PROMOTION OUTREACH EFFORTS FOR CENSUS 2000

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 29, 1997

Serial No. 105–81

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

46–496 CC WASHINGTON : 1998

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 AND OVERSIGHT

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER COX, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
DAVID M. MCINTOSH, Indiana
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
MICHAEL PAPPAS, New Jersey
VINCE SNOWBARGER, Kansas
BOB BARR, Georgia
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
GARY A. CONDIT, California
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
WILLIAM MOSCHELLA, *Deputy Counsel and Parliamentarian*
JUDITH MCCOY, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

J. DENNIS HASTERT, *Chairman*

MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
BOB BARR, Georgia

THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
GARY A. CONDIT, California
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
JIM TURNER, Texas

EX OFFICIO

DAN BURTON, Indiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

ROBERT CHARLES, *Staff Director*
MICHELE LANG, *Special Counsel*
IANTHE SAYLOR, *Clerk*
DAVID MCMILLEN, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on April 29, 1997	1
Statement of:	
Morgan, Michael L., commissioner, Department of City Planning, city of Milwaukee; and Leon A. Meyer, director, City Planning Department, city of Cincinnati, accompanied by Agnese Brienza, senior planner, Hamilton County, OH	10
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Davis, Hon. Danny K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, prepared statement of	74
Hastert, Hon. J. Dennis, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, prepared statement of	5
Maloney, Hon. Carolyn B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	67
Meyer, Leon A., director, City Planning Department, city of Cincinnati, prepared statement of	27
Morgan, Michael L., commissioner, Department of City Planning, city of Milwaukee, prepared statement of	13

PROMOTION OUTREACH EFFORTS FOR CENSUS 2000

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1997

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. J. Dennis Hastert (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Hastert, Davis of Illinois, Barr, Barrett Cummings, and Turner.

Staff present: Robert Charles, staff director; Michele Lang, special counsel; Ianthe Saylor, clerk; David McMillen, minority professional staff member; and Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk.

Mr. HASTERT. The subcommittee will come to order. It is my pleasure to welcome our guests and witnesses this morning and good morning to Mr. Morgan, Mr. Meyer and Ms. Brienza, I believe. We will work on that.

I also would like to extend a welcome to my friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. Davis, who will be joining us from the full committee and who has asked to join us here today.

The hearing is the first in a series of hearings we will be holding to review the Census Bureau's preparations for the critical task of conducting the 2000 decennial census. Throughout the 105th Congress, this subcommittee will be taking a very close look at the activities of the Census Bureau and will be placing a particular emphasis on ensuring the accuracy, reliability and inclusiveness for all Americans in the census process.

Today, we will begin with one of the most important elements required for accuracy in the decennial census, the conduct of an effective promotion and outreach program to ensure that every American understands the importance of participating in the census by completing his or her form.

The General Accounting Office has reported to the Congress that voluntary participation is the cornerstone of the decennial census, because it is the voluntary public response rate through mail-back, which is the most important and accurate and effective and efficient source of census data. The significance of a large mail-back response is not just because it reduces the staff, time and money required, but that it produces the best quality census data. Thus, it is clear that the most fundamental and important task before this subcommittee as it exercises its oversight responsibilities to

ensure an accurate census, is to examine the efforts of the Bureau to achieve a high response rate through promotion and outreach.

Unfortunately, we enter the 2000 census with a historic trend of a declining response rate over the last three censuses. When coupled with the persistent differential undercount of minorities, the problem becomes even more serious. These declining response rates have focused and forced the Bureau to devote greater resources to nonresponse followup, a costly procedure which relies on sending enumerators into individual housing units to collect census data. It is estimated that in 2000, the Bureau will expend on an average of $25 million for each additional percentage point of nonresponse to the mailed out form.

For every percentage point of mail response, there is $25 million less in resources to spend on promotion and outreach efforts in hard-to-count areas.

However, not all the news is bad. Despite its problems, the 1990 census was the most thorough census in history, accounting for 98.4 percent of the population. The most notable and publicized failure of the 1990 census was the majority of persons in the 1.6 percent of the population that were missed in 1990 were minorities. In a nation where the concepts of one person, one vote, and equal representation for all in government are sacred principles, it is imperative that these problems be resolved in the 2000 census.

On the bright side, as reported by the National Research Council, half of the 1990 undercount was due to missed households; that is, households which never even had an opportunity to participate in the census. Why did this happen? In a nutshell, because of inaccurate address lists. Without an accurate address list, the Bureau was unable to get a census questionnaire to these individuals and didn't know where to send an enumerator to count them.

I am pleased to see that in the preparation for the 2000 census, the Bureau has placed a major focus on improving its efforts in address list development. While I still have some questions and concerns about this process, it appears that the Bureau has made great strides in ensuring major improvements in the master address list. Through these efforts alone, the Bureau has laid the important groundwork to eliminate up to half the problem of the undercount.

However, where our real challenge lies, and the reason that we are here today, is to find out how we can reach the other half of the undercounted population, which is comprised of households which did receive census questionnaires but failed to return them for one reason or another.

This challenge, while not new, is not beyond our capabilities to solve. In fact, one of my predecessors at this subcommittee, the former Chairman Sawyer of Ohio, offered some wise guidance to us on this subject back at a hearing in 1989. Mr. Sawyer stated then what is still true today: Minorities and the poor are more likely to participate in the census if they have genuine confidence that their participation will bring them a step closer to playing a more meaningful and fuller role in this Nation's system of government.

Today's hearing is all about how we can translate that vision into a reality in time for the 2000 census.

The key to realizing that vision is promotion and outreach at the local level. It should be the building block on which the 2000 census is based. Our success in promotion and outreach, and ultimately in the census as a whole, quite frankly, depends far more on local mayors, school districts, business and civic leaders and volunteers, than it does on Washington-based statisticians, administrators and consultants.

These leaders in local communities, not statisticians with calculators, are the ones able to capture the unique characteristics of their community necessary to reach out and communicate the vital importance of individual participation in the census.

We are lucky to have with us today three individuals who fill this vital role of community leader that will determine the success of the Census 2000 effort. They are uniquely qualified to address the issues involved with promotion and outreach, and can speak from experience as to what works and what doesn't.

To this end, we will focus on drawing their expertise out in three separate and distinct areas.

First, we will revisit and review the local efforts of two communities which were very successful in the 1990 census. Conventional wisdom holds that minorities in hard to enumerate areas simply won't return their census forms and thus are doomed to be undercounted forever. I am pleased to say that this just isn't true.

I commend Mr. Michael Morgan, whose efforts as the deputy director of the Department of Administration for Milwaukee, WI, in the 1990 census, were instrumental in Milwaukee's achieving the second highest mail response rate of all metropolitan areas in the Nation. In fact, the response rates in Milwaukee for hard to enumerate minority areas exceeded the average national response rate for nonminority suburban areas. Through his efforts in developing a blueprint for promotion and outreach, responsible for obtaining a full and complete count of the citizens of Milwaukee, Mr. Morgan has created a national example that should disabuse us once and for all of all prejudicial notions about what is and isn't possible when it comes to including all Americans in the census count.

In another community, Mr. Meyer and Ms. Brienza of Cincinnati, are tremendous examples of how the dedicated efforts of local leaders in assuring a complete count at all local levels can result in $1 million of increased Federal funding for a locality, funding that would have otherwise been lost had it not been for both their careful preparation for their census and a meticulous followup after the census was completed.

Second, we will examine how well the Census Bureau has learned from their experience of 1990 and whether it has taken advantage of the knowledge gained through the successful techniques implemented by localities in 1990. As with most problems in our society, the real solutions are, and in this case, were found at the local level. I am most eager to see if these hard won lessons have been learned or if we are on a path to repeat easily correctable mistakes in the year 2000. The Bureau has indicated in written materials and at conferences that it understands the key role of building partnerships in the communities.

Has the Bureau listened to the success stories of the localities in 1990? Has the Bureau done a good job of communicating its plans to those at the local level who will be implementing it?

By exploring the Bureau's plans for 2000 from the perspective of local leaders who must actually implement them, we will be in a good position to answer these questions.

Finally, we will examine the larger scope of Census Bureau activities for 2000 and determine how they measure up to the standard of increasing accuracy through greater voluntary citizen participation. This concern cannot be emphasized enough, because it strikes at the heart of whether the 2000 census represents valid data that can serve as a base for almost every government function for the next 10 years or whether it is just merely just another set of numbers whose validity is in question and is viewed by the public with the kind of skepticism usually reserved for political polls.

Each of us should be asking at least three questions: First, whether the Bureau's overall census plan encourages or discourages political empowerment in these hard-to-count communities through participation in the census?

Second, does the Bureau's overall plan work to overcome a deep mistrust in the government process which many of these hard-to-count communities hold? And third, through its actions, is the Bureau sending contradictory messages to the American people about the need for individual participation in the Census 2000? If these questions cannot be answered satisfactorily, there is a great cause for concern.

I look forward to exploring these issues in depth today and at this time I would like to recognize the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin, for his opening statement and also thank him for his bipartisan assistance in pursuing our common goal of having the best ever census in the year 2000.

[The prepared statement of Hon. J. Dennis Hastert follows:]

DAN BURTON, INDIANA
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT
2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143
(202) 225–5074

OPENING REMARKS OF J. DENNIS HASTERT
CHAIRMAN
GOVERMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
NATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
APRIL 29, 1997

"Promotion and Outreach Efforts for the 2000 Census"

The Subcommittee will come to order. It is my pleasure to welcome our guests and witnesses this morning. Good morning Mr. Morgan, Mr. Meyer and Ms. Brienza. I also would like to extend a welcome to my friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. Davis, who is a Member of the full Committee and who has asked to join us here today.

This hearing is the first in a series of hearings we will be holding to review the Census Bureau's preparations for the critical task of conducting the 2000 decennial census. Throughout the 105th Congress, this Subcommittee will be taking a very close look at the activities of the Census Bureau, and will be placing a particular emphasis on ensuring accuracy, reliability, and inclusiveness for all Americans in the Census process.

Today, we will begin with one of the most important elements required for accuracy in the decennial census – the conduct of an effective PROMOTION and OUTREACH campaign to ensure that every American understands the importance of participating in the Census by completing his or her form.

The General Accounting Office has reported to Congress that "Voluntary participation is the cornerstone of the decennial census, because it is the voluntary public response rate through mail-back, which is the most accurate, effective and efficient source of census data. The significance of a large mail-back response is not just that it reduces the staff, time, and money required, but that it produces the best quality census data." Thus, it is clear that the most fundamental and important task before this Subcommittee as it exercises its oversight responsibilities to ensure an accurate census, is to examine the efforts of the Bureau to achieve a high response rate through promotion and outreach.

Unfortunately, we enter the 2000 Census with an historic trend of declining response rates over the last three censuses. When coupled with the persistent differential undercount of minorities, the problem becomes even more serious. These declining response rates have forced the Bureau to devote greater resources to non-response follow-up, a costly procedure which relies on sending enumerators to individual housing units to collect census data. It is estimated that in 2000, the Bureau will expend, on average, $25 million for each additional percentage point of non-response to the mailed-out form –for every percentage point of mail non-response, there is $25 million less in resources to spend on promotion and outreach efforts in hard-to-count areas.

However, not all the news is bad. Despite its problems, the 1990 census was the most thorough census in history, accounting for 98.4% of the population. The most notable and publicized failure with the 1990 census was that the majority of persons in the 1.6% of the population that were missed in 1990 were minorities. In a nation where the concepts of "one person, one vote" and equal representation for all in government are sacred principles, it is imperative that these problems be resolved in the 2000 census.

On the bright side, as reported by the National Research Council, half of the 1990 undercount was due to missed households - that is, households which never even had an opportunity to participate in the Census. Why did this happen? In a nutshell, because of inaccurate address lists. Without an accurate address list, the Bureau was unable to get a census questionnaire to these individuals, and didn't know where to send an enumerator to count them.

I am pleased to see that in its preparation for the 2000 Census, the Bureau has placed a major focus on improving its efforts in address list development. While I still have some questions and concerns about this process, it appears that the Bureau has made great strides in ensuring major improvements in the master address list. Through these efforts alone, the Bureau has laid the important groundwork to eliminate up to half of the problem of the undercount.

However, where our real challenge lies, and the reason we are here today, is to find out how we can reach the other half of the undercounted population, which is comprised of households which did receive census questionnaires, but failed to return them for one reason or another.

This challenge, while not new, is not beyond our capabilities to solve. In fact, one of my predecessors at this subcommittee, former Chairman Sawyer of Ohio, offered some wise guidance to us on this subject back at a hearing in 1989. Mr. Sawyer stated then what is still true today:

"Minorities and the poor are more likely to participate in the census if they have genuine confidence that their participation will bring them a step closer to playing a more meaningful and fuller role in this Nation's system of government."

Today's hearing is all about how we can translate that vision into a reality in time for the 2000 Census.

The key to realizing that vision is promotion and outreach at the local level. It should be the building block on which the 2000 Census is based. Our success in promotion and outreach, and ultimately in the Census as a whole, quite frankly depends far more on local mayors, school districts, business and civic leaders, and volunteers, than it does on Washington-based statisticians, administrators, and consultants. These leaders in local communities, not statisticians with calculators, are the ones able to capture the unique characteristics of their community necessary to reach out and communicate the vital importance of individual participation in the census.

We are lucky to have with us today three individuals who fill this vital role of community leader that will determine the success of the Census 2000 effort. They are uniquely qualified to address the issues involved with promotion and outreach, and can speak from experience as to what works, and what doesn't.

To this end, we will focus on drawing their expertise out in three separate and distinct areas.

First, we will revisit and review the local efforts of two communities which were very successful in 1990 Census. Conventional wisdom holds that minorities in "hard-to-enumerate" areas simply won't return their Census forms, and thus are doomed to be "undercounted" forever. I am pleased to say that this just isn't true. I commend Mr. Michael Morgan, whose efforts as the Deputy Director of the Department of Administration for Milwaukee, Wisconsin in the 1990 Census were instrumental in Milwaukee achieving the second highest mail response rate of all metropolitan areas in the nation. In fact, the response rates in Milwaukee for "hard-to-enumerate" minority areas exceeded the average national response rate for non-minority suburban areas. Through his efforts in developing a blueprint for promotion and outreach, responsible for obtaining a full and complete count of the citizens of Milwaukee, Mr. Morgan has created a national example that should disabuse us once and for all of prejudicial notions about what is and isn't possible when it comes to including ALL Americans in the Census count.

In another community, Mr. Meyer and Ms. Brienza of Cincinnati, are tremendous examples of how the dedicated efforts of local leaders in assuring a complete count at the local level can result in million of dollars in increased federal funding for a locality - funding that would have otherwise been lost had it

not been for both their careful preparation for their Census and meticulous follow-up after the Census was completed.

Second, we will examine how well the Census Bureau has learned from the experiences of 1990, and whether it has taken advantage of the knowledge gained through the successful techniques implemented by localities in 1990. As with most problems in our society, the real solutions are, and in this case, were, found at the local level. I am most eager to see if these hard-won lessons have been learned, or if we are on a path to repeat easily correctable mistakes in 2000. The Bureau has indicated in written materials and at conferences that it understands the key role of building partnerships in the communities. Has the Bureau listened to the success stories of the localities in 1990? Has the Bureau done a good job of communicating its plan to those at the local level who will be implementing it?

By exploring the Bureau's plans for 2000 from the perspective of local leaders who must actually implement them, we will be in a good position to answer these questions.

Finally, we will examine the larger scope of Census Bureau activities for 2000 and determine how they measure up to the standard of increasing accuracy through greater voluntary citizen participation. This concern cannot be emphasized enough, because it strikes at the heart of whether the 2000 Census represents valid data that can serve as a base for almost every government function for the next 10 years, or whether it is merely just another set of numbers whose validity is in question and is viewed by the public with the kind of skepticism usually reserved for political polls.

Each of us should be asking at least three questions: First, whether the Bureau's overall Census plan encourages or discourages political empowerment in these hard-to-count communities through participation in the census? Second, does the Bureau's overall plan work to overcome a deep mistrust in the government process which many of these hard-to-count communities hold? Third, through its actions, is the Bureau sending contradictory messages to the American people about the need for individual participation in Census 2000? If these questions cannot be answered satisfactorily, there is great cause for concern.

I look forward to exploring these issues in depth today.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding this first of a number of hearings we will hold on the important issue of the census. As we all know, the Constitution requires us each 10 years to hold a census so we can determine how many representatives we should have in each State in the country.

Over the course of time, of course, we have also seen another reason for the importance of the census and that is because so many Federal dollars flow as a result of where the people live in this country.

As we will find out this morning, my home community, Milwaukee, has done an excellent job of counting people in our community and it has done so with the relatively high number of minorities.

If you were to put together a black list or a Hollywood film you probably would want three elements in it. You would probably want money; you would probably want power and you probably want sex. I am not suggesting we throw sex into the mix, but we already have incentives for a good census, the issues of power and the issues of money. Because the number of representatives that a community will have or a State will have in Congress, of course, is dependent on the count, as is the number of Federal dollars they receive.

So, I believe that there are built-in incentives for local units of government to do a very, very good job in counting the people in their community and for that reason I am very proud of the job that my home community has done.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the ranking member. We are very pleased to have three distinguished witnesses with us today: Mr. Leon A. Meyer, the director of the City Planning Department of the city of Cincinnati, and with him is Ms. Agnes Brienza, a senior planner with Hamilton County.

Now, I would like to yield to Mr. Barrett to introduce the gentleman from Milwaukee, WI.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to introduce Mike Morgan, who has come out on the same plane I did last night, to share his testimony with us this morning.

As I indicated, Milwaukee did a fabulous job in 1990 in performing our census duties. There was a real local involvement that was spearheaded in large part by Mr. Morgan, and he played a key leadership role in performing the census in Milwaukee. He has been with the city for many years. He is a fine member of our community and a fine member of my neighborhood, and it is nice to have you here.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Mr. HASTERT. The Committee on Government Reform has in its rules that we swear in all of our witnesses. So would you please stand and raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. HASTERT. Let the record show that the witnesses have answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Morgan, would you please lead off?

STATEMENTS OF MICHAEL L. MORGAN, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING, CITY OF MILWAUKEE; AND LEON A. MEYER, DIRECTOR, CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT, CITY OF CINCINNATI, ACCOMPANIED BY AGNESE BRIENZA, SENIOR PLANNER, HAMILTON COUNTY, OH

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, good morning. I am Michael Morgan, commissioner of the Department of City Development of Milwaukee, WI.

First, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important subject. Eight years ago, as was indicated, I was responsible for getting a complete count of the citizens of Milwaukee during the 1990 census enumeration. We believe that our efforts succeeded. The district office of the Census Bureau that includes the city of Milwaukee had a mail response rate of 82 percent, the best in the United States. Metro Milwaukee's mail response rate was 60 percent, the second highest of all metro areas in the Nation.

The 1990 census found 628,000 people living in Milwaukee. State and Federal projections had estimated our 1990 population at only about 600,000.

The additional people found by our efforts have meant tens of millions of dollars in additional State aid to the city of Milwaukee and helped preserve a congressional seat for the State of Wisconsin.

Milwaukee is the 17th largest city in the United States, and 40 percent of our population are minorities. Historically, minorities have been undercounted by the census, as has been indicated here today, and one reason we suspect that that is true is because that part of our community is very distrustful of government.

Also, our minority residents are often poor. Their mobility makes them hard to find. What we found is that folks in the poorer community tend to move a lot and it is very difficult, from time to time, to find them.

The city of Milwaukee, of course, wanted an accurate census count to ensure that we had fair levels of congressional representation and our fair share of State and Federal aid.

Under the leadership of Mayor General Norquist, we aggressively pursued a complete count strategy in 1990 and our objective was to use local people to do people-to-people contact, to support the Census Bureau's own data collection process. We needed to do three things very well: One, build trust among the minority community, regarding the census; and to reassure people, No. 2, about the confidentiality of census information; and then, No. 3, heighten the appreciation for the importance of the census among our citizens.

Our complete count program actually began about a year before the census date. We got started by interviewing the dozens—interviewing dozens of local government officials and 50 neighborhood and social service agencies. We talked to staff at homeless shelters, community clinics, halfway houses, immigrant service organizations, food pantries, just among others.

We asked everyone for their suggestions on how to reach the undercounted community, the minority community. Using the insights provided by these groups, we devised our complete count

program, following some general principles, and I will go through them real quickly.

No. 1, get census information to places patronized by target audiences and use languages they understand. We distributed literature in unconventional places like resale shops and currency exchanges. A local tortilla manufacturer put census promotional labels on 70,000 packages of tortillas.

Our materials were printed in a variety of languages, and these are materials that we produced locally. We produced materials in Hmong, Spanish and Russian, just to name a few. We happen to have a fairly large Hmong and Russian population.

We did presentations at community events like Cinco de Mayo, Black History Month presentations, Vietnamese new year, bamboo volleyball tournaments. We found that bamboo volleyball was very popular upon the Hmong and Vietnamese community, and at powwows.

Our TV promotional ads featured Reverend Jessie Jackson and professional athletes, and rap singers. We even awarded gifts to the first baby born on census day.

No. 2, we hired staff from the community that we wanted to reach. Our outreach staff was intimately acquainted with the neighborhoods and residents of Milwaukee's central city. They were known and trusted. And we also referred qualified local residents to the Census Bureau in its search for enumerators.

And No. 3, we recognized that the complete count required effort and money. The city of Milwaukee spent over $400,000 in cash and donated services and will have to spend about that much again in the year 2000 to ensure a thorough count in the next enumeration, census enumeration.

Again, we started our effort almost a year before the Census Bureau did on April 1, 1990. Our project was kicked off with publicity in the fall of 1989 and we had an office opened in Milwaukee a full year before the Census Bureau was functioning in January of that year.

We knew that our advance work was going to be real critical so we got started right away.

I understand now that the Census Bureau has proposed many strategies to improve response rates to the 2000 census and we support these changes. We also offer the following suggestions to ensure the count—to ensure that at least the count in Milwaukee and Wisconsin, is complete.

No. 1, we feel the Census Bureau ought to consider local complete count projects as part of the team. We should not be a separate and distinct—we shouldn't have a separate and distinct Milwaukee or Wisconsin project. It should be part of a holistic approach to try to reach the undercounted population and the Census Bureau should be the lead agency on this team effort.

Also, the Census Bureau should try to take advantage of local expertise, knowledge and expertise of the community. That means promptly sharing information about issues like mail response rate in particular neighborhoods so local complete count staff can provide help in reaching those areas. The certification of local outreach work to the census enumerators could help improve the Census Bureau followup rate also.

No. 2, we feel the Census Bureau must hire local people who are well acquainted with census city neighborhoods for enumeration activities in those areas. We have to eliminate barriers such as newspaper ads indicating that enumerators would be subject to FBI checks, suggesting that a more onerous investigation would be conducted to check the background of potential enumerators. We want folks to be hired from the community in which they live.

Now, we understand that the Census Bureau has to do a background check and that's something that we are familiar with, but the mere fact that you mentioned that an FBI check is going to be performed tends to dissuade some folks, who may otherwise be qualified, from applying for a job with the Census Bureau.

No. 3, the Census Bureau should offer appealing incentives for mailing in the completed forms. We did some very simple things. For example, we teamed up with local fast food restaurants and we made coupons available for people who turned in their census forms and it worked.

And No. 4, we feel that Congress must understand that a people-to-people count, we feel, is the most effective way of doing the census enumeration, and Congress must provide the resources necessary for such an effort.

There really is no option, no other option, if we want a full and accurate count.

I have submitted a written statement regarding some of the things that we did in Milwaukee in much more detail, more detail than I have already talked about here today, and I would ask that that written statement be part of the record.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Barrett, for inviting me here today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Morgan follows:]

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak on Milwaukee's efforts to obtain a complete count of our citizens during the 1990 census.

My name is Michael Morgan. I am the Commissioner of the Department of City Development for the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Eight years ago I was Deputy Director of the Department of Administration, and responsible for getting a full and complete count of the citizens of my municipality during the 1990 census enumeration.

We believe our efforts succeeded. The West Allis district office of the Census Bureau, which includes the south side of the city of Milwaukee, had the highest mail response rate of all district offices in the country. Further, Milwaukee had the second highest mail response rate of all metropolitan areas in the nation -- second only to Indianapolis.

Perhaps the most important measure of our success is the fact that the 1990 census found 628,000 people living in Milwaukee. State and federal projections had estimated our 1990 population at only 600,000. The additional people found by our efforts have meant tens of millions of dollars in additional aid to the city.

Milwaukee is the 17th largest city in the United States. Our population is very diverse. African-Americans and Hispanics constitute 37 percent of the folks living in Milwaukee. We have a small percentage of Asians, primarily Hmong and Laotian. That population has grown more than 200 percent since 1980. Our city also includes American Indians and immigrants from dozens of nations around the world.

I highlight Milwaukee's minority population because we suspect, historically, that segment of the population is most often undercounted by the Census Bureau. The reasons for the undercount are varied, but one of the primary problems we found is that these groups are very distrustful of government. Additionally, because a disproportionately high percentage of these populations is poor and because of the transient nature of the poor in urban environments, members of these groups weren't contacted by the census bureau in past numerations because they were hard to find.

The City of Milwaukee, under the leadership of Mayor John O. Norquist, aggressively pursued a strategy to get a complete and accurate count of all of Milwaukee's residents in 1990.

Why were we so aggressive? We were aggressive for a number of reasons:

1. Political power. It was widely feared that unless the State of Wisconsin and the City of Milwaukee got a full and accurate count of their populations, the state would lose a congressional seat.

2. Annually, $50 billion in federal funds are distributed based in large part on data collected through the census.

3. State and local reapportionment and redistricting are based on census numeration.

As you can see, the stakes were high for the City of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin.

THE MILWAUKEE EXPERIENCE

We decided this task was so important that we would supplement the efforts of City staff with the advice and assistance of outside consultants. We released our Request for Proposals seeking consulting help on April 21, 1989 - about a year before the census enumeration was to begin.

Our objective was to support the Census Bureau's own data collection process with a great variety of activities that would make all citizens of Milwaukee aware of the significance of participating in the 1990 census. We needed to build trust about the census within the minority community; reassure people about the confidentiality of census information, and heighten appreciation for the importance of the census among all our citizens.

We broke down our activities into four categories:

1. **KICKOFF -- October, 1989.** We held a rally to introduce our efforts to a Complete Count Committee consisting of

300 people from throughout the community, with a special emphasis on members from traditionally undercounted groups.

2. **CENSUS DAY ACTIVITIES -- February through April, 1990.** During this period, we conducted an incredible variety of promotional and informational activities to reach as many people as possible about the importance of answering the census questionnaire.

3. **"IT'S NOT TOO LATE" -- April and May, 1990.** Our goal was to make sure that people received their census forms, filled them out, and mailed them in. We publicized and promoted, and provided personal assistance to people who needed help completing their forms. We also prepared people for the arrival of census enumerators who would contact individuals who hadn't returned their census forms by mail. We wanted to send two messages: answering the census is important, and the enumerators are "friends and neighbors" who can be trusted with confidential information.

4. **"WERE YOU COUNTED?" -- June, 1990.** In a final effort to reach people who hadn't been counted, we passed out forms through community organizations and publicized the Census Bureau's 800 phone line.

I'd like to explain in greater detail some of the strategies we used to ensure a complete count. I also will share some suggestions we have to duplicate Milwaukee's success in the 2000 census.

Early on, we identified two key groups that would serve as partners for our complete count efforts: local government elected and appointed officials, and community and neighborhood organizations. We interviewed members of the Milwaukee Common Council, Milwaukee County Board, and key City and County department heads. These interviews helped us to design the marketing plan and determine work tasks for census aides. The interviews also raised consciousness about the census, and gained "buy-in" from these officials. Their support was crucial throughout the campaign.

We surveyed 50 neighborhood organizations and social service agencies about their work with undercounted populations and their suggestions for strategies to reach our target group. Their ideas and support were outstanding.

Mayor Norquist appointed a Complete Count Committee, including 300 representatives from business, government, ethnic and community groups. Many of these individuals gave of their time to promote the census. We also created a 10-member advisory committee including representatives of traditionally undercounted populations: African American, Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian communities and the homeless.

We established liaison relationships with other levels of government, local universities and colleges, City agencies including the Health Department, Housing Authority, and Milwaukee Public Library, and the Milwaukee Public Schools. We got in touch with unions, central city church pastors, and our gas and electric utilities.

Using the insights provided by all these groups, we devised our complete count program. Under the theme "In for the Count," we organized outreach and promotion activities targeted to the African American community, Asian communities, Hispanic communities, Native American Indians, college students, residents of public housing, and school children. (Because Milwaukee County set up a separate project to do census outreach to elderly and handicapped residents, we did not concentrate on those groups.)

Our report of these activities fills two printed volumes, so I cannot attempt to enumerate them all here. However, I will attempt to generalize the principles that made these strategies successful.

Get information to the places that target audiences patronize, in languages they understand. We published brochures and posters in many languages, including Vietnamese, Laotian, Korean, Chinese, Hmong, Spanish and Russian, and distributed them in some unconventional places. These included Goodwill and Value Village resale shops; community health clinics; food pantries; currency exchanges; liquor stores and taverns, and beauty

parlors. A local tortilla manufacturer agreed to put census promotion labels (in Spanish, of course) on 70,000 packages of tortillas during one week in March.

We provided articles to community and ethnic papers, and also placed ads in those papers. Project staff were interviewed on Hmong and Spanish language radio shows. We did presentations at English as a Second Language classes. We attended Cinco de Mayo, Black History Month, and Vietnamese New Year celebrations and tribal pow wows.

We also established a network of 37 Volunteer Questionnaire Assistance Centers, where volunteers were available to help people fill out forms. The centers were located in community organization offices, churches, and other neighborhood locations.

Use spokespeople who are trusted and revered among the target audiences.

We created television public service announcements featuring Rev. Jesse Jackson; local professional African American and Hispanic athletes; and a local rap group. The rap group, by the way, created an original song specifically for the census. The group performed it at 16 special events and their regular gigs as well. We encouraged pastors to discuss the census at Sunday services.

Devise targeted special events that attract an audience for the census promotion message and attract publicity.

We sponsored various special events including a "Bamboo Volleyball" tournament; a seed give-away for southeast Asian

residents who sought help in completing their census form; a census awareness day for the American Indian community; and a mascot day in which local corporate and sports mascots visited malls and stores. We gave away small items like t-shirts and buttons at these events.

Our largest special event was "Stand Up and Be Counted," when thousands of people all over the city stood up for a five-minute period on a single day to draw attention to the census. We also awarded gifts to the first baby born on April 1, 1990.

Hire staff from the communities you want to reach. We hired outreach staff who knew intimately the neighborhoods and residents of Milwaukee's central city. They were assigned to get the word out. Our outreach workers were the folks who distributed flyers and posters; staffed census displays at community events; appeared on radio and TV programs aimed at particular market segments; did interviews with community media; kept in phone contact with individuals and organizations; and helped us plan events. They worked for the project for about six months.

We believe the Census Bureau ought to follow this same strategy. We were very concerned that the Bureau hired few minorities as enumerators in Milwaukee, particularly in the Hispanic community. We would suggest that, for the 2000 census, cities like Milwaukee work with local and regional census officials to recruit enumerators through advertising, community agency contacts, and so on. We believe a local Enumerator

Recruit Project that includes assistance to help central city residents prepare for the census enumerator tests could provide the Census Bureau with a pool of qualified recruits who are familiar with the people they are employed to count.

We further recommend that the Census Bureau designate local Complete Count Project outreach staff as official enumerators if they pass the required testing and training. Their status would help the Bureau to complete its counting task.

Recognize that a complete count requires effort and money. The City of Milwaukee spent about $300,000 for its Complete Count Project, and donated another $55,000 of in-kind services. Our consultants raised donated and discounted services valued at about $62,000. We believe these funds were well-spent, and expect we'll have to spend at least this much or more to ensure a thorough count for the 2000 census.

As I have noted earlier, we started our effort almost a year before Census Day on April 1, 1990. Our project was implemented by fall, 1989, while the local Census Bureau office was not fully functioning until January, 1990. Our longer timetable allowed us to involve many segments of the community, and to emphasize a theme of participation. We wanted to build a belief among residents that completing the form would benefit the community and themselves.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our experiences in Milwaukee during 1990, I would like to briefly offer several recommendations that could increase the count of citizens in cities all over the nation.

Complete count projects are meant to complement the work of the Census Bureau, and to help the Census Bureau be more successful in its efforts. We believe the Census Bureau ought to take maximum advantage of the local knowledge and expertise represented by competent local complete count activities.

For example, if the Census Bureau notes low mail response rates in particular neighborhoods, local complete count staff probably can suggest strategies to reach those areas. The certification of local outreach workers as census enumerators could help improve the Census Bureau's follow-up rate.

I have already talked about the importance of hiring local people who are well-acquainted with central city neighborhoods for enumeration activities in those areas. This is vital to the success of any effort to find undercounted groups. Once again, local complete count efforts can provide valuable assistance to the Census Bureau in achieving this goal. Also, we encourage a different approach to help-wanted advertising by the Census Bureau. The ads run in 1990 implied that employees would be subject to FBI investigation when actually no such investigation would take place. This type of review would be more appropriately discussed at the interview stage, when it could be

explained correctly that a routine check for felony convictions would be made.

I also would recommend that the Census Bureau take a page from Milwaukee's book with regard to promotion. For example, the Census Bureau might want to team up with a fast-food chain to offer food coupons to people who turn in their census forms. Perhaps a nationally-televised program featuring "celebrity" volunteers to help people fill out their census forms would help to increase the mail response rate.

Cooperation between the Census Bureau and local complete count programs will add significant value to the investment made in the census by the federal government. I hope the 2000 census will be conducted in ways that recognize the importance of federal-local teamwork to accomplish a critical national objective.

Thank you.

Mr. HASTERT. Your written statement will be made a part of the record, as is everyone's written statement will be made a part of the record. Thank you very much for being here and your excellent testimony, and we will have a few questions later.

Mr. Meyer.

Mr. MEYER. Thank you very much. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee and guests. Thank you for inviting Cincinnati to come and be a part of the hearing. I invited Agnese Brienza to join me because she was the driving force behind the 1990 census. I had just gotten my job as planning director at the city of Cincinnati in 1989, right before the 1990 census was due, so I wanted to bring Agnese because I knew you would have some questions about how that was put together. She will be very instrumental in the year 2000 census as well.

Your letter asked for information concerning the 1990 census experience in promoting census participation, hard-to-reach areas. I would summarize that up in one word, and that's BLITZ. You find every agency, every organization, every church group, every member that you possibly can to be a part of this process. You also use every kind of communication device you can, TV, radio, handouts, brochures, et cetera. Then one of the very effective things we do, and I am sure everybody does, is the school system, when your children come home from school they can bug you pretty heavily about what is the right thing to do. So, the school system is a very important part of this.

But I would like to make three other main points. No. 1 is the census numbers and data has got to be user-friendly, and I will get into why in a minute. Getting buy-ins from the governmental and nongovernmental agencies that are being contacted is an absolute must.

No. 3 is a local review program that's been used in previous censuses must stay. If the one number census means that the local review program goes, I would suggest that we need to keep the local review program.

User-friendly, the numbers must be user-friendly when they are done. Thirty-nine of the census tracks in the city of Cincinnati include both Cincinnati figures and county figures. We are in Hamilton County. Ms. Agnese Brienza is the senior planner with Hamilton County in Ohio.

Thirty-nine of those census tracks in the city of Cincinnati have city figures as well as county figures. So, when we start to use this information, we have to take out the county numbers and keep the city numbers when we use the census information. This has impacts on performance measures and how we do those numbers. Every time we look at census information, we have to go back to ground zero and basically massage those numbers. If we could have census tracks that were completely within the city, that would help.

Now, I realize that's against history and the census information has used geological features as well as man-made features to establish those lines, but if you are really trying to get to municipalities you have got to make it easy for the municipalities to use these numbers.

The next most important one is: Are we collecting these numbers for the Census Bureau to have a number or are we collecting them for us to use? And I think that's the basic—that's the basic question.

For instance, Jacksonville, FL, which is ahead of Cincinnati when it comes to using performance measures, they have a booklet out, "Life in Jacksonville, Quality Indicators for Progress," which I highly recommend to people if they are interested in that subject.

They have a distinct advantage because their county and city have the same boundaries so they don't go through this process of trying to eliminate figures that happen to be in the county and not in the city.

This leads me to point No. 2, getting buy-in from governmental and nongovernmental agencies and businesses. In order to entice all areas of the country to be willing to perform this monumental task that we go through every 10 years you must illustrate how the census will benefit the area. The "what is in it for me" attitude and is really important in this situation.

In 1990, the total population, the first figure was a little over 352,000. We had done projections each year actually from 1980 to 1990, and we were sure the number was higher than that, so we actually went out and counted all those census tracks that were on the borders of Cincinnati and came up with an additional 12,000 people.

That has translated into receiving an additional $4 million a year to the city of Cincinnati. Over a 10-year period that's $40 million. That is one way to reduce the budget, but not a way that Cincinnati would like you to do, actually.

In order to sell the idea of buy-in, the Census Bureau may want to collect a number of stories similar to Cincinnati's and then put out a pamphlet and say, this is how the census, a correct number, can affect your community.

I don't want to leave the impression that I am blaming the Census Bureau for Cincinnati's original undercount. It was an honest mistake, but one that needed correction, a correction that was accomplished through the combined efforts of the Census Bureau, the city of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. It was allowed to be made possible because of a local review program, which is my third point.

The local review program is really important to keep or at least some way of doing that because there must be a way to refute and change incorrect numbers. That's really so important in municipalities to get the correct number. So I strongly urge that some kind of local review program be kept.

At hearings such as these, I know there is a tendency to emphasize the negative. However, I want to say a few positive words. I went to the Annapolis, MD, April 9 through 11 conference that was put on by the Census Bureau and it was well done in every aspect. The entire conference was well-planned, well-executed. There were even special dietary needs that were respected.

The Census people obviously wanted to do a better, less expensive job of getting the right numbers, and there are four fundamental strategies for Census 2000: Partnership, simplicity, technology and statistical methods are exciting. It is the implementation of these strategies that I am somewhat worried about and my re-

marks are intended to help in this process. Obviously, I am going to continue to work on this for the next 3 years and so is Ms. Brienza.

We are open for questions any time you want. We can submit, if you like, more statements about how we did the 1990 census now that Mrs. Brienza is on board with me.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Meyer follows:]

Statement of
Leon A. Meyer
Director, City Planning Department
City of Cincinnati
before The Subcommittee on National Security,
International Affairs and Criminal Justice
April 29, 1997

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am Lee Meyer, Director of City Planning for the City of Cincinnati. With me today is Ms. Agnese Brienza, a Senior Planner with Hamilton County, who graciously agreed to join us. Hamilton County is the county in which the City of Cincinnati resides. Ms. Brienza is here today because she has a true and deep dedication to the right census numbers for Hamilton County and the City of Cincinnati. She spearheaded the tremendous effort that was made in Hamilton County during the 1990 census. She was the driving force behind the 1990 Complete Count Committee and will be the force behind the 2000 Year Census. Today she will help me to answer your questions.

Your letter asked for information concerning our 1990 Census experiences in promoting census participation in traditionally undercounted areas.

It could really be summed up in one word: BLITZ. The Cincinnati Complete Count Committee thought of every organization, public or private, and every special interest group that would help us to get the word out to the general public and used them. We used every means of communication possible with those groups and the general public. We used radio, TV, video tapes, written notices, brochures and handouts of all types. One of the ways we felt was particularly effective in reaching a large number of citizens was through the school system. Children are very effective communicators. We could talk about this further if necessary.

Today I would like to make three main points:

1. The census numbers and data should be user-friendly.
2. Getting buy-ins from all the governmental and non-governmental agencies that are being contacted by the Bureau of Census is an absolute must.
3. The Local Review Programs used in previous census programs must stay. If the "One Number Census" means that the Local Review Program must go, then I would vote for the "One Number Census" to go.

User friendly -- what do I mean by "user friendly"? Just that when the count is done, the municipality will be able to <u>use</u> the numbers produced. The numbers are not user friendly in the following ways: Thirty-nine census tracts cover land which is located

partially in the City and partially in the County; therefore, if the City wants to use census information, we have to do a major job massaging the data. Why not have a census tract completely in or completely out of a municipality? Such a method would simplify a municipality's use of the data. Also, don't change census block numbers. We need the continuity from one census to the next. That is very important to those of us comparing census data over long periods of time.

The question is, Are we collecting these numbers for the Bureau of Census simply to be able to say we have them, or are we collecting these numbers in order to provide usable information? I submit that we are collecting the numbers in order to use them. For that reason, let's take the simplicity strategy of the Bureau of Census a step further by keeping the numbers simple and easy to use. Currently, these numbers are very cumbersome to use. The Census Bureau's methods of collecting data, which is based upon significant geological and man-made features of the landscape, make it easy to collect data, but very difficult and complicated to manipulate and use that data. The landscape features normally do not coincide with municipal boundaries. For instance, in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, we have 39 census tracts which include dwelling units located both inside and outside of the City. Such instances have made it impossible to obtain accurate performance measures based upon census criteria, because it is much too hard to aggregate. The advent of the much more powerful computers and access to single dwelling unit information in the 2000 Year Census will help to alleviate that problem; however, there will still be quite a bit of work to do if each municipality is required to aggregate its own figures.

Jacksonville, Florida is far ahead of Cincinnati when it comes to using performance measures for the community of Jacksonville because the County and the City have almost identical boundaries, thereby making information gathering a piece of cake. Consequently, Jacksonville has its *Life in Jacksonville: Quality Indicators for Progress,* which has been published yearly since 1985, and is a model for other cities to emulate. Cincinnati clearly could not do that since we had no way to gather the data, aggregate the data, and manipulate it once we have it, a very frustrating experience. Incidentally, this is something we would very much like to do. With the new census, we are hoping we will be able to design and implement performance measures for which we can gather data on an ongoing basis.

This leads me into point number two: getting buy-in from all the governmental and non-governmental agencies and businesses. In order to entice all areas of the country to be willing to perform this monumental task, every ten years, you must illustrate how the census will benefit each area. The "What is in it for me" attitude. It is sad to say, but true, that very little is done these days just because it is right or out of altruism. Take Cincinnati, for instance: In 1990, the first total population figure for Cincinnati was approximately 352,232. City officials were convinced that was a low figure. Through a block-by-block analysis, we were able to prove to the Census Bureau that our actual count was 364,040. This difference of almost 12,000 people meant that the City of Cincinnati would receive an additional $4 million in federal funding each year, from

1991 until 2000. The total population figure also affects grant applications, where businesses decide to relocate, and a myriad of other factors which produce an effect on the city.

In order to sell the idea of buy-in, the Census Bureau may want to collect a number of stories similar to Cincinnati's and put them in a brochure/pamphlet to use to convince recalcitrant agencies, businesses, etc. to get on the band wagon. I don't want to leave the impression that I am blaming the Census Bureau for Cincinnati's original undercount in 1990. It was an honest mistake, but one that needed correction -- a correction that was accomplished through the cooperative efforts of Cincinnati, Hamilton County and the Census Bureau; a correction that was allowed or made possible because of the Local Review Program.

This leads the discussion into the next and last point, point number three. I have been informed that with the One Number Census there is to be NO Local Review Program, the very program that saved Cincinnati's count in 1990, that saved Cincinnati $4 million a year for a decade, plus other added benefits. I am strongly urging this subcommittee not to let that happen. We need to keep the Local Review Program. I cannot stress this point enough! There must be a way to refute and change incorrect numbers.

At hearings such as these, I know there is a tendency to emphasize the negative. I want to say a few words to emphasize the positives. I thoroughly enjoyed the conference in Annapolis, MD, April 9 - 11, produced by the Bureau of the Census. It was well done in every aspect. The entire conference was well planned and executed, with even special dietary needs being respected. The Census people obviously want to do a better and less expensive job of getting to the right numbers. Their four fundamental strategies for Census 2000 (partnership, simplicity, technology and statistical methods) are exciting. It is the implementation of these strategies that I am somewhat worried about. My remarks are intended to help the process. Obviously, I will continue to be involved in this process over the next three years to help the Bureau of the Census develop the right number for the City of Cincinnati.

That concludes my written statement. Ms. Brienza and I are open for questions, if you have any.

National Conference of Governments on Census 2000
April 9-11, 1997

GROUP A: ADDRESS LIST PARTNERSHIPS TO ENSURE COMPLETE COVERAGE

Background:

A good address list is essential to a good census, particularly in recent censuses in the United States that are primarily conducted by a mail-out/mail-back procedure. In the 1980 and 1990 censuses, in general the Census Bureau produced an address list by starting with a commercial vendor's list and updating it through an over-the-ground check by enumerators plus a check by the Postal Service. In some parts of the country, the Census Bureau had to create the address list from scratch, a very costly operation. Local governments had an opportunity to indirectly check the completeness of the address list by a process called Local Review. Generally, there were two phases to the review, once before the census (Pre-census Local Review) and once after the census (Post-census Local Review.) Because of a confidentiality law, the Census Bureau could not share individual addresses with local governments. Instead, the Local Review of addresses was a summary check of the number of housing units by block.

Overall, the address list preparation process in 1980 and 1990 was very accurate, having less than 1% error of missing addresses. (Somebody needs to check that number.) While coverage error may have been low, errors of having the address in the census but in an incorrect block were higher than the level of missing housing units. (Someone needs to check out the previous statement.) We call the error of having an address in the wrong block geographic coding error. Listening to representatives of local governments and looking at results of Local Review in both 1980 and 1990, it was clear that the process of review of summary address counts at a block level was not fully satisfactory. Therefore, the Census Bureau approached the Congress to ask for a law change to allow local governments to see individual addresses. The Congress responded by enacting a law to allow address sharing, but ONLY for the purpose of making sure the census address list was complete. In the spirit of partnership, the Congress worked with the Executive Branch to get such a law. That same law also allowed the Postal Service to share its address list with the Census Bureau and calls for the Census Bureau to use local address list to help build the census address list. So, for Census 2000, the Census Bureau will start with the 1990 address list and update it using local address information and the Postal Service list.

As a result of the new law, local governments will have several opportunities to partner with the Census Bureau to assure the address list is correct for their locality. Locality can mean a city, the area covered by a tribal government, a county, etc.

> The first of these programs is called the Program for Address List Supplementation, with an acronymn PALS. Generally, this means a locality can give the Census Bureau its address list and the Census Bureau will merge the local list with the census address list that has already been updated with the Postal Service list. The Census Bureau will then tell the local government the results of the merge- which addresses we already had, which addresses we added pending further investigation if needed, and which addresses we were

not able to code geographically. The Census Bureau STRONGLY urges as many local governments as possible to participate in PALS. In September and October, 1996, the Census Bureau sent letters to the highest elected official in each jurisdiction and tribal government inviting them to participate in PALS.

The second address list check program is called the Local Update of Census Addresses or LUCA. It is scheduled for calendar year 1999. In general, it parallels Local Review in the 1990 Census. Unlike 1990 however, there is only a precensus check of addresses. The other big difference is that the check is a direct one, so the Census Bureau will send the local government a unit by unit list of every residential address on our list. The local government will be asked to check the entire list and tell the Census Bureau of any missing addresses. Once again, the Census Bureau will then feedback to the local government the status of each address suggested to be added by a local government. But, there will only be limited time allowed for this check. For many localities, that could be burdensome. That is why the Census Bureau so strongly urges localities to participate in PALS. If we can resolve most address problems in PALS in 1997 and 1998, the LUCA check in 1999 should go much smoother.

Both PALS and LUCA are primarily aimed at making sure the address list is complete. There is a different problem to make sure that each address is correctly assigned (coded) to the proper block. For areas with city style addresses (E.G. 101 Main Street), the Census Bureau does geographic coding by an automated process. The acronym for the Census Bureau automated geographic system is TIGER. Many localities have developed their own geographic systems, and these in many cases are more up-to-date than TIGER. If a locality shares that geographic information with the Census Bureau, it means more complete and/or accurate address coding for the locality. The first way a locality can do this is by a program called TIGER Improvement Program or TIP. The Census Bureau will take the local geographic information in any format (paper, map, etc.) and update its TIGER system. The following are some examples of the kind of information the Census Bureau requires:

> The address range for Main Street in Block 101 is 100-198, even.
>
> A new subdivision has been added since 1990. It contains X Street and Y Street, with the appropriate address ranges.

Some cities have this kind of geographic information computerized in a local Geographic Information System (GIS). The Census Bureau will take the information in digital format in a program called Digital File Exchange (DEX) and use the information to update TIGER. Both TIP and DEX are going on right now. In late 1995, the Census Bureau mailed a letter to the highest elected officials of all state, tribal, and local governments plus regional and metropolitan planning organizations inviting them to participate in the TIP program.

The Census Bureau thinks the Census 2000 Address List Process is a major improvement over the 1990 system, especially in allowing local governments the opportunity to participate so directly. Partnering together, the address list for Census 2000 should be very accurate. Even so, there are some issues that need consideration. Within your working group, discuss these issues and give us your feedback on the topics at issue.

ISSUES

(In the following issue statements, you refers to the government or the governmental organization you represent.)

1. PALS participation

How can you partner with us to "spread the word" about PALS and encourage as many local governments as possible to participate?

How can you partner with us to identify and overcome any local "prohibitions" against address sharing?

Smaller governments may have trouble finding the time and resources to participate in PALS. How can you partner with us to enable such small governments to participate in the program?

Sometimes quasi-governments (Councils of Government, Regional Commissions, etc.) may have address lists for constituent governments. How can you help us to identify areas where it is better to work with the quasi-government rather than each constituent government? When we do, what is your advice on how to handle differences of opinion between the quasi-government and a particular constituent government?

For areas with primarily rural-style address (Rural route and box number, post office box, and general delivery addresses), the PALS process will occur later and in a narrower window of time. How can you help us prepare governments in these types of areas so they can participate in PALS?

2 LUCA Participation in 1999

The window for LUCAN participation is limited, two months. How can you partner with us to inform local governments of this fact so they can be prepared to act in that short time frame?

To participate fully in LUCAN, a local government has to prepare appropriate materials in advance. (Examples: their tax address files sorted in census geography order, etc.) How can you help us to inform and prepare governments for LUCAN?

The success of LUCAN also depends on the quality of the information provided by a local government. If the local government simply "dumps" a number of questionable address on the Census Bureau, it will result in wasted appeals and more important, the possibility of a large number of questionable addresses added to the census list. In that case, large amounts of money can be wasted following up questionable addresses meaning less money is available to enumerate the actual population. How can you help us inform and prepare local governments to develop "quality" address information to check against the census address list during LUCAN?

Many of the local address lists that the Census Bureau has already received do not appear to have undergone editing for consistency, etc. This is especially true in multi-unit buildings. Inconsistent address information presents serious problems in matching and unduplication when comparing two address files. How can you help us work with localities to minimize this kind of difficulty?

For governments that participate in PALS, LUCAN will have to concentrate on new addresses since the PALS process. How can you help us inform and prepare governments to concentrate their LUCAN efforts on new housing development?

3. Communication

The Census 2000 Address List process is a vast improvement over the past system, but it is complicated and will require good communication if it is to succeed. In points #1 and #2 above, we already mentioned some communications issues. In addition,

How can you help us be sure we are mailing our informational materials to the correct offices/persons?

When there is a quasi-governmental organization involved, how can you help us make sure our communications are consistent? How can you partner with us to resolve conflicting information about the same address?

Though the Census 2000 process is an improvement, there is no post-censal local review as in 1990. How can you help us inform localities of this so they participate on the many improved pre-census opportunities?

4. Confidentiality

The new law allows address sharing between the Census Bureau and a local government, but only for the purposes of the census address list. The Census Bureau cannot sell the list or give it to others. Local governments, on the other hand, cannot use the list information for anything other than the decennial census. So for example, census list information could not be used to identify areas of the city in violation of housing code or even for

"benign" purposes like adding addresses for growth areas to the locality's list.

How can you help reinforce this notion of confidentiality to local government?

How can you partner with us to identify any (if there are any) local governments who violate the confidentiality oath they must take to work on list preparation?

5. Appeals

There will be times when a locality thinks an address exists and the Census Bureau does not. The new law sets an appeals process for these cases. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will determine an independent reviewer. The decision of that reviewer will be binding.

How can we work with you to resolve as many disagreements as possible in the informal reconciliation phase so that formal appeals are reserved for significant differences?

National Conference of Governments on Census 2000
April 9-11, 1997

GROUP B: IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL KNOWLEDGE IN IDENTIFYING AND ESTABLISHING A PRESENCE IN "HARD TO ENUMERATE" AREAS

Background:

State, local and tribal governments can have a direct positive impact upon the Census 2000 results for their area by providing local knowledge which would help to identify areas within their jurisdiction which may be "hard-to-enumerate".

An area may be characterized as being "hard-to-enumerate" from a Census perspective for one of two major reasons. The Census Bureau cannot get a questionnaire either delivered or returned from the households in the area, or Census Bureau field staff cannot make contact with or get direct access to households from which a questionnaire was returned by mail.

Some specific examples of areas which may be hard to enumerate are:

1. Linguistically isolated areas.
2. Areas populated by new immigrants who may be afraid of participating in the Census.
3. High crime areas.
4. Areas where there are housing conversions, both legal and illegal or a highly transient population.
5. Areas in which there are difficulties or barriers in the delivery of services such as mail.
6. Areas where people may think that their cooperation and participation is not necessary or not important.
7. Areas where people think that the Census is an intrusive probing into personal and private information.
8. Areas where access to households may be limited such as, gated communities and security buildings.

State, local and tribal governments can take many steps to overcome areas that may be "hard-to-enumerate", especially from their position of being a local and credible voice/influence to which people will respond. They identify where and how Census questionnaires in languages other than English should be distributed. State, local and tribal government officials make people living within their jurisdiction aware of the direct local impact of the results of the Census. State, local and tribal governments can make inroads to getting the gated communities and security buildings so that they will participate in Census 2000.

ISSUES

Please consider the following issues related to the use of local knowledge in identifying and establishing a presence in "hard-to-enumerate" areas for Census 2000.

1. IDENTIFYING "HARD-TO-ENUMERATE" AREAS

A. What types of local information and statistics are available from State, local and tribal governments which may help to identify areas that might be "hard-to-enumerate"?

B. What types of agencies and organizations could be sources of information which could be useful in identifying "hard-to-enumerate areas"?

- Planning departments
- Economic development agencies
- Law enforcement and fire departments
- Building inspection departments
- Social services agencies
- Community-based organizations

C. How frequently and by what means are these sources of local information updated? How are changes and transitions in neighborhoods and communities identified?

2. ESTABLISHING A PRESENCE IN "HARD-TO-ENUMERATE" AREAS

A. How can State, local and tribal governments partner with unofficial groups such as gangs to help enumerate difficult areas.

B. How can State, local and tribal governments help to identify the "hidden leaders" and "gatekeepers" in hard to enumerate areas.

C. How can State, local, and tribal governments assist the Census Bureau in effectively using their social services programs such as meals on wheels," to reach diverse groups.

D. How can State, local and tribal governments assist the Census Bureau in establishing questionnaire assistance centers.

E. How can State, local and tribal governments assist with the distribution of Census "Be Counted" forms to be used by those who may not have received a Census questionnaire in the mail or who believe that they may not have been counted?

F. How can State, local and tribal governments assist census takers gain access to residents who live in security buildings and gated communities?

National Conference of Governments on Census 2000
April 9-11, 1997

GROUP C: RECRUITING AND STAFFING FOR LARGE-SCALE FIELD DATA COLLECTION OPERATIONS

Background:

Taking the Census, our once-a-decade National headcount, is the largest peace-time operation conducted by the Federal government. The Census Bureau hired more than 550,000 people to conduct the 1990 Census. In the late Spring of 1990, we reached an employment peak of approximately 302,000 people. To complete Census 2000, we estimated that we will need to hire 645,000 people, and that in the Spring of 2000, our employment peak will reach approximately 285,000.

Taking a Census requires us to fill a wide variety of positions, but by far the largest number of positions that we need to fill are census-takers -- locally hired people who work in their own neighborhoods visiting addresses and households from which we did not receive a questionnaire back in the mail.

The success of any large-scale field data collection operation, such as Census 2000, rests squarely on our ability to recruit enough qualified candidates for the census-taker positions in each neighborhood and community. We will train them to conduct more complex data-gathering tasks from a less-willing, less-cooperative public, and, hopefully, they will stay on the job long enough so that we can complete the Census on schedule and within budget.

Recruiting and retaining a competent, motivated, and representative staff of local census-takers, who are available to work flexible hours each day, seven days a week when residents are at home and are geographically distributed across each area where people live or could live is perhaps the most significant condition which affects the quality, length of time required, and overall cost of the field data collection phase of the Census.

CENSUS 2000 RECRUITING AND STAFFING STRATEGY

Our recruiting and staffing strategy for Census 2000 large-scale field data collection operations consists of 3 parts:

1. Hire locally. Strive to have people work within the neighborhoods in which they live.

2. Recruit a representative workforce.

3. Remove/reduce barriers to getting and keeping people.

FIELD DATA COLLECTION STRUCTURE

The major characteristics of the field data collection structure are:

- o Temporary, Focused
- o People-Intensive
- o Huge, Fast-Paced Operations
- o High Staff Turnover

MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CENSUS TAKER JOB

The time requirements for the census taker job can be summarized as follows:

- Short-term. Lasts only 6 - 10 weeks.
- Part-time. Best hours to work are evenings and weekends.

Many people with other commitments -- jobs, family, school, etc. -- can be census takers. Many people find the census taker job appealing because it is a good way to earn extra money.

The characteristics of a successful census taker include:

- Friendly, outgoing. Likes talking to people.
- Detailed. Follows procedures.
- Self-starter. Works productively.
- Organized. Completes tasks and projects.

In some neighborhoods and communities, census takers may also need the ability to speak a language other than English in order to communicate with residents.

Many people find the census taker job appealing because it is a way of helping their community.

The major challenges/frustrations that census takers face include:

- Finding people at home so that they can be interviewed.

- Convincing people of the importance of their being counted and participating in the census.

- Gaining access to interview people who live in security buildings and gated communities.

- Locating hard-to-find housing units.

These are some of the major factors that lead to the very high turnover rates that we experience among census takers.

ISSUES

The following list identifies several traditional methods for Census jobs recruitment:

- Employment offices and jobs hotline

- Local publications with wide distribution

- Locally produced cable TV shows and cable TV channels

- Proclamations and other positive statements made by local officials

- inserts to any type of mailing distributed by State, local and tribal governments

- Encouraging government employees to consider working on the Census. Where government employment and Census employment would not pose a conflict of interest such as in the case of law enforcement or tax collection

Please consider the following recruiting and staffing issues for Census 2000:

A How can State, local and tribal governments partner with organizations who can recruit individuals to assist us in collecting data, especially in the hard to enumerate areas?

B Identify Federal, state, local, and tribal governments' programs which could provide training and job opportunities as future incentives to participate as an enumerator in Census 2000

C How can State, local and tribal governments provide an assessment of the state of the local economy?

- Employment and unemployment rates

- Possible pools of qualified candidates. Including people already employed

- Changes in employment patterns. Openings/closings of businesses, plants, etc. Seasonal employment patterns

D. How can State, local and tribal governments provide assistance in identifying people with special skills to assist with the blind, hearing impaired, languages other than English etc., to be census takers?

United States Census 2000

National Governments Conference on Census 2000
April 9-11, 1997

GROUP D : HOW AND WHEN TO COMMUNICATE WITH GOVERNMENTS

Background:

The Census Bureau has used its Regional Offices, direct correspondence, presentations at meetings of national governmental "umbrella" groups, contacts through its advisory committees and other channels to communicate plans and seek input for Census 2000. Notwithstanding these efforts, the Census Bureau wants to expand and continue its efforts to inform and build partnerships with every jurisdiction for a successful census that will provide timely and useful information products to state, local, tribal and Alaska Native governments. We need your ideas, experience and local knowledge to communicate effectively and continuously from now through the release of the 2000 census results.

ISSUES

1 In the past, the Census Bureau has directed its written correspondence about Census "partnership" programs to the "highest elected" official in a state, city, county, township, etc. Is this procedure, alone, adequate ? If a jurisdiction has both a highest elected official and a chief administrative officer (e g , mayor of a city and a city manager), should both receive the letter ? If so, how can the Bureau determine that there is an administrative officer and obtain the name and address ?

2 The Bureau has inaugurated a new "Calendar of Governmental Interactions" on its World Wide Web site (www census gov). This calendar is aimed at allowing state, local and tribal governments to access schedules for upcoming programs which afford them a role in Census 2000 Is it realistic to assume that local governments will have the Internet access and time to query this new service periodically between now and 2001 ?

3 Between now and 2000, there will be many changes in the elected officials and administrative staff of state, local and tribal governments With over 39,000 such governmental jurisdictions, what are the best ways for the Census Bureau to stay aware of the changes and the current office holders ? Is it reasonable to expect to establish a "liaison relationship" in 1997 with local governments that will continue through 2000 , despite changes in local government administrations ?

4 Prior to the 1990 census, the Census Bureau conducted a series of "Regional Elected Officials Meetings" A host mayor in each of 20 cities invited his/her elected and appointed colleagues from a multi-state "region" to participate in a one-day, "hands-on" discussion of plans for the 1990 census and how local officials and the Census Bureau could work together to prepare for and promote an accurate count in their communities. These meetings were well-received and the Bureau plans to carry out some form of similar effort for 2000. Do you think this "regional meeting "concept is realistic in terms of attendance by officials from near-by states ? Is there a

more effective and economical way to reach local government officials, such as sessions at their state-wide annual meetings of county or municipal leagues ? We have held many session at the annual meetings of the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, etc., but the crowded schedules with many concurrent sessions have reduced attendance at the Census 2000 workshops. Should we continue these forums on the assumption that there will be greater interest as Census 2000 nears ? Whatever forum is used to hold such meetings, when should they be conducted ? 1997, 1998, 1999, early 2000 ?

5. Direct mail, national and local meetings of governmental officials, E-mail, articles in governmental publications and World Wide Web notices are among the ways the Census Bureau now plans to communicate information about Census 2000 partnership programs to state, local and tribal governments. Which of these communications methods would be most effective for your type of community ? Are there other methods the Bureau should use to supplement these approaches ?

6. What other suggestions do you have that would help us communicate Census 2000 plans to state, local and tribal governments ?

National Conference of Governments on Census 2000
April 9-11, 1997

GROUP E: PROMOTION OF CENSUS 2000

Background:

Building upon the marketing activities of the 1980 and 1990 Censuses, the Census 2000 information, advertising, outreach, and promotion program will be more comprehensive. Overall, the plan is to create partnerships -- with state, local, and tribal governments; organizations; and businesses. The goal is to increase awareness of the decennial census and to increase response rates.

The Census Bureau cannot accomplish its goals alone. The Census Bureau recognizes the unique local knowledge, experience, and expertise that state, local, and tribal governments, and organizations can bring to planning and implementing a more accurate census. Therefore, the Bureau has identified "implementing partnership at every stage of the process" with government and non-government entities as the number one strategy for Census 2000. The Census Bureau will reach out early and consistently to find partners with local knowledge and draw on their expertise to achieve the goals for Census 2000.

The Census 2000 information, advertising, outreach, and promotion program plan calls for an integrated communications effort comprised of five major components.

I. **Direct Mail:** The direct mail campaign will be integrated with the overall campaign in terms of themes and messages. The complete mailing package, including the envelope, questionnaire, design elements, slogans, and logo, will be wholly compatible with the rest of the communications effort. New "user friendly" questionnaires will be visually more attractive, simpler, easier to read, and easier to fill out. It will "market" participation in the census by giving examples of how census information will be used for vital community programs and planning activities. Census 2000 will offer respondents more ways to respond. Forms will be available in public places where respondents frequent, for example, public assistance offices, post offices, civic centers, and libraries. A well publicized toll-free telephone number will assist those who want to respond by phone. Internet access to the census questionnaire also is being considered.

II. **Paid Advertising:** Approximately $100 million has been budgeted for paid advertising, using professional advertising firms to manage efforts to promote Census 2000 more visibly and effectively. In designing the Census 2000 paid advertising campaign, the Census Bureau has benefited greatly from lessons learned in the 1990 Census and the 1995 Census Test; and, advice given by the U.S. military, the Postal Service, and independent communications contractors. As a result, the advertising campaign will include extensive research and focus group work to establish effective themes, messages, and media placement strategies; a national media campaign; and a flexible advertising effort aimed at both target audiences and traditional undercounted populations. There are four key operational phases where we have to get our message out:

1) **Build Awareness**...build awareness prior to Census Day;

2) **Maximize Mail Response**...encourage rapid response by mail during Mail-Out Mail-Back period, primarily aimed at increasing the initial mail response rate;

3)**Encourage Non-Response Follow Up (NRFU) Cooperation**....encourage cooperation with enumerators during NRFU; and

4) **Facilitate Integrated Coverage Measurement (ICM)**...convince people "The Census Isn't Over" during ICM.

III. Partnerships: Outreach for Census 2000 will be targeted and more specialized than the 1990 effort. The 1995 Census Test reaffirmed that the Census Bureau shares the goal of achieving a complete and accurate census count with governments. In 1995, partnerships built cooperative relationships with local governments that produced and distributed promotional posters and flyers; and used their familiarity with local residents, places, and events to promote census awareness and participation. Complete Count Committees, comprised of key leaders from a cross section of the community, were established by local governments to develop and implement a localized targeted outreach/promotion plan. Local governments also partnered with the Census Bureau to facilitate use of their channels of communication and influence to secure cooperation and assistance from community gatekeepers that otherwise might not have been attained. Census 2000 will build upon this level and quality of partnerships with governments.

Three types of Census Bureau partnership specialists will be hired throughout the country to establish and maintain continuing liaison and partnership with government and non-government entities.

Government Specialists(GS) will establish partnerships with state, local, and tribal governments to help develop the Census Bureau's Master Address List. In addition, they will work with governments to form state and local Census 2000 Complete Count Committees, and help facilitate other census outreach/promotion government initiatives.

Community Specialists(CS) will form partnerships with local and regional organizations in targeted traditionally undercounted and other areas to encourage local census participation. Community Specialists will work to encourage organizations to undertake active neighborhood efforts to alert undercounted as well as other populations to the census.

Media Specialists (MS) will establish partnerships with local broadcasters/news directors in communities to emphasize Census 2000 to newspaper readers, TV viewers, and radio listeners.

In addition, The Census Bureau, or contractors working with the Bureau, will form partnerships with national organizations, businesses, foundations, trade associations, educational organizations, and religious organizations to promote the importance of participation in Census 2000.

The efforts of the Partnership Specialists will be tied into the four paid advertising campaign phases in the following ways:

1) Build Awareness...We will need government partners to:

- Produce targeted messages and promotional materials, tailored to your community, stressing awareness and importance of quick response to census;

- Call periodic press conferences for the highest elected officials, council members, and other influential leaders to talk about the importance of the census;

- Establish a Complete Count Committee to design and implement a local plan of action for Census 2000 outreach and promotion;

- Call public and in-house meetings to help constituents and the general community understand the importance of the census;

- Issue official statement of agency's support for the census, publicize it, and post it in all government offices;

- Identify gatekeepers and persons of influence to make speeches, record public service announcements, appear on local TV and radio shows about census;

- Display and disseminate census promotional material in your agencies and throughout the community;

- Include census information and other promotional efforts in special government sponsored community events such as parades, fairs, ethnic festivals, and other gatherings.

2) Maximize Mail Return ... we will need government partners to:

- Organize community groups to conduct "mail your form back immediately"campaign;

- When mail return rates are publicized, launch campaign in low response areas stressing "it's not too late;"

- Hold ceremonial kick-offs to publicize the mailout (or hand delivery) of questionnaires;

- Identify local sports and entertainment personalities to appear on local TV and radio stations urging quick response to census;

- Offer government offices as sites for placement of blank questionnaires (Be Counted) and/or Questionnaire Assistance Center and publicize these sites throughout community.

3) Encourage NRFU Cooperation...we will need government partners to:

- Develop and disseminate messages/materials requesting participation and cooperation with enumerators when they knock on doors in the neighborhoods;

- When NRFU response rates are publicized, launch campaign in low response areas stressing cooperation when enumerators arrive.

4) Facilitate Integrated Coverage Measurement ... we will need government partners to:

- Help convince people the census "isn't over, and that quality checks are still being performed in their community.

IV. Public Relations: A traditional public relations effort, initiating and responding to local media inquiries, will be decentralized and assigned to the Media Specialists in Census Bureau regional offices. They will also provide background materials and press briefings about Census 2000 to local and regional media, and coordinate day-to-day contact with media.

V. Special Events: In 1990, special events promoting the census ranged from parades to company picnics to mayoral proclamations to athletic events to public service television documentaries For Census 2000, it is expected that similar events will be co-sponsored by state, local, and tribal governments and by businesses and community organizations.

The Census Bureau is committed to and will provide numerous opportunities for partnerships with state, local, and tribal governments for Census 2000. Partnerships with your agency will allow Census 2000 to benefit from new insights, information, and energies.

ISSUES

1. Promotion Activities

What approaches/strategies do you suggest to motivate/encourage other state, local, and tribal governments to participate in Census 2000 partnerships ?

What local promotion and outreach activities do you believe state, local, and tribal governments can best implement as partners to support Census 2000?

How can you help the Census Bureau tap into the expansive network (formal and informal) of businesses/associations/affiliations that governments have in order to implement outreach and promotion initiatives?

2. Local Message

Local and tribal governments are close to the people who ultimately decide the success of the census. Such agencies are positioned to know the kinds of public education and appeals that are most likely to be effective in increasing participation and influencing people to respond *positively* and *quickly* to the census.

Given the comprehensive array of activities proposed in the Census 2000 information, advertising, outreach and promotion plan, how can your government agency help the Census Bureau identify and plan for groups/areas the census message will not reach?

How can your agency help the Census Bureau identify the "message" that will motivate participation in your geographic area?

How can your agency partner with the Census Bureau to identify the most trusted and credible local messengers and the most effective medium for communicating that message?

3. Beyond Awareness

The Census 2000 Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Outreach and Promotion indicated that census awareness alone is not sufficient. Outreach and promotion efforts should also focus on changing behavior and attitudes. How can you and your government agency help the Census Bureau promote the census in such a way that it goes beyond awareness and changes behavior? What can your agency do to help the Census Bureau get the public to move from knowing about the census and its importance (awareness) to completing the questionnaire and mailing it back (action)?

4. Nonrespondents

Reducing the differential undercount among "hard-to-count" populations is a goal of Census 2000. However, while most of the population responds to the census, there is a growing percentage of nonrespondents from this traditionally responding base.
What can your government agency do in partnership with the Census Bureau to target promotional efforts to reach the "hard-to-count" and at the same time maintain the existing base of cooperation from most people?

5. Timing

Timing is critical to the success of a promotion campaign. How can the government agency you represent partner with the Census Bureau to identify when the bureau should start promoting Census 2000, and during which phase should most of its promotional efforts be placed (blitz)?

Mr. HASTERT. That would be very much appreciated, and we will put that in our record.

I would like to ask a few questions. First of all, Mr. Morgan, you say in your testimony that you were motivated to pursue an aggressive census outreach strategy because of three things: One, without a full and accurate count Wisconsin might have lost a congressional seat; two, local reapportionment and redistricting were at stake; and, three, $3 million of Federal funds stood to be foregone.

In fact, with the outreach efforts you conducted you found 28,000 more people than State and Federal projections had estimated living in Milwaukee and, in fact, your mail response rate was the second highest, next to Indianapolis, of all metropolitan areas in the Nation.

Do you think that other communities have to be on the verge of losing a congressional seat to be motivated like you were?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, you know, I can't speak for what motivates municipalities and States, but I can state definitively what motivated Milwaukee and Wisconsin, and it is what is stated in both my oral, as well as my written statement.

We found it so compelling of a challenge that we felt something had to be done. We couldn't stand idly by and not put together a campaign to get as accurate a count as altogether possible.

The city of Milwaukee had had some difficulty with its population before. After the 1980 census, we were very much dissatisfied with the counts that we got. We had a special census in 1985 and once again we showed that the State projections in terms of Milwaukee's population had been lower than the actual number of folks living in our municipality. So we had had sort of a running feud, if you will, with the State, in terms of how it estimated the population of the city of Milwaukee.

When it came to the 1990 census, because we did have these compelling factors that we were faced with, we thought something had to be done and we decided to spend some money to put together a campaign to work with the Census Bureau.

Mr. HASTERT. Do you think that, having been through the 1990 outreach effort, which is now documented you say in several thick volumes of information, and we are looking forward to looking at those, that it will still be necessary to hire outside consultants to assist your efforts?

Mr. MORGAN. The Census Bureau has proposed some things that I think will make the 2000 enumeration much better. It appears to be moving away from its policy of buying or asking for public service announcements to a more ad-specific professionally done approach to trying to reach the undercounted population.

It appears to be moving toward working toward partnerships with local municipalities and States in terms of who it is that they will hire. It appears that they are going to continue to use the local review, which means that we will share information, so that if we have questions or if we can provide some assistance, we can do so very early on. So they have made some real, I think, progressive things with regard to the way that they will go about trying to count people in the year 2000.

However, I still feel very strongly that municipalities and States have to take the bull by the horns and do whatever they can to ensure that the envelope is pushed and that they are getting as accurate a population as possible, particularly those municipalities like ours that have a high percentage of minority folks, who tend to be undercounted the most, who tend to be distrustful of government.

Our poor communities tend to be very mobile. We really have to find those individuals in a consulting community, and we happen to know who they are because they helped us the last time. We need to find them to help us do a good job. So I think, yes, we will.

Mr. HASTERT. You indicated for the 1990 you began your planning for outreach efforts almost a year before the actual census date. Is the city of Milwaukee thinking now about its efforts for 2000?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, we are, in fact. Of course, your asking me to be here today prompted a lot of that thinking. We had exchanged a few memos.

I am in the Department of City Development now. We are in real estate and business development. But the current director of the Department of Administration, I know, is looking at some of our volumes of old data and trying to decide now what our strategy will be for the 2000 census.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Morgan, your testimony stated that Milwaukee's promotion and activity campaign was in full swing in the fall of 1989, while the census office was not even fully staffed until January 1990.

Should Congress follow your lead by mandating and funding full field staffing and outreach programs to start in the fall of 1999 rather than waiting until January 2000?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not sure full field staffing would be appropriate that early in advance, but I think there are opportunities for the Census Bureau to begin to gear up a little bit earlier than they did the last time.

We had a good relationship with Stanley Moore in the Chicago regional office, but they were a little bit late in joining with us in terms of our effort to try to get a complete count. So, we would like to see them talk to us much earlier, maybe participate in some of the planning to start to gear up before—and mobilize for the census count a little bit earlier than they did the last time.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you, Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Meyer, what do you think about that?

Mr. MEYER. It is interesting you should ask me because we started a year and a half ahead of time as well, and Ms. Brienza could probably speak about that more. But, I think it is absolutely important to start ahead of time. I think what you have to do is to get people's attention. It may not be a full staff, but just get people's attention so they do start ahead of time. I think that's key. Just starting in January and going to April 1st is not enough time.

Mr. HASTERT. Not enough?

Mr. MEYER. No.

Mr. HASTERT. My time is up. I think we will go through a second round. But at this time I would like to yield to Mr. Barrett from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you may know and as my democratic colleagues may know, Milwaukee and Wisconsin does come to this issue from a unique perspective because, as Mr. Morgan indicated, we were basically on the bubble in 1990 and we were very close to losing a congressional seat in addition to the millions of dollars that were discussed.

After Milwaukee and Wisconsin did an excellent job in counting the residents of the State, we, in fact, earned some rewards or some plaudits from the Census Bureau for the excellent counting job that we did. After receiving those awards, we were then told that a statistical adjustment would be made and we would lose a seat. That led the State of Wisconsin, along with several other States, to become involved in litigation that went all the way to the Supreme Court, on the issue of whether there should be an adjustment made, a statistical adjustment.

I mention that because I think the perception is out there that the Democrats are on one side of this issue and the Republicans are on the other side of this issue.

I feel very strongly that you can have an accurate count, in particular in urban areas, if you take the type of aggressive approach that the city of Milwaukee took. Again, I applaud Mr. Morgan and our mayor, Mayor Norquist who recognized the reality that if Milwaukee is going to receive the dollars that is due it and the political representation that it is due it, it would take some aggressive and creative thinking.

So, I was amazed during this period in Milwaukee to see this campaign, and it was literally a campaign, where local leaders were involved, where, as Mr. Morgan indicated, grass-roots citizens got very involved in this process. I think it not only helped the campaign, but I think it actually helped the community. I think what it does is it forces local political leaders sometimes to go to areas where they would not go as often, and I think what this does is it—whether the local leaders like to do it or not, it forces them to get in touch with the people.

Just a couple of questions, if I could.

Mr. Morgan, in your testimony you mentioned that one of the things that was effective was printing some of the information in other languages. We have in Congress pending legislation, English-only legislation, which, frankly, I think would make it far more difficult to have that type of outreach in other languages.

How important was that for the drive in Milwaukee, being able to print those documents in other languages?

Mr. MORGAN. I think that was extremely important for our efforts. It is real important that, particularly in our immigrant communities, that they feel comfortable with the way information is presented, because to give our Hmong population, for example, they are a little bit distrustful of government because of the repressive nature of the governments from the countries that they immigrated from. So, when they come here, it takes a little bit of time before they understand that our governmental system is a little bit different from maybe what they had back home.

We thought it was real important that we put into the hands of the leaders of that community information in their native language

that could be explained, that could be disseminated and understood about our community.

So, I think it is extremely important that we have census information in the language of those communities in which we are working.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Meyer or Ms. Brienza, did you use any type of outreach in other languages?

Ms. BRIENZA. No. In Hamilton County, it is not necessary.

Mr. BARRETT. You don't have the immigration population that you have in other parts of the country?

Ms. BRIENZA. That's right.

Mr. BARRETT. In terms of local involvement in Cincinnati, did you use a lot of local people to get out?

Ms. BRIENZA. Oh, yes. We started a year and a half to form the complete count committee. What we did, we had two honorary chairs, the mayor of the city of Cincinnati was then Charlie Luken, who was in Congress for 4 years, and the president of the county commissioner, who was Bob Taft, who is now the Secretary of State. Also, we have a chair from the private sector, Ray Clark, who was the CEO of the Cincinnati Bell.

We did an incredible outreach and we documented in this thick volume all of the outreach we did, especially in the minority neighborhood, in the black and also other minority because in Cincinnati we have an Appalachian community. They don't trust the government too much. We work very close to the Omnibus Coalition. We have at least 10 or 15 organizations directly or indirectly in the Omnibus, and we work with them very closely.

Then we work with the press, all the schools, from the universities to the Headstart Program. We sent fliers home in each school district in Cincinnati. We have 22 school districts, two vocational schools, obviously two large universities and a large college. So, we used all the newspapers and newsletters. We used the Inquier Newspaper, the large newspaper in town, and the corporate community. We had incredible help from the corporate community, from Cincinnati Bell to Proctor and Gamble, General Electric and others. We had a cooperation with the CBC, which is a large group of CEOs that's the Cincinnati business committee. The outreach was incredible.

We designed our own logo. By the way, I would like to say that the office, the Census Office in Detroit Michigan, that's our region, they were always very helpful, especially Dwight Dean, the director, who is still there now. And we had incredible help from them, too.

We had our logo, that says "Count Me In," in many size and forms, from stickers to large banners and on the buses, the metro buses in town.

We also asked Public TV, Channel 48, to produce a 3 or 4 minute commercial and it was aired on the major stations for as a public service announcement.

Mr. BARRETT. Did the local television stations donate time?

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes, on public service announcement.

Mr. BARRETT. At a good time or in the middle of the night?

Ms. BRIENZA. Oh, no, no, a good time. Also Channel 48, obviously, did the production completely free.

The press was incredible. We had a lot of editorial. In Hamilton County, it is a very diverse county because we have 37 municipalities and 12 townships. Obviously, the city of Cincinnati is the major city. We worked with each mayor of those 37 municipalities and each township trustee, so that the cooperation was great.

We didn't have a congressional district issue, but one issue was for some of the municipalities they would lose their city status if they were less than 5,000 so their effort was very incredible.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank all of you for being here today. I want to also congratulate you on what you have been able to accomplish.

Let me ask this: Fiscal year 1996, the Census Bureau asked for $6.6 million for promotion and outreach, but was funded at $1.2 million. In fiscal year 1997, the request was $18.8 million and the appropriations was $8 million. You both, all of you indicated in your testimony, that a successful campaign must start early. It seems to me that this underfunding of the outreach and promotion process put us at a catch-up situation.

What would you recommend to be done with regard to that issue, Mr. Morgan?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as I indicated before, I think there has to be a realization that if we are going to reach those undercounted groups in our cities and in our rural areas, we are going to have to spend dollars. If Congress is serious about an enumeration that counts every individual, then we are going to have to get into the community, spend the dollars necessary, employ the techniques that we know have been successful and get the job done.

So, I am not sure what spending level is appropriate. That's something for Congress to try to understand. But there has to be an understanding that there is going to be a need for dollars.

That community that we are talking about is a very difficult group to get at. Conventional techniques sometimes don't work. So it becomes a little bit labor-intensive, hiring individuals to go into those communities or hiring individuals from those communities to go back into those communities to work and to find those individuals.

So, the frustration and the balancing—the frustration may be that while on the one hand we don't want an estimate, but we want a complete count, the dollars aren't there to do those things that are necessary to get that complete count. There has to be a balancing and we need the dollars. You need the dollars.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I live in such a community, so I understand exactly what you are talking about.

There is a tremendous distrust of the government and people, when they see anything coming from the government, it's likely to be thrown in the trash unless it is something from IRS. I am just wondering, the workers who you all hire to go into difficult areas, who are they? I mean, how do you convince them that their job is very important? These are tremendous jobs. So you wonder about who it is that is being hired. And I am just wondering, how do you make sure that they are folks who—I mean, how do you get them up and get them excited about what they are doing? Because I

think this kind of work can be rather—it is grunt work, and I am sure the pay is not extremely high.

Mr. MORGAN. No, no, the pay is not.

Mr. CUMMINGS. How do you get them motivated?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, what we did was, instead of trying to reinvent the wheel and hire workers to go into a community that had folks who were dedicated and working in their community, we suggested to the Census Bureau that they hire folks who work in the homeless community and to get into the homeless community and to get the count there, that they hire folks who work in social service agencies in the Hispanic or the Hmong or the African-American community to work in those communities.

And you get two things: You get folks who are trusted by their community, who if they say that the information is going to be kept confidential, individuals in that community are likely to believe them because they tend to be leaders in that community.

They know where these folks are. The individuals can't hide from them. They understand the community.

And the other thing, of course, is that to the extent that you are able to have the Census Bureau hire these individuals, sometimes that means extra dollars for that worker who may be working on an income from a social service agency so there is a little bit of a bump. There is an economic benefit for those individuals to work with the Census Bureau.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Just one last question.

Mr. HASTERT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you. You know, President Clinton has proposed that 4,000 people be hired from our welfare rolls to do this, do some census work. Do you all have any opinions on that?

Mr. MORGAN. I have been monopolizing the questions. I will defer to someone else.

Mr. CUMMINGS. No, you go ahead.

Mr. MEYER. Go ahead.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Ms. Brienza.

Ms. BRIENZA. I just want to say in 1990 we encouraged the Bureau of the Census, and they did, to hire local people. And so in our area, for instance, in Cincinnati, where most of the minority are, we have a very good organization already in place. We have a 52 community council. So we encourage—we did talk to each community council president to help us in the effort to count and include everybody, and also hire people from each community. So it was easy for them to be trusted.

For the welfare, you know, the new goal that President Clinton has, I think it is in Cincinnati we already have something underway because we have a program that is called Cincinnati Works. It is lead by Mr. Phillips, who is a retired CEO. He works for $1 a year. It is to revitalize the downtown. So the program, it is Cincinnati Works, they try to take people from welfare and train them for special work, and also provide baby-sitting, health insurance, all the other appropriate things. So what we can do, probably we can talk to Mr. Phillips and team up with him for the year 2000 census.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Cummings, I would say, yes, I think we should look at welfare, former welfare recipients, as potential workers for the census.

What we found in Wisconsin, through programs like New Hope, which is probably the best welfare reform proposed today, is that welfare recipients, if given an opportunity to work, if given adequate child care, if given adequate training, provide invaluable services to the community. And I see no reason why we shouldn't look to that work force as a potential group to help us get a good enumeration in 2000.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to respond to your first question, sir.

I think you see the people who make this work sitting to my left and right. All you need to do is find a person like this in each community, and you'll have your number by the time we're done with the year 2000.

I think that's the trick is how do you get—how do you use your resources at the Federal level to find the commitment of a Mr. Michael Morgan and a Ms. Agnese Brienza. That's the key right there because these people have put together the numbers for their areas, and the way they have done it is by their leadership is how it happens, how you trickle that down from the Federal Government, how you use the Federal staff to find these people, because I think that's the easy way for the Federal Government to do it. They don't have to do it themselves. Basically, the two people sitting to my right and left are the ones that did it in each of those two communities.

Ms. BRIENZA. Can I say something? Also, I want to clarify one point. For the Complete Count Committee within Cincinnati, the in-kind stuff, our full time is so that—the person in Cincinnati Bell worked full time. We didn't have any money. I mean, we didn't have any budget. We just asked the corporate community, the private sector and they really helped. We asked for one company to do 1,000 fliers and another one to print it or design it.

So we didn't have any special budget for the Complete Count Committee. I don't think money is the answer. Like we really need to look for people who have an interest and have love for the community and understand the importance of counting everybody.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you.

Mr. Meyer, you make the point in your testimony that little is done these days because it's the right thing. Our sense of truism seems to be weighing in the fear of citizens and for the majority of society. Our local communities must be able to see the relation to them of the census data with the resources.

Do you have any other advice with the Census Bureau regarding ways they might effectively communicate the importance of the census in order to strengthen the willingness to participate in the outreach or promotion efforts?

Mr. MEYER. I think that goes to my last answer is you've, again, got to find people that are really committed to the census number. I'm not sure how you do that. I think some people come on board because all of a sudden they've seen the importance of it.

That's why I suggested the pamphlet idea, to convince communities this is really important to them, and not just to the Federal Government just to find the right number and say, we now have

so many billion people living in the United States. I think if you convince them it's important to them, then you'll get the right number. How you go about doing that, I don't know.

Mr. HASTERT. I'm sorry. Mr. Barr came in here. I'm sorry sir.

Mr. BARR. That's OK. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Morgan, to follow on questions you were responding to just a few minutes ago about temporary employees to assist in this particular effort, of course they can't be compensated if they receive Federal assistance such as food stamp program, Federal housing, school, breakfast programs, job training partnerships and the Head Start. Have you experienced this prohibition as limiting the available pool of citizens that might otherwise be qualified to be hired by the Bureau for purposes relating to the 2000 census? Do you think that Congress should consider waiving this prohibition in order to make the pool of applicants as large as possible, as Congresswoman Carrie Meek, for example, has suggested in recent legislation?

Mr. MORGAN. Congressman, I cannot recall those prohibitions you speak of as being a problem in 1990. Of course, that doesn't mean it isn't a problem, it just means I don't have any present recollection that we had any real discussion regarding our inability to get folks who may have been on welfare or may have received the Federal benefits, some other Federal benefit, from working with the Census Bureau.

It seems to me that to the extent that we would want to look at individuals in that pool as potential workers, we would do whatever we could to make our efforts successful in reaching out to that group so that if there is an opportunity, if there is a problem, and if there is an opportunity for waivers, I guess it should be considered. But I can't say that that was a real issue for us in Milwaukee in 1990.

Mr. BARR. OK. Do either of the other two witnesses have any experience or recommendation in that particular area?

Mr. MEYER. I don't really have any experience, but my immediate reaction is waive it. And that goes back to the idea that if we're going to do this, we've got to get out of the box of our old way of thinking. You can't do new things if you keep thinking in the same old ways. So, in this situation, as soon as you can ask the question, what came to my mind is, why not? I don't see any reason why you shouldn't do it.

Ms. BRIENZA. I have to agree with Mr. Meyer, yes.

Mr. BARR. OK.

Ms. BRIENZA. It's one way to find people to really help, because it's such a short time. So why not?

Mr. BARR. I gather, both from reviewing some of you all's written testimonies as well as just listening to some of the questions since I've got here, that you all believe that special outreach and promotion efforts are best left at the local level. Is that a fair statement? Do you all agree with that?

Mr. MEYER. You certainly have to do them at the local level.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the local municipalities should be equal partners with the Census Bureau in getting the outreach effort done.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Morgan, I know that your effort was particularly successful in a lot of these areas in reaching some of the traditionally harder to reach groups in some of our communities; African-American community, for example. Could you just very briefly tell me how you developed or perhaps how best we can develop a plan to target each individual ethnic and racial group so that we can best get that count?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I can briefly recount what we did because we assumed that we didn't know enough about those communities that were undercounted. What we did was we went to folks who work in those communities every day, who provide services for them, and we asked, what is the best way of going about counting individuals in that community? What are some of the challenges or obstacles to counting that community? And he told us what they were.

We kind of, you know, had a, you know, an idea of what it might be based on, some writings on the part of sociologists around the country, and that is, you know, those communities tend to be distrustful of government.

The confidentiality of the information gathered on the census form was really something that concerned a lot of individuals in the community. So based on that—and the other thing, of course is communicating with leaders in the community who then would communicate with others in the community.

After gathering that information, we put together the campaign that we thought got at those challenges, began to erode some of those barriers, and we were fairly successful.

I would hope that we would go through a little bit of the same process for the 2000 enumeration also; that is, make sure that we understand what's going on in the community, what are those challenges, what are those barriers, and what are those best strategies for getting at that community.

Mr. BARR. That would include, I presume, utilizing agencies such as social services agencies, United Way; agencies that are already active in communities working with those very citizens.

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely, Congressman. I think that's the key. Even with the promotional efforts that we had in Milwaukee, we still found that the response mailed in from minority census tracks tended to be a little bit less than what we found in other census tracks. The real key, however, was getting workers into the community and finding those individuals, and getting those forms completed, and getting them back to the Census Bureau. That's where their hard work is. That's where you have to get in the trenches and have the foot soldiers out there, to use the military analogy. You get the foot soldiers out there and go house to house and door to door and get the information.

Mr. BARR. OK. I appreciate the witnesses, and I appreciate very much, Mr. Chairman, your convening these hearings well in advance of when we're going to have to be facing these problems so we can begin working now rather than later.

Ms. BRIENZA. Can I say something?

Mr. HASTERT. Yes.

Ms. BRIENZA. I want to say two things. One, in Hamilton County, we were very concerned about counting the homeless. So, where we did organize lunches, I went a few times in the homeless shelter

to have lunch with the homeless and all the appropriate organizations that worked with the homeless organization. So, they felt very comfortable to eat together and talk.

And one other thing that was important in 1990 in Hamilton County, including Cincinnati, was the local review program. What the Bureau of the Census did in 1990, was give a chance to the community to check the housing unit and the number of people. As I understand from the literature that I received from the Bureau of the Census, for the year 2000, they're going to eliminate the local review program, and I think that's the most important program because it's one way you can check the accuracy of the census.

I don't feel it's that expensive. It shouldn't be that expensive because we know that the technology today, a lot of communities are organized, and also, even if they do it with the land use map, they can easily double-check the census number. So, it seems to me that it's going to be very detrimental to complete count to eliminate the local review program, which means check the census number after the April 1st count.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Morgan, one of the things that you had talked about and mentioned is you really did some—I think some probably unique thing, that is, put messages on the wrappers for tortillas. That was a real outreach which is a product of imagination and effort. So, that was a special effort. Each community, I would guess, is a little special in those regards.

One of the issues I think is going to come down, a dialog that we're having with the Federal Government and the Congress right now is that the Federal Government thinks, well, every community can't be as unique as maybe Milwaukee was, so the easy way is just to take statistics and to figure out statistically where those people may be.

I think that if you give communities the resources and the incentive to do the right thing, and that's what the Constitution says, to count, to enumerate, you can get the job done, and even in a superior way. How do you feel about that?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, you know, our city hasn't taken an official position, but I will tell you how I feel about it.

Mr. HASTERT. I'm asking you for your feeling.

Mr. MORGAN. At the end of the day, it seems to me the most accurate way of understanding who is there is to find that individual and count them. And understanding that that's a hard thing to do, that you're going to have to spend money to be creative, to get the job done, is something that I think that Congress needs to wrestle with a little bit in terms of you know what dollars are going to be made available to the Census Bureau and maybe even what dollars may be made available for local municipalities like Milwaukee.

But it's my feeling and I—you know, I've taken a look at some of the testimony, for example, that our Attorney General, Jim Doyle, made. It's my feeling that constitutionally it seems that the best way to go about preserving the integrity of the process and understanding who is in our cities and who is in our States is to get out and count them.

Mr. HASTERT. Do you feel that maybe a secondary benefit from this—and it's probably a leading question, but I want your reaction

to it, and, Mr. Meyer, you may react to this, too—is when you actually reach out, find that person, where he's at, what his ethnic makeup may be or his beliefs, that you also reach out and find a person that the city can actually then help and make sure that the city or county or whatever agency is out there searching for those people, they can better serve.

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely. One of the things that statistical adjustments may not be able to get at is, right down to the census track, an understanding of actually who that individual is. With statistical analysis, and I'm not a statistician, it seems to me that you make certain assumptions, and sometimes those assumptions don't lie on the census track level.

In cities like ours where provisional services and dollars for social services are tied to the Census Bureau, it's real important that you get down to that level in a way that you'll never be able to get with that.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Meyer.

Mr. MEYER. Yeah, I may echo that. Actually my first degree is with mathematics, and I have had some brush with statistics. What I would be concerned about is that you're not really finding out who these people are. You might be able to count them and estimate the count, but when you get down to it, you want to know who they are. If we take that step down the road, there might be another step beyond that, which all of a sudden we're doing just the statistical census in the future and not actually going out and trying to count as many people as possible.

I'm real leery of a statistical census. I think we ought to use that information as a check, but I would be very concerned about getting rid of the local review program, as Ms. Brienza has stated.

I don't think we ought to use census as part of getting at the final number. We ought to use it as a check.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Barrett.

Mr. BARRETT. Ms. Brienza, you indicated that there were corporate dollars for loaned employees.

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT [continuing]. That were involved in that, which is an experience, I think, quite dissimilar from Milwaukee. I don't recall Milwaukee using corporate dollars or loaned employees.

My concern with that is do you think that there is any danger that if you use corporate dollars or loaned employees, that there might be areas where they don't want to get involved.

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes. I wasn't clear. Mr. Ray Clark, who was a CEO of Cincinnati Bell, agreed to chair the committee. So after all, it's very important for any corporation to have accurate census information, because, you know, they use it, that type information all the time from between the censuses.

And the corporate—there was no corporate dollars as such. There was a budget with in-kind donations.

I was asking to different corporations, because I had contacts in different places. They just agreed to help, but I don't see any interest. See, their goal was to have a complete count with all the accurate information, you know, the socioeconomic information and others, the location, because that's where they are. They sell their product. They install their phones. P&G sells their soap. You know,

it's good to have a complete count, good census information. It's not only important for local government, but it's very important for the private sector, too.

Mr. BARRETT. Well, that underscores my concern a little bit, especially when you talk about the sale of products. For example, one of the controversies that I have been involved in is the sale of insurance and allegations that insurance companies may want to sell in one part of a community but not in another part of a community. So, if we accept in-kind contributions from a corporation that is interested in a very accurate count for one part of the community for sales or promotional purposes, but has no desire at all to serve another area, my concern is you may get corporations that say, well, these are the areas that we like to serve. Frankly, I think that the very area that we're concerned about not reaching is the area where there's not a lot of dollars, and so that the incentive is small up there to have an outreach.

Ms. BRIENZA. They only help us to publicize the census, to make everybody aware that—you know, to answer the question, to answer the questionnaire.

Mr. MEYER. Yes. I think one of the things you're driving at is is there a conflict of interest here, and I don't believe there is from the point of view that the corporation has helped us to get to the number.

Now, if you get to the numbers in your scenario, and then the corporation is going to use that number in a wrong way, you're going to still get to the number. Whatever you do, you're going to have a number there, so you might as well get to the most accurate number. We can't help how the corporations use it, whether they're involved or not. So, they're not involved from a conflict of interest point of view. They're involved to try to get Cincinnati, and this was a community effort.

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes.

Mr. MEYER [continuing]. Community effort throughout the county and I think the city is even going to be more involved because, actually, we have a 40 percent African-American population ourselves, and I'm going to talk to this gentleman after we're done talking to you all because he has a lot of good information that we can use.

But to get back to the corporate thing, Cincinnati has always been a community that works closely with corporations. The community, the CBC, which is the CEOs for all the big companies downtown, and it's probably lead by Proctor & Gamble as much as anybody, they've always been involved in the arts and in these kinds of developments, and they give us in-kind services, and it's done in a manner that is not at all, I'm doing this and I want something back. I'm doing this for the community. And that's really the flavor of it. I don't have any problem with that in Cincinnati. Whether it would happen in another city, I can't tell you. I don't know that.

Ms. BRIENZA. Can I clarify one thing?

Mr. BARRETT. Go ahead.

Ms. BRIENZA. In Cincinnati we have a program. It's called Leadership Cincinnati. It's on the 25th year, and I was a member of one of the classes. The Leadership Cincinnati is organized by the

Chamber of Commerce. It's also done in other cities. I don't know if it's in your cities—in your city. They have a class of 50—45, 50 of the leaders of the community in different fields, and they are very—you know, they're black and white; they're men and women. They're not necessarily—they're people from a company.

So when I called Ray Clark, who was then the CEO of Cincinnati Bell, I called him as an alumni of Leadership Cincinnati, he was my friend, because I knew that we have an organization. So it's like a sorority in a sense.

Mr. BARRETT. Yeah.

Ms. BRIENZA. I wasn't thinking about the company. I was thinking about the person. I knew he was a respected person in the community. People listen to him. And the public officials don't have too much time to get involved in it. I called—so it's kind of different. If I know some of the CEOs, it's because I know them through the Leadership Cincinnati, not for what they sell or what they work——

Mr. BARRETT. OK.

Ms. BRIENZA [continuing]. Only by what they want to give to the community.

Mr. BARRETT. Chairman, I just have one other question. In 1993, Congress passed the Address List Improvement Act to allow local communities to review the census address list before the census. Has your community had any interaction with this thus far, this law? I have to admit I was in Congress, and it's not one that jumps out of me. I thought maybe among census gurus it was one that sort of hooked in.

OK. Mike.

Mr. MORGAN. Well I can tell you this: I did a little bit of research, and I found that this had been passed, and I asked our demographer in the Department is that a good thing, and she said yes.

Mr. BARRETT. OK.

Mr. MORGAN. And as far as we're concerned at this point——

Mr. BARRETT. OK.

Mr. MORGAN [continuing]. It's a good thing to have the ability to get the addresses.

Mr. HASTERT. All right.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one final brief question. It's my understanding that the Bureau's current plan calls for direct sampling of nonresponses to begin within 14 days of census day. However, expert testimony that I believe was recently provided to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee cautions that the Bureau's direct sampling scheme precludes making special outreach efforts at the sampling stage to hard-to-reach, hard-to-enumerate groups because those efforts would introduce bias into the nonresponse followup sample. I'm not sure all of that makes sense, but that's apparently their view.

The problem that I see is this seems to indicate that the Bureau will discourage special promotion and outreach programs. Mr. Morgan, do you have any familiarity with that or any comment on that?

Mr. MORGAN. You know, I don't have a lot of familiarity on that, but I would say that any policy that tends to discourage outreach

into those hard-to-reach communities is not a good thing. You know what we should do and you know, I'm a little bit reticent to comment because I don't really know if I understand your statements, Congressman, with regard to what the Census Bureau is proposing.

Mr. BARR. I'm not sure I do either, but that was their testimony.

Mr. MORGAN. Right, but I guess what I'm saying is we should do whatever we can to ensure we're communicating with that community and that we're reaching out to them and encourage them to participate in the census. And anything that discourages that I think is a negative.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HASTERT. One of the questions that plagues me from time to time is that we send out short forms in the census, and relatively easy for people to answer. Then, I think 1 in every 7 or 1 in every 8 forms is a long form. Especially, in the hard-to-reach areas where people are a little bit questionable about their trust in government, I'm afraid that those long forms probably don't get answered and in the sense that maybe they are thrown away as Mr. Cummings has talked about.

Could you tell us what your feeling is? Was it easier. My view of this thing is the job of the census is to count people, make sure we know what the accurate number of people are in this country and where they live. The long form tends to get into a lot of different details at some time—you know, does your water come from a well, or, do you have a septic system, and all these types of things that maybe some people would like to know, but really isn't the necessary stuff that we have to have to count people and make an accurate census. What was your experience with the short form as opposed to the long form?

Mr. MORGAN. Our experience was that the short forms worked very well in terms of getting the undercounted groups to respond, particularly as workers went into those communities. On the other hand, I have to say that for planning purposes, the information that you pick up on the long forms is fantastic information.

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. But, you know, I tend to agree with you, Congressman, and that is that I think the primary function of the census is to count people, and if we can do that and get the information on the long form and do it well, then that's great. But we should come down on the side of doing those things that get an accurate count, and I think the short form tends to do that better than the long form, in our experience.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meyer.

Mr. MEYER. I would agree with that, except, being somewhat into demographics, we need that information to be able to plan for our cities with the information that's supplied on the long form. The problem is when you allow people to voluntarily fill it out, you almost self-select certain things. You get certain people filling them out, so your information might not be that accurate.

So, what you need to do is the way the Bureau is doing it is statistically just send a certain number out to the population so that we keep those numbers fairly accurate from a statistical point of view about who's filling them out. I would like to keep it, but as you say, we need the numbers.

Mr. HASTERT. Would you be in favor—and this is, I don't know what the statistical ability to do this and how the use comes out, but to me we need to make sure that everybody fills out a short form. That gives the information. And among respondents, you can go back out after the fact then and ask them to fill out a long form. If they responded once, probably they'll respond twice. But the quality of the census is not a threat here. Do you think that would be a possibility?

Mr. MEYER. If you're directing that question at me, again, I think that that would have a tendency to self-select to certain groups and probably be statistically inaccurate. Also, once you fill one form out, my guess is, just from personal view, I don't want to fill out another form. I mean, I don't mind filling out the long form to start with, and I would do that willingly, but after I do the short form and then later come back and ask me to do the long form, I don't think I would. I don't know how the rest of the population would relate to that.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I don't think that I really have anything to add. I think Mr. Meyer summed it up accurately. I really couldn't comment on that.

Mr. HASTERT. OK. Great.

Let me ask you, according to the Bureau's own documents, it admits that smaller governments may have trouble finding the time and resources to participate in the PLS, which is the Postal List Service, so crucial to an accurate list. And the basis is that if you have the right list of addresses, that you can go out and find the people.

Doesn't this argue for a greater level of Federal activity or supplemental funding to assist communities in these efforts? I mean, what is your experience with this?

Mr. MORGAN. Our experience is that that's of crucial importance that we get good and accurate lists, that we cross-reference whatever sources that are available for getting addresses as early on in the process as possible so that we know where the people are, where the addresses are, and we can respond back to the Census Bureau.

For example, in our city there are areas where we're building, there are new addresses, and there are areas where we're, quite frankly, not getting units of housing or buildings down.

It's real important that the Census Bureau have accurate information in terms of what's there and what's not there anymore. They need accurate addresses. They need to cross-reference. We need to be involved in the dialog in terms of understanding how those lists are put together.

Mr. MEYER. One of the things we're doing in Cincinnati, we've actually already started——

Ms. BRIENZA. Yes.

Mr. MEYER [continuing]. For addresses, and one of the things that's going to be very important for Cincinnati is we have a Cincinnati Graphic Information System, or for short GIS, who I'm sure you've all heard of across the Nation, but ours is one of the most accurate, I think, across the Nation.

We've been working on the accuracy of the addresses for the last 8 years, and it will be very accurate for the year 2000. I think the census ought to look at those particular lists, because depending upon the particular community, that could be your most accurate information. And we're doing that for other reasons, so we have a reason to have it accurate.

Cincinnati Bell, we have a consortium of the city of Cincinnati, Hamilton County, Cincinnati Bell and Cincinnati Gas and Electricity. So, you can see they want those figures and addresses to be accurate.

The addresses, when you get into it, is a tremendously complex, difficult issue. I think people have a tendency to say, well, what's the problem? You have one house, you have one address. We have some homes that have four or five different addresses for some reason or other. You don't know why, but it happens.

When you start dealing with these issues in these geographic information systems, you find how complex. The Census Bureau has had to deal with these issues for a long time. And so I would suggest that they really look hard at those as being a source of information for them.

Mr. HASTERT. Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. For illustration, Congressman, if I could, we have fairly jagged borders with other neighboring municipalities in the city of Milwaukee, and what we found was that in working with the Census Bureau—and by the way, the Census Bureau was very, very helpful and very cooperative in the 1990 enumeration with the city of Milwaukee. We found that in cases, whole blocks of our city were moved over to neighboring municipalities. Of course we——

Ms. BRIENZA. That's right.

Mr. MORGAN [continuing]. We corrected those.

So we have a GIS system also that's fairly sophisticated, maybe not as good as Cincinnati, but we're very proud of it. And to the extent that we can work together with the Census Bureau in understanding the addresses and what's in the city and what's not in the city, that's real important early on in the process.

Mr. HASTERT. I also would like to welcome Danny Davis, who is a member of the full committee, not a member of the subcommittee, but we would like to invite him to ask any questions he might want to.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I didn't have a lot of questions, but I did indeed want to make a statement. But I certainly appreciate the opportunity.

I note, though, that both Milwaukee and Cincinnati had undercounts that were perhaps larger than the national average. I happen to come from the experience of having lived all of my life among individuals who were hard to count. I mean, that is, I have deliberately lived in what would be poor areas, and those individuals seemingly have a greater bit of difficulty participating effectively in many components of life.

In terms of the undercounting, did you find that it was pretty much relegated to certain areas or certain type population groups or certain communities?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, first, in terms of the undercounting in the city of Milwaukee, I think our undercount was less than the na-

tional average. In fact, we did a pretty good job of getting to the undercounted groups.

To answer your question, that the groups that tended to be undercounted are the groups that—African-Americans and other minorities, Hmong, Spanish in the city of Milwaukee. Russian immigrant groups tend to be undercounted, and poor people, and we knew that was the case. And that's where most of our efforts and most of our success in terms of finding undercounted folks were.

We worked directly in those communities, both in terms of trying to get a good mail response and then getting out and going door to door enumerating folks, filling out the forms with workers from those communities.

Mr. DAVIS. Would you suggest that there was a difference in the African-American community that was say, "middle class" and an African-American community that had lower socioeconomic standards?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Poor people definitely were—whether they're African-American or white or any other ethnic group tended to be a lot more difficult to find and to count. More middle class, more educated individuals tended to do better in terms of mail response, and we understood that. We understood that going in because we did a lot of work in preparation for doing a good job of enumeration.

Mr. DAVIS. Then are their special targeting efforts——

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS [continuing]. Here toward a particular group, and what might those be?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, what we did in the city of Milwaukee, was to go into the community and find those individuals who worked with what we knew were the hardest segment of our population to count. We asked the Census Bureau to hire some of them, we hired some of them, and we sent them back into the community to work with those individuals, to get them to respond to the census—the Census Bureau forms, to turn those forms and to complete the forms.

We worked through a variety of outlets, homeless shelters, social service agencies, mill programs. You name it, we did it. We worked with boys' and girls' club. We invited folks in. We did special promotions, too, that provided coupons for folks who responded. We did a variety of things that were targeted for specifically that segment of the community. That's why I think we were successful, because we knew the greatest gain was getting at that group that had been persistently over the years been undercounted.

Mr. DAVIS. I just have one—the promotions, I assume that these were creative promotions that sort of emerged in many instances through interaction——

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVIS [continuing]. With the people themselves.

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely.

It's easy for us to impose a solution on a problem rather than going in and trying to understand the problem and having the folks who work in those communities come up with a solution to the problem. And that's what we did. We went into the community. The tortilla—we talked earlier about the printing of—you know, re-

spond to the census on tortilla packages. You know, that wasn't something that spontaneously came up during the course of a discussion between myself and the consultants, that was an idea that came up with Hispanics in the community that said, you know, we really ought to do something with this packaging because we know it's reaching a large number of Hispanics. That's just one example of a creative way of getting the message out to that hard-to-count population.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEYER. Yeah. I would like to respond a little bit to that. The undercount in Cincinnati was basically we just missed a bunch of dwelling units, or the census did. So we went back through, and we have a statistician that works for the city of Cincinnati, and we felt we knew pretty close what that number ought to be, and it was just off by too much, so we went back to find that.

After being here today, though, and this is another way to communicate things, our population is 40 percent African-American, and you can bet we're going to be talking to Mr. Morgan to find out how to make sure we get an accurate count out of that population as well. So, we'll see what happens next in the year 2000.

Ms. BRIENZA. One thing we did in 1990 for the complete count, we focused on the inner-city school and sent fliers home with each kid, and more than once. Also, we used all the community leaders, Boy Scout, Girl Scout, and—and also the Head Start program, the Community Action Agency. It's very active in, you know, as a—about 5,000 kids in the Head Start program in Hamilton County. So, it reached a lot of people. We encourage also the parents, you know, to participate. And we had different programs.

Mr. DAVIS. And I assume that the schools were cooperative?

Ms. BRIENZA. Oh, absolutely. The schools were absolutely, and also the Head Start school where most parents are anyway. So there was a lot of interaction.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That concludes my questions. I would ask for permission at the conclusion to enter a statement into the record.

Mr. HASTERT. Without objection. Thank you for joining us today, and I just wanted to say that you weren't here for the beginning, but Mr. Morgan's city of Milwaukee was the second best city as far as getting information back in the whole Nation because of the efforts, and they actually did a better job than the Census Bureau did.

I welcome a member of our subcommittee, Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you. I would like to know if I could put my opening remarks in the record.

Mr. HASTERT. Without objection.

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

Opening Statement of
The Honorable Carolyn B. Maloney on
Outreach and Promotion for the 2000 Census

April 29, 1997

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am working to make sure that the next census is fair to all Americans, and as accurate as possible. We cannot settle for a repeat of 1990 which missed over 10 million people and counted 6 million people twice. Promoting the census in an important part in making it accurate, and I am pleased that you called this hearing.

In 1990, the census relied on Public Service Announcements to alert the public to "Be Counted." Unfortunately, because of the deregulation of the broadcasting industry, most of those announcements ran in the middle of the night. And since they ran in the middle of the night, they did very little to increase public awareness of the census. Dr. Barbara Bryant, who directed the census for President Bush, summed it up when she said, "we relied on public service announcements for one census too many."

The plans for promoting the next census are quite different from 1990. One of the differences is the result a law we passed in the 103rd Congress which requires the Census Bureau to share its address list with local government officials.

I have here an article from the *Wall Street Journal,* which I would like to submit for the record, that tells about a small town in Kansas that fought for six years to get its census count right. It seem that the census undercounted the town by 84 percent because the census map was wrong, and put most of the residents outside the city limits. The legislation we passed should keep this kind of mistake from happening again.

In the next census, the Census Bureau will make its list of addresses available to each and every local government before the census starts. Local officials can review the list, and make sure that every address in their town is on the list. If it is not, they can provide the correct information to the Census Bureau. If we can get agreement on the number of housing units in a community, it will go a long way towards making sure that the census counts everyone.

Unfortunately, knowing what addresses to mail the forms to is just the first step in an accurate census. The census still needs to count all of the people living at each address. To do that, it must make sure that the people know that the census is coming, and what the census is used for. A good promotion and outreach campaign is essential for getting that message across.

The Census Bureau has redesigned its campaign from 1990, and, for the first time, will use paid advertising. That will assure that the ads do not run in the middle of the night. It will use traditional public relations techniques, and use community organizations to reach hard to count populations. There are a number of changes besides these, but rather than take the Committee's time, I would like to submit a copy of the census outreach and promotion plan for the record.

No matter how successful the outreach and promotion campaign is, the 2000 census will still miss people. Every census since 1790 has missed a part of the population for one reason or another. In 1990, the census counted about 98 percent of the population. I believe that 98 percent is not good enough.

The Constitutional promise of one person, one vote can only be realized by a census that accounts for 100 percent of the population. We can only account for 100 percent of the population with a census that uses sampling to add in those that are missed and take out those that are counted twice. If we do not correct the census for these errors, we will be shirking our responsibility to make sure that the census is as accurate as possible.

Mrs. MALONEY. Right. Well, congratulations on doing so well, Mr. Morgan. The Census Bureau has been talking about spending roughly $100 million to advertise the 2000 census. Do you think this will help your local efforts? Would you recommend that most of the advertising be targeted at hard-to-count populations or directed to the general public?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I—yes, it will help, it will help tremendously. And I think there has to be a balance between a strategy of broadly promoting the census and a strategy of a targeted efforts to promote the census in those undercount efforts. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the preponderance of the dollars should be spent in trying to get at that undercounted community because it is a very difficult community to get at.

I think the Census Bureau should think strategically about the form in which it advertises to ensure that it is using outlets that will get to that community; that is, you know, the PSA sort of approach, public service announcement sort of approach, is good in terms of general knowledge about the importance of the census. But you really have to be a little bit creative in terms of getting to the undercounted community in a language that they understand with individuals that they trust.

Mrs. MALONEY. Would other people like to comment?

Well, you mentioned getting to them in a language that they understand. We've heard some reports that there were problems with translations used in the promotion materials of 1990. And did you experience, any of you, any such problems with translations used; and if so, would you describe the problems and how we would address them? You've brought up the point it's important to reach them with people they know, with their language. Was there any problem with the 1990 census in that direction?

Mr. MORGAN. You know, I'm happy to say that we worked well with the Census Bureau in getting the language, the information, translated into languages for those targeted communities that we had to reach.

In fact, Stanley Moore was very helpful in working with us in ensuring that we had the information in the language, in the form that we needed it.

Mrs. MALONEY. What in your opinion was the largest problem in the promotion of the 1990 census, and what would you do to correct it?

Mr. MORGAN. Well I think a promotion, the area that we have to work the hardest is getting to a segment of the community that really doesn't want to be counted, just doesn't want to have a dialog with the government, or for that matter anyone else. This is the homeless community. These are poor people who move around frequently, particularly in their central city. These are folks who are distrustful of the government because they may have individuals living in the household who may be illegally living in the United States.

So, the real hard part and the preponderance of the effort on our part in the city of Milwaukee was to have individuals go into the community and talk to those individuals, people who worked in those communities.

So our effort was really—and I used the military analogy before—we had to get into the trenches. We had to get some foot soldiers out there to talk to these folks. No amount of promotion was going to convince that segment of the population to mail back the responses. We knew that wasn't going to happen after a while, so we had to get folks out there to sit and to help get those forms completed.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, about 2 weeks ago, excuse me, you wanted to——

Mr. MEYER. Yes. Could I respond in a slightly different manner? I think what Mr. Morgan is talking about is, once you have a good, in-place organization like he heads up, to get to people, I think what the Federal Government's level—and I made this comment before you entered the room—is how do you get to people like Mr. Morgan to head up counting people in the different communities? And I think that's the Federal charge is, how do you make sure that each one of the municipalities, each one of the townships, each one of the cities, et cetera, actually has someone like Mr. Morgan that is out counting people?

Mrs. MALONEY. Very quickly, last week we celebrated pay equity day, and women are still paid at 71 cents to the dollar. What was interesting is they got to the number by the census.

Ms. BRIENZA. Census.

Mrs. MALONEY. That's how they reached that number. It's an important number to me, it's an important number to my constituents. This was gathered on the so-called long form. The long form gathers a lot of important information for the National Institute of Health, for pay, for demographics, for businesses actually. I have the Chamber of Commerce wanting Mr. Hastert to come down and talk to them in my district. So, the businesses are very concerned about what is gathered in the census. It happens very rarely, as you know, and it's a very important time.

We had a hearing last week where we talked about what would be on the short form and the long form. And we had interesting testimony that some of the scientists felt they needed consistent information so they——

Ms. BRIENZA. That's right.

Mrs. MALONEY [continuing]. So they could track what is happening in the country in certain areas. Yet, on the other hand, there is the need to really graph other information that really shows where we are as a Nation, and I use the example of the pay equity. And I just like to ask your opinion on the short and long form. There's been some debate on it. I personally support both forms. They both have important information on it. But many of you have been on the front lines, and I would like to hear your response. Anyone on the panel.

Ms. BRIENZA. I supported the long—the short and long form like you because all the information on the long form, they use it every day. For instance, I'm board member of the Community Action Agency, and we're doing now need assessment for the 3- to 4-years-old Head Start program. We used the long form from the Bureau of the Census to assess the children below the poverty level, so the long form it is very important.

Also, it's very important, like they say, to have community involvement because it's only the community people who can make everybody answer the census, because in 1990 we received boxes of information from the census, but we had a lot of people were able to give out information in the flier because it wouldn't serve any—anybody any good just to keep the information in somebody's office.

But I agree with you, the long form is absolutely—it's important for many, many things. But the community development program, for instance, every year, between census, we still use the 1990 census up to the year 2000 to qualify community. And the long form information, I use it.

Mr. MEYER. There's another interesting point that I didn't even realize until the day before I came here, and I was talking to a genealogist who goes back and looks at the census information for over 70 years ago, because it's not made public for 70 years, and finds—the other information that he finds on that, on what would be the long form now, probably the best information he can get in trying to trace people and trace his family. He's probably traced thousands of relatives and done that a lot through the census. So, there's another interesting aspect to this that I wasn't even aware of.

Mr. HASTERT. Well, I thank the panel and all the Members who are here today to contribute, and especially Mr. Davis, who is a visitor to our committee from the full committee. It's clear that we've learned a lot.

I think there's probably three things that we've also gleaned from this. No. 1, it's important that the community be committed and involved in trying to find the best way to reach the undercounts and to make sure that we have accurate counts of people living in our cities and other places in this country, and certainly Milwaukee and Cincinnati have led the way, and your testimony was very, very much appreciated today.

Second, we've found that promotion and outreach is certainly one of the keystones to be able to get members and citizens counted in this country, and we need to do an adequate amount of that, along with trying to lay out the accurate information, especially in the address lists that we have to work on.

And since we know that effective promotion and outreach can be done, we should certainly fully support those efforts and make sure that the funding is available in the appropriations process to do exactly that.

The Constitution requires us to have a census every 10 years, to count the people in this country to make sure that this Congress is adequately apportioned, and many, many other things that go along with it. There's a lot of extenuating results that come out of the census count, but I think the most important is to get the accurate count of the citizens of the United States.

You've helped us very much today. I appreciate your testimony. Anything that you could add to the record would be greatly appreciated, and we would welcome that. And this committee is closed.

Ms. BRIENZA. Thank you very much.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 10:50 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[The prepared statement of Hon. Danny K. Davis follows:]

Danny K. Davis

Promotion and Outreach for the 2000 Census
Statement of Representative Danny K. Davis
before the Subcommittee on National Security,
International Affairs and Criminal Justice,
Mr. Dennis Hastert (IL-14), Chairman
Tuesday, April 29, 1997

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to be here this morning and share with you and the committee some of the concerns and observations which I have developed from interacting with small businesses and firms which specialize in ethnic advertising and marketing.

In February of this year, executives of the U.S. Census bureau briefed a large number of advertising and marketing firms on the process they will use for selecting a firm to manage a $100 million campaign to promote the year 2000 Census. A key component of the Census promotional efforts is to target ethnic minorities, as members of these groups are more likely than the general population to be uncounted. It was reportedly announced at this meeting that the Bureau plans to grant the contract for $100 million to a large advertising firm, while requiring smaller firms that specialize in targeting ethnic minorities to sub-contract with these large, majority businesses. This practice would relegate the minority firms to a position which does not allow them to maintain creative control and more importantly, might not ensure appropriate financial compensation. Standard business practice when hiring an advertising or marketing agency, provides for a level playing field through the use of RFP's for all firms involved. In this instance, the Bureau has chosen to only accept proposals from large firms. The large firm that is chosen to lead the project will then have the authority to pick ethnic marketing firms using their own criteria. Typically, if more than one type of advertising/marketing expertise is required, RFP's are issued for those individual services. Without allowing minority firms to submit proposals directly to the bureau, the selection of the ethnic firms will be left to the discretion of the

majority firm. This process will place creative control and compensation arrangements squarely in the hands of the majority firm. This format could lead to the production of culturally insensitive images and may result in less than optimal financial returns for the minority firms. Given the aforementioned concerns, I urge that the Bureau seriously consider these issues and address them in a positive way. I would go so far as to suggest that a separate allocation of advertising dollars be established for African-American and Hispanic Agencies through a separate RFP process.

Of paramount importance is the assurance of creative control for minority firms and appropriate compensation for their expertise which is often most directly focused in the areas where the greatest amounts of difficulty seem to occur.

Thank you very much.

○

○