



# The Census Project

April 2009

## RESOURCES: "HARD TO COUNT" POPULATIONS BY STATE (Percent of Population in HTC Areas, by Race and Hispanic Origin)

Research has shown that it is easier to achieve a more accurate count of certain population groups than others in the nation's decennial census. 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\\*\\*&](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, Race, and Hispanic Origin**, was developed from the Census Bureau's Planning Database by Dr. William O'Hare and Edwin Quiambo of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. 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."

**PERCENT OF STATE POPULATIONS LIVING IN "HARD TO COUNT" AREAS, BY RACE\* & HISPANIC ORIGIN**

State	Percent of Group in Hard-to-Count* Areas										
	Total	White	Black	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Asian/ Pacific Islanders	2 or more races	Some Other Race	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic White
Alabama	11.4%	4.6%	29.8%	6.0%	14.2%	16.3%	14.3%	11.4%	16.7%	16.0%	4.5%
Alaska	24.0%	14.0%	31.4%	62.1%	31.5%	47.7%	33.3%	27.7%	32.0%	28.9%	13.8%
Arizona	27.2%	19.5%	38.9%	78.5%	21.8%	30.0%	22.4%	35.3%	51.0%	49.2%	14.3%
Arkansas	13.6%	8.4%	38.3%	12.8%	26.0%	17.6%	25.3%	17.7%	26.7%	25.2%	8.1%
California	30.7%	21.8%	49.7%	40.2%	25.2%	33.1%	25.4%	34.9%	56.3%	51.8%	15.0%
Colorado	11.1%	8.4%	23.6%	22.6%	11.6%	15.2%	11.7%	16.8%	30.4%	27.3%	6.6%
Connecticut	15.1%	8.0%	50.0%	30.3%	17.5%	33.2%	17.8%	35.5%	61.5%	53.1%	6.1%
Delaware	7.4%	3.4%	21.7%	6.8%	4.1%	8.1%	4.2%	9.9%	20.3%	16.1%	3.1%
District of Columbia	54.9%	22.5%	70.9%	59.7%	41.8%	36.0%	41.7%	54.8%	74.0%	66.1%	19.3%
Florida	18.7%	12.7%	45.4%	20.5%	15.6%	23.7%	15.8%	30.4%	36.6%	33.6%	8.9%
Georgia	15.4%	7.7%	30.9%	17.1%	16.0%	20.1%	16.1%	19.7%	34.4%	31.7%	6.9%
Hawaii	23.7%	18.3%	15.6%	23.8%	24.9%	34.4%	26.7%	23.8%	20.9%	24.3%	18.1%
Idaho	7.2%	6.5%	13.4%	21.4%	9.9%	12.9%	10.2%	9.8%	15.0%	13.9%	6.3%
Illinois	19.3%	9.1%	53.7%	32.2%	20.4%	30.6%	20.5%	30.4%	54.6%	48.2%	6.4%
Indiana	10.0%	6.0%	45.9%	14.8%	16.2%	16.1%	16.2%	18.5%	31.2%	28.2%	5.6%
Iowa	4.2%	3.0%	30.4%	15.7%	17.8%	11.0%	17.6%	12.5%	22.6%	18.2%	2.9%
Kansas	9.5%	6.7%	28.1%	14.5%	19.4%	16.9%	19.4%	16.9%	40.6%	35.5%	5.8%
Kentucky	9.2%	6.7%	36.8%	12.2%	17.0%	14.9%	16.9%	16.8%	22.2%	20.8%	6.6%
Louisiana	19.6%	8.2%	41.5%	18.8%	29.8%	18.4%	29.6%	20.6%	22.9%	19.5%	8.0%
Maine	4.4%	4.2%	19.3%	6.5%	11.8%	9.2%	11.7%	9.7%	13.5%	11.0%	4.2%
Maryland	10.5%	4.4%	24.4%	13.6%	7.7%	11.9%	7.7%	12.3%	19.4%	18.0%	4.0%
Massachusetts	15.6%	10.2%	49.0%	33.4%	28.5%	31.9%	28.6%	37.9%	61.6%	57.7%	8.9%
Michigan	12.4%	5.4%	48.1%	12.4%	14.6%	22.2%	14.7%	22.8%	38.6%	30.8%	5.0%
Minnesota	6.9%	4.1%	39.7%	27.5%	27.7%	18.7%	27.6%	19.6%	29.5%	25.1%	3.9%
Mississippi	18.6%	7.9%	36.6%	7.9%	23.2%	16.0%	22.9%	18.6%	23.7%	21.0%	7.8%

Missouri	10.8%	6.3%	41.4%	13.0%	19.3%	14.2%	19.1%	17.8%	32.6%	26.2%	6.1%
Montana	8.0%	5.0%	10.8%	49.4%	10.8%	10.0%	10.8%	11.0%	13.3%	13.1%	5.0%
Nebraska	8.6%	6.2%	40.4%	16.4%	19.8%	16.9%	19.7%	19.6%	29.5%	26.5%	5.7%
Nevada	25.9%	21.0%	45.5%	30.2%	27.2%	34.1%	27.8%	32.1%	50.6%	48.0%	17.0%
New Hampshire	4.5%	4.1%	19.0%	10.7%	9.1%	9.7%	9.1%	10.1%	38.0%	29.2%	3.9%
New Jersey	18.8%	9.3%	52.0%	39.4%	12.3%	33.5%	12.5%	38.1%	61.0%	54.0%	5.5%
New Mexico	34.2%	26.3%	39.7%	72.7%	25.9%	29.7%	26.2%	35.3%	43.2%	41.1%	19.8%
New York	29.3%	14.7%	63.4%	50.2%	39.7%	49.2%	39.8%	51.5%	73.8%	66.8%	10.8%
North Carolina	10.1%	5.1%	25.2%	13.1%	11.7%	13.6%	11.8%	14.1%	21.3%	20.0%	4.8%
North Dakota	4.1%	2.6%	4.4%	32.4%	6.1%	5.2%	6.1%	5.3%	3.0%	4.7%	2.6%
Ohio	10.8%	5.8%	44.1%	17.8%	14.7%	20.6%	14.9%	21.0%	34.0%	28.4%	5.7%
Oklahoma	15.2%	11.5%	39.4%	16.5%	25.4%	23.6%	25.3%	17.2%	41.4%	35.6%	10.9%
Oregon	12.4%	10.6%	28.8%	20.5%	15.6%	25.6%	16.3%	17.3%	33.9%	30.2%	10.0%
Pennsylvania	9.7%	4.3%	45.1%	22.8%	21.5%	21.1%	21.5%	24.2%	55.3%	45.5%	3.9%
Rhode Island	23.9%	16.4%	67.1%	48.8%	47.9%	58.2%	48.1%	55.1%	82.2%	78.9%	14.4%
South Carolina	9.5%	5.0%	19.4%	9.4%	9.2%	10.1%	9.2%	11.1%	16.4%	15.2%	4.9%
South Dakota	9.8%	4.7%	15.4%	62.5%	13.2%	10.7%	13.0%	14.9%	14.5%	16.7%	4.6%
Tennessee	11.1%	5.5%	36.9%	11.3%	14.6%	21.5%	14.8%	16.5%	26.2%	22.1%	5.3%
Texas	27.2%	21.9%	39.0%	30.9%	21.5%	27.0%	21.6%	33.4%	47.4%	49.5%	11.5%
Utah	10.9%	8.9%	31.7%	37.7%	21.4%	25.0%	22.4%	19.3%	31.0%	28.7%	8.1%
Vermont	3.4%	3.2%	13.5%	6.2%	13.6%	7.1%	13.4%	7.2%	8.1%	4.9%	3.2%
Virginia	7.5%	3.4%	21.3%	8.4%	6.9%	10.8%	6.9%	10.5%	18.5%	15.8%	3.1%
Washington	14.1%	11.3%	27.7%	26.7%	18.6%	21.7%	18.8%	19.3%	44.8%	38.2%	10.6%
West Virginia	5.4%	4.7%	21.7%	7.1%	20.7%	9.5%	20.2%	11.8%	14.6%	8.7%	4.6%
Wisconsin	8.3%	4.2%	54.5%	10.9%	22.4%	15.9%	22.3%	20.4%	46.8%	38.6%	3.7%
Wyoming	2.5%	1.8%	6.6%	27.5%	7.6%	1.7%	7.0%	3.8%	4.0%	3.9%	1.7%
<b>UNITED STATES</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>23.1%</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>

**Note: In this table, Hard-to-Count areas are defined as those census tracts with Hard-to-Count scores of 60+.**  
**\*All single race data (White, Black, AIAN, Asian, NHOPI, and API) reflect "Race alone" tabulations, and not responses in combination with another race.**