



April 2009

RESOURCES:

"HARD TO COUNT" POPULATIONS BY STATE **(Ranked by Number of People in HTC Areas)**

Throughout the history of the decennial census, it has been easier to achieve a more accurate count of certain population groups than others. Since 1940, scientific evaluations have confirmed that the census misses higher proportions of racial and ethnic minorities, low income households, and young children than of other population segments, such as non-Hispanic Whites, affluent households, and older Americans. Some of the latter groups are even subject to overcounting, due to factors such as ownership of more than one home and a higher percentage of children attending college away from home. (This gap in accuracy is often referred to as the "differential undercount.")

More recently, the Census Bureau has worked to identify the location and characteristics of communities that are at greater risk of being undercounted. The **Tract Level Planning Database with Census 2000 Data** (Planning Database, or PDB) uses a range of demographic, housing, and socio-economic factors that correlate to low mail response in the census. The Census Bureau designates these low response areas as "**hard to count**" (**HTC**) communities.

Factors that contribute to the HTC designations for neighborhoods include *demographic indicators* such as poverty, low educational attainment, unemployment, complex household arrangements, high mobility, and minority language status, and *housing indicators* such as high percentage of renters and vacant units, multi-unit buildings, crowded housing, and lack of telephones.

For more information on the Planning Database the Census Bureau is using to guide its 2010 census efforts, and to access to the PDB itself, go to:

https://ask.census.gov/cgi-bin/askcensus.cfg/php/enduser/std_adp.php?p_faqid=1410&p_created=1172675199&p_sid=NwTM6ppj&p_accessibility=&p_lva=&p_sp=cF9zcmNoPSZwX3NvcnRfYnk9JnBfZ3JpZHNvcnQ9JnBfcm93X2NudD0mcF9wcm9kcz0mcF9jYXRzPSZwX3B2PSZwX2N2PSZwX3BhZ2U9MQ**&

The table below, displaying **Hard To Count Populations by State**, was developed by Dr. William O'Hare and Edwin Quiamboa of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, from the Census Bureau's Planning Database. It is based on data from the 2000 Census, and in this analysis, census tracts with **HTC scores of 60 or higher** are defined as "hard to count areas."

States Ranked by Number of People in State Living in Hard-to-Count Areas*

| Rank | State | State Population Living in Hard-To-Count Areas* | Total Population in State | Percent of Population in State Living in Hard-to-Count Areas* |
|-------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Wyoming | 12,456 | 493,688 | 2.5% |
| 2 | Vermont | 20,950 | 608,827 | 3.4% |
| 3 | North Dakota | 26,268 | 641,993 | 4.1% |
| 4 | New Hampshire | 55,956 | 1,235,786 | 4.5% |
| 5 | Maine | 56,311 | 1,274,848 | 4.4% |
| 6 | Delaware | 57,784 | 783,600 | 7.4% |
| 7 | Montana | 72,160 | 901,934 | 8.0% |
| 8 | South Dakota | 73,624 | 754,755 | 9.8% |
| 9 | Idaho | 92,949 | 1,293,896 | 7.2% |
| 10 | West Virginia | 96,991 | 1,808,344 | 5.4% |
| 11 | Iowa | 122,656 | 2,926,273 | 4.2% |
| 12 | Nebraska | 147,850 | 1,711,202 | 8.6% |
| 13 | Alaska | 150,762 | 626,924 | 24.0% |
| 14 | Utah | 244,346 | 2,233,111 | 10.9% |
| 15 | Rhode Island | 250,646 | 1,048,319 | 23.9% |
| 16 | Kansas | 256,600 | 2,688,395 | 9.5% |
| 17 | Hawaii | 287,574 | 1,211,491 | 23.7% |
| 18 | DC | 313,884 | 571,898 | 54.9% |
| 19 | Minnesota | 338,862 | 4,919,479 | 6.9% |
| 20 | Arkansas | 364,721 | 2,673,400 | 13.6% |
| 21 | Kentucky | 371,814 | 4,041,744 | 9.2% |
| 22 | South Carolina | 380,810 | 4,012,012 | 9.5% |
| 23 | Oregon | 424,442 | 3,421,399 | 12.4% |
| 24 | Wisconsin | 446,763 | 5,363,670 | 8.3% |
| 25 | Colorado | 476,062 | 4,301,257 | 11.1% |
| 26 | Alabama | 505,834 | 4,447,081 | 11.4% |
| 27 | Connecticut | 513,369 | 3,405,516 | 15.1% |
| 28 | Nevada | 517,378 | 1,998,155 | 25.9% |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 29 | Oklahoma | 522,964 | 3,450,505 | 15.2% |
| 30 | Mississippi | 528,289 | 2,844,623 | 18.6% |
| 31 | Virginia | 530,209 | 7,078,486 | 7.5% |
| 32 | Maryland | 557,910 | 5,296,388 | 10.5% |
| 33 | Missouri | 603,329 | 5,595,116 | 10.8% |
| 34 | Indiana | 607,778 | 6,080,485 | 10.0% |
| 35 | New Mexico | 622,260 | 1,818,918 | 34.2% |
| 36 | Tennessee | 630,157 | 5,689,277 | 11.1% |
| 37 | North Carolina | 816,393 | 8,049,313 | 10.1% |
| 38 | Washington | 833,276 | 5,894,002 | 14.1% |
| 39 | Louisiana | 874,388 | 4,468,809 | 19.6% |
| 40 | Massachusetts | 988,281 | 6,348,960 | 15.6% |
| 41 | Pennsylvania | 1,194,589 | 12,280,771 | 9.7% |
| 42 | Ohio | 1,225,207 | 11,352,636 | 10.8% |
| 43 | Michigan | 1,236,057 | 9,938,119 | 12.4% |
| 44 | Georgia | 1,257,940 | 8,186,435 | 15.4% |
| 45 | Arizona | 1,395,113 | 5,130,309 | 27.2% |
| 46 | New Jersey | 1,583,306 | 8,414,036 | 18.8% |
| 47 | Illinois | 2,400,355 | 12,418,799 | 19.3% |
| 48 | Florida | 2,981,402 | 15,982,265 | 18.7% |
| 49 | New York | 5,559,642 | 18,974,875 | 29.3% |
| 50 | Texas | 5,661,540 | 20,851,377 | 27.2% |
| 51 | California | 10,393,982 | 33,870,923 | 30.7% |
| | United States | 49,684,189 | 281,414,424 | 17.7% |

*Hard-to-Count Areas are defined in this table as census tracts with HTC scores above 60.