NWX-US DEPT OF COMMERCE
Moderator: VERONICA VAQUER
August 23, 2022
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: ...and thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants are in a listen-only mode until the question and answer portion of today's event. At that time, if you are a plaintiff or attorney, you may press star 1 on your telephone to ask a question. You'll be asked to state your name and affiliation. Only plaintiffs and their attorneys will be able to ask a question. This conference is also being recorded. If you have any objections, please disconnect. I would now like to turn this conference over to Michael Cook to begin.

Michael Cook: Good morning, and thank you for joining us today. I'm Michael Cook, Chief of the Public Information Office at the US Census Bureau. This is the fourth and final status briefing for the National Urban League Plaintiffs in the case of National Urban League vs. Gina Raimondo. The Census Bureau has agreed in a joint stipulation in settling this lawsuit, to brief plaintiffs to allow an opportunity for questions and answers regarding the status of Census processing, data quality measures, and assessment of release data quality metrics.

Today, you'll be hearing from Al Fontenot, the Associate Director for Decennial Census Programs as well as Tim Kennel, the Assistant Division Chief for Statistical Methods in the Decennial Statistical Studies Division. Today's briefing is open to the plaintiffs, their attorneys, and the public. However, only the plaintiffs and their attorneys will be able to ask questions after today's presentations. Media and members of the public, you can find more information in our online newsroom at Census.gov. You can also access today's presentation in this briefing's Electronic Press Kit.

Now, let's turn things over to Al Fontenot, the Associate Director for Decennial Census Programs, who will provide you with an overview of today's presentation. Al?

Al Fontenot: Thank you, Michael, and good morning, everyone. As Michael noted, today is our fourth and final briefing for the National Urban League plaintiffs. I appreciate the opportunity to once again, provide this briefing and update this group on the Census Bureau's commitment to transparency and scientific integrity. Before we hear from today's subject-matter-expert, I would like to recap the insights we have shared today.

In our first briefing in July 2021, we provided updates on the status of operations as well as an overview of our disclosure avoidance system, and post data collection processing. At that time, we had released the apportionment results as well as two separate releases of data quality metrics, including the release of operational data quality metrics that were released the same day as the Census results, which I might add, was the first time we had done so in our history.

In our second briefing in October 2021, we provided the status update on post enumeration survey fieldwork, and went through a detailed presentation on

three separate data quality metric releases that had been released as of that date. The first data quality release included information on how people responded to the Census, as well as how the Census Bureau accounted for addresses that did not respond. The second release provided further insight into how housing units were enumerated, and included information on occupied and vacant housing units, and the size of occupied units.

The data in this release was provided for the nation, all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The third release provided sub-state level summaries for selected metrics, as well as metrics on item non-response, which occurs when a respondent provides some information but does not respond to all the questions. In our third briefing in March 2022, we provided the first results from the Post Enumeration Survey, also called the PES, as well as detail from demographic analysis.

These first PES results provided estimates of population coverage overall, and by demographic group, such as race and Hispanic origin, as well as age groups and sex. The DA results included net coverage estimates by age and sex. All of these previous data releases - the data quality metrics, PES results, and demographic analysis, add to our understanding of completeness, accuracy, and quality of the 2020 Census. And further bolstered our belief that the 2020 Census data are fit for use.

Before we get into today's briefing, I would like to take a moment and mention that on August 17th, the Census Bureau published a Federal Register Notice, soliciting input from the public as we enter into the early stages of planning for the 2030 Census. For the first time, the public can formally give input on planning and designing for the next Decennial Census. With the public's input, we'll aim to better reach and count historically undercounted

people, overcome challenges, and encourage everyone to respond to the 2030 Census.

This input will help inform our decisions for the 2030 Census, including our research, testing, and design. Specifically, we want to hear the public's input on reaching and motivating everyone to respond to the Census. As you know, there are certain populations that we have historically undercounted. These undercounts have persisted over many decades despite our best efforts. We're committed to addressing the factors that may contribute to these undercounts. And we are seeking the public's ideas on how to achieve this goal for the next Census.

Specifically, we'd like to hear about how we can effectively reach the Hispanic or Latino population, the Black or African American population, the American Indian and Alaskan Native population living on a Reservation, people who reported being some other race, and young children. We are eager to understand better the public's perception of how to reach these populations and how to motivate everyone to respond to the 2030 Census.

In the area of technology, we are interested in hearing from the public on what type of technological advancements could make responding to the Census more user-friendly, enhance our efforts to include self-response, and help facilitate our work to collect data in person. For new data sources, we're asking the public what additional data sources or methods of using them, could improve and increase operational efficiency and effectiveness, and improve the data quality.

Also, how we contact and interact with the public - how can we tailor our contact strategies to maximize the number of households responding to the Census on their own; what tools and messages should we use to invite people

to respond to the census; and how often should we reach out to each household? In the area of public support, what are people's needs when responding to the Census; how can we support people as they respond, whether online, by phone, by mail, in English, or in another language; and how can we increase access for people with disabilities?

All input must be received by November 15, 2022. And more information can be found on the Federal Register Notice, which is available on our Web site, Census.gov/2030Census. Please note, that all comments received are part of the public record. Back to today, today we will present additional results from the Post Enumeration Survey, the results that will be discussed today are more detailed and include the 2020 Census estimated undercount and overcount rates for people of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; coverage rates by Census operation, including Internet response mode, nonresponse follow up by type of enumeration, and coverage rates of housing units for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Before I turn it over to our subject-matter-expert, I would like to remind everyone that Decennial Censuses over time, inherently have featured varying levels of quality and fitness for use. Today's presentation, as well as all of our previous briefings, are part of our commitment to transparency and data science by informing you on the fitness for use, and the strengths and limitations of the 2020 Census data.

I would like to reiterate, for all we know, there is still more work to do in future Censuses, to ensure equitable coverage across the United States. We believe the 2020 Census data are fit for use to inform decision-making and paint a portrait of our nation's people. Now let me turn it over to Tim Kennel, our Assistant Division Chief for Statistical Methods, Decennial Statistical

Studies Division, who will discuss the most recent results of the Post Enumeration Survey. Tim?

Timothy Kennel: Good morning. In the past few months the Census released two reports about the coverage of the 2020 Census from the Post Enumeration Survey. Last week we released coverage estimates of the 2020 Census counts of housing units, and coverage of the 2020 Census counts in Puerto Rico. Today I'll provide additional estimates of 2020 Census coverage from the Post Enumeration Survey that I didn't present when we last met in March. I'll start with some introductions and then dive into the coverage estimates.

The main presentation is divided into two parts. The first part, coverage estimates of coverage, for the 2020 Census counts of people; the second part deals with housing units. Within each part I will cover national results, (state) results, and results for Puerto Rico. For coverage of people I also included a section on 2020 Census coverage, by Census operations. Today's presentation covers two of the three releases of the Post Enumeration Survey estimates. There's a lot to cover, so let's get started.

We start with an introduction. The Post Enumeration Survey or PES, provides an independent estimate of the number of people in the country. We compare the Census counts to the independent PES estimate. We call this difference the estimated net coverage error. If the net coverage error is negative, the Census was less than the estimated population size. We call that an undercount. If the net coverage error is positive, the Census count was higher than the independent estimate, called an overcount. And a number close to zero means that the two numbers were about the same.

The Post Enumeration Survey also gives us information about how many people were correctly counted in the Census, missed, or erroneously

enumerated. And consistent with our prior practice, we will not be adjusting the Census counts for apportionment or redistricting. The Post Enumeration Survey is a probability survey of about 161,000 housing units in about 10,000 blocks that's independent of the Census operations. After creating independent lists of how units and people in these 10,000 blocks from scratch, we look for these people in the Census, to determine who was missed from the Census or counted in error.

We've conducted a Post Enumeration Survey to measure the quality of the Census since 1950. We estimate Census coverage so you can see some of the strengths and limitations of the 2020 Census. Of course, the PES provides one of many different quality measures we have about the Census. The PES estimates contribute to our discussion on Census quality, but only show one aspect of Census quality, and that's coverage. The Census Bureau also measures Census coverage using demographic analysis.

Post demographic analysis and the Post Enumeration Survey provide independent estimates of the population size. One way they differ is in who is considered in scope. Demographic analysis includes people living in group quarters and remote Alaska areas, while the PES excludes both groups. In this slide, we do see the Census counts for demographic analysis in the PES.

So the demographic analysis universe, which includes group quarters, such as college housing, nursing homes, jails, and remote Alaska areas included in demographic analysis, the Census counted 331.4 million people and demographic analysis independently estimated 332.6 million people. For the PES universe, which excludes people in group quarters and people in remote Alaska areas, the Census count was 323.2 million people, and the PES estimate was 323.9 million people.

It's important to keep in mind that the PES estimates for each state apply only to the household population in each state. The PES does not estimate Census coverage for people who are living in group quarters, in each state. With that introduction, let's look at how the 2020 Census counts of people compare to the independent PES estimates by state.

At the state level there were 36 states and Washington, DC, that didn't have a statistically significant undercount or overcount of people in the 2020 Census. In a moment I'll show you the eight states had a statistically significant overcount and I'll show you the six states that had a statistically significant undercount. Some people might like to know why specific states had an undercount, overcount, or neither. The PES was designed to measure net coverage error, but it was not designed to answer questions about the root causes of coverage error.

So here we see a map showing the states with statistically significant overcount in green, and the states with a statistically significant undercount in purple. States for the 2020 Census population counts didn't statistically differ from the independent PES estimate are in light gray. A map with the state coverage results is in the America Counts story released in May. Here we see the states with statistically significant undercounts on the left table, and the states with statistically significant overcount on the right. States are listed alphabetically. The 90% confidence interval is shown to the right of each state.

Because our coverage results are based on a sample, there's some variability in the estimated net coverage error rates. We think the actual net coverage error rate should be somewhere in the 90% confidence interval, although we will be wrong sometimes. We estimate that the net coverage error rate of the 2020 Census population counts of Arkansas, is between negative 8.68% and

negative 1.40%. Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas, are statistically significant undercounts.

Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Utah, have significantly significant overcounts. The full table with the net coverage estimates and components of coverage, are in the PES report we released in May, and they can be downloaded on Data.Census.gov. In May we released several fascinating tables showing correct enumeration, erroneous enumeration, and whole person Census imputation rates by Census operations.

I'll share a few highlights now, but would encourage you to check out the PES report on the coverage measurement Web site and the tables on Data.Census.gov. Census operational areas and outcomes refer to how the Census was conducted and how people responded. These coverage estimates help us see what operation works well, and which can be improved in the future. Main highlights that I'll cover today is that the Internet self-response had a correct enumeration rate of 96.1%. In this section, I'm going to show components of Census coverage by enumeration mode, which means how people were counted.

To illustrate the different features of this table, I'll walk through the Internet self-response and then show estimates for other modes. Although some people responded to Census 2000 using the Internet, the Internet wasn't extensively used until the 2020 Census. Most people, over 206.6 million people, were counted in the Census through an Internet Response. Moving along the bar chart from left to right, you see an estimate of duplicates shown in red - 1.6% of the Internet self-response enumerations were duplicates of people already counted in the Census.

Duplication of people in the Census can arise in several ways. A classic example would be for a child with separated parents who are living at different places. If both parents included their child on the Census forms, the child would be duplicated. Another example would be for people who cycle between various addresses. For example, a person might live in one city during the weekend, but stay in another city with friends for work, during the work week.

If the person fills out the Census form at the weekend address and the friends include the person on their form at the work week address, the person might be duplicated. Duplicates can also arise when people move. A household might fill out their Census form at one location on April 1st and then move into a vacant house in June, in which case they might be counted at the new address, during the non-response follow up operation. There are many reasons for duplication in the Census. The PES helps to see how much of a problem duplication is.

The second type of erroneous enumeration is for records erroneously included in the Census for other reasons. As shown in yellow, 0.6% of Internet self-responses in the Census are erroneous enumerations for other reasons. Examples of erroneous enumerations for other reasons would be tourists visiting the country, people who are born after Census day, or people who die before Census day. They should not be included in the Census.

There are some Census records that we didn't even attempt to classify as correct or erroneous enumerations. For the PES, we call these whole person Census imputations. In general, these are records with very little or no person information. So it's very hard to follow up on them to verify if they were correctly counted in the Census or not. 3.4% of the people counted through Internet self-response were classified as whole person Census imputations.

We strive to get complete information from everyone in the household. We don't consider these whole person Census imputations to be errors, but they're less desirable because we generally prefer to get reported characteristics. Correct enumerations are shown in blue. The PES uses a strict definition of correct enumerations that includes checks and independent confirmation to make sure the Census enumerations correspond to a unique person in the population who is living on April 1, 2020. So for 96% of the Internet self-response enumerations were correct. So overall, Internet was successful, and people were correctly counted through this mode.

This slide shows the correct enumeration rate by the enumeration mode. There are a few ways people are counted that aren't shown here, but this draft accounts for the vast majority of Census enumerations. The enumeration modes are ordered chronologically in terms of when the response is provided. The self-response modes are shown at the top, and then move down into the non-response follow up and the administrative record enumerations at the bottom.

The PES report on person coverage for state and Census operations, goes into these operations in more detail. The main part from this slide is that depending on the mode, the PES estimated between 87.4% and 97.1% of the Census enumerations, met our strict definition of being correct enumerations. We also see at the bottom, that over 94% of the people enumerated through administrative records met the criteria of being correct enumerations. The administrative record mode was moved for the 2020 Census and these results suggest that administrative record enumerations are generally competitive with other modes.

The big picture is that generally, the Census counts are based on correct enumerations, thanks to the many households who answered the Census and who provided complete and accurate information. Now here we see the erroneous enumeration rates for the enumeration mode. The X-axis goes from 0% to 14%. Overall, the erroneous enumeration rates are quite low. There are some variations in the erroneous enumeration rates though.

This slide supports that the Internet mode at the top, was successful at having low erroneous enumerations. We also see that the duplication rates for the bottom three groups, responses given to a Census taker, or obtained through administrative records, should be improved in the future. The set of people who are counted in these modes may vary considerably. So this is clear, the enumeration mode counts as more erroneous enumerations, or if the set of respondents to that mode are more likely to report duplicates or other people who shouldn't be included in the Census.

Here I've added the whole person Census imputation rates. I've already mentioned these a number of times, but will reiterate that the Census strives to get complete demographic characteristics about everyone in the household. We don't have enough information to attempt to classify these whole person Census imputations as correct or erroneous. To summarize, at the state level, eight states had a statistically significant overcount, and six states had a statistically significant undercount.

In terms of the components of coverage, correct enumerations, erroneous enumerations, and whole person Census imputations, many of the innovations were successful. The Internet self-response mode was a widely used mode that was not available in 2010. Over 96% of the people counted through the Internet self-response met the criteria of being correct enumerations. Another

innovation of the 2020 Census was the use of administrative records to enumerate some non-responding households.

Over 94% of the people enumerated through administrative records, also met the criteria of being correct enumerations. We now turn our attention to coverage estimates for people in Puerto Rico. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the population of Puerto Rico, by 174,000. This represents a net coverage error rate of 5.7%. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the number of people in owned housing units in Puerto Rico, and the PES estimated statistically significant overcounts in Puerto Rico, for people age 30 years and over.

The Census counts for the household population in Puerto Rico was 3,248,000. The PES estimate was 3,075,000 people. The 2020 Census counts for the household population in Puerto Rico was 174,000 over the independent estimate from the PES. The Census had a statistically significant overcounted people in Puerto Rico. The estimated rate of erroneous enumerations was 9.8% or 319,000 people. Most of these erroneous enumerations were duplicates. Duplicates contributed to the overall overcount of people in Puerto Rico.

So we see the net coverage error rate by tenure. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the number of people in owned housing units in Puerto Rico. Now they'll receive the results by age group. The PES estimated a statistically significant overcount in Puerto Rico for people aged 30 years and people aged 50 years and older. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the population of Puerto Rico by 174,000 people. This represents a net coverage error rate of 5.7%. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the number of people in owned housing units in Puerto Rico, and

the PES estimated statistically significant overcounts in Puerto Rico for people aged 30 years and over.

We now turn our attention from the coverage of 2020 Census counts of people to the counts of housing units. The main takeaway for housing unit coverage is that the 2020 - is that the PES estimate of housing units for the nation, was not statistically different from the 2020 Census housing unit count. The national Census count is aligned with our independent estimate from the PES. We did not measure a statistically significant undercount or overcount for the 2020 Census housing units at the national level.

At the state level, 41 states and the District of Columbia, did not have a statistically significant undercount or overcount either. Seven states had a statistically significant overcount, two states had a statistically significant undercount. I'll show you these states in a moment, but first let's see some national results. Here we see a table that summarizes the main PES estimates for housing units.

The first row shows the 2020 Census count of housing units in the 50 states and DC, excluding remote Alaska areas. In 2020, there are 140.5 million housing units in the Census count. The second part of the table shows the PES estimate of the number of housing units in the same universe as the Census count. The PES estimated 140.4 million housing units. Because this number is estimated from a sample survey it's subject to some sampling error. The standard error quantifies our confidence in the PES estimate. A lower standard error means that we're more confident in our estimate.

Here the standard error is 291,000. If we had selected a different random sample and interviewed different households, we probably would have gotten a different estimate because we selected a different random sample. The

standard error gives us a sense of the range of estimates we would expect from different samples. We use standard error to calculate margins of error and confidence intervals. If we subtract the PES estimate from the Census number, we see that the Census was higher than the PES estimate by 50,000.

That means we estimate that the Census count had 50,000 more housing units than the PES estimate. Of course, because the standard error is much larger than 50,000 we can't say whether the Census overcounted or undercounted the number of housing units. Thus, the PES estimate was not statistically different from the Census count. For those of you doing the math and check this work, I will note that all the numbers here have been rounded. The net coverage error is calculated based on the (unrounded) data, and then it's rounded.

So you can know the difference between 140.5 million and 140.4 million is 100,000. The difference between the actual numbers is about 50,000 before they're rounded. At the top of the table we see components of the Census count. The Census counted 140.5 million housing units in the 50 states, DC, excluding remote Alaska. Of those, the PES estimated that 136.1 million or 96.9% were correctly enumerated. The PES does extensive follow up on records to determine which were correct enumerations and which were erroneous.

The remaining housing units in the Census were erroneous enumerations. These are for housing unit records that were included in the Census, but should not have been included. Overall, 1.4% of housing unit records in the Census, were duplicates of housing units that were already included in the Census. The duplicates should be included in the Census just for housing units that have multiple addresses. Sometimes street names, zip codes, house numbers, or a road route change over time. This can cause duplication, especially if it's difficult to link up the old and new addresses.

In addition to the duplicates, 1.8% of the housing units counted in the Census, were erroneously enumerated for other reasons. An erroneous enumeration for other reasons, is the result of including addresses in the Census, for buildings that are not housing units. For example, including businesses in the Census, including addresses for housing units that are under construction and not ready for habitation on April 1, 2020, or including addresses for demolished housing units that are not fit for habitation. They're all examples of erroneous enumerations in the Census.

These addresses should not have been included in the Census as housing units. I'll note that both vacant and occupied units are included in the Census. So vacant units are not considered erroneous enumerations. We now turn our attention to the PES estimate of housing units. The PES estimated 140.4 million housing units in the 50 states and DC excluding remote Alaska areas. Of those 136.1 million were correctly enumerated in the census. That's the same 136.1 million at the top of the table.

Of the estimated 140.4 million housing units in the 50 states, and DC, 96.9% were correctly counted in the census. And 3.1% were missed from the census. Hidden units such as basement apartments, garage apartments, vacant units, and housing units that are combined with businesses are classic examples of omissions.

Here we see the percent net coverage generates from 1990 to 2020. Statistically significant results are in black. In 1990, the PES estimated that the census count of occupied housing units was 0.53% lower than the PES estimate.

The census count of vacant units was 4.71% lower than the PES estimate. And the overall census count was 0.96% lower than the PES estimate. So the 1990 census undercounted the number of housing units in the United States.

In 2020, the PES estimated that the census count of occupied units was 0.33% higher than the PES estimate. The census count of vacant housing units was 2.5% lower than the PES estimate. And the PES estimate of total housing units was not statistically different from the census count. This finding suggests that the overall 2020 Census housing account is aligned with our independent estimates from the PES.

Yet there are some overcounts and undercounts. Here we see a graph of the percent net coverage error by region. According to the census there are 24,720,000 housing units in the Northeast Region.

The 2020 Census housing unit count in the Northeast was 1.6%* higher than the PES estimate. Thus, we say the census overcounted the housing units in the Northeast.

***Note: Our subject matter expert inadvertently said "1.6%" instead of “1.9%”. The data presented on slide 59 - which says 1.9% - is accurate.**

Since the estimated overcount is from a sample survey we would probably get a different estimate if we had selected a different sample. The interval shown here shows a range of estimated net coverage error percentages we would expect from different samples. These are all positive and between 1.4 and 2.3 indicating that census count was in fact higher than the PES estimate.

In looking at the other regions the estimated net coverage error crosses the zero line indicating that there could be an undercount, to the left, or an

overcount to the right. There isn't a statistically significant undercount or overcount for the Midwest, South or West.

For two states, South Carolina and Vermont, the census counts were significantly less than the PES estimates. Seven states Alabama, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Utah had statistically significant overcounts.

This slide shows the net coverage error rate as well as the 90% confidence interval of that estimate. The 90% confidence interval shows a reasonable range where the data suggests that the actual undercount or overcount rates should be. But there's no guarantee the actual census undercount or overcount will be in that range.

In summary, the PES estimate of housing units for the nation was not statistically different from the 2020 Census housing count. The national census count is aligned with our independent estimate from the PES, but we did not measure a significant undercount or overcount for the 2020 Census of housing units at the national level.

At the state level 41 states, and in the District of Columbia, did not have significant undercount or overcount either. Seven states had a statistically significant overcount, two states had a statistically significant undercount.

We'll now turn our attention to housing unit coverage in Puerto Rico. The PES estimated that the 2020 Census housing unit account in Puerto Rico did not have statistically significant net coverage error.

Here we see the main national coverage results from the PES for housing units in Puerto Rico. The census counted 1,598,000 housing units in Puerto Rico,

92.4% of the housing units in 2020 Census were correctly enumerated and 7.6% were erroneously enumerated.

The PES estimate was 1,631,000 housing units. The census was 33,000 housing units less than the PES estimate. However, because the standard error was 30,000 we can't say there was a statistically significant difference between the PES estimate and the census housing unit count in Puerto Rico.

Overall, the 2020 Census housing unit count in Puerto Rico is not statistically different from our independent estimate of the number of housing units. So we can't say whether there was an undercount or overcount of housing units in Puerto Rico.

The 2020 Census count of occupied housing units in Puerto Rico was not statistically different from the PES estimate. However, the count of vacant units was 5.8% lower than the PES estimate suggesting an undercount of vacant units in Puerto Rico.

To summarize this presentation, the PES estimated that the 2020 Census undercounted the number of people in six states and overcounted the number of people in eight states. The PES also estimated that the 2020 Census overcounted the number of people in Puerto Rico.

In terms of housing units, the PES estimated that the 2020 Census neither undercounted nor overcounted housing units at the national level. For two states the PES estimated that the 2020 Census undercounted the number of housing units and seven states had a statistically significant overcount.

For Puerto Rico, the PES estimated that the 2020 Census housing unit count did not have a statistically significant undercount or overcount. Thank you.

And I look forward to your questions. I'll turn it - I'll turn it back to Michael Cook.

Michael Cook: Thank you, Tim. Before we get started with the - before we begin to take your questions I'd like to remind everyone that only the plaintiffs and their attorneys will be able to ask questions. For those who are asking questions we please ask that you announce your name and your organization affiliation or who you rep or who you represent. And as a reminder everyone can visit our Web site, census.gov, where you can access today's presentation within this briefings electronic press kit.

In addition to our speakers to assist us in answering your vast questions about the 2020 Census let me introduce the following individuals, Pat Cantwell, he's our Chief of the Decennial Statistical Studies Division; Jennifer Reichert, she's our Chief of the Decennial Census Management Division; Karen Battle, Chief of the Population Division, Dale Kelly; Chief of the Field Division; and Deborah Stempowski, Assistant Director for the Census Bureau's Decennial Programs.

Operator, we're ready to begin taking questions. Will you please give instructions on how to submit them?

Coordinator: Thank you, sir. At this time if you do have any questions or comments press Star 1. Please unmute your phones and state your name and prompted. Again, that is Star 1 if you do have any questions and Star 2 to withdraw your question. One moment, please, for the first question.

Once again, please press Star 1 if you do have any questions. One moment please. Kelly Percival, your line is open from Brennan Center.

Kelly Percival: Hi, thank you. My first question is, is the bureau planning anything specifically to understand the causes and contributing factors of both statewide undercounts as well as racially differential undercount?

Michael Cook: Thanks for that line of questioning. I'm looking to our SMEs now who can speak to that question about undercounts statewide.

Jennifer Reichert: Hi Michael, this is Jennifer Reichert with the Decennial Census Management Division. I would just mention that we have officially kicked off our research program for the 2030 Census. And one of the highest priorities within that research agenda is to investigate different ways to motivate, and reach and engage with some of those key communities that have seen that a traditional undercount in our census data.

So that's one of the prime focuses of our new director, as well as our research program. So as some of you might know, and Al mentioned in his opening remarks, about the Federal Register Notice that is our first sort of large scale attempt to reach out to not only the public but also our key stakeholders in some of these critical communities to help us learn about how to better engage with those people and improve our engagement and hopefully improve the participation and the coverage within those communities.

But it is an underlying tenant in our entire research program to try to focus on those historically undercounted populations. So yes, we have a lot of interest and efforts in that venue going on now.

Michael Cook: Thanks for that Jennifer. Caller, you had an additional question I believe. You had two?

Kelly Percival: Oh yes. So my follow-up to that was just whether you're planning anything specifically to address those types of undercount?

Michael Cook: And I think Jennifer answered that. Thanks for that. Operator, do we have a next caller?

Coordinator: Once again, if you do have any questions or comments please press Star 1. Sir, at this time I'm showing no further questions.

Michael Cook: Well I'd like to thank everyone for joining us today as well as our presenters. A reminder you can sign up to receive alerts about the Census Bureau and our online newsroom to stay up date about future briefings and all the data and products that Census Bureau releases about our nation’s people, places and in our economy. And stay connected to us on social media at US Census Bureau.

Again, I'd like to thank everyone. This concludes our briefing for today.

Man: Thank you.

Michael Cook: Take care.

Coordinator: Thank you. This concludes today's conference call. You may go ahead and disconnect at this time.

[End]