

COVERAGE OF THE 1990 CENSUS

Q1 & A1s
prepared
12/26/90
am

Two activities will tell us about the coverage of the 1990 census. Both of these will be done in 1991 to serve as input into the Secretary's decision whether or not to adjust the actual enumeration to improve accuracy. The deadline for this decision is July 15.

First, demographic analysis. Demographic analysis is not complete. It is being refined using records still to come from 1990 Medicare, 1990 estimates being made of undocumented aliens and research to correct prior demographic analyses going back as far as 1940. The preliminary demographic analysis estimate of 253 million is preliminary, not a solid number. Along with refining the estimate, we will complete the development of error intervals to assess the accuracy of the 1990 demographic estimates of net coverage for race, sex, and age groups. Formal release of estimates of coverage for 1990 will include error ranges for the estimates.

Second, analyses of the post-enumeration survey. The Census Bureau is conducting a post-enumeration survey of about 150,000 households to be analyzed by 116 post-stratum groups based on census division geography, place type, race, Hispanic origin and tenure (renter/owner). A number of analyses will determine how good the post-enumeration survey is as a tool for adjustment to improve accuracy of the census.

① Prepared by Dr. Bryant with minor changes
from POP+OPLD

QUESTION

What is the undercount?

ANSWER

We don't know yet. Work continues on programs to evaluate the accuracy of these counts.

BACKGROUND

1. We have produced (and released) an estimate of the total resident population based on demographic analysis. The point estimate is 253.4 million persons, with a small range around that (and using various detailed assumptions that can be explained by POP). The comparable resident population figure from the census, including the District of Columbia, but excluding the overseas counts, is 248.7. This yields a national undercount estimate of 1.85%.
2. The comparable estimate of the national undercount for 1980 is 1.4%.
3. Our planning number of 250 million was just that: a planning number. It was derived using 1980 counts and estimates of births, deaths, immigration, emigration, and so on.
4. By April, based on demographic analyses, we will have national estimates of coverage rates by Race, Age, and Sex.
5. By July 15, the Secretary of Commerce will make a decision on adjustment, and we will have state and other sub-national estimates (using PES and demographic analyses) of coverage rates by Race, Age, Sex, and Origin.

2) Prepared by J. W. D. based on discussion with Thompson, Insekua

QUESTION

Would the apportionment be different if the overseas counts were excluded?

ANSWER

Any different set of numbers might produce a different apportionment. But, the official and therefore only apportionment does include the overseas counts.

BACKGROUND

The apportionment would be different if we excluded the overseas counts. DPLD understands you have this display.

③ J.V. with input

QUESTION

What lawsuits have been filed over these results? Can you comment on the validity of those suits?

ANSWER

Several lawsuits have been filed. As a party to those lawsuits, I cannot comment on their substance or validity. For details, please contact the Department of Justice.

4 J.R.

Question: When will race and Hispanic origin data be available?

Answer: January through March on a state-by-state basis

Background: From late January through March, we will be releasing on a state-by-state basis as mandated by Public Law 94-171, the Redistricting Program, the following data--

1. Total Population
2. Counts of the Population by Race
 - White
 - Black
 - Asian and Pacific Islander
 - American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut
 - Other
3. Total Hispanic Origin
4. Cross tabulation of data for persons not of Hispanic origin by race
5. Items 1-4 will be tabulated for all persons and persons 18 years old and over

Data will be shown for the following geographic areas for all States and the District of Columbia--

1. State
2. County
3. Place
4. Minor civil division/census county division
5. Tracts/Blocks
6. Block Groups
7. Blocks

(5) P. Berner

QUESTION

Your overseas counts totaled fewer than 1 million persons. Why is this figure considerably lower than the pre-census estimates?

ANSWER

Preliminary estimates of the overseas population were drawn in mid-1989 from the personnel records of Federal agencies. These estimates differed from the final counts primarily because they did not coincide with the scope of the census.

The overseas estimates included about 180,000 U. S. Navy personnel aboard ships that were berthed at home ports on Census Day; these personnel were counted in the census. Similarly, the estimates included Federally employed residents of the U. S. commonwealths and territories and Panamanian citizens working for the Panama Canal Commission.

BACKGROUND

Preliminary estimates of 1.2 to 1.6 million overseas personnel for the Defense Department were cited in a Commerce Department press release dated August 1, 1989, at which time we were negotiating to assist DOD in conducting an overseas census. The census was cancelled for lack of funding, and we agreed to accept administrative-record data for use in the apportionment and expanded the scope to the whole Federal sector. The personnel records of Federal agencies have been deficient in several respects:

- o Lacking standardization. Some agencies could not generate home-state data; some could not report on dependents; some (with relatively few personnel) conducted internal surveys to gather the counts; some provided partial counts; and one (Peace Corps) declined to participate while another (FEMA) allowed its personnel to decline. DOD was able to provide home-state data from administrative records for its military personnel, but not for its civilian component.
- o Coverage deficiencies. To collect the required information for its civilian personnel, DOD conducted a survey during the autumn of 1990. The response rate to this survey was 20 percent, meaning that perhaps over 100,000 overseas personnel/dependents are missing from DOD's submission. We did not receive counts from the covert agencies or from similar components of the Armed Forces.

The DOD accounts for 98 percent of the reported overseas total, and 91 percent of the military personnel were assigned a home state on the basis of home of record, 8 percent on the basis of legal residence. The two largest non-DOD agencies--State Department and Panama Canal Commission--included dependents in their counts.

(6) A Pay w/ input