

# Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000

## FINAL REPORT

This evaluation reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau. It is part of a broad program, the Census 2000 Testing, Experimentation, and Evaluation (TXE) Program, designed to assess Census 2000 and to inform 2010 Census planning. Findings from the Census 2000 TXE Program reports are integrated into topic reports that provide context and background for broader interpretation of results.

---

Nathan Carter  
Decennial Statistical  
Studies Division

USCENSUSBUREAU

*Helping You Make Informed Decisions*

# CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
1. BACKGROUND .....	1
2. METHODOLOGY .....	4
2.1 The Census 2000 Check In Files .....	4
2.2 The Non-ID Evaluation File .....	4
2.3 The Decennial Response File – Stage 2 .....	4
2.4 The Hundred percent Census Edited File with the Reinstated Cases .....	4
2.5 The Decennial Master Address File .....	5
2.6 The Planning Database .....	5
2.7 The Operation Control System 2000 Data Warehouse .....	5
2.8 The March 2001 Master Address File Extract .....	5
3. LIMITATIONS .....	7
4. RESULTS .....	8
4.1 What was the Workload of Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000? .....	8
4.2 What were the Characteristics of the Households Returning a Be Counted Form? ..	17
4.3 What were the Demographic Characteristics of Persons Enumerated by the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000? .....	21
4.4 What is the Profile of Addresses Added during the Be Counted Campaign? .....	24
4.5 What were the Cost and Time Line of the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000? .....	27
5. CONCLUSIONS .....	28
6. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	29
References .....	30
Appendix A: The Be Counted Form (D-10) .....	A-1
Appendix B: BCF Processing Flowchart .....	B-1
Appendix C: Variables used from the Non-ID Evaluation File .....	C-1
Appendix D: Variables used from the DRF2 .....	D-1
Appendix E: Variables used from the HCEF_D' .....	E-1
Appendix F: Variables used from the DMAF .....	F-1
Appendix G: Variables used from the PDB .....	G-1
Appendix H: Algorithm for the BCF and QAC Flags from the PDB .....	H-1
Appendix I: Variables used from the March 2001 MAF Extract .....	I-1

## LIST OF TABLES

Table A.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Printed and Picked Up by Language . . . . .	9
Table B.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Sites by Location Type . . . . .	10
Table C.	Frequency and Percent of Tracts Flagged for Sites by Site Location . . . . .	11
Table D.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Checked in from the Mail During Census 2000 by Week . . . . .	12
Table E.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms in Processing During Census 2000 by Outcome . . . . .	13
Table F.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Sent to Field Verification During Census 2000 by Outcome . . . . .	14
Table G.	Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms with the ID in Census 2000 . . . . .	15
Table H.	Frequency and Percent of the Number of Selected Persons and Persons Enumerated on Be Counted Forms with an ID in the Census . . . . .	16
Table I.	Return Types for Households with a Be Counted Form Return . . . . .	18
Table J.	Sampling Designation for Households with Only a Be Counted Form Return . . . . .	19
Table K.	Cross Tabulation of Be Counted Form Type by the Forms Returned for Housing Units Returning a Be Counted Form that Contained a Unique Person . . . . .	20
Table L.	Frequency and Percent of Tenure of Households Enumerated on a Be Counted Form in Census . . . . .	21
Table M.	Frequency and Percent of Age Groups of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census . . . . .	22
Table N.	Frequency and Percent of Sex of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census . . . . .	23
Table O.	Frequency and Percent of Race of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census . . . . .	23
Table P.	Frequency and Percent of Hispanic Origin of BCF Persons in the Census . . . . .	24
Table Q.	Be Counted Addresses by Address Type . . . . .	24
Table R.	Be Counted Addresses by Type of Structure . . . . .	26
Table S.	Be Counted Addresses by Type of Enumeration Area . . . . .	27
Table T.	Cost and Expenditure Category . . . . .	28

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

There were four goals for the Be Counted Campaign of Census 2000:

- to count persons who did not receive a census questionnaire,
- to count persons who believed they were not included on any other census form,
- to encourage participation of persons who are traditionally undercounted in the census and
- to provide a means for persons with no usual residence to be counted.

### **Was the Be Counted Campaign a Success by Meeting the Four Proposed Goals?**

- Respondents returned 804,939 Be Counted Forms to the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau expected approximately one million Be Counted Forms to be returned during Census 2000. Of the 605,905 Be Counted Forms that were included in census processing, 239,128 Be Counted Forms added persons to the census not included on other Census forms. These numbers exclude Be Counted Forms sent to other Census operations, including Service Based Enumeration and Special Place/Group Quarters enumeration.
- There were 236,482 households where the household contained some persons who were only enumerated from the Be Counted Form return. Of these households, 116,019 were enumerated only by Be Counted Forms and the remaining 120,463 were enumerated by Be Counted Forms as well as other census forms.
- There were 560,880 persons added to the census through the Be Counted Forms. This is more than double the number of persons added from the “Were You Counted?” program of the 1990 Census. There were higher percentages of groups traditionally undercounted than were observed in the census overall. These groups include renters, children and minority groups. This means that Be Counted Forms increased coverage in groups that have been hard to count. Approximately 40.7 percent of all Be Counted Forms that were picked up by respondents from distribution sites were non-English forms, most of which were Spanish.
- There were also approximately 15,410 Be Counted Forms that were returned to the Census Bureau that were determined to be persons with no usual residence. This is also important because this group is extremely hard to count.

### **What were the Shortcomings in the Be Counted Campaign?**

- The Census Bureau printed 16,326,400 Be Counted Forms. The number of Be Counted Forms shipped to the Local Census Offices (LCOs) was 13,415,711 of which 1,748,199 were picked up by respondents from the distribution sites. We were unable to determine how many of the forms shipped to the LCOs were distributed to the distribution sites. There were 804,939 Be Counted Forms returned to the Census Bureau. This means 89.3 percent of the forms printed were never picked up and 4.9 percent were returned.

- The Census Bureau flagged census tracts potentially needing a Be Counted Distribution Site or Questionnaire Assistance Center. This was done because the Planning Database indicated the tract was known to have high concentrations of populations that were hard to enumerate or had special language needs. Of the 8,783 tracts flagged for a site, 57.8 percent of them had a site located in them.

Considering the ability to meet our goals, overall the Be Counted Campaign was a success. It added 560,880 persons to the census through this program. While this number is small, these are people that would have been missed without this program.

### **What can We Recommend?**

Since all four goals were largely met and since 560,880 persons were added to the census from Be Counted Forms, the Census Bureau staff should consider the following points if implementing an operation like the Be Counted Campaign in 2010.

- There were discrepancies in the counts that came from the Non-ID Evaluation File and the Decennial Response File - Stage 2. Further analysis is recommended to explore the reasons for these discrepancies in order to prevent them in the future. This change would aid in the future evaluation of this operation.
- There was a high number of sites classified as “Other”. A review of write-in responses indicates that schools and municipal buildings were locations that were used frequently. Therefore, these should be added as separate categories.
- The evaluation planned to look at the Be Counted Forms that were matched/geocoded either through the automated system or by clerical staff. These data were available but inconsistent with the data used for this report. We were unable to reconcile these differences; thus, we were unable to report the matched/geocoded cases by whether they were automated or clerically processed. Further analysis should be done to investigate the number of Be Counted Forms matched/geocoded by the two different methods. If feasible, the automated matching should be done in real time. If a match is made to an ID in real time, then it could be excluded from Nonresponse Followup. The forms that go to clerical matching/geocoding would need a separate processing strategy. If this change is feasible and is made, it would make this operation a more effective mode of enumeration and would decrease the workload of Nonresponse Followup.
- When the Census Bureau was unable to match the respondent provided address to another address on the Decennial Master Address File, the Be Counted Forms then went to Field Verification. Some of these cases were coded as a duplicate, in which case the data on the Be Counted Form were removed from further processing. The Be Counted Form data were not linked to the census ID return information. There were 33,808 (16.8 percent) Be Counted Forms where this occurred. In the future Field Verification should be designed to permit the enumerator to record the census ID of the Be Counted Form duplicates. The

data processing system should collect the information, so the Be Counted Form data can be linked to the corresponding census ID. Making this change would improve the census address list.

- As part of the non-English mail questionnaire processing, the “Just-In-Case” box was used to track the language of the non-English form and whether translation or transcription was needed. This process was not done for the Be Counted Forms, therefore no language data are available for those Be Counted Forms included in the Census. In the future, a process should be implemented so the language of the Be Counted Form is retained. This would aid planning this program in future censuses.

## 1. BACKGROUND

During the 1980 and 1990 Censuses the Census Bureau used a post Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) campaign called "Were You Counted?" in order to allow persons who believed they were not counted an opportunity to be counted. This campaign did not start until most census field enumeration activities were completed. The "Were You Counted?" campaign printed "Were You Counted?" forms in local newspapers and other media. Anyone believing they were not counted could complete and return a "Were You Counted?" form.

The 1980 "Were You Counted?" evaluation estimated that 62,000 forms, containing about 140,000 persons, were received. Of these persons about 71,000 were added to the census after unduplication (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987).

In 1990 the Census Bureau received about 352,800 "Were You Counted?" forms. From these forms, about 260,000 persons were added to the census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993).

During planning for the 2000 Census, the Census Bureau researched many different approaches to improving respondent participation in the census. The Be Counted Campaign, similar to the "Were You Counted?" program, was designed as a tool:

- to count persons who did not receive a census questionnaire,
- to count persons who believed they were not included on any other census form,
- to encourage participation of persons who traditionally have been disproportionately undercounted in the census and
- to provide a means for persons with no usual residence to be counted.

During the 1995 Census Test, Be Counted Forms (BCFs) were widely available and heavily promoted. They were easily accessible in a multitude of generic distribution sites, such as city halls, all post offices and libraries, and other areas within the community such as grocery stores, community-based organizations, and laundromats.

Additionally for the 1995 Test, the Be Counted Campaign utilized the toll-free 1-800 telephone number from Telephone Questionnaire Assistance program in its advertisement. Respondents could call the toll-free Telephone Questionnaire Assistance number and request that we mail them a form in any of the five available languages (English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, and Vietnamese). Unless the caller had a census identification number and wanted the same type of questionnaire that they initially received, the form mailed was a BCF. Respondents could also call the Telephone Questionnaire Assistance number and provide their data over the phone as part of the Reverse-Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) operation. The Reverse-CATI was first tested in the 1995 Census Test and provided English language interviews only.

For the 1995 Census Test, we evaluated BCFs from the standpoint of operational feasibility, frequency of use, and the coverage yield of making them available at public locations. The 1995 Census test sites contained approximately 210,000 housing units and approximately 540,000 persons (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996b). In the three test areas a total of 1,698 BCFs were returned, 1,352 enumerating Whole Households (WHHs) and 346 enumerating Partial Households (PHHs). A total of 4,596 persons were enumerated on these forms, with 91.4 percent being included in the 1995 Census Test (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996c).

The Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal included a Be Counted Campaign. The BCFs were available in six languages - English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Mien, and Russian. The availability of the forms was limited to targeted locations within the test site that were identified by Local Census Office (LCO) staff, community groups and local governments. The promotion was also limited - consisting of posters outside of the distribution sites. The BCFs were also distributed at Questionnaire Assistance Centers (QACs). The availability of the BCFs was limited to the time frame between Census Day and the beginning of NRFU. Reverse-CATI was also available, and the interview that was conducted was a BCF interview.

The housing unit count for the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal in the three test areas was approximately 430,000 housing units (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999a). The population count for the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal in the three test areas was approximately 1,070,000 persons (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999a). During the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal in the three test areas a total of 2,379 BCFs were returned. Of these BCFs, 1,523 were eligible to be included in census. From these forms a total of 1,707 persons were enumerated that would not otherwise have been included in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999b).

The Census 2000 Be Counted Program provided a means for persons to be included in Census 2000 who may not have received a census questionnaire or believe they were not included on one. The program also provided an opportunity for persons who have no usual address on Census Day to be counted in the census. The Census 2000 BCF contained Census short form data questions, a question indicating whether the form is being completed for the respondent's WHH, and several additional questions needed to geocode the respondent's address and process the completed forms. The form number for the BCF was D-10 and the form follows in Appendix A.

The BCFs were not intended to replace the addressed census questionnaire, so they were only made available to the public in targeted locations in hard to enumerate areas. The sites for placing BCFs in hard to enumerate areas were identified through the use of Population Division's Planning Database, and through consultations with local partners. This was done to improve the coverage in these areas.

The Census Bureau expected to have approximately 85,000 Be Counted sites for Census 2000. In addition, the QACs had a supply of BCFs available. The BCFs were available in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Tagalog and Vietnamese. The Census Bureau printed and distributed about 16 million BCFs in anticipation of receiving about one million completed forms.

The BCFs were available in the targeted locations on March 31, 2000 and were removed from the sites on April 17, 2000. These dates coincided with Census Day (April 1, 2000) and the start of NRFU. Respondents were able to call the Telephone Questionnaire Assistance number and, if they met certain criteria, they could provide their short-form data via a Reverse-CATI interview. If the respondents did not know their census ID, they could request a form, and a BCF would be mailed to their address. The BCFs that were received for persons with no usual residence were counted in the service-based enumeration population. For a more detailed look at BCFs received from persons with no usual residence or persons living in Special Place/Group Quarters (SP/GQ) situations see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001c and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001d, respectively.

The addresses on the BCFs were matched to the addresses on the Master Address File (MAF) and the Decennial Master Address File (DMAF).

- If the BCF address could not be geocoded, it was not included in the census.
- If the address on the BCF matched to both the MAF and the DMAF, the BCF was linked to the ID on these files that had the corresponding address.
- If the address from the BCF was only matched to an address on the MAF or did not match to an address on either file, the address from the BCF was sent to geocoding.
- If the BCF address geocoded, then the BCF address was sent to Field Verification.
- Field Verification consisted of an enumerator visiting the address, provided by the respondent, and determining the status of this address. The status from Field Verification could be one of the following: verified as existing, determined not to exist (delete) or determined to be a duplicate of an address already in the DMAF.
- If these BCF addresses were verified to exist, the address and person information was included in the census.
- If the BCF address was determined to be a delete or a duplicate, then it was not included in the census.
- If the BCF address could not be geocoded, regardless of whether it matched or not, it was not included in the census.

See Appendix B for a flowchart of BCF Processing.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

To create this report we used six data sources:

- the Census 2000 Check In files,
- the Non-ID Evaluation file,
- the Decennial Response File – Stage 2 (DRF2),
- the Hundred percent Census Edited File with the reinstated cases(HCEF\_D’),
- the Decennial Master Address File (DMAF)
- the Planning Database (PDB)
- the Operation Control System (OCS) 2000 Data Warehouse and
- the March 2001 Master Address File (MAF) Extract

Each file will be addressed as to how they were used within this report.

### 2.1 The Census 2000 Check-In Files

The Census 2000 Check-In files were created by Lockheed Martin at the Data Capture Centers, one for each day at each of the four centers. The BCF Check-In files included a code for the BCF type (language) with a count for each type. These files were created each day check-in occurred. These files were used to get a count of how many BCFs were returned to the Census Bureau.

### 2.2 The Non-ID Evaluation File

This file was created by Decennial Systems and Contracts Management Office (DSCMO) and contained every Non-ID census return. The universe of BCFs was created by selecting only the D-10 forms from the file, variable FORMTYPE equals 090 through 097. For more information about the variable FORMTYPE see Appendix C. This file was used to get a count of the outcome of the processing for the BCFs.

### 2.3 The Decennial Response File – Stage 2

This file was produced by DSCMO and includes information about the outcomes of the Primary Selection Algorithm. The records that were included on this file were household returns. All D-10 form returns were selected from the DRF2 as the universe of valid BCF returns, variable RFT = 7. For more information about the variable RFT see Appendix D. This file was used to look at which BCFs were selected during Primary Selection Algorithm. In addition, the DRF2 supplied housing unit and person characteristics data.

### 2.4 The Hundred percent Census Edited File with the Reinstated Cases

This file was created by DSCMO and includes information about housing unit and person data

that were included in the census count. The cases/records selected from the DRF2 were used as the universe file. The DRF2 selected records were matched to the HCEF\_D' based on census ID, on the DRF2 variable RUID and on the HCEF\_D' variable MAFID. For more information about the variable RUID see Appendix D and about the variable MAFID see Appendix E. This file was used to see if the BCFs identified by the DRF2 were included on the HCEF\_D'.

## **2.5 The Decennial Master Address File**

This file was created by DSCMO containing information about each address on the MAF that was eligible to be in the census address list (DMAF). This file was used to determine which addresses were flagged for the census long form sample that returned only a BCF, variable ASAM = 6. For a description of the variable ASAM see Appendix F. The records selected from the DRF2 were used as the universe file. The DRF2 selected records were matched to the DMAF based on census ID, on the DRF2 variable RUID and on the DMAF variable MAFID. For more information about the variable RUID see Appendix D and about the Variable MAFID see Appendix F.

## **2.6 The Planning Database**

This file was created by Population Division (POP) for planning purposes based on 1990 census tract data. The PDB includes information at the census tract level. Each tract on the PDB includes flags for the Be Counted Site and the QAC flags variables, BCF\_\* and QAC\_\*, where \* represents three characters for a particular language. For a complete list of the flags used from the PDB see Appendix G.

## **2.7 The Operation Control System 2000 Data Warehouse**

This warehouse was created by Technologies Management Office (TMO) using data from OCS 2000. This warehouse contains the information collected about each operation by Field Division (FLD) during the census. The data for this evaluation was extracted from the OCS 2000 Be Counted section of the Data Warehouse. The extract contained tracts that were identified as having at least one Be Counted or QAC site within the tract, identified by the "Number of Sites" option under the metrics section of the warehouse program.

## **2.8 The March 2001 Master Address File Extract**

The March 2001 MAF extracts are used for some of the analysis done in this evaluation (see Appendix D for a complete list of variables used). These extracts are address files created by the Geography Division. The files contain housing unit and Group Quarters addresses as well as characteristics about these addresses. For this evaluation, we focused only on housing units. Therefore, we excluded all Group Quarters addresses prior to the analysis phase.

We used the original source variable from the March 2001 MAF extracts to determine the Be Counted universe. We took only records where the original source variable was equal to Be

Counted and/or TQA (OS=28, 29 or 30).

Evaluations of the MAF-building operations required identification of the source of every address on the MAF, which did not exist on the MAF. An original source variable was defined and created by Planning, Research and Evaluation Division (PRED) and Decennial Statistical Studies Division (DSSD). This variable identifies the first operation or file to add the address to the MAF, with the following three qualifications:

- If one operation added an address, but it was found by a later operation to exist in a different Type of Enumeration Area (TEA), the first operation does not receive credit for adding this address.
- Not every address in the MAF has sufficient operation information to indicate how the address was added to the MAF.
- In cases where one MAF-building operation overlapped with one or more other MAF-building operations, if the address was added independently in each operation, we give credit to each operation. An example of this is Local Update of Census Addresses 1998 and Block Canvassing.

Therefore, the original source variable identifies the first operation or operations to add the address to the TEA in which it exists for the census, provided there is sufficient information to identify a TEA and an operation. For additional information on how the original source variable was defined, see U.S. Census Bureau, 2001a.

A portion of this evaluation looks at addresses by type of address information. We classify addresses into five categories based on the highest criteria met. The categories are: complete city-style, complete rural route, complete post office box, incomplete address and no address information.

- The complete city-style category includes all units that had complete city-style addresses, which consists of a house number and street name.
- The complete rural route category includes units that did not have a complete city-style address but did have a complete rural route address, such as Rural Route 2, Box 3.
- The complete post office box category includes units that did not have a complete city-style or complete rural route address but did have a complete post office box address, such as P.O. Box 5.
- The incomplete category includes units that had some address information but did not have a complete address of any type.
- The no address information category includes units that are missing house number, street name, Rural Route, and Post Office box information.

Addresses are further delineated by whether or not the address had a physical/location description provided during a census field operation. For additional information on how this variable was defined, see U.S. Census Bureau, 2001c. For a list of variables used from the March 2000 MAF Extract see Appendix I.

### 3. LIMITATIONS

When considering the results of the evaluation, keep in mind several limits:

- There are count discrepancies between the files used for evaluation. There were two such discrepancies. First, the Check-In files and the Non-ID Evaluation file should have identified the universe of BCFs returned to the Census Bureau. They each resulted in a universe of size 779,140 and 804,939 respectively. This is a difference of 25,799 BCFs. Second, the Non-ID Evaluation file and the DRF2 should have identified the universe of valid BCFs, from Matching or Field Verification. They resulted in a universe of 506,026 and 605,905 respectively. This is a difference of 99,879. We were unable to determine the explanation for these discrepancies. This should be considered as a point for further research.
- For this evaluation, tract level data were obtained from the PDB and the OCS 2000 Data Warehouse. Data from these sources were matched by tract. Inconsistencies occurred when the matching was performed due to the following two reasons. First, The PDB contained the planned Census 2000 tract numbers. The OCS 2000 Data Warehouse contained the actual Census 2000 tract numbers. Some planned tract numbers were not the same as the actual tract numbers used for the census. Second, the source of the OCS 2000 Data Warehouse information came from a clerical keying operation in the Local Census Office. Errors in the keying of tract number may have occurred. As a result of these two inconsistencies, 2,483 tracts of the 63,890 tracts on these two data sources did not match.
- The ‘Number of Units at this Basic Street Address’ variable is overstated. It is based on addresses that are eligible to be in the census instead of on addresses included in the census. This variable is used to determine whether an address belonged to a single or multi-unit structure. Also, only city style addresses were matched to created multi-unit addresses. All non-city style addresses are treated as single unit addresses.
- The type of enumeration areas, enumeration methodologies, and analysis variables for Census 2000 may differ from previous censuses. Caution should be taken when comparing results across censuses. An example of an analysis variable that has changed from 1990 is size of structure--the closest approximation being size of basic street address in Census 2000. In the 1990 census, we had a census question asking the respondent the size of structure. In Census 2000, we defined the size of basic street address based on an address-level algorithm.
- In this evaluation, we look at address information in the following categories: complete city-style, complete rural route, complete post office box, incomplete, or no address information. Because of the way the address information is stored on the MAF, we are unable to distinguish between addresses that are used for mailing and those that are used for locating addresses in field operations.

- The evaluation planned to look at the Be Counted Forms that were matched/geocoded either through the automated system or by clerical staff. These data were available but inconsistent with the data used for this report. We were unable to reconcile these differences; thus, we were unable to report the matched/geocoded cases by whether they were automated or clerically processed.

## **4. RESULTS**

In order to determine the success of the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000, the workload and cost of this operation and the extent to which the goals for the program were met need to be determined. The description of the workload follows in Section 4.1. The characteristics of households returning a BCF will be discussed in Section 4.2. The demographic characteristics for persons added by the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000 follows in Section 4.3. The cost and time line for the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000 follows in Section 4.4.

### **4.1 What was the Workload of the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000?**

The workload of the Be Counted Campaign can be broken up into two parts, implementing the program and the processing of the BCFs. Each will be explored separately. The implementation component of the workload consists of the printing and distribution of the BCFs. The processing component of the workload consists of the check in and the outcome of processing of the BCFs.

#### *4.1.1 What was the Workload Associated with Implementing the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000?*

In this section, the workload associated with implementing the Be Counted Campaign will be explored. The operational component of the workload consists of the printing and distribution of the BCFs. The Census Bureau printed a total of 16.3 million BCFs. This includes English and Spanish BCFs for both stateside and Puerto Rico and an additional four Asian language BCFs for stateside. These include Chinese, Korean, Tagalog and Vietnamese. There were 13.4 million BCFs shipped to the LCOs, of which 1.7 million were picked up, which is 10.7 percent of the BCFs printed. We were unable to determine how many of the forms shipped to the LCOs were distributed to the distribution sites. Table A contains a breakdown of the number of BCFs printed and picked up by language for both stateside and Puerto Rico during Census 2000.

**Table A. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Printed and Picked Up by Language**

Language	BCFs Printed		Percent of Printed Forms	
	#	%	Shipped to LCOs	Picked Up
Total	16,326,400	100.0	82.2	10.7
English	12,060,000	73.9	87.7	8.6
Spanish	3,360,000	20.6	69.5	15.0
Chinese	247,200	1.5	80.3	28.2
Korean	216,300	1.3	79.8	20.5
Tagalog	236,900	1.5	28.3	18.3
Vietnamese	206,000	1.3	31.3	23.9

Source: Data provided by the Printing Branch of DSCMO and OCS 2000 Data Warehouse  
 # of English BCFs printed includes 12,000,000 stateside and 60,000 for Puerto Rico  
 # of Spanish BCFs printed includes 3,000,000 stateside and 360,000 for Puerto Rico  
 % Shipped excludes Puerto Rico  
 % Picked up includes Puerto Rico

As shown in Table A the majority of BCFs printed were in English (73.9 percent) and the next largest language printed being Spanish (20.6 percent). There was also a total of 5.6 percent of the BCFs were printed in four Asian languages.

The majority of English and Spanish BCFs printed were shipped to the LCOs, 87.7 percent and 69.5 percent, respectively (note only stateside numbers available). Note for Tagalog and Vietnamese only 28.3 percent and 31.3 percent of the printed BCFs were shipped to the LCOs, respectively.

In addition, it is important to consider the percent of printed forms that were picked up by a respondent. This number would explain how well the Census Bureau predicted the use of these forms. For each of the languages, this percent varied from 8.6 percent for English to 28.2 percent for Chinese. Also the percent of forms picked up compared to those printed are much higher for the languages other than English. This indicates that not only do we need to have better estimates of how many forms will be used, but we need to be careful not to under estimate the use of non-English BCFs.

Table B contains a breakdown of sites by location. The 1.7 million BCFs were picked up during the census at 51,692 distribution sites, which is fewer than the 85,000 planned sites. The sites were located in communities in such locations as private businesses, post offices, libraries and so forth. These sites included both QACs and other locations.

**Table B. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Sites by Location Type**

<b>Location Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	51,692	100.0
Business	14,601	28.2
Church	3,096	6.0
Community Organization	9,947	19.2
Department of Motor Vehicles	288	0.6
Library	6,321	12.2
Post Office	1,254	2.4
Questionnaire Assistance Center	2,479	4.8
Other	13,706	26.5

Source: OCS 2000 Data Warehouse

Private businesses represent 28.2 percent of the location classifications. The category “Other” represent 26.5 percent of locations. A cursory glance at the location name for this category indicates that additional location descriptions are needed, such as “School” and “Municipal Building”. In addition, some of the “Other” category could have been coded into one of the seven specific categories. Also, the category “Questionnaire Assistance Center” as a choice for location description does not get at where the actual QAC was located, for example a QAC located in a community center. The location type designation were not mutually exclusive which caused difficulty in evaluating the type of location used for Be Counted sites.

The Census Bureau Headquarters staff provided the PDB to FLD to aid the Local Census Offices in knowing which tracts needed QACs and/or Be Counted Distribution Site(s). Table C summaries the number and percent of tracts where a site was needed and number of tracts that actually had a site.

**Table C. Frequency and Percent of Tracts Flagged for Sites by Site Location**

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	63,890	100.0
Tracts flagged for a site	8,783	13.7
Tracts with a site	5,075	(57.8)
Tracts without a site	3,708	(42.2)
Tracts not flagged for a site	52,624	82.4
Tracts with a site	17,915	(34.0)
Tracts without a site	34,709	(66.0)
Invalid Tract Codes	2,483	3.9

Source: PDB and OSC2000 Data Warehouse

Table C shows that of the 8,783 tracts identified by Population Division as potentially requiring a distributions sites, FLD placed sites in 57.8 percent of these tracts. There are several possible explanations for this. One being the Local Census Office staff attempted to place a Be Counted Site or QAC in the tract, but was unable to for some reason. The other reason being that the Local Census Offices may have decided to use local knowledge rather than the PDB. Another explanation is that local knowledge of the area led to a site being omitted from a flagged area. For information on how the BCF and QAC flags were set, see Appendix H.

*4.1.2 What was the Processing Component of Workload of the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000?*

This section will discuss the processing component of the workload, which consists of the check-in and the outcome of processing of the BCFs. There were a total of 579,365 BCFs checked in during the census. Table D contains a breakdown of the number of BCFs checked in during Census 2000 by week.

**Table D. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Checked in from the Mail During Census 2000 by Week**

Week	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total	579,365	100.0	100.0
March 5-11	0	0	0
March 12-18	452	0.1	0.1
March 19-25	356	0.1	0.1
March 26-April 1 <sup>1</sup>	10,578	1.8	2.0
April 2-8	94,004	16.2	18.2
April 9-15 <sup>2</sup>	175,288	30.3	48.4
April 16-22	183,949	31.8	80.2
April 23-29	108,785	18.8	99.0
April 30-May 6	5,564	1.0	99.9
May 7-13	0	0	99.9
May 14-20	0	0	99.9
May 21-27	0	0	99.9
May 28-June 3	0	0	99.9
June 4-10	23	0.0	99.9
June 11-17	0	0	99.9
June 18-24	207	0.0	100.0
June 25-July 1	37	0.0	100.0
July 2-8	2	0.0	100.0
July 9-15	1	0.0	100.0
July 16-22	0	0	100.0
July 23-29	0	0	100.0
July 30-August 5	0	0	100.0
August 6-12	0	0	100.0
August 13-19	88	0.0	100.0
August 20-26	31	0.0	100.0
After August 27	0	0	100.0

Source: The Census 2000 Check In Files

<sup>1</sup>On March 31, 2000 BCFs were dropped off at the distributions sites.

<sup>2</sup>On April 15, 2000 BCFs were picked up from the distributions sites.

Table D shows that the Census Bureau received 11,386 BCFs (2.0 percent) by April 1, 2000. This is interesting since BCFs were not to be available for distribution until April 1. The cut for BCFs to be included in Field Verification was July 7, 2001. The Census Bureau received 120 BCFs (less than 0.01 percent) after this cutoff date. These forms could only be included in the census if they matched and geocoded to a Census ID already on the DMAF.

The Telephone Questionnaire Assistance program allowed respondents to provide a short form interview over the phone without a census ID from March 22, 2000 to June 30, 2000. During this time there were 199,775 of these interviews conducted, which were processed as BCFs. Together with the paper BCFs checked in, there were 779,140 BCFs received. This is short of the estimated one million complete forms.

The Non-ID Evaluation File has 804,939 BCFs on it. This is a difference of 25,799 between the two files. We were unable to determine an explanation for this difference. Table E contains a breakdown of the outcomes of the processing of the BCFs during Census 2000.

**Table E. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms in Processing During Census 2000 by Outcome**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	804,939	100.0
Matched to Census ID	408,098	50.7
Did not Geocode	178,768	22.2
No Usual Residence Case	15,410	1.9
Group Quarters Case	1,144	0.1
Sent to Field Verification	201,519	25.0

Source: The Non-ID Evaluation File

As shown in Table E the majority of BCFs in processing were matched to a census ID (50.7 percent). The next largest outcome of processing was in Field Verification (25.0 percent). No usual residence cases and Group Quarters were sent to Service Based Enumeration processing and Special Place/Group Quarters Enumeration processing, respectively. It is important to note that 178,768 (22.2 percent) BCFs did not geocode, which would mean that the Census Bureau was unable to place the address from the BCF into a census block. Thus, ungeocoded forms were not included in further processing. This most often occurred due to the respondent provide incomplete address information.

There were a total of 201,519 BCFs from processing that were included in Field Verification. Field Verification consisted of sending an enumerator out to an address and classifying it as verified (the address exists and is unique), delete (the address does not exist), or duplicate (the address is a duplicate of another address on the address list). Table F contains a break down of the number of BCFs in Field Verification during Census 2000 by outcome.

**Table F. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms Sent to Field Verification During Census 2000 by Outcome**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	201,519	100.0
Verified	97,928	48.6
Delete	69,451	34.5
Duplicate	33,808	16.8
Results not Reported	332	0.2

Source: The Non-ID Evaluation File

As shown in the table the largest number and percent of BCFs in Field Verification were verified (48.6 percent). These forms were assigned a new ID and included in the DMAF. This number is the housing unit coverage gain by this program. The people on these forms would not have been included in the census without the BCF program. Addresses that were classified as delete, duplicate, or no results reported were excluded from the census, 51.4 percent.

Of the 804,939 BCFs returned, we are unable to determine the number of unique housing units this represents. The reason for this is BCFs with an address that did not geocode could represent the same housing units as other BCFs. Also BCF addresses that went to Field Verification and were classified as a duplicate could have been a duplicate of another BCF address.

The total number of BCFs included in census processing is the 97,928 verified in Field Verification and the 408,098 matched to an existing census ID (Table E). This gives a total of 506,026 BCFs that went onto further census processing. The DRF2 contains all returns for housing units. The number of BCFs on the DRF2 is 605,905. The difference between the totals from the two files is 99,879. This may indicate the Non-ID evaluation file was flawed and did not include all BCFs.

Between the creation of the DRF2 and the HCEF\_D', the universe of IDs that were included in the census was determined. Some IDs that returned BCFs were removed from the census count. One reason for this was that a particular ID had been identified as a duplicate of another ID; i.e., the same housing unit. This would affect the number of BCFs included in the census count. Table G contains a breakdown of the BCFs by whether or not the ID for the BCF was in the final count of Census 2000.

**Table G. Frequency and Percent of Be Counted Forms with the ID in Census 2000**

<b>Outcome of Census Processing</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total	605,905	100.0
BCF ID in Census	587,070	96.9
BCF ID not in the Census	18,835	3.1

Source: HCEF\_D' and DRF2

From Table G, it is important to note that 18,835 (3.1 percent) BCFs came from IDs that were excluded from the final census count. The remaining 587,070 (96.9 percent) BCFs came from IDs that were included in census count. Note, this does not mean that any person on the BCF was included in the census count. The next table will discuss this.

The BCFs that were from IDs that were included in the census count could have contained persons who were counted on another type of census form for the same ID. The Census Bureau conducted a program called the Primary Selection Algorithm. This program was designed to identify which persons composed the household at a housing unit, specifically, when there was more than one return. It selected which persons from each return would go into the household. For more information about the format of the variable giving the results from Primary Selection Algorithm see Appendix D. There were a total of 587,070 BCFs from IDs included in Census 2000. Table H summarizes the number of people selected from these BCFs.

**Table H. Frequency and Percent of the Number of Selected Persons and Persons Enumerated on Be Counted Forms with an ID in the Census**

Number of Persons Included on BCF		Total	Number of Persons Selected to be in the Census from BCF						
			0	1	2	3	4	5	6+
Total	#	587,070	347,942	88,244	69,128	29,754	24,655	22,854	4,493
	%	100.0	59.3	15.0	11.8	5.1	4.2	3.9	0.7
0	#	2,184	2,184	-	-	-	-	-	-
	%	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	#	146,280	79,817	66,463	-	-	-	-	-
	%	100.0	54.6	45.4	-	-	-	-	-
2	#	177,271	109,025	5,461	62,785	-	-	-	-
	%	100.0	61.5	3.1	35.4	-	-	-	-
3	#	85,777	52,314	4,741	1,929	26,793	-	-	-
	%	100.0	61.0	5.5	2.3	31.2	-	-	-
4	#	79,946	49,656	4,188	1,630	1,240	23,232	-	-
	%	100.0	62.1	5.2	2.0	1.6	29.1	-	-
5	#	85,501	51,040	6,647	2,400	1,468	1,239	22,707	-
	%	100.0	59.7	7.8	2.8	1.7	1.4	26.6	-
6+	#	10,111	3,906	744	384	253	184	147	4,493
	%	100.0	38.6	7.4	3.8	2.5	1.8	1.5	44.4

Source: DRF2

- indicates a cell that is not possible

Percents are calculated by row

From Table H, 347,942 (59.3 percent) of the BCFs from IDs included in the census did not have a person selected from them. The persons enumerated on these BCFs duplicated a person on another census form or were not selected for some other reason. This means that 59.3 percent of the BCFs with IDs included in Census 2000 did not improve the coverage in the Census. The remaining 239,128 (40.7 percent) BCFs did have persons selected from them and improved coverage in the Census. There were 560,880 unique persons enumerated on these BCFs. Of the 239,128 BCFs, 206,334 (86.3 percent) had every person that was included on the form selected to be in the Census. The remaining 32,794 BCFs (13.7 percent) had at least one person selected, but only a subset of the persons included on the BCF were selected. These numbers are respectively 35.1 percent and 5.6 percent of the 587,070 BCFs. There were 2,814 BCFs that had no persons included on the form. The reason for this was that all the persons on these BCFs were cancelled, invalid, or not data defined.

## **4.2 What were the Characteristics of Households Returning a Be Counted Form?**

The previous section covered the processing of the Be Counted Forms. This section will discuss the characteristics for the households that returned a BCF which include:

- the composition of returns
- the affect BCFs had on the census long form sampling methodology
- the ratio of whole to partial household BCFs
- tenure

When looking at coverage, it is important to consider how the BCFs were returned in conjunction with other forms. The BCFs were processed after all other census operations had finished being conducted. This means that a household could have returned a BCF and then later been enumerated in NRFU or some other operation. As stated in the previous section, 605,905 BCFs were on the DRF2. These BCFs enumerated a total of 595,293 households. The difference in these numbers is due to some households returning multiple BCFs. Table I outlines the number and type of forms returned from each of these households.

**Table I. Return Types for Households with a Be Counted Form Return**

<b>Returns Types for Households with a Be Counted Form Return</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	595,293	100.0
Only a BCF Return	131,636	22.1
BCF with One Return Type	448,464	75.3
Mail Return	55,841	12.5
Telephone Questionnaire Assistance	68	0.0
Internet	49	0.0
Coverage Edit Followup	3,688	0.8
Nonresponse Followup	379,470	84.6
Coverage Improvement Followup	4,432	1.0
Enumerate <sup>1</sup>	4,321	1.0
Group Quarters	588	0.1
Orphan <sup>2</sup>	16	0.0
BCF with Two Other Return Types	15,032	2.5
BCF with Three Other Return Types	159	0.0
BCF with Four Other Return Types	2	0.0

Source: DRF2

<sup>1</sup> This category includes List/Enumerate and Update/Enumerate Forms

<sup>2</sup> This category are enumerator continuation forms unlinked to the original form

The majority of households, 77.9 percent, returning a BCF had some other return from some other enumeration method. Of the households with multiple return types, a large percentage of them had multiple enumerations of some combination of NRFU and/or CIFU, 86.0 percentage points (note preceding number cannot be taken from Table I, additional analysis was used). There were 22.1 percent of households that returned only a BCF.

There was some concern that households that received a long form would see the BCFs and return it as a replacement for their census form. In order to see the effect the Be Counted Campaign had on the long form sampling methodology of the census, the number of households returning only a BCF, 131,636 (see Table I) should be considered. Of these households, 85,354 had an Original Source of Be Counted, meaning the Be Counted Program was the first program to add the address to the DMAF. Addresses added to the DMAF from the BCF program (original source equal to BCF) were not eligible for the long form sampling process because they were added after the last data collection operation (Coverage Improvement Followup). Therefore, to answer the question about the impact the BCF program had on the long form sampling, the analysis is restricted to the 46,282 cases which were eligible to receive the long form. Table J gives the sampling designation of the 46,282 housing units that only returned a BCF.

**Table J. Sampling Designation for Households with Only a Be Counted Form Return**

<b>Sample Designation for IDs with only BCF returns</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	46,282	100.0
Long Form	2,999	6.5
Short Form	43,283	93.5

Source: DRF2 and DMAF

The percent of households that returned only a BCF but were flagged for a long form, is only 6.5 percent as compared to the national sampling rate of 16.7. The percent is even smaller if all the BCFs returned to the Census Bureau are considered. This would mean the Be Counted Campaign had little effect on the long form sampling methodology.

As stated in the previous section, 239,128 BCFs enumerated persons not included on other census forms. There were 236,482 households enumerated by these BCFs. This is the universe for Tables K and L. The BCFs could have been designated as WHH or PHH. The WHH BCFs enumerated the entire household, while PHH BCF supplemented other census returns for the household. Table K is a cross tabulation of households that returned WHH versus PHH BCFs by whether we received only a BCF for the household versus a BCF with another form. The previous table contained all households that returned a BCF, while the following table only contains households where the BCFs contained unique persons. In Table K, if a household returned a WHH BCF, the BCF type was classified as WHH, even if a PHH BCF was returned for the same ID. If a household returned a PHH BCF, and not WHH BCF, the BCF type was classified as a PHH. If a household returned a BCF without designating it as being either WHH or PHH, it is classified as an Undetermined Household (Undet. HH). It is important to note that during processing, a BCF without a response to the whole versus partial question were

considered to be a PHH BCF.

**Table K. Cross Tabulation of Be Counted Form Type by the Forms Returned for Housing Units Returning a Be Counted Form that Contained a Unique Person**

	<b>Be Counted Form Type</b>			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>WHH</b>	<b>PHH</b>	<b>Undet. HH</b>
Total HUs	236,482 (100.0%)	194,937 (82.4%)	22,557 (9.5%)	18,988 (8.0%)
HUs with Only BCF Returns	116,019 (100.0%)	102,373 (88.2%)	6,660 (5.7%)	6,986 (6.0%)
HUs with Mixed Returns	120,463 (100.0%)	92,564 (76.8%)	15,897 (13.2%)	12,002 (10.0%)

Source: DRF2

As stated above, WHH BCFs were expected to enumerate the entire household, while PHH BCFs would supplement other census returns for a household. Table K shows that for those households returning only BCFs, 88.2 percent of them returned a WHH BCF. This also indicates that we may only have partial coverage for the remaining 11.7 percent of households. For those households that returned a BCF and another census form, 76.8 percent of them returned a whole household BCF. This indicates respondent burden as a result of being enumerated multiple times. Another problem is the high number of forms, 18,988, that did not have a designation for the type of BCF. There is only 1.5 percentage point difference between the percent of forms that were PHH compared to those with no designation.

As stated previously, there were 236,482 households that returned a BCF and the form contained persons who were only enumerated from the BCF return. Table L gives frequency and percent of tenure of these households. Tenure was determined in the following manner:

- Tenure was determined to be Owner if
  - 1) The BCFs for a household were all marked as Owner or
  - 2) Some BCFs for a household were marked Owner and the remaining BCFs had this question blank
- Tenure was determined to be Renter if
  - 1) The BCFs for a household were all marked as Renter or
  - 2) Some BCFs for a household were marked Renter and the remaining BCFs had this question blank
- Tenure was determined to be Missing if all BCFs for the household had this question blank
- Tenure was determined to be Invalid if some BCFs for the household were marked as Owner and some marked as Renter

**Table L. Frequency and Percent of Tenure of Households Enumerated on a Be Counted Form in Census**

<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>		<b>All Census Returns</b>	
	#	%	#	%
Total	236,482	-	106,741,426	-
Owner	122,702	55.8	70,735,522	66.3
Renter	97,287	44.2	36,005,904	33.7
Missing or Invalid	16,493	-	-	-

Source: DRF2

Percents are calculated excluding Missing or Invalid values

Looking at the percent of renters from BCFs and comparing to the overall census percent it becomes clear that the BCFs enumerated a higher percent. This is important because this group is traditionally undercounted in the census.

#### **4.3 What were the Demographic Characteristics of Persons Counted by the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000?**

As stated in the Section 4.1, there were 560,880 unique persons enumerated on BCFs. This section will present the demographic characteristic for these persons. Tables M through P give BCF person demographic characteristics; age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, respectively. These tables contain comparisons to the overall census population by the same characteristics.

**Table M. Frequency and Percent of Age Groups of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>		<b>All Census Returns</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	560,880	-	285,230,516	-
0 to 4 years	37,961	7.1	19,471,204	6.8
5 to 9 years	42,497	7.9	20,854,667	7.3
10 to 14 years	37,791	7.1	20,833,872	7.3
15 to 24 years	77,095	14.4	39,798,518	13.9
25 to 34 years	80,819	15.1	40,426,056	14.2
35 to 44 years	76,466	14.3	45,664,190	16.0
45 to 54 years	60,279	11.3	38,140,998	13.4
55 to 64 years	46,615	8.7	24,624,131	8.6
65 to 74 years	42,646	8.0	18,631,937	6.5
75 to 84 years	25,348	4.7	12,497,660	4.4
85 years and over	7,113	1.3	4,287,293	1.5
Missing or Invalid	26,250	-	-	-

Source: DRF2

Percents are calculated excluding Missing or Invalid values

Looking at the different age groups and the percent observed in each group, the “0 to 4 years”, “5 to 9 years”, “15 to 24 years” and “25 to 34 years” groups were higher for the BCFs than the overall census. This is important because younger persons have been traditionally undercounted in the census.

**Table N. Frequency and Percent of Sex of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census**

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>		<b>All Census Returns</b>	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total</b>	560,880	-	285,230,516	-
Male	270,681	49.0	139,887,140	49.0
Female	281,510	51.0	145,343,376	51.0
Missing	8,689	-	-	-

Source: DRF2

Percents are calculated excluding Missing values

Looking at the sex of persons enumerated on BCFs and comparing to the overall census numbers, it does not appear that there is any real difference in the percent for the two sexes between the BCFs and the census.

**Table O. Frequency and Percent of Race of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>		<b>All Census Returns</b>	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total</b>	560,880	-	285,230,516	-
White	320,704	63.3	214,525,488	75.2
Black, African American	95,698	18.9	34,961,123	12.3
American Indian, Alaskan Native	6,120	1.2	2,489,292	0.9
Asian	31,892	6.3	10,250,958	3.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1,333	0.3	399,928	0.1
Some Other Race	38,918	7.7	15,619,084	5.5
Two or More	12,324	2.4	6,984,643	2.4
Missing	53,891	-	-	-

Source: DRF2

Percents are calculated excluding Missing values

Looking at race of persons enumerated on BCFs and comparing to the overall census numbers, it appears that a higher percentage was observed in every group on the BCFs, except White. This is important because these groups have been traditionally undercounted in the census.

**Table P. Frequency and Percent of Hispanic Origin of Be Counted Form Persons in the Census**

<b>Hispanic Origin</b>	<b>Be Counted Forms</b>		<b>All Census Returns</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	560,880	-	285,230,516	-
Non-Spanish/Hispanic	386,457	73.8	246,161,952	86.3
Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	84,517	16.1	20,652,257	7.2
Puerto Rican	14,007	2.7	7,029,570	2.5
Cuban	3,909	0.7	1,261,658	0.4
Other Spanish/Hispanic	34,665	6.6	10,125,079	3.5
Missing	37,325	-	-	-

Source: DRF2

Percents are calculated excluding Missing values

Looking at Hispanic origin of persons enumerated on BCFs and comparing to the census numbers, it appears that a higher percentage was observed in every Spanish/Hispanic group on the BCFs. This is important because these groups have been traditionally undercounted in the census.

#### **4.4 What is the Profile of the Addresses Added during the Be Counted Campaign?**

In a previous session, the processing of the BCFs was discussed. There were 804,939 BCFs returned to the Census Bureau. Also mentioned, the number of households enumerated by these forms is impossible to determine. This section will discuss what effect these BCFs had on the MAF. For the section the data source used was the March 2001 MAF Extract. Note that no matching was done to any other files. Only IDs that had an original source of Be Counted or Telephone Questionnaire Assistance are included. The characteristics being profiled are address type, structure type, and TEA.

Table Q shows Be Counted addresses by address type. For a discussion on how address type is defined, see the Methodology section. The 88.4 percent of the addresses added during Be Counted program were complete city-style type addresses. There were 3.1 percent and 4.9 percent of the addresses that fell into the complete rural route address category and complete post office box address category, respectively. The 2.7 percent of all address types had incomplete address information. There were 1.3 percent of Be Counted addresses with no address information. In all of the categories, the majority of addresses did not contain a large number of location descriptions.

**Table Q. Be Counted Addresses by Address Type**

<b>Address Type</b>	<b># of Addresses</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
TOTAL	328,732	100.0
with location description	1,083	0.3
without location description	327,649	99.7
Complete City-Style Address	290,445	88.4
with location description	123	0.0
without location description	290,322	88.3
Complete Rural Route Address	10,083	3.1
with location description	1	0.0
without location description	10,082	3.1
Complete Post Office Box Address	14,958	4.6
with location description	1	0.0
without location description	14,957	4.6
Incomplete Address (any of the 3)	8,851	2.7
with location description	5	0.0
without location description	8,846	2.7
No Address Information	4,395	1.3
with location description	953	0.3
without location description	3,442	1.0

Source: March 2001 MAF extracts

Table R shows Be Counted addresses by type of structure (single versus multi-unit). An address can either be classified as a single unit structure or it can be part of a multi-unit structure, such as an apartment. About 63.5 percent of the Be Counted addresses are single unit structures. This represents 208,823 of all added Be Counted addresses. The remaining 119,900 addresses (36.5 percent) are part of a multi-unit structure. Of these 119,900 addresses, almost 19.5 percentage points were included in structures that with two to four units.

**Table R. Be Counted Addresses by Type of Structure**

<b>Type of Structure</b>	<b># of Addresses</b>	<b>% of Addresses</b>
TOTAL	328,732	100.0
Single	208,832	63.5
Multi-Unit	119,900	36.5
2 to 4 units	64,198	19.5
5 to 9 units	21,315	6.5
10 to 19 units	9,031	2.7
20 to 49 units	9,413	2.9
50+ units	15,943	4.9

Source: March 2001 MAF extracts

Table S shows Be Counted addresses by TEA. An address can be classified into any of the following enumeration types: Mailout/Mailback, Update/Leave, List/Enumerate, Remote Alaska, Update/Enumerate, Urban Update/Leave, or no classification. The unclassified addresses are those addresses that did not geocode and would not have been included in DMAF. There were 11.1 percent of the Be Counted address that fail into this category. About 59.5 percent of the 328,732 Be Counted addresses are from Mailout/Mailback areas. This represents 195,481 of all added Be Counted addresses. There were also 92,194, 28.0 percent, of the Be Counted addresses that were returned from Update/Leave areas. The BCFs were only available in these two enumeration areas. The remaining 4,611 addresses (1.4 percent) were returned from a TEA where BCFs were not available.

**Table S. Be Counted Addresses by Type of Enumeration Area**

<b>Type of Enumeration Area</b>	<b># of Addresses</b>	<b>% of Addresses</b>
TOTAL	328,732	100.0
Mailout/Mailback	195,481	59.5
Update/Leave	92,194	28.0
List/Enumerate	1,224	0.4
Remote Alaska	32	0.0
Update/Enumerate	2,745	0.8
Urban Update/Leave	610	0.2
No TEA	36,446	11.1

Source: March 2001 MAF extracts

#### **4.5 What were the Cost and Time Line of the Be Counted Campaign for Census 2000?**

The printing branch in DSCMO tracked cost incurred when printing specific forms. The Field cost for specific programs during the census are stored in the Census Bureau Core Financial System. Also the costs for Field Verification were reported in the assessment report for the Field Verification operation (Census, 2001e). The total cost was \$8,008,451 incurred to fund this program. This cost estimate does not include cost incurred by the following items: processing cost, headquarters cost, field infrastructure cost, cost of forms design and postage. Table T give a break down of the \$8,008,451 cost estimate.

**Table T. Cost and Expenditure Category**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Percent</b>
TOTAL	\$8,008,451	100.0
Printing of BCF forms	\$2,869,366	35.8
English and Spanish forms	\$2,154,451	75.1
Other language forms	\$275,838	9.6
English and Spanish forms for PR	\$127,181	4.4
Containers and Stickers	\$311,896	10.9
Field Implementation	\$1,479,499	18.5
Field Verification <sup>1</sup>	\$3,659,586	45.7

Source: Printing Branch Contract Report, the Census Bureau Core Financial System and the Field Verification Assessment Report

<sup>1</sup>The estimated cost is not the entire cost of Field Verification. The costs are only those associated with the BCFs.

If the total cost is divided by the number of BCFs included in the census count, 239,128 BCFs, this would give us a cost of \$33.49 per BCF. If this cost is divided by the number of persons unique to BCFs included in the census count, 560,880 persons, this would give us a cost of \$14.28 per person.

The schedule in which the Be Counted Campaign took place is as follows:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
Write and Print Manuals & Training Guides	5/11/99	12/10/99
Train Clerks	3/07/00	3/10/00
Conduct Be Counted Advance Visits	3/08/00	3/27/00
Update Site List	3/09/00	3/28/00
Assemble and Deliver Kits	3/24/00	3/30/00
Conduct Be Counted Drop Off and Pickup	3/31/00	4/14/00

Source: Master Activity Schedule

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

There were four goals for the Be Counted Campaign of Census 2000:

- to count persons who did not receive a census Questionnaire,
- to count persons who believed they were not included on any other census form,
- to encourage participation of persons who are traditionally undercounted in the census and

- to provide a means for persons with no usual residence to be counted.

### **Was the Be Counted Campaign a success by meeting the four proposed goals?**

Respondents returned 804,939 BCFs to the Census Bureau, 195,061 below the estimated one million forms. Of the approximately 605,905 BCFs that were included in census processing, 239,128 BCFs added person coverage to the census.

There were 236,482 households that returned a BCF and the form contained persons who were only enumerated from the BCF return. Of these households, 116,019 were enumerated only by BCFs and the remaining 120,463 were enumerated by BCFs as well as other census forms.

There were 560,880 persons added to the census through the BCFs. There were higher percentages of groups traditionally undercounted than was observed in the census. These groups include renters, children and minority groups. This means that BCFs increased coverage in groups that have been hard to count.

There were also approximately 15,410 BCFs that were returned to the Census Bureau that were determined to be persons with no usual residence. This is also important because this group is extremely hard to count.

### **What were the shortcomings of the Be Counted Campaign?**

The Census Bureau printed 16,326,400 Be Counted Forms. The number of Be Counted Forms shipped to the Local Census Offices was 13,415,711 of which 1,748,199 were picked up by respondents from the distribution sites. We were unable to determine how many of the forms shipped to the LCOs were distributed to the distribution sites. There were 804,939 Be Counted Forms returned to the Census Bureau. This means 89.3 percent of the forms printed were never picked up and 4.9 percent were returned.

The Census Bureau flagged census tracts needing a Be Counted Distribution Site or QAC. This was done because the tract was known to have high concentrations of populations that were hard to enumerate or had special language needs. Using the PDB, there were 8,783 tracts flagged for a site, and 57.8 percent of them had a site located in it.

Overall the Be Counted Campaign was a success. It added 560,880 persons to the census through this program. While this number is small, these are people that would have been missed without this program.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Since all four goals were largely met and since 560,880 persons were added to the census from Be Counted Forms, the Census Bureau staff should consider the following points if implementing an operation like the Be Counted Campaign in 2010.

There were discrepancies in the counts that came from the Non-ID Evaluation File and the DRF2. Further analysis is recommended to explore the reasons for these discrepancies in order to prevent them in the future. This change would aid in the future evaluation of this operation.

There was a high number of sites classified as “Other”. A review of write-in responses indicates that schools and municipal buildings were locations that were used frequently. Therefore, these should be added as separate categories.

The evaluation planned to look at the BCFs that were matched/geocoded either through the automated system or by clerical staff. These data were available but inconsistent with the data used for this report. We were unable to reconcile these differences; thus, we were unable to report the matched/geocoded cases by whether they were automated or clerically processed. Further analysis should be done to investigate the number of BCFs matched/geocoded by the two different methods. If feasible the automated matching should be done in real time. If a match is made to an ID in real time, then it could be excluded from Nonresponse Followup. The forms that go to clerical matching/geocoding would need a separate processing strategy. If this change is feasible and is made, it would make this operation a more effective mode of enumeration and would decrease the workload of Nonresponse Followup.

When the Census Bureau was unable to match the respondent provided address to another address on the Decennial Master Address File the BCFs then went to Field Verification. Some of these cases were coded as a duplicate, in which case the data on the Be Counted Form were removed from further processing. The Be Counted Form data were not linked to the census ID return information. There were 33,808 (16.8 percent) BCFs where this occurred. In the future Field Verification should be designed to permit the enumerator to record the census ID of the Be Counted Form duplicates. The data processing system should collect the information, so the Be Counted Form data can be linked to the corresponding census ID. Making this change would improve the census address list.

As part of the non-English mail questionnaire processing, the “Just-In-Case” box was used to track the language of the non-English form and whether translation or transcription was needed. This process was not done for the BCFs, therefore no language data are available for those BCFs included in the Census. In the future, a process should be implemented so the language of the Be Counted Form is retained. This would aid planning this program in future censuses.

## References

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, *1980 Census of Population and Housing Evaluation and Research Reports: Programs to Improve Coverage in the 1980 Census*.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, *1990 Census of Population and Housing Evaluation and Research Reports: Programs to Improve Coverage in the 1990 Census*.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996a, *Decennial Statistical Studies Division 1995 Census Test Memorandum Series #F-48*, Subject: Processing and Operational Results from the 1995 Census Test Be Counted Campaign, dated April 24, 1996.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996b, *Decennial Statistical Studies Division 1995 Census Test Memorandum Series #L-5*, Subject: 1995 Census Test Research for the respondent-Friendly Implementation Evaluation of the Effects of the Replacement Questionnaire Mailing, dated March 8, 1996.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996c, *Decennial Statistical Studies Division 1995 Census Test Memorandum Series #F-25*, Subject: 1995 Census Test Results of Making Census Questionnaires Widely Available: Profile of Persons and Housing Units Enumerated via the Be Counted Campaign, dated February 13, 1996.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999a, *Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal Evaluation Summary*.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999b, *Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal Evaluation Memorandum D2*, Subject: Evaluation of the Be Counted Program, dated May 1999.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001a, *PRED TXE/2001 Memorandum Series:MAF-EXT-S-01*, Subject: Determining Original Source for the November 2000 Master Address File for Evaluation Purposes, dated March 5, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001b, *Census 2000 Informational Memorandum No. 98*, Subject: Program Master Plan: Census 2000 Matching/Geocoding Non-Master Address File (MAF) Identification (ID) Questionnaires Program, dated April 12, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001c, *Decennial Statistical Studies Division Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series #O-16*, Subject: Study Plan for the Operational Analysis of the Service-Based Enumeration (E.6), dated May 14, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001d, *Decennial Statistical Studies Division Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series #O-16*, Subject: Study Plan for Group Quarters Enumeration (E.5), dated July 12, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001e, *Completed 2000 Evaluation Report: Assessment of Field Verification (H.2)*, dated September 4, 2001

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001f, *PRED TXE/2010 Memorandum Series: MAF-EXT-D-01*, Subject: Determining Address Classification for Master Address File (MAF) for Evaluation Purposes, dated September 26, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Draft, *Census 2000 Information Memorandum*, Subject: Program

Master Plan: Questionnaire Assistance Centers and Be Counted Program, Draft.