DRAFT

BROOKLYN COUNTS IN 2000

[INSERT DIAGRAM HERE]

A Summary of Year 2000 Census Related Activities in Brooklyn and Recommendations for Census 2010

[INSERT BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S SEAL]

[INSERT DATE]

"...As nearly as is practicable one person's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's"

Source: United States Census Bureau

History

According to the Brooklyn Historical Society, Brooklyn (Kings County) took its first census[1] in 1698 and discovered that it had a population of 2,017 persons, of whom 1,721 were white and 296 were black. Almost one hundred years later, on August 1, 1790, the first decennial Census was mandated by Article 1, Section 2, of the United States Constitution, which established that the apportionment of the United States House of Representatives shall be based upon a national census. Its implementation was supervised by Thomas Jefferson, read by Benjamin Franklin, and delivered to George Washington.

Article I, Section 2, of the United States Constitution[2] mandates that 435 representatives be divided among the 50 states every ten years following the decennial census. This process of apportionment determines how many representatives each state is entitled to.[3] Each representative is elected by the voters of a congressional district.[4] States with greater populations are entitled to more representation.

Title 13, United States Code, requires that the apportionment population counts for each state be delivered to the President of the United States within nine months of the census date. In Census 2000, and for most 20th century censuses, Census Day has been April 1. Therefore, the President received the apportionment population counts by December 31, 2000.

---

[1] "The Census (Latin *censere*, "to assess") is a term primarily referring to the official and periodical counting of the people of a country or section of a country and the printed record of such a counting. In actual usage the term is applied to the collection of information on the size and characteristics of population, as well as the number and characteristics of dwelling units, business enterprises, and governmental agencies" (Source: Cited in New York City Census 2000, Office of the Mayor report, "The Importance of the Census to Americans with Disabilities," October 5, 1999).

[2] Article I, Section 2, United States Constitution, states that "Representatives...shall be apportioned among the several States...according to their respective Numbers...The actual Enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of Ten years, in such manner as [Congress] shall by Law direct."

[3] Apportionment is calculated based on the total resident population, citizen and non-citizen, including United States Armed Forces personnel and federal civilian employees stationed outside the United States and their dependents living with them. The populations of the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the United States Island Areas are excluded from the apportionment population, since they do not have voting seats in the United States House of Representatives.

[4] "The congressional districts of the 103rd Congress (January 1993 to 1995) were the first to reflect redistricting based on the 1990 census. These boundaries remained in effect until after Census 2000, except where a state initiative or a court-ordered redistricting had required a change." "The 108th Congress will be the first to reflect reapportionment and redistricting based on Census 2000 data" (Source: United States Census Bureau).

Title 2, United States Code, mandates that the President then submit the apportionment population counts for each state and the number of representatives to which each state is entitled to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within one week of the opening session in the year following Census Day. Also, according to Title 2, United States Code, within 15 days, the Clerk of the House of Representatives must inform each state governor of the number of representatives to which each state is entitled.

Through a process of redistricting, the legislatures in each state are then responsible for geographically defining and revising the boundaries within the state from which people elect their representatives to the United States House of Representatives, state legislature, county or city council and school board. Public Law 94-171 of the Voting Rights Act, requires the Census Bureau to submit to the states, race and ethnic data for small geographic areas to be used for census redistricting counts to the states. This data must be submitted by April 1 of the year following the census.

Over the years, the census has evolved into much more than just a population count---it gives us a chance to be part of the democratic process. In 1790, the census was primarily concerned with enumerating land-holding white males and determined that the national population was 3,615,920,[5] which included black slaves who were counted as three-fifths of a person.[6] Following the census of 1810, a process of "gerrymandering" was instituted, which politicized the manner in which congressional districts were drawn. For the first time in 1890, all Native Americans were counted as part of the United States population. Between 1790 and 1902, the census operated out of temporary offices. Finally, in 1902, Congress created a permanent Census Bureau as part of the United States Department of Commerce.

Since 1900, the Census Bureau has conducted a census every ten years to determine how many seats each state will have in the House of Representatives.[7] In 1941, Congress adopted United States Code, Title 2, Section 2a, which mandated that the Census Bureau begin using the method of equal proportions, or Hill method for the drawing of congressional and state legislative districts.[8] This method is still being used today.

---

[5] See Montana, 503 U.S. at 448, Cited in The University of Toldedo Law Review, Vol. 32, No. 1, Fall 2000, p.2.

[6] By 1960, black males were counted as 7/8ths of a person, while in 1990, black males were counted as 9/10ths of a person, based upon one in ten black males missed in the 1990 Census.

[7] Under federal law, each state is allocated a seat in the House of Representatives for an average of each 625,000 people counted by the census. The Constitution mandates that each state receive at least one House seat. Additional seats are assigned to states based upon a ratio that changes after each decennial census, because the nation's population continues to grow while the number of House seats remains constant at 435.

[8] The Hill method requires that both United States congressional districts and state legislative districts must be drawn so that their residents have a fair and equal share in the way in which they are governed. To accomplish this goal, the method of equal proportions uses a priority value, which is determined by dividing a state's population by the geometric mean of its current and next House seats. This ensures that the representation of each state in the United States House of Representatives reflects the relative size of its population as compared with other states.

In an historic decision in 1995, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the use of race as the determining factor in congressional reapportionment was a violation of the 14th amendment. Six years later, on April 18, 2001, the United States Supreme Court amended that decision, stating that race could be used as part of the reason for redistricting as long as it is not the "dominant and controlling" one.

In November 1997, in response to the undercount problems of the1990 census, Congress established the Census Monitoring Board, an eight-member bipartisan oversight board, charged with the responsibility of observing and monitoring all aspects of the preparation and implementation of the census.

On January 25, 1999, in another important and recent decision, the United States Supreme Court upheld 195, Title 13, United States Code, prohibiting the Census Bureau from using statistical sampling to determine the population count for congressional apportionment purposes.[9] This decision affected the way in which the Census Bureau used sampling in Census 2000 to collect additional information.

Regardless of the method of gathering information, data collected from the census determines how community leaders and agencies plan schools, build roads, manage health care services, build hospitals, provide recreational opportunities, and create new business industries in communities. The Census Bureau's data preparation division produces data that is used to form policy both locally and nationally. Businesses and corporations use census data to form domestic and foreign strategies, as well as to determine new locations for future business opportunities.

Today, the census is the primary provider of information about the American people. It is important for assuring congressional reapportionment and state and local redistricting. It is also used for compliance with civil rights statutes such as the Voting Rights Act, and anti-discrimination laws.[10] In addition, census information provides for adequate distribution of government funding for child care, senior services, student aid, Social Security, Medicare, Americans with disabilities, job training, and the Community Reinvestment Act.

On a local level, census figures are needed for New York City Council redistricting, to provide for better minority representation. Census numbers are also used for drawing community district maps in order to provide city services more efficiently.

Information derived from census records is confidential and protected by Federal law. Federal law restricts access to census records about individuals to Census Bureau employees for 72 years following the census.[11]

---

[9] See No. 98-564, Clinton, President of the United States, et al. v. Glavin et al., on appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

[10] Under existing civil rights legislation, the United States Department of Justice is responsible for overseeing redistricting and determines whether a state's proposed redistricting plan discriminates against minorities.

[11] At present, individual records from censuses taken between 1790 and 1920 are available to the public. Individual records from the 1930 Census will become available on April 1, 2002.

Ultimately, the Census Bureau is a large-scale government agency with more than 100,000 community partners, twelve permanent regional offices, a national headquarters, a data preparation division-including four data capture centers, and three telephone interviewing centers located around the country. Consequently, Census Bureau data shapes important policy decisions that help improve human conditions for everyone.

Mail Response Rates, Resident Population and Undercounts in the 1980 and 1990 Censuses

Mail Response Rates

In 1970, for the first time on a national basis, the Census Bureau in collaboration with the United States Postal Service used a mail-out/mail-back method regarding the delivery of census questionnaires to every "city-style" housing unit with a street name and house number. In 1970, the mail response rate[12] for the United States was 78 percent, while in 1980 it decreased slightly to 75 percent, and in 1990, it declined even further to 65 percent *(See Table 3, Appendix I and Map 1, Appendix J)*.

In 1990, New York State achieved a 62 percent mail response rate *(See Map 1, Appendix J)*, which was 3 percentage points lower than the 1990 national mail response rate, while New York City had a much lower 53 percent mail response rate in 1990.[13] Meanwhile, Kings County's mail response rate in 1990 was even lower at 49 percent *(See Table 3, Appendix I)*.

Map 2, Appendix J, shows a breakdown of mail response rates in Brooklyn by neighborhood. According to the map, the following eighteen neighborhoods were predominantly below 50 percent in mail return (response) rates in 1990:

1. Bedford Stuyvesant
2. Brighton Beach
3. Brownsville
4. Bush Terminal
5. Bushwick
6. Bushwick North
7. Coney Island
8. Crown Heights
9. Downtown - Fulton Mall
10. East New York
11. Flatbush Central
12. Flatbush East
13. Flatbush North
14. Ocean Hill
15. Prospect Heights
16. Seagate
17. Spring Creek
18. Williamsburg South

[12] "Mail response rate" is also referred to as "final response rate" by the Census Bureau.

[13] Since 1970, New York City has typically been 10 percent below the national level in mail response rates.

In 1990, the Census Bureau mailed one census questionnaire to each address in the nation. The Census Bureau reports that In 1990, the national mail response rate decreased in spite of the Bureau's support of a public service announcement effort to promote donated advertisements. According to the Bureau, this was partially due to their inability to ensure that public service announcements were broadcast at favorable times and to appropriate markets. The Census Bureau concluded that a professionally managed paid advertising campaign would yield greater response rates.

Resident Population

According to the Census Bureau, in 1980 the resident population of the United States was 226,542,199,[14] while in 1990 it increased to 248,709,873[15] *(See Table 7, Appendix I)*. Table 7 also shows that in 1980 New York State's resident population was 17,558,165, while in 1990 it increased slightly to 17,990,455, ranking second in the nation only to that of California with a resident population of 29,760,021. Meanwhile, in 1980, New York City's resident population was 7,071,639, while in 1990 it also increased to 7,322,564. Table 7 shows that in 1980, the resident population for Kings County was 2,231,028-the largest of all New York City boroughs, while Kings County's 1990 population increased slightly to 2,300,664, continuing to rank first as the borough with the largest population.

A report dated May 13, 1991 by the New York City Department of City Planning, stated that New York City's population increased between 1980 and 1990. Brooklyn as well as the rest of New York City "...gained through a natural increase - the excess of births over deaths - which more than offset the net out-migration of the population." In addition to the other boroughs, Brooklyn experienced a net immigration of people from Asia and the Pacific Islands. Brooklyn gained more than 50,100 Asian and Pacific Islanders through net immigration. Brooklyn also saw a large emigration of white non-Hispanics, 159,000 and a moderate emigration of black non-Hispanics, 6,600, and Hispanics, 11,000. However, there was also a large immigration of black non-Hispanics and Hispanics from outside the United States to Brooklyn between 1980 and 1990.

Based on a later report by the New York City Department of City Planning dated April 17, 1992, socioeconomic data from the 1990 Census released by the Department of City Planning, 953,000 foreign-born persons settled in New York City between 1980 and 1990[16] These New Americans, according to the Center for Immigration Studies, also reflected approximately one third of New York State's immigrant population in 1990 of 2,850,000. This influx of foreigners to New York City represented an increase of 2,082,000 persons or almost 25 percent since the 1970 census.

Undercounts

Census Bureau statistics revealed that in 1980 there was a net national undercount of

---

[14] The resident population includes the population of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, but not the overseas population.

[15] Does not include the population of Puerto Rico, which was 3,522,037.

[16] 28.7 percent of New York City's population.

2.1 percent. This undercount was distributed among various ethnic groups. Hispanics maintained the largest undercount of 5.2 percent. Similarly, 5.0 percent of American Indians were uncounted, while, 4.8 percent of Blacks were missed, 3.1 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders were undercounted, and 1.7 percent of non-blacks were missed.

New York City suffered a severe undercount in the 1980 census. According to a report released from the Office of the Mayor's 1990 Census Project on January 29, 1990, New York City's population was undercounted by 6 percent, or over 450,000 individuals. As many as 25 percent of the census forms were completed from second-party information. Consequently, the impact of New York City's undercount was far-reaching, including the loss of between $675 million to $1 billion of federal funds between 1981 and 1990.

The census undercount in 1980 was particularly devastating for Brooklyn, which lost a congressional seat and millions of dollars in federal funding. Furthermore, the Census Bureau did not adequately notify and prepare Brooklyn for a recount. Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden recognized that the implications for a census undercount could not be ignored and an accurate count was necessary for adequate congressional representation and for the allocation of government monies.

In 1981, the Brooklyn Borough President's Office and the Brooklyn College Institute for the Study of the Borough of Brooklyn conducted an independent study which estimated that Brooklyn was undercounted by as many as 407,000 people and projected that Brooklyn would lose more than $80 million a year in federal revenue-sharing money each year between 1981 and 1990 due to the undercount. This telephone survey of 451 Brooklyn households reached a random sample of 88 percent of all Brooklyn households with telephones.

The Borough President's report found that:

- At least 7.3 percent and possibly 11.1 percent of the borough's population had not been counted.
- 166,000 to 252,000 individual Brooklynites were missed.
- It is possible that 120,000 undocumented Haitians were not counted.
- 35,000 Brooklyn welfare recipients may not have been counted.

In response to the 1980 undercount, New York City filed a lawsuit in 1988 regarding the Commerce Department's decision to not use a post-enumeration survey for the 1990 Census that would "...yield a usable, reliable statistical adjustment of the census" *(See Anderson & Feinberg, 1999)*. The city and state also challenged the 1980 Census on the basis that failure to adjust the 6 percent undercount for New York City caused injury to New York State, which was deprived of one congressional seat, and lost millions of

dollars in federal funding. The city alleged that the Census Bureau's unwillingness to adjust the population count violated Article II of the United States Constitution, as well as the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. Essentially, the city claimed that if the Census Bureau's plan would lead to a more accurate census, then it is supported constitutionally. The city and other plaintiffs who joined the lawsuit moved for a preliminary injunction to force the Commerce Department to permit the Census Bureau to proceed with the development of statistical adjustment techniques. Consequently, the United States Court of Appeals agreed that the Census Bureau should have corrected the census if it was scientifically feasible, however, the District Court later found that accurate census adjustments were not possible.

In 1989, a stipulation was negotiated, whereby, the Secretary of Commerce agreed to withdraw the decision against adjustment and reconsider the issue later after the 1990 Census and a post-enumeration survey (P.E.S.) of 150,000 households were taken. In 1991, the Secretary of Commerce issued a decision against adjustment, based upon a recommendation from an independent, eight member Special Advisory Panel. The recommendation and decision was based in part on a post-enumeration survey that revealed between 14.1 and 25.7 million errors according to the General Accounting Office. The Secretary also argued that "the primary criterion for accuracy should be distributive accuracy-that is, getting most nearly correct the proportions of people in different areas" *(See Anderson & Feinberg, 1999).*

In 1990, there were 26 million errors in the census. On a national level, 4,020,496 people were missed-mostly poor people and minorities, which when added to the official population total yields an adjusted population total of 252,730,369[17] *(See Table 1, Appendix I).* According to results from the Census Bureau's Accuracy Coverage and Evaluation program (A.C.E.) for the 1990 census, the national undercount was between 1 and 2 percent.[18] Additionally, 13 million people were incorrectly counted.

The Census Bureau identified 4.4 percent of African Americans who were missed, 2.3 percent of Asian and Pacific Islanders who were undercounted, 5 percent of Latinos and Hispanics who were missed, and 12.2 percent of Native Americans living on reservations who were undercounted nationally in 1990. By comparison only 0.7 percent of the white population was missed. Furthermore, 10 percent of young Asian men, and 6 percent of Hispanic men between 30 and 50 were missed. In addition, there were two million children uncounted, making them the largest undercount of all. Ultimately, the 1990 census missed 7 percent of black children, 5 percent of Hispanic children, and over 6 percent of Native American children. In 1990, children accounted for nearly 26 percent of the United States population, but made up 52 percent of those undercounted.

In New York State, Census Bureau findings showed that 1.5 percent of the state's population was missed; 0.6 percent of Non-Blacks were not counted; 6.1 percent of African Americans were uncounted; 3.2 percent of Asian and Pacific Islanders were missed; 2.9 percent of Native Americans were undercounted; and 5.8 percent of

[17] Does not include the population of Puerto Rico, which was 3,522,037.

[18] The estimate from the Post Enumeration Survey (P.E.S.) was 1.6 percent, while the estimate from Demographic Analysis (D.A.) was 1.8 percent (Source: United States Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2000).

Hispanics were missed in 1990. Additionally, 2.6 percent of children were undercounted. Despite the large undercount, New York State was one percentage point below the national average of 1.6 percent.

A report from the Community Service Society of New York City, dated January 2001, states that of the seven congressional districts with the largest undercounts in the 1990 census, five were located in New York City. In addition, all five congressional districts located in New York City had minority populations of at least 65 percent. The report also found that in 1990, more than 185,000 African Americans and 136,000 Latinos in New York State (mostly from New York City) were not counted.

Studies conducted by the National Committee for an Effective Congress determined that New York City suffered the largest undercount of its residents compared to all other cities in the nation. A study conducted by Price Waterhouse Coopers taken after the 1990 Census found that New York State was undercounted by 277,000 people, with 245,000 residing in New York City. The report concluded that the undercount resulted in the loss of three Assembly seats, one State Senate seat and half a congressional seat to New York City.[19]

According to the Census Bureau and New York City Department of City Planning, the 1990 net undercount for New York City was 244,588 individuals *(See Table 1, Appendix I)*. A study by the Mayor's Office found that in the 1990 Census, New York City's undercount was even larger with almost 3.2 percent of the city's population uncounted or about 500,000 people living in 225,000 housing units on 1,300 New York City blocks.[20] This also represented 6 percent of the national undercount. The report also indicated that the census undercount in Brooklyn was between 13.4 percent and 20.4 percent for Brooklyn households[21] *(See Table 1, Appendix I)*. Additionally, the uncounted rate for blacks was between 20.6 percent and 26.6 percent, while white Brooklynites were undercounted by 13.2 percent.

An independent study was done by the Brooklyn Borough President's Office in 1991 entitled "Brooklyn Counts." This study discovered that Brooklyn's undercount in 1990 was even greater than the Mayor's Office had estimated. Based on the Borough President's study, which surveyed 549 households across the borough, between 310,000 and 473,000 Brooklynites were missed *(See Table 1, Appendix I)*.

[19] Editorial, New York Daily News, April 10, 2000 (Cited in Briefing Paper of the Legal and Governmental Affairs Division, Subcommittee on Census 2000, "Implications for the Future: A Review of Census 2000 and Recommendations for 2010").

[20] A more recent unofficial report from the New York City Department of City Planning, April 30, 2001, suggests that the number of housing units and city blocks in New York City during 1990 was unknown.

[21] A more recent unofficial report from the New York City Department of City Planning, April 30, 2001, suggests that the official undercount for Kings County was 3.7 percent.

The Borough President's report found that:

- Approximately 16.9 percent of Brooklyn households were not counted.
- The uncounted rate for blacks was 20.6 percent, but could be as high as 26.6 percent.
- The uncounted rate for low-income blacks was 23 percent.
- The uncounted rate for whites was 13.2 percent.

Another report issued by the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund (P.R.L.D.E.F.) in April 1999, also suggests that there was a serious undercount in 1990. According to that report, which is consistent with Census Bureau data *(See Table 1, Appendix I)*, the undercount for Brooklyn's total population was 3.7 percent or 88,486. According to the report's findings, African Americans faced the largest undercount with 7.4 percent or 58,770 residents missed, while 30,097 Latinos or 6.5 percent of that population was undercounted. Other races excluding whites, had 4,110 individuals missed or 3.5 percent of its population uncounted. Meanwhile, white Brooklynites were over counted by 4,491 or 0.5 percent.

In 1991, the New York City Planning Commission discovered that after forty years of continued decline, the average household size for New York City increased between the years 1980 and 1990. This slight increase from 2.49 persons per occupied housing unit in 1980 to 2.54 persons per occupied housing unit in 1990 occurred because of changes in the composition of the population at that time. The Planning Commission attributed this household increase to new immigrant groups and their extended families and multigenerational households. The decline in the economy and insufficient units of affordable housing may be other possible explanations for this modest increase. Unfortunately, the Census Bureau concluded that a decrease in housing units represented a decrease in population. The fact that more people lived in fewer housing units in New York City was not considered and instead of detecting the increases cited above, the census counts of 1980 and 1990 were seriously flawed and both New York City and Brooklyn suffered from the results.

In response to the undercount, in 1991 New York City filed a lawsuit along with several other cities and states, attempting to compel the Census Bureau to make census count adjustments for those people missed in the census count. The trial court deferred to the Census Bureau's technical expertise and ruled against using adjusted figures. New York City won on appeal in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, but in Wisconsin v. City of New York, 517 U.S. 1,1996, the United States Supreme Court reversed that decision. The Court ruled unanimously that "the good-faith effort to achieve population equality required of a state conducting intrastate redistricting does not translate into a requirement that the federal government conduct a census that is as accurate as practicable." Furthermore, the Court observed that "[t]he text of the Constitution vests Congress with virtually unlimited discretion in conducting the decennial 'Actual Enumeration'...and Congress has delegated its broad authority over the census to the Secretary [of Commerce]." Following that decision, Congress decided not to use adjusted figures for reapportionment. However, states were allowed to use census data adjustments in their own redistricting, though this was not mandatory. The Court also

"Any undercount robs people of an equal voice in government and their fair share of vital resources - - - and is an affront to our basic principles of democracy"

Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden, March 7, 1991

---

left open the possibility of using statistical sampling when allocating federal funds.

A 1991 study done by the Brooklyn Borough President's Office entitled "Brooklyn Counts," showed that between 310,000 and 473,000 persons were uncounted, resulting in the loss of over $500 million to the borough for the next decade (*See Table 1, Appendix I).*

The following reasons were attributed to the high undercount:

- Boarded-up residential structures and vacant structures undergoing rehabilitation were not included on census lists.

- New housing units never appeared on census lists and their occupants were also missed.

- Persons living in group quarters such as institutions, non-institutions, and dormitories were never defined as housing units.

- Both documented and undocumented immigrants were cautious about revealing personal information to governmental authorities, and were therefore uncounted.

- Black Brooklynites were more likely to be undercounted than white Brooklynites. Of black households polled, 20.6 percent reported not being counted, while white Brooklynites reported an undercount of 13.2 percent. When the margin of error of 6 percent for the sub-sample was considered, as few as 14.6 percent or as many as 26.6 percent of black households were not counted. The range for white households was between 7.2 percent to 19.2 percent.

- People in poorer communities who refused to open their doors to unfamiliar census takers were missed.

- Large numbers of the homeless population that were not visible in the streets or in emergency shelters for the homeless were not accurately counted.

- Persons residing in Nursing Homes and prisons were also typically omitted from census counts. In cases where too few housing units were listed, an undercount of residents likely occurred, because some residents did not receive census questionnaires.

The Latino or Hispanic population was one of the largest undercounted populations in New York City during the 1990 Census. According to the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund's (P.R.L.D.E.F.) April 1999 report, there were several factors which contributed to the Latino undercount in 1990:

- Poverty and poor neighborhood conditions.
- Illiteracy and a lack of education.
- Fear or mistrust of government among immigrants, welfare and other government benefits recipients.
- Language barriers.
- Geography.
- Changing family and household structures.
- High residential mobility.
- Lack of information about the importance of the census.
- Problems associated with Census Bureau enumeration, staffing and planning.

Conclusions:

1. All of the undercounted populations have grown since 1990.
2. Based upon the undercounts in 1980 and 1990 and the unwillingness of the Census Bureau to make census count adjustments, Borough President Golden established a dialogue with the Census Bureau and began plans for the formation of a Brooklyn Census 2000 Task Force to address many of the issues, problems and causes identified in both his 1991 "Brooklyn Counts" study, and other reports such as the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund's (P.R.L.D.E.F.) April 1999 report in order to avert another undercount in Census 2000.
3. Borough President Golden firmly believes that both the 1980 and 1990 censuses should have been statistically adjusted to compensate for the 'differential undercount.'[22] Unfortunately, that did not happen.

[22] "Differential Undercount" is defined by the Census Bureau as the undercount differences by race and Hispanic origin in coverage, and the greater likelihood of undercounting minorities (Source: New York City Department of City Planning, Population Division).