

STAN ROLARK: Good afternoon. My name is Stan Rolark, and I'm Chief of the Census Bureau's Public Information Office. Very happy to have you join us here today at the National Press Club for our latest update on Census Bureau activities. Today marks the final release of redistricting data, with the release of data for the District of Columbia, Maine, New York and Puerto Rico.

Today Census Bureau Director Dr. Robert Groves will provide updates on new census quality indicators and announce the new geographic center of population. Once Dr. Groves completes his presentation, two subject matter experts from our Population Division, Marc Perry, Chief of our Population Distribution Branch, and Nicholas Jones, Chief of the Racial Statistics Branch, will provide you with national and geographic distribution data of the population. Once their presentations are complete, Dr. Groves will return to sum up what you've heard today.

Once all presentations are complete, we'll open up the floor to questions and answers from the media. Also, remember we have callers on the phone, so we'll go back and forth between the room and the phone. So, before I introduce Dr. Groves, let me just remind you all, too, that you can go to www.census.gov to get the information from this presentation today. Once you get on our home page, if you look up in the upper left hand corner, click on that, you'll see all the presentations. You can also go to our Newsroom, which is found on that home page as well, to get the press releases that we'll be talking about today, as well.

So, if you have any questions with any of that, you can contact the Public Information Office. That phone number is 301-763-3030. So, without further delay, let me bring Dr. Robert Groves. Dr. Groves.

ROBERT GROVES: Thank you, Stan. It's great to be here. This is a big day for us at the Census Bureau. I think, as I speak, there are final data being released on our FTP site. And, within an hour, on American Fact Finder. And this moment in time deserves a little

reflection. This is the result of months, years of really diligent work by technical experts at the Census Bureau. We have delivered a big final product back to the country that allows states to begin to redistrict themselves. We're proud of this accomplishment.

And we want to share with you, today, the initial findings at the national level from these files. We're going to do three things. I will update you on some new indicators of quality of the census. I've been doing this every month. We're telling you both the good and the bad every month as we learn them. We will announce the new geographical center of the population. This is a cool thing that we do every ten years. I can't wait for that. And then, my two technical colleagues will report on race, Hispanic origin, and geographical distributions of the population.

So, let me begin by reviewing quality indicators. I've noted in the past there are three tools that censuses around the world use to answer the question, "How good is the census?" They are what we call process indicators. These are quality indicators, indirect quality indicators, that are produced as part of the data collection process. I'll tell you of new findings on that.

They're comparisons to different ways of estimating the population. All countries do that. I'll show you results on that. And then, a post-enumeration sample survey that's used directly to measure undercounts and overcounts in the census. We won't have those findings complete for a while, but I'll tell you what we have now.

So, let's first go through these process indicators. These are part of the fabric of a data collection process. I remind us that the mail participation rate exceeded all our expectations, ended at 74% when all was said and done. That's equal to the short form version of 2000. But, when you combine the short and the long form of 2000, it exceeds that participation. This is kudos to the American public. We thank them for that participation, because it allowed us to reduce our costs in the follow-up.

On the other hand, we found, this year, we collected more data. We had to collect more data from building managers and neighbors. We call these proxy interviews. Twenty-two percent of the non-response follow-up units had data provided in such a manner versus 17 percent in 2000. This is a negative indicator. We don't like this if we would have controlled the world.

At the national level, you can see this histogram that compares the 2000 census to the 2010 census. And it compares the amount of usable housing unit information. For 99.45 percent of the records in 2000, we had such huge usable information we exceeded that in a minor way, 99.62 in 2000.

We have these data at the state level, comparing usable data. This is the first time we've shown this, so let me help you read this. The x-axis here are different states, from Alabama to Wyoming, from left to right. The red line is the percent of records with usable data from 2000. The blue line is the same thing from 2010. Now, what we'd love to see is the blue line always exceeding the red line. You can make your own judgments on that. By and large, the tendency is in that direction. Only a few states had smaller completion rates in 2010. The vast majority had more.

And we as statisticians like to see low variability in this difference, low differences between across the states in that comparison. And using-- you remember your stat courses-- using the standard deviation as a measure of variability, we have lower variability in the 2010 data. We like that result.

We've also done this comparison down at very small geographical levels, census tracts, these things that are roughly 4,000 people or so. How do you read this chart? Ideally, we'd like 100 percent of all of the records giving us usable data. We'd like 100 percent on the blue and the red bar, way to the right on the x-axis. These are counts of census tracts, the height of the curve. And we compare the red 2000 with the blue 2010. The blue has shifted right relative to 2000. We're closer to our desirable ideal state in 2010

than we are in 2000. And the standard deviation is lower in 2010, less variation over the tracks in this contrast. That's a nice fact that we like to see.

For the first time-- Well, let me-- I got screwed up here. When we have no usable information on a case, we do an operation which is called "imputation," which uses the best information we can in order to determine the status of the unit, determine its occupancy, or, if necessary, the number of people in the household. This, again, compares 2000 with 2010. And, what you'll see on this chart is that the amount of usable information in 2010 was greater.

Status imputation means that we are faced with a case that we don't even know whether it's a housing unit or not. That's the least amount of information we have. And you can see, in 2000, we had relatively more imputation of that sort than we did in 2010. So, the conclusion off of this is, the amount of information we had on a case, in order to apply these imputation methods in 2010 was a little greater than in 2000. And we like that result.

For the first time, we're revealing, today, item completion rates. So, what are these? You may remember on the questionnaire, you were asked to fill out age and date of birth for each person, their sex, their race, Hispanic origin. You were asked to indicate whether your home was rented or owned, and the relationship of people to person number one. These numbers you see here in the column for 2000 and 2010 are the percent of those items that were successfully reported in the process of collecting the data. Ideally, these would be 100 percent.

And you can see the difference between 2010 and 2000. The differences are, in general, negative. That is, we have lower item completion rates on these items than we did in 2000. The differences are quite small, however. These are very high completion rates, but it is, indeed, the case that they are smaller.

I want to say a couple of special things about race and Hispanic origin, because we introduced an innovation that repaired part of this difference. For example, if race wasn't provided in the 2010 census, we checked to see if a response could be racially classified by looking at the Hispanic origin question, and vice-versa. Also, if race or Hispanic origin was not provided on the 2010 census, we checked to see if a response was provided in the census 2000 record that we could link to the same person. Or, in an American community survey response, if we had sample data from that person.

When we take these additional sources of information into account, the percentage reporting race in the 2010 census increased by about 1.4 percentage points. So that that goes from the 95.5 percent you see on this table to about 96.9 percent. It helps us. And then, on the Hispanic origin, it increases from 92.8 to 95.2.

You should also note that we are entering the time, as we release these files, that local officials notice little anomalies in the data. I want to report to you the kinds of things they're picking up, and what we do when this arises. Sometimes there are misalignments of counts, that we have made an error in placing counts in the wrong block. There are about eight million blocks in this country. It happens. It doesn't happen very frequently.

We've learned, in the 2010 census, that we placed the population on some Navy vessels in places in different ports to the wrong block. This was first noticed in Norfolk, Virginia. We've also noticed that, in a small number of areas, we've coded housing units into areas that they shouldn't be. They're actually in the median of a four-lane highway, because of errors in the GPS system.

When we find these kind of errors ourselves, or we find them because we've been alerted to them from local officials, we do something immediately. We try to see whether these are systemic errors. If we find that they are systemic, we indeed enter them into our review processes for repair at a later point. And, whenever possible, contact local officials to make sure that their needs are well served.

So I've now finished commentary on the first kind of quality indicator, process indicators. Now let's turn to comparing the census counts to other ways of estimating the population. And this relies heavily on the vital registration system of the United States. What do we know so far that I've reported already? When we compare the national census count total to the national counts for population estimates, we're within 0.1 percent. These are very close. This is a good thing. We were happy about that. Thirty-four states have a population estimate that was within one percentage point of the census count. We're happy about that.

But now we can look at these things by county. You've never seen this before. This is a similar sort of distribution. When we showed this to you by state, we saw that the red bars, reflecting 2000, that reflect the difference-- look at the x-axis. The x-axis is the difference between the census count and the population estimate as a percent of the estimate. We saw a big shift to the right, that the blue bars were, indeed, closer to the overall zero target than the red bars at the state level.

At the county level, there is more spread. And you can-- It's a little harder to see, but the blues are indeed heaping around the zero point a little more than the red bars. You can see that at the mean percentage in the box at the top, mean percentage difference of about 2.1 for 2000, about 1.8. These are smaller difference. The standard deviation, again, this measure of variability across the counties, lower in 2010. We'd like low variability across these contrasts. And we got that on this indicator as well.

Now, I want to note one property of this quality indicator. And that is the difference between the count itself and the population estimate is a function of the size of the county. We get a little closer. These are the 2000 data. Notice that all of them, the x-axis here is the census count of a county. So it goes up to 4.5 million, starts at zero on the left. Big counties are dots on the right part of this chart.

The y-axis is the same thing we were looking at, the percent difference between the census count and the population estimate. You notice that the red points tend to be above the zero point. We were getting, in 2000, higher census counts, on average, than the population estimates. This is the 2010 equivalent scatter plot. I can go back and forth on these. And you can sort of see how they differ. You notice how the blue is shifted closer around the zero point.

What is this saying again? There's bigger spread in population estimates as you go down to small counties. Things get more unstable. But the general tendency of finding a closer agreement between the population estimates and the census counts are present in both. This overlays the two. You can see how there's a preponderance of red points above the blue points. We look at that as saying we like the blue spread around the zero mark better than the higher points in the 2000.

There is one other way to look at this. And this is something that we're now looking at and trying to understand. This is a table that looks at the percent difference between the census count and the population estimate again. The rows are groups of counties that vary in their population count, their 2010 census count, from small counties at the top, to big counties at the bottom.

Let me call your attention to the very last two columns. These are the mean percent differences between them. In 2010, we're finding this result, that that mean difference is a function of county size. Notice that it goes from about 4.7 percent at the top down to numbers that are very close to zero at the bottom. That pattern doesn't appear in 2000. We're now drilling down into this as a curiosity that's a difference between the two censuses that we don't fully understand. And, when we understand it, we'll report it back to you.

So I've now gone through two quality indicators. The third is the post-enumeration survey, a direct sample-based estimate of undercounts and overcounts. These estimates

will be ready, as I've been saying, only until 2010-- or 2012. Only then will we release them. But we're starting to get initial findings.

What do we know so far? When we go out and list this sample survey of housing units, and match it to the 2010 census, the match rate is better this time than last time. That's a good result. We like the fact that it suggests that our address list is better than it was in 2000. The percentage of the units that were verified as correct enumerations in the 2010 census was higher than it was in 2000 at the national level. The percent of housing units that were found to be duplicates are lower in 2010 than 2000.

And then, we've just gotten some results on computer matching at the person level. Do we find the same people in the housing units? And the person level national match rate is at least 15 percentage points higher in this census than it was in the last census. These are all good signs. We're happy to see these. And that sort of sums up where we are on quality indicators.

Let me caution you that, in true Census Bureau fashion, we won't be through with evaluating this census for some months. We'll beat it up. We'll squeeze it. We'll look at it real hard. And, only after that point, will we have a sense of how good this is. But we promise to tell you both the bad and the good whenever we know it.

I want to now turn to a different topic. This is the time in the Census Bureau cycle, or the census cycle, when local officials find apparent anomalies. I've mentioned, already, those of misplacement of people in certain blocks. We have a program that is explicitly designed to seek input and to review these kinds of anomalies, and repair them if, indeed, we can document appropriate repairs.

There are three types of corrections that will flow from this, and you should know these things. One are boundary corrections. This part of the program addresses inaccurate reporting, or inaccurate recording of boundaries that were legally in effect January 1,

2010. We place people in jurisdictions as they are defined January 1, 2010. The second are geocoding corrections. I gave you an example. These place living quarters in associated populations into within the correct governmental unit boundaries in census tabulation blocks, if we've found we've made an error of that sort.

And then, finally, the third type of correction is a coverage correction. These result in the addition or deletion of specific living quarters, and persons associated with them identified during the census process, but erroneously included as duplicates or excluded for some sort of processing error that we've committed. It's important to note that none of those three are based on going out and recounting populations. That is something that we don't do. We are trying to get valid counts of the April 1, 2010 population and will not go out and re-enumerate units.

Let me just give you a sense of the magnitude of these challenges in 2000, because we want to compare ourselves with 2000 whenever possible. In total, there were about 841 challenges that were researched and processed. Half of them, sort of half of them we found, half of them were found by other people. Potential count problems were identified for about 1,200 of the 39,000 jurisdictions in the country. This is sort of less than three percent of all governmental jurisdictions. About 90 entities had a boundary change through the program. We moved about 3,200 group quarters to different blocks.

By the way, a footnote on that, we had a wonderful new program this fall, where folks from the state came in and found little geocoding errors on group quarters. And we repaired those before we went out this time. So we're hopeful we're in better shape on that.

When all was said and done in 2000, there was a net gain in population of about 2,700 out of the 281 million people. So you can get a sense that not a lot of net change occurs. This time, we began this process on June 1. We're in business for these sorts of count review questions. We're asking for people to deliver their inquiries by-- it's June, 2013, I

think, something like that. So we have plenty of time to do this. We're anxious to hear folks from local areas and try to do the best we can to get things right.

We have now come to the moment where we will announce the center of the U.S. population. This is one of the neat things that we do. I think it's neat, anyway. And what does it mean, first of all? Perhaps it's good to define what we mean by this. Imagine that we have conceptually a flat and weightless and rigid map of the United States. It's absolutely flat. And then, all of us, 308.7 million, weigh exactly the same, okay. Can you imagine that for a minute? And then, you sort of find the place where that balances. That's the center, that's the mean center of the population.

Yes, this is what I wanted to show you. In 1790-- this is an amazing fact. This is great cocktail party trivia. [laughter] The center of the population was in Kent County, Maryland. This is just fantastic for us to think about now, I think. And you can see how it moved over the decades. It moves west and south. The distance between the centers, decade by decade, vary, depending on how the population changed. These reflect the addition of territories. The country was growing. It was adding space to the geography. But also, the movement of people.

And you can see that in another way. We're going to show this again, so-- By this little graph, I have to show you how to read that. The right-to-left distance, horizontal distance, is how far the point moved in a decade westward. The north-south is represented by an up-down movement. So you see, from 1790 to 1800, it moved in that much. And it's sort of in a southerly direction, but mostly west. And now, let's watch it move over time. [pause] You can see the movement changing in its westward length, and also sometimes going north, sometimes going south.

Now, there are three very interesting-- four very interesting decades here. And I want to talk about them. First, look at the big blue line, the 1860 center, the movement between '50 and '60. That was the greatest distance. It actually represents about 80 miles from the

center in 1850. What was happening there? Texas joined the Union in 1845. By 1860, the population of Texas had seen enormous growth, tripling to 600,000. The decade of the '50s also saw growth in the west. On the Pacific coast, California's population quadrupled, from nearly 93,000 up to almost 400,000. Oregon's population did the same thing. So there was big westward movement, 1850 to '60.

Look at 1870, the green line. That's the most northerly movement of the center. This was following the Civil War, largely the result of substantial population growth in the cities of the Northeast and the Midwest. Of the 100 most populous cities in 1870, 80 of them, 80 of the 100 were in the Northeast or Midwest. These cities increased their populations by about two million over that decade. Thirty-five percent of the nation's growth occurred in that area.

Then look, although you can barely see it, at the 1920, a little bitty distance, mainly west, the shortest distance, just under ten miles. It's a good reminder that the center of the population can also be affected by eastward pulls. What was happening 1910 to 1920? That was the decade that saw large increases of immigrant populations going into the Northeast and the Midwest, as well as migration of African Americans out of the south to many of those same cities.

So this brings us to 2010, which you note is an outlier. 2010 is a special decade in our nation's history. The center of the population has moved to a southerly direction in the most extreme way we've ever seen in history. This distance, 23.4 miles, is a relatively short distance. The southerly drift is attributed to the strong pull on the center from population growth in the southeast-- Georgia, Florida, and the Carolinas, as well as the growth of Texas.

So, in 2010, in 2000, the center sat in southern Missouri. I can tell you, now, for the fourth time in a row, the center of population still sits in Missouri. The new population center is located at 37.517534-- remember that number-- North Latitude and 92.173096--

we'll test you on this later-- West Longitude in Texas County, Missouri. It's approximately 2.7 miles northeast of Plato, which you'll see on the map, on the left-most portion of the map.

The Plato population in 2010 is 109 people. I have spoken, this morning, with the chairman of Plato's City Board, Robert Biram, a wonderful man, to congratulate him on this honor and to get him ready for your calls about what it's like to be the center of the population.

We will, with our colleagues at the National Geodetic Survey, place a plaque, a-- what do you call it?--a marker in Plato at an event that you're all invited to, probably in April or May. Want to make a couple of comments about Plato. It doesn't exactly look like the rest of the United States. It has 109 people. You know that already. Ninety-five percent of them are white, non-Hispanics, versus 75 percent in the country. Two percent of the Plato population are African American versus 12.3 percent of our country. And 4.6 percent of them are Hispanic, versus the 12.5 percent that we have nationally. So I congratulate Plato, and I look forward to going out there and having a big celebration.

Those are my remarks. And this is a special day, as I said, because for the first time, we're actually going to show you results. We haven't been doing much of that. And I'm joined by two of our wonderful technical experts who work at the Census Bureau. Marc Perry, who's Chief of the Population Distribution Branch, will tell you about population distribution geographically. And then, Nicholas Jones, Chief of Racial Statistics Branch, will provide you some analyses about the changes in the nation's diversity, looking at trends of the Hispanic population, other major race groups.

I believe that Marc will start. And I welcome him.

MARC PERRY: Great. Thank you, Dr. Groves. Good afternoon. I'm going to be talking to you about some of the early findings from the 2010 census, with respect to

population growth and decline this past decade, and overall geographic distribution of the population. I'm going to begin with a quick recap of national patterns, and then I'll drill down to census regions, states, metropolitan areas, counties and cities.

So in December, the Census Bureau announced that the April 1, 2010 population was 308.7 million, which is up 27 million, or 9.7 percent, from census 2000. So, in this chart, we see that the total population changed for the United States for the last decades, it's shown. The blue bars show the numeric increases each decade, while the black lines show the percentage increases.

We see that the 27.3 million population increase this decade was down somewhat from the 32.7 million gain from the 1990s. Similarly, the percentage increase, 9.7 percent, was down from the 13.2 percent gain last decade. And it was the lowest of the last six decades.

Of course, population growth varied widely within the country. Looking at the four census regions, we see that the largest percentage increases were in the south, up 14.3 percent, and the west, up 13.8 percent. Together, those two regions contain nearly 85 percent of the country's entire population growth this past decade. Several other items I'll note here on the regions, this was the first decade in the last 100 years when the south grew faster than the west. And also, during this decade, the west surpassed the Midwest as the nation's most populous region.

Let's now look at states. On all of the maps that I'll be showing today, green indicates growth, with darker green indicating the fastest growth, while pink and purple shades will indicate population loss. The fastest growing states, shown in green on this map, were all located in either the west or the south. Most states in the Northeast and the Midwest grew, but at slower rates. Michigan had a small percentage decline in population this decade, as did Puerto Rico. And the overall geographic patterns were fairly similar to the 1990s.

While most of the states had slower growth this decade, as compared to the 1990s, five states did grow faster this decade. Those five were Hawaii, Maine, North Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The District of Columbia also grew this decade for the first time since the 1940s.

We'll now turn to metropolitan areas. The metropolitan population grew by 10.8 percent this decade, which was faster than the national increase of 9.7 percent. The U.S. population is increasingly metropolitan, with a record 83.7 percent of the population now living inside a metro area, edging up slightly from 82.8 percent in 2000. More than 90 percent of the country's entire population growth this past decade occurred inside metropolitan areas.

In this map, we see metro area population growth for the 1990s. Again, areas with high population growth are shown in dark green, areas with population decline are in pink. So we see that, for the 1990s, the fastest growing metro areas were in the south and in the interior west, while some metro areas in Upstate New York, Western Pennsylvania, and parts of the Midwest lost population. Overall, metro areas grew slower between 2000 and 2010 than in the 1990s.

So here we see the pattern for the 2000 to 2010 decade. Fewer metro areas grew by 30 percent or more, which is the dark green shade. And a larger number of metro areas in the Northeast and the Midwest lost population. No metro area in the west lost population this decade. The five fastest growing metropolitan areas, in terms of percentage increases, were Palm Coast, Florida, Saint George, Utah, Las Vegas, Nevada, Raleigh, North Carolina, and Cape Coral, Florida. They're all shown in red circles on this map. Houston, Dallas/Fort Worth, and Atlanta metro areas all gained over one million people.

We now turn to counties and county equivalents, like parishes in Louisiana, *municipias* in Puerto Rico, etcetera. This map shows the percent change in population by county for the

1990s. Dark green counties grew by 50 percent or more, which was about four times the U.S. average. Counties shaded purple, on the other hand, had population declines of 10 percent or more.

Metro area patterns are visible in some parts of the country. In Georgia, for instance, most of the 28 counties in the Atlanta-metropolitan area grew at a much more rapid clip than the rest of the state. You can see that on the map. In Texas, the Houston, Dallas-Fort Worth, Austin and San Antonio metro areas are all visible as darker green areas on the map, contrasting with declines in much of the rest of the state.

And this is what the pattern looks like for 2000 to 2010. Two-thirds of all counties grew this decade. But you'll notice far fewer dark green counties in this map, as opposed to the last one. I'm going to toggle back and forth a couple times between this decade and the 1990s so you can get a sense for how the patterns have changed from last decade to this decade. This is this current decade. That's the 1990s and the current decade.

Among counties that started the decade with 10,000 or more people, two counties more than doubled in size this decade. They were Kendall County, Illinois, which is in Chicago's western suburbs, and Pinal County, Arizona, which contains Phoenix's southern suburbs.

Many of the country's fastest growing counties this decade are, like Kendall and Pinal, on the outer edges of metropolitan areas. But, as Kendall County, Illinois reminds us, not all of the rapid population growth this decade occurred in the south or the west. There were some slow-growing metro areas in the Midwest that also had pockets of rapid population growth. So, for instance, in the Midwest, Dallas County, Iowa, which is west of Des Moines, Hamilton County, Indiana, which is north of Indianapolis, and Delaware County, Ohio, which is north of Columbus, all grew by more than 50 percent.

I'll now compare and contrast patterns for this decade and last for several other areas of the country. In the Great Plains, which is circled on this map, many of its more rural and thinly populated counties had population declines of 10 percent or more in the 1990s. Moving ahead to this decade, we see that many of these same counties continue to lose population, again, some declining by 10 percent or more.

But I'll note here that some parts of the Great Plains did see modest population rebounds this decade. North Dakota's population grew by 30,000, which is nearly ten times its increase for the 1990s. While most of North Dakota's population growth was in its metropolitan areas, it was helped, in part, by renewed population growth in some of the counties in the state's western half. And that was spurred, in part, by energy.

In the Great Lakes area, we see a different story. During the 1990s, many of the counties in that area had modest population gains. But, if we move ahead to this current decade, many of these counties switched from population growth to population decline.

Along the lower stretches of the Mississippi River, a number of counties had population declines in the 1990s, in some cases continuing decades-long patterns. These population declines became more pronounced between 2000 and 2010, with a solid band of counties declining by 10 percent or more.

And finally, in the interior west, population growth was generally rapid in the 1990s, with many counties growing by 50 percent or more. This decade, the region is still home to solid population growth. So, for instance, every one of Utah's counties grew between 2000 and 2010. But the population gains slowed for most of the counties in the area.

Now I'll turn to cities. On this map shows the 20 most populous cities in 2010. Louisville, Jefferson County is new to the top 20. Its population growth largely reflecting the consolidation of the City of Louisville with Jefferson County during the past decade. Other cities new to the top 20 include Fort Worth, Texas, Charlotte, North Carolina, and

El Paso, Texas. Baltimore, Boston, Memphis and Milwaukee all fell out of the top 20 this decade.

Twelve cities gained more than 100,000 people this decade. Eight of them were among the 20 largest in the previous map. The others include Las Vegas, Nevada, North Las Vegas, Nevada, Bakersfield, California, and Raleigh, North Carolina. Aside from Louisville, Jefferson County, the biggest gains were in Fort Worth, Charlotte, San Antonio, and New York City, all of which gained more than 150,000 people.

The cities with the largest percentage increases in their population this decade were also largely in the south and west. Among cities that started the decade with populations of 10,000 or more, the ten fastest growing cities are shown in this map in red. All of those rapidly growing cities are close to larger cities, which are the black dots on this map. So, for instance, we see that Lincoln, California is a suburb of Sacramento. Plainfield, Illinois is near Chicago. Surprise and Goodyear are both suburbs of Phoenix, etcetera.

I'll conclude my remarks with this map, which shows the overall distribution of the population by county in 2010. The sizes of the diamonds on the map are proportional to the county populations. The heavily populated Boston to Washington corridor is prominent, as are the more populous metro areas across the area. This map also reminds us how sparsely populated much of the country remains. It's possible to travel through the country's midsection, from Canada to Mexico, without passing through any heavily populated areas.

And with that, I will turn the stage over to Nicholas Jones to talk about trends in race and Hispanic origin.

NICHOLAS JONES: Thanks Marc. Good afternoon everyone. I'm honored to be here, and excited to be here, to speak with you today about our 2010 National Census results for race and for Hispanic origin. Before I begin, I'd like to thank all the dedicated census

staff, and especially my colleagues in the Racial Statistics Branch, and the Ethnicity and Ancestry Branch, for bringing us this far.

Many of the findings we share with you today are part of a report that we just released on the Internet, the overview of race and Hispanic origin. I'll walk you through some of our major 2010 findings, present racial and ethnic population distributions at the national level and at lower levels of geography, and discuss some of the changes.

These data provide insights to our nation's changing racial and ethnic diversity and illustrate the new portrait of America. First, a quick overview of something that you all are very familiar with, the 2010 census questions on Hispanic origin and race. The U.S. Census Bureau collects data on race and Hispanic origin, following the guidance of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which we refer to as OMB, in their 1997 revisions to the standards for federal data collection on race and ethnicity.

These federal standards mandate that race and Hispanic origin are two separate and distinct concepts, as you can see here in the graphic, and that two separate questions must be used when collecting these data via self-identification. Here is a close-up of the question on Hispanic origin.

Starting in 1997, OMB required federal agencies to use a minimum of two ethnic categories: Hispanic or Latino and not Hispanic or Latino. The first response category is intended for respondents who do not identify as Hispanic. The other response categories: Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban, are there for individuals who identify as Hispanic. And those responses, along with the write-in areas for the last category, "Other Hispanic," can be combined into the larger Hispanic category.

Next we have a close-up of the question on race. OMB required federal agencies to use a minimum of five categories: white, black or African American, American Indian and Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and then with the

Census Bureau's permission, with OMB's permission, the Census Bureau included a sixth category, "Some other race," in both the 2000 and the 2010 census.

The race question, as you can see, includes 15 separate response categories and three areas where respondents may write in more additional information. All of those can be combined to create the minimum five OMB categories, as well as the category "some other race." And, for the first time, in census 2000, as well as in 2010, individuals were presented with the option to report more than one race when self-identifying.

Thus, there are 57 combinations of the six major race groups. The first numbers I'll present are for responses to the question on Hispanic origin. Note throughout the presentation I'll use the color orange, with orange bars, to represent Hispanic responses. In 2000, the Hispanic population numbered 35.3 million, and Hispanics made up 13 percent of the total United States population. The Hispanic population crossed the 50 million mark in 2010. And people of Hispanic origin now clearly represent the second largest group in the country, with 16 percent of the total U.S. population.

The next numbers I'll present are for responses to the question on race. In 2010, the white alone population was the largest group at 72.4 percent. The black or African American alone population represented 12.6 percent of all people. 0.9 percent of all people reported American Indian and Alaska Native alone. 4.8 percent of all respondents identified as Asian alone. And the Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander population represented 0.2 percent of the total population. 6.2 percent of all people in the United States reported responses which were classified as "some other race," primarily a reflection of people who reported their ethnicity in response to the race question as Hispanic. Finally, people who reported more than one race in 2010 are represented with the pink bar, and made up 2.9 percent of the total population.

The data on race from the 2010 census can be presented and discussed in a variety of ways. The race alone concept we saw on the previous slide represents the number of

people who reported a particular race group alone, as shown here, again, with the blue segment of this bar. The pink segment of the bar denotes the race in combination population, the proportion of each race group where people reported said race group, as well as one or more additional races.

Adding the blue bar and the pink bar segments together presents the race alone or in combination population. This reflects the total number of people who reported a particular race group, either alone or in combination with one or more additional races. This increases the white population and the black population slightly, but the differences between the race alone and the race alone or in combination groups are more important and more dramatic for American Indians and Alaska Natives and for Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders, where you can see that the in combination population doubled their respective size to 1.7 percent and to 0.4 percent.

It's important to note that the differences among the race alone or in combination categories don't sum to the total population, as they represent multiple people reporting across the groups. For example, someone who reported that they were Asian and white is tabulated in both the Asian alone or in combination category as well as in the white alone or in combination category.

You can see the importance of this concept more clearly in the next graphic, where we examine the proportions of people in each major race group who reported more than one race. Overall, the yellow bar on the left illustrates that 2.9 percent of the total population reported more than one race in 2010. The first two pink bars, for whites and for blacks, show that they have the lowest proportion reporting multiple races. Asians and people who reported some other race had somewhat higher proportions at 15.3 percent and 12.1 percent.

However, as in 2000, the two smallest population groups, American Indians and Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders were unique, in that large

proportions of these populations indicated more than one race, compared to the other major race groups. In fact, almost half of American Indians and Alaska Natives and over half of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders reported more than one race in 2010.

This slide provides details on the largest multiple race combinations in 2010. Over the last ten years, considerable research has been done on people reporting multiple races and how they self-identify. And this has become a more common part of our discussions about race and ethnicity in the United States. Results from the 2010 census provide new information on the diversity of the population reporting two or more races. And, among people who reported more than one race in 2010, the vast majority reported exactly two races.

As you can see on the graphics, starting at the top, four groups were, by far, the largest race combinations in 2010: white and black, representing 1.8 million people, white and some other race, with 1.7 million, white and Asian, with 1.6 million, and white and American Indians and Alaska Native, with 1.4 million people. Together, these four combinations comprised nearly three-fourths of the total multiple race population in 2010.

Many data users also like to examine the race and Hispanic origin results side-by-side. And this yields important results for us to examine and good insights to explore. This approach provides mutually exclusive groups, shown here as non-Hispanic race groups in blue, and the Hispanic population with people of any race in orange. Additionally, the purple bar at the bottom of the graphic represents people who reported their race and ethnicity as something other than non-Hispanic white alone, which we referred to in the report as the minority population.

In the 2010 census, just over one-third of the U.S. population reported their race and ethnicity as something other than white alone/non-Hispanic. Another interesting 2010 census finding pertains to the racial and ethnic distributions of people under 18 years of

age, which you see in this graphic, were kids. When we examined the data for kids, we found their distributions are strikingly different than data for the total population, and especially for people over 18 years of age, the adult population.

Most striking is that nearly half of all kids, 46.5 percent, as you see in the purple bar, are something other than non-Hispanic white alone. In 2010, 23.1 percent of kids were Hispanic, 14 percent were black non-Hispanic, 4.3 percent were Asian non-Hispanic, and 3.8 percent were two or more races, non-Hispanic. This insight, from looking at kids in the United States, provides some interesting information for us to look at, in terms of what the future may bring in future generations.

This slide illustrates the growth of these groups over the decade. Again, returning to the total population of all ages, you can see the U.S. grew by 9.7 percent since 2000, the yellow bar at the left. And, while all the major race groups and Hispanic origin in the United States grew between 2000 and 2010, they grew at different rates. The vast majority of the growth in the total population came from increases in people who reported their race or races as something other than white alone non-Hispanic. The minority population grew by 28.8 percent, as you can see with the purple bar. And, in contrast, growth was relatively slow for the non-Hispanic white population at 1.2 percent.

Over the decade, two groups, the Hispanic population and the non-Hispanic Asian population, experienced the fastest growth rates, at about 43 percent. Of the 27.3 million people added to the U.S. population over the last ten years, 25.1 million were minorities, and more than half of the growth, 15.2 million people, came from increases in the Hispanic population. Non-Hispanic Asians had the next largest increase, with 4.3 million people.

The different patterns of growth for kids are even more striking. Overall, the total population under 18 grew by 2.6 percent, shown here with the yellow bar. Kids who represent a minority group grew by 21.9 percent, the purple bar. But, there was a 9.8

percent decline in the number of kids who reported non-Hispanic white alone, also drops in non-Hispanic black alone, and non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native alone kids, who also declined. At the other end of the graphic, we see tremendous growth in non-Hispanic Asian kids, Hispanic kids, and especially in kids who reported more than one race.

To provide even more insights to our national trends, we present county level maps which illustrate the geographic patterns of race and ethnic reporting. Across the country, the proportion of the total population that reported that it was minority ranged from 22.2 percent in the Midwest to 31.3 percent in the Northeast, 40 percent in the south, and 47.2 percent in the west.

In 2010, there were 348 counties where at least half of the population was minority, illustrated here by the dark blue counties that you can see on the map. Counties with large minority proportions were concentrated along the east coast, from Massachusetts to Florida, and within counties in the Gulf Coast states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

A band of high proportion minority counties also stretched across the southwest through states lining the U.S.-Mexico border, from Texas and New Mexico to Arizona and California. Additionally, counties along the Pacific coast, and in Hawaii and in Alaska, had high proportions of minority populations.

This map illustrates the percent change in minority population between 2000 and 2010 for counties a minority population of at least 1,000 people in 2010. The blue areas illustrate increases, the orange areas illustrate decreases in the proportion of the county that was minority.

Minority population growth was concentrated in counties in the Pacific Northwest, the Pacific Southwest, Western Arizona, Southern Nevada, and areas of the interior west.

Counties in the Mid-Atlantic corridor, in Florida, and in clusters throughout the southeastern United States also had significant growth in the minority populations proportion of the county. Additionally, multiple groupings of counties in Texas, in Northern Illinois, Southern Wisconsin, and Southern Minnesota experienced substantial growth in the minority population over the last ten years.

There were 53 counties with a minority population of 1,000 or more people that experienced a decline of at least 10 percent in the minority population over the past ten years, again shown here in the counties with dark orange. Many of these counties were located along the Mississippi River and Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, as well as in Central and Western Alabama.

Overall, we've learned that our nation's population has become more racially and ethnically diverse over the past ten years. And, in your press packets and online, you have a copy of our report, [The Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin](#). My colleagues, Karen Humes(?) and Roberto Ramirez, are here with me today. And we're available to help answer questions about the report findings. And throughout the year, we're going to present more information which our research teams are currently undertaking on race and Hispanic origin detail and various groups. And we look forward to sharing that information with you. Thank you.

ROBERT GROVES: Thanks guys. This was great. As you've seen today, the 2010 census data are illustrating and tracking the dynamic nature of our population. We are growing at a smaller rate, as we reported before. We are increasingly metropolitan, as noted today. Our country is becoming racially and ethnically more diverse over time, as is clear in the growth rates of the minority populations. Geographically, there are a lot of areas of the country growing in number that have large minority proportions. And we expect this to continue.

As time goes on, we're going to give you more and more features of this portrait of America. We have many more reports to come out. And we look forward to sharing those with you. With that, I think we are finished, and we're happy to take questions. Stan will organize this.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, so we'll take some questions and answers. And we have questions in the room and we have questions on the phone. Remember, when you ask a question, to please give your name and your media affiliation. So we'll start, first off, with a couple questions in the room. And, before you say anything, let me say this as well. Make sure you have a mic. So we have two folks passing around mics. So make sure you have a mic. The first question is the young lady there, sir, and then I'll come to you.

SABRINA TAVERNISI: Sabrina from the *New York Times*, Sabrina Tavernisi(?). I have two questions. One, all of the fastest growing cities in one of the charts you gave us, it looked like they were all suburbs. Is that the case? And then, in 2010, it was 36.3 percent non-white. What was it in 2000? Maybe I just didn't see it in the slide.

MARC PERRY: Yeah, I'll answer the first question. All of the fastest growing cities, at least the top ten, are all sort of outlying suburbs of larger cities nearby.

MALE: [00:59:24] I work for Bloomberg Radio. Dr. Groves, more broadly trend-wise, do we have more people moving into cities than before, versus suburbs? Or the other way around? Do we have a situation in which the cities are becoming whiter and the suburbs more minority? What are the trends?

ROBERT GROVES: Some of these things we don't know, but I'll leave this to Marc.

MALE: Yeah. Dr. Groves, also, would you just give us, from your own experience and in your own mind, two or three things, or four or five if you want, that really caused you

to raise your eyebrows in this overview, including what you previously reported? What are the “gee whiz” factors in the 2010 census, as far as you're concerned?

ROBERT GROVES: Let me let Marc do the first part of the question. And I'll try to raise my eyebrows. [laughter]

MARC PERRY: Sir, thank you. As to the city level, it's hard to fully generalize. I mean, there's a mix of results. I mean, some cities that declined last decade did grow this decade-- Washington, D.C. is a prime example of that. Other cities, most of them that declined last decade continued to decline this decade. We haven't done too much analysis of the race/Hispanic origin detail of the cities yet. I see that as coming in the next few months.

ROBERT GROVES: Let me do the eyebrow thing. You know, the amount of surprise from the 2010 census is smaller, I think, among those following the U.S. demography, because of this wonderful thing we have called the American Community Survey that's been giving us hints of what the country is looking like every year. Actually, it's a very rich data source. So, the growth of the Hispanic population was foretold by those data that we got in 2010.

The movement of the population that we continue to see, from the Northeast and the Midwest to the South and the West, we've been tracking with the American Community Survey. So, some of the surprise factor in 2010 has been depressed by the fact that we're just smarter about the country because of the American Community Survey. So that's a matter of fact, as it turns out.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, thank you for those two questions. So let's take another question in the room. We have one in the back first.

ALEX DANIELS: Alex Daniels from the *Arkansas Democratic Gazette*. Curious about the mean center of population. What sort of likelihood is there for that to cross the Arkansas border next time? [laughter]

ROBERT GROVES: Where are you from again? [laughter] Well, it depends on a lot of things, right, as we taught ourselves this historical review. Where the population moves and grows will determine where that goes. I haven't personally calculated how many miles away we are from the border. You probably know that already. But you can sort of look at overall trends, right. The biggest movement was 80 miles. If we're within 80 miles of the Arkansas border, so maybe if we had a big change, it would happen. But, if we're way below, if we're beyond that, it's unlikely that we're going to hit Arkansas next time.

STAN ROLARK: Now, with that question, let me also mention, Dr. Groves mentioned earlier our partnership with the National Geodetic Survey. So we have the director who is here today, Juliana Blackwell. So, she will be available after the news conference to ask all those tough questions about longitude and latitude. So now, I know, sir, you had the mic.

CHARLIE ERICKSON: Charlie Erickson with Hispanic Link News Service. Quickly, the 16 percent Hispanic you give, now, that is effective what date? And is that an estimate? Or is that a new actual count? Secondly, a question about Arizona. That is the one state that I am aware of, where you actually over-estimated the number of Hispanics who would be found in that state. So, does that have any impact on your final figures? What is the percentage of error that you feel you have with regard to Hispanics now? And, do you feel you did an accurate job in Arizona?

NICHOLAS JONES: Okay, thanks for you question. So I'll answer the first one, then I'll turn it over to my colleague, Roberto Ramirez. The first question that the number that

we presented to you today was 50.5 million, the total number of Hispanics in the United States. They represented 16.3 million of the population. That is the 2010 census count.

ROBERT GROVES: I think he wants to follow up an answer, so we're going to steal your mic for a second.

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: Hi, I'm Roberto Ramirez. I work in Population Division with the Census Bureau. As Nicholas said, the Hispanic count, the 16 percent of the population, and the 50.5 million Hispanics, that's coming from the census. So your question was regarding, what is the Hispanic count in Arizona. Sorry, I didn't know who actually answered that question. Okay, over there.

But, one of the things I want to point out is that, when you compare census counts to the actual estimates, we're talking about two different methodologies; which, by the way, we're still actually investigating and researching now. So we'll hopefully get back to you on a little later date on that.

ROBERT GROVES: You know, now that we have these out, we're drilling down on this contrast between population estimates and counts, because it's important for us to evaluate both the population estimates and the counts themselves. So we're doing a lot of this work, now that we're freed up from some of these files that we got out, we're jumping on these things. So we'll be better.

MALE: Does that include Puerto Rico in your 50.25?

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: No, no it does not.

MALE: And what is the population of Puerto Rico?

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: Puerto Rico, right now, well the last population-- [side remarks] These are excellent questions that you're asking. We counted about 3.7 million people in Puerto Rico.

MALE: Thank you.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you, Roberto. He wasn't planning on having a speaking part. [laughter] We're very happy that you're able to do that. So now, people on the phone have been waiting patiently. So operator, can we get a question from the phone, please.

OPERATOR: You have a question from Sam Roberts with the *New York Times*. Your line is open.

SAM ROBERTS: Thank you. Dr. Groves, Mayor Bloomberg in New York said it was inconceivable that the count in New York could have been so low, given the fact that the count added 166,000 people to New York City, but there were 170,000 new housing units. And he suggested that a lot of the found vacancies were, in fact, occupied. What do you have to tell him that might reassure him, or otherwise?

ROBERT GROVES: Well, two things. This is the time when many mayors receive counts that disappoint. And we understand that. In fact, I have great empathy for those who are building their communities with all their energy, and then we deliver a count that's lower than they wish they had. I understand that.

We have released these counts just in the past few hours. And we haven't drilled down into them. We will do so, and evaluate them as best we can, over the coming weeks. But the specific things that Mayor Bloomberg addresses, we actually can't speak to yet.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, thank you for that question, sir. Your question, please.

MARK BLUMENTHAL: Yeah, Mark Blumenthal, *Huffington Post*. There was a report yesterday on Source that, when the activities of the 2010 census are completed, that you're thinking of moving on. Your spokesman tells me that's not true. I wondered if you could comment on that. And, assuming that you're sticking around for a while, what are the two or three things that you are looking forward to the census doing better or differently in 2020?

ROBERT GROVES: This must be blogger fantasy that's going on here, so I don't know anything about that. We have tons of things we're doing at the Census Bureau collectively. We are seeking, from every employee, ideas about how to get more efficient. And there is an overwhelming response of this. We're reorganizing the IT systems, the IT structure. We've reinvented, reinvigorated a research director. We're trying to knock down silos as much as we can. And we're trying to do more with less, as best as possible. So that's a lot of work to do. And I'm not going anywhere soon.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Now let's go back to the phones. I think we have a question on the phone. Operator, may we have that question, please.

OPERATOR: Christine Smaller with the *Bloomberg News* your line is open.

CHRISTINE SMALLER: Thank you. Now, my question is already asked. Thank you.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you. In the room, any further questions in the room? Operator, any further questions on the phone? We do have one. Sabrina. Wait for a mic please.

SABRINA TAVERNISI: Sorry, I just had the same question from the beginning that wasn't answered, actually. What was the 2000 non-white population? So now minority population is 36.6 in 2010. Do you know what it was in 2000?

ROBERT GROVES: We're getting that.

NICHOLAS JONES: In the report, we compare figures, both at the national level and at region and state level. And you have proportions of the population that are non-Hispanic white alone. In 2000 it was 194 million. And in 2010 it was 196 million. It went up by about two and a half million.

STAN ROLARK: So what's the complement, so the minority?

NICHOLAS JONES: Oh the minority population was 86.9 million. And it went up to 111.9 million. It increased by 25.1 million.

SABRINA TAVERNISI: So 86.9 million would have been what percentage of the population?

NICHOLAS JONES: I'm sorry. If you hold on one second, I can get that for you. I'm looking at slides, which I don't have. [pause]

STAN ROLARK: Let me remind everyone, as well, that you can go to our website. All the questions that you're asking are great questions. www.census.gov. Everything that we've shown today will be available on that website, all the tables, all the reports. And certainly, you could always call the Public Information office at 301-763-3030. And if you can't find it, we'll find it for you.

NICHOLAS JONES: So the proportions in 2000 were 30.9, the percent minority. And it rose to 36.3 percent in 2010. Thanks.

ROBERT GROVES: There was a question here, I think.

STAN ROLARK: I know we have a question in the room. But we have some folks that have been waiting on the phone. So let me go to the phones and get one question from there first. Can we have a question from the phone, please, operator.

OPERATOR: Michael Martinez, of CNN, your line is open.

MICHAEL MARTINEZ: Hello, gentlemen. What accounts for the Hispanic population growth? Birth rates or immigration or both? And how much does illegal immigration account for this growth?

STAN ROLARK: Okay, so Nick are you going to answer it? Or Roberto?

NICHOLAS JONES: Roberto.

STAN ROLARK: Roberto, we're pulling you back in service.

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: So, maybe you could repeat the question.

STAN ROLARK: Yes sir, would you please.

MICHAEL MARTINEZ: Explain the sources, the origins of the Hispanic population growth: birth rates? Domestically? Immigration? And how much does illegal immigration account for this growth?

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: Those are actually very excellent questions. And we're actually in the middle of the process, right now, of actually investigating and doing that. We hope to come out later in the year with more specific information about what contributions the specific Hispanic group origins have contributed to Hispanic growth, and immigration as well.

STAN ROLARK: And let me just remind everyone that this is actually the first time we've seen the national numbers, too. So we're still crunching them, as Dr. Groves said. And we'll continue to do so, and we'll have more information for you as we move right along. So I know we have a question in the room.

LUCIA GRAVES: Recent polls out of--

STAN ROLARK: Can we have your name? Let me have your name.

LUCIA GRAVES: Oh, it's Lucia Graves with the *Huffington Post*.

STAN ROLARK: Go ahead.

LUCIA GRAVES: Recent polls out of California have found an uphill battle for Republicans hoping to make inroads with Latino voters. Any concerns for the party with this population being the fastest growing population in the country?

ROBERT GROVES: I'm happy to say that we don't have an answer to your question. There's one thing about the Census Bureau that we believe in strongly, and that is we are non-partisan. We provide information to the society for everyone, any political stripe. And we leave it to you and others to speculate on the implications for politics.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, and thank you for that question. We have a question on the phone. Operator, can we have that question please?

OPERATOR: You have a question from Maria Pena with the ESC News Service. Your line is open.

MARIA PENA: Yes, thank you. I haven't had a chance to go through the enormous report you guys put out today. But I was wondering if you broke it down by origin, when

it comes to the Hispanic population. I know that, for a while, the narrative has been that Mexicans are the top growing group among Hispanics. And I was wondering if you have any data on that today.

ROBERTO RAMIREZ: We actually don't have that data today. But it will be coming out soon, starting in May, with our demographic profile product and our summary follow one product starting in June, specific information regarding, for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other Hispanic nationalities.

STAN ROLARK: And prior to the release of that data, we'll do a technical webinar, similar to the one we did prior to this release. So, if you have questions, those types of technical questions, we'll certainly be available to answer them at that time. That'll be a little further down the road. So operator, I know we have another question on the phone. Can we have that question please?

OPERATOR: Doug Morris, the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, your line is open.

DOUG MORRIS: [01:14:06] me to the website. If that's where it is, fine. I'm just looking for a complete list of ranking of the MSAs and of the major city rankings, based on the 2010 population numbers. I saw that in a report there was a summary, but it doesn't give a complete list or ranking of those. Are they online now?

MARC PERRY: Yes. They are not online now. They will be going up online, rankings for all counties and both metropolitan and micropolitan areas. And they will be available on the website with the rest of the media package.

MALE: When might that?

MARC PERRY: Later today, possibly yes.

DOUG MORRIS: I will be able to get those this afternoon, though?

STAN ROLARK: Okay, we'll get that up as soon as we can. And then, if you have a question about that, you can call the Public Information Office at 301-763-3030. Is there a question in the room? Yes.

LUCIA CARRERA: Thank you very much for your presentation. My name is Lucia Carrera, and I'm not with the media. My question was, in answering the 2010 census-- and I also helped distribute those and helped people fill them out-- people like myself, Mexican-American, had trouble saying, "Yes, I'm Hispanic." But then, when it came to the race question, most people had to say white when they didn't feel white, because the next closest thing would have been American Indian. But we're more-- Most Hispanic people in the United States are Mestizo, which are-- it's a combination of European and indigenous Indian. So, what would you have written? And I know a lot of people had that question and thought, "I don't feel white, but I feel like I have to write Hispanic white on here."

NICHOLAS JONES: Thanks, that's an excellent question. It's important to understand the census questions are based on self-identification. A diverse question which we ask according to OMB standards is on Hispanic origin, which you mentioned. Second question on race is for people to report their race or races. Individuals are free to report one race or more races or to write in an origin.

As I mentioned on the slides, the population that reported some other race is the population that's classified amongst all the responses that cannot fit into one or more of those major OMB groups. That was there in 2000. It was also here in 2010. And many of the people that reported some other race were, in fact, Hispanic origin responses, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban.

LUCIA CARRERA: What would you write it?

NICHOLAS JONES: It's based on self-identification.

LUCIA CARRERA: Is indigenous Indian of Latin American origin or race?

NICHOLAS JONES: Well, according to the OMB standards, groups who represent American Indian populations, both from North America as well as Central America and South America are coded as American Indian and Alaska Native. That's following the OMB standards.

LUCIA CARRERA: See, when you live in the United States, you think of that as a U.S. American Indian tribe. And, therefore, we didn't-- Maybe you could specify that on the form. Because the majority of Latinos are Mestizos.

STAN ROLARK: Well, let me say this. We have a wonderful Q & A section on our website FAQs. So the types of questions that you're asking, just go to www.census.gov. You'll have your answers there. But thank you for those questions.

So, we're getting kind of late in the day. I know we have a call, one more question on the phone. Operator, can we have that question please?

OPERATOR: And our last question comes from Christine Smaller with the Bloomberg News. Your line is open.

CHRISTINE SPOLAR: Hi. I just want to clarify, because I'm on the phone, I want to make certain that Director Groves answered the question about the issue in New York and New York City. And two, has New York City, has the mayor filed a complaint or done-- pursued some questions regarding an undercount?

ROBERT GROVES: The answer to the first question is yes. And the answer to the second question is I do not know. You should ask the mayor, I think.

CHRISTINE SPOLAR: Well, we will. I just wanted to know if you had received anything official.

ROBERT GROVES: I have not.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, and with that question, we have perhaps one more question in the room. Are there any more questions in the room?

MALE: Do you have an undercount figure? Or do you know when you're going to have any undercount broken down by race and ethnicity?

ROBERT GROVES: Yeah. As I probably didn't say enough on this. But the post-enumeration sample survey that's going on right now is totally designed to answer that kind of question. The final results of that will be 2012. This is a long process. It will break down estimates by race and ethnicity, and also by a variety of the operations we do. So we're looking forward to that. It is a sample-based estimate. It has other weaknesses to it. But it is the tool that censuses around the world use to answer these kinds of questions as best we can. And we'll share that to you as soon as we get it.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, and that's our final question. So we'll close up. And, in closing, let me also let you know that on April 5th at two o'clock, we're going to have a webinar from the Survey of Business Owners, Businesses for Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders. So feel free to join us at that time. We'll have information on our website. Thank you very much.

END OF MEETING