MONITORING BOARD APPLAUDS BUREAU’S EFFORTS AND AWAITS CORRECTION RESULTS

The release of today’s population numbers by the U.S. Census Bureau is the culmination of long-term planning by the professionals at the Bureau and almost one million dedicated temporary employees who carried out the census locally.

While early indicators show the Census Bureau did an admirable job of counting the nation, historical trends also show that some communities are counted better than others. Since 1940, even as the accuracy of the decennial Census has increased, so has the so-called ‘differential undercount,’ meaning the proportion of minorities, poor people and children missed by the census.

According to Co-Chairman Gilbert F. Casellas, “The Census Monitoring Board has kept a close watch and reported on the development and implementation of Census 2000. With the release of state population figures today, the Census Bureau has met another benchmark deadline. The stage is now set for the Bureau to complete its Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation, designed to help produce a corrected count.”

Lt. Governor Cruz M. Bustamante noted, “California contributed significant resources at the State and local level to get as many people counted in the census as possible and the State gains representation from our efforts. However, in my role as a Member of the Census Monitoring Board, I remain concerned that populations that most need an accurate count – Latinos, African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and children are under served by old census methods.”

“Today’s census numbers govern the allocation of congressional seats for every state but that is not to say the census is over. The corrected data now being compiled by the Census Bureau will serve as an important insurance policy for those who were unable to participate in this great national undertaking. The initial enumeration combined with the follow-up survey will allow us to account for those we failed to count,” said Everett M. Ehrlich.

Lorraine A. Green stated, “The census will help guide national policy decisions for the next decade. Therefore, the pursuit of accurate numbers derived from modern statistical methods must continue. As a Board Member, I have been very interested in the census process, especially because the District of Columbia had the highest undercount rate in the 1990 Census.”

###

The U.S. Census Monitoring Board, established by Congress in 1997, is a bipartisan board that monitors the Census Bureau’s preparations for the 2000 Census. Its findings are reported every six months to Congress.
Dr. Eugene P. Ericksen, one of the nation’s preeminent experts on statistics and the census submitted today an Issue Brief to the U.S. Census Monitoring Board describing the nature of the census undercount. As indicated above, the net undercount has historically been getting smaller while the differential undercount has steadily increased. Based upon observation of the trend lines, he expects that Census 2000 will have a differential undercount of about 4 percent.

The net undercount is the difference between the number of people missed and the number of people counted twice in the census. History shows that people of color are missed at a disproportionate rate. The racial bias in the census undercount is called the differential undercount. Due to the civil rights implications of a differential undercount, the professionals at the U.S. Census Bureau conducted a follow-up survey to correct for errors and undercounts inevitably found in a traditional census.

Dr. Ericksen’s Issue Brief can be found on our website at:  www.cmbp.gov
Demographic Analysis

Demographic Analysis (DA) uses administrative records on births, deaths, migration, and Medicare to develop an independent estimate of the population. DA is a benchmark to evaluate the national population figure from the decennial census. First developed in 1955, and later improved through continued research at the Census Bureau and elsewhere, DA estimates are considered to be the standard for judging the completeness of the census count. These estimates are reliable at the national level for the black and non-black populations only. The estimates are not reliable for any other racial or ethnic group. They are also not reliable at any sub-national level.

The following demographic projection for the April 2000 population, assumes that the sizes of the Black and non-Black net undercounts are the same in 2000 as they were in 1990. The Census Bureau’s population estimate, not incorporating the net undercount, for April 2000 is 274,520,000. Adding the net undercount of 4,720,000 brings the total estimated population to 279,240,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Black Population</th>
<th>Non-Black Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-APR-90</td>
<td>248,791</td>
<td>30,517</td>
<td>218,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253,511</td>
<td>32,362</td>
<td>221,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-APR-00</td>
<td>274,520</td>
<td>35,195</td>
<td>239,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>279,240</td>
<td>37,040</td>
<td>242,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method assumes sizes of undercount hold constant for Blacks and Non-Blacks.
Numbers are in thousands.

Sources:

For April 1990 all groups and April 2000 Blacks: Census Bureau website, Population Estimates Program, [http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile3-1.txt](http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile3-1.txt)
