing a national address list;
- Rules governing tribal, state, and local governments' access to census address information for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the information for census purposes;
- Development of an appeals process; and
- An amendment to existing law that specifies that the Postal Service shall provide to the Secretary of Commerce for use by the Census Bureau such address information as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for any census or survey.

The Act authorized the Census Bureau to provide individual addresses to officials of local and tribal governments who agreed to pledges and conditions of confidentiality. In prior decennial censuses, the Census Bureau was limited to providing block summary totals of addresses to local and tribal governments. Census 2000 marked the first decennial where address lists could be provided for review to governments (that signed the required confidentiality agreement).

Partnership with tribal governments, local governments, states, and other groups that represent the interests of these governments has been an important component of Census Bureau activities and is likely to continue if not increase its importance in an era of increasing fiscal accountability and decreasing sources of revenue. This trend reflects the importance of tapping into the knowledge reserves of these governments in a manner that is cost effective for Census Bureau operations while maintaining a positive and cooperative partnership.

1.1. Problem/Opportunity

In preparation for Census 2000, the LUCA program was conducted in various phases in partnership with tribal and local governments, as well as various organizations that represent the interests of their local government members. Since Census 2000, the Planning, Research and Evaluation Division (PRED), the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Anteon Corporation conducted evaluations and surveys of the LUCA program. These evaluations and surveys resulted in a number of recommendations aimed at improving the LUCA Program. Although testing of improvements to the LUCA program was proposed for the 2004 and 2006 Census Tests, this aspect of the two Census Tests was cancelled due to budget constraints.

The Geography Division (GEO) is proposing that the Census Bureau implement as many planned 2010 LUCA features as possible in the 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal. In addition the GEO is conducting a customer survey that will gauge participant capabilities and readiness to participate in the 2010 LUCA program, as well as preferences for products (paper versus computer-readable products) and mode of participation. The Census Bureau is testing the effectiveness of state government participation in LUCA. These efforts are important elements in bridging the gap between project planning and implementation. They afford an opportunity to determine participant interest in and demonstrate design changes to the LUCA products, participant procedures, production systems, processing systems, control systems and reporting systems.

The goals and objectives described in the following sections are subject to budget and policy/review approval.

1.2. Project Goals/Objectives/Benefits/Risks

1.2.1. Goal 1: Improve communications with tribal, state and local governments.

The effective use of local knowledge is critical to the success of the Census Bureau's geographic and statistical operations because of the almost limitless breadth and variation in local cultural and geographic factors. It is only through partnerships that the Census Bureau can hope to efficiently and cost effectively keep-up with changes in the street and address inventory as well as legal boundaries nationwide.

Using local knowledge effectively through partnerships requires meeting not only the Census Bureau's operational requirements and schedules, but also meeting our partners' needs in these regards. The following objectives apply to all LUCA programs:

1.2.1.1. Goal 1 – Objective 1: Coordinate communications with local governments

The reorganization of the Geography Division provides new opportunities to effectively coordinate Census Bureau communications with tribal, state and local governments, as well as other interested parties and entities including state-based organizations. The Geography Division organizational alignment by type of government entity should help improve partnership efforts. However, an organizational risk will be the failure of each branch to coordinate interaction outside of each branch's area of focus. This coordination may be needed to align the local governments with regional and state governments to maximize participation and housing unit coverage.

Because the Census Bureau will have several reasons to communicate and request input, participation, or other responses from a tribal or local government, aside from LUCA, it is important to plan these interactions, and coordinate internally among the various Census Bureau offices. Providing the local governments with a high-level schedule informing them of what will be requested of them, why, and when will allow tribal and local governments to plan and prepare for the requested participation. This method accommodates the need for advance notice expressed by small governments that lack the resources to respond quickly.

1.2.1.2. Goal 1 – Objective 2: Ensure upper management involvement

Upper management involvement is key to developing an overall approach to address list development and coverage improvement that is cost positive for LUCA and reduces or eliminates the need for redundant field operations. LUCA and the other decennial census activities should complement each other. Upper management should support a separate LUCA Implementation Team comprised of members from the various stakeholder divisions that have direct input into the LUCA program or receive outputs from the LUCA program. LUCA is one of the few decennial census programs required by legislation and should be on the critical path instead of an activity scheduled to meet other operational requirements.

1.2.1.3. Goal 1 – Objective 3: Promote cooperation and resource sharing among local governments

Not all tribal and local governments, especially smaller ones, have the staff and other resources to participate effectively in the LUCA program. In its communication to governments inviting them to participate, the Census Bureau should promote cooperation and resource sharing among local governments to increase participation.

The Census Bureau's Geographic Programs Participant (GPP) database should be expanded and maintained to incorporate linkages or cross references between the local governments and higher level governments or quasi governments that have the capabilities and willingness to assist the local governments in responding to Census Bureau data needs. The Census Bureau should promote cooperation among local governments in its communications and as part of its outreach efforts. Updates to the highest elected officials and other contacts should be linked to the Census Bureau's other contacts databases such as Field Division's PRISMS.

1.2.1.4. Goal 1 – Objective 4: Promote state and regional partnerships

State and regional groups may be in a position to assist local governments, and did so in the Census 2000 LUCA program as well as the 1990 Census Local Review program. One of the recommendations made in the Census Bureau's report dated September 24, 1997 "Census 2000 Address List Reengineering – Case for Change" was the need for "establishing stronger relationships with state data centers, metropolitan and regional planning organizations, and councils of government, especially in areas where local governments are unable to participate."

Messages need to promulgate through communication channels already established between state organizations, associations and other groups representing local governments. It is more cost effective to use these channels, and more likely to influence local governments to participate if a trusted entity known to have aligned interests recommends participation in LUCA. These partnerships may be helpful in reaching a number of non-responsive governments.

1.2.1.5. Goal 1 – Objective 5: Provide options for LUCA participation

Research and study of local governments has shown that all governments are not able to participate to the same extent in a LUCA-type review of the address list and related maps. Options that allow participation without requiring the local government to dedicate resources it does not have should be helpful toward the goal of improved participation. The objective of providing options for participation is to allow a government to provide as little or as much input as it can.

Recommended 2010 Census LUCA Participation Options

The 2010 Census LUCA Implementation Team recommends three LUCA participation options. These options are:

- A full Census Bureau address list review by participating governments, with count review for census blocks containing noncity-style addresses (Title 13 confidentiality required);
- Participant address list submission for city style addresses only, but with Title 13 confidentiality agreement to allow additionally for participant viewing of the Census Bureau address list and provision of address-level feedback to participants
- Participant address list submission for city style addresses only, **without** Title 13 confidentiality, participant viewing of the Census Bureau address list, or provision of address-level feedback to participants

1.2.1.6. Goal 1 – Objective 6: Use flexible, three-stage contact strategy to encourage participation

Communications with tribal and local governments about the LUCA program have demonstrated the value of advance notification and prompt follow-up activities to promote participation. Follow-up activities yielded improved response to the LUCA program, especially for non-participants. A flexible contact strategy consisting of the following three stages is recommended to encourage participation in the LUCA program:

- Initial Contact – that simplifies initial communications to obtain useful information from local government contacts and alerts the jurisdiction to the program objectives and schedule. This initial contact sets the stage for the formal invitation.

- LUCA Participation Invitation – formally invites the jurisdiction to participate in the LUCA program. This communication demonstrates the value to the tribal and local governments as a motivation for their participation. For governments with no or low participation in partnership programs, the invitation letter should suggest the possibility of local governments partnering with other levels of government. The LUCA participation invitation also includes the forms to designate the type of review the jurisdiction will participate in as well as the type of material or format they wish to receive (paper versus computer-readable versus web-based).
- Follow-up/Customer Care – target areas where there is a high need for review (high growth communities, address conversion areas, etc.) as well as non-responding communities. Follow-up may also target jurisdictions that choose a participation option or material type that may seem inconsistent for that size government (for example a jurisdiction that supplied a good digital file for TIGER enhancement that chooses to receive paper maps to review).

The three-stage communications strategy will work best when the following principles for communication efforts are followed:

- Initial contacts should be made every year or so to ensure the data in the GPP is current.
- Information in the Census Bureau's materials should be consistent and represent the most current planned activities.
- Employ effective planning and scheduling.
- Sufficient time should be provided between the initial contact, the participation invitation, and the timing of the work to be done.
- Sufficient lead-time is required to use information obtained through the initial contact to guide participation options and follow-up efforts. Sufficient lead-time could play a part in motivating local governments to participate.
- Separate instructions manuals for computer-readable, web-based, and paper participants will simplify the government's use of the materials.
- The Census Bureau's process and schedule once promulgated should be maintained, unless dire circumstances dictate otherwise.
- Promote cooperation and resource sharing among local governments.
- Promote stronger partnerships with intermediaries such as state and county governments and associations that represent them, or tribal governments and the associations that serve them.
- Improve the knowledge base describing capabilities and interest of local governments regarding the LUCA program.
- Promote electronic means of participation where feasible. Use Internet based interfaces where appropriate and allowable.

1.2.1.7. Goal 1 – Objective 7: Improve knowledge base describing capabilities and interest of local government regarding the LUCA program

The Census Bureau can improve the effectiveness of its communications with local governments by expanding the information it maintains describing the government, its capabilities and desire to participate in the LUCA program.

- Determine governments where follow-up activities will be most effective, or ineffective given the fact that some governments will either not be able to participate or do not desire participation.
- Demonstrate customer focus through improved data and understanding of a community when communicating with the highest elected officials or LUCA contacts.
- Support related recommendations that require knowledge of such things as what other government might be participating on behalf of another.

- Encourage participation by matching requested actions to a community's capabilities and interests.

It is important to keep the data maintained in the GPP current. Given the election cycle for many small governments is one to two years, a yearly refresh cycle is recommended.

1.2.1.8. Goal 1 – Objective 8: Compile and clearly communicate up-to-date information about the benefits of a complete census count to communities

The benefits to local governments from participating in the LUCA program are hard to link directly to participation efforts; the Census Bureau needs to quantify them in order to communicate them effectively to potential participants.

Population data is an important factor in several ways. Besides the Constitutional reasons for a decennial census, apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives, there are a number of ways that the data is used. According to the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), "Population counts, as derived from the decennial census, are frequently used to apportion federal grants to states and units of local government. Of the 185 billion in population-based grant funding for fiscal year 1998, formula grants composed 95 percent of the amount and discretionary grants accounted for the rest." In fiscal year 2000, about $283 billion in federal grant money was distributed to state and local governments by formula…States receive money based in part on factors such as annual population estimates derived from the previous decennial census…"

The GAO report also specified "Most formula grants apportion funding among states, however, several, such as Community Development Block Grants and Federal Mass Transit Grants, apportion funding to units of local government as well." In addition to federal funds, significant amounts of state generated funds use population data as the basis for fund distributions. No estimate of the state funds that are distributed in this manner is available.

Also of importance to local governments are the discretionary or competitive grants used to fund specific social, economic, environmental, and other studies/projects. In addition to population and population characteristics, other census data provide the statistical support (or justification) for proposed projects and programs. Successful funding for these projects and programs can bring millions of dollars to a community to provide social, economic, environmental, and other much needed improvements and enhancements.

Given this situation, it is important for the Census Bureau to compile current information about the flow of funds to local governments. The information the GEO has now is not current and may require additional research.

1.2.1.9. Goal 1 – Objective 9: Evaluate the cost and benefits of the Census Bureau's LUCA related activities

Evaluation work for the 2010 Census should be directed towards associating the costs with the benefits of the various operations, including LUCA, used to develop the address list for the 2010 Census. In addition to determining the benefits of various address list development activities, an analysis should be made of the negative results of the activities. For example, this analysis could identify the number of nonexistent addresses generated or the reverse, the number of valid addresses deleted, the number of improperly geocoded addresses, and the number of duplicated addresses added.

1.2.1.10. Goal 1 - Objective 10: Pilot test to determine the benefits of extending direct LUCA participation eligibility to states

P.L. 103-430, the Address List Improvement Act of 1994, calls for the Secretary to "provide officials who are designated as census liaisons by a local unit of general purpose government with access to census address information for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the address information of the Bureau for census and survey purposes." P.L. 103-430 is unclear about the eligibility of states to participate in LUCA. The new section of Title 13 established by the act is entitled "Address information reviewed by States and local governments," but elsewhere there is reference to providing access to census address information to "officials who are designated as census liaisons by a local unit of general purpose government." This indicates legislative intent to ensure that local governments had the opportunity to directly participate in LUCA and not have to work through their state government. The act allows each government to designate as a census liaison for LUCA any party it chooses—including contractors and staff from other governments. The Census Bureau's legal staff has stated on numerous occasions that nothing in P.L. 103-430 legally precludes the Census Bureau from extending LUCA eligibility to states, assuming that it makes the change public via a *Federal Register* notice.

The Census Bureau's policy determination for the Census 2000 LUCA was that states were ineligible to be direct participants in LUCA. This made sense in an environment where we were trying to create the list for the first time and pulling entire states' worth of addresses together for timely review would have been a huge logistical challenge. This determination caused dissatisfaction on the part of several states, most notably Alaska.

There is some evidence that LUCA participation by the states could improve the census address list. For Census 2000, FSCPE contacts from most states were sworn in to perform the Count Review operation of Title 13-protected data on-site at the Census Bureau. There is agreement that the Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates (FSCPE) reviewers found and corrected many errors, particularly with group quarters information. The FSCPEs have proposed that they be involved in such a review earlier, both to ensure timely processing for the decennial census and to potentially improve the current American Community Survey sampling frame. Evaluations of the Census 2000 LUCA by the National Academy of Sciences and the Anteon Corporation identified many barriers to local government participation in LUCA, including lack of resources and expertise; this factor as well seems to argue for a role for the states. We do not believe, however, that this is sufficient basis on which to proceed and, therefore, propose the pilot test outlined in this document.

The Geography Division's proposal for the 2010 LUCA is that eligibility to participate directly in LUCA be extended to states and that the identification of a liaison be made in the same manner as for local governments—the highest elected official (in this case the governor) would receive the LUCA invitation and be asked to identify a single lead LUCA contact of his/her choosing to participate. Alternatives for allowing states to perform the LUCA review for any part of the state or for just areas without a local participant will have to be weighed, and the pilot test may help with this decision. For the 2000 LUCA, in cases of conflicting or discrepant LUCA changes from different participants for a given address, the change proposed by the lowest-level government was sent to the field verification operation, but all participants received feedback on the field verification result; for the 2010 LUCA, this same approach would be proposed to determine which version is sent to the address canvassing operation for verification. Allowing LUCA participation by the states in no way infringes upon the opportunity for local governments to participate in LUCA.

The Data Stewardship Executive Policy Committee has in principle approved the extension of direct LUCA participation eligibility to states, but has directed staff to conduct a limited-scale pilot test of

LUCA participation by a state or two to determine whether this extension results in the hypothesized benefits to the address list. Sites have been selected for this test and implementation is underway.

1.2.1.11. Goal 1 Objective 11: Ensure participant understanding of and compliance with computer and physical security requirements for Title 13-protected address information

The Geography Division is proposing several enhancements to the measures taken for the Census 2000 LUCA to ensure that LUCA participants understand and meet the requirement that they protect the confidentiality and security of Title 13 address data. These include the encryption of computer readable data for transmission, more stringent requirements for passwords and data backups, and the development and use of a self-assessment checklist.

1.2.2. Goal 2: Expand the LUCA participation review period, material format options, and tools

1.2.2.1. Goal 2 – Objective 1: Provide a longer review period for LUCA participants

Not all tribal and local governments, especially smaller ones, have the staff and other resources to participate effectively in the LUCA program within the time constraints imposed by the Census Bureau. Tribal and local governments need a longer time period to respond to invitations and requests for data, as well as a longer time period to review and comment on the Census address list and maps. A flexible, three-stage contact strategy already addressed will afford adequate time for the local government to decide whether or not to participate. The overall schedule for the census should emphasize allowing the address list and map review time to be increased from 90 days to 120 days.

1.2.2.2 Goal 2 – Objective 2 Traditional Title 13 paper address list review activity

Benefits -- The traditional paper products option allows governmental units without computers, or with minimal computer experience, to participate in a format that they can more easily understand and use. The Census Bureau and participants have the most experience with this format. It is relatively easy to train participants and manage production.

Risks – Production of the outgoing paper products have the highest overheads. Paper formats require transcription and keying of returned products, which introduces error. Quality assurance of the outgoing materials takes the longest. Paper products require a large storage space for materials necessary to produce the outgoing products and storage of returned materials.

1.2.2.3 Goal 2 – Objective 3: Traditional Title 13 computer-readable address list review activity

Benefits – Provides the LUCA participant with a computer-readable file usable with most spreadsheet and database software. Allows the participant to use automated matching software to compare the Census address list with the participant's address list. The Census Bureau and many participants already have experience with this method. Returned computer-readable formats do not require keying for data capture, and therefore fewer errors are introduced. Quality assurance is easier using matching techniques.

Risks – Production of outgoing materials have relatively high overheads and take longer to produce than paper products. Participants tend to make the most mistakes because of the diversity of software used to make updates.

1.2.2.4 Goal 2 – Objective 4: Participant submits their local address list

Benefits – This option is similar to the Program for Address List Supplementation (PALS) that the Census Bureau tested and discontinued prior to the Census 2000. This option may be one of the easiest options for the tribal and local governments since they are providing a copy of their address list and do not have to review a Census address list. This option may increase participation because it requires minimal effort. This option does not require the local government to abide by Title 13, since they are not reviewing the Census address list.

Risks – This option has potentially high data capture and processing costs for the Census Bureau, even though the intent is to require that lists be submitted in electronic form and according to a predetermined record layout. If standards and file formats are not defined and adhered to during the program, participants could potentially submit files with varying formats; files could contain business and residential addresses with no metadata to distinguish between the two. The potential exists to overwhelm the program because of the high amount of review and attention required to process each submission. This option could reduce the participation rate in the traditional LUCA address review activity. Files may not contain unit designations at multiunit basic street addresses. Many addresses may not geocode because map updates are not submitted. Participants might object to the stringent format the Census Bureau would require.

1.2.2.5. Goal 2 – Objective 5: Participant uses Census Bureau supplied personal computer-based software to conduct their LUCA review

This option supplies the LUCA participant with personal computer-based software that they use to update the Census address list and TIGER. This software might be similar to the software developed for the Census 2000 LUCA program that was never distributed (that software later was developed into the ALMI).

Benefits -- Reduces some of the Census Bureau's back-end office review and processing costs. Reduces some of the Census Bureau's front-end cost to produce and ship materials for participant review. Supports the President's e-commerce initiatives and objectives. Forces predefined formats and standards for address and map updates. The application could be portable from desktop to laptop, allowing the LUCA participant to field verify their updates and the Census address list. Integrates both address and TIGER updates into one application. Participants do not have to provide geocodes, since the software does it automatically when they map spot living quarters. The software is relatively easy to use and the Census Bureau already has some experience using similar applications like ALMI and the ESRI ArcPad software used on the hand-held computers.

Risks -- Requires a substantial amount of front-end planning and application development time. Requires a totally new training methodology. May increase distribution time because each data set will be unique. May have a high cost if software licenses are required. Not all LUCA participants may have computers with compatible operating system requirements.

1.2.3. Goal 3: Design and test the usability of new LUCA products and training

1.2.3.1.Goal 3 – Objective 1: Test new LUCA listings and map products

The Geography Division has proposed and programmed a number of changes to the Census address list, census block housing unit tally list, census block-to-map sheet listing, and to the LUCA maps. Some of

these changes were implemented and tested during the Demographic Area Address Listing Dress Rehearsal in 2002. Other changes were implemented for the 2004 Census Test and the 2006 Census Test LUCA programs, but both programs were cancelled before LUCA participants had the opportunity to use the new products. As many new or enhanced product as possible should be demonstrated in the 2010 Census LUCA program.

Additionally, the Census Bureau must assess participant response to the LUCA Program Participant Guide. Separate participant guides must be written for each mode of participation (paper, computer-readable, Internet web-based applications, Census supplied software mode, etc.). Because the Census Bureau has a MAF that encompasses all of the United States, there will no longer be separate review phase as provided in Census 2000 (LUCA 98, LUCA 99, and Special Place LUCA). Participating governments will receive the entire address list for their jurisdiction at one time. The Census address list for a jurisdiction may contain both map spotted addresses representing non-house number and street name type addresses as well as areas without map spots representing areas with house number and street name type addresses. The review and updating of both the addresses and maps will require mixed procedures that may produce undesirable results.

1.2.3.2. Goal 3 – Objective 2: Design, demonstrate, and implement new LUCA training materials and products

The Geography Division proposes a number of changes to the LUCA training materials and products based upon feedback from the 2000 Census LUCA program and in support of new modes of participation. Training guides and self-study guides will be tailored to the mode of participation chosen by LUCA participants. For example, participants who are using the traditional paper methodology will receive a user guide, self-study guide and workbook tailored to that methodology. Likewise, participants choosing the computer-readable format will receive materials that cover computer security, importing the Census Bureau's address list, and other issues related to computerized files.

Additionally, computer-based training modules on CD-ROM, DVD and web-based training will be offered to participants. The Geography Division had a contractor develop a computer-based training module on CD-ROM after Census 2000 that reviewers responded to favorably when comparing it to the Census 2000 LUCA training materials.

1.2.4. Goal 4: Design, test, and implement new LUCA production, control, processing and reporting systems

1.2.4.1. Goal 4 – Objective 1: Design and implement a modernized production and control system

The Geography Division's production and control systems typically track the creation, printing, and shipping of outgoing LUCA products, as well as the return receipt, review, data capture and processing of the participant submission. In anticipation of the 2004 Census Test LUCA program, improvements were made to the production and control system to accommodate the multiple options for participation. With the cancellation of the 2004 and 2006 LUCA programs, these systems were not tested.

In addition, with the potential expansion of participation modes, new requirements must be defined and the appropriate systems expanded to accommodate those options. Consolidating the LUCA participant review into one phase also means that the potential exists for the production and control systems to be backlogged waiting for data input from the production site. Based upon Census 2000 LUCA experience, the entry of data into the control system was a severe bottleneck that went on for weeks after all materials were shipped. This had a huge impact on the reporting systems.

A modernized production and control system utilizing bar code scanning and control technology should be phased in during the 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal LUCA program and the 2010 Census LUCA program. This system should utilize similar technology used in department stores and supermarkets to track inventory as it enters the store, is on the shelves, and leaves the store. All of the current LUCA products contain bar codes that can be utilized in such a system.

1.2.4.2. Goal 4 – Objective 2: Design and implement a case-based interactive MAF update system

A case-based interactive MAF update system moves away from the large batch processes used during the Census 2000 LUCA program and initiates a system similar to the Census 2000 Count Question Resolution (CQR) processing system that enabled each CQR case to move through the system independent of other cases. Each case was processed through the various steps as the reviewer completed each task. A similar system for LUCA would enable Census Bureau staff to even out the workflow; potentially discover errors or problems with submissions before they become time-critical; allow follow-up to resolve problems with participants.

The MAF/TIGER legacy software may not accommodate an interactive case-based processing environment and the modernized MAF/TIGER redesign may not be in place in time to support the 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal LUCA program. Use of this system requires more extensive training of Census Bureau review staff, than what occurred during Census 2000 LUCA. If the case-based system does not allow more than one active case per county partition, it could potentially create severe bottlenecks.

1.2.4.3. Goal 4 – Objective 3: Design and implement an interactive preprocessing system

During Census 2000 LUCA, participants submitted computer-readable files that potentially contained formatting errors, missing or invalid data, and/or invalid geographic codes and action codes. Because submissions were all processed in large batch update processes, the errors were usually not corrected and the erroneous or inconsistent records were later rejected. Interactive preprocessing software will provide a suite of edits that can be run on each computer-readable submission during the office review, thus discovering erroneous data prior to updating the MAF, while time remains to contact the participant for corrections.

1.2.4.4. Goal 4 – Objective 4: Design and implement an interactive geocoding system

During Census 2000 LUCA, participants submitted computer-readable address files that contained missing or invalid geographic codes. Because submissions were all processed in large batch update processes, the errors were usually not discovered in time to correct the erroneous data. An interactive geocoding software system will allow the file reviewer to run the participants' submission to discover geocoding conflicts between the address list and TIGER, as well as invalid geographic codes for the submitting entity, or erroneous geographic codes. Identification of the errors early in the review process will allow time for the reviewer to contact the participant for corrections.

1.2.4.5. Goal 4 – Objective 5: Test a centralized location for the production and shipping of LUCA program materials

For the Census 2000 LUCA program, the Census Bureau's Field Regional Offices (FLD RO's) were responsible for the printing and shipping LUCA program maps to participants. The National Processing Center (NPC) was responsible for printing and shipping the address lists and other LUCA documents. This method of production and shipping resulted in participants receiving their maps and address lists at different times. This method of production and shipping resulted in inflated costs as well as confusion on the part of participants.

Consolidating production at a centralized facility can provide advantages, including minimizing shipping costs and minimizing participant's confusion from receiving products at different times from multiple sites. Centralizing production also allows headquarters staff to more closely monitor production and provide on-site training and assistance.

1.2.5. Goal 5: Design and implement a LUCA Entity Customer Survey

1.2.6. Goal 6: Design and implement a state level LUCA review

1.2.7. Goal 7: Design and implement a 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal LUCA program

1.3 Assumptions

1.3.1. All group quarters (GQ) addresses added by participants will be added to the MAF as "other living quarters" (OLQ) and sent to the address canvassing operation. LUCA Feedback to participants will state that OLQ addresses found by the field staff will be enumerated as group quarters if they are verified as GQs during the group quarters validation operation; otherwise the OLQ will be enumerated as a regular housing unit.

1.3.2. There will be an appeals process as required by P.L. 104-430.

1.3.3. There will be an appeals phase for participants choosing Option 2 – Local Address List Submission, allowing the participant to appeal the results of the address canvassing operation for addresses they submitted, but not for other addresses that they did not review or provide comments for, on the Census address list.

1.3.4. All software development for web-based applications, distributed address review/map update software, training module software, etc. will be done by contract and not developed by Census Bureau staff.

1.3.5. The LUCA Feedback for participants in the 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal will serve as the 2010 Census LUCA listing for the participants because of the potential overlap between the operations.

1.3.6. The 2010 Census Dress Rehearsal LUCA program will have an Appeals Phase to test the procedures and workflow.

1.3.7. All production and shipping of outgoing LUCA materials (maps, address lists, and similar materials) will take place in the National Processing Center.

1.3.8. All keying of paper address list submissions, boundary update digitizing and similar data capture from paper products will take place in the National Processing Center.

1.3.9. LUCA address list keying is not covered by the DRIS contract.

1.3.10. The Field Data Collection Automation (FDCA) contract will supply all hardware necessary to support LUCA activities that will occur in the regions.

1.3.11. Non-boundary map digitizing will take place in the National Processing Center or the Field Regional Census Centers.

1.3.12. Regional Census Center staff will review all LUCA participant submissions and conduct all follow-ups regarding the completeness and consistency of the submission.

1.3.13. There is only one 2010 Census LUCA review phase conducted prior to the Address Canvassing Operation, which acts as the LUCA verification phase.

1.3.14. All mass mailings of program announcement letters and materials as well as invitation letters and materials will take place from the National Processing Center under the Census Bureau Director's signature.

1.3.15. Reminder letters and follow-up letters will be sent under the regional directors' signatures and depending upon volume, may be staged from the regional census center or from the National Processing Center.

1.3.16 There will be no post-census local review activity.

1.3.17. There will be jurisdictions excluded from the formal LUCA program; because they are in geographic areas where the Address Canvassing Operation will not be conducted, there is no way to verify address list submissions. Examples of geographic areas where address canvassing will not take place are Remote Alaska Enumeration and Remote Update/Enumerate.

2010 Census Dress Rehearsal LUCA Program

Activity	Start Date	End Date
DRESS REHEARSAL SITE SELECTION	09/01/05	12/31/05
Send LUCA Pre-Invitation Letters and Materials to Entities in Dress Rehearsal Site	01/09/06	01/13/06
Design, develop and implement the LUCA GPP module and reporting system	10/03/05	02/13/06
Design, develop and implement the LUCA production and control system	09/01/05	03/15/06
Design, develop LUCA program materials (address list and maps)	09/19/05	03/10/06
Design, develop and implement LUCA training materials	09/19/05	03/10/06
Design, develop LUCA invitation materials (letters, brochures, forms) INCLUDES Pre-Invitation Package	07/11/05	03/10/06
Invite tribal, state and local governments to participate in LUCA	03/13/06	05/14/06
Print and ship initial outgoing review materials	05/15/06	06/15/06
Tribal/state/local governments review address list/maps and submit updates	06/16/06	10/16/06
FLD regional offices review tribal/state/local LUCA submissions	10/17/06	11/28/06
Census Bureau processes tribal/state/local government submissions and updates MAF/TIGER (including production of MAF extract for address canvassing)	11/27/06	12/29/06
Prepare to conduct the address canvassing activity	01/02/07	04/03/07
Conduct the address canvassing activity	04/06/07	05/19/07
Update MAF/TIGER with the results of the address canvassing activity	04/13/07	08/14/07
Conduct Group Quarters Validation	08/17/07	09/24/07
Design, develop LUCA feedback program materials (address list and maps)	02/12/07	07/16/07
Create/produce/assemble/pack/ship LUCA Feedback	08/17/07	12/14/07
Participant reviews LUCA Feedback and files appeal	12/17/07	01/28/08
LUCA Appeals Office reviews and resolves appeals	01/29/08	03/14/08
Census Day		

2010 Census LUCA Program

Activity	Start Date	End Date
Design, develop and implement LUCA participant web-based MAF/TIGER update software	11/08/04	08/16/06
Design, develop and implement LUCA participant PC-based MAF/TIGER update software	11/08/04	08/16/06
Design, develop and implement the LUCA GPP module and reporting system	03/27/06	09/25/06
Design, develop and implement the LUCA production and control system	01/05/07	06/08/07
Design, develop LUCA program materials (address list and maps)	01/05/07	06/08/07
Design, develop and implement LUCA computer-based, web-based, and paper training materials	08/26/05	02/01/07
Design, develop LUCA Advance Notice materials (letters, brochures, etc.)	10/06/06	12/28/06
Design, develop LUCA invitation materials (letters, brochures, forms)	12/22/06	05/24/07
Send LUCA advance notice letters and promotional materials to tribal, state, and local governments.	09/01/06	01/23/07
Invite tribal, state and local governments to participate in LUCA	03/05/07	11/17/07
Print and ship initial outgoing review materials	07/23/07	03/14/08
Tribal/state/local governments review address list/maps and submit updates	07/30/07	04/04/08
Review tribal/state/local LUCA submissions	08/06/07	08/06/08
Census Bureau processes tribal/state/local government submissions and updates MAF/TIGER	08/16/08	10/08/08
Prepare to conduct the address canvassing activity	10/09/08	04/03/09
Conduct the address canvassing activity	04/06/09	05/15/09
Update MAF/TIGER with the results of the address canvassing activity	04/13/09	08/14/09
Conduct Group Quarters Validation	08/18/09	09/23/09
Design, develop LUCA feedback program materials (address list and maps)	01/14/09	06/17/09
Create/produce/assemble/pack/ship LUCA Feedback	08/17/09	10/19/09
Participants review LUCA Feedback and file appeals	09/01/09	12/02/09
LUCA Appeals Office reviews and resolves appeals	09/08/09	01/15/09
Census Bureau data captures LUCA Appeal Office's final determination	09/15/09	02/01/10
Census Day	04/01/10	