

**OVERSIGHT OF THE 2000 CENSUS: EXAMINING  
THE AMERICA COUNTS TODAY [ACT] INITIA-  
TIVES TO ENHANCE TRADITIONAL ENUMERA-  
TION METHODS**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON

GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 2, 1999

**Serial No. 106-1**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.house.gov/reform>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

55-702 CC

WASHINGTON : 1999

## COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland	TOM LANTOS, California
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California	PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	GARY A. CONDIT, California
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia	PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
DAVID M. McINTOSH, Indiana	CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio	ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina	DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
BOB BARR, Georgia	ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DAN MILLER, Florida	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
ASA HUTCHINSON, Arkansas	JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
LEE TERRY, Nebraska	JIM TURNER, Texas
JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois	THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
GREG WALDEN, Oregon	HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
DOUG OSE, California	
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin	BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California	(Independent)
HELEN CHENOWETH, Idaho	

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*

DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*

DAVID A. KASS, *Deputy Counsel and Parliamentarian*

CARLA J. MARTIN, *Chief Clerk*

PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

DAN MILLER, Florida, *Chairman*

JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California	CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin	HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	

### EX OFFICIO

DAN BURTON, Indiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

THOMAS B. HOFELLER, *Staff Director*

KELLY DUQUIN, *Professional Staff Member*

DAVID McMILLEN, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

## CONTENTS

---

Hearing held on March 2, 1999 .....	Page 1
Statement of:	
Myrick, Hon. Sue, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina; and Hon. Carrie Meek, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida .....	2
Prewitt, Kenneth, Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census .....	35
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Maloney, Hon. Carolyn B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of .....	32
Meek, Hon. Carrie, a Representative in Congress from the State of Flor- ida, prepared statement of .....	10
Miller, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, prepared statement of .....	24
Myrick, Hon. Sue, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina, prepared statement of .....	4
Prewitt, Kenneth, Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, prepared state- ment of .....	40



**OVERSIGHT OF THE 2000 CENSUS: EXAMIN-  
ING THE AMERICA COUNTS TODAY [ACT]  
INITIATIVES TO ENHANCE TRADITIONAL  
ENUMERATION METHODS**

---

**TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1999**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS,  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:10 p.m., in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Miller (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Miller, Maloney, and Davis.

Ex officio present: Representative Waxman.

Staff present: Thomas B. Hofeller, staff director; Jennifer Safavian, chief counsel; Kelly Duquin, professional staff member; Phil Schiliro, minority staff director; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; Michelle Ash, minority counsel; David McMillen, minority professional staff member; and Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk.

Mr. MILLER. Good afternoon. A quorum is present and we shall begin the hearing of the Subcommittee on the Census.

We are going to have a slight change in the order this afternoon, since a vote is coming in about another 20 minutes, we thought we would have the two Members of Congress who will be testifying today make their statements and handle any questions and then we can break for the vote and then probably we will reconvene, I would guess right now, around 3, as soon as we finish the second vote. Congresswoman Meek is on her way and so in order to expedite time, let us call on Congresswoman Sue Myrick.

Congresswoman Myrick is a former mayor of Charlotte, NC and was involved with the census and is going to be able to testify today.

Congresswoman Kay Granger was also going to testify but she is apparently sick with the flu and is not even back in town today, so maybe on another occasion we will have her be able to testify.

So with that, I would like to call on Congresswoman Sue Myrick.

**STATEMENTS OF HON. SUE MYRICK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; AND  
HON. CARRIE MEEK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS  
FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

Mrs. MYRICK. Thank you Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Maloney, and the members of the subcommittee. I really appreciate the invitation to testify today.

As you mentioned, I am a former mayor of Charlotte, NC and also represent the 9th District of North Carolina, so I do understand the census from both the local, regional, and national perspective.

I have a great deal of respect for the Census Bureau and the work that it does and I have a link to them on my web page, for instance, but it is out of this respect for the Bureau and the process of the census that I come before you today with some grave concerns regarding the 2000 census.

I have serious concerns regarding the use of the sampling plan put forward by the Census Bureau. It was difficult for me to understand all this and it has been exceptionally difficult for my constituents to understand.

How can counting 90 percent of the population and estimating the rest yield accurate results, especially when the census accurately counted 98.4 percent of the population in 1990?

I understand there were statistical experts who said it would be more accurate and those who said it would not. However, as an elected official knows, we must be able to explain the plan to the people in a way that they can understand and for this reason alone the Bureau's plan failed to convince my constituents that it was in their best interests to change the fundamental way the census has been conducted for the last 200 years.

In my years of public service, I have learned many things, but most importantly, I have learned that the "we know better than you" attitude that is so common in Washington breeds distrust and apathy. And it is amid this respective trust that I raise my first concern today, the failure of the Census Bureau to include a plan for post-census local review in the 2000 census.

The ability of local governments to check the work of the Census Bureau is fundamental to building trust between local and Federal Government. The Census Bureau has made a concerted effort to involve local governments during the planning stages to help develop maps and address lists and it seems fundamentally flawed to cut them out from a final review at the end.

I am also keenly aware that most local government officials are in favor of post-census local review. And why should they not be? They and they alone are going to have to answer to their constituents if problems arise from the census and certainly personnel at the Census Bureau are not going to answer my constituents' concerns.

I am keenly aware that the Census Bureau has proposed what they term an alternative to post-census local review. This alternative is to do a two-number census and provide sample numbers to the States for their use. The original sampling plan was difficult enough to understand and how do I explain this need for two sets of numbers?

As I understand it, population numbers for the second manipulated number will include a mixing of population data from other States. If I were a Governor, how could I draw up a redistricting plan based on population data from other States?

I believe that the Bureau's answer is that the States have a choice, but why waste time and money giving the States useless information?

As many members of the subcommittee know, North Carolina has been tied up in court for most of the decade with redistricting disputes and we are there again now. If the Bureau continues with its current plan for a two-number census, these suits will only become more prevalent. California, Indiana, Wisconsin, Virginia, Florida, New York, Illinois, and Tennessee will find themselves in similar situations.

Many of the members of the subcommittee have served in local government. Is there anyone here that honestly believes that you could put forth a redistricting plan based on population data from other States and not have it challenged in court?

I would like to thank the subcommittee for the fine work you have done. The census is the foundation of our democracy and everything that we do is based on actual enumeration in America. If the census is not trusted by the people, then it becomes a failure.

I hope the Bureau will incorporate Chairman Miller's common sense plan to count Americans. We must provide not only the Bureau but local governments and community-based organizations with the resources and the tools they need to have an accurate 2000 census.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to share my concerns with the subcommittee.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Sue Myrick follows:]

Thank you Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Maloney and Members of the Subcommittee on the Census for inviting me to testify today. As the former mayor of Charlotte, North Carolina and the current Representative of the Ninth District of North Carolina, I understand the importance of the Census from both a national and local perspective.

I have a great deal of respect for the Census Bureau and the work that it does. In fact, I have a link to the Census Bureau's information about the Ninth District on my web page.

It is out of this respect for the Bureau and the process of the decennial census that I come before you today with grave concerns regarding the 2000 Census.

I, like many others, have serious concerns regarding the use of the controversial sampling plan put forth by the Census Bureau. It was difficult for me to understand, and even more difficult to explain to my constituents.

How can counting 90 percent of the population and estimating the rest yield more accurate results? Especially, when the 1990 Census accurately counted 98.4 percent of the population.

I understand that there were statistical experts who said it would be more accurate and those that said it would not. However, as any elected official knows, we must be able to explain the plan to people in a way that they understand.

For this reason alone, the Bureau's plan failed to convince my constituents that it was in their best interest to change the fundamental way the census has been conducted for 200 years.

In my years of public service, I have learned many things. Most importantly, I've learned that the "we know better than you" attitude that is so common in Washington breeds distrust and apathy.



It is amid this aspect of trust that I raise my first concern today: the failure of the Census Bureau to include a plan for Post Census Local Review in the 2000 Census. The ability of local governments to check the work of the Census Bureau is fundamental to building trust between local governments and the Federal government.

The Census Bureau has made a concerted effort to involve local governments during the planning stages to help develop maps and address lists. It seems fundamentally flawed to cut them out from a final review at the end.

I am also keenly aware that most local government officials are in favor of Post Census Local Review. And why shouldn't they be? They, and they alone, are going to have to answer to their constituents if problems arise from the census. Certainly personnel at the Census Bureau are not going to answer my constituents concerns.

I am keenly aware that the Census Bureau has proposed what they term an "alternative" to Post Census Local Review. This "alternative" is to do a two-number census and provide sampled numbers to the states for their use.

The original sampling plan was difficult enough to understand. How do I explain the need for two sets of numbers? As I understand it, population numbers for the second manipulated number will include a mixing of population data from other states.

If I were a Governor, how could I draw-up a redistricting plan based on population data from other states? I believe that the Bureau's answer is that the states have a choice. But, why waste time and money giving the states useless information?

As many of the Members of the subcommittee know, North Carolina has been tied-up in court for most of the decade with redistricting disputes.

If the Bureau continues with its current plan for a two-number census, these suits will only become more prevalent. California, Indiana, Wisconsin, Virginia, Florida, New York, Illinois, Tennessee will find themselves in similar situations.

Many of the Members of this subcommittee have served in local government. Is there anyone here that honestly believes that you could put forth a redistricting plan based on population data from other states and not have it challenged in court?

I would like to thank the Subcommittee for the fine work that you have done. The Census is the foundation of our democracy. Everything we do is based on "actual enumeration" of America. If the census is not trusted, then it is a failure.

I hope that the Bureau will incorporate Chairman Miller's common sense plan to count America. We must provide not only the Bureau, but local governments and community based organizations with the resources and the tools they need to have an accurate 2000 Census.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to share my concerns with the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Ms. Myrick.

Congresswoman Meek, we have had a little change in schedule. Because we are going to have a vote shortly, we decided for your convenience, actually, to allow you all to go first before we have our opening statements, so that is the reason you are immediately put in the chair to make your presentation, so we will be able to ask you to make your presentation and then we will have a chance for some questions before we proceed to vote.

Congresswoman Meek helped us have a hearing on the census down in Miami last December, and I thank you very much. And the day before we had the opportunity to spend touring your district and getting a better feeling and understanding of your district.

I think it was very valuable, both the trip to Phoenix—where we talked mainly about the Indian undercount problem and then to Miami, the unique problems in Miami. It was very enlightening for both Congresswoman Maloney and myself.

So we are glad that we are cosponsoring a bill that I think you are going to talk about today and look forward to your comments.

Congresswoman Meek.

Mrs. MEEK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. I am pleased to be here and I want to thank you for taking this opportunity to mark up H.R. 683 on the Improvement Act of 1999. As you know, this legislation was introduced last year. I am so happy that we are able to bring it up this year.

Now, I must say to the subcommittee it is good to have a good bill, but it is even better if you have the chairman as a cosponsor of the bill, so I am more than pleased to be here.

Various techniques, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, can be used to improve the accuracy of the physical count in the 2000 census, particularly in the year 2000, particularly in poor neighborhoods.

I do not think I can embellish or enhance too much more than each of you has said and known already, but thousands of additional enumerators are going to be needed and will be hired. And my reason for sponsoring this bill and the chairperson as well is that about 683 people will be allowed to be hired if this bill is passed and people who are on public assistance and veterans will be able to get jobs as temporary census enumerators without losing benefits.

Now, all of you understand that it makes a count more reasonable if there is someone who lives in that neighborhood or someone who knows the persons who are living there who go in to count.

It is a known fact that many people do not want to be counted. They do not want to be found. Many of them are in apartments, in the back of other apartments. Many of them are living with people that other people do not even know where they are living.

So it does help to a great extent to have people from those neighborhoods, people who know these people counting, so when they knock on the door, they do not think it is a bill collector or they do not think it is someone they know nothing about.

So this bill provides temporary pay for these census enumerators in the decennial census and they will not have to lose their benefits. The last time this question came up, some agencies had poli-

cies that would allow them to go ahead and be temporary enumerators without losing their benefits; others did not.

There was really no widespread acceptance of this. Even the Secretary of HHS could not say this would be a standard policy throughout the agencies. So it would be very good if this committee sees fit to pass this.

The real thing we are aiming for here is a more accurate count. We know that the accurate count will be much—the count will be improved if we have people who are in these poor and minority and immigrant communities.

Mr. Chairman, in many of these communities, people come in daily. They come in by boat, they come in whatever way they come in by. They are there.

According to our constitutional mandate, we have to count every head. So if you have people who are in that neighborhood who are willing and able to find people and count them, everyone will be counted.

I will end by saying there is suspicion of government. There is suspicion of new people coming to your door asking who is there and asking questions. So what this bill will do is allow these enumerators to be hired on a temporary basis and allow neighbors to count neighbors.

We do not all agree on everything. We do not all agree on sampling and other methods and methodologies, but we do agree on one thing: that if we are able to enhance the count and make the count much more accurate, we need to be sure that we count these areas where we know the undercount has been very glaring in poor and minority communities and we know this points us in the right direction.

We are going to press for passage of this bill and we are certainly going to press the Census Bureau, when this bill passes, to aggressively recruit minority enumerators in these poor and minority communities.

This is a fair and crucial process and I hope that the subcommittee will see fit to pass it.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Carrie Meek follows:]

CARRIE P. MEEK  
17TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA  
COMMITTEE ON  
APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEES  
TREASURY, POSTAL  
SERVICE, AND GENERAL  
GOVERNMENT  
VA, HUD, AND  
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES



Congress of the United States  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515-0917

Please Respond To:  
421 CANNON HOUSE  
OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-4506  
(202) 226-0777 FAX  
3550 BISCAYNE BLVD.  
SUITE 500  
MIAMI, FL 33137  
(305) 576-9303  
(305) 576-9763 FAX

STATEMENT OF REP. CARRIE P. MEEK  
CENSUS SUBCOMMITTEE  
March 2, 1999

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today. I am very pleased that the Census Subcommittee is marking up HR 683 - the Decennial Census Improvement Act of 1999. As you know, I introduced this legislation last year and I am very pleased that the chairman has joined me this year as a co-sponsor. I learned long ago in my service in government that, even when a bill makes as much sense as this one does, it never hurts to have the Chairman as a co-sponsor.

Various techniques can and must be used to improve the accuracy of the physical count in the 2000 census; particularly in poor neighborhoods. Thousands of additional enumerators must be hired. HR 683 allows people receiving public assistance, and veterans, to work as temporary census employees without losing benefits. Under current law, if you take a census job, your added income could cost you your health care, or your food stamps. The bill provides that pay for temporary census enumerators in the 2000 decennial census will not be used to reduce benefits under Federal assistance programs.

The improvement we are aiming for in this bill is a much more accurate census count in poor, minority and immigrant communities. As you know, the census undercount problem is greatest in these neighborhoods. One of the big reasons the census undercount is so high in poor neighborhoods is suspicion of strangers working for the government who ask a lot of questions. You answer a lot of questions, you get in trouble. Everyone in Washington knows that. Our bill makes it possible for neighbors to count neighbors in these communities.

Now, Chairman Miller, as you know, many people don't agree on the need for sampling, or even what the Supreme Court decided in the recent sampling case. But we do agree that we need to do much more to get accurate counts in poor and minority communities, and that this bill will move us in the right direction.

We're going to press for passage of our bill, and we're also going to press the Census bureau to aggressively recruit enumerators in poor, minority and immigrant communities. Community-based enumerators are crucial to a fair and accurate count in the 2000 census. Community-based enumerators are also indispensable to correcting the fundamental problem that plagued the disastrous 1990 census -- the gross undercount of minorities.

We should hire census enumerators who live in the communities where they are working. Persons working in our neighborhoods are uniquely qualified to work as temporary census enumerators and maximize the chance that everyone will be counted. The residents of a community know their neighbors, and can more readily identify when someone has not been reached by the census enumerators. This is especially true in economically depressed communities.

The Census Bureau has had difficulty in attracting people in poor neighborhoods to work as temporary census workers because, frequently, these persons could not earn additional income from temporary census work without exceeding the income limits for receiving benefits under various Federally-financed assistance programs, such as welfare benefits, food stamps, housing, and health care assistance.

We need to expand our efforts to bring good jobs, hope, and opportunity to welfare recipients and to the least fortunate in our society. This bill is good for working mothers and for veterans, because it increases their opportunities to earn and learn, as well as to supplement their income. Hopefully, this temporary census work will give welfare recipients not only a good job, but also the confidence and the opportunities they need to gain more, good quality, full-time permanent employment. Passage of this bill will be an important step in improving the accuracy and fairness of the 2000 census count. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Congresswoman Meek, we are not marking up the bill today. Hopefully, I think we are doing it on Thursday morning. But the criticism I have heard from both people on the Ways and Means Committee, and Secretary Shalala, is that we are usurping State power since we delegated all this power to the States. And we have talked about this, but the question is, well, how do we justify doing this?

I mean, I am supportive of it, but how do you answer the question of some of the critics of our bill that say, well, why are we taking away a State power, since in 1996 we gave them the State power?

Mrs. MEEK. I think that the States' rights issue is not a good issue here in that in terms of States—they will be the first ones to sue you if they do not think that you have an accurate count. History is replete with States who have sued the Census Bureau and the Government because they did not feel there was an accurate count.

So I think one of the strongest parts of our rationale is keeping closely to an accurate count. They all agree that the count is very, very important.

I think it will be much better this time if we are able to get these people involved and I think it does say something also to poor people and minorities, that, look, we are so interested in your being counted, we are going to find you wherever you are, even though many of you may feel that we are encroaching upon you. We need to know that every citizen is there.

Now, I will tell you another thing, Mr. Chairman. The States are not going to hold back when you start issuing the money. When it comes down to issuing the money and giving them their share of the money, they are not going to say, oh, we have States' rights. They will be happy if you have gotten an accurate count in their community.

I think that is something that each of them will be very much secure in, if they know that they are getting the good count.

Mr. MILLER. And another argument I will make is that it is—this is a constitutional requirement to do the census.

Mrs. MEEK. Right.

Mr. MILLER. And it is very specific that we must conduct the best census possible in our Constitution, that I think in this case we have—you know, once every 10 years we have a right to make it possible. So I agree with you.

Let me ask Congresswoman Myrick a question.

Mrs. MYRICK. I was just going to ask if I might comment on that, because I also support the bill. And, you know, this is on my mind. I am a great States' rights person, so I am always big on States' rights, but this is like providing guidelines for the States to follow so you know that you are going to get an accurate census. And, as you said, it is a constitutional matter and that is really what is important, so I do not see this as a conflict.

Mr. MILLER. You mentioned in your statement about the lawsuits.

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. And I have been reading about North Carolina. I do not know if it is settled yet, but—



Mrs. MYRICK. No.

Mr. MILLER. I mean—

Mrs. MYRICK. It is not. Not until this summer.

Mr. MILLER. I mean, lawsuits are going to happen, but with a two-number census, there are going to be more lawsuits than we can keep track of, the whole area of census law is going to be developing. What is your comment about this? You have the lawsuits that North Carolina—

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, it has been a real frustration, again because you go back to the people in the districts. I mean, they do not know what district they are in.

Since 1992, when Mel Watt's district was established, we have had challenges every time to his district. And so we are constantly having new districts. And it is just—people just throw up their hands. They do not know where to vote, they do not know who is their representative. And, you know, we just help everybody out because it is so frustrating to everyone.

And, of course, Mel's district and my district border each other, so we are especially affected by all this. And, you know, we just keep hoping that it is going to stop. We believe that he has a good district now and it does not need to be done again, but people challenge it, so that is really where we are coming from.

But if you have more reason for them to challenge, I mean, they challenge now with hardly any reason at all, that we are going to just be tied up in court and who knows how long this will go on, not only in my State but in other States as well.

Mr. MILLER. Can you imagine how two sets of numbers will tie it up even more?

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, I mean, that is a perfect reason for them to challenge it. So which number is right? It is just mass confusion is all we can see. And having been through this now since 1990, his district was established in 1992, so it started in 1990—

Mr. MILLER. So he had a different district in 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1998?

Mrs. MYRICK. We did not have a new one in 1996, but we did again for the 1998 election. We have another new one.

Mr. MILLER. How about 2000? Is it going to be challenged?

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, right now, if the Supreme Court rules this summer that the challenge is OK, we will have a new district in 2000 and then a new district in 2002.

Mr. MILLER. OK.

Congresswoman Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I would like to commend both of the speakers.

And Carrie Meek, I certainly support your bill.

Building on the comments of the chairman on the hearing that was held in your district earlier, it was interesting to note that all of the panelists, save one, on the record came out in firm support of modern scientific methods in counting and there was a cross-section of civil rights groups, of Latinos, blacks, Asians, elderly, youth programs, well over 50, 60, almost 100 different groups from the Miami area that came out likewise in support of a modern scientific count.

But I would like to ask Sue Myrick some questions based on her testimony.

It has been suggested that the post-census review operation should be reinstated, and you support that. While I certainly support the concept of local review, I believe that the Census Bureau's current program of pre-census local review is more effective, efficient, and practical than a post-census review.

For starters, the program's value in 1990 in terms of adding people was small in relation to the work and cost required. Only 4.2 percent of the 6.5 million census blocks nationwide were challenged. The re-canvass of these blocks added only 124,000 people. Further, for every housing unit that was added through the program, upwards of two units were deleted.

What is your opinion of the new pre-census local review program?

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, I support that also. I think that the Census Bureau—in order to have the most effective census, if they consult with the local officials firsthand, you know, they can give them information as to where they know that they have the problems because most local officials know where their areas are that you will have undercounts or, you know, projected undercounts, whether it may be people you cannot identify—I mean, you know, in our city, I know where all the bridges are that people sleep under, so, you know, you can go to the bridges and count them. Very seriously. And there are regular people who are there all the time, they live there. That type of thing.

And then the reason I support the post-census is because again, it is just going back for one final check and making sure you have covered all those areas before you move forward. So I do not see it as duplication, I just think that it is another mechanism. I think most local officials will be perfectly willing to work and not hold it up to be controversial or anything, just simply as a support mechanism.

Mrs. MALONEY. Is Charlotte participating now in the pre-census local review program?

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, I will be honest with you, and I cannot answer that question.

Mrs. MALONEY. Could you find out for us and get back to us?

Mrs. MYRICK. I will be glad to find out for you and get back to you.

Mrs. MALONEY. What their participation is and—

Mrs. MYRICK. I cannot imagine they are not, because we have always had an active process before.

Mrs. MALONEY. In 1990, were you the mayor of Charlotte, in that time period?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mm-hmm.

Mrs. MALONEY. And did you participate in the post-census local review program?

Mrs. MYRICK. I am trying to remember just how we were involved and I should have checked this before I came today, Carolyn, and given you an exact rundown and I will do that.

Mrs. MALONEY. OK. Because I would like to know.

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes. I will.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to know how many people were added in Charlotte's 1990 census count as a result of the post-census review.

Mrs. MYRICK. We will get that to you.

Mrs. MALONEY. And how much it cost Charlotte and in your opinion was the effort and cost worth it in terms of the Federal funds that flowed into Charlotte's coffers.

Mrs. MYRICK. Right.

Mrs. MALONEY. One of the things about this is that when we did it back in 1990, 50 percent of the persons added were from two cities, Detroit and Cleveland.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mm-hmm.

Mrs. MALONEY. And when the Census Bureau looked at this, this was based on their prior testimony, I understand Dr. Prewitt will be testifying later, he can add to this, but it was my understanding because the post-census review was not successful in that it only added 124,000 people, they decided to work with the mayors and the local governments before to get the address lists—

Mrs. MYRICK. Right.

Mrs. MALONEY [continuing]. To check those bridges, to check those buildings, everything that you said. They thought it would be smarter and more cost effective to do this now or do it before, which is what they have done.

Mrs. MYRICK. Right.

Mrs. MALONEY. And so what we are talking about in the process that you are proposing that we now add to their plan, what does it add to it? They have already done it. They have already done that particular job.

Mrs. MYRICK. I think all it adds to it is, again, just a double checking and a making sure that all those areas have been covered—that they have done the areas that were specified in the pre-check and that everything is OK before they move forward, nothing has been forgotten.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, I think that is what the pre-census local review is for. But—

Mr. MILLER. The red light does not go on. The green goes off.

Mrs. MALONEY. OK. My time is up.

Mr. MILLER. OK. If I can, Mr. Davis, I will switch over to Mr. Waxman. May I?

Mrs. MALONEY. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, can I get to her in writing questions about Charlotte?

Mr. MILLER. Of course.

Mrs. MYRICK. We will get you those answers. I have a staff person who is taking notes on those.

Mr. MILLER. We have requested information from the Census Bureau on this and we have not been able to get it ourselves on the 1990 post-census.

Mrs. MYRICK. Right. One of the problems, Mrs. Maloney, is I did go back and check with my records. All my records are archived and we cannot get to them.

Mrs. MALONEY. Oh, really?

Mrs. MYRICK. And so the person who is in the office now, you know, did not know and there was no way for me actually to check without them going back into the archives out at the university, so

that is why I was not able to get the information for you ahead of time, because we did try.

Mr. MILLER. Some of this we can get from the Census Bureau, too.

Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank both of you for your testimony today. We all share the interest in wanting an accurate census.

In 1990, we took a census. We did not have any adjustment which would have reflected what the Bureau of the Census wants to do this time around to be sure the census is accurate.

Ms. Myrick, you said your constituents cannot understand why we would do sampling or do any of these adjustments, we would just count the people.

Mrs. MYRICK. Right.

Mr. WAXMAN. And that should be good enough. Now, the GAO—

Mrs. MYRICK. No, I did not say we should not do adjustments. I said we should count the people.

Mr. WAXMAN. OK. What adjustments would you make?

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, again, if you have a review that you know you are going to be reaching the people in the areas where they are living or staying even though they are not registered at addresses, so you would have a pretty good idea that you have counted everybody. Then you should be OK before—and, as I said, checking with the city people before and then again afterwards, I do not see really is duplication, and then when you move forward you should have a pretty good feel that you have everybody.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, the GAO said that despite all the best efforts in 1990, we did not get everybody in some places and we double counted people in other places.

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, I think that is one reason Carrie's bill is such a good idea because—

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, let me finish. Because the GAO—we want any proposal that will help us get the most accurate count. I am not arguing against her bill. But the GAO said that in 1990 there was an attempt to try to take the figures and project where there was an overcount and where there was an undercount and rearrange it.

They proposed to do that, but the Secretary of Commerce refused to do it and, as a result, we have many States that have lost money that they otherwise would have had over this last 10-year period; we have some States that made more money, they received more money, because they had people counted twice.

They indicated, GAO indicated, that 27 States and the District of Columbia lost \$4.5 billion over the decade in Federal funds due to the failure to correct the 1990 census.

Now, the biggest loser was California. The next biggest was Texas. There were six States, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, each lost over \$100 million. Florida should be of interest to our chairman. But even North Carolina lost money. In fact, GAO said that North Carolina lost \$68,300,000.

Now, are your constituents not going to say to you, why are we losing money because the census is not making sure that we can

project all the people that are here to sample and get an accurate picture of all the people that are here?

There are people in your State that are not being counted despite all the best efforts, even with Ms. Meek's bill they are not going to be counted. Do you not think we ought to make sure that they are all counted and that we are not duplicating and overcounting in other States?

Mrs. MYRICK. I have no problem with the fact that they should all be counted and I, of course, cannot answer for why the Secretary of Commerce would not allow an adjustment after the last census. But, again, I go back to the fact that if we do the best job we can in counting them now and not just estimating, then if there are adjustments needed, if you look at the local communities, you are going to know pretty much. They pretty much have a handle on where their people are.

Mr. WAXMAN. I think they do and they do not. Maybe you know where the bridges are, but you do not know exactly what numbers of people are under these bridges, but there are methods for getting some sampling that can tell you the totality of the amount, the same thing as you do and as Ms. Meek does and all the other politicians do when we try to figure out what public opinion is.

We do not count every single person, we get enough of a sampling, we use a scientific method to determine the totality of the population in an area.

Ms. Meek, do you not think we ought to have—count all the people we can and then use all the scientific methods to make sure that we have a sampling and a projection of the total population in each area?

Mrs. MEEK. My answer is yes.

Mr. Waxman, for the last 4 years, and even before, I have been a strong proponent of sampling in that I do know that I have been in one of the States in one of the fights since 1970 regarding the counts in the census. And it has been very, very standard right after each census for minority communities to find out there has been an undercount. And, of course, certainly, if we could do sampling I would be very, very happy, very satisfied that we would get these people.

Even with my bill, no matter what methodology you do here, unless you follow science in what you do, in the end you will probably come up with a less than accurate count.

Mr. WAXMAN. The Census Bureau is made up of career people who understand statistics and the best way to count the population. We ought to take their judgment as to how to do this thing.

The Census Bureau was overturned by a political appointee at the Secretary of Commerce, who I think decided that it would not be in the Republican party's interest to make sure they had an accurate count. And I must say that I think we are having the same thing this time around where Republicans are saying we are afraid that if you count everybody the way the Census Bureau thinks is scientifically the best way to get the most accurate statistics, that it may hurt Republican party interests.

Now, maybe it does, maybe it does not, but it hurts a lot of people in a lot of States, including States where we have Democrats and Republicans. We have Democrats and Republicans in Califor-

nia, in Florida, in North Carolina, and your constituents, our constituents, want to know why they are not getting their fair share of Federal dollars in order to do the things that they—

Mr. MILLER. The red light—

Mr. WAXMAN [continuing]. Need to build roads and everything else.

Mr. MILLER. The red light does not work. The green light is off, which means the same thing.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank both of the witnesses.

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, if I may have just a second?

Poor people, the people on food stamps, the people on welfare, they do not care anything about parties. They really do not.

They are concerned about what benefits they can get from the government and how the government can help them. When they are waiting for a house or something that the government should be giving people who cannot afford to do it, they can care very little about the ideologies that we hear in the Congress and in the public.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me commend you and Representative Meek for what I consider to be a very common sense, solid piece of legislation in terms of trying to make sure that individuals who are indigenous to low income communities have an opportunity to participate as enumerators without penalty.

Representative Meek, my question is even if we make use of these individuals who are indeed indigenous to local areas and who have a greater sense of awareness of what is there, after all is said and done, do you think that the people still will be counted or will we have missed a considerable number of people even making use of indigenous people to those areas?

Mrs. MEEK. I think the utilization of indigenous people will enhance the ability to get an accurate count. It means that common sense tells you that if you have someone who is known in that area to go in, since you are going to have a head count, you are looking for enumerators. The Constitution says you must count every head.

Well, what is any more logical way of counting every head than to have someone who knows where those heads are, who can go and tap them?

And I think in that particular realm that one of your better methods is to not exclude them in any scientific sampling that you may be able to do, but this does mean that your enumeration will be much better than it would be if you did not have them.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it your experience that in many such areas that there are still persons who could be termed unreachable, untouchable, and that no matter how hard you try in terms of the actuality of seeking them out that there still is a strong possibility that you are going to miss them?

Mrs. MEEK. I do not think there is a strong possibility. I think there is a possibility, but it is not as strong as it would be if you were not to use enumerators from those areas and that they know where the people are.

I visit a lot of the homeless shelters in my district and those without; and if it were not someone that we would enlist from Catholic Charities, from some of the rescue missions who know where those people are, the regular enumerators would never find them.

Or if you were to go to a housing project, you would find out that there are many people there you never know are there, but you will find them if you use people who live in that particular housing project, in that particular unit. And that happens a lot with children, in that many times they do not get an accurate count with children.

You will get a better, more accurate count with children if you are working through the local CAAs, if you are working through the local Head Start programs.

And to answer your question, I guess anything that exists in any amount can be measured. If that is the case, then we should use the best methodologies we can find to measure them.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you.

Representative Myrick, I agree with you that there is a certain amount of confusion that will in fact exist, especially if we have two sets of numbers in any kind of way. Of course, some people are going to be confused even if there is only one.

Mrs. MYRICK. True.

Mr. DAVIS. But with two sets of numbers, and especially the way that we are talking about using those now, I guess we are talking about using one set for one purpose, that is, the purpose of entitlement, another set for apportionment.

Do you think if one had to weigh or try and determine if one part of this equation was more important than the other, I mean, is entitlement more important than representation or could you see both being equally important?

Mrs. MYRICK. I think both are equally important. And my main concern was simply with the fact of the confusion in, first of all, having the two numbers and then second, if there are estimates other States use, then that just gives people an opportunity to sue.

And a lot of people today do not need an opportunity, they do it anyway. For instance, in North Carolina, as I said, with our districts, you know, we thought we had done a very fair job of redistricting this last time, but they came back and said, no, it is not.

The concern that I have is what happens with the people at home when they are trying to figure all this out.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I certainly appreciate your response and, you know, I just think it is unfortunate and I feel very strongly that after all is said and done, as we are currently moving, that there are indeed people who are going to be denied either entitlement or representation and I think that is most unfortunate because I do not believe that it is necessary that we do that. I do think it is possible that we could indeed provide the opportunity for people to both count and be counted.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. I was just handed a note by the staff concerning Mrs. Maloney's question that Charlotte, Ms. Myrick, that Charlotte did participate in the post-census local review in 1990, but they did not know the outcome because the bill did not tell all the commu-

nities exactly what the impact was and that Charlotte/Mecklenberg is supporting post-census local review now. Those are the counties, the two counties together, I guess.

Mrs. MYRICK. Well, Charlotte is a city in Mecklenberg County.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I see. That is the county. OK.

Mrs. MYRICK. So they work together.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Well, we have a vote going on. Hopefully we can be back here right after that second vote, which would be approximately 3 p.m. We will stand in recess until then.

[Recess.]

Mr. MILLER. The subcommittee will come back into session and we will begin with opening statements by the Members.

Good afternoon. Today we have heard from two distinguished Members of Congress, Sue Myrick and Carrie Meek, and we will now hear from Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, the Director of the Census Bureau.

Last week, the Clinton administration, to my extreme disappointment, officially announced its plans for a two-number census. One, a legal number, mandated by the Supreme Court and a second number manipulated by their controversial and unproven sampling plan and then provided to the States.

This plan, when put forth by the Clinton administration, reverses 6 years of policy calling for a one-number census. For years, the Clinton administration has said that to provide two sets of numbers measuring the same population would cause confusion and controversy for the American people.

As recently as this past November, the Census Bureau said in its operational plan, "The Census Bureau plans to produce a one-number census estimate of the United States population in Census 2000 that will improve accuracy and eliminate confusion and controversy caused by having more than one set of census results measuring the same population."

Apparently, now that the Clinton administration's plan to use population polling, rather than counting, in the census has lost in two Federal courts and the Supreme Court, the administration is perfectly willing to ignite controversy and cause confusion. This two-number census is a recipe for disaster and will lead down a path that will force every State and local government in America into court.

While most Members of Congress and the American people thought that the Supreme Court would make the final determination on how the 2000 census would be conducted, few thought that the Clinton administration would still attempt to sidestep the high court in order to pursue its illegal sampling plan.

Director Prewitt, I read with interest your comments yesterday in Roll Call. You said that people were getting the impression that we are headed toward two censuses: a Republican and Democrat census. I could not agree more: a Republican census approved by the Supreme Court and a Democrat census that is headed toward confusion, controversy, and the courts.

In the Roll Call article, you were very concerned about this perception, but you should not be surprised. Last week, the Clinton administration reversed 6 years of Bureau policy by advocating a



two-number census, once again putting politics over good public policy.

The full count, in accordance with the Supreme Court, must be the most accurate count possible. That is why the very week of the Supreme Court's decision I introduced the America Counts Today [ACT], initiatives at the U.S. Conference of Mayors winter meeting. The America Counts Today initiatives is designed to provide the additional tools needed to improve the 2000 census.

The America Counts Today initiatives are only the beginning. I would hope and expect that the administration would have concrete ideas as well on how to legally improve the 2000 census. I made a pledge that day and I repeat it today, that if more is needed, I will support it.

For some time I have been focused on how to reduce the minority undercount. I began a series of field hearings throughout the country in the hardest to count areas to learn ways to count the people that have been missed in the past. These hearings were designed to solicit the input of community stakeholders on ways to improve a traditional census in their respective communities. To date, there have been field hearings in Miami and Phoenix.

The America Counts Today initiatives are an outgrowth of this effort. I believe we need three major community-based improvements for the 2000 census. We need to increase community awareness, increase involvement of community leaders and reinforce community enumeration.

First, I want to increase the involvement of community leaders. My top priority has been to reinstitute post-census local review. That bill, H.R. 472, is an important first step to improving the 2000 census.

Nobody knows better than mayors and local officials where people in their communities live. Post-census local review gives them the opportunity to review census numbers in their communities before the Bureau makes them final.

This program was used in 1990 and added more than 80,000 households, but was discontinued in 2000 to the disappointment of most local government officials. Post-census local review is a common sense idea.

Why should not the Census Bureau be subject to a local audit of their work? Everyone makes mistakes and we all know that the census is a difficult and complex undertaking. If you want local governments to trust your numbers, then you must give them a reason to do so.

I have also proposed establishing a matching grant program for local partnership groups and communities to provide the resources needed to conduct outreach efforts and to encourage participation in the census in their respective neighborhoods.

Community awareness is critical to a successful census. Consequently, I have proposed increasing the advertising budget from \$100 to \$400 million with a significant portion of the new money targeted toward the hardest to count areas of the Nation.

Compared to some other Federal advertising programs, the \$100 million total advertising effort seemed inadequate. For example, in fiscal year 1998, the Federal Government provided \$195 million for the Partnership for a Drug-Free America advertising campaign. In

fact, the campaign is expected to spend over \$1 billion in advertising over 5 years. If the census is as important as we say it is, then we must advertise it.

In addition, we have proposed expanding the census in the schools program. If we can get all the schools involved, we should make any effort we can to get them involved. Additionally, we can and must increase the number of paid census partnership specialists and, again, target them to work in the areas with the worst undercount.

My third major initiative involves reinforcing community-based enumeration. I have proposed adding a minimum of 100,000 additional census enumerators and target them to work in the hardest to count communities. By organizing enumerators into elite teams and focusing their efforts exclusively on reaching hard to count populations, we will have a far more accurate count in these areas.

I have also proposed enlisting Americorp volunteers in the census effort. Why not use this program to reduce the undercount? They can go in early and stay late to help organize the hardest to count communities and build trust and partnerships.

I have already joined with Congresswoman Carrie Meek in sponsoring H.R. 683, the Decennial Census Improvement Act, which will provide waivers to welfare recipients and retired military officers who would like to count their neighborhoods but cannot because of bureaucratic red tape that would cause them to lose their benefits by taking a temporary census job.

Finally, I propose that we send a second census questionnaire to households and expand the languages covered. A second questionnaire gives another opportunity to those who did not respond the first time. In the dress rehearsals, this was shown to increase the response rate by almost 7 percent. That would mean that in the 2000 census some 19 million people could be added before we send enumerators into the field.

The Census Bureau should also publish their census forms in 33 languages so no significant group misses out on being counted because they could not get a form in their language. The Bureau has planned to only publish forms in five languages. Let us go back to 33 and add Braille in order to give everyone a chance to be counted.

These initiatives are both big and small, but all will help make the 2000 census a success. Above all, we need to work together, Republicans and Democrats, blacks, whites, Asians, Hispanics, Americans and immigrants.

We all have a stake in the census. While we have not agreed on the path to the 2000 census, we have always agreed that the destination is a complete and accurate count in 2000.

I am encouraged that since I introduced the ACT initiatives the Bureau has shown encouraging signs of adopting many of the proposals, such as increasing census in the schools, increasing the number of partnership specialists, and increasing the advertising program. In fact, the Bureau has now said that it is working with Americorp on how they can be incorporated into this important constitutional duty.

Let me say, Director Prewitt, that I do not envy your job. It is a most difficult one. I do believe that you are being pulled in two

different directions. At times, from my perspective, it is difficult to tell where the professionals of the Census Bureau start and the political appointees of this Commerce Department end.

I also understand that this fact may be largely beyond your control. However, as the Census Director, you are the one that has to answer the difficult questions.

I look forward to the testimony of the witness today and hearing your comments on the America Counts Today initiative as we all work to end the differential undercount in the 2000 census.

Mrs. Maloney.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Miller follows:]

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

**The Honorable Dan Miller, Chairman**

**H1-114 O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Chip Walker 202/226-1973

March 2, 1999

### STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN DAN MILLER DIRECTOR PREWITT HEARING MARCH 2, 1999

Good afternoon. Today we will hear from two distinguished Members of Congress, Sue Myrick and Carrie Meek as well as Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, director of the Census Bureau. Last week the Clinton Administration, to my extreme disappointment, officially announced its plans for a two-number census. One -- legal number -- mandated by the Supreme Court, and a second number, manipulated by their controversial and unproven sampling plan and then provided to the states.

This plan, put forth by President Clinton, reverses six years of policy calling for a one-number census. For years the Clinton Administration has said that to provide two sets of numbers measuring the same population would cause confusion and controversy for the American people.

As recently as this past November, the Census Bureau said in its operational plan: *"The Census Bureau plans to produce a one number census estimate of the U.S. population in Census 2000 that will improve accuracy and eliminate confusion and controversy caused by having more than one set of census results measuring the same population."*

Apparently, now that the Clinton Administration's plan to use population polling, rather than counting, in the census has lost in two federal courts and the Supreme Court they are perfectly willing to ignite controversy and cause confusion. This two-number census is a recipe for disaster, and will lead down a path that will inevitably force every state and local government in America into court.

While most Members of Congress and the American people thought that the Supreme Court would make the final determination on how the 2000 Census would be conducted, few thought that the Clinton Administration would still attempt to sidestep the High Court in order to pursue its illegal sampling plan.

Director Prewitt, I read with interest your comments yesterday in Roll Call. You said that people were getting the impression that we are headed toward two censuses, a Republican and a Democrat census. I couldn't agree more. A Republican census approved by the Supreme Court and a

Democrat census that is headed toward confusion, controversy and the courts. In the Roll Call article you were very concerned about this perception, but you shouldn't be surprised. Last week the Clinton Administration reversed six years of Bureau policy by now advocating a two-number census, once again putting politics over good public policy.

The full count, in accordance with the Supreme Court, must be the most accurate possible. That is why the very week of the Supreme Court's decision, I introduced the America Counts Today or ACT initiative at the US Conference of Mayors winter meeting. The America Counts Today initiative is designed to provide the additional tools needed to improve the 2000 Census. The America Counts Today initiative is only a beginning. I would hope and expect that the Administration will have concrete ideas, as well, on how we can legally improve the 2000 Census. I made a pledge that day, and I repeat it today, that if more is needed I will support it.

For quite some time, I have been focused on how to reduce the minority undercount. I began a series of field hearings throughout the country, in the hardest to count areas, to learn ways to count the people that have been missed in the past. These hearings were designed to solicit the input of community stakeholders on ways to improve a traditional census in their affected communities. To date there have been field hearings in Miami and Phoenix.

The **America Counts Today** initiative is an outgrowth of this effort. I believe we need three major community-based improvements for the 2000 Census. We need

to increase **Community** Awareness; increase Involvement of **Community** leaders and reinforce **Community**-based enumeration.

First, I want to **increase the involvement of Community Leaders**. My top priority has been to reinstate **Post Census Local Review**. That bill, HR 472, is an important first step in improving the 2000 Census.

Nobody knows better than Mayors and local officials where people in their communities live. **Post Census Local Review** gives them the opportunity to review census numbers in their communities before the Bureau makes them final.

This program was used in 1990 and added more than 80,000 households, but was discontinued in 2000 to the disappointment of most local government officials. **Post Census Local Review** is common sense idea.

Why shouldn't the Census Bureau be subject to a local audit of their work? Everyone makes mistakes and we all know the census is a difficult and complex undertaking. If you want local governments to trust your numbers than you must give them reason to do so.

I have also proposed establishing a matching grant program for local partnership groups and communities to provide the resources needed to conduct outreach efforts and to encourage participation in the Census in their respective neighborhoods.

**Community Awareness** is critical to a successful census. Consequently, I have proposed increasing the advertising budget from \$100 million to \$400 million with a significant portion of the new money targeted toward the hardest to count areas of the nation.

Compared to some other Federal advertising programs the \$100 million total advertising effort seems inadequate. For example in fiscal year 1998, the Federal government provided \$195 million dollars for the Partnership for a Drug Free America advertising campaign.

In addition, I have proposed expanding the Census-in-the-schools program. If we can get it in all schools we should make every effort to do so. Additionally, we can and must increase the number of paid Census Bureau partnership specialists, and again, target them to work in the areas with the worst undercount.

My third major initiative involves **Reinforcing Community-based Enumeration**. I have proposed adding a minimum of 100,000 additional census enumerators and target them to work in the hardest to count communities.

By organizing these enumerators into elite teams and focusing their efforts exclusively on reaching hard-to-count populations, we will have a far more accurate count in these areas.

I have also proposed enlisting Americorp Volunteers in the census effort. Why not use this program to reduce the undercount? They can go in early and stay late to help organize the hardest to count communities and build trust and partnerships.

I have already joined Congresswoman Carrie Meek in sponsoring HR 683, The Decennial Census Improvement Act, which would provide waivers to welfare recipients and retired military officers who would like to help count their neighborhoods but can't because of bureaucratic red tape that would cause them to lose their benefits by taking a temporary Census job.

Finally, I propose that we send a second Census Questionnaire to households and expand the languages covered. A second questionnaire gives another opportunity to those who did not respond the first time. In the dress rehearsals this was shown to increase the response rate by almost seven percent. This would mean that in the 2000 Census some 19 million people could be added before we send enumerators into the field.

Originally, the Census Bureau planned to publish census forms in 33 languages so no significant group misses out on being counted, because they couldn't get a form in their language. The Bureau has cut this down to five languages. Let's go back to 33, and add braille in order to give everyone a chance to be counted!

These initiatives are both big and small, but all will help make the 2000 Census a success. Above all we need to work together. Republican and Democrat, black and white, Americans and immigrants we all have a stake in the census. While we haven't agreed on the path to the 2000 Census, we have always agreed that the destination is a complete and accurate count in 2000.

I am encouraged that since I introduced the ACT initiative the Bureau has showed encouraging signs

of adopting many of the proposals such as increasing census-in-the-schools, increasing the number of partnership specialists, and increasing the advertising program. In fact, the Bureau has now said that it is working with Americorp on how they can be incorporated into this important constitutional duty.

Let me say, Director Prewitt that I don't envy your job, it is a most difficult one. I do believe that you are being pulled in two different directions. At times, from my perspective, it is difficult to tell where the professionals at the Census Bureau start and the political appointees at the Commerce Department end. I also understand that this fact may be largely beyond your control, however as director of the Census Bureau you are the one who has to answer the difficult questions.

I look forward to the testimony of all the witnesses today and hearing your comments on the America Counts Today initiative as we all work to end the differential undercount in the 2000 Census.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS**

**The Honorable Dan Miller, Chairman**

**H1-114 O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515**

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Contact: Chip Walker 202/226-1973

March 2, 1999

### **America Counts Today (ACT): A Community-Based Plan for a Full Count Census**

#### ***Creating Community Awareness:***

**Quadruple the advertising and promotion budget** of the census to \$400 million and target the increased resources toward the hardest to count communities in America.

**Expand the 'Census in the Schools' program** so every child in America can learn about the census at school and educate their parents on the importance of being counted.

**Triple the number of partnership specialists** at the Census Bureau so they can work with local officials to find innovative ways to count people in diverse environments.

#### ***Increasing Involvement of Community Leaders***

**Reinstate Post-Census Local Review** - No one knows better than America's mayors and local elected officials where the people in their community live. We must recognize their expertise and realize that a 'Washington-knows-best' approach to the census won't work. They can be relied upon to provide the best 'quality check' possible for the 2000 census.

**Establish a Matching-Grant Program** to enable cities, counties, and non-profit groups to encourage participation in the census in their community. More local outreach and promotion programs by the stakeholders in the affected communities will be an effective tool to reach the undercounted.

#### ***Reinforcing Community-based Enumeration***

**Hire a minimum of 100,000 additional new census enumerators** targeted to work in the hardest to count communities in the United States. By organizing these enumerators into elite 'super-enumeration' teams and focusing their efforts exclusively on reaching hard-to-count populations, we will have a far more accurate count in these critical areas.

**Enlist Americorp's Volunteers** in the census effort. The 2000 census is the largest peacetime mobilization in American history. Americorp's volunteers could provide their country no greater service than by assisting to make the census a success.

**Remove barriers to hiring more enumerators** by providing waivers to welfare recipients and retired military officers who would like to help count their neighbors but can't because of bureaucratic red tape that would cause them to lose their benefits if they take a census job.



***Restoring the Census Bureau's Commitment to Counting Communities***

**Send a second census form** to households that didn't respond the first time so that people have another chance to be counted in the most efficient way possible.

**Make census forms available in 33 different languages** so no one misses out on being counted because their census form is printed in a language that they don't understand

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you.

Every American counts, so we must count every American using the most modern scientific measures.

Mr. Chairman, I was truly surprised and I must protest your statements on the "two-number census." Eighteen months ago, it was the Republicans who wrote into Title XIII, the requirement to have a two-number census. I have a quote from the 1997 appropriations bill. This was the language that was put into the bill. And at the time, you spoke out against a one-number census.

Do you have his quote from that?

So quite frankly, I am surprised to now hear you criticize the Census Bureau for trying to comply with the law, the law that the Republican majority wrote, and the Supreme Court ruling.

I say let us let the Census Bureau do its job and keep politics out of how we count our population. And let us count every American.

The Supreme Court ruled that Congress placed limitations on the Census Bureau's ability to use modern methods for better accuracy. It said congressional apportionment needed to be carried out by the old methods and it cited a law, but the court stated that besides apportionment, which is the distribution of seats among the States, we should allow the Census Bureau to be as modern and as accurate as possible. And I would like to put into the record right now the law, Title XIII, that the Republicans wrote calling for the two-number census and your particular quote at the time.

Now you have come forward with many new ideas, but the time for these ideas or proposals, which are just proposals, they are not laws, they are not thought out, was 2 years ago and we are really past adding bells and whistles to the 2000 census and without specific legislative proposals, it is very difficult to say what effect any of these proposals would have.

The only proposal that you have made specifically you rammed through the subcommittee only days after it was introduced and I would say the ink was still wet.

I am glad that you are supporting Mrs. Meek's bill. She introduced it in 1996. I really know that every Democrat will support her bill. I understand that Senator Moynihan intends to introduce a companion bill in the Senate. And I think her bill—and I am glad you support it—is a very good idea.

But let us be very clear, it will not do anything to truly address our biggest problem, the racial differential and the fact that the old methods of counting will never be as accurate as modern scientific ones, no matter what we do.

The most glaring problem with your proposal, or all of your proposals if they were fleshed out or if they were worked out, is that they will not address this real problem.

In 1990, there were 8.4 million people missed in the census and 4.4 million people counted twice. Nearly 70 percent of those missed were in households that were counted. And for African Americans, 80 percent of those missed were in households that were counted.

Adding housing units as your local review bill calls for does not address these problems.

Increasing the advertising budget, studies have shown, will not help to count those who are missed and it will not eliminate the

millions who are counted twice. At best, it can improve the mail response rate.

A grants program might raise awareness, but it is not likely to get people counted in the right place on April 1st.

We have done the hard work on Representative Meek's bill. My staff and Senator Moynihan's staff have worked with her and with your staff and I hope that you will have a markup this week and that it will be a signal of the beginning of a bipartisan 106th Congress we have been hearing so much about.

As part of that bipartisan effort, Mr. Chairman, I would urge you and your colleagues to please discontinue your attacks on the professionals at the Census Bureau. You have called the Census Bureau professionals statistical skills and more recently accused them of "peddling snake oil."

The speaker has called the Census Bureau experts hypocrites. A Republican foundation funded by the Republican National Committee, has gone as far as to compare the Census Bureau to the Mafia. What is next, Jerry Springer?

These kinds of attacks are unprofessional and they are just demeaning to everyone. We can have policy disagreements without resorting to name calling.

The opponents of a fair and accurate census decided to fight the census plan in the courts. Well, as a result of the Supreme Court decision, the census is going to cost \$2 or \$3 billion more and be less accurate, at least for purposes of apportionment. You cannot escape these sad facts by attacking the professionals at the Census Bureau.

I would like to really end by clarifying one point and ask that my comments in full be put in the record.

The Supreme Court decision was very clear. It touched only apportionment. It clearly stated that more accurate numbers using modern scientific counts could be used for other purposes, such as good data, distribution of funds to our localities and redistricting within a State.

And I would suggest that we should let the professionals at the Census Bureau do their job. I would suggest that most Americans would prefer that professionals conduct the census and not politicians.

So I really hope that you will in a bipartisan effort support the professionals at the Census Bureau and at the very least stop the name calling.

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



Congresswoman

14th District • New York

**Carolyn Maloney****Reports**

---

2430 Rayburn Building • Washington, DC 20515 • 202-225-7944  
1651 Third Avenue • Suite 311 • New York, NY 10128 • 212-860-0606

---

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CAROLYN B. MALONEY  
MARCH 2, 1999**

Thank you Mr. Chairman, I look forward to a discussion of your proposals, but I am afraid that it is too little and too late. The time for these proposals was two years ago. We are now well past the time to be adding bells and whistles to the 2000 Census. In addition, many of your proposals lack sufficient detail for us to consider them seriously. Some of them sound like good ideas, but as you know, the devil is in the details. Without specific legislative proposals it is difficult to say just what effect any of these proposals would have. The only proposal that you have made specific, you rammed through the Subcommittee only days after it was introduced and with the ink still wet on the pages. And I hear that one or two more of your ideas have made it to the discussion draft stage.

I am pleased you have invited the Census Bureau to comment on your ideas and that you have asked Mrs. Meek to be with us today. I was a cosponsor on her bill when she first introduced it in 1996, and have shared her frustration through the last two congresses when we couldn't get a hearing on the bill, and attempts to move the bill as part of other legislation were blocked by the majority. I hope you will use your influence with the Speaker to finally get this bill passed. It is my understanding that Senator Moynihan plans to introduce a companion bill in the Senate. I strongly support this bill. It is a good idea. But let me be clear -- it won't do anything to truly address our biggest problem -- the racial differential and the fact that the old methods of counting will never be as accurate as modern scientific ones, no matter what we do.

Let me use one of your proposals as an example of why we need more details. Let's look at your proposal for a federal grants program. This is not a new idea. This concept has been discussed at meetings of the Secretary's 2000 Committee, and among local officials discussing the census. But simply to say you want to have a grants program doesn't tell us much, especially about how much such a program would cost. If we were to give \$1000 to each governmental unit the Census Bureau deals with, the price tag would be \$39 million. As you know, \$1000 is not going to do much in New York City. Even \$10,000 for each local unit, a \$390 million dollar program, would not produce even marginal gains in most major cities. We could propose \$2 per person. That would be a \$550 million dollar program, but I am not sure what New York City would do with \$17 million to spend on the census. Another option would be to give money only to the top 10 cities with the highest undercounts in 1990. But I wonder what you would say to the Mayor of Jacksonville, when he asks why you are providing money for New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, and not for Jacksonville? I suppose we could develop a funding formula that includes the square root of the population, local funds spend to address list development, and two or three other variables, but then we would start a funding formula battle.

Even if we could solve the problem of how much to spend, and how to distribute it, we still need a bureaucracy to actually distribute the money. The Census Bureau has no grant making authority, and consequently, no staff trained in distributing and monitoring the expenditure of funds. There I go again making assumptions. I assume you want some accountability on how the money gets spent.

Finally, if we solve the problem of how much to spend and how to distribute it, if the money is to have any effect on the census, local governments need it sooner rather than later. The fact of the matter is, if we were going to give local governments money, it should have been done already.

The most glaring problem with your proposal, however, even once it is fleshed out, is that it will not address the real problem. In 1990 there were 8.4 million people missed in the census and 4.4 million people counted twice. Nearly 70 percent of those missed were in households that were counted, and for African Americans, 80 percent of those missed were in households that were counted. Adding housing units, as your local review bill calls for, does not address these problems. Increasing the advertising budget- studies have shown- will not help to count those who are missed and it will not eliminate the millions who are counted twice, at best it can improve the mail response rate. A grants program might raise awareness, but it is not likely to get people counted in the right place on April 1st.

We have done the hard work on Rep. Meek's bill. My staff and Senator Moynihan's staff have worked with Rep. Meek and her staff and with legislative counsel to make sure that all of the I's are dotted and the t's crossed. Thank you for scheduling the mark-up of that bill on quickly. I can assure you there will be no opposition from this side to that bill. I hope that mark-up will signal the beginning of the bipartisan 106th Congress we have been hearing so much about.

As part of that bipartisan effort, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that you and your colleagues discontinue your attacks on the professionals at the Census Bureau. You have called the Census Bureau's professionals statistical shills and more recently accused them of peddling snake oil. The Speaker has called the Census Bureau experts hypocrites. A Republican foundation funded by the Republican National Committee has gone so far as to compare the Census Bureau to the Mafia. These kinds of attacks on the professionals at the Census Bureau do nothing but demean everyone. We can have policy disagreements without resorting to name calling.

The opponents of a fair and accurate census decided to fight the census plan in the courts. Well, as a result of the Supreme Court decision, the census is going to cost 2 or 3 billion dollars more and be less accurate, at least for purposes of apportionment. You can't escape those sad facts by maligning the professionals at the Census Bureau.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis, do you have a very brief opening statement so we can proceed?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I would want to echo some of the sentiments expressed by the ranking member.

I also want to thank you for calling this hearing regarding initiatives designed to increase the accuracy of the 2000 census. I am also pleased that you have decided to hear from the Census Bureau regarding the issue of post-census local review and the nine additional activities that you proposed today to improve the accuracy of the census.

First of all, let me state that no one can be opposed to ideas that seek to improve the accuracy of counting the people. However, as the census date fast approaches, it is important that we find consensus on one plan and not duplicate efforts that are already under way.

Several of the initiatives embodied in the America Counts Today proposal by you seem to be already under consideration by the Census Bureau. If that is the case, then I do not see the need for the initiatives aside from pure discussion. Nonetheless, I look forward to hearing Dr. Prewitt's comments regarding the initiatives that have been proposed.

In addition, as a former city councilman and Cook County commissioner, I can really appreciate the zeal to allow local governments a last opportunity to review census data for errors. After all, as a local government, the opportunity to have one last chance to increase your count is too tempting to pass up.

However, based on the testimony that I heard at the last hearing regarding post-census local review, I am not convinced that it worked that well in 1990. Most of the communities that participated were displeased with the process and less than 20 percent of the governmental units participated at all.

Thus, the Census Bureau's comments regarding this issue would be noteworthy because I remain concerned about a serious undercount, especially in rural and minority communities.

Finally, I am pleased that within the initiatives proposed is a recommendation for a waiver to allow individuals who receive Federal assistance to work as part-time enumerators without having their benefits affected. Therefore, I commend you and Representative Meek for the work on this legislation.

Again, I look forward to all the witnesses and appreciate your calling this hearing today.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Mr. Prewitt, Dr. Prewitt, if you would stand and raise your right hand and I will swear you in.

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. MILLER. Dr. Prewitt, you have an opening statement?

**STATEMENT OF KENNETH PREWITT, DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS**

Mr. PREWITT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Davis, especially for this opportunity to present and answer questions on the census 2000 operation plan first sent to this subcommittee 6 weeks ago and subsequently refined to incor-

porate the evaluation based upon the Census Bureau's dress rehearsal experience.

I appreciate as well the opportunity to comment on Chairman Miller's 10 suggestions for how to improve the census. Later in my comments I will divide this 10-point list into two categories.

On seven of the items, we welcome the approach taken by the chairman. They are consistent with what the Census Bureau has learned about how to strengthen the census and we obviously readily embrace a more extensive advertising campaign, an effort to reach 100 percent of the Nation's schools, greater resources for the partnership program, additional enumerators, partnership with Americorp volunteers and the waiver initiative. And in each of these areas, if time allows, I can outline what the Census Bureau has already itself initiated.

On three of the items, the second mailing, the language initiative, and local government review of mailing addresses, the Census Bureau believes it has presented a superior program than the way in which the chairman has set forth his views.

Indeed, in some instances, if legislated in the manner before you, these proposals would disrupt census 2000 and could even put it at risk. I will have to express those views rather strongly. I will, of course, allocate more time to those three in which there are differences than the seven on which there is general agreement.

But, first, if I may, a word about the census. It has unique features making it one of the most complicated operations conducted by the U.S. Government. Think of it as a three-dimensional task. It is a count, it is an address list, and it is a date.

We have to count every resident of the United States, estimated to be about 275 million in 2000. We have to identify every residential address in the United States, estimated to be about 120 million in 2000. And then we have to assign the 275 million people to the 120 million addresses on a fixed, single date, April 1st. Each of these operations is enormous.

People are on the move, addresses come and go and this movement and transformation does not conveniently pause just because census date is April 1st.

It is because the task is huge and complex as you have acknowledged, and I appreciate that the Census Bureau is very careful in how it proceeds. To the extent possible, and especially for procedures not used in prior censuses, we test everything and weigh what works and what does not. Hours of deliberation, even argument, precede a decision to build any given procedure into the census.

Census staff takes turns challenging each other to prove the merits of a given operation. Nothing is haphazard, nothing is casual. Every step is carefully, deliberately considered.

This lengthy process, which started for the 2000 census 12 years ago, just as in 2000, we will test procedures that might be incorporated in 2010. We select and discard based on one overriding criterion: Will this procedure or operation lead to a more accurate and complete count?

Selection among alternative procedures is based not on what is more or less difficult, but what is more or less productive. To suggest that the Census Bureau excludes a particular procedure be-



cause it would be too much trouble reflects a serious misrepresentation of the dedication and commitment of the Census Bureau career professionals.

Then when all of the pieces are put together, when the whole is assembled, testing starts all over again, for now we must determine how well the integrated system will work, not just the individual pieces.

As the chairman knows, because he visited our beta testing sites in Suitland, this, too, is a painstaking task. We currently have in test 25 major software systems. They not only have to work in their own terms, they have to fit together.

We have to track 175 million forms, pay hundreds of thousands of workers, monitor tens of thousands of partnership programs, produce 12 million maps. Every step, every operation, every procedure is at a huge scale and is interdependent with every other step, operation or procedure.

This operational plan, as refined in this update, was submitted to you 6 weeks ago. It is a census plan. This census plan, as you know, is now being documented in excruciating detail in what the Census Bureau terms its master activity schedule.

The master activity schedule is 4,000 lines of individual code, but it is more than that. It is a software program that shows how each one of these individual steps connects with every other step in the census. Every procedure links to previous procedures. Every procedure links horizontally to all other procedures and forwards to dozens of other procedures.

This morning, I sat in what we call our lock-up room, windowless, in the basement of, as you know, not a very nice building. Fifty people down there tracking every single line of this code to make sure that it fits together, nothing is left out, no mistakes are made.

When completed in approximately 2 weeks, it will be a very substantial set of detailed operations of how to conduct the census. The point is we have to sort of establish these procedures now.

I beg the subcommittee, please do not impose on us the burden of going into the census with just in time programming, which we will have to do if we add things once this is finished. Do not impose on us the burden of going in with untested procedures or with additions whose consequences for other operations will not be discovered until they happen. The operational machinery that constitutes a census is not something to be taken lightly.

Now, you have asked me to focus on procedures to enhance traditional enumeration procedures and also to comment on the 10-point list of suggestions under ACT, America Counts Today.

Mr. Chairman, I intend no disrespect, but I do have to emphasize that ACT does not itself constitute a census plan. It is a series of isolated initiatives. I do not make light of these initiatives and I have already indicated that we readily embrace seven of them. I only suggest that they are not a plan.

For example, they speak to only a tiny part of the huge operation described in census 2000 as the master address file. Except indirectly and, in this instance, not helpfully, they have little to do with the enormous optical scanning operation planned for census 2000. They do not help us with the difficult issue of unduplication,

with the operations needed to validate the housing units that are vacant, and so on and so on.

Again, we welcome seven of the initiatives, have serious reservations about three, but more generally, I have to describe them for what they are: isolated suggestions. They are not a census plan.

This, Mr. Chairman, compared to this, is what turns something into a census plan that has to be managed and operated with something in the multiple thousands of people, as we all know.

Take, for example, how to reach the linguistically isolated in our population. We welcome the chairman's interest in this most difficult area and can assure the subcommittee that we intend to be as linguistically friendly as we possibly can.

We do, however, believe that the program set forth in the operational plan reaches Mr. Miller's goal more efficiently than printing census forms in 33 languages.

We are printing forms in six languages that account for 99 percent of all of the households in the United States. Does this mean that we are indifferent to the other 1 percent of the households? Which speak, by the way, not just 27 additional languages, but about 120 different languages over the mean six.

The Census Bureau gave a lot of attention to how to reach these population groups. But, of course, it wanted to do so in a manner that did not place other census operations at risk, such as how many pages of the form can be optically scanned.

We subjected this issue to what we call a business analysis, 28 pages of detailed analysis listing all the pros and cons of not just one but four major alternatives. In the end, we designed a careful operation to reach those linguistically isolated households.

I invite you to study it carefully before leaping to the conclusion that we did not give careful consideration to the idea that is imbedded in the draft legislation before this committee.

We did consider that idea. We did not reject it because it was too hard. We rejected it because it would not do the job. Instead, we have set forth an integrated language program that involves 15,000 paid temporary staff positions in the questionnaire assistance centers drawn from a wide range of language communities, as well as the preparation of 15 million assistance guides in several dozen languages.

We have also included a language focus in our partnership agreements with community organizations. All of this to reach that 1 percent of the population which does not speak one or more of the six languages already covered in our census operations.

Were the bill before you to pass, the following would have to happen.

We would have to renegotiate all of our largest contracts, including nearly 20 printing contracts, the contracts for our telephone questionnaire assistance program, for our data capture initiative, and for the data capture service centers.

The entire workflow for the receipt, image capture, transcription and keying from paper would have to be modified. Let me offer just one simple example.

Here is what we call our pre-census letter, our letter to alert all American households that the census form is coming. It will go to

120 million households. The wording has been carefully designed to minimize confusion and to maximize cooperation.

After internal discussion, it was decided that the best way to announce the availability of the five languages other than English would be to put a very small set of reminders down here at the bottom and then on the back list in the five languages how to get a questionnaire in those languages.

I would invite you, if you would like to persist with this legislation, to imagine how we are now going to do this to announce to the American public that there are 33 languages.

The letter will not work. It becomes a different document and once that document hits the addresses, 99 percent of the households are now getting a piece of paper which bears not at all on their conditions.

That is not the way we would design a census. We would do it in such a way as to try to minimize confusion, maximize cooperation, and indeed put in place a mechanism that will reach all of those linguistically isolated communities.

Similarly, with the second mailing, which I will not consider here in detail. But, again, there is research, there is analysis, there is deliberation, there is judgment, there is the dress rehearsal experience, all of which indicates that the value of the second mailing is outweighed substantially so by the risks that it introduces into other census operations, not the least of which is the deterioration in data quality and non-response followup.

The targeted mailing is operationally impractical. The blanket mailing postpones non-response followup by approximately 6 weeks. Also with the post-census review, which I have discussed in some detail in my written testimony why the Census Bureau replaced a procedure that worked poorly in 1980 and 1990 with a much stronger, more extensive procedure in 2000.

I should take no more time in these opening comments. I appreciate the time that you have given me, but I do hope that the question period will provide time to examine why the Census Bureau's carefully considered programs should be the ones that we move forward at this point.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Prewitt follows:]

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF  
KENNETH PREWITT  
DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS  
Before the Subcommittee on the Census  
Committee on Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
March 2, 1999**

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Maloney, and Members of the Subcommittee:

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee for the first time and to discuss ways to enhance traditional enumeration methods. The Census Bureau has been trying continuously since at least 1950 to improve census enumeration procedures. That's what we do. We examine what worked well and what didn't work in each census and we apply rigorous testing and research practices to find better ways to make the census more accurate. One way that Census Bureau professionals believe we can make Census 2000 more accurate is to enhance traditional methods by using sampling and estimation techniques to eliminate the measured differential undercounts that have plagued each of the last six censuses. While there is disagreement on that enhancement, we are planning a number of other enhancements as well. I am encouraged by the fact that, while there are differences, we are all united in the goal of having an enumeration that is as complete as possible. The chairman's commitment to that is embodied in the America Counts Today initiative.

Just as having an accurate census is essential, it is also imperative that we come to quick agreement on one plan that the dedicated, hard-working professionals at the Census Bureau can carry out. With Census Day just a little over a year away and major census preparatory activities ongoing, we must look for ways to establish common ground so that we can move forward together. I pledge to you my willingness to do so.

I especially want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for providing me an occasion to speak to the issue of Post Census Local Review, and I will address that later in my testimony. First, I want to begin by honoring the request in your letter of invitation to discuss efforts relevant to increasing response rates and participation in Census 2000. Our first and most important effort is to put a census form in the hands of every single household in America, as well as enumerating those who live in group quarters (such as college dormitories) or who have no usual home. The Bureau evaluated the response problems of the 1990 census and established a testing and evaluation program designed to put in place significant improvements to enhance our ability to improve public response:

- o First, the Bureau is using a questionnaire that is designed to be more user-friendly and that will be easier and simpler for respondents to understand and complete.

- o Second, the Bureau will implement a multiple mail contact strategy, which will include a letter before delivering a questionnaire and a reminder card, in addition to the questionnaire itself.

- o Third, respondents will have more ways to respond to the census than ever before. For example, through the Be Counted program, we will make census forms available in stores, schools, civic and community centers, and other locations so that people who think they have not been counted can respond. A well-publicized toll-free telephone number will be available for those who have questions. And householders will also have the option of responding via the Internet.

- o Fourth, we have increased our partnership activities over previous censuses and are working with state, local, and tribal governments and community groups to advise us of opportunities to publicize Census 2000, help us update and correct census maps and our address list, and tell us where to put questionnaire assistance centers to help people who have difficulty completing the questionnaire.

- o Fifth, we will, for the first time, use paid advertising to encourage the general population to complete and return their census questionnaires and to better target our messages to specific audiences that we believe may be difficult to enumerate.

In our operational plan for a census using traditional census-taking methods, which we submitted to the Congress on January 14, 1999, we noted that we plan to expand our partnership program and expand and enhance the paid advertising and promotion program. Both of these programs are geared toward greater public awareness of Census 2000, which in turn should lead to greater public response and cooperation.

- o We plan to expand the partnership program to increase Bureau partnership staffing and assistance. This expansion will allow the Bureau to form additional partnerships with both nongovernmental organizations that represent historically hard-to-enumerate groups

and with governmental entities, including tribal governments, that have not yet taken the opportunity to be included in the partnership program. Already, more than 10,000 partnership agreements have been signed. The expanded program includes "in-kind" funding to support partners by providing services, such as printing locally designed promotional materials for Census 2000.

- o We plan to expand and enhance paid advertising and promotion by developing and implementing additional advertising messages. One additional message, which we will use before Census Day, will target information about community benefits to areas with historically low participation in the census. Another message will seek the public's cooperation with enumerators during the Nonresponse Followup operation. This is increasingly important now that we must make followup visits to 45 million housing units, instead of 30 million.

- o We also plan to expand the "Census in the Schools" program to allow all schools to participate instead of only those in selected areas. Nontraditional advertising methods also would be pursued. Fact sheets and promotional materials will be available on a larger scale with the expanded program. And finally, we plan to conduct special publicity events that would bring the Census 2000 message to communities across the Nation.

Now, I would like to briefly address each of the ten America Counts Today proposals, reserving Post Census Local Review, which I will discuss in some detail, until last.

First, hiring an additional 100,000 enumerators to work exclusively in the hardest to count communities. We will need to hire additional enumerators to conduct the additional follow up work required to comply with the Supreme Court's decision, and we anticipate that this number will be well in excess of 100,000. Without knowing what base is being used in calling for additional enumerators, it is difficult to know whether our plans are different or are in agreement.

Second, raise the advertising budget from \$100 million to \$400 million. We strongly agree that the advertising and promotion budgets will need to be increased. Our budget specifics are currently being developed, but as I said earlier we do expect to expand both our paid advertising and promotion campaign and our partnership program.

Third, conduct a second mailing of census forms to nonresponding housing units. As I described in my letter to you of February 2, 1999, the Bureau has decided not to implement either a targeted or blanket second mailing. We considered a targeted second mailing, but printing vendors told us they would require at least a month to send a second mailing targeted only to nonresponding housing units. A targeted second mailing would, thus, have significantly delayed the start of the Nonresponse Follow up operation, and our experience and research indicate that to ensure high quality and accuracy we need to begin this critical operation as soon as practicable after Census Day. Next, we considered a blanket second mailing, that is, mailing a second questionnaire to every housing unit, whether or not we had received a response to the original mailing. But a

National Academy of Sciences panel advised us that there is considerable risk that a blanket second mailing could reduce the accuracy of the census. It could increase costs in dealing with duplicate forms, lead to massive duplication, and create adverse public reaction. Our Dress Rehearsal evaluations showed that a blanket second mailing did increase the overall mail response rate. However, the evaluations also indicate that about 40 percent of the households that mailed back a second questionnaire had also mailed back the initial questionnaire. Thus, the Dress Rehearsal processing had to be extended three weeks to handle the complexity introduced by the large volume of duplicate forms. For Census 2000, a workload of this magnitude would significantly delay data processing operations and potentially introduce significant errors into the data.

A final point I would make is that while a second mailing can help to increase mail response, there is no evidence that it reduces the undercount. In fact, if persons who mail back the first form are the easiest to count, those who would mail back a second form are the next easiest to count. They would almost entirely be included in the Nonresponse Followup operation and we do not expect great difficulty in enumerating them.

Fourth, allow welfare recipients, veterans, and American Indians to take temporary census jobs without losing their Federal benefits. We appreciate any effort to help broaden the potential applicant pool for temporary census jobs. Hiring the numbers of workers we will need to conduct Census 2000 will be a monumental challenge and we will need all the help we can get. We have already secured from the Office of Personnel Management a waiver for the Federal civilian and military retirees, similar to what we had in 1990. We have also secured a waiver from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for recipients of public housing and American Indian housing assistance. There currently are no waivers under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program and it is our understanding that individual states and American Indian tribes would have to approve them consistent with the new welfare reform rules. We are working closely with the states to bring welfare recipients into our workforce and, indeed, to look for any other ways that would make it easier for people to come to work for us. We have already hired some 3,500 welfare recipients to work on our address-listing and Dress Rehearsal programs. This is the largest number of welfare-to-work employees in any agency or department of the federal government.

Fifth, enlist the help of Americorps volunteers to conduct promotion and outreach. We have already met with Americorps officials to obtain their endorsement and work out procedures for using their volunteers to help in the census effort. We are looking forward to being able to use these dedicated and knowledgeable volunteers to help us with efforts to reach all Americans.

Sixth, expand the "Census in the Schools" program. As I mentioned above, we agree that this program should be expanded. We plan to send information packets to every principal of every school in the country. In addition, we are doubling the number of direct contacts to individual classrooms. A result of this effort is an increase in the number of schools receiving information in the "hard-to-enumerate" areas of the country. In addition, we have expanded the program to

include all Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools. About half of all those missed in the 1990 census were children. We welcome your support of this program because it is an important way to increase our outreach efforts to children whose parents do not speak English or who might not be motivated to answer the census questions for a variety of reasons.

Seventh, a matching grant program to local partnership groups and communities in the hardest to count areas. I am concerned that a matching grant program, particularly if all 39,000 local governmental entities would be eligible, would be very costly but also very complex to run. The Census Bureau has no experience administering a matching grant program. At this late date, it would be difficult to implement. Nevertheless, we do have experience working closely with our partners to achieve mutual goals. And we are doing that.

Eighth, publish forms in 33 languages. We will make language assistance guides available in over 30 languages, as we did in the last census, to help people respond to the census. In addition, we will make questionnaires available in five languages other than English. These include Chinese, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. We are also offering telephone questionnaire assistance in these five languages. Additionally, we plan to staff 15,000 questionnaire assistance centers in local communities to ensure we provide assistance in languages other than English to those who need it. This program reaches communities that speak more languages and dialects than the 33 listed in your proposed bill. Our research indicated that the program described above would be much more effective than a program that included printing questionnaires in 33 languages. Designing, testing, printing, and preparing to scan so many additional forms is not practical.

Ninth, triple the number of paid partnership specialists and target them to work in undercounted areas. Our initial plan called for 320 partnership specialists and the Census 2000 Operational Plan indicated that we anticipate increasing this number. I hope we can work together on funding for this activity.

Tenth, reinstating the Post Census Local Review. The Post Census Local Review program provided some limited benefit within the context of the 1990 census. But since early in this decade, the Census Bureau has been working to find a better way to improve the address list and to correct the deficiencies of the 1990 local review process. One such improvement is providing state, local, and tribal governments an earlier and more effective opportunity to correct the Census 2000 address list for their areas. We believe we have done that through the Local Update of Census Addresses, or LUCA, program made possible by the Census Address List Improvement Act that the Congress passed in 1994, which for the first time allows the Census Bureau to share its address list with its partners. And, I am pleased to report that we are looking at ways to modify our ongoing procedures for the Census 2000 address review process to respond to concerns raised by our governmental partners about newly constructed housing units.

As I said in my February 10 letter to you, the 1990 Post Census Local Review process cost too much on a per-case basis and took too much time relative to the extremely small number of



people it added to the census. It came too late in the process and gained participation of only one-fourth of the nation's 39,000 governments. The 1990 Post Census Local Review added only one-twentieth of one percent to the overall population count, or about 125,000 persons. If we were to conduct such a program again, it would cost more and add even fewer people to the count than in 1990 because it would be redundant to the precensus address list review activities that are already underway.

The address list review process the Census Bureau has designed for Census 2000, with congressional and participant encouragement and support, is innovative, responsive to our partners, and efficient. I believe the LUCA program thus far has been a success. We have encountered problems, but because we started early, we have had time to make refinements and correct the problems. Through our extensive outreach efforts, twice as many local and tribal governments are participating in LUCA as participated in the 1990 Post Census Local Review; those governments cover about 85 percent of all addresses. So, thus far, response to the program has been great.

We have heard increasing concerns from our governmental partners that housing units newly constructed in the months before Census Day may not be adequately accounted for under our existing plan. Any benefits from a Post Census Local Review would derive particularly from local governments' information on newly constructed units in their jurisdiction. Such information can and should be used in the census, but much earlier in the process than would occur under Post Census Local Review.

To address these concerns, we have developed a plan that we are refining in consultation with members of the Secretary of Commerce's 2000 Census Advisory Committee. Although these plans are still being refined, we have developed a program that will allow local and tribal governments an additional opportunity to review the address list for their area starting in mid-January 2000 and ending on Census Day, April 1, 2000. The purpose of this review is to bring to our attention any newly constructed housing units that are not on the Census 2000 mailing list. This opportunity will be offered to all governments in which the Census Bureau will have the U.S. Postal Service deliver Census 2000 questionnaires--approximately 94 million addresses. Local and tribal governments will have this opportunity whether they participated in LUCA or not.

Any units that are identified during this procedure will be verified during our coverage improvement field activities, and enumerated if they, in fact, were occupied on April 1. This opportunity for local and tribal governments to bring new construction to our attention will complement our planned check by the U.S. Postal Service that is scheduled to be conducted mid-January to mid-February 2000 and that also will result in the addition of new addresses to our list. In the more rural areas of the country, our plan already requires census enumerators to look for newly constructed units at the time they deliver the questionnaires or conduct the enumeration.

In addition, we have established a program to validate the boundaries for every local and tribal government in the United States. As we do before every decennial census, in late 1999 we will provide maps to them all showing their latest reported boundaries and ask that they provide any corrections needed to make them accurate as of January 1, 2000, the official boundary date for Census 2000. Then we will provide a set of maps showing each government that we incorporated their changes. This is unlike 1990, when governments did not see the results of their efforts until after the census. These boundary validation maps will be sent in the late spring of 2000 and we will seek any residual corrections by early summer of 2000.

That brings me to what I believe is the critical weakness of H.R. 472. It would mandate a program that Census Bureau professionals believe will not effectively and efficiently contribute to the overall accuracy of the census. The bill proposes a Post Census Local Review process that is very similar to the 1990 census process and that would face the same problems that the 1990 process faced and that I have described above. The bill does make two changes to the 1990 Post Census Local Review; it gives local officials more time to conduct the review and provides an opportunity for feedback. But because of the extensive address list review program that will take place before the census, including the new program to add newly constructed units that will carry up to Census Day, there will be nothing left for local officials to contribute in terms of adding housing units to the census. They will receive essentially the same address list they received in January. And this unproductive review, under the bill, would be conducted late in the process, extending even later than the 1990 program because it would give local officials three times as much review time as they had in 1990. The bill does nothing to improve upon the 1990 process. We have looked at ways to improve that process and concluded that an earlier review and input from local governments process would be most efficient. That is what we have designed.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the census clock is ticking. In just 366 days, the first Census 2000 forms will be delivered. Given the lateness of the hour, we must acknowledge the hard reality that we cannot take a chance on untested operations or late additions. The most we can do is to modify already existing operations to enhance quality where that is possible, and we continue to look at ways to do so. The largest peacetime mobilization in U.S. history must go forward relying on the considered professional judgment of the career scientific and operational experts at the Census Bureau. I look forward to working with this Subcommittee to achieve that goal.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I will be pleased to answer any questions.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Director Prewitt.

We will work under the 5-minute rule, but we will have more than one round, probably. I do not know why it is not working, so we will just do the best we can.

First of all, I get concerned that the statements by the minority and by the Census Bureau that the Congress is almost irrelevant to this process, it is kind of offending.

We do not know the details of the plan. Yes, you have a book there, but the details are not there. You know that. We do not have a budget. Two weeks you say we will have it and we are supposed to wait until it is out and then we are supposed to get involved in it.

Well, you know, the agreement back—actually passed into law back in 1997, was that you were going to have a dual track and be prepared.

You were not there, I know, and you just went to the Bureau in October, but we should have been prepared and this information should have been out months ago and I think you would have been pleased to have had it out months ago. But instead, the administration, the Clinton administration and the Bureau have decided to only go on one track, unlike what the law said back in 1997.

And so we all of a sudden have to scramble now to put together the plan and it is unfortunate that we are having to wait this long and we cannot wait any longer and we need to move forward because, as I have said before, we all agree.

I think we want to focus today on what we can do to improve the thing and I am glad to see that a number of the ideas are going to be acceptable; that will help, because we are trying to reach the same goal.

But let me start off with the post-census local review. We did have a hearing on that issue. And I am just still baffled by the opposition to it. This is in effect an audit after the mailings have gone out.

What you are doing with LUCA is very fine and I am very pleased that it is there and that is good. You know, there are a lot of good programs there, and that is one that we compliment.

But it does not replace, in my opinion, post-census local review. This all boils down to an issue of trust. We have been saying trust for the past year and a half and there is a real trust problem here. And if people do not trust the numbers, we have a failed census. And what is wrong—I do not see the harm of post-census local review. I do not see what the problem is in having this post-census local review.

The LUCA program has been successful to some extent, not as many as we would like to have participate, but I think we can build upon it and do a better job.

Tell me why—I do not understand what damage does it do? What harm does it do to the thing?

Mr. PREWITT. Mr. Miller—Mr. Chairman, excuse me. I am still learning the protocol. This is my first hearing.

I am a little confused why this is not a plan.

Mr. MILLER. Well, do you have a budget with the details in it? Do you have the master activity schedule?

Mr. PREWITT. I am sorry, I am just really trying to learn—well, as I said, the master activity schedule is not a plan, it is something that turns this into a set of activities.

This is detailed about our coverage improvement followup, our enumeration strategy, our advertising strategy, our dress rehearsal results. It seems to me like this would be a plan. I am just confused about what in your mind constitutes a plan.

Mr. MILLER. Well, we have a lot more detail on the illegal plan that the courts threw out. That detail was provided. Now this one we are scrambling to put together with the detail we had before.

Mr. PREWITT. We are actually—

Mr. MILLER. Do you think that is a complete plan that you can go out and—do you have a budget? Is that not part of a plan? How much money are we going to spend? We do not know yet. I just found out last week you are going to have an accuracy and coverage evaluation [ACE]. Is a budget not part of a plan?

Mr. PREWITT. I am simply trying to understand—

Mr. MILLER. Well, the details are missing, is all I am saying. There are a lot of parts there.

Mr. PREWITT. Just so we understand that we do have—

Mr. MILLER. You have a plan?

Mr. PREWITT. We have some serious details here and—

Mr. MILLER. But a lot of the details are missing.

Mr. PREWITT. Serious details on many of the things that you have now put into your ideas.

Mr. MILLER. OK.

Mr. PREWITT. Want to make sure we are talking about the same thing. We are talking about what is a plan. The post-census LUCA, would you like for me to comment on this? Because I would have to have some clarification on this.

My current information says that the cooperation with our current LUCA program covers about 86 percent of all the addresses in the United States, so I am just not sure—I do not know where you—I just do not know what this is based on.

Mr. MILLER. OK. All right. But what harm does the post-census local review do? What harm is done, what damage is done if we do the post-census local review? That we give communities a chance to review the numbers?

Mrs. Maloney said—there were 124,000 people added in 1990. Well, they are not important to Mrs. Maloney apparently because we should count everybody.

Mr. PREWITT. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLER. Everybody says everybody should be counted. Tell Mayor Archer that 45,000 people did not matter. Tell Congressman Petri up in Wisconsin that some ward in his area was left out, I do not know the details of it, he thought it was just a computer error. Mistakes are made. You are not perfect, obviously. But we want to catch mistakes. We want local communities to trust the numbers.

Just what harm is done having this? This is in addition to LUCA.

Mr. PREWITT. Well, let us try again, try to establish what LUCA does. LUCA is an attempt, and we think a reasonably successful

attempt thus far, though we have much more work to do and we will continue to do it right up until March 31—

Mr. MILLER. LUCA is good. We are pleased with it.

Mr. PREWITT [continuing]. To list every address in the United States and actively—actively involve local government in putting together that address list.

Mr. MILLER. That is good.

Mr. PREWITT. But that is what the post-census LUCA was about. The post-census LUCA was to say did we get every address in your community?

Mr. MILLER. Right.

Mr. PREWITT. And we are now doing that before we—before we go to the field. It seems like a perfectly reasonable thing for us to be doing.

Mr. MILLER. OK. My time is up, but it sounds like you say we are perfect and we do not make mistakes, there are no computer errors. Mistakes happen and why cannot local communities have a chance to check the numbers? It is an audit after the fact.

I came from the private sector when I came into Congress and we had audits. I served on a lot of boards of non-profits. We always had an audit.

If someone came to me as the chief financial officer of an organization and said, "Oh, we do not want to have an audit, we will save some money, we will skip that audit," I would be really suspect. What are you trying to hide? This is the type of doubt to erase.

Why are we afraid to let a local mayor, county commission, look at the numbers? I do not understand that danger.

Mr. PREWITT. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MILLER. I am talking about post-census local review.

Mr. PREWITT. We are talking about numbers, not addresses. You are asking—

Mr. MILLER. Well, post-census local review.

Mr. PREWITT. You are asking us to ask 39,000 jurisdictions to look over our actual counts? Population counts?

Mr. MILLER. The similar program we had in 1990.

Mr. PREWITT. Population counts, not addresses.

Mr. MILLER. The housing counts.

Mr. PREWITT. The housing counts? Or the people counts?

Mr. MILLER. The same way we did it in 1990, basically. We will allow a little more time.

Mr. PREWITT. I am just trying to understand.

Mr. MILLER. I am just trying to figure out what the harm is. I have not found the harm.

My time is up, so we will come back, because we will do another round after Mrs. Maloney.

Mr. PREWITT. OK.

Mr. MILLER. So maybe you can think about what harm is done.

Mr. PREWITT. OK.

Mrs. MALONEY. A point of personal privilege. You mentioned that I thought 124,000 people did not count. I think they count very much, but I think the number should be much higher and what happened in 1990, as I understand it, is there was very low participation, therefore the Census Bureau came back with a new plan that checked housing and addresses prior that involved the coun-

ties and the localities, the Director just said, to the point of 86 percent as opposed to the 5 percent success rate here.

I think that we should have for the record where these numbers came from, since he does not appear to know.

Mr. PREWITT. I do not recognize them. I am sorry.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to just take your question and ask it in a different way. You said what harm will the post-census local review be.

I would like to ask it in the way of what will it add? Will it add anything to your ability to count every American?

It is my understanding you started the pre-census to make the count even better, but—

Mr. PREWITT. Well, what we tried to set forth in our plan is a number of coverage improvement strategies, starting with getting address lists right because if we do not get the address lists right we will not have a quality census and a lot of time and effort and a lot of cooperation with the U.S. Congress on that score. And then a series of coverage improvement.

As I tried to say in my opening comments, we look at a whole portfolio of procedures and operations and then choose the ones which we think could fit within 9 months, which is a very, very serious constraint to make our December 31 obligations. Pick those procedures which will maximize the accuracy and the completeness of the count. That is what we are trying to do.

And we actually think that the procedures that you have not yet wanted to spend any time on, the coverage improvement strategies are much superior, much superior, to post-census local review.

If we thought post-census local review, having already gotten the address list right, would be successful, we would want to do it. It just simply will not add up to what we think we have produced in its place.

It is not as if we do not want to count everyone. We obviously do. We are professionals. That is our job. And we would be very disappointed on behalf of our professional responsibilities to the American public if we did not count everyone.

We know it is going to be difficult in 2000. We have been saying that for years. We know why it is going to be difficult. I am sorry, I should edit myself better.

Mrs. MALONEY. I have heard some of my Republican colleagues say that we need a general to take over the running of the Census Bureau. What in your opinion would be the comments of a general to these added proposals at the last minute, at this late date?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, Mrs. Maloney, generals sometimes speak in rather earthy vocabulary, and I would not want to directly quote.

I honestly think that, and I would invite the subcommittee to ask General Schwarzkopf, who has been frequently used in this connection, to come and answer that question. What would you do, General Schwarzkopf, if just as you were going into the field, a subcommittee of the Congress came along and said, oh, we like this better than what you are talking about, we want you to do this instead of that.

I think the general would say no, or words to that effect. And I would invite you to put that question to a general about what it

is like to manage the largest peacetime operation activity, mobilization, in U.S. history.

Mrs. MALONEY. As I mentioned in my opening statement, because it has been rather troubling to me, the repeated attacks, slurs on the professionals at the Census Bureau and what have these attacks done to the morale of the really—most of whom are career professionals at the Census Bureau?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, I think we would like to believe that people who use that language do not believe them. I think if we really believe that people did believe the language that is being used, the way we are being described, it would be deeply disappointing.

Could I just take a minute? I want to—I would like to just show the subcommittee this document. This is a questionnaire called the Consumer Expenditure Survey, which the Census Bureau collects on a routine basis using, of course, modern statistical methods. This is the data which go into the CPI.

The CPI goes into Alan Greenspan's head when he is talking about the state of the economy, as well as the Bureau of Labor Statistics data, which are based on census collections, of course, and also the industrial capacity data, which is, again, a Census Bureau survey.

I just do not think that Alan Greenspan thinks that when he is talking to you about the state of the economy based upon these census data that he is peddling snake oil. I think he thinks he is peddling the very best data that can be produced by the keystone statistical agency of the United States.

And obviously if Members of Congress really think that the Census Bureau when it does this kind of work is producing stuff which cannot be used, cannot be trusted, then we have a very serious problem in this society. I just do not believe it.

So I have to tell you that the reason that morale does not suffer as much as you might imagine is we simply cannot believe that people who say that actually believe it, because they turn around in other parts of their job and use the data all the time. When they make economic policy, when they make social policy, when they look at the poverty rates, when they look at educational statistics, they are using these kind of data all of the time. So I cannot believe that they do not believe in the quality of that work.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis.

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

Dr. Prewitt, we have had some discussion relative to the proposed initiative that the chairman is presenting today.

Did I understand you to suggest that if we get into the business of starting with something different at this juncture that there are currently plans in process that would have to be changed, such as contracts that have been let and initiatives that are currently under way?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, yes, sir. With respect to, say, the language program that has been suggested by Mr. Miller, we would simply, as I did try to say, we would have to renegotiate every one of our major contracts, every one of our major contracts. It would be extremely difficult for us to meet the April 1st deadline if we have to do that.

We would have to rewrite not only this plan but all of these 4,000 lines of code because all these things connect to each other. The same thing with the second mailing. If we use the second mailing, we would have to rewrite every bit of this. We would have to start again.

With respect to post-census LUCA, that is an entirely different procedure which we have not built into our plan nor our design.

So, yes, I simply have to say in all candor that if we were asked late in the game to put in a procedure which was not already part of our operational plan that it could put the census at risk.

Mr. DAVIS. You have indicated that we would probably miss the deadline. Do you have any projections as to by perhaps how much or how long it would take to renegotiate this?

Mr. PREWITT. Oh, I think we are talking certainly weeks and maybe months to renegotiate the contracts and then to re—as I say, we already have 19 printing contracts out there. It is very hard for me to estimate because it depends on the nature of the suggestions that would be introduced or be legislated by the Congress and when we would learn those.

I mean, it is one thing if these things were—you know, said, OK, today this is the law, we would scramble as best we could. If we learn that in June, it is one thing. If we learn it September, it is just simply something else. We are at a point in this census which if we do not get about it, we are not going to get it done. I cannot say that more strongly.

Mr. DAVIS. Let us say for some reason we miss the deadline. I mean, other than the fact that it is a miss, what happens?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, there are three key dates, Mr. Davis. One is April 1st, census day 2000. The next one is 9 months later, December 31st, apportionment numbers. And the next one is April 1st, by which time we have to have provided all 50 States their redistricting data.

Obviously if—and everything that we do is geared around trying to make those dates and we work—this morning when I was in the lock-up room watching these people work, the thing that got flashed up on the screen was aha, calendar No. 4, this procedure gets matched against calendar No. 4. Calendar No. 4 is 24 hours a day, 7 days a week from April 1st to April 1st.

They are now planning against a calendar that has no space in it. They are down there in that basement room arguing about hours and half days. If you need that half day for this, you cannot have it because I need a day and a half for that.

That is the argument that is going on. There is not space in there. You put something in that takes 6 weeks like the second mailing? It is a different census.

Could we do it? Sure, we can do anything, I guess. Would it be accurate? No. We would reduce accuracy at this point if we start trying to introduce entirely new procedures into the operational plan that already exists.

Mr. DAVIS. So you are saying that we would get the exact opposite result than what is being desired, that rather than enhancing our ability to get accurate information, that we are really creating a level of confusion that would make it virtually impossible to get accurate information.



Mr. PREWITT. I am afraid, Mr. Davis, that that is—I would not put it in quite such blunt words, but I am afraid that you have interpreted me correctly.

We start with as many different procedures as we can imagine. We are all on the table. Then people go into rooms and they argue this versus that, this is going to give us more accuracy, this is going to give us a more complete count, and that is going to take 7 days, but this only takes 4 days, but that will take 13 days, let us do this, not that and so forth. That is the discussion that goes on.

Then you put it all together and you start testing it. And then once it is tested, to start taking it apart is very risky. It means we will go into the field without the software system having been tested, without making sure that it integrates across these 25 different big software packages.

It just is a very difficult way to do a census, and that is why I would go back to General Schwarzkopf. I would love to have him sitting here with me today and asking him what would you do if you were asked to make these kinds of changes to an operational plan at this late date.

They are not bad ideas, necessarily. They were—the ones that we are not using, we think we have superior ideas. On languages, on the mailing, on the involvement of local governments in address lists, they are not bad ideas.

We simply worked hard to put together a better version of that idea in our judgment, and that is what we get paid to do. We are doing the best job we can.

Mr. MILLER. Well, we will have another round.

It was interesting you brought up Mr. Greenspan and the CPI. That was an interesting one because I have sat on the budget committee for 6 years and Mr. Greenspan came before our committee about 4 years ago and said the CPI is overstated by two points and went through the problems. We had hearings both on the appropriations committee, I served at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and on the budget committee about the problems with it, about substitution rates, and such, and how they needed to update it.

Now these are great statistical methods, but it was overstating CPI by two points, according to Alan Greenspan. Now, they are starting to correct some of these problems. So you bring up an illustration of statistical methods making mistakes and now we are acknowledging that there have been mistakes made with CPI. So that is a good illustration you brought up. I am glad that that was discussed.

Let me go back to post-census local review. The census advisory committee supports post-census local review. Local governments—I have not found a local person that was opposed to it. The National League of Cities have supported it. And these local cities deal with this LUCA program. And the LUCA program is fine.

It has not reached as many people as we would want, I do not think, but it has reached a fair number and we wish we could get more people to participate in it.

But I am getting back to the question of what harm will be done?

You know, there is a New York Times article, there is your quote up there, it says, “It’s an incentive for anyone to try to boost their

numbers for either economic or political gain.” What is wrong with that?

Why should not the mayor of Detroit, the mayor of Charlotte, the mayor of New York City want to get numbers? And why should they not say, hey, you missed this block in your numbers?

I do not see the harm. And it is not something that is untested, because you did it in 1990. You should be able to do a better job on it in 2000.

Mr. PREWITT. I am absolutely certain that if we did it in 2000 we would do a better job than we did in 1990. Everything that we worked with in 1990 that we have introduced into 2000 we have improved on those procedures.

Just quickly, on the advisory council committee that you have cited as well as a number of other local leaders, I think perhaps your staff has reported back to you that to a person, to a person, everyone in the census advisory committee asked that this not be legislated, that if they were here today they would be all suggesting to you that to try to legislate a procedure at this late stage in the census cycle is very risky business.

And so I only point that out to you and if your staff did not mention that to you, they did not give you a full report on that meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Now, with respect to this quote, the Founding Fathers were, as we know, unusually intelligent and when they first introduced the idea of a census for purposes of apportionment, they were very worried that the States would inflate their numbers and what they put into the initial design was that the count of the population of each State would be used for two purposes, one of which was apportionment and the other one of which was for taxation.

And they argued and they said the reason that we want both of those in there is that one is an incentive to increase the numbers, to inflate them, and the other is an incentive to keep them down. And that is the way in which we have confidence that this procedure of asking the local governments to tell us how many people there are, that there will be some sort of check on them.

Now, what this quote suggests, and I certainly will not—I will say that it is certainly a direct quote, that if you actually give 39,000 jurisdictions a count and there is anything they can do to increase that count, whether that is validated or not, why would they not want to do it?

As I said in the comment that I made at the end of this particular quote, I was at a meeting in Albuquerque and a mayor of a fast growing city came over to me on the podium and said we have a fast growing city, we need 50,000 people in our city because our city depends upon retail taxes and if we get above 50,000, then we will get a shopping mall. And he came over and he put his hand on my shoulder and said, Mr. Director, your job is to make sure there are 50,000 people in my city.

That is not my job. My job is to find out how many people are in his city, which may be 47,000, it may be 53,000. My job is not to give him the number he wants, my job is to give an accurate count without an undercount, without missing the Hispanics.

Mr. Waxman mentioned the number of States which lost money. All of them, I believe, are heavily concentrated Hispanic popu-

lations. It does not surprise me that they are the States that miss money because those are the States where we miss people, and we know it.

So my job is not to go out and find the number that some mayor needs. My job is to find out how many people are actually there as best we can do, and that is our task. And, so, yes, you do create an incentive. Would you not admit that? Would you not agree?

Mr. MILLER. Right. You want the incentive, but the Census Bureau is going to be the judge if they are real people. The Founding Fathers very specifically did not trust the States, you are right to say that. That is the reason they were suspect of—they did not even know about sampling back then, but the concept of sampling allows for that manipulation, the exact thing that the Founding Fathers were concerned about is trusting the States with it. Now we want to trust a political system to get involved with it and that is what the real danger is.

Mr. PREWITT. No, I think what you are asking with post-census LUCA is you want 39,000 political jurisdictions to be involved in the count.

Mr. MILLER. But you will judge if they are real people. If they are not real people, they are not going to be counted. But they should have the right to say, hey, you missed somebody. You do not think they should have that right now because you are not going to make any mistakes. The Bureau—there are a lot of professionals there, I do not want to criticize them—

Mr. PREWITT. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. But there are going to be mistakes. You are going to have to admit—but now you are saying we do not want—we do not trust the local communities to make that—that is what you are saying. You just do not trust them, and I do not understand—I have not found a reason we should not have it. Actually, we need—

We are going to go through a couple rounds here, so let me go to Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Dr. Prewitt, one of the greatest concerns that State and local governments have in regard to local review is to make sure that all new construction is counted and actually, Mr. Chairman, this was one of the items that was raised in our hearing in Arizona, where there is a tremendous amount of new construction taking place. And they want to make sure that it is counted up to April 1, 2000; that it receives a census form.

Do you agree that this is a legitimate concern and are you doing anything in the Census Bureau to address it?

Mr. PREWITT. Mrs. Maloney, two things have led to that concern, one of which is our dress rehearsal experience that we did encounter, especially in Sacramento, as well as in South Carolina, a large influx of new construction and then the recommendation of our various advisory committees.

So we have now included a procedure that allows the local governments to add addresses, especially of new construction and recently inhabited new construction, right up to March 31, 2000. That is a difficult procedure. We embrace it.

It has the nice property that it slides into procedures we already had in place and that really is important because we are going to have duplication. That is, two things happen between late fall and early spring, late fall of 1999 and early spring of 2000.

Two things are happening, one of which is a postal casing check, where we go to every post office and ask them to take our address list and see if they can add anything to it. That should have found all of that new construction. But we were not convinced that would find all the new construction, so we added a separate procedure which goes back to the local governments, back with our address list. Even if they did not participate in LUCA, they are going to get this opportunity and say are there any new housing units since we finalized this address list. If so, it puts it into the mail stream.

The problem is, just so you know how complicated this is, two things are now feeding into that mail stream. One is the postal casing check and one is the local government. There will be duplications. Some addresses will appear twice. We have to unduplicate those and then we have to send an enumerator out to make sure the address really is there, which we will do, and then to enumerate the residence.

So, yes, we have now put in place something that slides into our procedures in a way to bring that address list up to date to the very last minute before census day.

Census day is really important. You have to count people on April 1st. If somebody dies the afternoon before it, they should not be counted. If a baby is born the next day, they should not be counted. Everything has got to happen on that single day or we do not have an accurate count.

Mrs. MALONEY. Could you comment on two areas? In 1990, very few local governments participated in a post-census local review. Could you comment on why you think so few participated? I understand you got the participation up to 86 percent with the pre-census?

Mr. PREWITT. Yes.

Mrs. MALONEY. That is really quite remarkable.

Mr. PREWITT. Yes.

Mrs. MALONEY. And have you identified, your professionals or the department, identified that if you had additional resources what would you institute before post-census review if resources were available that would make the count more reliable or accurate? Do you have any other ideas that you would like to have added?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, with respect to the local involvement in our address list, we indeed are very pleased this time around. We think we actually put together a better program, by far a better program, and one which had more time built into it, which had more interaction with local governments, in which they recognized how critical it was to get that address list right before went into the field. And I think that is why 86 percent of the addresses in the United States have fallen into that program.

I should say, by the way, I do not interpret 14 percent as unimportant. My guess is some communities did not participate because they realized we would do a good job without their participation,

that maybe the address list is so straightforward, as they are in some communities.

So I am not even anxious about the ones that did not cooperate because we think every city that wanted to cooperate, needed to cooperate, had the opportunity to do so.

Additional resources? Let me say a word about resources. The Census Bureau appreciates the generosity expressed by Congressman Miller and other Members of Congress saying we will pay whatever it takes and so forth. And we do appreciate it because we are under an enormous burden to be accurate and to fully count.

On the other hand, the Census Bureau does not want to spend more money than it needs to. We have a responsibility to the American taxpayer as well as the American public and we do not want to put in procedures which just because they seem to make sense on the surface but would be costly but in our judgment, our professional judgment, they will not add accuracy and they will not add to the count.

So we actually all the time are looking at something and asking is it going to give us real value for the money or are we going to get real productivity out of this procedure.

So you will find us in some instances suggesting that perhaps for some reasons we should not spend as much money as perhaps would be coming out of one source or another.

We—well, let me stop there.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Prewitt, we know that advertising is a substantial part of the overall process, yet we know that advertising is not necessarily going to give us the bottom line results that we are looking for.

Are there categories or who are the categories of people who are likely to be least impacted by the advertising campaign?

Mr. PREWITT. Mr. Davis, the advertising campaign is designed to increase the mail response returned because every extra percent we get in mail response returned lessens the pressure on us to go out and enumerate in what we call our non-response followup.

The hard to count, the really hard to count, are a very special—once you get into that, you have gotten 94 percent, you have gotten 96 percent, you have even gotten to 97.5, it really gets difficult for all of those extra—the additional hard to count people. We do not anticipate that the advertising campaign will be particularly successful at reaching those people.

Let me put it this way. The advertising campaign rests upon a model of civic engagement. It rests upon an idea that we should make people aware of the census, educate them to the importance of it and engage it. The partnership program rests upon the same kind of general model.

The problem is that the hard to count, the really difficult to reach, the alienated, the angry, the “I don’t want to be bothered” people are the same people that are going to be hard to find in a partnership program, the same people who are going to be hard to reach with an advertising strategy.

So I welcome Mr. Miller’s interest in expanding and strengthening our partnership program. We really deeply believe in it. I welcome the commitment to expanding the advertising program, but

it would be imprudent of me to suggest that that will solve the fundamental problem that we will have a differential undercount.

There will be certain population groups in the United States which will be counted, they will be racial groups, I regret to say, because they are the groups which live in—two things go into the undercount. There are housing attributes, crowded housing, housing that does not have regular addresses, irregular housing patterns, and then there are person attributes, poverty, lack of education, unemployment, high mobility.

Certain population groups, particularly racial minorities in this society, have a preponderance of both the housing attributes which make it difficult to count and the personal attributes which make it difficult to count. Put those things together and it is simply very difficult to find 100 percent of people who have that set of housing attributes and that set of personal attributes.

So the advertising campaign, the partnership program, the promotion efforts really matter. It will turn this census, I hope, into a census the American people will participate in, be proud of, but it will not reach the hardest to count and they will be differentially spread across different racial groups.

Mr. DAVIS. What about second mailing?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, second mailing is a—the Census Bureau actually tested it and thought about it and did a lot of research. I brought a lot of that research with me today, if you would like to, peruse it on the second mailing.

The problem with the targeted mailing, which is the one that we initially wanted to do, which is the most appropriate, it is very—the targeted mailing adds 6 weeks, so we simply had to set it aside because what you have to do is forms have to come in, you have to then code them all, find out who answered and who did not and then find the ones that did not, re-mail it, wait for those to come in.

We went to our printing contractors, we went to other of our consultants. They all said 6 weeks, which would be a real delay. If you wait 6 weeks before you go out to do non-response followup, the data in non-response followup begins to deteriorate because people forget where they were. They have memory lapses. They forget who lived in that apartment complex 3 months ago. And we are trying to find 40 million households.

So there is a real consequence of the targeted mailing. Therefore, blanket mailing closed that time down. We tried blanket mailing, it produced duplicate responses, it produced a lot of confusion. We simply could not do it.

The other thing to bear in mind about the second mailing is that is the part of the population which almost cooperated. By definition, they are the ones that, well, oh, I forgot, I should have, and so forth. We are going to find them. We are going to enumerate them. We wish they had mailed it in in the first place, but we are not going to miss them.

That is not going to help us with that last 3 or 4 percent, that hard to count population group and we know that half of that count is going to be children, that we are going to find not 100 percent of the African Americans but 95 percent. We are not going to find

100 percent of the American Indians, but maybe 88, 90, 90 percent. The same with the Hispanics, 95 percent.

That second mailing would not touch that problem at all.

Mr. DAVIS. You have given me a good feeling that you are going to put forth and that we are going to put forth our best effort, and I think it is most unfortunate that without utilization of the scientific knowledge that we have, in spite of all you are going to do, we are still going to come up short.

Thank you very much.

Mr. PREWITT. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

Mr. MILLER. Let me go over some of the other areas in ACT so that we can continue this.

Mr. Davis brought up advertising. Have you got a proposed advertising budget yet or is that going to be a couple of weeks before we get it or will Mr. Daley have it tomorrow or—it was \$100 million originally and—you know—

Mr. PREWITT. Mr. Miller, as you appreciate, in this hearing I am really not supposed to be talking about budget numbers.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Fine. But there is going to be an increase from the original plan. Is that right? In advertising?

Mr. PREWITT. We hope so.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Let me—see, this is what is frustrating. We do not know what is happening.

Mr. PREWITT. Well—

Mr. MILLER. We ask for details and—do not change it, but I cannot show you the details until it is over and then it is too late. That is kind of an interesting strategy being used. But at any rate, let me ask you one thing.

We had hearings in Miami and in Phoenix and, for example, with the Haitian community in Miami, in Congresswoman Meek's district, their great concern is to be able to have it as tailored to their community as possible. When you advertise, you should advertise on the Haitian radio station.

Now, I know during the dress rehearsal, for example, up in the Dakotas on the Indian reservation, the advertising was not as tailored to that Indian reservation as possible.

How much flexibility is going to be in the advertising so that it is not just the New York ad agency doing it, but so that the Haitian radio in Miami can have some tailored advertising? Is that going to be possible?

Mr. PREWITT. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. In great detail and in great abundance.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Because I think that is true for—anything we can, the more flexibility at the local level, and that is the partnership specialists and such. So you are going to be increasing the number of partnership specialists, I think I have seen some numbers, fairly significantly because, you know, working with the local community is very important. So you are increasing the partnerships, right? The specialists?

Mr. PREWITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Let me talk about the language for a minute. The Haitian community, you know, they speak Creole within a lot of the Haitian community, especially the new ones just coming over. How are they supposed to complete a form?

Does someone have to—you have instructions, but they cannot—they have to have someone else do it for them? Is that what you are saying?

Would it not make it easier if we could let at least the—it does not have to be everybody in the country has a form in Creole, but within the Haitian community, in Miami in particular, the partnership specialists could help target and make them available? Why would we not want to make it easier for the Haitians to fill out the form?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, that is what our telephone assistance centers will do and our 15,000 other specialists. We will draw them out of those language communities. We will work with them with our partnership program and other activities, work with them to go back into those communities where people have not responded. We are talking about a small number, but nevertheless we want to find them all.

So I do think that our language program—quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, I really think that our language assistance program is as comprehensive and thoughtful as it can possibly be to reach even that last less than 1 percent of the population.

And I just invite you to think with us about the problem of taking—you have a Creole population in Miami and we are now sending a form up to Alaska that says, aha, we can give you a Creole questionnaire. It is not a good way to go about doing this business. You want to be flexible and targeted.

I did read the testimony from the Miami hearing, Mr. Miller, and I think the reason that they came back to you and back to you and back to you on sampling is because they were afraid all those people would not be counted unless we had something like an accuracy in coverage evaluation.

Mr. MILLER. But the courts have ruled, we are going to do a full enumeration, and the concern we have is the two-number census. I think you agree the Supreme Court did rule and we are going to a full enumeration.

Mr. PREWITT. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. MILLER. OK.

Mr. PREWITT. Here it is. Here it is.

Mr. MILLER. OK. So we can talk about sampling, we can talk about sampling, but the fact is we need to do a full enumeration and so—I just—how about people that are blind? I guess they will have to do it by telephone. They are not allowed to fill out a form because we do not offer it in Braille.

But I would think in Congresswoman Meek's district it would be that she has a fairly high concentration, I do not know what the number is, of Haitians and we should make it easier rather than more difficult. So let me go to a couple of the other issues.

The Meek bill that Congresswoman Meek talked about. Do you all support that bill? I was reading your testimony, I was a little—I was not sure. Do you support that legislation that Congresswoman Meek has proposed?

Mr. PREWITT. We know that recruiting the enumerators is a huge task. We have already had very substantial experience and success at welfare-to-work recruits. We also know this runs into some complicated legal questions in 50 States.



Certainly we support anything that will make it easier to us to recruit the enumerators we need and if that turns out to be the wavier bill, good. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want to put words in Secretary Shalala's mouth, but when she was at the corporation's hearing, she had some legal doubts, too. But I think it cannot hurt in this—local review—it cannot hurt.

Mr. PREWITT. It certainly cannot hurt the Census Bureau.

Mr. MILLER. It cannot hurt the Bureau and neither does it hurt post-census local review.

Congresswoman Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. The bottom line is that we want to get the most accurate count possible, and we know what we got in the last count, we know what happened in 1990, we know that we missed 8.4 million people, that 4.4 million were counted twice, and we know that the people missed were largely children, Latinos, Asians, blacks, American Indians. So really the underlying question we have is how do we increase the count for particularly the undercounted areas?

And in a bipartisan effort, and I would like to quote from the Republican former head of the Census Bureau, Dr. Barbara Bryant, and in talking on enumeration she said, "Enumeration cannot count everyone. Throwing more money at enumeration will not improve it. In 1990, we hit the wall trying to count everyone by enumeration. The 1990 census was adequately funded, there was no shortage of funds for hiring more enumerators or making additional efforts."

And, as we know, she was a strong supporter of a modern count to correct the undercount. So the bottom line is we either correct the undercount or we knowingly go forward, missing millions of Americans. That is the fundamental question before us. We know we are going to do enumeration for apportionment. That is over.

We know the courts have said we can get a more accurate count for data, the distribution of funds and for redistricting within the States. The only question before us is are we going to get a more accurate count or not, or are we deliberately going to forward missing millions of Americans.

Now, we have had many bells and whistles put before this committee, but if I understand your testimony, none of it improves the undercount. Am I right or wrong?

Dr. Prewitt, would you comment?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, regretfully not. I have explained in other forums, I would re-explain today if I may, that the—and I appreciate that Mr. Miller has characterized this as being defeatist; it is not being defeatist, it is being honest, I would not want to mislead either the U.S. Congress, that would not be my job to mislead the U.S. Congress or to mislead the American people.

All of the conditions which make it difficult to count people which we have experienced in 1980, 1970, again in 1990, they are growing. We have a better census. That is, this census is better than the 1990 census. So we are running harder to stay in place.

Now, running harder to stay in place means that we will not count everyone. I hope we do as well as 1990. It is not defeatist to say that, it is to recognize the blunt realities of the lack of civic

engagement, of the alienation, of the mobile life styles, of the irregular housing. It is to recognize those realities and to try to compensate as best we can for them.

There will be an undercount, I am afraid, and it will be differential. It will not be equally spread across all regions and all population groups. The rural poor, the urban minorities, we will not find them at the same rate we find people living in the kind of neighborhoods we do. It just—those are the facts. I wish they were not.

The only way to know that after the fact will be if we do, as we have proposed, an accuracy and coverage evaluation. That will tell us after the fact how well we did up until December 31st. This is not a two-number census. There is one number for apportionment and that will be presented, as is our obligation, to the U.S. President by December 31st. The census is not over.

That does not conclude the census. The census goes on. And we will continue to be as complete and accurate as we can be. And that will produce a more accurate set of numbers which can be used for purposes other than apportionment.

Mrs. MALONEY. So it is very clear, my colleagues, what is before us. We either continue to miss millions of Americans who are disproportionately children and minorities, or we correct it and we have the scientific community which universally has come forward and pointed out the way to correct it and the Census Bureau has built it into their plan for their accuracy and evaluation.

Now, I have one question that I think is tremendously important—

Mr. MILLER. We will have another round.

Mrs. MALONEY. I have to ask it right now because I have a lot on my chest and I am beginning to get very angry with what I am beginning to see here.

What I am beginning to see and what I am beginning to hear from the professionals is that some of these “improvements” which are not the improvements that are suggested by the scientific community, but the “improvements” are going to hinder the Census Bureau, it is going to make it harder for them to come forward with an accurate count. I have heard you say that today.

My question is do you think it is deliberately being put forward by the Republican majority to just make the census professionals have a more difficult time or make it impossible for them to go forward? If you have to re-let all of your contracts, if you have to re-change all your programs.

Would you please comment?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, if it is all right with Mrs. Maloney, I will not comment on motives. I can comment on consequences, but not motives.

I have every reason to believe that Mr. Miller wants a complete and accurate count. I would have to suggest that some of the things that have been put on the table like the second mailing, the post-census LUCA, the language initiative, those three in particular, if they were now mandated by legislation, they would be very difficult, this thing would have to be—we would have to start aspects of this all over. Contracts, procedures, software, training, printing, publication, promotional materials. We would have to sort of take a back look. And this is very late in the day to do that.

I would not at all impugn anyone's motives, of course, but I would say that certain kinds of things have consequences that perhaps have not been completely thought through, and that is why I welcome the opportunity to testify.

Mr. MILLER. Before I go to Mr. Davis, I wanted to say I am offended by Mrs. Maloney's accusation that my motives are different.

I thank you, Dr. Prewitt. We all want the best count possible. I think it is going pretty low to start making those type accusations.

Mr. Davis.

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

And, Dr. Prewitt, I just want to again thank you for your candor, for your forthrightness and professionalism. It seems to me that what you have suggested and what you are saying is that you really cannot get blood out of a turnip, that you can take it, you can dice it, you can slice it, you spice it, you can curl it, you can swirl it, but in the end you are still going to have turnip juice and I am afraid that is where we are, so I thank you very much.

Mr. MILLER. Let me—we had 10 proposals and you said you are basically agreeable with most of them, seven of them, anyway. And I would think rather than being fatalistic or pessimistic like my colleagues on the minority, that we cannot do any better, I think we need to do the best job we can and by having more partnership specialists, which you agree with, is going to help, because the partnership specialists hopefully are going to be targeted, I assume additional ones will be targeted to the hard to count areas. Is that a good assumption?

Mr. PREWITT. [Nodding.]

Mr. MILLER. I mean, that should help. And we have got to do a full enumeration. The courts have ruled and we can start—we need to go back to sampling, go back to sampling, go back to sampling, it is a broken record. The courts have ruled, let us move forward, do the best job we can.

Let me go over a few more of the issues. Census in the schools; that is a good program, I think. Now, start off with only 20 percent of the schools but I do not know if we can get all of the schools. Any idea of how many we are going to be able to try to get yet or—is that still secret information?

Mr. PREWITT. No, I did—in case the committee has not had a chance to see it, we did, of course, pre-test our census in the schools program and I have these materials if you are interested.

The 20 percent was targeted on the hard-to-reach parts of the population and it was restricted to 20 percent for budgetary reasons. And if we can go to 100 percent, we would love to go to 100 percent. We would love to engage every school child in the United States in this civic ceremony. It would be a marvelous thing. And so we would welcome the opportunity to get this into 100 percent of the schools.

Mr. MILLER. Well, if that is possible, I would be very supportive because it is—civics is what it is and to make it possible, anything we can do, I think I would be supportive and I would hope my colleagues would not object to that.

The Americorp, I understand you are working with Americorp trying to find a way to work out something. Is that right?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, yes. In fact, we have already met with Americorp, not with Americorp, but the Corporation for National Service, of course.

Americorp is only one of their five programs and we have now worked out with Mr. Wolford and his staff a way to cooperate not just with Americorp but also with the National Service Sector, with the Foster Grandparent Program, their retired and senior volunteer program, every part. It is one of our most important partnerships. We have after all already signed up over 10,000 partnerships.

Mr. MILLER. Well, that is good. And a lot of this will help in the hard to count areas, right? Some of these will be in inner city areas? Is that right?

Mr. PREWITT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MILLER. So I hope my colleagues will not object to helping use that effort, too, since they minimize the ability.

The matching grant program you said you are not just not set up to be a grantmaking organization. Is there someone else at the Census Bureau that can do that? Not the Census Bureau, at the Commerce Department? The Commerce Department is a huge grantmaking organization.

Mr. PREWITT. I have not explored it with the Commerce Department. You know, after all, I spent 10 years in private foundations. I have a bit of experience with grant programs. And perhaps there is a way you could look to the private foundations. Many of them are quite engaged in the census.

They have bureaucracies, they have mechanisms to sort of control the quality of the grants, monitoring the performance of the people who get grants and so forth. So perhaps you would like to explore this with the American foundation community. It would be a very important partnership between the public and the private sector. We would welcome more money going into our partnerships.

You can appreciate why I am a little hesitant at this late stage to make the Census Bureau into something which I know is very difficult for it to be, which is to say a grantmaking operation because I have had 10 years of experience with that.

So it is not a hesitancy about wanting money in the hands of the partners, it is how is the most effective way to make that happen.

Mr. MILLER. Well, maybe, within the Commerce Department, there is more of an appropriate vehicle that can be handled kind of independently because this is something that again I think we would all support, especially for the hard-to-count areas.

Let me have one final question and go back to post-census local review. What is the relationship to post-census local review and the ACE issue? Is there any connection between the two of those? The 300,000 sample.

Does it impact the—because I have heard that one of the reasons you are opposing it is that it will make it harder to do the sampling adjustment. Is that true or—

Mr. PREWITT. No, sir. I do not know on what basis that would have been suggested to you.

Mr. MILLER. So the post-census local review has no impact, to your knowledge, on the 300,000 sampling process, right?

Mr. PREWITT. No.

Mr. MILLER. Because of the time factor. Is that—

Mr. PREWITT. It is important to know that the accuracy and coverage evaluation is an accuracy and coverage evaluation of addresses and people.

Mr. MILLER. Right.

Mr. PREWITT. So maybe in some kind of complicated way, but, no.

Mr. MILLER. OK.

Mr. PREWITT. We will go back and find out how well we did with our address list, just as we will go back and find out how well we did with our count.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Thank you. That is my final question.

Does anybody else have a final question?

Mrs. MALONEY. I do.

Are you aware, Dr. Prewitt, that the advisory committee does not support the post-census local review? They uniformly came out in opposition to it?

Mr. PREWITT. I believe that what they recommended again was the attempt by a congressional committee to legislate it in such a way that it would sort of interfere with the ongoing procedures of the census itself.

Mrs. MALONEY. And are you aware that the post-census local review is scheduled for a markup this week to be reported out and to pass, I assume?

So I would just like to ask you, GAO came out with a report that was very critical of the post-census local review program and, given their findings, I am sure you read their report and the Bureau's prior experiences, what reasons can you give to hope that the outcome of the post-census review will be any different this time?

Mr. PREWITT. Well, there should be sort of nothing for the local governments to do if they cooperated with us back when we wanted them to cooperate with us, which is to get the address list right.

I do want to remind you that there is also a boundary annexation process that we do do late in the fall of 2000 which makes sure that all the boundaries are correct and we do do that, of course, with the local governments.

So it is not as if we are not constantly interacting with the local governments about sort of improving our procedures. I guess I am just less convinced than the chairman that sort of giving them the counts and then asking them to sort of say, well, is that as many people as live under these bridges or whatever, to use the metaphor that was used earlier, it strikes me as not a very effective way to go about involving local governments in the census operation, which we have now been doing for about 8 months.

Mrs. MALONEY. Will it hinder your ability to get the job done?

Mr. PREWITT. Any new procedure that is not already embedded in what we are trying to put in place today will hinder our job. It just will. And I cannot say that strongly enough. And this is not to say a given idea is not a good idea, perhaps, but it is very unlikely that it is in a domain that we have not thought about.

We have been doing it, you know, for a couple hundred years. We are not perfect and it is quite possible that there is something out there we have not even thought of. But the job is not like most people think it is. It is a count, it is 120 million addresses and it is

putting them together on a single day. There is no other operation like it. So people who have not lived in that operation perhaps do not appreciate what goes into it.

I would love it if the members of this subcommittee would come out and sit in that lock-up room for an hour or two and watch the process at work. And then you would know how risky it is to sort of say at this late state in the cycle, aha, I have a better idea. And say pull this out and put that in.

It is just—I have to say, Mr. Miller, you worried about my administrative accomplishments and achievements before I got here and I appreciate the basis of that worry, but I can tell you as a manager that it does not make sense to take something of this complexity and this magnitude and start redesigning it at this stage in the process. We are actually on schedule.

I am sorry we do not have the budget for you today, but we are on the schedule that matters. The schedule that matters is April 1, 2000, December 31, 2000, April 1, 2001. We are on that schedule. Nothing that—anything that would deviate us from that schedule, the country will pay a price.

And that is all I can say and I can say it as strongly as you will allow me to say it. I would invite you, members of your staff, to come out to that lock-up room and watch it happen and know how intricate it is.

It is this sort of stuff and then it is putting it up on the screen, it is pulling down all of the procedures that go into a particular line, all of the subsequent activities that happen because of that line, making sure that everything connects with everything else. That is what it is to put this kind of operation in place. And it is very, very late in the day to imagine that we can do anything other than move forward with it.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, I would like to respond to your invitation to go to the lock-up room and see how it works. I hope my colleagues on the committee will join us and I hope you would open it up to the public so that we could all see it. Maybe we could put it on C-SPAN or CNN and let everyone see how changing the census this late in the game will jeopardize being able to come forward with a more accurate count.

I thank you, Dr. Prewitt, for your testimony.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Davis, do you have any—

Mr. DAVIS. No further questions.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you for your invitation, because we have had a great frustration over the past few months or so, due to a lack of information from the Census Bureau and now maybe—I guess the openness is that the staff can go out and maybe see a little bit more of what is happening and that, I think, would be good because this secret attitude is not building trust when we do not have the numbers and we need to have a system.

We need to also start talking about what is going to happen in the 2010 census, how do we avoid this issue of trust we have today.

And I look forward to our next time, after we get the plans, to come back, and Congress does have a role and I think if you—to say that Congress is irrelevant—and I know you are not saying exactly that, but you are saying basically, butt out, we are the professionals, it is kind of what you are saying, because it is too late for

us to get involved. But, read Article 1 of the Constitution, the House of Representatives very specifically has the power to direct, and so we want to have the best census possible. I think working together, we can.

So with that, let me say on behalf of the committee, let me thank you again for coming and I ask unanimous consent that all Members' and witnesses' written opening statements be included in the record and without objection, so ordered.

I also ask unanimous consent that the record remain open for Congresswoman Kay Granger to submit an opening statement, if she would like.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

