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Executive Summary

The primary objective of the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation was to enumerate people who lived or stayed in a group quarters. The purpose of the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration Operation Assessment is to address major aspects of the Group Quarters Enumeration operation that include data on defined group quarters types, added group quarters, the address status of the group quarters, group quarters population counts, and the demographic characteristic distribution of persons enumerated. The assessment will discuss costs, staffing, productivity, quality assurance, data capture, lessons learned, and best practices.

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation included Service-Based Enumeration, Military Enumeration, and Shipboard Enumeration. This assessment report is focused on the overall results for these operations, including results from the enumeration of military installations. Detailed results and analysis for the 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration and Shipboard Enumeration have been documented in separate assessment reports.

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation supported the Census Bureau’s efforts to enhance the coverage and classification of group quarters by implementing improvements that were tested during the decade. These improvements included applying revised definitions to improve the classification of group quarters, administering a redesigned Individual Census Report and Military Census Report, electronic linking of the Individual Census Reports and Military Census Reports to their respective group quarters, and maintaining the Unit Status Code for each group quarters on the Census Bureau’s Master Address File for future use.

The universe of addresses for the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation included addresses that were validated as group quarters during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation operation, Group Quarters Advance Visit, and Group Quarters Enumeration operations. In addition, addresses from Phase I and II of the 2010 Census Address List Update Program were also added to the Group Quarters Enumeration universe and supported the 2010 Census enumeration frame development for Group Quarters Enumeration.

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation consisted of three phases: Pre-Enumeration, Enumeration, and Post-Enumeration. The Pre-Enumeration phase included obtaining a list of residents and/or staff from each group quarters as of Census Day, April 1, 2010. The Enumeration phase included distributing, collecting, and reviewing Individual Census Reports and Military Census Reports. The Post-Enumeration phase included obtaining data for incomplete and/or missing Individual Census Reports and Military Census Reports, and returning the completed Individual Census Reports or Military Census Reports along with their associated Enumeration Record to the Local Census Office.

The 2010 Census Military Enumeration was conducted using a new methodology developed after Census 2000. This new methodology included enumerating military personnel by address rather than military unit (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). This assessment will document the procedures, challenges, security concerns, and other issues as well as resolutions in enumerating.

1 See Russell, et. al 2012
2 See De Vos, et. al 2012
group quarters on military installations. This assessment will also provide qualitative data on the enumeration of stateside military personnel assigned to group quarters.

**Results**

The following responses to the questions below are key findings from the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation:

**What was the distribution of group quarters by size of population and group quarters type category?**

There were 8,025,278 people tabulated at 166,827 group quarters in the 2010 Census. The three group quarters types with the most people were:

- College/university student housing (2,523,971 people at 27,926 group quarters),
- Correctional facilities for adults (2,276,581 people at 12,308 group quarters), and
- Nursing and skilled nursing facilities (1,508,081 people at 21,758 group quarters).

**How many residents filled out their forms themselves and how many forms were filled out by other means?**

There were 7,591,135 Individual Census Reports that indicated how the questionnaire was filled out. This response option was not available for Military Census Reports and Shipboard Census Reports.

- Approximately 64 percent of the questionnaires were filled out using administrative records.
  - The largest number of questionnaires completed using administrative records were from correctional facilities for adults (1,803,812), nursing and skilled nursing facilities (1,312,772), and college/university housing (869,700).
  - The next largest number of questionnaires completed using administrative records came from group homes intended for adults (237,859), shelters and service-based locations (178,187), and juvenile facilities (118,368).
- Approximately 31 percent of the questionnaires were filled out by the respondent or answered by conducting an interview with the respondent.
- Approximately five percent of the questionnaires had a blank or invalid response.
How did the actual group quarters population count compare with the maximum and expected population counts reported from the 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation questionnaires and the interview records used during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Advance Visit operation?

The maximum population count was collected during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation operation; however, if the maximum population count changed after the Group Quarters Validation operation then the update was made during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Advanced Visit operation. The maximum population count from these two operations was recorded on the Group Quarters Advance Visit file.

Of the 166,827 group quarters enumerated in the 2010 Census:

Comparison of Actual Population Count and Maximum Population Count
- There was no difference between the actual population count and the maximum population count for approximately 22 percent of the group quarters enumerated.
- For approximately 43 percent (72,301) of the group quarters, the difference between the actual population count from the Census Edited File and the maximum population count recorded on the Group Quarters Advance Visit file was between one and ten.
- For approximately 11 percent of the group quarters enumerated no comparison could be made while the difference between the actual population count and the maximum population count was more than ten for about 24 percent (39,636) of the group quarters enumerated.

Comparison of Maximum Population Count and Expected Population Count
- There was no difference between the maximum population count and the expected population count for approximately 49 percent (81,375) of the group quarters enumerated.
- For approximately 24 percent (39,447) of the group quarters enumerated the difference between the maximum population and expected population counts recorded on the Group Quarters Advance Visit file was between one and ten.
- For approximately 15 percent (25,561) of the group quarters enumerated no comparison could be made when the difference, between the maximum population and the expected population counts, was more than ten for about 12 percent (20,444) of the group quarters enumerated.

The above findings for the comparison of the maximum and expected population counts indicate that the maximum population count obtained during Group Quarters Validation and Group Quarters Advance Visit was a good predictor of the expected population count for group quarters on Census Day.
How many people were added to group quarters from Be Counted Forms?

There were 26,975 persons added to 7,737 group quarters from Be Counted Forms.

- The majority, 80 percent (21,681) of these persons were added to shelters and other service-based group quarters. For more information about the geographic allocation of Be Counted persons to group quarters see Russell et al., 2012.
- About three percent of these persons were added to group homes intended for adults.

How many questionnaires reported a Usual Home Elsewhere (by group quarter type)?

There were 150,562 eligible questionnaires that reported having a Usual Home Elsewhere.

Persons from military ships (57,209 or 38 percent) and service-based locations (70,594 or 47 percent) accounted for the largest number of questionnaires that reported having a usual home elsewhere, followed by residential treatment centers for adults with over seven percent, and Workers’ group living quarters and job corps centers with approximately six percent.

How many group quarters were added during the Group Quarters Advance Visit and Group Quarters Enumeration operations (by type)?

Of the 18,818 group quarters added during Group Quarters Advance Visit and Group Quarters Enumeration:

- Shelters and service-based locations accounted for nearly 40 percent (7,332).
- College/university student housing (2,864) and group homes intended for adults (2,725) each accounted for about 15 percent.
- With the exception of nursing homes, skilled nursing facilities, and correctional facilities for adults, the other group quarters type categories accounted for less than five percent.

What was the status of the group quarters at the time of enumeration (i.e., how many group quarters had residents, how many group quarters were vacant, how many group quarters were duplicated, nonresidential, or did not exist)?

Of the 242,693 group quarters where a status could be determined at the time of enumeration:

- The majority, over 82 percent (199,310) of group quarters were occupied at the time of enumeration.
- Approximately 18 percent (43,381) of group quarters were vacant.
- Nine group quarters did not exist.
- Four group quarters were found to be duplicates.
One reason for the low number of group quarters that did not exist or were found to be duplicates during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration is attributed to the implementation and output of the 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation operation.

**What was the demographic/characteristic distribution of persons enumerated during the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration (considering age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin of each person)?**

- The group with the most people enumerated were 15 to 19 years of age (1,560,576 or 19 percent), follow by 20 to 24 years of age (1,615,904 or 20 percent), and 65 years and over (1,426,586 or 17 percent). Age information was missing for approximately seven percent of persons enumerated.
- Most of the persons enumerated (5,298,683 or 66 percent) indicated that they were not of Hispanic or Latino origin. Hispanic origin information was missing for about 25 percent of persons enumerated.
- Most of the people enumerated were either White (4,345,164 or 54 percent) or Black/African American (1,597,655 or 20 percent).
- Between the two sexes, there were more males (4,738,277 or 59 percent) enumerated than females (3,046,113 or 38 percent).

**How many Group Quarters Enumeration cases were selected for random reinterview?**

There were a total of 9,219 reinterview cases. Of these, 8,927 cases were selected for random reinterview and had a reinterview outcome code of either “pass,” “soft fail,” “hard fail,” “unable to contact,” or “no final outcome.” Of the 8,927 cases, 90 percent (8,294) had a reinterview outcome code of “pass.”

**Military Enumeration Results**

**Was collecting the building number on the enumeration record effective for counting people at the correct structure?**

Collecting the building number on the enumeration record facilitated counting people at the correct structure. Having the building number on the enumeration record helped in resolving issues with Military Census Reports that were missing a group quarters identification number.

**Did census staff experience any issues with coordinating the enumeration with the military installation point of contact?**

The main issues that census staff had with coordinating the enumeration with the military installation points of contact were, gaining an accurate list of military installation points of contact, turnover of military installation points of contacts, and contacting the correct military installation point of contact.
What documents did the military representatives find most useful in preparing the installation point of contacts for the 2010 Census?

The military representatives reported that they found the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” to be useful and should be used in future censuses.

What issues did the military installation points of contact have in contacting the Census Bureau points of contact?

Military installation points of contact had trouble contacting Census Bureau points of contact at times due to turnover in the Census Early Local Census Offices. This issue was resolved after the 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation operation. A census point of contact list was developed and provided along with each individuals’ and Local Census Office number.

What procedure requests were made by the military and how were these requests implemented?

The special procedures that the military representatives asked for pertaining to the listing/enumeration of military installations were documented in the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” document. These instructions were also described in the crew leader, enumerator, and lister manuals provided by Field Division for each of the 2010 Census operations with the exception of Update/Enumerate, which was not conducted on military installations.

- Census points of contact were instructed to contact the military installation point of contact with a 60-day and 30-day advance phone call prior to each operation.
- Census employees were required to provide vehicle registration, driver’s license, proof of insurance and photo identification before a vehicle could be taken on a military installation.
- The Census Bureau agreed to wear a florescent orange vest, which had ‘Census Bureau’ written on both the front and back of the vest to help with identification.

What were the main security concerns and how were these issues resolved?

During the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation several military installations felt that the procedure of collecting map spots on military installations could pose a national security risk. These installations halted all address canvassing on their installations and notified their higher ranking officials. The higher ranking officials then contacted the Defense Manpower Data Center so that a meeting could be held to discuss the procedure of collecting map spots and why the map spots were needed. A meeting was held, which included representatives from the Defense Manpower Data Center and the Census Bureau along with high ranking officials in the United States Army. After the meeting, the United States Army requested that the collection of map spots on United States Army installations be discontinued and that all map spots collected be removed from census records.
How effective was the Census Joint Service Working Group in communicating the Census Bureau needs to the installation points of contact?

The Census Joint Service Working Group was effective in communicating the Census Bureau needs to the installation points of contact. However, they had to overcome several major obstacles. Each military service had their own procedures for distributing materials to the installations, for some military services this was a fairly simple task, while for other services this was a difficult task due to the structure of their communication network to the installations. The greatest challenge for distributing the documents was the “trickle-down effect.” In some cases it did not matter how diligent the military representative was when they attempted to distribute the document or how efficient their communication network to the installation was, the biggest factor of distributing the documents was whether or not the documents were being handed down the line to the correct person on the installation.

Did the procedures for enumerating military personnel reach the highest level ranking official of the military? If not, at what level should the procedures be sent to and how much detail should be provided to the higher ranking officials?

The military representatives in the Census Joint Service Working Group were very helpful in gaining insights into the best ways to list/enumerate military installations. They also did an excellent job in resolving issues for gaining access to installations. However, at times operations on military installations were delayed due to a high ranking official’s concerns about enumeration procedures taking place on the installation. A possible way to avoid these types of issues would be to provide the high ranking officials a copy of a document similar to the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” and then having at least one meeting with the high ranking military officials to review the document prior to 2019.

Were there issues regarding residency rules for the stateside military? If yes, then what were the primary issues?

The three most common residency rule issues that occurred during the 2010 Census were: 1) should a spouse be counted at their residence when they were deployed overseas, 2) where should an individual be counted if they were training at an installation other than their permanently assigned installation, and 3) where should individuals deployed overseas be counted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration operation succeeded in meeting its objective of obtaining the most accurate count possible of people who lived or stayed in group quarters. Although the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration was effective in meeting its objective, there is room for improvement. Listed below are recommendations intended to help the Census Bureau reach its goal of making Group Quarters Enumeration more cost effective while simultaneously sustaining and improving high quality data. A more detailed description of the recommendations can be found in section 8.2 of report.
• Research and test automated methods to collect group quarters data in the field prior to the 2020 Census, which should include:

  • Researching and testing the use of the Internet as a mode of data collection for group quarters enumeration.
  
  • Researching and testing the use of a mobile device for group quarters enumeration field personnel to capture and enter group quarter questionnaire data, type codes, contacts, and geocodes.
  
  • Testing and evaluating the use of administrative records to collect data for persons residing in group quarters.

• During the 2020 Census planning cycle, the Census Bureau should consider testing and tailoring the use of administrative records for certain group quarter types.

• Explore and test procedures for obtaining administrative records data electronically.

• Develop and test data quality control procedures for the enumeration of group quarters through administrative records.

• Future planning for the enumeration of group quarters for the 2020 Census needs to include outreach to professional organizations such as education, health care, and tribal organizations.

• Access letters should be prepared in advance using the list of external stakeholders developed for the 2010 Census for example, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, prisons, Salvation Army, and the American Hospital Association.

• Research and test the enumeration of military personnel using one national military personnel file provided by the Defense Management Data Center.

• Continue the use of 60 and 30-day advance phone calls to the military installation points of contact prior to the start of decennial operations.

• A separate Special Sworn Status form should be designed for military escorts.

• In the future, Group Quarters Advance Visit instructions should instruct field staff to ask the military installation point of contact if there are any other military branches on the military installation.

• Military representatives suggested obtaining a Department of Defense Instruction that would include all census operations and could be used for future censuses.
1. Introduction

1.1 Scope

The intent of this assessment report is to describe how the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration (GQE) operation was implemented, document the results to be used for historical and informational purposes, and provide best practices and recommendations that can be used during the next planning cycle to support the 2020 Census GQE operation. Although the 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration (SBE) and 2010 Census Shipboard Enumeration (SHB) operations were components of GQE, analysis of these operations are documented in separate assessment reports.

In addition, the assessment report will do the following:

- Provide data on defined group quarter (GQ) types;
- Document the number of added GQs;
- Document the address status of the GQ at the time of enumeration;
- Document reinterview results;
- Document the distribution of GQs enumerated by type;
- Discuss the lessons learned for aspects of the operation;
- Document issues with military and census points of contact (POCs);
- Document military procedural request;
- Document military security concerns and resolutions; and
- Describe the components of enumerating the population living in group situations such as college/university dormitories, prisons, juvenile facilities, nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities.

1.2 Intended Audience

The information in this assessment is pertinent for senior management, interdivisional stakeholders, and external stakeholders responsible for planning, preparing, and implementing census operations for the population living in group quarters. The assessment can be used as a tool to refine and improve GQE and Military Enumeration operations for future censuses.

2. Background

2.1 Census 2000

In preparation for Census 2000, the Census Bureau conducted extensive research to identify prospective Special Places (SP). A SP in the census was an establishment that was administratively responsible for one or more GQs. In some cases, the SP and its associated GQs were one in the same.
The Special Place Facility Questionnaire (FQ) operation was administered to gather information about known SP facilities and their associated GQs and Housing Units (HUs). The information was collected using the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI). If the interviewer experienced problems collecting the required information, a personal visit (PV) was made to the facility to conduct an interview to obtain the information. For each GQ, the FQ collected information on: where each GQ was located, the type code of the GQ, the hours of operation, approximately how many people would be living there on Census Day, and any other pertinent information required to conduct the enumeration. The Special Place/Group Quarters (SP/GQ) inventory of GQ addresses was maintained on a SP/GQ control file. The SP/GQ inventory development resulted in the creation of the address list of GQs to be enumerated for the Census 2000 GQE operation. However, developing and maintaining a SP/GQ inventory completely separate from the Master Address File (MAF) resulted in duplication of addresses on both lists, i.e., once as a HU and once as a GQ (Abramson, 2004).

Although the GQ entity was managed at the SP level in Census 2000, a better understanding of the GQ universe was still needed. Different kinds of GQs were given different type codes by which data were grouped for publication. In Census 2000, there were nearly sixty GQ type codes in nine major SP categories to define GQs: correctional institutions, juvenile institutions, nursing homes, hospitals, colleges and universities, military barracks, service-based facilities, group homes, and other GQs not fitting into the other eight categories. Each category contained between one and eleven distinct GQ type codes (Jonas, 2003).

Special procedures and questionnaires were developed and used to conduct enumeration at GQs. The Individual Census Report (ICR) and the Individual Census Questionnaire (ICQ) were the data collection instruments used to obtain census data from respondents at GQs. The ICR was used to enumerate the majority of the GQ population. The ICQ, a new form for Census 2000, was used strictly at soup kitchens and regularly scheduled mobile food vans (Abramson, 2004).

Census 2000 was the first attempt to link the SP with the associated GQ and link the respondent data via the ICQs/ICRs to the appropriate GQ. Linking the ICQs/ICRs to the correct GQ was a manual process. This process was problematic because the enumerators were instructed to transcribe the 14-digit GQ identification number (GQ ID) in the processing box on the back of each ICR/ICQ. This ID number was the critical step that associated the ICQ/ ICR to its associated GQ. In many cases the GQ ID numbers were transposed or not entered at all therefore, they could not be matched to a legitimate GQ ID. If the ICR/ICQ did not have the GQ ID on it, the questionnaire was not data captured (Schoch, 2003). Over 141,000 ICQs/ICRs were received at the data capture center with either a missing GQ ID or had an insufficient GQ ID number that could not be used. This accounted for about 1.7 percent of the total GQ ICQs/ICRs. A large clean-up operation was implemented at the data capture center to attempt to assign the correct GQ IDs to these forms (Benetti, 2006).

The Operation Control System 2000 (OCS) was a decennial field automated computer system used to manage and control the enumeration in the field. There were no requirements for the OCS 2000 to maintain the history and outcome of the GQ. Therefore, there were no final unit status outcome codes assigned to the GQs to define whether the GQ was occupied, refused, deleted, or non-residential. In addition, there was no requirement for the information to be maintained on the MAF to be used for future censuses and other surveys.
2.2 2006 Census Test Group Quarters Enumeration

During the 2006 Census Test, electronic linking of the ICRs to their respective GQs was tested. This test was conducted to determine whether or not it would improve the number of ICRs to be linked to their respective GQs over the manual linking process conducted during Census 2000. To accomplish the electronic association, each ICR was pre-printed with a unique scannable bar code and each GQ Enumeration Record was printed in the Local Census Office (LCO) with a bar code containing the GQ ID. The pre-printed bar code on each ICR was scanned and electronically associated with its GQ ID during check-in of completed questionnaires via the OCS by the staff in the LCOs. The electronic association of each ICR also produced a count of the number of questionnaires checked-in to the LCO for that GQ. Then, staff scanned the barcode of the ICR during check-out to the National Processing Center (NPC) and again during check-in at data capture.

In addition, a new procedure was implemented which required the LCO staff to enter the Unit Status Code (USC) for the address of each GQ into the OCS. The USC was used to indicate the outcome of each GQ. For example: if the address of the GQ was no longer used as a residence, the outcome was non-residential and the USC entered into OCS was “N”. The USC was sent to the Geography Division (GEO) in an integrated MAF update file of GQs and HUs and was converted to a MAF USC, legal value description code. USCs for GQs, including vacant GQs were required to be maintained on the MAF to be used for future censuses and other surveys (Benetti, 2006).

Data from the 2006 Census Test revealed with certainty that the electronic linking of the ICRs to the GQs was a success. It addressed both the linking problem and the inability to track each individual questionnaire encountered in Census 2000. The number of ICRs checked out of the LCOs for each GQ matched the number of ICRs data captured for that GQ. No ICRs were lost or not associated with a GQ when they arrived at the NPC (Benetti, 2006). Thus, it was recommended to apply this process for the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal and the 2010 Census.

2.3 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal Group Quarters Enumeration

The 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal Group Quarters Enumeration Operation was planned to implement the following improvements:

- apply the revised GQ definitions to improve the classification of GQs;
- administer the redesigned ICR that had all of the respondent questions on the front of the form and a message from the Census Bureau Director encouraging respondent participation on the back of the form;
- employ electronic linking of the ICRs to their respective GQ;
- enter the population and USC for each GQ into the OCS; and

---


4 The ICQ was discontinued. The redesigned ICRs were preprinted with a unique barcode and used for all GQs except Military and Shipboard enumeration.
• provide requirements to the GEO to maintain the population and USC for each GQ on the MAF for future use.

Additionally, the Just In Case (JIC) box on the back of the ICR was designed to determine whether or not the respondent completed the ICR. Instructions were included for enumerators to check the JIC box if the respondent participated in completing the ICR. The cancellation of certain operations in the 2008 Dress Rehearsal precluded final testing of these improvements (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007b).

2.3.1 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal Military Enumeration

The 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal was the first time that the new procedures for enumerating military personnel by address were to be conducted. During Census 2000 military personnel were enumerated by military unit. The groundwork for testing the enumeration of military personnel by address was started with the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal for Address Canvassing, Group Quarters Validation (GQV), and mailout/mailback operations. However, the enumeration of military GQs was not completed in the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal due to budget constraints. The new procedures included a revised Military Census Report (MCR) and modifying the method of enumerating military personnel (Vitrano, 2007).

Prior to cutting Military Enumeration from the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal, the Census Bureau worked closely with the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in coordinating and gaining access to the military installations located in the two 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal sites. In order to help gain cooperation from the military installations, the Census Bureau and DMDC worked together to obtain a letter of support from the Under Secretary of Defense. This letter was distributed by military representatives to the military installations that were participating in the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal and also to military installations across the nation. This helped gain support from the participating installations and also helped gain awareness for the 2010 Census. The letter of support was also distributed to the two Early Local Census Offices (ELCOs) as a means to gain assistance in case representatives at the military installations did not receive a copy of the letter (U.S. Department of Defense, 2007).

In addition to a letter of support from the Under Secretary of Defense, the Census Bureau developed a memorandum (2008 Census Dress Rehearsal on Military Installations, March 5, 2007) which contained the listing tasks and any other information pertinent to the operation from the Census Bureau. This memorandum was distributed from the Census Bureau to the Census Joint Service Working Group (CJSWG) and from the ELCOs to the military point of contact (POC).

The planned 2010 Census enumeration of military personnel by address was only one part of the new procedures that were scheduled to be tested for the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal. The MCR used in Census 2000 was significantly changed for the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal. In Census 2000, military personnel were given a six page MCR, that asked for the individual’s usual home elsewhere (UHE), along with questions asking for detailed housing characteristics, and length of military service (see Appendix F to view the entire Census 2000 MCR).
For the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal, the revised MCR (one page, printed on both sides) was distributed to only military personnel assigned to a military GQ. This revised MCR asked military personnel for their installation name, barrack/dormitory name, barrack/dormitory number, and GQ address information. However it did not provide military personnel the option of reporting a UHE. See Appendix G to view the 2008 Dress Rehearsal MCR.

### 2.4 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration

#### 2.4.1 Overview

The primary objective of the 2010 Census GQE operation was to enumerate people who lived or stayed in a GQ. A GQ is a place where people live or stay in a group living arrangement that is owned or managed by an entity or organization providing housing and/or services for the residents. This is not a typical household-type living arrangement. These services may include custodial or medical care as well as other types of assistance, and residency is commonly restricted to those receiving these services. People living in GQs are usually not related to each other. GQs include such places as college residence halls, residential treatment centers, skilled nursing facilities, group homes, correctional facilities, and workers’ dormitories. The SP concept used during Census 2000 was not used for the 2010 Census. Eliminating the SP concept was an important change to ensure the physical location of GQs was geocoded and that the enumeration was conducted at the GQ and not at the SP.

The 2010 Census GQE operation was conducted by field staff out of LCOs located both stateside and in Puerto Rico. GQE was a paper-based operation which was conducted from April 1 through May 21, 2010 for all types of GQs, except for the GQs defined under the SBE operation. The 2010 Census SBE operation was conducted from March 29, 2010 to March 31, 2010. The GQE and SBE operations were conducted in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The GQE operation included a quality assurance component called Reinterview (RI). RI was implemented to ensure that field staff visited the GQ facility to conduct the enumeration, verify the population count, and verify that information was not falsified. RI was conducted for all GQs except military, shipboard, and service-based GQs. The following provides a break-down of the dates the operations were conducted:

- April 1 through May 14, 2010 for Military GQ Enumeration, and
- April 1 through May 21, 2010 for GQE, that included RI.

There were three phases in GQE. They were pre-enumeration, enumeration, and post-enumeration. The pre-enumeration phase included preparation, such as checking assignments, locating the GQs on Census maps, listing residents on the listing sheets, and preparing census enumeration packets. The enumeration phase included conducting the enumeration using one of four methods that was applicable to the GQs. The post-enumeration phase involved obtaining data for incomplete and/or missing ICRs/MCRs, and turning in completed assignments.
There were four different methods used to enumerate GQs based on what was applicable to them:

- for small GQs (nine or fewer residents), a personal interview could be conducted to enumerate the respondents,
- for large GQs (10 or more residents), enumerators could distribute census enumeration packets, one for each resident,
- larger GQs, such as correctional facilities used administrative records and
- selfEnumeration, which involved swearing in POCs at the GQs and training them to conduct the enumeration at their GQs. This was the preferred method for military GQs.

Field staff used the Census Bureau’s Paper Based Operation Control System (PBOCS) to monitor and control the work. The ICR, also referred to as the GQ census questionnaire, was the data collection instrument used to collect individual respondent data during the GQE operation for all GQs except military GQs and shipboard GQs. The MCR was the data collection instrument used to collect individual respondent data at military GQs. The Shipboard Census Report (SCR) was the data collection instrument used to collect individual respondent data for military and maritime vessels.

Prior to the enumeration of people living in GQs (excluding military and maritime vessel GQs); the Census Bureau conducted two field operations to prepare for the GQE Operation. Those operations were:

1. **Group Quarters Validation (GQV)** – The 2010 Census GQV operation was an address validation operation where field staff visited addresses identified as Other Living Quarters (OLQs) during the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation and addresses identified as potential GQs by various selected sources. Field staff administered the GQV Questionnaire to the GQ contact person to determine if the OLQ address was a nonresidential unit, a housing unit, a transitory location, or a GQ. If the OLQ was validated as a GQ, the specific type of GQ was determined and the maximum number of people who could live or stay at the address was collected. The maximum number of residents at a GQ was used to determine the number of ICRs and enumerators that were needed to conduct the actual enumeration.

2. **Group Quarters Advance Visit (GQAV)** – The 2010 Census GQAV operation was the subsequent field operation to GQV. Field staff met with the GQ contact person to inform them of the upcoming GQ enumeration, discuss any privacy and confidentiality concerns related to personally identifiable information, as well as identify any security issues, such as restricted access that may hinder the actual enumeration. During this visit, field staff conducted an interview to confirm a date and time to conduct the enumeration and to obtain the number of people expected to be at the GQ on Census Day (April 1, 2010). For SBE, field staff explained that the SBE operation would be conducted over a three-day time period and that the GQ POC could select the best day for the GQ to be enumerated within that time period.

---

5 For a list of sources that provided addresses of potential GQs that were included in the 2010 GQV, see Group Quarters Validation (GQV) Assessment Study Plan – Williams and Barrett (2010).
The list of addresses that were validated as GQs during the GQV operation and the addresses of GQs added during the GQAV operation resulted in the initial GQ universe for the 2010 Census GQE operation that included GQ addresses from the Military Enumeration and Service-Based Enumeration.

Specialized procedures were implemented for personnel enumerated on vessels and persons enumerated at service-based locations. Refer to the 2010 Census Shipboard Enumeration Assessment Report, and the 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration Assessment Report respectively for additional information unique to these GQ types (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009b).

2.4.2 Planning

During the planning cycle for the 2010 Census, new and improved definitions were developed and tested that resulted in collapsing similar GQ types. For the 2010 Census there were 30 GQ type codes in the following seven major categories: Correctional Facilities for Adults, Juvenile Facilities, Nursing Facilities/Skilled-Nursing Facilities, Other Institutional facilities, College/University Student Housing, Military Quarters, and Other Non-institutional Facilities (Lamas, 2009). See Table 1 for a list of the 2010 Census GQs type codes. Data results for type codes 701, 702, 704, and 706 are covered in the 2010 Census Service Based Enumeration Assessment Report. Data results for type codes 602 and 900 are covered in the 2010 Census Shipboard Assessment Report. The objective of this effort was to produce a set of definitions with associated GQ type codes that were recognized by industry professionals, apply them to the Census Bureau’s GQs operations, and reflect the needs of data users.
Table 1: 2010 Census Group Quarters Type Code List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Group Quarters</th>
<th>Type Code</th>
<th>Correctional Facilities for Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Federal Detention Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Federal Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>State Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Local Jails and Other Municipal Confinement Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Correctional Residential Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Military Disciplinary Barracks and Jails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Group Homes for Juveniles (non-correctional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Juveniles (non-correctional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Correctional Facilities Intended for Juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Facilities/Skilled-Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Nursing Facilities/Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Institutional Facilities

|                              | 401       | Mental (Psychiatric) Hospitals and Psychiatric Units in Other Hospitals |
|                              | 402       | Hospitals with Patients Who Have No Usual Home Elsewhere |
|                              | 403       | In-Patient Hospice Facilities |
|                              | 404       | Military Treatment Facilities with Assigned Patients |
|                              | 405       | Residential Schools for People with Disabilities |

Non-Institutional Group Quarters

|                                | 501       | College/University Student Housing |
|                                | 601       | Military Quarters |
|                                | 602       | Military Ships |
| Military Quarters              | 701       | Emergency and Transitional Shelters (With Sleeping Facilities) for People Experiencing Homelessness |
|                                | 703       | Domestic Violence Shelters |
|                                | 702       | Soup Kitchens |
|                                | 704       | Regularly Scheduled Mobile Food Vans |
|                                | 706       | Targeted Non-Sheltered Outdoor Locations |
|                                | 801       | Group Homes Intended for Adults |
|                                | 802       | Residential Treatment Centers for Adults |
|                                | 900       | Maritime/Merchant Vessels |
|                                | 901       | Worker’s Group Living Quarters and Job Corps Centers |
|                                | 902       | Religious Group Quarters |
|                                | 903       | Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disaster |
|                                | 999       | Vacant GQs* |

Source: DMD 2010 Census Group Quarters Definitions and Code List, 1/30/09

*GQs that were vacant during the time of interview in any of the seven categories were assigned a type code of 999. Type code 999 was also OLQs/GQs that the field operations were unable to validate as GQs.
2.4.3 Workload Universe

The 2010 Census GQE universe consisted of addresses that were validated as GQs during the prior 2010 Census GQV operation, addresses of GQs that were added during the 2010 Census GQAV operation, addresses added during the 2010 Census GQE operation, and addresses of GQs identified by the Federal-State Cooperative Program on Population Estimates (FSCPE) and the NPC SBE GQs and Group Homes Internet Research.

During the GQAV operation, Census Bureau workers visited the POC at the GQs to verify information about the GQ, and to determine and agree on a date and time to conduct the enumeration. The planned workload for the 2010 Census GQE operation was 300,000 GQs. The initial workload for the 2010 Census GQE operation was 240,243. The number of GQs added to the initial workload was 39,932. Thus the total workload for the 2010 Census GQE operation was 280,175 (C&P, June 3, 2010).

2.4.4 Promotional Materials, Access Letters, and Partnerships

In preparation for the 2010 Census GQE operation, staff at Census Bureau Headquarters (HQ) provided documentation to various organizations across the country to gain their support/cooperation. These organizations included:

- Department of Corrections for all states,
- Juvenile Correctional facilities for all states,
- Department of Education,
- American Hospital Association,
- American Health Care Association,
- Administration of Children and Families,
- Federally Affiliated Alcohol and Substance Abuse facilities,
- Salvation Army, and the
- Department of Defense.

Promotional Materials

Brochures for GQE were developed and printed in English and Spanish for distribution to the POCs of GQs and residents of GQs, with the exception of military materials, which were only printed in English. The GQE brochures provided information about the census, uses of census data, and information about privacy, specifically the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The brochures also briefly described GQE and provided an overview of enumerating GQs along with examples of GQs for the 2010 Census. See Appendix L to view the brochures.

Posters were developed and printed in English and Spanish for placement in GQ facilities, with the exception of military promotional materials, which were only printed in English. For GQs facilities, the posters highlighted when the enumeration would take place and included a snapshot of the ICR.
For military installations, the posters highlighted when military personnel could complete their Census forms. See Appendix M to view these posters.

Following are the promotional materials print estimates for the 2010 Census GQE operation that can be used as a reference in the future.

Table 2: 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration Operation Estimates for Promotional Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Estimates</th>
<th>Quantities for *Advance Visit Packets –</th>
<th>Overage for NPC and LCOs (75 percent)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Brochure Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE, Form D-197 (GQE)</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>202,500</td>
<td>472,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE, SKs, MFVs and Shelters\ Form D-197 (SBE)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form D-3277 Military Fact Sheet</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Poster Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE, Form D-1155 Group Quarters</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHB, Form D-38 Maritime(Vessels)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL, Form D-39 Military (Vessels and GQs)</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>11,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Spanish Brochures Estimate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE, Form D-197 (GQE)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE, (SKs, MFVs, and Shelters)\ Form D-197 (SBE)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>7,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Spanish Poster Estimates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE, Form D-1155 Group Quarters</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>78,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>714,592</td>
<td>535,319</td>
<td>1,249,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Column B: Advance Visit Packets were to include 100 percent of materials. Unused material was returned to the LCO.
Legend: GQE=Group Quarters Enumeration, SKs=Soup Kitchens, MFVs=Mobile Food Vans, SHB=Shipboard, SBE=Service-Based Enumeration, and MIL=Military
Source: Excel Spreadsheet, Promotional Material Estimates for 2010, 10/23/08

**Access Letters**

Access letters for the 2010 Census GQE operation were given to the POC at the GQ facility during the GQA/V operation. Access letters were not mailed to GQ facilities. The access letters were printed in English and Spanish. Access letters were printed for Facility Managers, Health Care organizations, and Student Housing locations. As with the brochures, the access letter provided information about the 2010 Census, the need for including the population living in GQs, uses of
census data, and information about privacy, specifically the HIPAA and FERPA. The access letter also informed the GQ facility POC that they would be contacted to verify an appointment for enumeration and to gather information about the residents at their facility to conduct the census. See Appendix A to view the access letter.

Brochures, posters, and access letters were developed and printed as part of an informational packet for distribution during GQAV. The informational packet of census material included the telephone number of the LCO in their geographic area.

**Partnerships**
In an effort to update the address list of GQs, the Census Bureau leveraged partnerships with external stakeholders. For example, members of the FSCPE participated in the 2010 Census GQ Update program by providing an updated list of GQs. This information was used to enhance the MAF/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER) database prior to the Address Canvassing operation.

In addition to meeting with members of the FSCPE, Census Bureau HQ staff met with federal agencies and advocacy organizations to discuss and/or coordinate as applicable:

- gaining access to some GQs (i.e., military installations and prisons),
- enumerating GQs,
- addressing concerns for the residents,
- addressing concerns with procedures and/or implications with HIPAA for residents of medically related facilities, and
- providing clarification on the impact of language identified for FERPA on the 2010 Census GQ operations for residents of college and university related facilities.

### 2.4.5 Schedule

The 2010 Census GQE operation, including RI was originally planned to be conducted from April 1, 2010 through May 21, 2010. The operation started as scheduled, but did not end until June 4, 2010. The planned duration of the GQE operation was 37 days, while the actual duration was 47 days. The PBOCS encountered functionality and performance issues while simultaneously tracking GQE cases and the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup operation cases. Thus, work for GQE on the PBOCS was suspended on May 14, 2010. Specifically, the work suspended prior to completion was Reinterview and outstanding GQE cases to be checked-in from the field and checked-out to the NPC. As a result, close out of outstanding GQE cases had to be manually processed outside of the PBOCS environment, causing the GQE operation to end late.

The 2010 Census Master Activity Schedule (MAS) included the GQE, SBE, and Military operations. While these operations were separate, all of the operations were included on the MAS under GQE. The GQE was comprised of 45 activities listed on the MAS. Of the 45 activities, four finished on time, 20 finished ahead of the base-line finish date, and 19 activities finished after the base-line finish date. Key schedule activities can be viewed in Appendix N.
2.4.6 Configuration Management

There were five Change Requests (CRs) submitted to support GQE. The CRs were required to effectively implement the GQE operation. The CRs submitted included:

- a request to the Decennial Response Integration System (DRIS) to data capture the unique pre-printed barcode located on the back of the GQ forms, that is the ICRs, MCRs, and SCRs which would have allowed the DRIS to create the electronic linkage of the GQ forms to their associated GQ ID,
- a request for additional GQE forms (ICRs, MCRs, SCRs, and outgoing envelopes) to be printed in order to minimize a risk of deficit in form quantities for the 2010 Census GQE operation. There was no cost associated with this change because funding was allocated from the Decennial Automated Contracts Management Office (DACMO),
- a request to print additional GQE forms for development and testing for DRIS data capture,
- a request for the NPC to send residual GQE linkage files to DRIS to modify the DRIS: NPC External Interface Control Document (EICD), and
- a request to change the form color of the MCR so that it could be easily distinguished by the LCO staff. This change had no effect on the schedule or production.

2.4.7 Field Training and Staffing

The 2010 Census GQE operation was conducted out of LCOs located both stateside and in Puerto Rico. The LCO staff consisted of both office and field staff. The 2010 Census GQE operation required the following field and LCO staff positions:

- Group Quarters Supervisor (GQS),
- Crew Leader (CL), and
- Enumerator

Table 3 provides a summary of the total 2010 Census GQE operation staff (includes staff working on GQE and Military Enumeration). The table includes the employee type and the percent of the front loading rate for replacement training, the number of positions budgeted for training and the total number actually trained, and actual working staff for production and RI. The Decennial Management Division (DMD) Cost Model included replacement training at a rate of 25 percent for CLs and 50 percent for enumerators. Replacement training was used to accommodate staff that could have left unexpectedly during the course of the operation or were unable to work as many hours as anticipated. For CLs and GQS’, replacement training was used to accommodate no-shows and people who did not complete training (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009b).

All staff working on the 2010 Census GQE operation received instructions and training on how to perform their jobs using manuals and procedural materials prepared under the direction of the Field Division (FLD) staff.
GQE field staff charged to specific task codes for monitoring actual costs and production. Likewise LCO staff also charged to a specific task code to conduct RI. The field staff was provided with suggested weekly progress goals for the operation.

Table 3: GQE Staffing and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Type</th>
<th>Percent Front Loading Rate (Replacement Training)</th>
<th>Number of Positions Budgeted</th>
<th>Number of Positions Actual Working Staff as of 3/28/10 – 4/2/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enumerators………..</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48,419</td>
<td>41,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Leaders……….</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>3,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ Supervisors …….</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GQE Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,905</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,737</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census GQE Operation Status Final Meeting Notes, 4/7/2010. Column Notes: 1) Employee Type—this column represents the field staff employee types. 2) Front loading rate—this column represents the percentage of replacement training. 3) Cost Model Staff Budget—this column represents the number of staff budgeted. 4) Working Staff—this column reflects data for the number of employees who submitted a Daily Pay and Work Record, Form, D-308 for the position, time period and task code.

2.4.8 Cost and Progress Reports

The 2010 Census DMD Cost and Progress (C&P) System interfaced with PBOCS, the Decennial Applicant, Personnel and Payroll System (DAPPS), and the DRIS to obtain data to generate reports that Census Bureau HQ, Regional Census Center (RCC), and LCO staff used to monitor the cost and progress of the 2010 Census GQE operation. The 2010 Census GQE operation used seven C&P reports that included budget, costs, and progress of the workload.

Initially, the C&P system was planned to interface with the Field Data Collection Automation (FDCA) Operation Control Environment/Operation Control System (OCE/OCS). However, after the FDCA Replan, the PBOCS was used to provide the automated functionality necessary to support tracking of data for the 2010 Census GQE operation.

Source data included the GQE cost models from the DMD budget office and FLD progress goals. DMD generated a budget for the GQE operation using the DMD cost model, which contained assumptions about the total workload, production rates, production, and training hours. These budgeted values were entered and distributed throughout the C&P system to the LCO level. This data populated the budgeted values for field work and training hours for both the production and RI phases of the operation.

Production progress goals provided by the FLD budget office were used to determine expected percentages of workload and cost to be completed by the RCCs and LCOs each week of the operation.
2.4.9 Budget

The national total budget for the 2010 Census GQE operation was approximately 87 million dollars. The national total budget for GQE was based on the workload; that is the number of GQs and estimates for training, production hours, and miles. The actual cost was approximately 57 million dollars. The national total budget and costs included GQE, Military Enumeration, and SBE. Although SBE was appropriated a separate budget, SBE budget and actual costs are included with GQE and Military Enumeration as reflected in C&P. Additional information on the SBE operational budget and costs can be found in the 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration Assessment Report.

Table 4 highlights the national budget and actual costs for GQE. The budget and actual costs for training in Table 4 below reflect one week of training for Group Quarters, Military, and Service-Based Enumeration field staff. Table 4 shows that production comprised 75.6 percent of the budget and 70.9 percent of the actual cost. Training comprised 24.4 percent of the budget and 29.1 percent of the actual cost. Accordingly, production attributed 84.5 percent of the variance and training attributed 15.5 percent of the variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload (Number of GQs)</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>280,175</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$21,201,526</td>
<td>$16,496,933</td>
<td>$4,704,593</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours – Cost................</td>
<td>$20,816,859</td>
<td>$16,172,532</td>
<td>$4,644,327</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles - Cost................</td>
<td>$384,667</td>
<td>$324,401</td>
<td>$60,266</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Production                | $65,860,244 | $40,163,686 | $25,696,558 | 84.52%             |
| Hours – Cost................ | $52,274,333 | $32,415,092 | $19,859,241 | 65.32%             |
| Miles – Cost................ | $13,585,911 | $7,748,594  | $5,837,317  | 19.20%             |

| Total GQE Cost            | $87,061,770 | $56,660,619 | $30,401,151 | 100%               |

Note: Total GQE cost include SBE production and training costs.
Source: 2010 Census GQE Cost and Progress Reports, 08/19/2010.

The 2010 Census GQE operation was under budget primarily because of the number of GQs, specifically colleges/universities, and prisons that used administrative lists for enumeration. Because administrative lists were used more than expected, there were fewer visits to group quarters by enumerators. This resulted in the LCO staff using administrative lists to transcribe information onto the ICRs rather than having enumerators complete ICRs in the field. Thus, work was charged to the LCOs rather than to the field/production.
Administrative lists were used in Census 2000 and the Census Bureau anticipated them being used again in the 2010 Census, particularly because HQ staff worked proactively with colleges, prisons, hospitals, and various organizations across the country to provide documentation to gain their support and cooperation. However, the Census Bureau did not anticipate so many GQs using them in the 2010 Census. For colleges and universities, using administrative lists afforded them the opportunity of having less intrusion, if any, on their campuses from Census staff.

State prisons used administrative lists. Some state prisons unexpectedly mailed administrative lists to the RCCs rather than to their LCO. The RCCs then had to sort the lists and forward them on to the appropriate LCO for transcription onto ICRs. Again, the work was charged to the LCOs rather than to the field/production.

The 2010 Census GQE operation was also under budget because RI was discontinued prior to the scheduled end date of May 21, 2010 due to performance issues with PBOCS. The discontinuance of RI resulted in about one week of cost savings.

Table 5 shows the actual GQE cost per case was less than the budgeted GQE cost per case. The costs per case was calculated by dividing the budgeted training and production costs by the planned workload and dividing the actual costs for training and production by the total workload as reported in the DMD C&P system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>280,175</td>
<td>19,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Production Costs</td>
<td>$87,061,770</td>
<td>$56,660,619</td>
<td>$30,401,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE Cost Per Case</td>
<td>$290.20</td>
<td>$202.23</td>
<td>$87.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Cost and Progress Reports, 6/3/10 and 8/19/10

Military Enumeration Cost

Of the $40,163,686 production cost for GQE, the total cost for the enumeration of military GQs for the 2010 Census was $403,201 (C&P 8/19/10). Military GQs were self-enumerated which reduced cost. The mileage and training hours associated with the enumeration of military GQs is included in the 2010 Census GQE costs. A separate budget for the enumeration of military GQs was not developed and costs were generated through the use of crew leaders charging hours worked while enumerating military GQs to the Military Enumeration task code which was part of the 2010 Census GQE operation.

2.4.10 Key Improvements

The following key improvements are highlighted because they were developed and tested throughout the decade and were successfully implemented during the 2010 Census. These improvements were not part of prior censuses:

- GQ definitions were improved to better define and distinguish GQs from HUs;
- GQs were no longer managed at the SP level;
• Emphasis was placed strictly at the GQs;
• The concept of SPs was no longer used;
• The census reports (ICRs, MCRs, and SCRs) were redesigned;
• The ICRs, MCRs, and SCRs were electronically linked to their respective GQs;
• The USC outcome for the address of each GQs was entered and maintained;
• The concept of embedded HUs to improve field operations was removed;
• The HU and GQ universes were integrated to reduce duplication of addresses on both lists;
• Access letters addressing HIPAA and FERPA were developed to help ease access to educational and medical facilities; and
• The process of adding GQs was refined to define the specific types of GQs that could be added before/during the 2010 Census GQE operation.

Census reports were printed with a unique barcode to electronically link each report to its respective GQ by scanning the GQ ID on the Enumeration Record and then scanning the barcode on all of the associated reports. The USC for each GQ was entered into the PBOCS to be maintained on the MAF for future use. This change in the enumeration methodology was implemented to assign and maintain the status codes for all GQs in the universe and to define and document the disposition of the GQs at the time of the enumeration.

The census reports were redesigned and included the following changes:

• all of the respondent questions on the front page; and
• an “answered by” area with a box for “respondent” and a box for “other” on the back page.

The enumerators were instructed to mark the correct box to indicate whether or not the respondent participated in the completion of the ICR. The LCO management staff was instructed to record information on all GQs with a zero population count. The staff recorded the reason why the GQ resulted in a population of zero on census day on the newly designed Management Attention Report (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009b).

2.4.11 Contingency Plan Implementation

Census Bureau executive staff decided to suspend all PBOCS work on the 2010 Census GQE operation in order to minimize the load on the PBOCS, thus allowing system resources to be applied toward the production of the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup operation.

Due to performance issues with the PBOCS, the work for the GQE operation was suspended on May 14, 2010. Contingency plans were implemented for the GQE operation in order to move GQE material from the 486 stateside LCOs and eight LCOs in Puerto Rico to the NPC and to ultimately close out the 2010 Census GQE operation.

As part of the plan, the GQE materials (Form D-352 Enumeration Records, ICRs, MCRs, and maps) from the LCOs were shipped May 28, 2010 through June 3, 2010 to the NPC for processing that is, check-in and completion. The NPC modified and reprogrammed the Automated Tracking and Control (ATAC) system. ATAC was originally designed and used for the 2010 Census Domestic
Violence Shelters (DVS) and the SHB operations. In order to implement the contingency plan to close out the GQE operation, staff at the NPC modified the baseline procedures for ATAC to sort and check-in GQE materials (ICRs and MCRs) that were not checked-in to the PBOCS. Then, the NPC staff processed the outstanding workload of GQE cases using the ATAC system to:

- link the GQE forms (ICRs and MCRs) to their respective GQ IDs on Form D-352, Enumeration Record,
- send the linkage files to the DRIS and the Universe Enumeration Control Table (UECT) population and status files to the Decennial Systems Processing Office (DSPO), and
- create and deliver end of operation files.

The contingency plan was successfully implemented. GQE materials (ICRs, MCRs, RI forms, and maps) were shipped from the LCOs and received at the NPC. Census Bureau HQ staff delivered to the NPC a GQ Add Table Specification for GQ “Adds” received at the NPC, but had not been checked into the PBOCS. The PBOCS team generated and delivered to the NPC a file of GQ IDs that were not checked into the PBOCS. The intent of these files was to provide the NPC awareness of the expected workload from the preexisting workload. The files also facilitated reconciliation of GQ IDs that were in the initial workload universe. The 2010 Census GQE operation closed out with a final GQ workload of 280,175 GQs (C&P, June 3, 2010). This was a testament to the staff at NPC and HQ planning, coordinating, and executing the contingency plan to close out the operation in a timely manner (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Of the 280,175 GQs final workload (captured during the operation), the Census Edited File (CEF) revealed there were 166,827 GQs with a population of one or more for stateside and PR.

2.4.12 Zero Population Group Quarters

In mid-July 2010, a review of the data from the PBOCS for the 2010 Census GQE operation led to a concern about the number of GQs classified as a refusal or as occupied but for which no population count was obtained. Research ensued and results were provided to explain the outcome.

The PBOCS review provided a total of 3,026 GQs for which there was a zero population count. This total was reduced to 1,559 by removing 1,467 SBE GQs from the count. Of the remaining 1,559 GQs with a zero population count, 782 GQs were classified as correctional facilities, nursing facilities, student housing, military quarters, or workers’ living quarters.

These 782 GQs were reviewed and researched. The RCC staff conducted research by contacting these GQs to obtain a population count. The Census Bureau HQ staff reviewed notes from GQ Enumeration Records and Management Attention Reports for the GQs classified as either a refusal or occupied with no population count. The review of these documents revealed that many cases were classified as such because many respondents indicated that they had already returned questionnaires received in the mail. These GQs addresses duplicated addresses in the HU universe. The GEO then attempted to match the GQs being researched to HUs on the MAF.
**GQs that matched to HUs on the MAF**

Of the 782 GQs reviewed, 358 (45.8 percent) matched addresses listed as HUs on the MAF. No persons were added to the GQ counts from any matched addresses to avoid potential duplication of persons in the census. This high percentage appeared to confirm what many residents reported, that they were unwilling to respond during GQE because they had already returned questionnaires. The actual number of duplicate addresses between the HU and GQ universes was probably somewhat higher because only “exact” address matches were accepted in this work.

Most (65.1 percent) of the GQ to HU matches were from the Workers’ Living Quarters GQ type. The next highest category of GQ to HU matches was for Nursing Facilities at 23.5 percent. These two GQ types accounted for 88.6 percent of the GQ addresses duplicated in the HU universe.

**GQs that did not match to HUs on the MAF**

Of the 424 non-matched GQs reviewed, 235 (55.4 percent) resulted in persons being added to the census. This represented 30.1 percent of the 782 GQs originally classified as refusals or occupied with no population count. A total of 6,296 persons were added from these 235 GQs. These persons would have been missed if this closeout procedure had not been implemented.

**GQs ineligible for GQE**

Of the 424 non-matched GQs reviewed, 143 (33.7 percent) were determined to be ineligible for GQE. This represented 18.3 percent of the 782 GQs originally classified as refusals or occupied with no population count. Note that all of these were therefore misclassified during field operations as a refusal or occupied with no population count. Reasons for ineligibility include the GQ was vacant on April 1, the address was not an eligible GQ (e.g., the address was identified as an acute care hospital or a boarding school for high school students with no staff living quarters), the GQ ID was a duplicate of another GQ ID, or the address was enumerated during another operation, such as Update/Leave or Enumeration at Transitory Locations. Almost half (48.3 percent) of the 143 ineligible GQs were from the GQ type Workers’ Living Quarters.

**GQs occupied, but with no population count available**

Of the 424 non-matched GQs reviewed, 46 (10.8 percent) were determined to be occupied GQs, but for which no population counts were obtained during either the 2010 Census GQAV or GQE operations. That is, these GQs were those where the 2010 Census probably missed counting eligible GQ persons. This group of GQs represents 5.9 percent of the GQs originally classified as a refusal or occupied with no population count. This group is an extremely small component (0.02 percent) of the total GQE universe.

The review of data in the PBOCS provided an opportunity to further improve the data collected from the 2010 Census GQE operation. The final results added 235 GQs accounting for over 6,000 additional persons being included in the 2010 Census.

**2.4.13 Quality Assurance/Reinterview**

A quality control program, RI, was implemented for the 2010 Census GQE operation. The RI component of the 2010 Census GQE operation was a telephone operation. The purpose of RI was to confirm that the enumerator visited the correct facility at the correct address and the enumerator
administered and collected the ICRs correctly. RI also determined whether or not the enumerator obtained a population count within the acceptable range (plus or minus 20 percent) of the count provided by the GQ contact during the telephone RI. The RI workload was a ten percent random sample via the PBOCS of the total number of completed GQs cases. RI was GQ based and not enumerator based. A GQ case was ineligible for RI if it:

- Had a population count of zero,
- Did not contain at least one ICR,
- Was a military or SBE GQ,
- Was completed by a CL or GQS,
- Had been selected for “Management Attention,”
- Was previously selected for RI, and/or
- Had been checked-out for rework.

Once a case was selected for RI, the following procedures were performed:

1. The office clerk contacted the initial POC at the GQ (or another POC at the GQ if the initial POC was unavailable) to ask them the questions from GQE RI Form, D-941, Section A.
2. If contact to the GQ POC determined the enumerator conducted the GQ interview correctly; the office clerk recorded the responses on the D-941 form.
3. After the office clerk completed Section A on the D-941, GQE RI Form, the form was passed to the Assistant Manager for Quality Assurance (AMQA).
4. Then, the AMQA reviewed the form and entered one of the following RI codes in Section B to indicate the outcome of the RI as: Pass, Soft-Fail, Hard-Fail, or Unable to Contact.

If the clerk appropriately verified the responses with the POC at the GQ, the case was marked “Pass.” If the AMQA determined after checking with the POC at the GQ that the enumerator made an honest mistake, the AMQA marked the case “Soft-fail.” Cases that were marked “Soft-fail” were sent out for repair. If the AMQA determined after checking with the POC at the GQ that the enumerator falsified the data, the case was marked “Hard-fail.” Cases marked “Hard-fail” were assigned to a CL to be reworked.

There were two types of RI cases: Random and Supplemental.

- Random RI was taking a sample of an enumerator’s work and checking it for accuracy. The PBOCS was programmed with an algorithm to select a sample of eligible GQE cases for RI during the check-in from the field work. The PBOCS randomly selected the first eligible completed GQs case checked-in, and then every tenth eligible completed GQs case checked in.

---

6 GQE is unlike most surveys that selects a random RI sample of cases from each enumerator’s work assignment. In GQE, the first eligible GQs case checked-in is selected and then every 10th eligible case checked-in thereafter, regardless of who completed the assignment (Sebron, 2010).
• Supplemental RI allowed the LCO supervisor to select cases from any enumerator with an original enumeration assignment. Any of the cases that the enumerator worked that were not selected for the random RI, except military GQs, SBE, or “Management Attention” cases and cases completed by a CL, were available to be selected for supplemental RI. The LCO supervisor could place an enumerator in supplemental RI for various reasons: the enumerator cases were not selected for RI; or the office needed to RI additional cases to investigate the enumerator for suspected falsification (Sebron, 2010).

Every enumerator had at least one case selected for the RI process. The average number of cases per enumerator was 6.79. Results for RI are found in Section 5.9.

Due to performance issues with the PBOCS, the C&P system was not tracking the 2010 Census GQE cases correctly; therefore, FLD reports were used to capture RI results and report out for all 486 stateside LCOs and the eight LCOs in PR.

2.5 2010 Census Military Enumeration

The 2010 Census was the first time that the Military Enumeration was fully conducted using the new procedures and revised one-page MCR developed after Census 2000. These new procedures consisted of a change from the Census 2000 enumeration of military personnel by military unit to the 2010 Census enumeration of military personnel by address (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).

The primary objective of the 2010 Census Military Enumeration was to enumerate military personnel living in housing units and group quarters on military installations. A military installation was defined as a fenced/secured area used for military purposes. Each of the 2010 Census operations covered the enumeration of military personnel. For the purpose of this assessment, only enumeration procedures relating to military GQs will be covered.

The Census Bureau established special procedures for contacting the military installation’s POC and for gaining access to military installations. These procedures were developed through meetings with the CJSWG, which consisted of representatives from the U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Coast Guard, and the Census Bureau.

For the 2010 Census, military personnel were enumerated by type of address (i.e., HU or GQ). The 2010 Census questionnaires and forms that were used on the military installations to enumerate HUs were the same as those used for the general public. The data collection instrument used to collect individual respondent data for members of the military assigned to GQs was the MCR. Only military personnel assigned to a GQ completed an MCR for the 2010 Census. The MCR provided data fields that allowed individuals to enter the address of their GQ residence. The address fields for the MCR were different from other Census questionnaires since the address fields included military installation or base name, barrack or dormitory name, and barrack or dormitory number. This address information was used by the field staff to make sure the MCR was assigned to the correct GQ. This address information was neither used to update the official MAF address of the GQ nor was it data captured. Military personnel assigned to a GQ did not have the option to claim a UHE in the 2010 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).
Representatives from the military branches requested that the LCO POC contact the military POC with a 60-day and 30-day advance phone call prior to census workers going to the installations. This allowed the military installation’s POC to prepare for the enumeration of the military GQs on the installation. The 60-day advance phone call was to let the military installation POC know that there was an upcoming census operation and also to gather contact information. During the 30-day advance phone call details were clarified, such as: determining how many military escorts were needed, establishing the best times to conduct the enumeration, and letting the military POC know what kind of resources would be needed (e.g., installation maps). This 30-day advance phone call was designed so the military installation POC could advise the LCO POC of any installation-specific rules while on the premises.

2.5.1 2010 Census Group Quarters Operations on Military Installations

Military GQs are barracks, disciplinary barracks/jails, and military treatment facilities. The Census Bureau needed the assistance of the military installation POC to complete the enumeration accurately and on time. The military installation POC’s duties changed from one GQ operation to the other. Installation personnel conducted enumeration themselves with training and assistance from the CL. Military installation POC’s that had the responsibility of a secret installation needed to include all personnel living in military GQs at the secret installation in the overall base enumeration.

During the 2010 Census GQAV operation, CLs conducted a preparatory visit to the military installation POC to confirm and explain the procedures for the upcoming 2010 Census GQE operation. CLs also provided the military installation POC with a manual for military personnel describing the enumeration of military GQs. A CL contacted the military installation POC at the installation to schedule a meeting to discuss and verify the following:

- Expected population of assigned personnel to GQs on April 1, 2010,
- Number of personnel required to conduct enumeration,
- Date for the enumeration training,
- Date for delivery of enumeration materials to the military POC, and the
- Location for delivery of enumeration materials.

2.5.2 Conducting Military Enumeration

On the agreed upon date, the CL returned to the military installation to train the POCs on enumeration procedures and distribute enumeration materials, since military GQs were self-enumerating. During the training, military installation POCs were sworn in to protect Title 13 data using the Form BC-1759 (see Appendix H).

The military installation POC began the enumeration of the GQ by first creating listing sheets of all personnel assigned to the GQ on April 1, 2010. The military installation POC then distributed MCRs to each resident that was permanently assigned to the GQ on April 1, 2010. The military installation POC attempted to get data for incomplete MCRs and/or MCRs not received during enumeration. Additionally, the military installation POC provided the population count, which is the total number of MCRs collected for the GQ, on the D-352, Enumeration Record. After the enumeration was complete, a CL contacted the military installation POC to schedule a date to pick
up the forms. The CL reviewed the materials with the military installation POC to verify that the enumeration was complete.

3. Methodology

3.1 Overview

The 2010 Census GQE Assessment will focus on several components of enumerating the population residing in group situations such as college/university dormitories, prisons, juvenile facilities, nursing facilities/skilled-nursing facilities, and so on. These components range from population counts by GQ type categories to the status of the GQ at the time of the enumeration. The assessment will also address the following standard topics as required by all assessments:

- Workloads and results nationwide (Stateside and Puerto Rico),
- Schedule/cost results,
- Data quality and GQE RI results,
- Automation implementation results,
- Findings from debriefings, and
- Findings from lessons learned.

3.2 Quality Assurance Procedures

U.S. Census Bureau standards and quality process procedures were applied throughout the creation of this report. These procedures encompassed how the methods in the assessment were determined, the creation of specifications for project procedures and software, the design and review of computer systems, the development of clerical and computer procedures, the analysis of the data, and the preparation of this report.

3.3 Data Sources

All GQs in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are included in the summary statistics in this assessment. State-by-state breakdowns of the GQ population by specific GQ types will be provided where applicable. Demographic characteristics will be displayed only at the national level. In addition, questions will be answered using data from the following sources described in the data requirements:

- Census Unedited File (CUF),
- CEF,
- Decennial Response File (DRF),
- 2010 Census GQE Field Debriefings,
- C&P Reports,
- ATAC system output files,
- MAF Extract,
- GQE Quality Profile (RI), and the
- Universe Control & Management File (UC&M).
3.4 Questions to be Answered

Questions to Be Answered
This section describes methods and data sources used for answering each study question in the 2010 Census GQE Assessment Study Plan:

1. What was the:
   a. Distribution of GQs by size of population and GQ type category?
   b. GQ Population Counts by State by GQ type category?

   Methodology and Source: The distribution of GQs by size of population and GQ type category was obtained from data in the CEF. A GQ type category was assigned to each person record based on the GQ type code. Certain GQ type codes were grouped together to produce a specific GQ type category. To produce the distribution of the GQ population by GQ type category, all person records for GQs were counted for each GQ type category. Additionally, using the state code assigned to each person record, the distribution of the GQ population was performed at the state level by each GQ type category.

2. How many residents filled out their forms themselves and how many forms were filled out by other means such as administrative records (by GQ Type)?

   Methodology and Source: There was more than one variable from the CEF that was used to determine how many residents filled out their forms themselves or an enumerator conducted an interview with the respondent compared to those filled out by other means such as administrative records or from personal knowledge of the GQ contact person. Only those person records enumerated on ICRs were extracted. In order to determine how the form was filled out, we referred to the information on the back of the ICR in the “For Official Use Only” section. In this section, Item D “Answered by” contained two check boxes, “Respondent” or “Other” that indicated how the form was filled out. The results of Item D were used to produce the count for the number of residents who filled out their forms themselves versus other means. This distribution was shown by the GQ type category assigned to each person record enumerated on ICRs. For those questionnaires filled out by other methods, the number of questionnaires filled out using administrative records versus those filled out using personal knowledge of the GQ contact person could not be determined from the data provided.

3. How did the actual GQ population count compare with the maximum and expected population counts reported from the GQV questionnaire and the GQAV Operation?

   Methodology and Source: The actual GQ population count was obtained from data in the CEF using the count of all person records from each GQ. The GQ records on the 2010 Enumeration MAF/TIGER database (MTdb) Extract had a maximum population value obtained during GQV. The maximum population value from GQV was included on the GQAV file and was updated during GQAV where applicable. This count was used to compare to the actual population count. The expected population count was obtained during the GQAV operation and was included on the GQAV file. The expected population count was compared to the maximum population count obtained during the GQV/GQAV operation.
4. How many persons were added to GQs from Be Counted Forms (BCFs)?

Methodology and Source: The DSPO produced a file that contained the results of the allocation of persons from the BCFs. This count provides those persons enumerated on BCFs who reported no UHE on April 1, 2010 and were successfully geocoded to a state and county during Non-ID processing. The DSPO used an algorithm as specified by Decennial Statistical Studies Division (DSSD) to allocate persons enumerated on BCFs to GQs that were proportional to the number of persons in each of the GQs. First priority was given to SBE GQs. If there were no SBE GQs in the county where the BCF person was geocoded then the person was allocated to other GQ types. To count the number of BCF GQs by GQ type category, only one record for each GQ was used in the tabulation. For the tabulation of persons at BCF GQs by GQ type category, all records for each GQ were included.

5. How many questionnaires reported a UHE (by GQ type)?

Methodology and Source: The ICRs and SCRs permitted an address to be reported; however, only certain types of GQs were eligible for the UHE to be processed and used. To produce this count, only those persons indicating a UHE on ICRs from the following type GQs were extracted from the DRF:

- Hospitals and In-Patient Hospices,
- Soup Kitchens (SKs),
- Regularly Scheduled Mobile Food Vans (MFVs),
- Residential Treatment Centers for Adults,
- Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers,
- Religious GQs, and
- Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters.

Persons indicating a UHE on SCRs from Military Ships and Maritime/Merchant Vessels were also extracted, that is, those who responded “Yes” to question eight on the SCR “Do you have a house, apartment, or mobile home where you usually stay when off duty?” and who were asked to provide an address of the UHE.

6. How many GQs were added during GQAV and GQE (by type)?

Methodology and Source: The 2010 GQE Address Update (ADDUP) file delivered from the GEO was used to determine the number of GQs added during GQAV/GQE by GQs type category. To determine if a GQ was added during GQAV/GQE only those GQ records indicating it was an added GQ were extracted. Using the GQ type category, the number of GQs added during GQAV/GQE by GQ type category could be determined.

7. What was the status of GQs at the time of enumeration (i.e., how many GQs had residents, how many GQs were vacant, how many GQs were duplicated, nonresidential, or did not exist)?

Methodology and Source: The 2010 Census Final Enumeration MTdb Extract was used to determine the status of GQs at the time of enumeration. The unit status for the GQ record was
used to determine whether the GQ was a duplicate, or did not exist. Additionally, the vacant status for the GQ record was used to determine whether the GQ was vacant or had residents at the time of enumeration.

8. What was the demographic/characteristic distribution of persons enumerated during GQE considering age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin for each person?

Methodology and Source: The demographic/characteristic distribution of persons enumerated during GQE was taken from the DRF for data defined persons on GQE forms. The age and date of birth were used to produce a calculated age. Using the calculated age, each person was assigned to an age category, under five years, five to nine years, 10 to 14 years, etc. For the Race and Hispanic Origin coding, write-in variables (corresponding to write-in fields on questionnaires) and non-write-in variables (corresponding to the different checkboxes on questionnaires) were used to determine the Race and Hispanic Origin of persons enumerated during GQE. Additionally, for Race or Hispanic Origin the following was determined:

- a single checkbox marked for Race or Hispanic Origin,
- both checkbox indicated and write-in completed for Race or Hispanic Origin,
- only write-in for Race or Hispanic Origin, or
- neither checkbox marked or write-in completed for Race or Hispanic Origin

The values for sex were used to assign the person to a sex category, that is, either male or female. The following sex categories were assigned:

- “Both Checkbox and Write-in” assigned when both male and female were indicated
- “Missing” assigned if neither male or female was indicated

Reinterview

9. How many cases were selected for Random Reinterview (RI)?

Methodology and Source: This question was answered by DSSD through the analysis of information data captured on the completed GQE Reinterview Forms, D-941 (GQE) that were received at the NPC.

10. What percentage of the production cases were random RI?

Methodology and Source: Due to performance issues realized with the PBOCS, this question cannot be answered as asked.

11. How many cases were selected for supplemental RI?

Methodology and Source: This question was answered by DSSD through the analysis of information data captured on the completed GQE Reinterview Forms, D-941 (GQE) that were received at the NPC.
12. What percentage of the production cases were supplemental RI?

Methodology and Source: Due to performance issues realized with the PBOCS, this question cannot be answered as asked.

13. What percentages of the random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,” “Soft-fail,” “Hard-fail,” and “Unable to Contact”?

Methodology and Source: This question was answered by DSSD through the analysis of information data captured on the completed GQE Reinterview Forms, D-941 (GQE) that were received at the NPC.

14. What percentages of the supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,” “Soft-fail,” “Hard-fail,” and “Unable to Contact”?

Methodology and Source: This question was answered by DSSD through the analysis of information data captured on the completed GQE Reinterview Forms, D-941 (GQE) that were received at the NPC.

**Military Enumeration**

15. Was collecting the building number on the enumeration record effective for counting people at the correct military structure?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with Census Bureau HQ staff.

16. Did census Staff experience any issues with coordinating the enumeration with the military installation POC?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.

17. What documents did the military representatives find most useful in preparing the military installation POCs for the upcoming 2010 Census?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.

18. What kind of issues did the military POCs have in contacting the census POCs?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.
19. What procedure requests were made by the military and how were these requests implemented?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the CJSWG meeting minutes.

20. What were the main security concerns of the military branches and how were these issues resolved?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the CJSWG meeting minutes.

21. How effective was the CJSWG in communicating the Census Bureau needs to the military installation POCs?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with Census Bureau HQ staff and from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.

22. Did the procedures for enumerating military personnel go to a high enough level of the military? If not, at what level should the procedures be sent to and how much detail should be provided to the higher ranking officials?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with Census Bureau HQ staff and from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.

23. Were there issues regarding residency rules for the stateside military? If yes, then what were the primary issues?

Methodology and Source: Data were collected from the lessons learned debriefing with Census Bureau HQ staff and from the lessons learned debriefing with the CJSWG.

4. Limitations

4.1 Paper Based Operation Control System (PBOCS)

The PBOCS experienced several functionality and performance issues, such as: producing inconsistent data across reports, unexpected downtime, and performance and load difficulties. The latter resulted in finally suspending the 2010 Census GQE work on PBOCS prior to the planned completion date. Once the GQE operation was suspended, the contingency plan was implemented for securely closing out the GQE operation via the use of the ATAC system and using the NPC as a satellite LCO.

Suspending GQE work on PBOCS resulted in:

- about 300 GQs cases not being selected for RI,
- a conflict with the number of GQs cases checked-in from the field and checked-out to the NPC,
• the development of contingency instructions required for the LCOs to ship GQE materials (ICRs, MCRs, and maps) to the NPC,
• the reconfiguration of ATAC to accommodate the alternative contingency plan to receive GQs cases from the field (ATAC was designed to process Domestic Violence Shelter GQ cases and military/maritime vessel cases only), and
• the NPC staff having to develop an ICR/MCR to GQ ID linkage file for the DRIS and DSPO.

Census Bureau HQ staff traveled to the NPC to reconcile GQE work shipped from the LCOs and to ensure GQ cases were data captured via the ATAC and DRIS.

4.2 Cost and Progress Reports

Data obtained to generate the DMD C&P reports for the 2010 Census GQE operation were derived from sources including the PBOCS and the DAPPS. However, report data from these sources did not always yield consistent information. This was in part due to functionality and performance issues with the PBOCS.

4.3 Budget and Costs

The cost results presented in this assessment were generated by program office staff using methods predating the U.S. Census Bureau’s commitment to comply with the Government Accountability Office’s cost estimating guidelines and the Society of Cost Estimating and Analysis’ best practices. Hence, while the Census Bureau believes these cost results are accurate and will meet the needs for which they will be used, the methods used for estimating costs of 2010 Census operations may not meet all of these guidelines and best practices. The Census Bureau will adhere to these guidelines in producing 2020 Census cost estimates.

5. Results

This assessment documents how well the operation was implemented and documents results to be used for historical and informational purposes. Additionally, it provides recommendations and best practices that can be used during the next planning cycle to support the 2020 Census GQE operation.

Data from the 2010 Census GQE operation are documented for defined group quarters types, added group quarters, the address status of group quarters at the time of enumeration, a comparison of population counts, and the distribution of demographic characteristics. In addressing these major components, the methodology and data sources used for each of the specific assessment questions are provided in this report.

In the following analysis, all GQs in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are included in the summary statistics in this assessment. State-by-state breakdowns of the GQ population by specific GQ types will be provided where applicable.
5.1 What was the: a) distribution of GQs by size of population and GQ type category (Stateside/Puerto Rico) and b) What were the GQ population counts by state by GQ type category?

Table 6 provides the distribution of GQs by size of population and GQ type category. These counts are the final tabulation of persons in GQs by the various GQ type categories for stateside and Puerto Rico. Overall, there were 8,025,278 people tabulated in 166,827 group quarters in the 2010 Census. The number of people tabulated in the 2010 Census differs from the number provided for the demographic characteristic distribution for data defined persons on GQE forms included in the final 2010 Census due mainly to different data sources used to produce the results to the respective assessment questions. The demographic characteristic results were based on data from a pre-processing file (Decennial Response File) which was the standard file used to produce demographic characteristic assessments that were part of the 2010 Census Program for Evaluations and Experiments while data results for this assessment question were based on a final-processing file (Census Edited File). See Appendix P of this report for a breakdown of the GQ population counts by state and Puerto Rico by GQ type category.

Of the 8,025,278 people tabulated in GQs in the 2010 Census:

- As in Census 2000\(^7\), the three GQs types with the most people in the 2010 Census were: College/University Student Housing (2,523,971 or 31.45 percent), Correctional Facilities for Adults (2,276,581 or 28.37 percent), and Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities (1,508,081 or 18.79 percent). In addition to the three GQ types with the most people in Census 2000 and the 2010 Census, Shelters and Service-based locations contributed a significant amount of people with 422,972 or 5.27 percent.

- The four GQ types with the least number of people (where the population was greater than zero) were: Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters (26 or 0.00 percent), Military/Maritime Vessels (51,864 or 0.65 percent), Residential Schools for People with Disabilities (9,730 or 0.12 percent) and Hospitals and In-Patient Hospices (70,966 or 0.88 percent).

\(^7\) Persons enumerated in the Group Quarters Population in Census 2000: Colleges and Universities (2,066,302 or 26.4 percent), Correctional Facilities (1,993,302 or 25.5 percent), and Nursing Homes (1,727,811 or 22.1 percent).
Table 6: Population of Group Quarters by Group Quarters Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of GQs</th>
<th>Group Quarters Count*</th>
<th>Group Quarters Percent of Total†</th>
<th>Population Count*</th>
<th>Population Percent of Total‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total......................................</td>
<td>166,827</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8,025,278</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing...........</td>
<td>27,926</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>2,523,971</td>
<td>31.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults ..........</td>
<td>12,308</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>2,276,581</td>
<td>28.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes Intended for Adults..............</td>
<td>40,354</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>307,129</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals** and In Patient Hospices .......</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>70,966</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities..........................</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>152,745</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters...........................</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>288,812</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels.................</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>51,864</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities.....</td>
<td>21,758</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>1,508,081</td>
<td>18.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Group Quarters and Domestic Violence Shelters</td>
<td>10,548</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>100,888</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults...</td>
<td>8,199</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>142,406</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service-based locations......</td>
<td>18,527</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>422,972</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>12,454</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>169,107</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
†Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
‡Hospitals include GQs that were mental or psychiatric hospitals, the mental or psychiatric unit or floor for long term care at a regular hospital or hospitals that accept patients with no disposition.
Source: 2010 Census Edited File (CEF).
Overall, there was approximately a 13.2 percent decrease in the enumeration of GQs counts (166,827) compared to the Census 2000 enumeration of GQs counts (192,286). The percent change in the number of GQs enumerated in the 2010 Census and Census 2000 was calculated using the following formula:
5.2 How many residents filled out their forms themselves and how many forms were filled out by other means?

For each of the forms completed, the enumerator was instructed to indicate how the form was filled out by marking the appropriate box to the “Answered by” question on the back of the form. The enumerator was to either check the “Respondent” box or the “Other” box for this question. If the enumerator checked the “Respondent” box that indicated that the respondent filled out the questionnaire or the questionnaire was filled out by the enumerator interviewing the respondent. On the other hand, if the enumerator checked the “Other” box that indicated the form was completed by other means, that is, through the use of administrative records or personal knowledge of the GQ contact person. This question was only applicable to the ICR form, a contrast from Census 2000. In Census 2000, this question applied not only to ICR forms but also to MCR and SCR forms. See Figure 1 below for the “Answered by” question.

Table 7: Comparison of Select Group Quarters Type Categories Between Census 2000 and the 2010 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Type Category</th>
<th>Persons Enumerated*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing…………………</td>
<td>2,066,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults ……</td>
<td>1,993,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Homes and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>1,727,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts are unweighted.
†Percentages do not sum to 100.
Source: CEF for 2010 Census and Group Quarters Enumeration Report for Census 2000

Figure 1: “Answered By” Question on the ICR

The results for this question are based on a subset of data contained in the CUF; therefore, due to a different data source used to produce these data the numbers presented here are different from those presented in questions 5.1 and 5.8. Table 8 shows the results of how GQs questionnaires were filled out. For those questionnaires filled out by other means, it could not be determined from the data.
provided what percentage were filled out using administrative records compared to those filled out using the personal knowledge of the GQ contact person. There were a total of 7,591,135 ICRs where the response to the “Answered by” question fell into the following categories:

- Respondent filled out form him/herself
- Form filled out using administrative data or GQ contact person’s knowledge
- Blank or invalid response

Of these 7,591,135 ICRs:

- About five percent of the forms had a blank or invalid response for the “Answered by” question.
- Most (about 64 percent) of the forms were filled out using administrative data or through the use of the GQ contact’s own knowledge.
- About 31 percent of the forms were filled out by the respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,591,135</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ Contact filled out form using administrative data or personal knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,857,410</td>
<td>63.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent filled form him/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,326,292</td>
<td>30.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank or invalid response</td>
<td></td>
<td>407,433</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
+Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Note: Totals are only applicable to ICRs.
Source: 2010 Census Unedited File (CUF).

Table 9 shows the distribution of how GQ questionnaires were filled out by type of GQs. The distribution by type of GQs showed:

- The use of administrative data or personal knowledge of the GQ contact person complete the questionnaires was the means most frequently used at most GQ types.
  - The three GQ types that most likely used administrative data to complete the questionnaires were:
    - Hospital and In Patient Hospices (89.99 percent)
    - Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities (89.12 percent)
    - Residential Schools for People with Disabilities (88.78 percent)

Although it could not be determined from the data provided the number of questionnaires filled out by administrative records versus the personal knowledge of the GQ contact person, large GQs such as
nursing and skill nursing facilities and correctional facilities for adults more than likely used administrative records to fill out questionnaires. For GQs with a small number of residents such as a small group home, it could have been possible to use personal knowledge to fill out questionnaires.

- The three GQ types where respondents filled out most of the ICRs completed were:
  - Military GQs (71.61 percent)
  - College/University Student Housing (60.57 percent)
  - Shelters and Service-based locations (50.13 percent)

Respondents staying in military GQs were supposed to fill out MCRs. However, 1,842 ICRs were inadvertently included with MCR packets and distributed to respondents in military GQs for completion. Of the 1,842 ICRs distributed to respondents in military GQs, respondents of military GQs completed about 72 percent.
### Table 9: How GQ Questionnaires Were Filled Out by Group Quarters Type Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Category</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>How ICRs Were Filled Out</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Blank or Invalid Response</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,591,135</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,326,292</td>
<td>30.64</td>
<td>4,857,410</td>
<td>63.99</td>
<td>407,433</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td>2,514,624</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,523,182</td>
<td>60.57</td>
<td>869,700</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td>121,742</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults</td>
<td>2,233,388</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>230,129</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1,803,812</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>199,447</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes Intended for Adults</td>
<td>302,366</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>55,868</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>237,859</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>8,639</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>70,494</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>63,435</td>
<td>89.99</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>146,272</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>23,416</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>118,368</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Group Quarters</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>71.61</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>1,473,047</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>132,652</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>1,312,772</td>
<td>89.12</td>
<td>27,623</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs and Domestic Violence Shelters</td>
<td>100,508</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>42,746</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>47,782</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>9,980</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>17,109</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>15,190</td>
<td>88.78</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>143,134</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>44,788</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>93,525</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>4,821</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service-based locations</td>
<td>398,753</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>199,913</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>178,187</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>20,653</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown GQ Type</td>
<td>28,569</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8,337</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>18,482</td>
<td>64.69</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>161,003</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57,473</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>98,032</td>
<td>60.89</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.

†Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Source: 2010 Census Edited File (CUF)
5.3 How did the actual GQ population count compare with the maximum and expected population counts reported from the GQV questionnaire and the GQAV operation?

As part of the GQV operation conducted September 28 through October 23, 2009, the GQ contact person was asked, “What is the maximum number of people who can live or stay here at this address?” The response provided for this question was the maximum population for the GQ. In the GQAV operation conducted February 1, 2010 through March 19, 2010, the GQ contact person was asked to confirm the maximum number of persons since this was pre-filled information on the GQAV interview record. If the pre-filled information for the maximum number of persons changed since GQV, then the crew leader had the opportunity to make corrections during GQAV. This information provided the maximum population for the GQ from the GQAV operation. During the GQAV operation, the GQ contact person was also asked about the expected number of persons for the GQ. This question was asked in various ways depending on the type of GQ. The following provides how this question was asked for the various GQ types:

- Shelters – How many clients do you expect at this shelter daily?
- Soup Kitchens – How many persons do you expect at this meal?
- Targeted Non-Sheltered Outdoor Locations – How many people do you expect at this location on March 31, 2010?
- Military Group Quarters – What is the expected population on April 1, 2010?
- Other Group Quarters – What is the expected population of this facility?

The answer provided for this question from the various GQ types was the expected population. In this section, the expected population will be compared to the maximum population count from GQV/GQAV.

5.3.1 Maximum Population

Table 10 below shows the results of the comparison between the actual population count from the CEF and the maximum population count from GQV/GQAV. For the 166,827 GQs enumerated, about 89 percent (148,159) had a maximum population greater than zero on the GQAV file. For about 43 percent (72,301) the actual population count and the maximum population count was between one and ten while for approximately 22 percent (37,221) of the GQs enumerated there was no difference. Overall, for approximately 66 percent (109,522) of the GQs enumerated the difference between the actual population count and the maximum population count was within 10, that is, between zero and ten.
Table 10: Comparison of Actual Population Count and Maximum Population Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Count</th>
<th>Comparison Category</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ..................</td>
<td></td>
<td>166,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With Population Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No More than 10 ...........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With Population Count Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 ................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With No Difference In Population Counts .....</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs Where No Comparison Could Be Made ..........</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
†Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Source: 2010 Census Edited File (CEF), 2010 Census PBOCS GQAV

5.3.2 Expected Population

The expected population on the GQAV file was greater than zero for about 88 percent (147,114) of the 166,827 GQs enumerated. Table 11 below provides the results of the comparison between the maximum population count from GQV/GQAV and the expected population count from GQAV. For about 24 percent (39,447) of the GQs enumerated, the difference between the maximum population count and the expected population count was between one and ten while for about 49 percent (81,375) of the GQs enumerated there was no difference between the maximum population count and the expected population count. Overall, for about 72 percent (120,822) of the GQs enumerated the difference between the maximum population count and the expected population count was within ten, that is, between zero and ten. These two findings indicated that the maximum population obtained during GQV/GQAV was a good predictor of the expected population on Census Day for GQs.
5.4 How many persons were added to GQs from Be Counted Forms?

There were persons who were enumerated on BCFs who indicated that they had no usual home elsewhere. These persons were asked to indicate where they resided on Census Day such as city, state, county or any appropriate address information. The addresses for these cases were included in the Non-ID\(^9\) process for possible assignment of a state and county code. An attempt was first made to allocate\(^{10}\) these BCF persons to SBE GQs. If there were no SBE GQs within the county then the BCF person was allocated to another GQ type within the county using a hierarchy for this assignment.

Table 12 provides the number of persons added to GQs from BCFs by GQ category. There were 26,975 persons added to 7,737 GQs from BCFs. As expected, a majority of the persons from BCFs were counted at Shelters and Service-based locations, that is, approximately 80 percent (21,681). Approximately 12 percent (3,197) of the BCF persons were allocated to a GQ where the type of GQ was unknown. Most of the other GQ categories had less than one percent of persons from BCFs allocated to it with the exception of Correctional Facilities for Adults and Residential Treatment Centers for Adults.

\(^{9}\)See Alberti 2010. “DSSD 2010 Decennial Census Memorandum Series #A-04R: Customer Requirements for the 2010 Decennial Census Non-ID Processing” for more information on the Non-ID processing.

\(^{10}\)See Barrett 2010. “DSSD 2010 Decennial Census Memorandum Series #A-01R1, 2010 Census Non-ID Records: Specifications for the Disposition of Group Quarters Usual Home Elsewhere and Be Counted Forms With No Usual Home Elsewhere and the Geographic Allocation of Be Counted Forms – Revised”.

---

Table 11: Comparison of Maximum Population Count and Expected Population Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Count Comparison Category</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total …………………………………………</td>
<td>166,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With No Difference In Population Counts ……</td>
<td>81,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With Population Difference</td>
<td>No More than 10……………….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs Where No Comparison Could Be Made …….</td>
<td>25,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQs With Population Count Difference</td>
<td>More than 10 …………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
+Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Source: 2010 Census PBOCS GQAV
### Table 12: Persons Added to Group Quarters from Be Counted Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Category</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,975</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes Intended for Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>882</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals** and In Patient Hospices</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service-based locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,681</td>
<td>80.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown GQ Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.

†Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

**Hospitals include GQs that were mental or psychiatric hospitals, the mental or psychiatric unit or floor for long term care at a regular hospital or hospitals that accept patients with no disposition.

Source: The Be Counted Form Geographic Allocation Results file (Decennial Systems Processing Office)
5.5 How many questionnaires reported a Usual Home Elsewhere (by GQ type)?

The ICRs and SCRs permitted an address to be reported, however only certain types of GQs were eligible for the UHE to be processed and used. These UHE eligible GQ types were: Hospitals and In Patient Hospices, Maritime/Merchant Vessels, Military Ships, Regularly Scheduled Mobile Food Vans, Religious Group Quarters, Residential Treatment Centers for Adults, Soup Kitchens, and Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers. Unlike Census 2000, persons assigned to military GQs were not given the option to claim a UHE in the 2010 Census.

Table 13 provides the distribution of persons who indicated that they had a UHE by type of GQ. The data presented below are only for those eligible questionnaires where “No” was marked on the ICR for the question, “Do you live or stay in this facility MOST OF THE TIME”. For the SCR data for the questionnaires marked “Yes” to the question, “Do you have a house, apartment, or mobile home where you usually stay when off duty?” are included below. Overall, there were 150,562 questionnaires with a reported UHE. Of these eligible questionnaires, persons from service-based locations (70,594) and Military/Maritime Vessels (57,209) accounted for the largest number of questionnaires reporting a UHE. Persons at Hospitals and In Patient Hospitals (855) and Religious Group Quarters (1,456) contributed the least to the number of questionnaires reporting a UHE.

---

11 For more information on military GQs, see Ciango, A, De Vos, B, and Williams, A. “2010 Census Military Enumeration Assessment Study Plan,” DSSD 2010 Decennial Census Memorandum Series #O-C-12, June 2, 2011.
### Table 13: Usual Home Elsewhere (UHE) Reported on Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Category</th>
<th>Usual Home Elsewhere (UHE)</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total........................................</td>
<td>150,562</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals** and In-Patient Hospices ....</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels ...............</td>
<td>57,209</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Group Quarters..................</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>11,199</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Based Locations ..................</td>
<td>70,594</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.

** Hospitals include GQs that were mental or psychiatric hospitals, the mental or psychiatric unit or floor for long term care at a regular hospital or hospitals that accept patients with no disposition.

†Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Source: DRF
5.6 How many GQs were added during GQAV and GQE (by type)?

During the GQAV/GQE operations, field staff were allowed to add new GQs and make corrections to existing GQs. GQs were also added from other operations such as: Remote Alaska and Rural Update Enumerate (RA/RUE), SBE, and SHB. These added GQs were part of the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration Address Updates.

Table 14 shows the number of GQs that were added during GQAV/GQE by GQs type category. There were 18,818 GQs added during GQAV/GQE. Shelters and Service-based locations accounted for the largest number (7,332 or 39 percent) of GQs added during GQAV/GQE. GQs from College/University Student Housing (2,864 or 15 percent) and Group Homes Intended for Adults (2,725 or 14 percent) contributed to a large number of GQs added during GQAV/GQE. With the exception of Correctional Facilities for Adults (1,191 or six percent) and Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities (1,072 or six percent), the other GQs type categories each accounted for less than 1,000 (or less than five percent) GQs added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Category</th>
<th>Added Group Quarters</th>
<th>Count*</th>
<th>Percent of Total^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total ...................................................................</td>
<td>18,818</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing ..........................</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults ............................</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes Intended for Adults ................................</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals* and In Patient Hospices ............................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities ................................................</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters ..........</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters ..................................................</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels ........................................</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities .......................</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs and Domestic Violence Shelters ...............</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities ...........</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults ....................</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service-based locations .......................</td>
<td>7,332</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown GQ Type ....................................................</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers .......</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
**Hospitals include GQs that were mental or psychiatric hospitals, the mental or psychiatric unit or floor for long term care at a regular hospital or hospitals that accept patients with no disposition.
^Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Source: 2010 GQE Address Update File
5.7 What was the status of GQs at the time of enumeration (i.e., how many GQs had residents, how many GQs were vacant, how many GQs were duplicated, nonresidential, or did not exist)?

Table 15 provides the results of the status of GQs at the time of enumeration. There were 242,693 GQs where the status at the time of enumeration could be determined. In particular, a determination could be made as to whether these GQs were occupied or were vacant at the time of enumeration. Of these 242,693 GQs, 199,299 or approximately 82 percent of these GQs had residents at the time of enumeration. There were 43,381 or approximately 18 percent vacant GQs at the time of enumeration. Additionally, nine GQs did not exist at the time of enumeration while four were found to be duplicates. For those cases that had a status of did not exist or duplicate, this was the action taken by the enumerator. One reason for the low number of GQs that did not exist or were found to be duplicates during GQE is attributed to the implementation of and output from the GQV operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>199,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>43,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Exist</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counts and percentages are unweighted.
+Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Source: 2010 Census Final Tabulation MTdb Extract

5.8 What was the demographic/characteristic distribution of persons enumerated during GQE (considering age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin for each person)?

There were 8,022,940 data defined persons within GQs included in the 2010 Census. This section will present the demographic characteristics for these persons on the GQE form. Since the Military Enumeration, Shipboard Enumeration, and Service-Based Enumerations are components of the GQE, persons enumerated during those specific enumerations are included in these demographic distributions. Tables 16 through 19 gives GQE person demographic characteristics: age, Hispanic origin, race, and sex. Age was calculated based on the date of birth provided; if no date of birth was provided then the write-in-age was used. Age was calculated only if the date of birth fell within valid date ranges. Similarly, the calculated age or write-in age was used only if it fell within valid age ranges; otherwise it was considered missing.
Because the demographic data used in this assessment are unedited, direct comparisons with published 2010 Census results are not possible. These tables include a row for people with missing values for the specific characteristic. The data in published census reports have undergone editing and imputation, and therefore will have no missing values.

Table 16 gives the distribution of age for each person enumerated during the GQE operation. Persons in the following age groups accounted for those enumerated the most during the GQE: 15 to 19 years (1,560,576 or 19.45 percent), 20 to 24 years (1,615,904 or 20.14 percent), and 65 or older (1,426,586 or 17.78 percent). Persons enumerated in the following age groups each accounted for less than one percent of persons enumerated during the GQE: under 5 years (0.54 percent), 5 to 9 years (0.36 percent), and 10 to 14 years (0.71 percent). Approximately seven percent (6.55 percent) of persons enumerated during the GQE operation were assigned to the “Missing” age group.
Table 16: Standard Assessment Demographic Table for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>43,724</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>28,629</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>56,995</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>1,560,576</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>1,615,904</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>541,612</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>438,186</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>374,451</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>360,660</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>359,608</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>300,479</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>221,216</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>169,170</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>1,426,586</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>525,144</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,022,940</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRF (2010)

Table 17 shows the distribution of Hispanic origin for each person enumerated during the GQE operation. Most (66.04 percent) of the persons enumerated during the GQE operation indicated that they were not of Hispanic or Latino origin. Of those marking a single checkbox for the Hispanic origin, those persons indicating that they were Mexican (4.54 percent) occurred more frequently compared to those indicating that they were Puerto Rican, Cuban, or of another Hispanic origin. Most of the persons enumerated during the GQE operation marked a single box for the Hispanic origin while less than one percent (0.14 percent) marked multiple checkboxes for this demographic characteristic. Approximately 25 percent (24.75 percent) of the forms did not have Hispanic origin indicated.
### Table 17: Standard Assessment Demographic Table for Hispanic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Checkbox and Write-in</td>
<td>136,547</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban checkbox only</td>
<td>22,255</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican checkbox only</td>
<td>364,359</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1,986,004</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple checkboxes</td>
<td>10,990</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino checkbox only</td>
<td>5,298,683</td>
<td>66.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Hispanic checkbox only</td>
<td>92,054</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican checkbox only</td>
<td>103,457</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-in Only</td>
<td>8,591</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,022,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRF (2010)

Table 18 provides the distribution of race for each person enumerated during the GQE operation. Most of the forms had only one race indicated while almost one percent (0.91 percent) had multiple checkboxes marked for race that is persons associated themselves with more than one race. Those persons indicating that they were “White” (54.16 percent) or “Black or African American” (19.91 percent) accounted for the most among the single race categories. About 18 percent (18.01 percent) of persons enumerated during the GQE operation did not indicate a race on the forms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native checkbox alone</td>
<td>37,339</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian checkbox alone</td>
<td>30,372</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American checkbox alone</td>
<td>1,597,655</td>
<td>19.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Checkbox and Write-in</td>
<td>269,846</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese checkbox alone</td>
<td>59,926</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino checkbox alone</td>
<td>33,183</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro checkbox alone</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese checkbox alone</td>
<td>13,349</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean checkbox alone</td>
<td>32,398</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1,444,920</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple checkboxes</td>
<td>72,975</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian checkbox alone</td>
<td>5,936</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian checkbox alone</td>
<td>12,555</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander checkbox alone</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race checkbox alone</td>
<td>26,917</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan checkbox alone</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese checkbox alone</td>
<td>13,387</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White checkbox alone</td>
<td>4,345,164</td>
<td>54.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-in Only</td>
<td>20,147</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,022,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRF (2010)
Table 19 gives the distribution of sex for each person enumerated during the GQE operation. There were more males (4,738,277 or 59.06 percent) enumerated than females (3,046,113 or 37.97 percent) in GQs in the 2010 Census. A small number of the forms had both male and female indicated for sex. Approximately three percent (2.96 percent) of the forms did not have sex indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,046,113</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,738,277</td>
<td>59.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>237,680</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total</td>
<td>8,022,940</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRF (2010)

These distributions may vary across different census operations due to differences in corresponding populations and census procedures.

5.9 How many GQE cases were selected for Random RI?

There were 9,219 GQE reinterview cases. Of these cases, 8,927 had a RI outcome code of either “pass,” “soft fail,” “hard fail,” “unable to contact,” or “no final outcome.”

5.10 What percentages of the production GQE cases were eligible for Random RI?

This question cannot be answered as asked because of RI being cancelled prior to the completion of the operation due to issues with PBOCS. Also, the exact number of eligible production cases could not be produced with the data at hand. That is, the data did not delineate eligible GQ cases based on GQ types, cases completed by a CL or cases that were classified as “management attention.” These cases were considered ineligible for RI.

5.11 How many GQE cases were selected for Supplemental RI?

There were 101 cases selected for Supplemental RI. This number represents 1.09 percent of the total 9,219 cases that were selected for RI.

5.12 What percentage of the production GQE cases were eligible for Supplemental RI?

This question cannot be answered as asked as a result of RI being cancelled prior to the completion of the operation due to issues with PBOCS. Also, the exact number of eligible production cases could not be produced with the data at hand. That is, the data did not delineate eligible GQ cases based on GQ types, cases completed by a CL or cases that were classified as “management attention.” These cases were considered ineligible for RI.
5.13 What percentages of the Random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,” “Soft Fail,” “Hard Fail,” and “Unable to Contact?”

- A total of 90.0 percent (8,294) of the Random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,”
- A total of 3.3 percent (301) of the Random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Soft Fail,”
- A total of 0.01 percent (1) of the Random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Hard Fail,”
- A total of 2.8 percent (251) of the Random RI cases received a final outcome code of “Unable to Contact,” and
- A total of 4.0 percent (366) of the Random RI cases had no final outcome code.

5.14 What percentages of the Supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,” “Soft Fail,” “Hard Fail,” and “Unable to Contact”?  

- A total of 93.1 percent (94) of the Supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Pass,”
- A total of 1.98 percent (2) of the Supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Soft Fail,”
- A total of 0 percent (0) of the Supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Hard Fail,”
- A total of 0.99 percent (1) of the Supplemental RI cases received a final outcome code of “Unable to Contact,” and
- A total of 3.96 percent (4) of the Supplemental RI cases had no final outcome code.

Quality assurance was an integral part of the GQE operation. Reinterview was conducted with the GQ contact person to verify the enumerator’s work that is whether or not the enumerator visited the correct facility at the correct address and if the ICR was collected as instructed.

In selecting the RI sample, the PBOCS was designed to flag 10 percent of the eligible GQs completed. The first eligible GQ checked-in was selected and then every tenth eligible GQ checked-in afterward.

For supplemental RI, the AMQA selected enumerators for RI and then used the PBOCS to select one or more eligible cases within the enumerator’s work assignments. The AMQA used supplemental RI for enumerators they suspected of falsification or of not following proper procedures (DSSD Quality Profile, F-47, July 21, 2011).

The initial RI contact was made by office clerks under the supervision of the AMQA. The clerk telephoned the GQ contact person (or another spokesperson if the contact person was unavailable) and determined if the enumerator conducted the GQ interview correctly by asking the contact person predetermined questions on the GQE RI Form D-941 (GQE). See Appendix K.
Table 20 shows that of the 9,219 total GQE RI cases 96.8 percent (8,927) of GQE cases were selected for Random RI. The total number of eligible cases cannot be provided in part due to suspending GQE RI as a result of performance issues realized with the PBOCS. Table 20 also shows that there were 101 cases (0.01 percent) selected for Supplemental RI.

Each case that underwent RI, Random or Supplemental, received a RI outcome shown in Table 20 below.

Table 20: Reinterview Outcomes for Stateside and Puerto Rico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Selected for Random RI Outcomes</th>
<th>Cases Selected for Supplemental RI</th>
<th>Cases with No Sample Type*</th>
<th>Total RI Cases</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total..................................</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Fail</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Fail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Contact</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Final Outcome</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages include both random and supplemental GQE cases. Percentages for supplemental RI were not calculated since there were only a few cases. Instead, percentages were calculated for the combined random RI and supplemental RI GQE cases.

*GQE cases with no sample type include blank RI forms.

**Military Enumeration**

5.15 Was collecting the building number on the enumeration record effective for counting people at the correct structure?

Yes, collecting building number on the enumeration record did assist in counting people at the correct structure. Barrack name and number was also asked for on the MCR and by having this information on both Form D-325, Enumeration Record and on the MCR, it helped in resolving issues with MCRs missing a GQ ID.

5.16 Did Census Bureau staff experience any issues with coordinating the enumeration with the military installation POC?

The main issues that census staff had with coordinating enumeration with military installation POCs were, gaining an accurate list of military installation POCs, turnover of military installation POCs, and contacting the correct POC at the military installation.

The Census Bureau asked the CJSWG members, in the CJSWG meeting held on October 28, 2008, to provide a list of military installation POCs for each of the military services by January 1, 2009. These lists were needed before the end of January 2009 so that the ELCOs could make the agreed upon 60-day advance phone call to the military installation POCs for the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation. These lists were then used for all of the 2010 Census operations.
The U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard delivered their list prior to January 26, 2009. This allowed the ELCOs to contact their installations in time for the 60-day advance phone call. The remaining services delivered their military installation POC lists after both the initial phone call and the second phone call was to be made, which was March 9, 2009. The U.S. Air Force delivered their military installation POC list on March 11, 2009. The U.S. Marine Corps delivered their installation POC list on March 26, 2009. The U.S. Army delivered their military installation POC list on April 23, 2009, which was two weeks after the 2010 Census Address Canvassing Operation started.

The late deliveries of the military installation POC lists slowed down the coordination of the listing of military installations. Without a military installation POC list, ELCOs had to find the military installation POCs for their areas on their own and scramble resources so that they could complete the listing of military installations on time. On numerous occasions, the ELCOs contacted the RCCs to see if the RCCs had a military installation POC from the American Community Survey (ACS) that they could use. The ELCOs contacted Census Bureau HQ when they were unable to find a military installation POC. In these cases, the ELCOs contacted the FLD at Census Bureau HQ, who then contacted the primary military contact for the DMD, who then contacted the primary contact at the DMDC, who then contacted the military branch’s representative of the CJSWG, who then contacted the military installation to see who should represent their installation as the military installation POC. This process was inefficient and time consuming. Significant time could have been saved if the ELCOs had a complete list of military installation POCs.

Once the ELCOs received the military installation POC lists, they became outdated rather quickly due to changes in installation personnel. The CJSWG expected this turnover, which is why the procedures asked the ELCOs to call the military installations 60 days and 30 days in advance. These phone calls helped to resolve turnover issues prior to the start of the operation in most cases. One recommendation that may resolve this issue is to ask for the military installation POC office number along with the POC phone number. This would provide the ELCOs and LCOs with another contact number at the installation in case the individual assigned as POC leaves.

Some military installations had multiple military installation POCs because the installation was a joint installation. Often the Census Bureau only had one military installation POC for the installation on its list and that military installation POC was unable to help in the enumeration/listing of the other service’s living quarters. Several times the ELCO/LCO did not know that there were multiple military branches on the installation until late in the enumeration/listing process. In these instances, the ELCO/LCOs had to scramble to find a military installation POC for the newly discovered military branch. Once a military installation POC was established for the newly discovered military branch a couple steps had to be undertaken. First, the ELCO/LCO had to update the new military installation POC on the status of the operation. Then the military installation POC had to go through his/her channels to verify with higher ranking officials that the Census Bureau was conducting operations on his/her installation and that he/she had to support these operations. This process was time consuming and often these instances happened near the end of the operations.

Another issue with military installation POCs is that some installations provided a military installation POC for each GQ on the installation. This slowed the process down because it led to multiple contacts for the installation.
5.17 What documents did the military representatives find most useful in preparing the installation POCs for the upcoming 2010 Census?

The military representatives reported that they found the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” to be useful and that it should be used in future censuses.

The “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” document included an overview of the importance of the 2010 Census along with general agreed upon procedures, summaries of each of the operations (including operation specific procedures for the military installation POCs), and a schedule listing the 60 and 30-day advance phone calls along with the operational start and end dates. The Census Bureau asked that the military representatives distribute the document on November 21, 2008. There was one update made to the document after the 2010 Census had started and those changes reflected two procedure changes. During Address Canvassing several military installations felt that the procedure of collecting map spots on military installations could pose a national security risk. On May 20, 2009 the Census Bureau agreed to discontinue the process of collecting map spots on military installations. The second procedure change was to limit the amount of information collected on the Form BC-1759, Special Sworn Status. Military personnel did not feel that they needed to provide personal information such as social security number and personal phone number since they were representing the U.S. military. These procedures were changed so that the individuals only had to provide office contact information in case a discrepancy was found during the enumeration/listing. The change to the procedures for map spot collecting and the reduction of personal information asked for on the Form BC-1759, Special Sworn Status were sent to the military representatives with an addendum to the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” on August 7, 2009.

5.18 What kind of issues did the military installation POCs have in contacting the census POCs?

Military installation POCs had trouble contacting census POCs at times due to turnover in the census ELCOs. During Address Canvassing the Census Bureau provided the military with a list of census POCs and their office phone number. There were several reports of military installation POCs being unable to reach the census POC after several attempts. When this happened, the following steps were used to resolve the issue:

1. The military installation POCs contacted their military representatives
2. The military representative contacted the Census Bureau liaison
3. The Census Bureau liaison provided the military representative with an updated census POC for the ELCO.

After the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation, a lessons learned session was conducted with military representatives and this was brought up as an area that needed to be improved. An updated census POC list was provided prior to the 2010 Census GQV operation and there were no other reported issues of military installation POCs having difficulties in contacting the census POCs. After the 2010 Census GQV operation, a Census POC list was put together that provided a census POC, their individual office number and an LCO office number for each of the LCOs. The military
installation POC was asked to try the census POC number and if that number went unanswered then to use the LCO office number.

5.19 What procedure requests were made by the military and how were these requests implemented?

The special procedures that the military representatives asked for pertaining to the listing/enumeration of military installations were documented in the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” document. These instructions were also described in the CL, enumerator, and lister manuals provided by FLD for each of the 2010 Census operations.

Census POCs were instructed to contact the military installation POC with a 60-day and 30-day advance phone call prior to each operation. These advance phone calls were put in place so that the issues involving contacting and establishing POCs for the military installations could be resolved prior to the start of the operations. These phone calls allowed the census POCs and the military installation POCs to discuss and go over the procedures for the upcoming operation. Lastly the 30-day advance phone call was used to review the operation workload, to set up the correct number of escorts needed and to set up a listing/enumeration time.

Out of concern for national security, census employees were required to have a military escort at all times unless instructed by the military installation POC. Another request was that census employees were required to provide vehicle registration, driver’s license, proof of insurance and photo identification before a vehicle could be taken on a military installation.

Some installations did not allow cell phones to be taken onto the military installation. In these cases, census employees were asked to leave the cell phone at the check point. When cell phones were allowed on installations, census employees were not allowed to use the cell phones while driving even if they had a hands free device.

Cameras were not allowed on any installations. If a census employee had a cell phone with a camera, the installation decided if it could be carried or was checked in at the check point. In all cases, photos were not allowed to be taken while on the military installations.

The military installation POCs provided a list of things that census employees were allowed to do while on the installation; these instructions were installation specific.

Military representatives asked that the census employees distinguish themselves so that military personnel on the installation would know that they were census employees. This concern arose due to situation that came up during the 2008 Dress Rehearsal when a census employee and a military escort knocked on a door where a spouse was deployed to a war zone. The spouse that answered the door thought she was receiving bad news. In response to this, the Census Bureau agreed to wear fluorescent orange vests, which had ‘Census Bureau’ written on both the front and back of the vest to help with identification.
5.20 What were the main security concerns and how were these issues resolved?

The CJSWG members developed procedures prior to the start of the 2010 Census to address security concerns. Those procedures were that census employees must have a military escort at all times unless instructed by the military installation POC, restricted areas were off limits, no cameras were allowed on installations, and depending on the installation, cell phones were not allowed. These general security measures were described in the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” that was distributed to the military installation POCs prior to the start of the 2010 Census.

The biggest security concern during the 2010 Census Military Enumeration was not discovered during the development of the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” but during the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation. The procedures for 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation were summarized in the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census.” In this document, it stated that during the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation the Census Bureau would use a hand held computer (HHC) which would provide Global Position System (GPS) functionality to assist the census worker when they collected map spots and made updates to the maps. However, during the 2010 Census Address Canvassing operation several military installations felt that the procedure of collecting map spots on military installations could pose a national security risk. These installations halted all Address Canvassing listing on their installations and notified their higher ranking officials. The higher ranking officials then contacted the DMDC so that a meeting could be held to discuss the procedure of collecting map spots and why the map spots were needed. A meeting was held, which included representatives from the DMDC and the Census Bureau along with high ranking officials in the U.S. Army. After the meeting, the U.S. Army requested that the collection of map spots on U.S. Army installation be discontinued and that all map spots collected be removed from census records. On May 20, 2009 the Census Bureau agreed to discontinue the process of collecting map spots on military installations for the entire 2010 Census and future census survey and operations.

5.21 How effective was the CJSWG in communicating the Census Bureau needs to the installation POCs?

The CJSWG was effective in communicating the Census Bureau needs to the installation POCs. However they had to overcome several major obstacles. Each military service was asked to distribute copies of the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census,” copies of each of the informational questionnaires, an addendum to the procedures document, the “Military Fact Sheet” (see Appendix I), and to spread general information for the upcoming 2010 Census. Each military service had their own procedures for distributing materials to the installations. For some military services this was a fairly simple task, while for other services this was a difficult task due to the structure of their communication network to the installations.

The greatest challenge for distributing the documents is the “trickle down effect.” In some cases it didn’t matter how diligent the military representative or how efficient their communication network to the installation was, the biggest factor of distributing the documents was whether or not the documents were being handed down the line to the correct person on the installation. Distributing census materials to the military installation POCs will always be challenging. The lack of materials
getting to installation POCs was not geographic nor service based, the primary factor affecting distribution seemed to be whether or not someone along the line passed the information to the correct person.

The last challenge of the distribution of census materials was the turnover of the military installation POCs. The military representatives stated that the military installation POCs may be transferred off of the installation without a military installation POC available for them to hand the materials off to. The time between the former military installation POC leaving and the succeeding military installation POC often resulted in a lack of transfer of duties or materials. This at times led to confusion or surprises when the census POC contacted the new military installation POC stating that they would need to gain access to the installation. The turnover and lack of transfer of knowledge about the 2010 Census led to delays in the listing/enumeration of the installations. A recommendation for helping in the distribution of the census materials is to ask that each of the materials contain a military service specific cover page, which would make the material look more official and hopefully in turn, be passed to the correct individuals on the installation.

The distribution of the census materials was a challenge, but the challenges were not as frequent as it would seem. For the most part, the CJSWG members accomplished their goal of communicating Census Bureau’s needs to the installations. There were only a few instances where ELCO/LCOs reported that the military installation POCs did not receive their materials. When the military installation POC did not receive the 2010 census materials, the CJSWG members resolved the issue quickly.

Another challenge that the CJSWG had in communicating Census Bureau needs was that there was turnover amongst the CJSWG members. Some services had a stable group of individuals who participated in the CJSWG for the entire duration of the 2010 Census while other services had a lot of turnover. This turnover lead to more efforts on the Census Bureau to reeducate the CJSWG of the Census Bureau needs.

5.22 Did the procedures for enumerating military personnel go to a high enough level of the military? If not, at what level should the procedures be sent to and how much detail should be provided to the higher ranking officials?

The military representatives in the CJSWG meeting were very helpful in gaining insights into the best ways to list/enumerate military installations. They also did an excellent job in resolving issues for gaining access to installations. However, at times operations on military installations were delayed due to a high ranking official’s concerns about enumeration procedures taking place on the installation. A possible way to avoid these types of issues would be to provide the high ranking officials a copy of a document similar to the “Procedures for Enumerating Military Installations for the 2010 Census” and then have at least one meeting with high ranking military officials to review the document and Census Bureau’s procedures for enumerating military installations prior to 2019. This would hopefully lower the risk of having military installations halting operations due to census procedures.

During the 2010 Census Military Enumeration there were times when enumerators/listers had difficulty in gaining access to a military installation. Some military installation POCs did not feel
that the “Letter of Support” (see Appendix J) from the Department of Defense (DoD) was a sufficient order for them to follow the procedures. During the 2010 Address Canvassing operation the U.S. Army halted all census work on their installations until the Assistant Secretary of the Army wrote a letter of support for 2010 Census operations. During the lessons learned meeting with the CJSWG the military representatives suggested that in the future the Census Bureau work with the DMDC to gain a Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) to cover all Census Bureau activities including current surveys, the ACS and Decennial operations. A DODI would be recognized by all the military services and carries more weight than a letter of support and also does not have an end date.

A letter was sent to the Department of Homeland Security to help in gaining access to U.S. Coast Guard installations. This letter provided an overview of the 2010 Census operations along with the amount of support that the Census Bureau would need on U.S. Coast Guard installations. A letter of support from the Department of Homeland Security was never obtained for the 2010 Census but there were no reports of listers/enumerators having difficulty in gaining access to U.S. Coast Guard installations.

The LCOs that enumerated the non-restricted island areas (America Samoa, Guam, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and Virgin Islands of the United States) were confronted with numerous refusals by the military personnel in filling out their 2010 Census questionnaires. The military personnel cited several reasons for not completing the questionnaires, lack of orders, differing legal residence (e.g. Texas, Florida, etc.) or their intention that Guam not “take credit” for their residence on the island. The primary issue in gaining cooperation with installations in the non-restricted island areas was that the LCO lacked formal orders from the Commander of Joint Region Marianas in allowing them to conduct 2010 Census activities. For future censuses it is recommended that the Census Bureau obtain orders from the Commander of Joint Region Marianas in support of the census.

5.23 Were there issues regarding residency rules for the stateside military? If yes, then what were the primary issues?

The three most common residency rule issues that occurred came up during the 2010 Census were; 1) should a spouse be counted at their residence when they were overseas, 2) should an individual be counted if they were training at an installation other than their permanently assigned installation, and 3) where should individuals deployed overseas be counted.

The Census Bureau received several e-mails from the CJSWG members who relayed questions concerning where spouses deployed overseas should be counted. These questions were resolved with reply e-mails stating that the spouse deployed overseas should not be entered onto the 2010 Census mailout/mailback questionnaire and that they would be counted through the use of administrative records provided by DoD. The Census Bureau also received e-mails on where military personnel should be counted when they are attending training at an installation other than their permanent duty station. These questions were resolved with reply e-mails stating that the individual should not be counted at the training installation and that the individual should either be counted at their HU or at their permanently assigned GQ. In the e-mail replies to both of these
questions the D-3277 Military Fact Sheet (Appendix I) was attached, which provided living scenarios and where military personnel should be counted in these circumstances.

The biggest issue during the 2010 Census regarding residency rules for the stateside military was ‘where should military personnel deployed overseas be counted’. Military personnel stationed or deployed overseas are counted via administrative records received from the DoD. These military personnel are only counted in state population totals and are not included in the tabulations used for redistricting or in any other decennial census tabulations. Due to the high number of military personnel deployed due to war efforts, this topic became an important issue to the states with large number of military personnel deployed, such as Texas, North Carolina and Georgia. Congressmen from the states felt that the Census Bureau’s current method of counting military personnel stationed or deployed overseas was robbing them of counts and that different methods could be used that would help their states gain more counts. The Census Bureau did not change their methods of counting military personnel overseas or military personnel stateside on account of these congressional letters. Stateside military personnel were counted at the address level throughout the 2010 Census and the overseas military personnel were counted via administrative records, with the use of Home of Record being the primary variable for the state placement of the overseas military personnel. The Census Bureau cited the Congressional Research Service (CRS) report (Huckabee, 1990) and Bill H.R. 4903 (Library of Congress, 1990) to support the methods being used for the 2010 Census.

Below is an excerpt from the 2010 Census Federally Affiliated Overseas Count Operation Assessment Report (Crook, 2011) concerning the methods used to count military personnel overseas.

“For DoD military personnel and dependents, the DMDC used three variables to determine state assignments for overseas military and their dependents: home of record (HOR), legal residence, and last duty station. The decision by the Census Bureau to use these variables was based on the Congressional Research Service (CRS) report (Huckabee, 1990) and Bill H.R. 4903 (Library of Congress, 1990.) The CRS report found that allocating military personnel using home of record most closely resembled the state by state distribution of the resident population. Bill H.R. 4903 required that members of the Armed Forces and their dependents “be enumerated as if residing at such member’s ‘home of record,’ as defined by the Department of Defense for administrative purposes.” The Census Bureau made the decision for 2010 to rely on precedent when determining usual residence for U.S. military personnel overseas and to follow the procedures set forth in the CRS report.

As in Census 2000, the Census Bureau asked DoD to use the home of record (HOR) designation in its administrative files to assign a home state for its military personnel. Military personnel include the U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, U.S. Air Force, and U.S. Coast Guard12 as well as total reserve forces overseas. Home of record is generally defined as the permanent home at the time of entry or re-enlistment into the Armed Forces as included in personnel files. When HOR was not available, legal residence, the residence a member declares for state income

12 The U.S. Coast Guard although one of the five branches of the U.S. Military, is under the Department of Homeland Security. This could change for 2020. Information is available for the U.S. Coast Guard from the DMDC and the Department of Homeland Security. We will need to look again at what data source to use in 2020.
Dependent tax withholding purposes was used second, and last duty station was used third to assign a home state.

Dependents of military personnel were assigned a home state based on the military employee’s home state. “

There is a chance of duplication of counts for military personnel deployed or stationed overseas since they are counted at the state level and may be mistakenly entered on the housing unit questionnaire. The Census Bureau is currently conducting an evaluation of possible duplication between overseas and stateside counts for military personnel.

6. Related 2010 Census Operational Assessments

6.1 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation (GQV) Operational Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Validation (GQV) Operational Assessment documents the results (and lessons learned) of the GQV operation to include the distribution of Other Living Quarters (OLQs) validated as Group Quarters (GQs), Housing Units (HUs), Transitory Locations (TLs), Non-Residentials, Vacants, or Nonexistent (Deletes). It also describes the data capture results and the update actions to the Master Address File Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing database (MTdb) and Reinterview. Additionally, the report documents recommendations in preparation for the 2020 Census.

6.2 2010 Census Shipboard Enumeration Operation Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Shipboard Enumeration Operation Assessment Report documents the results of the enumeration of military and maritime vessels as well as provided recommendations and best practices that can be used during the next planning cycle to support the 2020 Census Shipboard Enumeration Operation.

6.3 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration (SBE) Operational Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration (SBE) Operational Assessment Report assesses how well the SBE was implemented and recorded the population data by defined service-based GQ types. It also assesses the number of added service-based GQs and the number of service-based GQs that no longer exist.

6.4 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration Group Homes and Carnival Locations Address List Update Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Service-Based Enumeration (SBE): Group Homes and Carnival Locations Address List Update (ALU) Assessment document the results regarding the process to obtain address information to update the address frame by obtaining information from tribal, state, and local governments, national and state advocacy organizations, and administrative record sources.
6.5 2010 Census Federally Affiliated Overseas Count Operational Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Federally Affiliated Overseas Count Operational Assessment documented results as well as provided recommendations and best practices that can be used during the next planning cycle to inform the 2020 Census.

6.6 2010 Census Item Nonresponse and Imputation Assessment Report

The 2010 Census Item Nonresponse and Imputation Assessment Report documented the data quality, specifically data completeness, for the person-level and household-level items from the 2010 Census.

7. Key Lessons Learned

After the 2010 Census GQE operation was completed, DMD conducted several lessons learned debriefings with Census HQ and NPC staff involved in the development and monitoring of GQE. Census HQ and NPC staff documented successes, challenges, and recommendations for planning future GQE operations. Following are key lessons learned:

7.1 Successes

Using Endorsement Letters

- External and endorsement letters were beneficial in gaining access to GQs, for example the FERPA, HIPPA, Salvation Army, hospitals, and a Memorandum from the Under Secretary of Defense. Continue to use access and/or endorsement letters to gain access to GQs for future censuses.

- Group Quarters facility POCs liked the GQAV information packet. This was the first time the facility POCs were given the LCO contact name and number instead of the ELCO information given to them during GQV. CLs found that during GQAV, the GQ contact name was the item that changes the most since the GQV operation. We recommend continuing to provide the GQ POC with the LCO contact information.

Partnerships

- Cooperative partnerships were conducive in gaining access and conducting the 2010 Census at GQ facilities. Specifically, successful partnerships were developed with colleges and universities, the Bureau of Prisons (BOP), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), DoD, and U.S. Marshal Detainees. Although the partnerships were conducive in gaining access to GQ facilities, challenges were realized. In order to gain access to BOP facilities, census staff had to be cleared through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). Also clearance was required for individuals that had to verify the geography of the GQs for each ICE and U.S. Marshal Detainees facilities. This process was challenging due to the BOP’s limited resources and high turnover among FLD Division staff. It is recommended to submit the names of LCO managers to the BOP to serve as a backup and to work with the BOP to increase the number of persons cleared through the NCIC. The BOP recommended allowing more lead time, about five
months to conduct clearances for state/county prisons. Overall, it is recommended to continue these partnerships for future censuses.

**Administrative Lists**

- Some GQs (prisons, college dorms) preferred to provide administrative records rather than having an enumeration conducted. Using administrative records is more cost efficient than field enumeration. Most correctional facilities provided an administrative list of the residents by GQs which provided the Census Bureau the ability to place residents in the appropriate GQ geocode. However, there were prisons that provided a list of inmates in situations where it was not feasible to distribute questionnaires nor were there staff to conduct the enumeration at the GQ. Thus, administrative lists were taken back to the LCO for transcription. It has been recommended that the Census Bureau explore using electronic administrative records to obtain census data for various GQs such as colleges/universities, military installations, and prisons. However, there may be some limitations using data from administrative records such as obtaining demographic data (i.e., race and Hispanic origin), as well as integrity issues with the data. For example, the FERPA never allows the combined release of sex, race, or ethnicity data.

**Linking ICRs/MCRs with their Respective GQs**

- After some challenges, the PBOCS and ATAC systems were able to successfully add GQs and link the ICRs and MCRs to their respective GQs. The DRIS initially had a requirement that they only send to the GEO Division ICRs and MCRs that were linked (associated with a GQ Enumeration Record, Form D-352.1). However, an alternative linking methodology was needed for unlinked GQ forms (ICRs/MCRs). A requirement was established to view images of unlinked GQ forms. This requirement to view images of unlinked GQ forms was a success and helped the DRIS with the development of an alternative linking process. It is recommended the Census Bureau consider developing an alternative methodology for linking.

**Training**

- Including enumerator training with the CL training provided the CLs insight on the work required of an enumerator. The following is recommended: 1) additional time, at least five days for the combined GQAV/GQE training for CLs, 2) training sessions should include interactive scenarios that staff could experience in the field, and 3) continue to explore additional options to improve verbatim training.

- Procedures for adding GQs were clearly stated for the enumerators. While the ability to add a GQ was a carefully controlled function, in the future the process for adding a GQ should be revised in any control system used so that there is no need to go back to a previous operation (GQAV) to enter an add in GQE.

**Reinterview**

- The telephone RI worked well. This methodology was cost efficient, as it eliminated the use of field staff resources.
Contingency Planning
• The contingency plan for closing out GQE worked well overall and was beneficial to capturing GQ updates. It is recommended that contingency software be made available for use in other locations as a component of a failover system in applicable Data Capture Centers.

7.2 Challenges

Automation
• There were data inconsistencies between systems. Requirements for obtaining data were not clear. For example, the PBOCS had the requirement to capture IDs more than once and the DMD C&P system had the requirement to receive unique IDs.

• The GEO division encountered difficulty developing post-processing update requirements and processes because the PBOCS had not been fully developed and because of difficulty determining how data was to be entered and captured from the enumeration forms in the PBOCS and ATAC systems. Requirements for data flows should be clearly defined. System requirements should be developed and available prior to the development of post-processing requirements and processes.

Kits
• A standard military kit was developed which prevented the NPC from having to prepare military kits tailored to each LCO. This facilitated distributing the appropriate number of one kit versus building a kit for each office. The NPC recommended an integrated logistics system to eliminate the need for providing duplicate materials to the LCOs.

Requirements Development
• When developing requirements for any operational control system used in the future, developers and key stakeholders that have a comprehensive understanding of the flow of data should be in requirements meetings. Divisions should have a separate GQ branch so that resources do not have to compete between HUs and GQs. All requirements should be documented in one book or repository to be viewed by all as a reference when needed and to minimize ambiguity.

Military Enumeration
• Some military installations had a POC for each GQ while other bases had multiple services on the installation. This slowed down the enumeration process since this led to multiple contacts within a military installation, instead of the usual single military installation POC.

• At the start of the enumeration of military installations, the military was provided with a list of census POCs, which included a LCO POC along with the LCO POC’s phone number. During the enumeration it was discovered that some military installation POCs were having trouble getting in contact with the census POC due to turnover. A new census POC list was provided to the military that provided the LCO POC’s phone number along with the LCO’s main office number. There were no reports of military installation POCs having difficulty in getting in contact with the census POCs after this change was made.

• The U.S. Army informed the procedure of collecting map spots on military installations posed a national security risk. The Census Bureau agreed to discontinue the process of collecting map
spots on military installations for the entire 2010 Census and future census and survey operations.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Conclusions

The 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration succeeded in meeting its objective of obtaining the most accurate count possible of people who lived or stayed in group quarters. Although the 2010 Census Group Quarters Enumeration was effective in meeting its objective, there is room for improvement. Listed below are recommendations intended to help the Census Bureau reach its goal of making the enumeration more cost effective while simultaneously sustaining high quality data.

8.2 Recommendations

- **Research and test automated methods to collect GQ data in the field prior to the 2020 Census.** Testing needs to be conducted to see what kinds of automated methods are feasible and may be tailored for various types of GQs. For example, prisons and skilled nursing facilities may prefer to use administrative records but a small group home may prefer to provide their data over the internet or in person through a mobile device. Testing also needs to include methods of confirmation for the geographical location of GQs that are included in administrative records.

- **Research and test the use of the Internet as a mode of data collection for Group Quarters Enumeration.** Some group quarters such as college/university student housing may prefer to respond to the 2020 Census through the use of the Internet rather than being enumerated by a census worker or administrative records. Internet enumeration could be more cost effective than being enumerated by a census worker and provides another option that allows the group quarter to select the mode of enumeration that is best for them.

- **Research and test the use of a mobile device for Group Quarters Enumeration field personnel to capture and enter group quarter questionnaire data, type codes, contacts, and geocodes.** Enumeration through the use of a mobile device may be more cost effective and have faster data processing times than the current paper enumeration procedures for enumerating group quarters. Mobile devices could be more effective enumerating small group quarters, that is, group quarters with less than 10 people.

- **Test and evaluate the use of administrative records to collect data for persons residing in Group Quarters.** The use of administrative records or personal knowledge of the group quarters contact person was an important source of data collection for the 2010 Census GQE operation. This method of filling out ICRs was more prevalent than any other means during the GQE operation. Overall, approximately 64 percent of the questionnaires were filled out using administrative records or personal knowledge of the group quarters contact person. However, the percentage of questionnaires filled out using administrative records versus personal knowledge of the group quarters contact person could not be determined from the data provided. The top three GQ type categories where administrative records were most
likely used to collect person level data on ICRs were residential schools for people with
disabilities, nursing and skilled nursing facilities, and hospitals and in-patient hospices,
which comprised close to 90 percent. Additionally, about 81 percent of the ICRs for persons
at juvenile facilities and correctional facilities for adults were mostly filled out through
administrative records. The following recommendations are offered for testing and
evaluating the use of administrative records in preparation for the 2020 Census:

- **Test and tailor during the 2020 planning cycle the use of administrative records for certain
group quarter types.** By targeting certain group quarter types, the Census Bureau could
evaluate which group quarter types and sizes are best qualified to produce a cost effective and
high quality group quarters operation through the use of administrative records. Furthermore,
this testing could potentially provide evidence of the feasibility of supplementing the
conventional mode of group quarters data collection with a group quarters-based administrative
records system especially at group quarters with a high usability rate of administrative records.
Focus tests on GQs types such as nursing and skilled nursing facilities, correctional facilities for
adults, and other GQs types where this assessment revealed a high prevalence of administrative
records usage. College and university student housing could be another potential target GQs,
despite a relatively low propensity of the use of administrative records at the time of
enumeration. Given a large population coming from this GQs type, it is recommended to work
with the National Center for Education Statistics of the Department of Education to obtain a
comprehensive source of administrative records of student housing. Another administrative
source highly useful to certain GQs, such as nursing/skilled nursing facilities and in-patient
hospitals and hospice, is the Business Registers obtained by the Census Bureau for the economic
census.

- **Explore and test procedures for obtaining administrative records data electronically.** There
were some group quarters that provided the Census Bureau administrative data electronically.
However, due to the lack of a system in place at Census Bureau headquarters to receive the data
electronically, the only means of receiving administrative records data was through printouts and
census staff tasked with transcribing the information directly onto the questionnaires. This not
only consumed a lot of time but also increased cost. During the 2020 Census planning cycle, the
Census Bureau should test the feasibility of receiving administrative data for group quarters
electronically. In exploring this method of receiving administrative data, it could lead to a more
cost effective group quarters operation as well as provide the Census Bureau an opportunity to
respond to the request of certain administrators from group quarters enumerated in the 2010
Census to accept the electronic transmission of data.

- **Develop and test data quality control procedures for the enumeration of group quarters via
administrative records.** For example, a method for correlating the population number of the
expected/maximum number of residents that could live or stay at the group quarters indicated on
the Group Quarters Validation Questionnaire or Group Quarters Advance Visit interview with
the actual number received from the administrative record. Through the use of a tested quality
control procedure, the Census Bureau will be able to maintain high data quality standards.
Future planning for the enumeration of group quarters for the 2020 Census needs to include outreach to professional organizations such as education, health care, and tribal organizations. Outreach to professional organizations that relate to the enumeration of group quarters is important in communicating Census Bureau procedures, promoting the importance of the decennial census and resolving any issues that the organizations have on privacy concerns. These activities should be included in the Master Activity Schedule in the future so that they will not be overlooked. Outreach to these professional organizations will help in gaining cooperation and help in resolving issues prior to the start of the 2020 Census.

Access letters should be prepared in advance using the list of external stakeholders developed for the 2010 Census such as Immigration and Customs Enforcement, prisons, Salvation Army, and the American Hospital Association. The Census Bureau needs to be aware of umbrella organizations supporting group quarters and reach out for more input from the Regional Census Centers and community organizations when preparing letters. For the 2010 Census, these letters were written in late 2009, but for the 2020 Census they should be written in early 2019 and also be included on the Master Activity Schedule to make sure that they are not overlooked. The use of access letters to these umbrella organizations was beneficial in gaining cooperation and disseminating information through the organizations for the 2010 Census and should continue to be used in future censuses.

Research and test the enumeration of military personnel through the use of one national military personnel file provided by the Defense Management Data Center. The Defense Management Data Center stated that they could provide one administrative record file that contains address data for every enlisted military personnel. The Census Bureau would need to test the use of this file and develop procedures that would enable the Census Bureau to accurately place the military personnel to their associated housing unit or group quarter addresses. More research needs to be conducted to see how this administrative data could be used. The use of this administrative record file could greatly reduce the amount of Census Bureau resources needed to enumerate the military. The use of an administrative record file would also reduce the respondent burden for the individual military installations, which was noted by the Regional Census Centers who stated that many military installations lacked the necessary personnel to conduct the self-Enumeration of group quarters.

Continue the use of a 60 and 30-day advance phone calls to the military installation Point Of Contacts prior to the start of decennial operation. This was critical in setting up communication between the Census Bureau Point of Contact and the military installation Point of Contact and keeping the enumeration of the military installations on time.

A separate Special Sworn Status form should be designed for military escorts. The form should only ask for the military escort’s name, office number and office address. During the 2010 Census, military escorts did not feel comfortable providing their social security number, citizenship, phone number, and home address on the Special Sworn Status form. Procedures were changed so that the military escorts did not have to provide this information. A newly designed Special Sworn Status form will help in gaining cooperation from the military installations for future censuses.
• In the future, Group Quarters Advance Visit instructions should instruct field staff to ask the military installation Point of Contact if there are any other military branches on the military installation. During the 2010 Census, enumeration of military group quarters was delayed because the field staff found out that there were multiple services on the military installation in the closing days of production. This issue can be avoided in the future by asking if there are any other military branches on the military installation during Group Quarters Advance Visit. This will also help the field staff to establish a Point of Contact for each of the military branches on the military installation prior to the start of production.

• Military representatives suggested obtaining a Department of Defense Instruction that would cover all future Census operations. Department of Defense Instruction would replace the Memorandum from the Under Secretary of Defense. Military representatives also recommended providing a military branch specific cover letter along with procedures for enumerating military installations for the 2020 Census.
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DE: DIRECTOR INTERINO
NEGOCIADO DEL CENSO DE LOS EE.UU.

A: Vivienda de estudiantes

La Constitución de los Estados Unidos requiere que se lleve a cabo un censo cada diez años. El título 13 del Código de los EE.UU., que establece las leyes básicas para la administración del censo, especifica que Puerto Rico será incluido en el censo decenal. En el 2010, el Negociado del Censo de los EE.UU. llevará a cabo un censo para contar a todas las personas que residen en Puerto Rico. El Censo del 2010 va a proporcionar información clave en la cual se basa cada comunidad para recibir la parte que le corresponde de los fondos estatales y municipales que se distribuyen anualmente para la asistencia médica, servicios para los adultos de edad avanzada, servicios de empleo, escuela y otros.

Durante el Censo del 2010, necesitamos incluir a las personas que viven o se quedan en alojamientos de grupo, tales como viviendas de estudiantes, casas residencia universitarias y casas de fraternidad y casas de hermandad. Un enumerador del Negociado del Censo va a comunicar con usted para concertar o verificar una cita, y recopilar información acerca de los residentes de su facilidad, con el fin de llevar a cabo el censo del censo.

Cuando contengamos a los residentes en su escuela, el Negociado del Censo va a recopilar los datos en conformidad con la Ley de Derechos de Educación y Privacidad de la Familia. A los estudiantes se les dará la oportunidad de completar un Informe Individual del Censo. Para los estudiantes que no respondan, las universidades pueden divulgar legalmente la información de directorio de los residentes de estudiantes al Negociado del Censo sin el consentimiento previo del estudiante o sus padres o tutores. La información de directorio incluye el nombre del estudiante,fecha de nacimiento, la dirección de la escuela y las fechas de matrícula.

Es de vital importancia que el Negociado del Censo tenga un conteo preciso y completo de todos los estudiantes que viven en alojamientos de grupo en su escuela. Es importante recordar que, para fines jurídicos del Negociado del Censo, los estudiantes universitarios se consideran residentes del lugar donde viven mientras están asistiendo a la universidad, no de la dirección de sus padres. La operación de alojamientos de grupo va a tener lugar a principios de abril, antes de que finalice el año escolar. Toda la información que recopile el Negociado del Censo es confidencial en conformidad con la ley.

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta, tenga la bondad de llamar a la Oficina Local del Censo al número de teléfono provisto en sus materiales del censo. Gracias por su cooperación, y esperamos poder trabajar con usted.

Atentamente,

Robert M. Groves
Director

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Helping You Make Informed Decisions

www.census.gov
DE: DIRECTOR INTERINO
NEGOCIADO DEL CENSO DE LOS EE.UU.

A: Gerente de la facilidad

La Constitución de los Estados Unidos requiere que se lleve a cabo un censo cada diez años. El Título 13 del Código de los EE.UU., que establece las leyes básicas para la administración del censo, especifica que Puerto Rico será incluido en el censo decenal. En el 2010, el Negociado del Censo de los EE.UU. llevará a cabo un censo para contar a todas las personas que residen en Puerto Rico. El Censo del 2010 va a proporcionar información clave en la cual se basa cada comunidad para recibir la parte que le corresponde de los fondos estatales y municipales que se distribuyen anualmente para la asistencia médica, servicios para los adultos de edad avanzada, servicios de empleo, escuela y otros.

Durante el Censo del 2010, necesitamos incluir a las personas que viven o se quedan en alojamientos de grupo, tales como hogares de grupo, alojamientos de grupo de trabajadores, facilidades de corrección y centros residenciales de estudiantes. También necesitamos incluir a las personas que se quedan en instalaciones que no proporcionan alojamiento y otros servicios a las personas sin hogar, tales como los centros que proveen un refugio o un comedor de beneficencia. Nuestro objetivo es tener a todas las personas en el censo.

Durante el Censo del 2010, un encuestador del Negociado del Censo se va a comunicar con usted para concertar o verificar una cita para recopilar información acerca de los residentes de su facilidad, con el fin de llevar cabo el conteo del censo.

No pedimos ninguna información relacionada con la salud y, por lo tanto, cumplimos con las regulaciones estipuladas por las Reglas de Privacidad de la Ley de Transferibilidad y Responsabilidad de Datos Médicos de 1996. Cuando contornos a los residentes en su facilidad, vamos a obtener el número, sexo, edad, fecha de nacimiento, raza y origen étnico de cada residente. La información que recopila el Negociado del Censo es confidencial en conformidad con la ley.

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta, tenga la bondad de llamar a la Oficina Local del Censo al número de teléfono provisto en sus materiales del censo. Gracias por su cooperación, y esperamos poder trabajar con usted.

Atentamente,

Robert M. Groves
Director

D-30 (L) FM
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DE: DIRECTOR INTERINO
NEGOCIADO DEL CENSO DE LOS EE.UU.

A: Facilidades de Cuidados de Salud

La Constitución de los Estados Unidos requiere que se lleve a cabo un censo cada diez años. El título 13 del Código de los EE.UU., que establece las leyes básicas para la administración del censo, especifica que Puerto Rico será incluido en el censo decenal. En el 2010, el Negociado del Censo de los EE.UU. llevará a cabo un censo para contar a todas las personas que residen en Puerto Rico. El Censo del 2010 va a proporcionar información clave en la cual se basa cada comunidad para recibir la parte que le corresponde de los fondos estatales y municipales que se distribuyen anualmente para la asistencia a niños, servicios para los adultos de edad avanzada, servicios de empleo, escuela y otros.

Durante el Censo del 2010, necesitamos incluir a las personas que viven o se quedan en alojamientos de grupo, tales como hospitales, facilidades de atención médica especializada (hogares de convalecencia) y facilidades de pacientes admitidos en el programa de hospicio. Un enumerador del Negociado del Censo se va a comunicar con usted para concertar o verificar una cita, y recopilar información acerca de los residentes de su facilidad, con el fin de llevar a cabo el conteo del censo.

No pedimos ninguna información relacionada con la salud y, por lo tanto, cumplimos con las regulaciones estipuladas por las Reglas de Privacidad de la Ley de Transferibilidad y Responsabilidad de Seguros de 30 de octubre de 1996. Cuando contemos a los residentes en su facilidad, vamos a recopilar el nombre, sexo, edad, fecha de nacimiento, raza y origen étnico de cada residente. Todas la información que recopila el Negociado del Censo es confidencial en conformidad con las leyes.

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta, tenga la bondad de llamar a la Oficina Local del Censo al número de teléfono provisto en sus materiales del censo. Gracias por su cooperación, y esperamos poder trabajar con usted.

Atentamente,

Robert M. Groves
Director
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233-0001
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

To: Student Housing

The United States Constitution requires that a count of the Nation's population be taken every 10 years. In 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau will conduct a census to count every person residing in the United States. The 2010 Census will provide key information that each community relies on to obtain their share of more than $300 billion in federal and state funding distributed each year for schools, employment services, health assistance, parks, services for older adults, and more.

During the 2010 Census, we need to include people who live or stay in group quarters, such as student housing like residence halls and fraternity and sorority houses. A Census Bureau enumerator will be contacting you to make or verify an appointment and to gather information about the residents at your school in order to obtain an accurate count.

When counting the residents at your school, the Census Bureau collects data in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. Students will be given the opportunity to complete an Individual Census Report. For students who do not respond, colleges and universities can lawfully disclose directory information from student records to the Census Bureau without prior consent of the student, parents, or guardians. Directory information includes a student’s name, date of birth, school address, and dates of attendance.

It is vital that the Census Bureau has an accurate and complete count of all the students living in group quarters at your school. It is important to remember that for Census purposes, college students are considered residents of the place where they live while attending school, not at their parents' address. The group quarters operation will occur in early April, before the end of the school year, so all the information the Census Bureau collects is confidential by law.

If you have any questions, please call the Local Census Office at the telephone number provided in your census materials. Thank you for your cooperation, and we look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert M. Groves
Director
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U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
Helping You Make Informed Decisions

www.census.gov
FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

To: Health Care Facilities

The United States Constitution requires that a count of the Nation’s population be taken every 10 years. In 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau will conduct a census to count every person residing in the United States. The 2010 Census will provide key information that each community relies on to obtain their share of more than $300 billion in federal and state funding distributed each year for health assistance, services for older adults, employment services, schools, and more.

During the 2010 Census, we need to include people who live or stay in group quarters, such as hospitals, skilled nursing facilities (nursing homes), and in-patient hospice facilities. A Census Bureau enumerator will be contacting you to make or verify an appointment, and to gather information about the residents at your facility in order to conduct the census count.

We do not ask for any health-related information and, therefore, are in compliance with regulations issued under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 Privacy Rule. When counting the residents at your facility, we will collect each resident’s name, gender, age, date of birth, race, and ethnicity. All the information the Census Bureau collects is confidential by law.

If you have any questions, please call the Local Census Office at the telephone number provided in your census materials. Thank you for your cooperation, and we look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Groves
Director
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US CENSUS BUREAU

www.census.gov
FROM THE ACTING DIRECTOR  
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

To: Facility Manager

The United States Constitution requires that a count of the Nation’s population be taken every 10 years. In 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau will conduct a census to count every person residing in the United States. The 2010 Census will provide key information that each community relies on to obtain their share of more than $300 billion in federal and state funding distributed each year for health assistance, services for older adults, employment services, schools, and more.

During the 2010 Census, we need to include people who live or stay in group quarters, such as group homes, workers’ group living quarters, correctional facilities, and residential treatment centers. We also need to include those who stay at facilities that provide living accommodations and other services to people experiencing homelessness, such as services provided by a shelter or a soup kitchen. Our goal is to count everyone in the census.

During the 2010 Census, a Census Bureau enumerator will be contacting you to make or verify an appointment, and to gather information about the residents at your facility in order to conduct the census count.

We do not ask for any health-status information and, therefore, are in compliance with regulations issued under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 Privacy Rule. When contacting the residents at your facility, we will collect each resident’s name, gender, age, date of birth, race, and ethnicity, and usual residence address if they have one. All the information the Census Bureau collects is confidential by law.

If you have any questions, please call the Local Census Office at the telephone number provided in your census materials. Thank you for your cooperation, and we look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Groves
Director
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDUP</td>
<td>Address Update File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMQA</td>
<td>Assistant Manager for Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAC</td>
<td>Automated Tracking and Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCF</td>
<td>Be Counted Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATI</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>Census Edited File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJSWG</td>
<td>Census Joint Service Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Crew Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;P</td>
<td>Cost and Progress System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRs</td>
<td>Change Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Congressional Report Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUF</td>
<td>Census Unedited File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACMO</td>
<td>Decennial Automated Contracts Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPPS</td>
<td>Decennial Applicant Personnel and Payroll System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>Decennial Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMDC</td>
<td>Defense Manpower Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODI</td>
<td>Department of Defense Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRF</td>
<td>Decennial Response File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS</td>
<td>Decennial Response Integration System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPO</td>
<td>Decennial Systems Processing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSD</td>
<td>Decennial Statistical Studies Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVS</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EICD</td>
<td>External Interface Control Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCO</td>
<td>Early Local Census Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDCA</td>
<td>Field Data Collection Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLD</td>
<td>Field Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ</td>
<td>Special Place Facility Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCPE</td>
<td>Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>Geography Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>Group Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQE</td>
<td>Group Quarters Enumeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQS</td>
<td>Group Quarters Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQAV</td>
<td>Group Quarters Advanced Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQV</td>
<td>Group Quarters Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHC</td>
<td>Hand-Held Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR</td>
<td>Home of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Housing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>Individual Census Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR</td>
<td>Individual Census Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIC</td>
<td>Just In Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCO</td>
<td>Local Census Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>Master Address File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>Master Activity Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Military Census Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTdb</td>
<td>MAF/TIGER database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Processing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Operation Control Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Operation Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLQ</td>
<td>Other Living Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Point of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBOCS</td>
<td>Paper Based Operational Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>Regional Census Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Reinterview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>Service-Based Enumeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>Shipboard Census Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHB</td>
<td>Shipboard Enumeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Special Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER</td>
<td>Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Transitory Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC&amp;M</td>
<td>Universe Control &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UECT</td>
<td>Universe Enumeration Control Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHE</td>
<td>Usual Home Elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>Unit Status Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 17, 2010

A message from the Director, U.S. Census Bureau . . .

This is your official 2010 Census form. We need your help to count everyone in the United States. It is important that everyone be counted, regardless of where they may be living at the time of the census. This Individual Census Report is to be used to count people who are currently living or staying in group quarters, such as college or university dormitories, nursing homes, group homes, emergency and transitional shelters for people experiencing homelessness, and other such locations. Please follow the instructions you were given when you received this form for returning it to the appropriate person.

Your answers are important. Census results are used to decide the number of representatives each state has in the U.S. Congress. The amount of government money received also depends on these answers. That money is used for services for children and the elderly, roads, and many other local needs. As allowed by law, your census data becomes public after 72 years. This information can be used for family history and other types of historical research.

Your answers are confidential. This means the Census Bureau cannot give out information that identifies you. Your answers will only be used for statistical purposes, and no other purpose. Please visit our Web site at www.census.gov/2010census and click on "Protecting Your Answers" to learn more about our privacy policy and data protection.

Thank you for completing your official 2010 Census form.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that, for the average respondent, this form will take about 5 minutes to complete, including the time for reviewing the instructions and answers. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this burden to Paperwork Reduction Project 0997-0519, U.S. Census Bureau, AMSO-9X138, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20533. You may e-mail comments to Paperwork@census.gov; use “Paperwork Project 0997-0519-C” as the subject.

Respondents are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

QQ Control Number

A. PN  B. JIC1  C. JIC2

D. Answered By: ☐ Respondent ☐ Other

Form D-41(CFR) (4-2-2008)
Appendix D: Military Census Record

United States Census 2010

Military Census Report

Use a blue or black pen.

Start here

1. What is your name? Print name below.
   Last Name
   First Name
   MI

2. What is your sex? Mark ☐ ONE box.
   ☐ Male  ☐ Female

3. What is your age and what is your date of birth?
   Please report babies as age 0 when the child is less than 1 year old.
   Print numbers in boxes.
   Age on April 1, 2010
   Month
   Day
   Year of birth

   NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 4 about Hispanic origin and Question 5 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

4. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?
   ☐ No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   ☐ Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
   ☐ Yes, Puerto Rican
   ☐ Yes, Cuban
   ☐ Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spanish, and so on.

5. What is your race? Mark ☐ one or more boxes.
   ☐ White
   ☐ Black, African American, or Negro
   ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
   ☐ Asian Indian
   ☐ Chinese
   ☐ Filipino
   ☐ Other Asian — Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.
   ☐ Japanese
   ☐ Korean
   ☐ Vietnamese
   ☐ Other Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander — Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
   ☐ Native Hawaiian
   ☐ Guamanian or Chamorro
   ☐ Samoan
   ☐ Some other race — Print race.

6. What is the full name and address of the place (barrack/dormitory, disciplinary barrack/jail, military treatment facility) where you are assigned?
   Please complete all that apply.
   Military installation or Base name
   Barrack or dormitory name
   Barrack or dormitory number
   Street number
   Street name

U.S. Census Bureau
March 17, 2010

This is your official 2010 Census form. We need your help to count everyone in the United States. It is important that everyone be counted, regardless of where they may be living at the time of the census. This Military Census Report is to be used to count people who are assigned to military group quarters, such as barracks, dormitories, disciplinary barracks or jails, or military treatment facilities. Please follow the instructions you were given when you received this form for returning it to the appropriate person.

Your answers are important. Census results are used to decide the number of representatives each state has in the U.S. Congress. The amount of government money received also depends on these answers. That money is used for services for children and the elderly, roads, and many other local needs. As allowed by law, your census data becomes public after 72 years. This information can be used for family history and other types of historical research.

Your answers are confidential. This means the Census Bureau cannot give out information that identifies you. Your answers will only be used for statistical purposes, and no other purpose. Please visit our Web site at <www.census.gov/2010census> and click on "Protecting Your Answers" to learn more about our privacy policy and data protection.

Sincerely,

Steve H. Murdock
Director, U.S. Census Bureau

United States Census Bureau 2010

Thank you for completing your official 2010 Census form.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that, for the average respondent, this form will take about 5 minutes to complete, including the time for reviewing the instructions and answers. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this burden to Paperwork Reduction Project 0607-0219, U.S. Census Bureau, AMSD-SK138, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20233. You may e-mail comments to <Paperwork@census.gov>, use "Paperwork Project 0607-0219" as the subject.

Respondents are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.
# Appendix E: Form D352.1, Enumeration Record

This listing contains confidential information, the release of which is prohibited by Title 13, U.S.C., CMR No. 0907-0915-C. Approval expires 12/31/2011.

**GROUP QUARTERS ENUMERATION RECORD**

**GROUP QUARTERS ENUMERATION**

**2010 CENSUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ Contact Name</td>
<td>GQ Contact Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ Contact Telephone Number</td>
<td>Max Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your facility be closed anytime between April 1 and May 14, 2010?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Pop</td>
<td>Are clients males only, females only, or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best days and times for facility to be enumerated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumeration appointment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Administrator want to self-enumerate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you or a staff member assist with the enumeration?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff member name and telephone number:</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a roster available for our use during enumeration?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES SECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lead) Enumerator Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Assigned (mm/dd/yy):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Enumeration Conducted (mm/dd/yy):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of ICRs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This is the control number for this group quarters. Your materials for enumeration include labels printed with this number.**
Appendix F: 2000 Military Census Report

Page 2

Note: Please answer BOTH Questions 5 and 6.

5 Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? Mark the "No" box if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.
- No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino — Print group.

6 What is your race? Mark ONE or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.
- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Filipno
- Japanese
- Korean
- Vietnamese
- Other Asian — Print race.
- Some other race — Print race.

7 What are the last four digits of your Social Security Number?

8 What is your marital status?
- Now married
- Separated
- Widowed
- Never married
- Divorced

9 a. At any time since February 1, 2000, have you attended regular school or college? Include only elementary school and schooling which leads to a high school diploma or a college degree.
- No, has not attended since February 1 — Skip to 10
- Yes, public school, public college
- Yes, private school, private college

9 b. What grade or level were you attending? Mark ONE box.
- Grade 1 to grade 8
- Grade 9 to grade 12
- College undergraduate years (freshman to senior)
- Graduate or professional school (for example: medical, dental, or law school)

10 What is the highest degree or level of school you have COMPLETED? Mark ONE box. If not currently enrolled, mark the previous degree or highest degree received.
- No schooling completed
- Nursery school to 4th grade
- 5th grade or 6th grade
- 7th grade or 8th grade
- 9th grade
- 10th grade
- 11th grade
- 12th grade — NO DIPLOMA
- HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE — high school
- DIPLOMA or the equivalent (for example: GED)
- Some college credit, but less than 1 year
- 1 or more years of college, no degree
- Associate degree (for example: AA, AS)
- Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, AB, BS)
- Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA)
- Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
- Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD)

11 What is your ancestry or ethnic origin?

(For example: Italian, Jamaican, African Am., Cambodian, Cape Verdean, Norwegian, Dominican, French Canadian, Haitian, Korean, Lebanese, Polish, Nigerian, Mexican, Taiwanese, Ukrainian, and so on.)

Continue on page 3.

82
12. Do you speak a language other than English at home?
   No → Skip to 13

13. What is this language?
(For example: Korean, Italian, Spanish, Vietnamese)

14. Where were you born?
   ☐ In the United States — Print name of state.
   ☐ Outside the United States — Print name of foreign country, or Puerto Rico, Guam, etc.

15. Are you a CITIZEN of the United States?
   ☐ Yes, born in the United States → Skip to 16a
   ☐ Yes, born in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Northern Marianas
   ☐ Yes, born abroad of American parent or parents
   ☐ Yes, a U.S. citizen by naturalization
   ☐ No, not a citizen of the United States

16. When did you come to live in the United States?
   Print numbers in boxes.
   Year

17. a. Do you have any of your own grandchildren under the age of 18 living at the address in questions 2d or 2e?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No → Skip to 18a

   b. Are you currently responsible for most of the basic needs of any grandchild(ren) under the age of 18 who live(s) at the address in questions 2d or 2e?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No → Skip to 18a

   c. How long have you been responsible for the(se) grandchild(ren)? If you are financially responsible for more than one grandchild, answer the question for the grandchild for whom you have been responsible for the longest period of time.
   ☐ Less than 6 months
   ☐ 6 to 11 months
   ☐ 1 or 2 years
   ☐ 3 or 4 years
   ☐ 5 years or more

CONTINUE on page 4.
18. During which of the following periods have you served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces?
   Mark [ ] a box for EACH period in which you served. If the only active duty was for training in the military Reserves or National Guard, mark [ ] this box ___ and then ___ Skip to 19.
   [ ] April 1995 or later
   [ ] August 1990 to March 1995 (including Persian Gulf War)
   [ ] September 1980 to July 1990
   [ ] May 1975 to August 1980
   [ ] Vietnam era (August 1964—April 1975)
   [ ] February 1955 to July 1964
   [ ] Korean conflict (June 1950—January 1955)
   [ ] World War II (September 1940—July 1947)
   [ ] Some other time

19. In total, how many years of active-duty military service have you had?
   [ ] Less than 2 years
   [ ] 2 years or more

20. Did you work LAST WEEK? Mark [ ] the "Yes" box if you worked at all or were in training, at your duty station or elsewhere.
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No ___ Skip to 23

21. At what location did you work LAST WEEK? If you worked at more than one location, print where you worked most last week.
   a. Address (Number and street name)
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      If the exact address is not known, give a description of the location such as the building name or the nearest street or intersection.
   b. Name of city, town, post office, or military installation or base
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
   c. Is the work location inside the limits of that city or town?
      [ ] Yes
      [ ] No, outside the city/town limits
   d. Name of county
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
   e. Name of U.S. state or foreign country
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
   f. ZIP Code
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________

22. a. What time did you usually leave home to go to work LAST WEEK?
      [ ] a.m. ___ : ___
      [ ] p.m. ___ : ___

   b. How many minutes did it usually take you to get from home to work LAST WEEK?
      Minutes ___

CONTINUE on page 5.
What is your branch of service?

☐ Air Force
☐ Army
☐ Marine Corps
☐ Navy
☐ Coast Guard
☐ Not in U.S. Armed Forces – Describe the kind of business of your employer.

OCCUPATION

a. What kind of work are you doing? (For example: aircraft engine mechanic, electronic technician, field artillery surveyor, sonar technician, tactical intelligence officer)

b. What are your most important activities or duties? (For example: repair seaplanes, research on electronic components, survey artillery ranges, repair sonar equipment, edit intelligence manuals)

c. What is your main job specialty? If you have more than one specialty, list the one at which you spend the most time.

(1) Job Title

(2) Job Code (AOC/MOS/NOBC/Rating/AFSC/Cc Fld)

What is your paygrade? Enter the two-character code. (For example: D-3, W-2, E-4)

Paygrade

INCOME IN 1999

Mark ☑️ the "Yes" box for each income source received during 1999 and enter the total amount received during 1999 to a maximum of $999,999. Mark ☐️ the "No" box if the income source was not received. If net income was a loss, enter the amount and mark ☑️ the "Loss" box next to the dollar amount.

a. Pay and allowances as a member of the U.S. ARMED FORCES including special, incentive, and bonus pay. Also, wages, salaries, commissions, and tips from CIVILIAN JOBS — Report total amount from all jobs BEFORE DEDUCTIONS for taxes, bonds, dues, or other items.

☐ Yes Annual amount – Dollars

☐ No

b. Self-employment income from own nonfarm businesses or farm businesses, including proprietorships and partnerships — Report NET income after business expenses.

☐ Yes Annual amount – Dollars

☐ No

CONTINUE on page 6.
c. Interest, dividends, net rental income, royalty income, or income from estates and trusts — Report even small amounts credited to an account.

- Yes  Annual amount – Dollars
- No

Please check this form to be sure you have answered all the required questions completely. Please return your completed form to your Census unit representative.

Military personnel living in housing units on- or off-base will also receive a census form at home to complete. To ensure that such personnel are assigned to the correct jurisdiction, it is important that YOU MAKE SURE YOU ARE INCLUDED ON BOTH THIS REPORT AND THE CENSUS FORM SENT TO YOUR HOME.

The Census Bureau estimates that, on average, each respondent will take either 2 minutes (first 7 questions) or 7 minutes (all 28 questions) to complete this form, including the time for reviewing the instructions and answers. Comments about the estimate should be directed to the Associate Director for Finance and Administration, Attn: Paperwork Reduction Project 0607-0856, Room 3104, Federal Building 3, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233.

Respondents are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.

Thank you for completing this official U.S. Census 2000 form.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

A. GQ ID

B. PN  C. JIC1  D. JIC2  E. JIC3  F. JIC4

FORM D-21
Appendix G: 2008 Dress Rehearsal Military Census Report
6. What is the full name and address of the place (Barrack, BOQ, disciplinary barrack, UPH, etc.) where you are assigned? Please complete all that apply:

Military Installation or Base name

Barrack or dormitory name

Barrack or dormitory number

House number

Street name

Apartment number

City

County

State

ZIP Code

The Census Bureau estimates that, for the average respondent, this form will take about 5 minutes to complete, including the time for reviewing the instructions and answers. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this burden to: Paperwork Reduction Project 0607-0919-DR, U.S. Census Bureau, 4500 Silver Hill Road, AMSO-3K126, Washington, DC 20233. You may e-mail comments to Paperwork@census.gov; use “Paperwork Project 0607-0919-DR” as the subject.

Respondents are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

GQ Control Number

A. PN
B. JIC1
C. JIC2

Thank you for completing your official 2008 Dress Rehearsal form.
Appendix H: Form BC-1759, Special Sworn Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART A – IDENTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name – Last, first, middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date of birth (Month, Day, Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Place of birth – City and State or Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Security Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local home address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Name and address of present employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prior investigation contact: Telephone number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART B – WAIVER OF COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, the undersigned, offer my services to the U.S. Census Bureau with Special Sworn Status on a voluntary/contractor basis without compensation. On behalf of myself and my heirs and assigns, I release and discharge the Government of the United States from any claims, suits, or demands that I or my heirs or assigns may, can, or shall have in connection with compensation for my voluntary/contractor services for the Government of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART C – AFFIDAVIT OF NON-DISCLOSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any information contained in the schedules, lists, or statements obtained for or prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau to any person or persons either during or after appointment. (Under title 13, U.S.C. section 214 and title 18, U.S.C. 3581, et. seq., the penalty for unlawful disclosure is a fine of not more than $250,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Signature of appointee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribed and sworn (or affirmed) before me this day of , 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SEAL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My commission expires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART D – DIVISION/OFFICE AUTHORIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Div. &amp; Org. code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Census facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Non-Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Special access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Attach documentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approving Census Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. COTR/Division Chief - Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Approver's telephone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Badge issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Date of request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART E – TO BE COMPLETED BY SECURITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approved by Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Badge issued for – Specify time limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fingerprints required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Badge issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATION OF SPECIAL SWORN STATUS  
(BC-1759)

Part A: Completed by the special sworn/contractor. Contractors who are not U.S. citizens should bring INS documentation with them.

Part B: Signed by the special sworn/contractor in the presence of a witness. The witness should be either a Census Bureau employee authorized by the Security Office or a notary public.

Note: Signature for Part B of the BC-1759 is a Human Resources Division requirement. Individuals working as contractors or volunteers are not paid employees of the U.S. Census Bureau; therefore, they do not receive the benefits of the Bureau’s payroll system. Volunteers receive no compensation. Contractors are paid through a contractual agreement with the Bureau’s procurement office or sponsoring division.

Part C: Signed by the special sworn/contractor in the presence of either a Census Bureau employee authorized to administer the oath of non-disclosure or a notary public.

Note: Special sworn/contractors who refuse to sign Part C will not be allowed to have access to Census Bureau facilities or information.

Part D: Signed by the authorized Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) or the sponsoring Division Chief.

Note: Part D MUST be completed before the Security Office will initiate any action on the security processing or issuance of a building pass. Special Access includes 24-hour access and proxy card access, which require additional documentation. For further information, contact the Security Office. The authorized signature in Part D indicates that the COTR or Division Chief is responsible for the actions of the special sworn/contractor.

Renewals: Contractors complete Part A of BC-1759, and COTR or Division Chief completes Part D. Contractor brings completed form to Security Office for approval.
Appendix I: D-3277, Military Fact Sheet


Where Will You and Your Family Be Counted?

People in the United States will be counted at their usual residence, the place where they live and sleep most of the time. This place is not necessarily the same as the person’s voting residence, legal residence, or permanent residence. Determining usual residence is easy for most people—but it may not be so apparent for people in the military and their families.

- U.S. military personnel residing in the United States are counted at the residence where they live and sleep most of the time. This residence might be on or off the military installation.
- Crews of military vessels with a U.S. homeport are counted at the onshore residence where they live and sleep most of the time. If they do not report an onshore residence, they are counted at their vessel’s homeport.
- U.S. military personnel stationed outside the United States, including dependents living with them, will be counted as part of the U.S. overseas population using administrative records from the Department of Defense. These persons stationed overseas will be included in the state totals used to determine the allocation of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. The military overseas population includes U.S. military personnel deployed for wartime efforts and U.S. military personnel on U.S. military vessels with a homeport outside the United States.

An Overview of the 2010 Census for the Armed Forces.

Military installations in the United States appoint a project officer to work with the Local Census Office (LCO). The LCO trains base personnel, provides materials, and assists with any questions or problems during the census.

- Armed forces personnel, who live in military group quarters such as barracks/dormitories, disciplinary barracks/jails, or military treatment facilities, will be given a special census form called a Military Census Report (MCR). Personnel assigned to a military group quarter will be counted at the group quarter.
- U.S. military personnel on board Navy and Coast Guard vessels with a U.S. homeport will receive a Shipboard Census Report (SCR) to complete. If they have an onshore address, they can claim it as their home address. If not, they will be counted on board the ship at its homeport.
- People living in family housing on base in the United States will receive the standard census questionnaire through the mail.
- Vessel personnel, who also have an onshore address, will receive the standard census questionnaire at their home address AS WELL AS A SHIPBOARD CENSUS REPORT ON BOARD THE SHIP. Please complete both the standard census questionnaire and the Shipboard Census Report. When completing the Shipboard Census Report, make sure to write in the full address OF YOUR ONSHORE RESIDENCE IF you live or stay THERE most of the time.
The 2010 Census: Quick, Easy, and Confidential.

- 2010 Military Census Reports contain 8 questions and are simple to fill out.
- By law, the Census Bureau cannot share an individual’s census questionnaire responses with anyone, including other federal agencies and law enforcement entities.

Your Participation Is Vital.

The U.S. Constitution directs the Census Bureau to conduct a complete count of all people living in the United States every 10 years. Census information helps in determining how federal, state, local, and tribal governments make decisions affecting the people of this country and how over $400 billion per year of taxpayers’ money is allocated by government. Participating in the census is in everyone’s best interest. People who answer the census help their communities obtain state and federal funding for neighborhood improvements, such as deciding where to build schools, hospitals, and roads, or about services for the elderly, job training, and more. The best way to make sure people like yourself are counted in the census is to fill out the form and encourage others to do so.

By law, the Census Bureau cannot share individual answers it receives with anyone. Also, we do not share individual answers with welfare agencies, courts, police, or the military. Census workers are sworn to secrecy. The Census Bureau workforce understands the importance of safeguarding confidential data. They know that if they give out any information, they can face a $250,000 fine and jail time.

For additional information about the 2010 Census, visit the Census Bureau’s Internet site at <http://www.census.gov> or call one of our Regional Census Centers across the country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Census Center</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>404-335-1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>617-223-3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>704-936-6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>312-454-2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>214-267-6900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>720-475-3640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>313-396-6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>816-994-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>818-717-6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>212-971-8810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>215-717-1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>425-909-3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Letter of Support from Under Secretary of Defense

ACTION MEMO

September 4, 2009, 5:00PM

FOR: Gail H. McGinn, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Plans)
FROM: Sharon H. Cooper, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Program Integration)

SUBJECT: 2010 Census on Military Installations and Vessels

- The purpose of this package is to transmit a memorandum for your signature that
  advises the Services of the need for their continued support of the Census Bureau’s
  2010 Census. To maintain the Census Bureau’s current schedule, DMDC requests
  signature and distribution of the memorandum by Friday, September 25, 2009.

- This memorandum was requested by the Census Bureau in support of Census
  personnel conducting operations at installations in 2009, and continuing into 2011.

- This memorandum from you will clarify why Census Bureau personnel need to visit
  installations and will minimize the amount of time they will be on site. Therefore,
  your memorandum will improve communication between the Census Bureau and the
  installations, and will lessen the burden on the installations.

RECOMMENDATION: ACTING USD (P&R) sign the attached memorandum.
ACTING USD (P&R) Approve: 
ACTING USD (P&R) Disapprove: 

COORDINATION: NONE

Attachment:
As stated

Prepared by: Frederick Licari, Dr. Robert O. Simmons, DMDC, 703-696-7425/8961
MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

SUBJECT: 2010 Census on Military Installations and Vessels

The Department of Defense is committed to assisting the Census Bureau with counting military personnel for the 2010 Census. This collaborative effort began in April 2009 and will continue through June 2011. A schedule of 2010 Census activities is attached. To facilitate these efforts, I ask that you provide the following support through June 2011:

- Ensure that an installation POC is assigned at each military installation, that each installation POC has a copy of the attached activities schedule, and that each installation POC maintains contact with your Service’s representatives on the Census Joint-Service Working Group (CJSWG) (contact information attached).

- Ensure that the installation POC assigns escorts to accompany Census Bureau workers on the installation. Escorts will also need to tell Census Bureau workers the types of identification or documentation needed to enter the installation, identify the various types of living quarters available on each installation, and give the Census Bureau workers installation maps and a list of “Do’s and Don’ts.”

- Ensure that the installation POC will place posters and fact sheets at key locations following receipt of these materials in February 2010. On or around March 16 and April 5, 2010, the POC should also distribute, via installation media, messages supplied by the Census Bureau to remind households to complete and return the census questionnaire.

We appreciate your ongoing support of census-related efforts and ensuring your Service can meet the Census Bureau’s requirements.
If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact the chair of the CJSWG, Dr. Robert Simmons, (703) 696-8961 or Robert.Simmons@osd.pentagon.mil.

Gail H. McGinn
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Plans)
Performing the Duties of the
Under Secretary of Defense
(Personnel and Readiness)

Attachments:
As stated

cc:
Census Joint Service Working Group
Appendix K: GQE Reinterview Form, Form D-941 (GQE)
Appendix L: GQE Brochures
USES OF CENSUS DATA

Federal Laws
The federal government is the main user of census data. More than 50 laws require the use of census data in one form or another. Here are some examples of how the data are used.

Schools
Locations where new schools are needed are identified using data about age.

Social Services
Local health agencies plan and administer programs promoting the well-being of families and children using data about family types, composition, and living arrangements of the population.

State, Local, and Tribal Governments
States, cities, counties, and American Indian reservations use census data to plan:
• Health care services and facilities.
• Housing and community development needs.
• Locate election areas.

Businesses
Businesses use census data to:
• Plan for future product demands.
• Plan new sites.
• Determine if their workforce matches the community.

Organizations
Churches, day care centers, nursing homes, and charities use census data to plan for:
• Community needs.
• Writing grants.
• Distribution of resources.

USES OF CENSUS DATA—CON.

Data Analysts
Census data are used to monitor:
• Population growth and change.
• The quality of life in America.
• Changes in our society.

The census provides a snapshot of the nation, which helps define who we are.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT PRIVACY

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
The major goal of this privacy rule is to assure that individuals' health information is properly protected, while allowing the flow of health information needed to provide and promote high quality health care and to protect the public's health and well-being. The census forms do not have questions related to health or health issues and therefore do not conflict with this act.

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
The U.S. Census Bureau data collection is compliant with this act in terms of disclosing information. Colleges and universities can disclose directory information from student records, without prior consent from the student or his or her parents to the Census Bureau. Directory information includes a student's name, date of birth, address, and dates of attendance.

For more information about the 2010 Census, visit <www.2010census.gov>.
GROUP QUARTERS ENUMERATION

The goal of Group Quarters Enumeration is to include people in the 2010 Census who live in group quarters. Group quarters are places where people live or stay in a group living arrangement. These places are owned or run by an organization that provides housing and services for the residents. This is not a typical household-type living arrangement.

EXAMPLES OF GROUP QUARTERS FOR THE 2010 CENSUS

• Group home.
• Skilled nursing facility (nursing home).
• Residential treatment facility.
• Residence hall, dormitory, or fraternity/sorority house for students (college, university, seminary).
• Religious group living quarters (e.g., convent, monastery, and abbey).
• Correctional facility for adults or juveniles.
• In-patient hospice facility.
• Hospital.
• Workers group living quarters.
• Vocational training facility group housing for students.

Enumerating Your Group Quarters
On a set date, census workers will:

• Visit your group quarters and meet with a staff person.
• Distribute census forms to the residents.
• Help residents fill out their forms, if needed.
• Collect forms completed by residents.

How You Can Help

• Inform your residents and staff about the arrival of census enumerators.
• Assure residents and staff that all information collected is confidential.
• Volunteer to be sworn in by census workers to help with enumeration.
• Stress the importance of the 2010 Census to the community.
• Promote the census by displaying posters.
• Remind staff of the upcoming enumeration.
• Be sure there is a private area for the enumerators to work.
• Let residents and staff know about possible census jobs.

ABOUT THE CENSUS

The census is conducted by the federal government to learn about the nation’s population and housing. The Constitution requires a census every 10 years to determine how many seats in the U.S. House of Representatives each state will have.

Census data are used to draw the electoral districts within states, allocate federal funds, track changes in the population, and measure changes and trends in society.

The U.S. Census Bureau is the government agency responsible for conducting the census. The census is conducted in years ending in zero, such as 1990, 2000, and 2010.

The 2010 Census data are used to distribute Congressional seats to states, make decisions about what community services to provide, and distribute $360 billion in federal funds to local, state, and tribal governments each year.

The census is conducted under authority of Title 13 of the U.S. Code which is the census law. The law requires that all answers are kept confidential. Information about individuals can only be seen by sworn census employees and is not released for 72 years.

The Census Bureau does not share the answers from the census with any individual or organization. This includes the Internal Revenue Service and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service. Also, we do not share answers with welfare agencies, courts, police, or the military. Answers are not even shared with the President of the United States.
Appendix M: Military Poster

2010 Census: It's Your Duty.

Complete your Census form between April 1 and May 14, 2010.
Appendix O: 2010 Group Quarters Enumeration Assessment GQs Type Categories

**College/University Student Housing**
- College/University Student Housing

**Correctional Facilities for Adults**
- Federal Detention Centers
- Federal Prisons
- State Prisons
- Local Jails and Other Municipal Confinement Facilities
- Correctional Residential Facilities
- Military Disciplinary Barracks and Jails

**Group Homes Intended for Adults**
- Group Homes Intended for Adults

**Hospital & In Patient Hospices**
- Mental (Psychiatric) Hospitals and Psychiatric Units in Other Hospitals
- Hospitals with Patients Who Have No Usual Home Elsewhere
- In-Patient Hospice Facilities
- Military Treatment Facilities with Assigned Patients

**Juvenile Facilities**
- Group Homes for Juveniles (non-correctional)
- Residential Treatment Centers for Juveniles (non-correctional)
- Correctional Facilities Intended for Juveniles

**Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters**
- Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters

**Military Quarters**
- Military Quarters

**Military/Maritime Vessels**
- Military Ships
- Maritime/Merchant Vessels

**Nursing & Skilled Nursing Facilities**
- Nursing Facilities/Skilled-Nursing Facilities

**Religious GQs and Domestic Violence Shelters**
- Religious Group Quarters and Domestic Violence Shelters

**Residential Schools for People w/Disabilities**
- Residential Schools for People with Disabilities
Residential Treatment Centers for Adults
  • Residential Treatment Centers for Adults

Shelters and Service Locations
  • Emergency and Transitional Shelters (with Sleeping Facilities) for People Experiencing Homelessness
  • Soup Kitchens
  • Regularly Scheduled Mobile Food Vans
  • Targeted Non-Sheltered Outdoor Locations

Workers’ Group Living Quarters & Job Corp Centers
  • Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corps Centers
### Appendix P: Table 21 2010 Census Group Quarters Population by GQ Type Category by State & Puerto Rico (PR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Type Category</th>
<th>AK</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>36,341</td>
<td>24,144</td>
<td>27,987</td>
<td>172,843</td>
<td>29,952</td>
<td>48,537</td>
<td>24,087</td>
<td>10,184</td>
<td>85,243</td>
<td>72,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>41,177</td>
<td>25,844</td>
<td>67,767</td>
<td>256,807</td>
<td>40,568</td>
<td>20,059</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>6,457</td>
<td>167,453</td>
<td>104,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>6,571</td>
<td>48,488</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>11,463</td>
<td>4,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals &amp; In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>9,211</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>18,610</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>3,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>5,172</td>
<td>42,989</td>
<td>10,945</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>11,693</td>
<td>15,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>22,995</td>
<td>18,532</td>
<td>13,819</td>
<td>111,884</td>
<td>18,079</td>
<td>26,371</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>73,372</td>
<td>34,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs, Domestic Violence Shelters and Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>15,474</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>23,183</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8,414</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service Locations</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>76,430</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>5,988</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>24,108</td>
<td>9,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>28,368</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>20,354</td>
<td>4,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,931</strong></td>
<td><strong>139,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>819,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>253,199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix P: Table 21  2010 Census Group Quarters Population by GQ Type Category by State & Puerto Rico (PR) - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Type Category</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>KY</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College University Student Housing</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>44,574</td>
<td>7,223</td>
<td>92,960</td>
<td>75,434</td>
<td>27,754</td>
<td>36,340</td>
<td>24,891</td>
<td>135,773</td>
<td>48,141</td>
<td>17,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>13,309</td>
<td>11,275</td>
<td>70,828</td>
<td>48,694</td>
<td>8,009</td>
<td>41,122</td>
<td>60,804</td>
<td>24,683</td>
<td>35,832</td>
<td>3,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>10,536</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals &amp; In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td>8,806</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>12,483</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7,534</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>5,198</td>
<td>26,871</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>81,516</td>
<td>41,158</td>
<td>20,672</td>
<td>26,044</td>
<td>24,524</td>
<td>43,833</td>
<td>28,001</td>
<td>7,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs, Domestic Violence Shelters and Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service Locations</td>
<td>7,483</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>12,882</td>
<td>6,953</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>10,017</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42,880</td>
<td>98,112</td>
<td>28,951</td>
<td>301,773</td>
<td>186,923</td>
<td>79,074</td>
<td>125,870</td>
<td>127,427</td>
<td>238,882</td>
<td>138,375</td>
<td>35,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters Type Category</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td>78,033</td>
<td>50,444</td>
<td>52,869</td>
<td>26,472</td>
<td>8,332</td>
<td>89,795</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>22,073</td>
<td>22,820</td>
<td>55,483</td>
<td>8,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>62,083</td>
<td>20,397</td>
<td>41,956</td>
<td>34,273</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>61,680</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>8,084</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>44,468</td>
<td>17,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes</td>
<td>19,059</td>
<td>15,207</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals &amp; In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,217</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>26,297</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>42,473</td>
<td>32,989</td>
<td>44,866</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>46,638</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>13,519</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>45,512</td>
<td>5,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs, Domestic Violence Shelters and Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>4,233</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service Locations</td>
<td>11,673</td>
<td>6,563</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>10,514</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>12,123</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>229,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,142</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,964</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>257,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,629</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Quarters Type Category</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>PR*</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>218,960</td>
<td>106,042</td>
<td>30,148</td>
<td>23,704</td>
<td>177,332</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>24,687</td>
<td>46,463</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>53,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>19,891</td>
<td>95,306</td>
<td>76,590</td>
<td>40,562</td>
<td>22,203</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>41,649</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>46,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>35,564</td>
<td>9,789</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>16,476</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>3,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals &amp; In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>9,149</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>8,840</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>5,005</td>
<td>116,558</td>
<td>83,019</td>
<td>21,678</td>
<td>11,491</td>
<td>87,775</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td>7,005</td>
<td>33,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs, Domestic Violence Shelters and Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>14,661</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>16,098</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service Locations</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>52,284</td>
<td>15,544</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>14,741</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>6,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>8,847</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>5,527</td>
<td>7,068</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>585,678</strong></td>
<td><strong>306,266</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>426,113</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>139,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>153,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Quarters Type Category</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>WY</th>
<th>Total Pop by GQ Type Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/University Student Housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15,666</td>
<td>84,048</td>
<td>16,895</td>
<td>35,534</td>
<td>56,773</td>
<td>17,113</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>2,523,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities for Adults</td>
<td>267,405</td>
<td>12,666</td>
<td>65,240</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>31,960</td>
<td>38,102</td>
<td>16,591</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>2,276,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homes Intended for Adults</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>11,272</td>
<td>8,013</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>307,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals &amp; In Patient Hospices</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>70,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Facilities</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>152,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Quarters</td>
<td>35,224</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>16,678</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>288,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/Maritime Vessels</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>94,278</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>30,324</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>22,156</td>
<td>33,808</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>1,508,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious GQs, Domestic Violence Shelters and Living Quarters for Victims of Natural Disasters</td>
<td>3,697</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Schools for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment Centers for Adults</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>142,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters and Service Locations</td>
<td>20,069</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>13,658</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>422,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Group Living Quarters and Job Corp Centers</td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>169,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>581,139</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>239,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,329</strong></td>
<td><strong>139,375</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,712</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,025,278</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Puerto Rico (PR)

**Total population count includes Puerto Rico (PR)

Source: 2010 Census Edited File