

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU PRESS BRIEFING
DECEMBER 21, 2010

STEVE JOST: Introduce our guest today, Dr. Robert Groves of the US Census Bureau.
[Applause]

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Happy to be here today, great to see all of you here. This is a big day for the Census Bureau. And kicking it off, I'm very quite proud to introduce Under Secretary Rebecca Blank and Secretary Locke. Under Secretary Blank will begin with a set of remarks and then introduce the Secretary. Becky? [Applause]

REBECCA BLANK: Thank you, Dr. Groves, and good morning everyone. It's good to get to this point. I would like to echo what Dr. Groves and I have talked about many times, which is that we really went into this with the intention of being a team. And I'm very pleased to say that in the past 18 months, that we have been a team between Secretary Locke, between my office and between Dr. Groves in the Census Bureau. It's been a pleasure and an honor to work with the Census Bureau on the 2010 Census. The US Census Bureau is in very good hands with Dr. Groves at the helm, leading a dedicated group of professionals.

Many of whom, are sitting right here in the front row. I appreciate the work that literally thousands of Census employees have done to assure a successful 2010 Census, as well as hundreds of thousands, over a million of Americans who became temporary Census workers and who helped collect the actual data. Congratulations to you all. We're here today to do something that has only taken place 23 times in the nation's history. We are complying with Article 1, Section 2 of the US Constitution, which mandates the actual enumeration of the population every ten years. The Founding Fathers of our nation had a bold and ambitious plan to empower the people over their new government. The plan was to count every person living in the United States, and to use that count to determine representation in Congress.

Enshrining this mandate in our Constitution marked a turning point in world history. There had been censuses before, but they had been used mainly to collect taxes or to confiscate property. Or to conscript residents into military service. That is not what the US Census is about. The genius of our founders was taking a tool of government and making it a tool of political empowerment for citizens over their government. We cannot be a representative government without being able to apportion our House of Representatives in a way that reflects the changing nation of the past two centuries. And that requires us to know who lives where. It requires a population census. The first Census in 1790, at the very start of the Republic, was managed under the direction of Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State.

James Madison, often called “Father of the US Constitution,” recommended at least five of the six questions that were asked on that very first Census form. US Marshals were charged with conducting the 1790 Census in the original 13 states, and took about 18 months to do the work. While the 2010 Census is a far bigger endeavor than faced those marshals in 1790, it remains almost as simple in one respect. For the 2010 Census, we asked only ten questions. Just four more than in 1790, and very much with the same content as Mr. Madison had recommended. The founders would no doubt be astounded and amazed at how the new nation that they had created has evolved and has changed.

However, they surely would be most pleased that our Constitution and our way of government enshrined in that document has survived, and indeed, it has thrived. This is due in part because the founders invented a new use for a census that helped regularly redistribute political power as the nation expanded westward and grew. Today, in reporting these first 2010 Census results, our great American democracy renews itself in the midst of a changing nation peacefully, fairly, and openly.

I am now honored to introduce to you the man who was charged by Congress with making sure that the Department of Commerce conducts a decennial census, Secretary Gary Locke. Secretary Locke has been deeply interested in and involved with key Census related decisions over the past 18 months. Sir, it has been a real honor to serve

with you and to serve you in making sure that this important mandate was completed.
Ladies and gentlemen, join me in welcoming Secretary Locke. [Applause]

SECRETARY LOCKE: Well, thank you very much, Becky, for the introduction and for your remarks on the history of the Census. It's really a pleasure to be with all of you this morning. Some important news must be about to be unveiled. This is really an important day for the American people. And earlier this morning, in accordance with the law and fulfillment of a Constitutional mandate, I delivered the 2010 Census findings to the President of the United States. This is a ritual that has occurred only 22 other times in American history.

My report to the President included the national and state populations, and the apportionment, or the allocation of seats to the United States House of Representatives based on the official population count of the 2010 Census. I told the President also that the 2010 Census was completed on time and under budget. Before we get to the actual numbers, it's important to stress this achievement because it demonstrates that government can deliver a promise on time and within its budget. Before this Census began, experts inside and outside the government predicted that long standing operational and fiscal problems at the US Census Bureau would doom the 2010 Census to cost overruns and diminished participation by the American people.

In 2009, the Commerce Department's own Inspector General as well as the government accounting office, ranked the 2010 Census as one of the federal government programs most likely to fail. That did not happen. Earlier this summer, I joined Dr. Groves to announce the Census Bureau had spent \$1.6 billion dollars less than it was given by the Congress for Census operations in 2010. And with the final accounting completed, I'm very pleased and very proud to announce that the number has actually grown to \$1.87 billion dollars. Almost \$1.9 billion dollars under budget, which represents more than 25% of the total that congress allocated in 2010 for spending on the decennial census.

At least half of this budgetary accomplishment can be directly attributable to better management, greater productivity among our Census takers, and our successful effort to get more Americans to mail back their Census forms, which reduced the number of Census employees we had to hire to go door to door, counting. The other half of the \$1.87 billion dollars is from reserves that we had set aside to deal with operational problems such as concerns with our computer systems and other unforeseen circumstances, such as severe weather. All of which, fortunately, never arose.

Ultimately, 74% of US households returned the Census questionnaire by mail, matching what had been achieved in the 2000 Census, and exceeding the predictions of the experts, and halting a three decade decline in mail back response since 1970. These are substantial achievements that did not happen by chance. The Senior Management of the Department of Commerce and the management of the Census Bureau ran a very tight ship.

We constantly demanded accountability, rigorous internal management reforms and constant monitoring of performance. And we made sure that we stretched every taxpayer dollar as far as it could go. We also revamped our public outreach efforts and our advertising was marked more targeted than it had ever been before with concentrated advertising and hard to count communities. Advertising in more languages. We also set aside resources to rapidly intervene, if necessary, with targeted advertising and outreach in areas with lagging response rates. And the impact of this targeting effort was measurable and immediate. In late March of this past year, the Census Bureau had identified media markets containing a total of 17.7 million households that seriously lagged in mail back response.

And after three weeks of more intensive and targeted advertising and public engagement, low performers were reduced to just ten media markets with 1.6 million households. And of course, we could not have realized these savings without the American public-- The American public's impressive participation in the 2010 Census. And so, we'd like to express our deep, most sincere thanks to all those who returned the questionnaire or even took a few minutes to answer the simple questions from the almost three-quarter million Census workers who followed up with the households that had not mailed back their

response. All of you have helped us paint this latest portrait of America, which we will start showing you in just a few seconds.

The 2010 Census has been a priority of mine since my very first day as Commerce Secretary, perhaps made more so because of the pessimistic predictions. In fact, the very first thing I did as Secretary, even before I ever set foot in the Commerce Department building, was to attend a kickoff meeting with 2010 Census partners at a Washington, D.C. conference center. For the 2010 Census, there were more than 257,000 partner organizations all across America, who joined with the Census Bureau to inform and motivate their communities to participate. And these partners range from community groups to non-profit organizations to businesses large and small.

And many of them are represented here, today. And they also deserve our heartfelt thanks for their support, their commitment, and their tremendously successful efforts. Much is riding on the results that we're announcing today. The Census data will determine how more than \$400 billion dollars is allocated every single year by the Federal Government and for the next ten years. To local communities for everything from education, to senior services, to housing, to law enforcement and transportation. And the 2010 Census will help shape the makeup of state legislatures and decide the allocation from the different states, to the US House of Representatives. Our business colleagues will also benefit enormously from the Census data.

This data will provide vital information that the business community will use to identify new markets, to decide where to make major capital investments, and ultimately create more jobs and grow our economy. So indeed, the 2010 Census will serve as a backbone for our political and economic system for years to come. And again, it's been a real pleasure to work with our great colleagues and our professionals at the Census Bureau. It's a pleasure to be here on this important day for our nation. And I'm so very proud of our entire management team at the Secretary's Office, at the Department of Commerce, our Census Bureau headed up by Bob Groves, our temporary Census workers, and our hundreds of thousands of community partners. So with that, let's get on to the news and

the statistics and the information you've all been waiting for. And I'll turn it over to Dr. Groves who will give us that exciting news.

[Applause]

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Thanks Gary. Thank you, Secretary Locke. Well, I am proud on behalf of all my colleagues at the Census Bureau to report to the American public the 2010 Census national and state population counts, and the apportionment results for the US House of Representatives. As you've heard, this is the 23rd time this country has done this. At that time, we were just a nation of 3.9 million people, in 1790. This is the time when all of us come together to count ourselves and make possible a critical step in the democracy. We begin this release with the revelation of the national population count.

The official count of the US as of April 1, 2010. The population on that date is the cumulative effect of generations of Americans growing and moving throughout the country. This first graphic tracks the growth of the 50 states, even reflecting the populations of territories that later became states. A hundred years ago in 1910, there were 92 million people in this country. By 1970, the population had more than doubled. Ten years ago, the resident population, that is the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, was 281,421,906 persons. Ten years ago. Under our Constitutional mandate, the Census Bureau was charged with the job of conducting the 2010 Census, to update that number.

Following that in early 2009, our staff visited every street in this country to update our list of addresses. Then in 2010, we mailed or delivered 132 million forms. We worked with over 250,000 community and civic organizations to promote the Census. We hired 600,000 staff members to knock on about 50 million doors around the country to collect data in person. And then we optically scanned 166 million forms. We built and reviewed very large data sets, stripped of personal identifiers. At this point, I am happy and proud to note we have finished the work required to produce our first 2010 Census product. And I ask that Secretary Locke and Under Secretary Blank join me up here in revealing for the

very first time, to everyone in the country, at the very same moment both here on television and on the internet, the official US April 1, 2010 population count.

As of April 1, 2010, according to the 2010 Census, the resident US population is 308,745,538 persons. [Applause and side talk] This 2010 Census population represents a growth of 9.7% over the official population count of 2000. Now, I'm going to provide more details, including the 2010 state population counts and I'm going to review the results of the reapportionment of the House of Representatives. First, let's break down the national figures to see the variation within the country, showing geographical variation and population growth. Here we see the continuation of a multi-decade trend of growth in the southern and western regions.

The northeast grew by a rate of 3.2% over the last ten years. The Midwest grew by 3.9%. the south, already the region with the largest population, grew by 14.3%. And finally, the west grew by 13.8%. If you look at a state map, the state map, we see large variation across the states. Many different circumstances have combined to contribute to the population growth or decline in each state. The state with the largest rate of population growth in the last ten years is Nevada with 35.1% growth. I note that in the last census, Nevada showed a 66% growth. On the other hand, Michigan saw a decline of 0.6%, and Puerto Rico, a decline of 2.2%. In Census 2000, ten years ago, no states experienced a ten year decline, however in the 1990 Census, four states experienced a decline.

Now, let's drill into each reason-- Region. Within the regions, you'll see variation across states. We begin in the northeast, where we see Rhode Island with 0.4% growth compared to New Hampshire, with 6.5% growth. In the Midwest, we again see the decline in Michigan, but we also see a 7.9% growth in South Dakota. In the south, there was a great range among individual states. For example, Louisiana with a 1.4% growth, and West Virginia with a 2.5% growth, can be contrasted with Texas, with a 20.6% growth. In the west, there's even a wider difference between Montana at 9.6% growth and then again, Nevada with 35.1. Now, I turn to the implication of the 2010 official Census results on the membership of the US House of Representatives.

As you know, the Constitutional purpose of the Census is the redistribution of the membership of the House of Representatives across states, proportional to the population. Since 1940, the law has specified that the Census Bureau use the method of equal proportions to assign seats to states. This method is based on the population of the 50 states, excluding the District of Columbia, supplemented by the federally affiliated overseas population. If we look at the congressional reapportionment each decade since 1940, the trend is a growth in seats for western and southern states, and a tendency to lose seats from the Midwest and the northeastern states. In fact, since 1940, there's been a net shift of 79 seats to the south and west. The effect of the official 2010 population counts at the state level on congressional apportionment is a shift of 12 seats, affecting 18 different states.

Those states gaining seats include Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Washington, as you see on the graphic. Those losing states are Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. For 32 states, there is no change. Texas gained the most seats this decade, a total of four, and indeed that state has gained seats for seven consecutive decades. The next graphic shows a national snapshot of the 2010 Census apportionment of the US House of Representatives. California will have 53 seats. Texas will 36. New York and Florida will each have 27. Seven states will have only one representative. The average population size of each House district will be 710,767 persons. This is up from 646,952 at this time in 2000. And I might note, in 1790, each representative represented 34,000 people roughly.

We have grown. Let's return to examining the pattern of population change. Over the last 100 years, the rate of growth of the US population has gradually slowed. This is true in many developed societies, but there's a lot of variation across the decades as you can see from the red line on this graphic. There are two notable decades here. Between 1930 and 1940, the small growth rate of 7.3% is thought to be related to the Great Depression of the 1930s. Between 1950 and 1960, the high growth rate of 18.5% reflects the so-called

baby boom. The percentage growth this last decade, as I stated earlier, 9.7%, is thus the second lowest of the past century. The Census Bureau also tracks the center of the population each decade.

In 1790, the center of the population was in Kent County, Maryland. It consistently moved west, and in more decades, noticeably south. In the year 2000, it sat in southern Missouri. We've not yet computed the new center. It's based on lower geography data. We can't wait to see whether the center will remain somewhere in the state of Missouri or move south into Arkansas. We'll let you know as soon as we know. Another way of looking at change in the population over time is to consider the relative sizes of the four major regions of the country. In 1910, the west region comprised only 7.7% of the national population. In 1990, for the very first time, the northeast became our smallest region with 20.4%.

The northeast and Midwest regions consistently declined in relative size over the last 100 years. In contrast, by the 2000 Census, the west was 22.5% versus that early 7.7% in 1910 of the national population. Based on the 2010 results, we note that this is the very first decade in our country's history that the west region is more populous than the Midwest. Now let's look at states with the largest and smallest populations in the country. In 1910, four of the five most populous states were in the northeast and Midwest, with Texas as a fifth. Starting in 1940, California displaced Texas in the top five. By 1970, Texas rejoined the top five. In 1990, Florida joined the top five.

New York is the only state that is ranked among the five largest in each decade. In fact, this has been true since 1790. What are the top five most populous states as of April 1, 2010? They are California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois. And you see their population counts there on the graphic. The identities of the five least populous states vary a little less over the decades. If we look, for example, at Alaska, I note that it grew from 64,000 people as a territory in 1910, to 627,000 in the year 2000, yet it has always been among the least-- The five least populous states. We note that Delaware and Vermont on the east coast are also consistently among the least populous states. Today,

according to the 2010 Census, the least populous states include Wyoming, Vermont, North Dakota, Alaska, and South Dakota.

I've been talking about the size of populations, but let's turn to percentage change, the rate of growth of populations over the decade. Between 1920 and 1930, Michigan grew at a rate of 32%, reflecting the growing manufacturing sector in the state. Between 1950 and 60, Florida grew at a fast rate of 78.7%, reflecting large in-migration from New York and other northern states, the prevalence of air conditioning and economic conditions in the state. Arizona has been among the five states with the highest population growth for nine of the last ten decades. Starting with a growth rate of 63.5% between 1910 and 20, and then more recently, in 1990 to 2000, 40% growth rate.

Based on the 2010 Census data, the five states with the fastest growth rate during the past decade are Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, and Texas. And you can see their growth rates there on the graphic. There's also a story to tell for the states with the slowest growth or declines over the past century. The 1920s saw the great migration from the south out of states such as Georgia. During the dust bowl years in the 1930s and 40s, many residents of the Great Plains were forced to leave. Also, consider West Virginia, where the population declined for two decades, then rebounded strongly in the 1970s, reflecting the changing fortunes of coal mining. Losses, therefore, can be temporary.

This decade, the five states with the slowest growth include Michigan, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Ohio, and New York. Let's turn to the geographical dispersion of the population. We are a large country geographically, but our population is not evenly spread throughout it. An important attribute therefore, is population density, measured by the average number of persons per square mile. I had been talking a lot about movement east to west, but it's important to note that the five states with the highest population density have remained the same for the past 40 years in this country. They are New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maryland. All of these were part of the original 13 states in the country.

The five states with the lowest population density have remained the same for the last 20 years, although the ranking varies somewhat over those years. They are Alaska, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. States with some of the larger land mass in the country. Let me sum up. This really completes our first look at the results of the 2010 Census. There is much, much more to come, revealing how our nation has changed over the last ten years at levels as small as a city block, as small as school districts and counties and cities throughout the country. I want to end this press conference with some thank yous. To the nearly 309 million residents of this wonderful country, I thank you on behalf of all of us at the Census Bureau for your civic participation in the 2010 Census.

I want to thank the thousands of Census Bureau staff throughout the country, and I want to congratulate them for a job well done in the 2010 Census. And especially to Secretary Locke and Deputy Secretary Blank, Becky phrased in precisely correctly, this was a team with a leader in Secretary Locke, that allowed us to keep our eye on the prize throughout this endeavor. With his input and leadership throughout this Census, we've produced for the country a wonderful Census in my belief. I want to thank you for the hundreds of hours, both of you, that you spent assuring that this Census was successful, and importantly for me, was conducted in a non-partisan and professionally statistical way. A statistically valid way. I want to thank you for coming today, and I know how packed your schedules are, and I thank you for your continuing support. This ends my remarks today. Steve? [Applause]

STEVE: So while we give the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, a chance to get back to their duties, a couple of announcements. We'll open it up here to Q and A to the press in a second. If you're on Twitter, you can send a question to @USCensusBureau. If you're on the phone to get in the Q, I think you need to press one, and we'll start with questions in the room for Dr. Groves right here in front. Oh, and if you want to go to our website, either 2010census.gov or census.gov. This presentation and the materials we are now handing out to the press are both available on our website for download right now. Yes, sir?

Q: What do you attribute the slow [off microphone]

STEVE: Can we get you-- We'll get you a mic. We'll get you for everybody. And please identify your affiliation.

Q: What do you attribute the slow growth in Louisiana to? And how much of an impact was Hurricane Katrina and Rita-- I mean, Hurricane Katrina?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: One attribute of these numbers is we've looked at them only for a few days just as you've seen them only for a few minutes. So, the growth in any state is yet to be discovered in terms of what the root causes are.

STEVE: Do we have a question on the phone? Okay, we'll go to the room right here, in the front row. Please identify yourself.

Q: Alex [off microphone]. Alex Daniels, Arkansas Democratic Gazette. What's the significance of the population center? And do you suspect that it will be in Arkansas?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The significance of the population center, I think, is the answer to question, "Well, if everyone weighed the same amount and we sort of balanced the country by geography, where would the center point be?" I think the value of tracking the center of the population over time is that it teaches us how we've changed as a country. This movement south and west is really a very simple way to note how we as a population have changed and how we've moved over the decades.

STEVE: Okay, we'll go to a question on the phone, please. Operator?

OPERATOR: Thank you. We do have a question from a Shaun Tandon, AFP.

Q: Yeah, thank you for doing this. I just had a question about the rate of growth. Since this is the slowest since the 1930s, what do you really think is the main reasons for that? Is it a mixture of-- Is it because of the immigration issue? Or is it also because of-- Because it's of fewer births?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, growth in our country comes both from natural increases, fertility processes of the folks who live here, and part of the growth is due to that in this country, and part of the growth is due to immigration. Based on our demographic analysis, it looks like about 60% of the growth over this decade is due to these natural increases, and maybe 40% due to immigration. Net.

STEVE: So, we have a question from Twitter. This one from Utah, Dr. Groves. When and where do we get county data?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Starting in February, state by state, the Census Bureau will release data that will be used by the states for redistricting. Those-- That information gives counts down to the block level. And you could assemble blocks up to county level from those data. That will be February through the end of March. And then later, we'll begin to have profiles and other files released that will give results on all sorts of geographical units.

STEVE: Okay, we'll come back to the room, here. In the way back. Way back, you.

Q: Hello. Katie Fowley with KPCC Public Radio in Southern California. You spoke about the ways that the population grows. Could you specifically speak about California? How much of its population? We grew by 10%, how much of that was immigration and how much of that was natural birth? Because California's a little different than the rest of the country, usually, in this area.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: As you know, on December 6th, we released estimates of the population based on birth and death certificates in migrants and out migrants. Those data, that process do not permit us to go down to the state level. So the answer to your question

at this point, we don't really have. We have a wonderful tool in this country now, called the American Community Survey, that tracks over time, where people were-- They report where they lived in the prior year. And that would be one way of going about answering that question. I don't have those data with me.

STEVE: So let's check if we have a question on the phone. Operator?

OPERATOR: One question from the phone, Angela Carter, New Haven, Connecticut register.

Q: Yes, thank you. Good morning, everyone. I'd like to know the actual budget from Congress for the 2010 Census. What's the actual dollar amount?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, Secretary Locke referred to the 2010 fiscal year budget, which was about \$7.4 billion dollars. Of that-- That \$7.4 billion dollars was spent on Census operations, data collection operations and the beginning of the processing activities. And as he noted, of that 7.4 billion, we were able to return 1.87 billion. We saved enough money to return that to the Treasury.

STEVE: A new question from Twitter. Were undocumented residents included in the Census and the apportionment computation?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: In every Census since 1790, following the guidance of the founding fathers, we have counted all persons who live in the country. We count residents, whether they are citizens or not, whether they are documented non-citizens or not. We did that in 2010, just as we've done it every ten years since 1790. As you may recall from your Census questionnaire, we did not have a question on whether you were a citizen or not, what your status was. And hence, from these counts, we can't answer the kind of questions that some have about the proportion of the population that is new immigrants, based on the Census data.

STEVE: Okay, we'll go to the other side of the room. This gentleman in the back row?

Q: Hi. James Rosen, McClatchy Newspapers. Am I correct in remembering that 1910 was the last time that the number of members of the House of Representatives went up to its current level of 435? That's part one of the question. Part two is will there be-- Since the districts keep getting larger, will there be a point where the Census Bureau will have to consider increasing the number of districts? And that does that require an act of Congress?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: On the first question, the size of 435 seats was fixed for the 1920 Census. I remind us that the 1920 Census did not lead to a reapportionment of the 1920 House. That was the one decade where the Census was not used for reapportionment. On your second question, the size of Congress is a matter for Congress. The Census Bureau has no role in determining or recommending the number of seats. That's a matter for the Congress, itself.

STEVE: And I think we have another question on the phone. Operator?

OPERATOR: Adriana Gomez, The El Paso Times.

Q: Yes, I have two quick questions. In New Mexico, there was an undercount-- I'm sorry, not an undercount, but not a lot of people answered the questionnaire. It was the lowest responding rate. What did the Census do to make sure that the accurate count-- That New Mexico had the accurate count?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: There are two things. And actually, this is a great question because it allows me to go over how we do a Census. We do, indeed, mail out or deliver questionnaires, but that's the beginning of a process. You can think of that as sort of the first half of a Census. Any household that did not return the questionnaire we sent them, was followed up in what we call the non-response follow up step. That amounted to about 50-- 47 million households. We knocked on those doors repeatedly. We visited as many

as six times throughout that process. So the relationship between the mail return rate and the complete count is really quite a fuzzy one, because we follow up on every household. At the end of this process, for every household on our master address file, we have a resolution. We have a population estimate or we have a population count through all of our processing and data collection. So, the Census, as much as we can know from our operations, is complete in all those areas.

Q: Thank you.

STEVE: We have another question from our friends in Twitter land. This is from Craig. Is the female to male ratio changing?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, from these data, as you can tell from the press conference, we haven't released counts by gender. We will do that over the coming months and we can look at this ratio. This is an important ratio for us as statisticians, because we have the ratio of males to females by age from the vital registration system. And most people believe those to be pretty good numbers. As soon as we get the same, what we call sex-ratios, male to female ratios, from the Census, we'll compare those to, as a way to compare demographic analysis to the Census. That will give us insights into how good demographic analysis and the Census are. There's a big evaluative tool for us, but so far, we don't have those gender ratios.

STEVE: We'll come back to the room, here. The gentleman in the second row?

Q: Thanks. Todd Gilman with the Dallas Morning News. Can you talk about the variation in size, ratio of constituents per member of Congress under this apportionment? And also, which states were next in line for seats?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I'm not prepared to talk on the variation, although, within you know, seconds, given the data you have, we could all do this. I just haven't-- I just haven't done that. It could easily be done. So take the population of the state, divide by

the seats, and you'll see variation. The method of apportionment tries to reduce that relative variation. That's why it's been used since 1940. And then you're second question, I [off microphone]. The 435th seat was assigned-- Was given to Minnesota. Minnesota didn't change its number of seats. The next state in line was, if we had a 436th seat, that would have been assigned to North Carolina. The population difference that would have switched the order of Minnesota and North Carolina, was 15,700 and some-odd. I can tell you, that is the largest discrepancy in half a century. So there's a pretty good spread between the 435th and the 436th, relative to past censuses.

STEVE: Let's go back to the room for one more question. Right over here.

Q: Tony Peer, with McClatchy Newspapers. I believe you said that the decade between the 30s, the decade of the Great Depression was the slowest growth rate. I think 7.3%?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah, 7.3%.

Q: I'm wondering if you all have calculated how this great recession affected the 9.7% growth rate from 20 to 2010? And where does that rank in terms of smaller growth rates?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah. You've quoted me right, and if you think about this for a minute, this is an assertion on the part of historians, that the Great Depression depressed growth rates. We don't really have anything to compare to it. When you look at that trend in growth rates, I think the case is pretty attractive to make that the Depression hurt the growth rate. But teasing out the marginal effect of the Great Depression versus all the other things that were happening in that decade, is just as hard as trying to answer your question, "What is the marginal effect of the recession on our growth rate?" I do know that a lot of developed countries around the world are slowing in their growth rate. This is a pattern that is a worldwide pattern. So part of it is that, and part of it may be the recession. We'll never know-- We'll never really be able to piece those things apart, I think.

STEVE: So, we'll go to another question on the phone. Operator?

OPERATOR: Terri Ann Lowenthal, The Census Project.

Q: Yes, good morning, Dr. Groves. I apologize if you addressed this because I lost my phone connection at one point. But could you confirm or tell us whether or not the inclusion of the overseas military and federal civilian population in the state population totals, affected the apportionment outcome in any way, if it did in the last two censuses?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I cannot answer that question. I do not know the answer to that question. We haven't done that. I haven't seen that. As you know, the overseas federal employees, the Department of Defense employees who are stationed abroad, state and other federal agencies, supply to the Census Bureau counts of their personnel by their home state. We assign for apportionment purposes, those counts to the home states. We don't have finer geographical data, so that those counts are not used in the redistricting process, but they are used in the reapportionment process. And this was a question that's a hypothetical one, if you pulled them out, would it change the apportionment process? And I don't know the answer to that.

STEVE: We'll go all the way over here to the waving hat for a question.

Q: Thank you so much. My name is Rita Gerona-Adkins, I write for Asian Pacific American audiences. This is just a very quick follow up of the previous question regarding, and your answer was that the Census does not ask questions regarding citizenship. Now, of course, I'm referring to then documented, especially those coming from Asia-- I write for Asian Pacific audiences here in America. What would be the process after the count, the decennial count that [off microphone] would pursue to be able to have an estimate, more or less, of the undocumented or the uncounted? Especially those coming from Asia. Thank you.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The-- I refer you, first of all, when thinking about the decennial Census to Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution that specifies that Congress specifies how the Census would be taken by law. So one answer is if you're talking about the decennial Census, this is certainly a matter where Congress would need to weigh in. Our other surveys that we do ask about country of origin. And we ask other questions that get to this. None of the surveys we do ask about the documentation status of non-citizens. So this is something that we haven't inquired into.

STEVE: That's a good segue to our next question from Karina on Twitter. What is the difference between these results today, and the recent ACS, American Community Survey results?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: There are multiple estimates. This refers to a huge release of small area estimates that we provided just a few days ago. There's several differences. They reflect the period 2005 through 2009. The counts I just released are April 1, 2010 counts. There's a time difference between the two. The second thing is one of the benefits of the short form Census was all of us didn't have a lot of work to do. It took just minutes to fill this out. The bad thing about that is there aren't many pieces of information in the decennial Census. The American Community Survey, on the other hand, is rich in characteristic data. Socioeconomic data, housing data, travel patterns of travel to work, and so on. And so, using those in combination is a wonderful way to understand this country. And that's how we use them at the Census Bureau.

STEVE: Okay, let's-- We've got time for about four or five more questions. We'll go this gentleman here, do a couple in the room, and then go back to the phone. We have a microphone for you?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: We lost the mic, here.

Q: My name's Brian Tumulty, I write for Gannett Newspapers in New York. Going into today, there was speculation that New York might lose only one House seat instead of

two. How close was it? And the state's slow population growth, how much of that was attributable to out migration offsetting the influx of new residents?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, I'm going to disappoint you, because I can't answer either one of your questions at this point. Your first question is answerable by going through the apportionment process and seeing how far down New York was. The second question is a little like other questions we've talked about today. Piecing apart the causes of growth and, or decline, is really a complicated process. The Census-- The decennial Census is a snapshot. So we have two portraits, 2000 and 2010. And I focused your attention on the difference between those two time points. A lot happened in those ten years. As you can go through in your own mind for New York, and we can all do this on other things, piecing apart the marginal effects of those is very difficult. This is the matter of demographers over the coming years. People will analyze and reanalyze and reanalyze these data in a variety of ways, combine them with other information to try to answer those questions. Today, we haven't even scratched the surface at answering those, I think.

STEVE: We're going to go back to the other side of the room. Gentleman in the front row?

Q: Al Milliken, AM Medium. At this point, what do you know about those without housing? Those that would be considered homeless, that you were not able to send a Census form to their address or even deliver it to them personally? Is there reason to believe this Census would be more or less accurate than in the past? And is there any dramatic changes that you can notice at this point?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, this is the third Census that we've had a very deliberate approach at those who are homeless. And so on March 29th, March 30th, and March 31st of 2010, we had three separate operations that were the culmination of a lot of outreach to local community organizations that helped us locate where the homeless tended to congregate. Either for the provision of services, food and shelter-- So we went

to food kitchen-- Soup kitchens and shelters, or on outdoor locations. So on those three days, we made a massive effort to count the homeless.

Those counts were added in and are part of the numbers we just released. We don't publish separately, counts of the homeless, nor are there plans to do so. I can say with regard to your question, this is one of the toughest challenges of the Census Bureau. We acknowledge that. We believe we are relatively successful in counting homeless when there are groups together. An isolated homeless person who lives in a tent in the woods of Wyoming, we may not get, and we acknowledge that. This is a challenge for every developed country in the world, and we do the best we can.

STEVE: So, we're going to go back to the phones. Operator, one more question there.

OPERATOR: Thank you. Lisa Roche, KSO News.

Q: Hi. Utah came very close to getting a fourth seat in the 2000 Census and even went to court over the issue of counting church missionaries overseas. I'm wondering if you could speak to, not counting those missionaries in this Census, and whether or not that might have made a difference even in a fifth seat this time around? Thank you.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, first of all, as I think you're referring to, Utah did gain a seat given its relative growth rate. The procedures used for counting residents in 2010 with regard to the missionary population were exactly the same as in 2000. They were-- Those out of the country were not counted as part of the Census operations. So I think that-- Did I answer your question, first of all?

Q: What I was wondering is what the reason for that was? Was that reconsidered for this Census given the lawsuit last time and the concerns raised about those people not being counted? And whether or not that number might have made a difference in pushing Utah toward a fifth seat for the 2010 Census, since we were so close to a fourth seat last time. Thank you.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, I've only been in my job about a year and a half. To my knowledge, there was no serious reconsideration of the counting procedures for missionaries. With regard to whether had we counted them the seat allocation would have been different, I can't speak to because I don't know how many there would be. One could go about that if you had that estimate, I guess.

Q: Thank you.

STEVE: Okay, we'll return to the room next after this question from our friends on Facebook. Dr. Groves, how do we find out the results of minority group counts for each state?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: In the files that we'll release starting in February, as I said, we'll have block level counts. Those counts will be broken down by race and ethnicity groups. From those data, one can derive counts at all levels of aggregation for minority groups. And I expect there will be hundreds of thousands of people doing that as soon as those files are out. Later on, we'll have more specific reports that will give you those breakdowns directly.

STEVE: Okay, two more questions in the room, here. And then we'll go back to the phones for our final question.

Q: Deborah Barry with Gannett Newspapers. Just a follow up on the Katrina question. There was a call, as you well know, for a recount in those areas. Particularly since many of the victims had moved to other states. Is that still likely to happen and do you still support that as you did months ago?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Let me clarify what occurred. So, I've actually visited the New Orleans area several times because we changed our operations to address the unique circumstances in Plaquemine, St. Bernard and Orleans Parish. So we hand delivered

questionnaires. We wanted to make sure that we kept up to date with the heavily dynamic population. People are moving back, people are rebuilding, and we wanted to count people as best we can. But we never violated in any of this, the principle that we count people where they usually live. And whereas I understand that some who are now living in Baton Rouge or in Mississippi or in Houston, think of themselves as New Orleans residents. Under the counting rules that we've used since 1790, they must be counted where they now live, and that's how we counted them. But we did attempt to count as accurately as we can, through these extraordinary procedures we used in that area. Other parts of the Gulf coast got the same-- Parts of Galveston were handled the same way.

STEVE: Okay, so for our last question, one more on the phone, operator?

OPERATOR: Thank you. Julie Shaw, Philadelphia Daily News.

Q: I'm sorry, my question was answered already. Thank you.

STEVE: Do we have one more on the phone?

OPERATOR: Okay. Clark Corbin, Idaho Falls Post Register Daily.

Q: Yeah, thanks for taking my call. Regarding Idaho's position among the five fastest growing states, do you attribute that to the larger trend of population moving out of the northeast and the Midwest towards the west? Or do you see other factors that might have contributed to the bump in population that Idaho experienced?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, we share all the speculations you just went through, and we can't wait to dive into this to get more information about these patterns of migration. And there are tons of demographers, I can tell you right now as we speak, working on answers to your question. But I don't think any of us know them yet.

Q: All right, thank you.

STEVE: Well, thank you everybody for joining us. And a reminder, you can go to census.gov or 2010census.gov. This presentation is on those websites, as well as the materials that we are handing out in the room, and a transcript of the director's remarks. And we'll also have posted within 24 hours, a full transcript of the entire event today. Thank you again, and thank you, Dr. Groves. [Applause]

END