



MAY - 8 2009

Ms. Cynthia Taeuber
Email: cmtaeuber@comcast.net

Dear Ms. Taeuber:

This is in response to your email of April 29, 2009, to Ms. Donna Souders, Decennial Management Division at the U.S. Census Bureau, regarding your comments to the *Federal Register* notice on the Proposed Information Collection for the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program (ICP) Evaluation.

In addressing your concerns, the following is the Census Bureau's response to your questions and comments:

1. Are there any estimates of the expected final response rate to this q're?

The expected weighted-response rates are 65 percent for the American Indian and Alaska Native sample, 66 percent for Asian, 67 percent for Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and 68 percent for the core sample that includes Hispanics, non-Hispanic Blacks, and non-Hispanic Others. Weighting the response rate is necessary due to the subsampling for face-to-face interviewing and to correct potential coverage problems due to non-response.

2a. I assume there is no resolution to the "cell phone only" households and the related bias.

The advantage of address-based sampling is the full coverage of cell-phone-only and non-telephone households.

2b. Is that where mailing and the sub-sample of in-person interviews comes in?

It is exactly these two components of the address-based sampling plan that gives full coverage of cell-phone-only and non-telephone households.

2c. My impression is that [the proportion of] cell phone only households is relatively higher within the priority race/ethnic communities—do we know if that is correct?

It is expected the telephone-matching rate could be lower for some race/ethnicity groups (especially for the American Indian and Alaska Native sample on reservations) due to higher cell-phone-only rates and/or non-telephone household rates. Personal interviews with all six race/ethnicity groups will be conducted for a 20 percent subsample of addresses that could not be matched to a telephone number or were not interviewed by telephone despite a telephone match.

For groups with a lower telephone-matching rate, the percentage of interviews completed by telephone will be lower while the percentage of interviews completed by personal interviews will be higher.

2d. What I am getting at is whether the sub-sample will be sufficiently large to get the data you want for the target groups of interest? I don't think [Census] 2000 results [are] a good guide, but I'm saying that based on my impressions, not data—[are] there data one way or another?

The overall sample sizes (of housing units) chosen were based on the eligibility rates for the census tracts selected for each of the samples (the core sample and the three supplemental oversamples). If the assumed rates for eligibility, screening, or interviewing turn out to be too high, there will be additional replicates to provide a safety margin to meet the target sample sizes for each race/ethnicity group.

3. The results are national level only, right?

Yes, the sampling strategies are designed to be nationally representative, though some limitations were accepted for the three rarer race/ethnicity samples (the American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander samples). The core sample will collect some interviews for the three race/ethnicity groups as part of the 500 interviews for non-Hispanic Others, but the numbers for Asians, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander will be small. Therefore, supplemental samples are necessary to increase the number of interviews for these three groups. We are still working on refinements of these three supplemental samples with the National Opinion Research Center to achieve the best balance of cost and national coverage.

4. I have a small curiosity question -- looks like this has already been through cognitive testing - - I am curious about what seems to me to be stilted wording in Question 5 of the Wave 1 q're: "The Census is *the count* of all the people who live in the United States" I would think it would say, "The Census *counts* all the people who live in the United States." My curiosity is why "the count" instead of "counts"? This is a minor matter -- just struck me as odd, different from what we usually did and wondered if the change just happened or was actually because of the testing -- if you don't know the answer off the top of your head, don't spend any time on it.

The wording is taken unchanged from prior census questionnaires to include the Census Barriers, Attitudes and Motivators Survey (CBAMS) and the Census 2000 Partnership and Marketing Program Evaluation (PMPE).

5. There is another grammatical thing -- the questionnaire uses "whether or not" -- the "or not" is useless verbiage -- just "whether" does it.

We acknowledge your comment and are taking it under consideration.

We appreciate your support and interest for an accurate count for the 2010 Census. If you have further questions, please contact Mr. James L. Dinwiddie, Assistant Division Chief for Decennial Program Information, at (301) 763-1346.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank A. Vitrano", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Frank A. Vitrano
Chief, Decennial Management Division