

**2010 Census Coverage Measurement Results
News Conference**

**May 22, 2012
10:00 am ET**

Stan Rolark: Good morning. My name is Stan Rolark. I'm the chief of the Census Bureau's Public Information Office. I'd like to welcome everyone in the audience today as well as people who are watching via Ustream. We're happy to have all of you with us today.

Today's news conference is on the 2010 Census Coverage Measurement results. We have two speakers. We'll have Dr. Robert Groves who is the Census Bureau director and Patrick Cantwell, an assistant division chief in our Decennial area at the Census Bureau.

Following their questions we'll - their presentations rather, we'll have questions from the media. And again, we'll have media in the room and media on the phone, so we'll go back and forth if that's the case.

We ask that if you could that you limit your questions to one question and one follow up to make sure everyone has an opportunity to ask a question. So with that, I'll bring up Dr. Robert Groves. Dr. Groves.

Dr. Robert Groves: Thank you Stan. Today's a big day for us at the Census Bureau. We are releasing the third of three sets of evaluative measures on the 2010 Census. These today will describe the results of what we call a post-enumeration survey, this decade called the Census Coverage Measurement program.

We've been doing this an organization since 1950, routine sample survey after the census to evaluate it. And I've noted in past news conferences that there

are three tools that we use to answer the question how good a census that we've done.

One, are a set of process indicators, two are other ways of measuring, estimating the population size. Demographic analysis is a key tool in that. And then finally today, a post-enumeration survey.

And I want to review those other measures just very briefly. The mail return rate measures the proportion of occupied households that are - that have returned the mail out questionnaire. And the 2010 rate at 79.3% was slightly higher than the 2000 rate. We were happy in seeing that.

We think that's partially due to the removal of the long form out of the census, the use of a replacement questionnaire, a follow up questionnaire for those that didn't return it, and then the use of a bilingual form. We also had (released) but not strong data on the value of the (type) of outreach that we had throughout the country.

In addition to this process indicator, we collected - on the downside, we collected relatively more data from proxy respondents, about 22% of the non-response follow up cases (gave us) data through a proxy respondent. The prior decade was about 17%. This was a negative indicator.

But then finally at the national level, we obtained usable household - housing unit information from slightly more records than we did in 2000. So in short, these indicators, these kinds of indicators that we reported many months ago were on the positive side. We felt that the operations themselves worked well.

The second method is demographic analysis based on historical birth registration, death registration as well as estimates on in-migration and out-migration. These estimates are the compared to census counts. And the

estimates themselves permit contrast by age, sex and a limited set of race groups.

This decade the estimation reflected uncertainty, different judgments about components of demographic analysis. And so we've presented to the country, a range of estimates that you see on this chart - DA for demographic analysis - so you can see a movement of about 306 million people on the left all the way up to about 313 million people. About 70% of that range of estimates was due to different judgments about immigrants to the population.

Now there's been a revision over the past few weeks of DA and if you look in the middle of the chart, you'll see DA revised in the middle. And that is a revision that took place just in the last few weeks. You note that the revised middle estimate is slightly smaller. It suggests an over count of the decennial census if you compare the red dots of the revised middle of about 400,000 people.

The most substantial change in those revisions came from a very innovative use of the 2010 census of Mexico which allowed us to measure out-migration, components of out-migration in the country in new ways. That revision led to that new DA middle estimate.

We also saw that when comparing the age distribution of the demographic analysis estimates with the census, that the patterns of the differences across age, sex and race groups were consistent with those that we've observed in 1990 and 2000. For example, census counts were lower than the demographic analysis estimates for ages under 10 and higher for ages in the late teens.

So that leads us to today and we will, for the first time, reveal the results of the post-enumeration survey. This survey, as I said, called part of the census coverage measurement program is conducted independently of the census. It's designed to provide sample based estimates. Therefore, they have some

sampling error attached to them, a net coverage of under counts and over counts.

This post-enumeration survey is novel in the history of the country in that we also are going to present for the first time components of census coverage, correct enumerations, missed persons, erroneous enumerations, including duplicates.

And we're going to do this in a way to break down, to drill down into census operations and space to try to understand big patterns of coverage in the 2010 census. So I will present basically national figures. Pat Cantwell of the Decennial Statistical Studies Division will then drill down into the results.

I will provide mostly national results including comparisons to prior decades. I will first begin by telling you what the post-enumeration survey doesn't do. It does cover the household population and housing units but it excludes certain subpopulations. It excludes group quarters and the people who live in group quarters.

These are things like assisted living facilities, prisons, dormitories and so on. It also excludes people enumerated in remote Alaska. These two things are just exclusions for logistical reasons. In mounting a post-enumeration survey, we first independently list addresses in the country, a sample of addresses. We then interview households about where they were living on census day, April 1st. We do this after the census is completed.

We then conducted a series of follow up activities. Actually a lot of follow up activities to resolve any discrepancies between what we were finding in interviewing people in the CCM sample and what the census found from residents living in the same area at census time.

We also worked to resolve duplications that were apparent in this data collection and unresolved resident status.

So how does the 2010 census count compare to the CCM target population? That's important to know. The census count was about 308.7 million people. We exclude about 8 million people who live in group quarters. We exclude a set of people in remote Alaska.

So the target population, if you will, for the post-enumeration survey, is 300.7 million people, not the full population. That's important to remember. We will be presenting today a set of statistics that characterize the coverage - what we call the coverage of a census.

Net census coverage is defined as the difference between the estimate based on this post-enumeration survey and an equivalent census count. So we use the sample survey to estimate national totals, compare those national totals to the census count.

If we get a positive number out of that, the tradition is to estimate net undercount. A positive will be viewed as a net undercount, a negative as an overcount and then we estimate percentages of net coverage relative to the estimate based on the census.

So if we've got a positive percentage, we'll refer to this as a positive net undercount, a negative percentage of a net over count. So I think we're ready now to see the results. What are they?

The census count of the population based on the target CCM population is 300.7 million. We get very close to that, a difference of 36,000 in the percent net undercount. We estimate an over count of .01%. That's the national total based on the CCM target population.

We can compare these figures to prior decades - 1980, if you go to the left of the chart, the Y axis on the chart is positive numbers are net undercounts, negative numbers are net over counts. In 1980, there were - constructed by the Census Bureau, a series of coverage estimates that range from .8% to 1.4% net undercount. That's what you see on the left.

And these bars that you see are essentially confidence intervals about that - 90% confidence intervals about those numbers. In 1990, an equivalent number was 1.6% undercount. In the 2000 census, a 0.5% over count. And today, we just saw this -.01%, over count.

It is useful and we do this routinely to look at other censuses and ask the question sort of how is this country doing in measuring its population using the tools we have?

And the next slide is a busy slide that compares four countries - the United States, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom. So on the left portion of the graph are presented the results for the 1980, 1981 round of censuses in some of these countries do censuses in the years that end in 1. The United States is the first bar in the set, so you see the number you just saw compared now to Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom.

And then you could go decade by decade. You see the very small number that I just announced in the 2010 round. We don't yet have equivalent figures from other countries. It is easy to look at this chart and feel proud as a resident of the United States about the quality - historical quality of censuses that we do in this country. We do world class censuses in the United States and we will see how things compare for the 2011 round, but we're proud of this chart.

We can also cut the sample of the post-enumeration survey by something that the Census Bureau calls tenure, which is in essence, whether you own or are

renting your home or whether you're buying your home or you're renting your home.

On the left of this chart for 1990, 2000 and 2010, you see comparisons of net over count and undercount for owners and, on the right, renters. The contrast is clear. This has been a contrast that appears in all censuses that renters tend to be - people who live in rented units tend to be undercounted. Owners tend to be over counted.

You can see the comparison among the renter group between 1990, 2000 and 2010. These differences between 2000 and 2010 are non-significant. By the way, this might be the first time I'm presenting little asterisks next to numbers. You're going to see that format. And that means that number itself for that decade is judged on a 90% probability basis significantly different than zero. So that's what the stars mean - the asterisks.

We can also cut the sample by race ethnicity groups, race and Hispanic origin. The results shown here are for seven mutually exclusive race and Hispanic origin groups used in the estimation. If you look at the last column of - for 2010, you can see that non-Hispanic Blacks, American Indians on reservations and Hispanics have undercounts this decade as they have in prior decades.

The non-Hispanic white alone group at the top are over counted. The remaining race and Hispanic origin groups do not have significant undercount or over count.

We can also do comparisons across the decades, so I've just added a panel to the right on the same table. And the word yes that appears in there is a comment on whether there are statistically significant difference across decades. So let me help you on just one.

If you go to the top row - non-Hispanic white, the yes that appears in 1990 is a comment that the 0.68% in 1990 is statistically different than the -0.84 in 2010. So that's how you read this chart. Again, the asterisk means within that particular decade something different from zero statistically.

So we can zoom in on this chart and ask are there differences between 2000 and 2010? And, indeed, there appear to be a rise in net undercount for the American Indian population on reservations. That's the comparison between the -0.8 and the 4.88. And that was judged statistically significant.

You can also examine - focus in on non-Hispanic blacks and Hispanic - those of Hispanic origin in general, two groups that have been the focus of great attempts on the part of the Census Bureau to reduce undercount. Here there are no differences between 2000 and 2010. But there are differences across the three decades that you see there.

Now we'll look at net coverage estimates by age and sex, focusing first on children. The measurement of ages that we could look back on the historical data are not consistent across the three years. So you have to be careful when doing these comparisons.

The 2010 figures show a net undercount of the 0 to 4 year olds and a net over count of those 10 to 17. And you can look at comparisons across the two. There are no significant differences between this census and last decade census but there is, indeed, with the 1990 census.

We can now look at net coverage estimates by age and sex, focusing on adults. The 18 to 29 year old males, the 30 to 49 year old males has been undercounted in the last three post-enumeration surveys. The 50-plus males and the 50-plus females have been over counted for the past three.

You can see the 30 to 49 year old females continues to be over counted for the second consecutive survey. How do these compare to prior years? The 18 to 29 year old females have seen a reduction from the 1.39% net over count in 2000 to a 0.28 in the positive direction, a net over count in 2010.

The 30 to 49 year old males have seen an increase in undercount between 2000 and 2010 census. And comparing to 1990, you see a significant change in undercounts and over counts for all groups except the 50-plus males.

We can slice the data by region. For the four census regions, you see an over count of people living in the Midwest. None of the three other regions has statistically significant undercounts or over counts different than zero. We can also drill down to the state level.

For the 50 states and the District of Columbia, none of these estimates that you see within the state boundaries were significantly different either undercounts or over counts.

And then finally, and this is the first time we've done this and will yield a lot of commentary over the coming months, we're presenting net undercount estimates for persons for counties and places that have 100,000 or more population. And none of those counties or places that fall in that set have a statistically significant undercount or over count.

So to sum up, compared to prior censuses, the percentage undercount for 2010 was smaller. We're pleased at that. At the national level, there was no statically significant undercount or over count of people in the census. We saw that at state levels. But we also saw that the traditional demographic groups, those who live in rented housing, those whose income and educational background are connected with those kinds of housing had the same sorts of net undercounts that we've seen in prior decades.

So although the picture at the national level is one of unprecedented excellence, I think we can say that the same groups that were hard to enumerate over the past 40 years remained hard to enumerate and those are our challenges as we move forward.

At this point, I'll turn it over to Pat and he will drill even further into the CCM findings.

Pat Cantwell: Thank you Bob. Before I say anything about the components or even the final components, I'd like to make two points. First is that in the past, after 1990 and 2000 censuses, studies were done where researchers tried to break the net error rate into what they called gross errors at that time.

And so this is not the first time that anybody has attempted to do any of this. However, this is the first time that we've actually designed the survey, designed the questionnaire to try to estimate what we're going to call components of census coverage.

And from this, provide extensive detailed estimates from many breakdowns of the population. This is also the first time where we've taken - where we're going to provide estimates of net error and components of census coverage for census operations.

This is a very important part of our work, our preparation for the 2020 census. Now the first to define the components of the census coverage, here are two numbers you've seen before from what Bob put up two minutes ago. On the left-hand side, we see the census count. On the right-hand side, the estimate from the survey.

Well, I'm going to start with the census count of 300.7 million and break it down into components. And the components, that you see, well you see

mostly that blue part in the first column. These are the correct enumerations of the census records.

You see other smaller parts near the top which we'll define as erroneous enumerations and whole person census imputations. And because most of what you see are the correct enumerations, we can blow up the top over to the right-hand side so you can see a little more clearly at the top.

So let's look at some numbers and define some of these terms. So the census count, 300.7 million records rounded. Of this, almost 95% of them were determined to be correct enumerations, or estimated through our survey, 284.7 million. These are the correct enumerations.

The next category are the erroneous enumerations. In the survey, we estimated 10 million erroneous enumerations, about 3.3% of all census records. So what causes something to be erroneous? Well, the major category are those due to duplication or sometimes we call them duplicates.

You have one person in the census, but that person has two records so it may be even more. If there are two records there, no more than one of them can be correct. The other will be a duplicate. These are two records at different addresses. There are 8.5 million erroneous enumerations due to duplication.

For other reasons, a much smaller part, about 15% of the erroneous, these are due to things such as somebody who died before census day or was born after census day, somebody who is visiting from another country but just temporarily, not planning to stay here. We had 1.5 million estimated erroneous numerations for other reasons.

The last category, whole person imputations. We had 6 million of these in the census. This is not an estimate. This is a rounded number, but 6.0 million is an actual tally of census records. We call them whole person census imputations.

And it's important to realize, first of all, that these are records counted in the census. They have no name and all their characteristics have been statistically inserted or imputed.

Now for over 80% of these 6 million census imputations, we actually know how many people were in the housing unit. We got a count. For example, we may have gone to the household or we may have first received no mail back for a form. So we went to the household, knocked on the door several times. And eventually we contacted someone nearby - a neighbor, a building manager.

Maybe the information was that there were three people living there. That's all they could tell us. So we use the count of three. Now three people are counted in the census. But all the characteristics are statically imputed. In fact, for over 95% of these 6 million people we actually know the housing unit was occupied but the characteristics aren't there.

Now you see back to the chart I gave before, let's turn to the estimate from the survey. On the right side, 300.67 million and break this into its components. So you break this down into its two components. The first, are correct enumerations and these are the same ones we saw before in the census count, so the same number.

At the top we have what we call omissions. This is in the light green. So we have the estimate for the survey, 300.7, correct enumerations you've already seen. And the omissions - this really represents two groups of people - those people who were actually missed in the census and then other people, for whom we couldn't verify they were correct in the census, for instance, those imputations that I mentioned in the census.

They have no name and no characteristics so we couldn't verify during our survey that those are actually the people that should've been there. So they're

included in these omissions. What you see, the two parts put together, the census count on top and the components of the CCM estimate down below.

And if you look at them side by side, especially if you look on the right side, we can see blown up at the top, the correct enumerations are the same by definition. Sixteen million omissions in the count but they're offset by 10 million erroneous enumerations in the red and 6 million whole person census imputations.

That's why we see a net error of essentially zero. And I'm going to start breaking down this into some categories, so you can see the net error but also the components. In this case, we saw these results a few slides ago. I've just shown 2010 instead of the other censuses as well.

So this is looking at people who are renters or owners. On the right side in the red, you see renters had a 1.1% undercount. This is consistent with prior decades. The owners a .6% over count.

Let's break this into some of its components. Erroneous enumerations - you can see the renters had more erroneous enumerations, 4.4% to 2.8% for owners. Whole person census imputations, 3% to 1-1/2%, twice as many for renters, twice as many in the percentage.

Omissions - again, for renters, 8.5% to 3.7% for owners. What do we take away from this? Well, among renters we see higher rates for erroneous enumerations, census imputations and omissions, all of them. But it's also important to realize is that in many of the breakdowns that you might see in our memos that we're releasing and other results, that sometimes a part of the differences between the different groups can be explained by owner versus renter.

Otherwise, some groups have higher proportions of renters than the average population does. And this is part of the reason why you might see higher rates of errors in net undercount.

Now let me move on to some census operations. I'm going to look at just two of them right here. We have many more in our various memos. The first of these two, we'll look at the date of mail return. So here I'm only talking about people from whom we received a valid mail form. So this is not the entire country, it's about two-thirds of the country.

And the first slide is just giving you numbers so you can get an idea, for instance, this is broken down in two different windows of time. On the left-hand side, February to March 17th is the first window. You can see some weeks beyond that in March, weeks in April, two week period at the end of April.

What you'll see is that if you look in the middle column are the counts, and these counts are in thousands, you can see most of the mail returns came in in March or early April. So the first and the last category are not as important, but we're leaving those in for completeness.

By the way, those percentages are among just these numbers, so not for the entire United States. These are some results - first before we even look at what happens with the mail returns, on the left-hand side just for a basis of reference, we have the U.S. total and this includes everybody including mail returns. And these are the same numbers that I had a few slides ago.

Erroneous enumerations at the U.S. level was 3.3%. Imputations, 2%. That's in the purple. Now let's look at these different windows of time. You can see as we go along, for the most part we see higher rates of erroneous enumerations. Again, the first and last window of time they have very few people in them.

If you look at the imputations, they're much lower across these various time windows for these people who responded by mail. What we see from this, is that among those who mailed back a census form to us, we see lower rates of erroneous enumerations, by a small amount, and we see much lower rates of imputations than the national averages. And in general, these rates increase slightly as the weeks go up.

The next operation I'll look at is the non-response follow up field operation. Now it's important to realize that these are the people from whom we did not receive a mailed form back and were placed in the non-response field operations, so we went to the door, knocked a number of times if necessary to try to get the interview in person.

Now you can see the numbers here. Again, three categories, the main two categories. We're looking at this slide by respondent type. So except for those for whom we didn't know which the respondent type was, for the most part we had a household member respond, somebody in the household who knows the people responding to us.

And occasionally, we couldn't get somebody in the household so we went to the proxy. And that split was almost 80% for household members. A little over 20% were proxies.

This is what the error structure looks like. Household members - 5% erroneous enumeration, proxies, 6.7%. Both of these are higher than the national average. In fact, here for a different set of points of reference, on the right-hand side, I have those not in the nonresponse followup so again, erroneous enumerations are higher.

Look at the imputations. For those whom we have a household member respond, imputations are low. For those for whom we need a proxy, 23.1%,

almost a quarter of the records didn't have characteristics that we could use. So we had to impute all the characteristics. Again, that unknown respondent, the numbers are large there but that's a very small category.

Our observation here, for those people requiring non-responsive follow up, so they didn't mail back a form. We see much higher rates of erroneous enumeration and imputation compared to those who mailed back the form. Also we see that proxies, proxy responses, have a higher rate of erroneous enumeration slightly higher than those from household members. The imputation rate is much higher among proxies than from a household member.

One last operation to look at, well, the operation is the same - non-response follow up field operations, but I'm going to look at a different aspect of this one. For this one I'm going to look at the completion month. Now again we have five categories here - April, May, June, July and August are combined, and unknown month but most of these responses are in May and June, most of these completion dates are in May and June.

Pictures tell a lot. If you look at the erroneous enumerations, you can see them increasing slightly as we go further in time. The imputations as well. They increase steadily across the months. Again, May and June are the main ones here. You can see wider confidence intervals than in the other categories.

But you can see the results - or the observations I should say, among NRFU respondents. The rates of erroneous enumerations and imputations are larger in June and in May, otherwise further away from census day.

Also the rate of imputation increases the longer it takes to complete the response, to increase the response in the field. So in summary, at the national level, we estimated 16 million omissions. And 6 million of these were likely counted as census imputations.

These omissions, 16 million, were offset by 10 million erroneous enumerations and 6 million whole person census imputations. As a whole, the erroneous enumerations and imputations were lower among people who mailed the census form back to us.

And in the non-response follow up field operation, the responses from proxies suffered a higher rate of errors than responses from household members. And we saw more errors the further away from census day we were.

There are two other conclusions here that look at the value of these components of census coverage. First, you can see for instance, at the national level, we had essentially no net undercount or over count. But by breaking it down further and looking at these components, we can see what happens to these errors, how many of these errors can offset but they're still very important to measure and to evaluate.

And we can study the results by operations now because we have these results by the various census operations. This will help us as we focus the research and planning and testing for 2020 census.

Stan Rolark: So, thank you Dr. Groves and Pat. Now before we open up for questions, let me just remind everyone that if you want to see a copy of the presentation, you can go to the Census Bureau's Web site at www.census.gov. When you go there you'll see a slider at the top of the page if you'll click on CCM, you'll get the electronic press kit and get all the information that's presented today. In addition, you can contact the Public Information Office at 301-763-3030 and someone there will be happy to help you.

So if – let me ask if there are any press in the audience that have any questions. No hands, so then we'll go to the phone lines. Operator, do we have any questions or comments?

Coordinator: One moment. At this time if you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1. That's star 1 to ask a question. One moment.

Stan Rolark: And hearing no questions on either, let me - well, wait just a second. Let me just again repeat...

Coordinator: This is the operator.

Stan Rolark: ...if you want to see this presentation today and if you want to get a copy of that, you can go to our Web site at www.census.gov. You'll see the electronic press kit there. And you'll also see other information that we put out recently at the Census Bureau that you might find interesting and helpful.

Coordinator: Sir, I do have questions on the audio portion that just came in.

Stan Rolark: Oh great. Great. Can we have that first question please?

Coordinator: One moment.

Stan Rolark: When we answer the questioner or give your name and your media affiliation.

Coordinator: Our first question comes from Haya El Nasser. Your line is open sir.

Haya El Nasser: Yes, hi. This is Haya El Nasser, USA Today. Dr. Groves, it seems to me that some of the efforts that were made to promote the census, the outreach efforts, the advertising campaign and so forth probably helped to reduce the net undercounts. But can you explain why you were not able to reduce the undercounts of major groups such as blacks and Hispanics?

Dr. Robert Groves: Let's see, first thing to note is that the figures we're presenting today don't really answer the why question. They're estimates of net undercount or net

over count. And why we achieved one number of another is something that the data don't reveal. There are other evaluation studies that are going on.

The - you make reference to the historical patterns of undercount that are present here as well. I would note that this tendency, say, to undercount young babies, to have both duplicates and missing cases among young black males, to have over counts of the elderly, to tend to undercount Native Americans, those basic ingredients of census taking you see in other country's censuses, these are populations, that for a variety of reasons, pose difficulties for us in enumeration.

The outreach that you described is but one operational antidote for that and our belief is that without that outreach, these numbers would've been much, much, much worse on the undercount side. So we believe strongly that the community connections that we made offered opposing influences on the tendency to undercount these groups.

But we admit that these traditional pattern over multiple decades is present in these data as well.

Haya El Nasser: Can I just follow up real quick with another question?

Dr. Robert Groves: It looks like Stan will allow you another question.

Haya El Nasser: Thank you. I'm just wondering, with this information now, what is that going to do to the Census Bureau's efforts in the next decennial census in terms of trying to go online to do - filling out the forms online? Talk a little bit about, based on what you've found out in this post-enumeration survey, whether that sort of adds ammunition to do it differently.

Dr. Robert Groves: I think the watch word that we have for the 2020 planning is to efficiently allocate the resources we have. So you referenced our commitment to using an

Internet mode in 2020 because it's clear from our own research and research in other countries, or practice in other countries, that that allows the freeing up of some resources since it's relatively inexpensive, that can be used for the hard to enumerate groups more directly.

So our plans going forward will lean on these CCM results in major ways and we're just beginning to mine the data in that fashion to see what operations have what positive and potentially negative effects on the quality of the census and that will allow us to reshape those and re-resource them in ways to be more efficient.

Haya El Nasser: Okay, thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question will come from Olivia Winslow. Your line is open ma'am.

Olivia Winslow: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Dr. Robert Groves: Yes, we can hear you well.

Olivia Winslow: How can I find the breakdown of the undercount, over count by various demographic characteristics at the large county level?

Pat Cantwell: This afternoon – this is Pat Cantwell. This afternoon, we'll be posting memos that will be available online this afternoon. We'll have net undercount results for all places and counties that have 100,000 or more in census population. And we'll have component breakdown for those places and counties that have at least 500,000 population so it will be available online.

Olivia Winslow: Approximately what time?

Stan Rolark: Around 1:00 Olivia.

Olivia Winslow: Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from Tom Brokerbrow. Your line is open sir.

Tom Brokerbrow: Good morning and thank you. You're giving information on error rates based on people who did not mail in a response. Our community, we had large areas that did not even have response mailed to them. The original way to reply was to sit at their home and wait for a census enumerator to come to their residence. Do you have any type of error rates based on that type of - how you collected your data?

Pat Cantwell: Yes, actually, we determine an error rate, we estimated error rates for every - all the various types of enumeration. And one of the breakdowns we will have available this afternoon are error rates by the three major types of enumeration - the mailout/mailback, what's called update/leave and what's called update/enumerate. So it'll be available, broken down for components and for net error.

Tom Brokerbrow: Thank you.

Stan Rolark: Okay, thank you. Operator, next question please.

Coordinator: At this time I show no further questions sir. I do have another one that came in from Ms. Nasser. Would you like to take that?

Stan Rolark: Yes, go right ahead.

Haya El Nasser: I'm just wondering, can any of these studies, surveys, be used in challenging the count of - in, you know, municipalities challenges of the counts? Or is that process over?

Dr. Robert Groves: We are through the middle of 2013, receiving questions about counts arising at the community level. Where local officials, in examining their own data available to them, believe that there's some discrepancy between their population counts or their housing unit counts and those of the census. And we - this is called the Count Question Resolution program. We will continue to receive those and that is the design program by which these sorts of concerns are raised.

Haya El Nasser: Okay.

Stan Rolark: And if you have further questions about that, you can contact the Public Information Office and we'll help you. The phone number is 301-763-3030. Operator, are we showing any other questions in the queue?

Coordinator: I have no further questions.

Stan Rolark: Well, I don't think we have any questions in the room either so with that, we'll close out today's press conference. I want to thank everyone for participating, coming and participating on the phone and watching us on Ustream.

Once again, if you go to the Census Bureau's Web site at www.census.gov you can get information on this press conference and all of the information that was discussed today and information on other products that we have available. Thank you. Have a good day.

Coordinator: At this time, that will conclude today's conference. You may disconnect and thank you for your attendance.

END