



## Local Factors Affecting a Fair and Accurate Census On Which State and Federal Legislators Can Have Impact



| CAUSES OF UNDERCOUNT  | WHAT CAN BE DONE   | POLICY, LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>No Opportunity to Respond (&gt;25% of immigrant HH's without standard mail delivery—PO Box only, shared, friend's house/other).</b></p> | <p><b>Improve Delivery of Census Materials (invitations for online response, mailed forms, reminders)</b></p> <p><b>Augment in-field address canvassing, more U/L to identify more hidden housing units</b></p> <p><b>Invest heavily in QAC deployment including staffing with linguistically/culturally competent staff—including employment-authorized non-citizens.</b></p> | <p><b>Federal: Oversight hearings, earmarked funding, GAO review</b></p> <p><b>State: earmarked funding, guidance, T/A to contractors</b></p>   |
| <p>Households in Hidden Housing Units (~3-5% in HTC tracts)</p>   | <p>Target Summer, 2019 Census Bureau address canvassing not just to remote rural areas but also urban low-income census tracts where there's a high proportion of hidden housing units</p>   | <p>Federal—Oversight hearing re MAF quality in urban areas and differential undercount</p>  |
| <p>Households in Hidden Housing Units (~3-5% in HTC tracts)</p>   | <p>Expand U/L in “bad MAF” areas—not just remote rural areas</p>   | <p>Federal—Earmarked funding for additional U/L costs</p>   |
| <p>Households in Hidden Housing Units (~3-5% in HTC tracts)</p>   | <p>Increase # of local user-friendly QAC's and deploy messaging campaign specifically to promote going to QAC's for NID.</p> <p>Mobile QAC's both inquiring about all HU's and offering help with NID response</p>   | <p>State—earmark portion of state funding for staffing QAC's in areas with high prevalence of “bad MAF” and language minorities.</p>  |
| <p>Households within “Complex” Households (“extra” persons, and/or family units living under the same roof)</p>                               | <p>Messaging specifically to <u>rentors</u> promoting safety of including everyone (as per Census Bureau instructions)</p> <p>Messaging from local building code/planning enforcement with commitment to never use Census Data. Legislation prohibiting use.</p>   | <p>State/Local Collaboration--Analysis of Census PDB, ACS, and housing, planning department data to identify priority areas</p>   |
| <p>Households within “Complex” Households (“extra” persons, and/or family units living under the same roof)</p>                               | <p>Increase # of local user-friendly QAC's and deploy messaging campaign specifically to <u>rentors</u> to encourage going to QAC's for NID.</p> <p>Mobile QAC's both inquiring about all HU's and offering help with NID response</p>   | <p>State/Local Collaboration—Development of specific messaging, priority areas, and QAC locations.</p> <p>Identify local partners and secure funding, recruit personnel and provide training for mobile QAC's</p> |



| CAUSES OF UNDERCOUNT  | WHAT CAN BE DONE  | POLICY/LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>No Opportunity to Respond (&gt;25% of immigrant HH's without standard mail delivery to household—PO Box only, shared, friend's house/other)</b></p> | <p><b>Improve Delivery of Census Materials (invitations for online response, mailed forms, reminders)</b></p> <p><b>Augment in-field address canvassing, more U/L</b></p> <p><b>Invest heavily in QAC deployment including staffing with linguistically/culturally competent staff—including employment-authorized non-citizens.</b></p> <p><b>Targeted messaging with SPECIFIC message re proactive response</b></p> | <p><b>Congressional advocacy for earmarked funding increases for expansion of U/L</b></p> <p><b>Congressional advocacy for earmarked funding increases for local QAC's. State funding if no federal support feasible.</b></p> <p><b>Congressional advocacy for waivers to hire non-citizen staff for QAC's in language minority neighborhoods.</b></p> |
| <p>PO Box Delivery only</p>   | <p>Advocate for increased use of U/L and identification of census tracts for U/L including input from knowledgeable local community groups</p>  | <p>LA region/local/community-based organization collaboration in reviewing current TEA designation</p>   |
| <p>PO Box Delivery only</p>   | <p>Co-locate staffed satellite QAC at every post office</p> <p>Use state administrative records for promotional mailing</p> <p>Messaging/census promotion from USPS office staff</p>  | <p>Collaboration with USPS to set up QAC's with high proportion of HTC PO Box users.</p> <p>Collaboration with USPS to engage local postal service workers in promoting census participation (particularly with PO box users)</p>  |
| <p>Shared mail delivery</p>   | <p>Multi-lingual statewide-wide mailout (perhaps including reliance on state administrative records such as CDL), acknowledging problem and promoting including everyone and initiative to respond at QAC if a family unit believes they've been left out</p>   | <p>State-wide mailout, complemented with local specific messaging via media and outreach workers</p> <p>Sec. State Padilla messaging? AG Becerra messaging?</p>  |
| <p>No mail delivery (e.g. gets mail at friend's or relative's house)</p>  | <p>Specific messaging that individual and family will probably be left out unless they take the initiative to go to QAC for NID</p>   | <p>State-wide mailout, complemented with local specific messaging via media and outreach workers</p>   |



| CAUSES OF UNDERCOUNT  | WHAT CAN BE DONE   | POLICY/LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Householder Willing to Respond but Find it Difficult</b></p>  | <p><b>Quality staffing of QAC's with linguistically-competent personnel (including non-citizens)</b></p> <p><b>Messaging to promote QAC friendliness, accessibility</b></p>  | <p>Advocacy for increased, earmarked Census Bureau funding. State funding program for QAC's if no federal funding is available. Implementation by CBO's with substantial training and monitoring from state.</p>  |
| <p>Spanish-speaking and limited in English and lives in census tract w/ &lt;20% linguistically-isolated Spanish-speaking HH's</p> | <p>Factor in QAC location specifically % of linguistically-isolated HH</p> <p>Messaging SPECIFICALLY to relatives, friends, co-workers, neighbors (social networks) of monolingual Spanish speaking HH heads to help them respond</p>                              | <p>Congressional advocacy for bilingual mailing down to tracts with &gt;10% linguistically isolated</p> <p>State funding program for QAC's if no federal funding is available. Implementation by CBO's with substantial training and monitoring from state.</p>   |
| <p>Limited-English language minority speaking language NOT supported by Census Bureau (e.g. Hmong, Khmer, Punjabi)</p>            | <p>Staffing of QAC's in areas with relatively high proportion of Asian language minorities with linguistically competent staff</p> <p>Mobile QAC's or satellite QAC's in densely-settled neighborhoods (e.g. apartment building in Stockton, southeast Fresno)</p> | <p>Congressional advocacy to extend minority language support to significant languages where language support is not currently provided.</p> <p>Pilot program to use Governor's Discretionary WIOA funding to provide classroom-based interpretation/training to bilingual individuals in key languages followed with work experience opportunities during Census 2020 NRFU</p> |
| <p>Spanish-speaking in census tract w/ &gt;20% linguistically-isolated Spanish-speaking HH's but low-literate</p>                 | <p>Messaging SPECIFICALLY to de-stigmatize low literacy as barrier and encourage seeking help at QAC's.</p> <p>Mobile QAC's</p>  | <p>State funding program for QAC's if no federal funding is available. Implementation by CBO's with substantial training and monitoring from state.</p>   |



| CAUSES OF UNDERCOUNT   | WHAT CAN BE DONE  | POLICY/LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS   |
|--|---|---|
| Refusal to Participate   | <p><b>Briefing Census Bureau enumerators about local perspectives, concerns</b></p> <p><b>Improving census <i>promotore/as</i>'s capacity to address broad range of concerns</b></p>  | <p><b>Set-aside from eventual overarching “outreach” budget for media and county and ACBO funding. Ideally 10%-15% of total outreach budget, e.g. \$18 million</b></p>  |
| Census Bureau Briefing   | <p>Briefing teams re SJVCRP findings, NALEO findings, local insights</p> <p>Distinguishing “reluctant” vs. “refusing” Householders</p> <p>Refusal conversion strategies</p> <p>Local applied research re priority LOCAL interests vis-à-vis community benefits from fair/accurate census among different sub-populations of immigrant and other HTC respondents</p>   | <p>Local research on local population concerns, messaging and development of training curriculum--20 sub-state areas. \$400,000</p> <p>Modest cost. Estimate 600 workshops @ \$500/workshop=\$300,000</p>   |
| <p><i>Promotore/as</i> training and support for outreach workers, mobile QAC's, and fixed-base QAC's</p> | <p>Same as for Census Bureau briefing</p> <p>Additional—constant telephone support for mobile QAC's and fixed-base QAC's with answers to questions (e.g. skipping CQ if included, specific uses of census data)</p> <p>Monitoring QAC operations and quality improvement, corrective action as needed</p> <p>Local applied research re priority LOCAL interests vis-à-vis community benefits from fair/accurate census among different sub-populations of immigrant and other HTC respondents</p> | <p>Fixed-base QAC staffing @ 600 QAC's with 2 staff for 4 hrs./day for 4 days/week (2 on weekends) x 12 weeks. About \$5.5 million.</p> <p>Mobile QAC staffing—assume same costs as for fixed-base QAC plus \$2 million tablet hardware and mobile subscription=\$7.5 million</p> |



| CAUSES OF UNDERCOUNT   | WHAT CAN BE DONE  | POLICY/LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Reluctance to Participate—Attitudes, Aspirations</b></p>   | <p><b>Enhanced Messaging Strategy—for media-based messaging and for on-the-ground outreach</b></p>  | <p><b>Contractor Requirements for “market segmentation” analysis as part of “outreach” messaging and strategy.</b></p> <p><b>Investment in effective and innovative communication strategy development</b></p> |
| <p>Neighborhood effect in determining reluctance to participate—potential “negative buzz” in neighborhoods with concentrations of immigrants (&gt;20% non-citizen)</p> | <p>Social network mobilization as key component of strategy to promote census participation</p> <p>Census promotion strategy to include provisions for mobilizing diverse socially-defined networks, not simply reliance on co-ethnic outreach: workplace networks of co-workers, messaging designed for dissemination to secondary audiences—e.g. via neighborhood interactions, hometown associations</p> | <p>Enhanced oversight of “outreach” networks.</p>  |
| <p>Ineffectiveness of standard Census Bureau NRFU efforts to promote self-response (e.g. reminder postcards)</p>   | <p>Specific messages synchronized with phases of census implementation—e.g. “if you forgot to respond, pay attention to the reminder and go ahead”, “if an enumerator comes to visit and you’re not home, remember to go to QAC”</p>  | <p>Coordination of media-based outreach, county, and state agency and on-the-ground outreach with Census Bureau ACO’s and special programs—e.g. Census in Schools</p>  |
| <p>Ineffectiveness of standard “informational” communications as a vehicle to impact attitudes, aspirations, response behavior</p>                                     | <p>Preparation for “deep-level” interactions with reluctant households—beyond “fact sheets”, “slogans”, public service announcements, standardized scripts for canvassers.</p> <p>Development of “high touch” resources for addressing wide range of concerns in the course of messaging and outreach.</p>  | <p>Coordination with recognized pro-immigrant state officials</p>  |



| <b>PREPARATION FOR CENSUS EVALUATION AS BASIS FOR LITIGATION FOR ADJUSTMENT</b>  | <b>WHAT CAN BE DONE</b>   | <b>POLICY/LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS</b>   |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Planning of overall independent evaluation of Census 2020 with focus on measuring differential undercount among HTC groups—including specific analyses of race/ethnic populations, immigrants, families in crowded housing, limited-English households, farmworkers</p> | <p>Advocacy for best possible Census Bureau coverage measurement—e.g. well-stratified sample, more detailed analysis than in 2010.</p> <p>Funding and planning need to be in place by Fall, 2019 to optimize research efficacy. Funding required for CA FY 2019-2021 in order to support data collection in 2020 and analysis on into 2021.</p> | <p><b>Allocation of appropriate funding for top-quality research—likely in the range of \$16-24 million (1%-2% of CA Dept. of Justice FY16-17 budget of \$800 million+ for all activities)</b></p> |
| <p>Stratified sample design for independent “quasi dual-system measurement” of census undercount and potentially “triple enumeration”.</p>   | <p>Discussion with California Demographic Research Unit. Detailed planning needed—based on Test of Adjustment-Related Operations (TARO) in Los Angeles Basin in 1986</p>  | <p>Sample design—negligible cost. Implementation of independent quasi dual-system estimation study in range of \$2-5 million.</p>  |
| <p>Identification of priority ethnographic alternative enumeration HTC populations for independent program (or in collaboration with Census Bureau—if funding/organizational agreement available)</p>  | <p>10-12 crucial undercount groups and 2-4 sites per group for ethnographic alternative enumeration in different community contexts. Partnership with local county and CBO organizations for implementing research design. Determine sample size for each (perhaps larger than 1990 Census Bureau initiative)</p>                               | <p>40 ethnographic research sites @ \$80,000=\$3.2 million</p>   |
| <p>Real-time monitoring of Census 2020 operations and NRFU implementation</p>  | <p>State-led evaluation research initiative examining key components of Census 2020 data collection, including mailing of census materials, response to census materials, NRFU including enumerator interviews and proxy interviews. Partnership with local county and CBO organizations for implementing research design.</p>                  | <p>Intensive monitoring in diverse sample of 10 CA counties @ \$300,000/county evaluation=\$3.0 million</p>  |
| <p>Identification of counties for program of sub-state regional demographic analysis based on local capacity and patterns of in-migration and out-migration</p>  | <p>Discussion with California Demographic Research Unit</p>   | <p>Sampling costs negligible. Costs for optimal institutional participation TBD</p>  |