



ISSUE BRIEF

Money and Power: The Economic and Political Impact of the 2020 Census on Illinois

**The Chicago Urban League
May 2019**

**Prepared by
Chicago Urban League
Research and Policy Center**

**Authors
Kathleen Kane-Willis
Stephanie Schmitz Bechteler
Scott Metzger
Kareem Butler**

This is the second issue brief in a series written by the Research and Policy Center (RPC) at the Chicago Urban League. The RPC will produce timely briefs in response to important issues that impact the African American community in Chicago.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To the average person, the census may seem inconsequential, simply a form to fill out once a decade. But that form plays a major role in shaping the day to day lives of people all around the country. Through the census, the federal government keeps track of the US population, and allocates funding based on that data. The census also determines political representation. So although many people may view the census as “just another form,” what it really represents is *money and power*.

Money. The Census count determines how the federal government allocates funding for more than 100 different services and programs, including: health and human services; education; roads and infrastructure; and a variety of programs focused on rural areas.

- In Fiscal Year 2016, under the 55 largest programs, *nearly \$35 billion* was disbursed to the state of Illinois based on 2010 census data. Adjusted for inflation, this amounts to \$36.2B today.
- Based on FY2015 data, a 1% undercount would result in the loss of \$122M per year in Medicaid (Federal Medical Assistance Percentage) – the *5th highest* loss in the nation, after Texas, Pennsylvania, Florida and Ohio
- Over a 10-year period, a 1% undercount would conservatively amount to a \$1.2B cut in Medicaid Funding alone.
- More than 70% of census dollars allocated to Illinois (over \$24B in FY 2015) was spent on just five programs, including Medicaid, student loans, SNAP benefits, and highway construction funding.
- Census derived allocations for rural programs in Illinois amounted to \$425M in FY 2016, and Illinois ranked 6th in per capita allocations for rural programs among the 10 most populous states. These dollars are also at risk if there is an undercount.

Power. Illinois has lost population and is likely to lose at least one Congressional seat and perhaps two if there is an undercount in the state. The US Census is used to apportion political representation in Congress as well as in the electoral college.

- In 2010 Illinois lost one Congressional seat due to loss of population;
- From 2014-2017, Illinois has experienced population loss each year and population declined by more than 150,000 people, the largest decrease in the Midwest.

To avoid further loss of both money and power, it is essential to ensure that *every resident in the state of Illinois is counted*. An undercount in *any* part of the state – of *any* population – impacts both fiscal allocations from the federal government and political representation. *Each Illinoisan is equally important in completing the census to retain our state’s money and power.*

Barriers to Participation to Ensure an Accurate Count. Unfortunately, trust in the federal government has reached a historic low point. Changes to the way data is gathered raises concerns as well. Both of these factors are likely to result in an undercount:

- According to the Pew Research Center, just 17% of Americans say that they can trust the government to do what is right most of the time (14%) or always (3%).
- The census moving primarily online also presents new barriers, including lack of access to the internet (the “digital divide”).

- The reduction in on-the-ground enumerators, cut by one-third (600K to 400K) since the 2010 census.

Focus groups conducted by Census Bureau found significant barriers, including: 1) Lack of Knowledge about the census and what it is used for; 2) Confidentiality and privacy concerns; 4) Distrust of Government; 5) The citizenship questions and the ramifications of completing the census; 6) Access to the Internet; 7) Concerns about Internet breaches and privacy.

Hard to Count (HTC). The Census Bureau defines Hard to Count (HTC) populations based on a number of variables, including high non-response rates on the census in previous years. African Americans are the most undercounted racial group. Other HTC populations include: 1) Children under age 5; 2) rural populations; 3) renters; 4) ethnic and Racial minorities; 5) immigrants; 6) non-English speakers; 7) people without access to the Internet; 8) young, mobile people; 9) disabled individuals; 10) low income individuals. This list by no means encompasses *all* HTC populations, but represents some of the groups who are historically undercounted. In Illinois:

- Sixteen percent of residents live in Hard to Count census tracts, making up more than 2M people;
- The five counties with the highest non-response rates in 2010 included Cook (25%), Jackson (23%), Champaign (23%), Alexander (23%), and St. Clair (23%).
- Among the 10 most populous states, Illinois ranks fourth in households without access to Internet (16% or 2M Illinoisans);
 - In four counties, at least 50% of the population did not have Internet access: Scott (50%), Hardin (50%) De Witt (56%) and Alexander (65%) Counties.

Nationally, Illinois ranks 6th highest in the number of specific Hard to Count populations living in HTC areas, for example:

- Nearly 42% of African Americans in Illinois live in HTC census tracts, numbering more than 800,000 Illinoisans;
 - Counties with the highest percentage of African Americans include Alexander (34%), Pulaski (32%), St. Clair (30%), Cook (24%), and Lawrence (20%);
- About 33% of Latinx Illinoisans live in HTC census tracts – nearly 700,000 people;
 - Illinois counties with the largest percentage of Latinx residents include Kane (31%), Cook (25%), Lake (21%), Boone (20%), and Cass (18%);
- Nearly 20% of children under age 5 live in HTC census tracts—more than 150,000 of Illinois’ children;
 - The top five Illinois counties with the highest percentage of children under age 5 includes Kendall (8%), Kane (7%), Peoria (7%), Alexander (7%), and Douglas (7%).

Chicago in particular is home to a number of HTC populations, including:

- Chicago ranks second in the country in the number of African Americans (600,000) who live in HTC tracts, and two-thirds of African Americans in Chicago (66.7%) live in HTC tracts;
- More than 55% of children under age 5 live in HTC census tracts – more than 100,000 of Chicago’s children, and the second most among all cities in the nation.
- More than 60% of Chicago’s Latinx residents live in HTC tracts—more than half a million people, third highest number in the nation.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure that 2020 census participation messaging and outreach is tied to community benefits, comes from trusted voices in communities, and is customized for each targeted community or population.
2. Provide adequate funding at the state and local levels for trusted community leaders and organizations. At the state level, allocate at least \$33M for FY2020. While this may seem like a generous appropriation, \$33M is just 27% of what Illinois stands to lose in Medicaid funding in just one year (\$122M) if there is even a 1% undercount, or less than 3% over a decade.
 - a. Ensure these funds are targeted toward Hard to Count populations.
 - b. Create a fair and transparent process for the selection and distribution of grant funds.
 - c. Involve community experts in the determination of grant allocations.
3. Ensure that the Illinois Complete Count Commission is funded for staffing positions and operational costs. While the enacting legislation created two positions, no funding was allocated for staff or operational activities. This funding is needed to ensure coordination of all Illinois census activities. This is particularly important because of the reduction in staff at the Census Bureau.

PART I: UNDERSTANDING THE DECENNIAL U.S. CENSUS

What is the U.S. Census?

The census is how the federal government keeps track of the US population—how many people live where, and certain characteristics, like race and ethnicity. Since 1790, the census has been conducted every ten years, as mandated by Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution. Since 1930, the Census has been conducted on April 1 of each decade ending with a 0. Ultimately, participation in the 2020 Census is key to preserving the continued well-being of our democracy.

In 2010, the census questionnaire was one of the shortest in history - asking only 10 questions of all households in the United States and territories. Questions were related to name, gender, age, race, ethnicity, relationship, and whether you own or rent your home. Impressively, spending for the 2010 census generated about \$1.6 billion in savings returns.¹ Still, the 2010 census missed more than 1.5 million minorities after struggling to enumerate black Americans, Hispanics, and renters, among others.² And, while the questions previewed by the Census Bureau for the upcoming 2020 census remain similarly simple, new and unique challenges highlighted throughout this report have emerged that may recreate and worsen the impact of some of the problems encountered 10 years ago.

To the average person, the census is a piece of paper that each household fills out once a decade. Few may fully understand why we even complete a decennial census or how the information gathered in the census is used once collected. While many of us have had experiences taking surveys, we might not realize how important and powerful the census is for our government. The data gathered by the census translates into *money and political power* for each state –providing for the financial capital and resources states require to fund the public programs, public institutions, agencies, and social services that communities and individual residents depend upon, while also maintaining fair political representation needed to advance community interests. It is imperative that the information collected during the census is as accurate as possible. The data gathered by the census plays a critical role in two main ways:

1. Allocation of Federal resources each state will receive based on the population;
2. Determining the number of Congressional seats each state will receive based on the population;

Funding Allocations Are Determined by the Census

The federal government determines how to allocate funding for a wide range of services, including 132 programs such as: health and human services; education; roads and infrastructure; as well as many programs specifically for rural areas. These allocations are determined by the count of individuals living in a state. In 2015, more *than \$675B* was allocated to states for these kinds of programs.³ Adjusted for inflation, these funds would equal nearly \$720B in 2019 dollars.

Congressional Representation and Civil Rights

A fundamental purpose of the census is to ensure proportional Congressional representation based on the population residing in a state. The larger a state's population, the more federal representatives that state has out of the 435 total in Congress (for example, Illinois currently has 18 representatives; California has the most with 53, and some states, like Alaska and Wyoming, have just one. Census data certifies how many people live in each state, and therefore determines the number of representatives a

state will send to Congress for the next 10 years. Furthermore, districts will be redrawn based on the count. In 2011, during the redistricting process, Illinois lost one Congressional Seat.⁴ Illinois is at risk of losing at least one more congressional seat and may lose two congressional seats if there is an undercount of the population in 2020. Compounding the issue, Illinois' population has been dropping since 2014—the state has lost more than 150,000 residents since then.⁵ Equitable political representation provided for by the census is, and always has been, a prominent civil rights issue. Fair, proportionate voting representation in our democracy depends on valid census data. Federal agencies rely on census data to monitor discrimination and implement civil rights laws that protect voting rights, equal employment opportunities, and more.

What are the key differences between the 2010 and the 2020 Census?

Due to the high cost of conducting the 2010 Census, government officials created a new plan for the 2020 Census. This new plan relies heavily on computer and internet technologies and promotes the use of an online census form to reduce production, mailing and administration costs. If implemented properly, the plan could save \$5 billion on the projected cost for the 2020 Census.⁶ Recognizing that not all households have access to computers or fast, reliable internet, the census will still be made available in phone and paper formats.

Technology Concerns

The Census Bureau cannot save as much money as possible without thoroughly testing new technologies and procedures. Yet, much of what the census requested in test funding was not allocated. From 2012-2016, the Census Bureau received \$200 million less from Congress than the Bureau anticipated needing in 2020.⁷ These severe funding restrictions led the Census Bureau to cancel two out of three crucial tests used to identify potential flaws in census questionnaires and technology prior to Census Day. Ultimately, technological improvements for 2020 may save less money than they could were the census properly funded.

Funding and Staffing Concerns

Documents requested by the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) indicate that there are several concerns at the Census Bureau about the upcoming 2020 Census. A primary concern is the degree to which staffing levels have been cut compared to previous years. For example, the number of field enumerators (those who go out to communities to ensure an accurate count) has been cut by one-third from 600,000 in 2010 to just 400,000 for next year's decennial census, diminishing the capacity of state governments to hand-deliver questionnaires to households without internet access, or those who failed to return mail-in forms or respond to phone calls.⁸ Fewer enumerators means more people missed by the census.

The federal government shut-down, which occurred from December 22, of 2018 – January 25, of 2019, also hurt the Census Bureau's planning and implementation timeline, as a significant number of workers with vitally important roles were furloughed during a period already characterized by chronic underfunding.⁹ In this way, the shut-down compounded issues with ensuring an accurate count in 2020.

The Citizenship Question

For the first time since 1950, the Department of Commerce confirmed plans to include questions regarding citizenship status in the 2020 Census. Since then, nearly 20 states have levied suits against the Department citing constitutional duties incumbent upon the federal government to enumerate all living persons in the United States regardless of citizenship or legal status.¹⁰ In the wake of growing bipartisan concern, several former Census directors have delivered warnings to the Department about the risks and costs associated with including a citizenship question, and more than 160 mayors from both major political parties wrote to Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross requesting its removal.¹¹

Experts believe that adding a single question regarding citizenship to the 2020 Census would dramatically alter participation, thereby providing an inaccurate picture of the people living in the United States. Career staff at the Census Bureau validated these concerns in a written memo indicating that the inclusion of an untested citizenship question could frighten individuals and drive down response rates among communities that are already difficult to count.¹² In that memo, John Abowd, the Census Bureau's Chief Scientist wrote that adding a citizenship question is "very costly, harms the quality of the census count, and would use substantially less accurate citizenship status data than are available."¹³ These comments not only emphasize the harm this question poses to immigrant families, but also demonstrate how pointless and unnecessarily expensive it would be to use the census to gather low quality citizenship data. Even federal courts seem to agree. On April 5th, 2019, a third federal U.S District Court Judge in Maryland found the decision to include a citizenship question in the upcoming census unlawful, citing the "lack of any genuine need for the citizenship question," and "the mysterious and potentially improper political considerations that motivated the decision" to incorporate it.¹⁴ Like the two previous cases adjudicated in New York and California, the most recent ruling concluded that Secretary Ross' decision to include the question violated administrative law and was unconstitutional because it limits the government's ability to collect decennial data on every living person in the U.S.¹⁵

Even if the Supreme Court decides to remove the citizenship question from the census, the consequences of adding the question in the first place among immigrants and mixed status families will be dire. It is very difficult in this era of fear and distrust of the federal government to "unring the bell" on the citizenship question. Many immigrant families, even if the question is not included on the census, might still believe that it is, due to all of the media and community attention paid to it. Likely, organizations that work with immigrant families will have to reassure members within the communities that the citizenship question is no longer on the census.

If the question remains on the census, outreach workers will have to emphasize that under Title 13 of the United States Code that private information is never published and that Census Bureau employees swear for life to protect your information, including the sharing of information with other government agencies.¹⁶ However, reassuring immigrant and mixed-status families that census information is protected by federal law might not be reassurance enough to encourage households to complete the census.

What are the challenges in securing an accurate count of people in America?

An accurate census count means getting it right—correctly recording how many people live in the country. Without full participation in the census, communities already vulnerable to undercounting are even more likely to experience marginalization. The various economic and social challenges endured by

historically Hard to Count populations make them particularly vulnerable to diminished federal funding and political representation. When communities are undercounted, it is even more difficult for them to grow and thrive economically. And in Illinois, the risk is stark and significant.

Understanding the Importance of Hard to Count Populations

It may seem simple to ensure that every single person living in the United States is counted in the census, but the many changes to the census, including underfunding, understaffing, and cuts to tests make it a particularly complicated endeavor in 2020. The addition of the new digital format of the census in 2020 only makes an already troubled process more troubling. The 2010 census cost more than \$12B to ensure an accurate count, yet still fell short.¹⁷ If we hope to do better in 2020, costs will certainly exceed that amount. Given the challenges encountered in 2010, 2020's financial restrictions will only further strain our ability to produce an accurate count and provide for the equitable allocation of dollars and political seats determined by the census.

There are a number of populations that have historically been difficult to enumerate. These populations are considered "Hard to Count," meaning that these populations might be less likely, for a number of reasons to complete the census. Hard to Count populations include:

1. Children under age 5;
2. Rural populations;
3. Renters;
4. Ethnic and Racial minorities;
5. Highly mobile persons (not living in the same place for long);
6. LGBTQ+;
7. Individuals with disabilities;
8. Persons experiencing homelessness;
9. Non-English speakers;
10. Immigrants;
11. People who don't live in traditional housing;
12. People without access to the Internet;
13. Low-income individuals;
14. Reentering individuals or those with criminal records;
15. People who distrust the federal government.

The Census Bureau is also at risk of undercounting overseas military personnel due to new Department of Defense (DOD) procedures limiting the release of military records about U.S troops deployed to active combat/war zones.¹⁸ Although they have not typically been designated as a hard to count subgroup, 15% of those stationed abroad are at risk of being undercounted due to these new DOD policies.

Consistent, targeted outreach to these populations will be critical to achieving an accurate count for the United States. An accurate count, in turn, allows the federal government to enforce civil rights, apportion congressional seats, and to allocate federal funding. Further, this outreach must be grounded in a deep understanding of the concerns and barriers facing these populations.

Barriers to Census Participation

People from all walks of life trust the federal government less today than they ever have. Survey data from the Pew Research Center show that, as of March 2019, only 17% of people trust the federal government always or most of the time.¹⁹ As we approach Census 2020, this distrust serves as an important backdrop for the various other barriers that limit census participation.

Indeed, people don't participate in the census for a variety of reasons, distrust in government being one among many. The increased digitalization of the 2020 Census also creates additional challenges. According to the Census Barriers, Attitudes and Motivators focus group results gathered by the US Census bureau, most people's concerns fall into two categories: 1) attitudinal; and 2) operational.

Attitudinal Concerns

Lack of knowledge about the census was one of the key findings of focus groups. Many people do not understand the purpose of the decennial census and these attitudes can have an impact on the response rate. For example:

"It would help if somebody would explain to you what the census is used for... What's the benefit of being part of it? It's not been sold very well because nobody knows. It might as well be the IRS, you know." — Rural respondent²⁰

"[I would not fill it out] just for not wanting to do it. Just not feeling like it... It kind of seems like taking a survey or something. Almost kind of pointless, like it doesn't mean anything. It's not going to help anyways or do anything. It's more bothersome or more of a nuisance than anything, I guess." — Infrequent Internet User²¹

People don't know about the census—what the census is or even know who are the census people... You don't know if it's a legit government official or just some guy in a suit trying to rob you and take information... You know it's a cop, right? But you don't know if it is a government official and if it is, you're probably scared because you're like, 'Why are they at my door?' So it's like if you know who they are, you'd probably be scared of them and if you don't, you're still scared of them or you don't trust them." — Native American/Alaskan Native respondent²²

If Illinois residents believe the census is "just another form" that must be completed – and don't understand how money and power are allocated, they are less likely to fill it out.

Confidentiality and privacy concerns were among the highest areas of concerns among many different groups. For example:

"[Census information is shared] with the entire government. With everyone in the government...police, immigration, hospitals, everything, everything, everything. Everything is connected." Spanish-speaking respondent²³

"Every single scrap of information that the government gets goes to every single intelligence agency, that's how it works... individual-level data. Like, the city government gets information and then the FBI and then the CIA and then ICE and military." — Middle Eastern/North African respondent²⁴

“[Someone might choose not to participate because] it can come back and haunt them... Like if you get food stamps, you’re allowed to have three different households in one household and just declare it like that, but some people don’t understand that and they will be afraid that it’s going to affect their food stamp if they report somebody else is there.” — Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander respondent²⁵

For rural and African American communities in particular, respondents felt as though their communities were “left behind” and felt anger and frustration with the government, as well as powerlessness over their communities:

“They won’t ever come into the hood, give us stuff that we need, or give us anything. You go out where she at [a suburb] and you see parks and they get cleaned up, you see areas and centers and everything. Well, we have none of that. That’s why it be a thousand kids on the block every day... So many high schools been closed. [It’s connected to the census] because they not helping. They not giving us no money. Then they up there counting, taking counts for everybody for what?” — Black respondent²⁶

“A lot of small businesses have shut down over the years. All the old factories that used to be here 20 years ago are gone. You know, there’s just a few employers. The dropout rate is worse and worse all the time. The schools are not real good so a lot of kids, if they want to make a good living, they have to move away and if they stay, then they’re looking at going to Walmart or something like that... The drug use is real bad so I think my feeling is that it’s going backwards in terms of quality of life and community since the nineties.” — Rural respondent²⁷

Distrust of the government and what the Census Bureau will do with the sensitive information is of grave concern to many groups of people, including rural populations and African Americans. For example, a rural respondent indicated:

“I think it’s just a general distrust when it comes to anything that comes from the government...Whether you have a reason for it or not...there's just a general distrust”²⁸

Concerns about the citizenship question were apparent among immigrant groups as well as others:

“What I do know is that for this census, like it or not, a lot of people are afraid. It doesn’t matter if they ask you whether or not you’re a citizen. The first question they ask you, are you Hispanic or Latino? And that’s enough. That’s all they need. And people are scared.” — Spanish-speaking respondent²⁹

“There might be worry that if you fill in other people’s information... Like if you included your roommate, and they don’t have legal status, because I filled it in, it might cause them trouble.” — Chinese respondent³⁰

Even those who are not personally affected by the citizenship question raise concerns about how it might affect others:

“Personally I would still fill out the census if they asked me if I was a citizen, but I could see that someone who is not a citizen who is getting these forms from the government in the mail that are asking them if they are citizens. If I was an immigrant here, and I wasn’t a citizen that would

kind of freak me out. Getting that in the mail from the US government, I would feel like they would tie it back to me even though they said they wouldn't." — Youth respondent³¹

Operational Barriers

Concerns about online fraud and scams were a key issue for focus group respondents, particularly due to language barriers and the push to complete the form online. Many different groups are also worried about the safety of online interactions:

"Anytime you buy anything up there [online] now, you put your card number in. There's a chance it's going to get stolen. Anytime you put in a password and put in some kind of information, it could be stolen. You add your phone number on Facebook. They get into your phone... That's the point. It's not just with the census. It's with everything." — Rural respondent³²

"I just don't trust the Internet." — Chinese respondent³³

"And, what's going to happen to the information? Our Social Security numbers were just jeopardized thru Equifax, and lots of other information, and I get that that is a big problem, so I'm concerned about the protection." — Respondent with limited internet experience³⁴

"[Before I fill out a Census form, I would need] proof that they are from a government agency." — Chinese respondent³⁵

As mentioned, *language barriers* represent a real concern among households where English is not the primary language, especially among Asians/Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, perhaps because forms are routinely available in Spanish. For example:

"Yeah [it's okay if someone comes to the door to fill out the form]. Sometimes there's a language barrier. —Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander respondent³⁶

"Going online if it has Chinese then that's good." — Chinese respondent³⁷

Overcoming Concerns and Barriers

People reported feeling most motivated to complete the census by the prospect of benefits to their communities. These benefits include funding for community programs, education, infrastructure, and more:

"I think it's important to see that community and education is where everything, in my opinion, should start. I think education is incredibly important, especially at a younger age to older, from education a lot of things fall apart from there." — Youth respondent³⁸

"I think all of these services need to have consideration. The fire department, the police department, and the schools. They all need funding and they all need things...and our roads." — Infrequent Internet User³⁹

Some groups wanted specifically to be shown how the census benefits their community:

“[I would fill it out] because that data is going, going to impact my community... And if it’s not my community, because I die, then my grandchildren and my children.” — Spanish respondent (U.S. Mainland)⁴⁰

“[I’d fill it out because] in ten years, it should be they would’ve helped my kid with something at least. Yeah [I’d fill it out to help future generations].” — Black respondent⁴¹

“We will also think about the next generation. — Chinese respondent

“If they could include a letter like they’re saying that tells you what they use it for and then show some examples of what good has come from it in previous years...like the grants and, you know...encourage people that didn’t want to do it to do it.” — Rural respondent⁴²

“[I’m going to fill out the form because] I’ve been told many years about politics and everything, ‘Go get out there. Document what you’re saying. Vote. It means something. It’ll help. If you don’t write it down and you don’t make your voice heard, you won’t [see] nothing,’ and that’s where my mind is at. I’m hoping one day [that] whatever they say is going to help, maybe one day they’ll slip in and help us out some.” — Black respondent⁴³

Many communities stressed the importance of obtaining information about the census from trusted messengers. Examples of trusted voices were community-based organizations, libraries, schools, and local advocacy organizations, as well as activists, faith leaders, tribal officials, and other people deeply embedded in communities.

“I think the person that comes around, you know, they come around and give you the census, if they sold it to you, if they talked it up a little more. ‘Hey this might help the community, this might do that,’ you know, and explained it and took the time to explain it. I think that would help out a whole lot.” — Black respondent⁴⁴

“Those who are representing and helping the Hispanic communities [are people that could give me confidence they are not going to share my information]... Those who are independent [not politicians] are those who support all the Hispanics. Those who are now helping [with] DACA and all those young people.” — Spanish respondent (U.S. Mainland)⁴⁵

“Most definitely [my church would be a trustworthy messenger if I had concerns about filling out the census form].” — Rural respondent⁴⁶

“Probably tribal officials [are trusted people in the community], maybe, if they govern them, you know, at community meetings or chapter houses.” — American Indian/Alaskan Native respondent⁴⁷

“It’s one thing about the library, they are—they will tell you what you need to know.” — Infrequent Internet User⁴⁸

“If you’re like not used to a white person knocking at your door, you’re going to be less apt to answer the questions, you know? If you’re going to be asking questions of people, maybe sent—sorry, can’t talk—send out the same race. It makes it a little bit easier to talk to somebody that you kind of can open up to.” – American Indian/Alaska Native respondent⁴⁹

“Somebody from the neighborhood. Somebody born and raised in the city, knows the hardships, and something like that, not somebody that just got elected to be somebody.” – Black respondent⁵⁰

When trusted voices explain what the census means and how it can help communities, participation rates rise.

“[I went from ‘maybe or no’ to ‘yes’ I will participate] because I didn’t really know what the census was and now I know what it’s used for so now I will do it.” — Middle East/North African respondent⁵¹

“I learned a lot of things like, oh so this thing actually helps me, personally, or for the community, the entire society, it is a very positive thing. At least I can understand it now. So really, if you want people to do this census thing, you really need to work on making the promotions even more accessible. So that all these people will understand what this is really about. So, people will have a better understanding that doing this is actually for your personal well-being, and also for your kids to have a better future, and the community will also be better.” — Chinese respondent⁵²

PART II: WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR ILLINOIS

What do census dollars help fund in Illinois?

In Fiscal Year 2016 (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016), the federal government allocated funds to Illinois from federal spending programs that were guided by the 2010 census. Under the 55 largest programs, *nearly \$35 billion* was disbursed to the state of Illinois based on 2010 census data.⁵³ Adjusted for inflation this amounts to allocations of *\$36.2 billion* in 2019 dollars. The top five programs funded under this disbursement represent 70% of total allocations to the state.⁵⁴ These dollars provide funding for critical programs that assist residents with medical costs, student loans, supplemental nutrition and Medicare, as well as funding for highway planning and construction projects (Table 1). These funding allocations represented \$1,535 per person.⁵⁵ But this number cannot be used to calculate the per capita cost of an undercount because not all census dollars are allocated based on a count of the population. For many programs, census data simply determines if a *community* is even *eligible* for important federal financial contributions.⁵⁶ Examples include Rural Electrification loans, which are determined by population density, and Community Development Block Grants.⁵⁷ Other programs determine funding based on specific household characteristics like average income.⁵⁸ An accurate count will explicitly determine allocation levels for a few programs and will indirectly influence funding levels for many other associated programs. Medicaid is one such program that has a direct relationship to population undercounts.

Table 1: Allocation of Funds from the Highest Ranking Large Spending Programs⁵⁹

Program	FY2016
1. Medical Assistance Program (Medicaid)	\$12,064,086,000
2. Federal Direct Student Loans	\$4,580,206,425
3. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	\$3,040,976,772
4. Medicare Suppl. Insurance Program (Part B)	\$2,807,867,069
5. Highway Planning and Construction	\$1,530,790,690
Total (Five Programs)	\$24,023,926,956
All Funding	\$34,331,000,530

Undercount's Impact on Medicaid and Associated Programs

While we cannot calculate the impact of an undercount per person for all census-derived allocations, we can examine the impact of a 1 percent undercount on Medicaid or Federal Medical Assistance Percentages (FMAP)¹. In 2016 dollars, a 1% undercount would mean the loss of \$953 per Illinoisan, or \$1,016 in 2019 dollars.⁶⁰ Over 10 years this undercount would constitute a loss of \$10,160 per

¹ The five grant programs that require a state match. The five FMAP programs are Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, Title IV-E Foster Care, Title IV-E Adoption Assistance, and the Child Care and Development Fund. These federal dollars require a match by the state, for example a range of \$.50 to \$.78 for each dollar the state spends towards these programs. Illinois is one of two states – including Washington – that will reach the FMAP floor of \$.50 with a one percent undercount. Andrew Reamer, "COUNTING FOR DOLLARS 2020 The Role of the Decennial Census in the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds."

Illinoisan.⁶¹ In Illinois, an undercount of less than 1% would result in the 5th highest dollar loss in the nation: \$122,231,690 in 2015 dollars, and \$130,358,740.81 in 2019 dollars (Table 2).⁶² Put another way, Illinois would stand to lose more than \$1.34B in funding for Medicaid and FMAP programs alone from 2020 to 2030 (not adjusted for inflation), due to a less than 1% undercount in 2020.

²Table 2: Projected FY2015 Loss in FMAP-Based Program Funds Due to Additional 1% Undercount,⁶³

Rank	State	FMAP \$
1	Texas	\$291,908,615
2	Pennsylvania	\$221,762,564
3	Florida	\$177,848,466
4	Ohio	\$139,097,423
5	Illinois	\$122,231,690
6	Michigan	\$94,277,076
7	North Carolina	\$94,277,076
8	Missouri	\$76,194,260
9	Wisconsin	\$76,101,387
10	Tennessee	\$69,205,364

How will Illinois funding losses impact our rural communities?

Rural program funding is critical to the vitality and livability of rural communities. The census funds many important grants, loans and assistance programs in rural areas, for which an accurate count is vital. The largest of these include housing loans, rental assistance programs, electrification loans, water and waste disposal systems, and business and industry loans. Housing loans and rental assistance help ensure that people in rural areas of the country have safe, decent, and affordable housing. These programs alone required nearly \$20 Billion in FY2016.⁶⁴ Electrification loans allow residents of rural areas to access electric services comparable in quality to people in other parts of the country, and water and waste disposal systems ensure sanitary conditions and good health. Electrification and water/waste system programs received over \$5 Billion from the census in 2016.⁶⁵ Finally, business and industry loans help organizations, Indian tribes, and individuals in rural areas obtain loans to develop business, industry, and employment, and improve the economic and environmental climate in rural communities. Rural business and industry loans accounted for about \$1 Billion in 2016.³

One rural resident, speaking in the Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators study, explained the importance of census funding to rural areas in this way:

“My town receives grants based on how many people live in it for the trails they opened and small business grants and stuff. Absolutely [I feel like the census helps]. I pulled all the information before I opened my business in that town so I could have a profitable business or not, if there’s enough people to support it.”

² This does not include states that have already reached the FMAP floor of 50. See above table for these states.

Illinois Rural Communities Stand to Lose Millions

Among the 10 most populous states, Illinois ranks 6th in rural census funds spent per resident living in rural areas in 2016, accounting for more than 1.5M residents.⁶⁶ That year, Illinois received nearly half a billion dollars in funds crucial to the livelihoods, health, and well-being of people in Illinois’s rural areas, or \$282 per rural Illinoisan (\$311 adjusted for inflation).⁶⁷ Rural Illinois residents could lose millions in federal dollars as a result of a census undercount.

Below are the 10 most populous states ranked by census dollars spent per person in rural areas in 2016 (Table 3). Included are the six-program funding totals for each state, using the five programs described above (electrification, housing, etc.), as well as the Cooperative Extension Service program.

Table 3: 10 Most Populous States by Rural Census Expenditure Per Capita, 2016⁶⁸

\$ Rank	State	2016 Population	% Population Rural	Six-Program Total	Rural Per Capita
1	Georgia	10,310,371	24.90%	\$1,435,939,900	\$ 559
2	Florida	20,612,439	8.80%	\$907,186,691	\$ 500
3	North Carolina	10,146,788	33.90%	\$1,369,804,196	\$ 398
4	California	39,250,017	5.10%	\$699,074,262	\$ 349
5	Michigan	9,928,300	25.40%	\$862,138,937	\$ 342
6	Illinois	12,801,539	11.50%	\$425,304,806	\$ 289
7	Ohio	11,614,373	22.10%	\$717,437,349	\$ 280
8	Pennsylvania	12,784,227	21.30%	\$760,728,267	\$ 279
9	Texas	27,862,596	15.30%	\$957,457,542	\$ 225
10	New York	19,745,289	12.10%	\$306,660,667	\$ 128 ⁶⁹

PART III: UNDERSTANDING ILLINOIS' HARD TO COUNT POPULATIONS

Hard to Count populations, described in Part I, live throughout Illinois and are at risk of being undercounted again in 2020. During the 2010 census, only 76% of Illinois' population returned the census surveys they received—referred to as a “response rate.”⁷⁰ About 16% of Illinois' population lives in Hard to Count census tracts, localities where fewer than 73% of people returned their surveys.⁷¹

Shown below are the 20 counties in Illinois with the lowest response scores on the 2010 Census (Table 4). These counties contain the hardest to count communities in the state and warrant considerable attention for an accurate count.⁷² Of these, high non-response rates are found in urban counties (Cook 25%) as well as rural counties (Alexander 23%), all throughout Illinois.⁷³

Table 4: Top 20 Illinois Counties by Lowest Response Rate on 2010 Census

Rank	County	%Low Response
1	Cook	25%
2	Jackson	23%
3	Champaign	23%
4	Alexander	23%
5	St. Clair	23%
6	DeKalb	22%
7	Kankakee	21%
8	Pulaski	21%
9	Kane	21%
10	Peoria	21%
11	Winnebago	21%
12	McDonough	20%
13	McLean	20%
14	Rock Island	20%
15	Cass	20%
16	Boone	19%
17	Vermillion	19%
18	Coles	19%
19	Brown	19%
20	Sangamon	19%

Illinois Residents without Broadband

Because the 2020 Census will be, for the most part, conducted online, we examined the 10 most populous states in the nation in terms of the number and percent of residents who lack reliable Internet access in their homes. Of these largest states, Illinois ranked 4th in both number and percentage of residents lacking Internet access (over 2M and 16% respectively) (Table 5).⁷⁴

The Illinois county with the lowest degree of home internet access was Alexander (65% no internet)⁷⁵. In total, there are 14 Illinois counties where at least 40% of the population lacked Internet access (Table 6). In more than one fifth of Illinois counties (22), at least one-third of residents lacked internet access.⁷⁶

Although the Census Bureau has plans to reach rural populations, the number of national enumerators has dropped by one-third from the last census (from 600,000 to 400,000 planned hires).⁷⁷ Because the labor market is relatively tight, census hiring has been slowed significantly. This makes reaching geographically isolated rural populations harder, and leaves those without internet access at significant risk of being undercounted.

Table 5: Rank of Top 10 Most Populous States by Population Without Internet⁷⁸

Rank	State	%No Internet	2018 Est. Population	Pop. w/out Internet
1	Texas	20.0%	28,701,845	5,740,369
2	California	9.5%	39,559,045	3,758,109
3	New York	10.8%	19,542,209	2,110,559
4	Illinois	16.0%	12,741,080	2,038,573
5	Florida	9.4%	21,299,325	2,002,137
6	Michigan	18.7%	9,998,915	1,869,797
7	Georgia	17.6%	10,519,475	1,851,428
8	Pennsylvania	13.6%	12,807,060	1,741,760
9	Ohio	14.8%	11,689,442	1,730,037
10	North Carolina	14.6%	10,383,620	1,516,009

Table 6: Top 10 Illinois Counties by % Lacking Internet Access⁷⁹

Rank	County	% No Internet
1	Alexander	65%
2	De Witt	56%
3	Hardin	50%
4	Scott	50%
5	Greene	44%
6	Cumberland	40%
7	Gallatin	40%
8	Hamilton	40%
9	Henderson	40%
10	Perry	40%

Other Hard to Count Populations in Illinois

Although we cannot rank all of Illinois Hard to Count populations as compared to other states, we can look at specific Hard to Count groups, such as African Americans, Latinx, and children under age 5. Illinois ranks sixth in the nation in the number of Hard to Count Populations living in Hard to Count census tracts. These three population groups (Latinx, African Americans, and young children) living in

Hard to Count areas accounted for more than 13% of Illinois' population and represented more than 1,669,000 residents in 2016 (the most recent year for which data were available).⁸⁰

Black Americans

Black Americans are the most undercounted racial group. Black Americans have the least knowledge of the census compared to other groups and often distrust the federal government. Additionally, Black Americans are over-represented in other hard-to-count subgroups: children aged 0-5, renters, precariously housed, and low-income status. Black poverty plays a role within many of these groups, and likely exacerbates the possibility of an undercount. About 2.1% of the Black American population nationwide is undercounted, and more than 10% of Black Men aged 30-49 are undercounted.⁸¹

Forty percent of African Americans in Illinois live in Hard to Count Tracts, which amounts to approximately 820,000 residents (Table 7).⁸² Illinois ranks sixth among all states by number of African Americans living in HTC tracts. Within Illinois, five counties are more than 20% Black: Alexander, Pulaski, St. Clair, Cook, and Lawrence (Table 9).⁸³ In Chicago alone, 500,000 African Americans reside in HTC tracts, ranking second among all cities with large African American populations (Table 8).⁸⁴

Table 7: States with the Highest Number of African Americans⁸⁵

Rank	Place	AA Total	#AA in HTC Tracts	% AA in HTC Tracts
1	New York	3,344,602	2,223,383	66.5%
2	Texas	3,390,604	1,179,455	34.8%
3	Florida	3,401,179	1,051,690	30.9%
4	California	2,710,216	1,025,100	37.8%
5	Georgia	3,212,824	1,024,076	31.9%
6	Illinois	1,972,360	819,560	41.6%
7	Louisiana	1,528,695	740,277	48.4%
8	New Jersey	1,314,132	670,018	51.0%
9	Pennsylvania	1,561,343	669,746	42.9%
10	Ohio	1,585,347	639,248	40.3%

Table 8: Cities with the Largest Number of African Americans in Hard to Count Tracts⁸⁶

Rank	Place	AA Population	#AA in HTC Tracts	%AA in HTC Tracts
1	New York City	2,194,096	1,597,657	72.8%
2	Chicago	878,304	585,458	66.7%
3	Philadelphia	691,427	465,741	67.4%
4	Detroit	562,887	335,423	59.6%
5	Memphis	413,971	260,425	62.9%
6	Houston	499,678	208,166	41.7%
7	New Orleans	227,363	195,079	85.8%
8	Dallas	320,987	188,933	58.9%
9	Los Angeles	393,076	185,035	47.1%
10	Milwaukee	249,340	178,490	71.6%

Table 9: Top 10 Illinois Counties by %African American⁸⁷

Rank	County	%Black
1	Alexander	34%
2	Pulaski	32%
3	St. Clair	30%
4	Cook	24%
5	Lawrence	20%
6	Peoria	17%
7	Brown	16%
8	Kankakee	15%
9	Macon	15%
10	Jackson	14%

Latinx

Latinx residents constitute a significant Hard to Count group in Illinois and around the country. In the 2010 Census, Latinxs were undercounted by 1.54%, due to factors like poverty, mobility, precarious housing and distrust in the government.⁸⁸ Survey results from the Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators Study (CBAMS) show that Latinxs fear that census information will be used against them, or shared with other government agencies, including ICE.⁸⁹ These fears have only increased in the lead up to the 2020 Census, due to rhetoric used by the federal government around immigration issues and, in particular, the proposed addition of a citizenship question to the census.

Nearly 700,000, or about one-third of Illinois' Latinx residents, live in Hard to Count tracts (Table 10).⁹⁰ Within Illinois, a greater share of Kane County's residents are Latinx than any other county's (31%). Kane is followed by Cook, Lake, and Boone counties (Table 12).⁹¹ More than 60% of Latinx Chicagoans live in Hard to Count tracts, a greater share than most large cities in the country (Table 11).⁹² With the citizenship question left unresolved, these individuals are at an even higher risk of being undercounted in the 2020 Census than in previous censuses.

Table 10: States with the Highest Number of Latinx Residents Living in Hard to Count Tracts⁹³

Rank	State	Latinx Total	#Latinx in HTC Tracts	%Latinx HTC Tracts
1	California	14,750,686	5,063,956	34.3%
2	Texas	10,196,367	3,397,490	33.3%
3	New York	3,619,658	1,951,436	53.9%
4	Arizona	2,014,711	895,637	44.5%
5	Florida	4,660,733	734,513	15.8%
6	Illinois	2,122,841	695,907	32.8%
7	New Jersey	1,688,008	687,467	40.7%
8	New Mexico	986,972	520,751	52.8%
9	Massachusetts	707,928	386,119	54.5%
10	Georgia	915,120	334,690	36.6%

Table 11: Top 10 Cities with Number of Latinx in Hard to Count Tracts⁹⁴

Rank	Place	Latinx	#Latinx HTC Tracts	%Latino in HTC Tracts
1	New York City	2,437,297	1,398,360	57.4%
2	Los Angeles	1,899,421	802,652	42.3%
3	Chicago	790,621	479,496	60.6%
4	Phoenix	626,943	342,041	54.6%
5	Honolulu (CDP)	950,600	324,041	34.1%
6	Dallas	527,287	245,826	46.6%
7	San Antonio	890,855	199,512	22.4%
8	San Diego	411,035	189,309	46.1%
9	Santa Ana	246,512	165,079	67.0%
10	Austin	313,012	156,175	49.9%

Table 12: Top 10 Illinois Counties by %Latinx⁹⁵

Rank	County	%Latinx
1	Kane	31%
2	Cook	25%
3	Lake	21%
4	Boone	20%
5	Cass	18%
6	Kendall	17%
7	Will	16%
8	DuPage	14%
9	Rock Island	12%
10	McHenry	12%

Children Under Age 5

Children ages 0-5 were undercounted in the 2010 Census and face the prospect of another undercount in 2020. Young children are missed due to errors made by respondents and enumerators alike. Young children living in hard to count communities pose additional challenges. Not only are these children most likely to be undercounted, they are also more likely than older children to live in households with a variety of other hard to count characteristics. As with other hard to count groups, poverty often plays a key role.⁹⁶

Children under age five, regardless of their race, where they live, or other factors, are the most undercounted population group. Nearly 20% (more than 150,000) of Illinois' children live in Hard to Count Tracts (Table 13).⁹⁷ Within Illinois, Kendall County's population has the highest proportion of children under age five at 8% (Table 15).⁹⁸ Counties with high proportions of children under five are located all around the state. Among cities nationwide, Chicago has the second highest number of children living in HTC census tracts – nearly 55% of children under age 5, representing more than 100,000 young kids (Table 14).⁹⁹

Table 13: States with the Highest Number of Children Under Age Five¹⁰⁰

Rank	State	Children	#Children in HTC Tracts	% Children in HTC Tracts
1	California	2,511,776	755,614	30.1%
2	Texas	1,951,305	565,391	29.0%
3	New York	1,176,432	503,626	42.8%
4	Florida	1,081,057	205,237	19.0%
5	Georgia	665,305	171,794	25.8%
6	Illinois	801,195	153,826	19.2%
7	Arizona	433,835	149,973	34.6%
8	New Jersey	533,644	149,355	28.0%
9	Louisiana	309,966	113,773	36.7%
10	Ohio	695,996	106,217	15.3%

Table 14: Top 10 Cities with Number of Children in Hard to Count Tracts¹⁰¹

Rank	Place	Children	#Children in HTC Tracts	% Children in HTC Tracts
1	New York	555,811	347,446	62.5%
2	Chicago	183,479	100,980	55.0%
3	Los Angeles	249,705	99,721	39.9%
4	Philadelphia	107,711	64,882	60.2%
5	Houston	166,577	64,441	38.7%
6	Phoenix	114,272	55,006	48.1%
7	Dallas	102,111	52,957	51.9%
8	San Diego	87,151	35,061	40.2%
9	Memphis	49,867	33,989	68.2%
10	Detroit	48,733	33,890	69.5%

Table 15: Top 10 Illinois Counties by % Children Under Five¹⁰²

Rank	County	%Under 5
1	Kendall	8%
2	Kane	7%
3	Peoria	7%
4	Alexander	7%
5	Douglas	7%
6	Vermillion	7%
7	Cook	6%
8	St. Clair	6%
9	Rock Island	6%
10	Grundy	6%

PART FOUR: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

How can we overcome barriers to census participation?

1. *Ensure that Census 2020 participation messaging and outreach is tied to community benefits.*

Research has shown that many people lack a clear understanding of what the Census is, how the information is used and what federal-level political and funding decisions are tied to the data. When crafting messages encouraging census participation for both the general and Hard-to-Count populations, it is critical that the messages also serve as educational tools to help people understand why their participation is so critical. While appeals to civic duty and civic participation may be a motivating factor for some people, others will be better influenced by concrete examples of how their participation in the census directly leads to funding decisions. Where possible, help residents understand the link between their lack of participation and loss of real dollars for needed health and human services, education and infrastructure development. This is federal money spent by the states on schools, hospitals, roads, public works and other vital programs. Our communities can't afford to lose those dollars.

The community benefits go beyond just the lost funding, although that is an important point to emphasize. According to the U.S. Census Bureau website, a lot of decisions that will directly impact residents' lives come from Census data. They note:

“Businesses use census data to decide where to build factories, offices and stores, and this creates jobs. Developers use the census to build new homes and revitalize old neighborhoods. Local governments use the census for public safety and emergency preparedness. Residents use the census to support community initiatives involving legislation, quality-of-life and consumer advocacy.”¹⁰³

Additionally, state and local governments can use census data to plan their public health programs, design their transportation plans and networks, and determine where to build new public institutions such as schools, police and fire departments and hospitals. This information forms the foundation of our community decision-making. For example, if we want to build a new nonprofit hospital in a community with a large percentage of people living in low income households, we need to have an accurate understanding of the communities in our state that fit that profile. This information comes from the Census. If we lose this information and instead base our planning and development on an assumption of where these families live, we risk putting this hospital in the wrong town, or even the wrong region. That doesn't help anyone and is a tremendous waste of resources. This is why it is critical that residents understand their role in supplying census data. The Census isn't just a piece of paper they fill out every 10 years – it is their critical contribution to effective and efficient planning and governance.

2. *Ensure that Census 2020 messages come from trusted voices.*

distrust is a common theme limiting census participation, especially among Hard to Count communities. The Census Bureau's 2020 Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators Study Survey Report signified declining trust in public institutions and government agencies – they then drew associations between distrust and poor census participation.¹⁰⁴ Managing distrust and minimizing its impact on census-survey response rates requires that Census 2020

messages are carried out and delivered to HTC residents by trusted community-based representatives, organizations, and institutions. Securing an accurate count of Illinois' population demands a sensitivity to the origins of distrust and skepticism prevalent in Hard to Count areas. Hence, messaging and outreach campaigns must be clearly tied to organizations familiar to HTC residents whom demonstrate an understanding of community concerns and uncertainties about census surveys. Leveraging trust found in authentic relationships between community-members and locally involved entities is crucial to countering misconceptions about the census and producing an accurate count.

3. *Ensure that Census 2020 messages are hyperlocal and tied specifically to your targeted community or population.*

Promoting participation depends on a messengers' ability to express the importance of census data to specific communities. Outreach campaigns must be relevant to the communities being addressed in that they reflect cultural competence in considering the wants and needs of community-members. Doing so requires that messengers are deeply aware of the history of individual communities, their demographic makeup, their political involvement, and their financial and social stability. This knowledge will help organizations participating in outreach campaigns construct Census 2020 messages that are as effective as possible in encouraging census-survey participation.

How should we fund Census 2020 education and outreach activities?

1. *Ensure the appropriation of funding at the state and local level for trusted community leaders and organizations.*

4. Considering all of the barriers, the difference in the census and the amount of money and power that the State of Illinois would lose if there is, in fact a 1% undercount in Medicaid funding alone, an amount of \$2.5 per capita is a reasonable appropriation. This amount would be \$33M to ensure an accurate count. While this may seem like a generous appropriation, \$33M is just 27% of what Illinois stands to lose in Medicaid funding in just one year (\$122M) if there is even a 1% undercount, or less than 3% over a decade.

2. *Ensure that adequate funds are targeted to Hard-To-Count populations.*

Prioritize the distribution of funds and resources to Hard to Count (HTC) communities in Illinois. Hard to Count communities demonstrate lower rates of participation in census surveys and are therefore areas where money and capital can have the greatest impact in increasing census response rates. If these communities do not receive targeted financial and material support for the census they are more likely to be adversely impacted by an undercount, given existing inequities that already affect their political representation, and economic and social well-being.

Providing targeted funds and resources to Hard to Count communities will also require the identification and cooperation of local community-based organizations and institutions whom HTC residents trust and rely upon as advocates and supporters.

3. *Create a fair and transparent process for the selection and distribution of grant funds.*

Transparency is of fundamental importance to the appropriate distribution of funds to the communities with the most demonstrated need. The criteria for the grants evaluation process used

by the grant-making panel must be public. Information about the grantees including their names, the amount which they were awarded, and a description of their proposed census outreach strategies must be publicly accessible. Grant application reviewers must also be selected in a manner that eliminates the likelihood that conflicts of interest between grantors and grantees will emerge.

4. *Involve community experts in the determination of grant allocations.*

In determining where grants should be distributed, the grant-making panel should be composed of individuals keenly aware of, and sensitive to the challenges of Illinois' Hard to Count communities. On that basis, panel members will possess the relevant knowledge and expertise to determine which grantee organizations qualify for grant-funding based on their cultural competence, their capacity to carry out effective census outreach, and the authenticity of their relationships to residents from HTC communities. Expert panelists must also have prior grant-making experience.

5. *Ensure that the Illinois Complete Count Commission is funded.*

While two positions were designated to be filled under the legislation that created the Illinois Complete Count Commission (CCC), Illinois did not appropriate money for either of these positions and no monies were allocated for operational expenses. Moving forward, it is essential that these positions as well as operational costs are funded. This funding will allow for coordination of all census related activities around the state. As Complete Count Committees form across the state the Illinois CCC can help to ensure that there are no duplication or replication of efforts, as well as providing guidance and training – as well as elevating emerging practices to reach HTC populations – is a necessary and a good use of funding. Half a million dollars would be a worthwhile investment to ensure an accurate count in Illinois.

APPENDIX A

Illinois Census Funding FY16 by Line

Illinois Funding Total¹⁰⁵	FY 2016		\$34,331,000,530
By Line Item			
1) Financial Assistance Programs (52)	CFDA	Dept.	\$33,785,591,013
Medical Assistance Program (Medicaid)	93.778	HHS	\$12,064,086,000
Federal Direct Student Loans	84.268	ED	\$4,580,206,425
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	10.551	USDA	\$3,040,976,772
Medicare Supplemental Medical Insurance (Part B)	93.774	HHS	\$2,807,867,069
Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	DOT	\$1,530,790,690
Federal Pell Grant Program	84.063	ED	\$1,071,400,000
Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers	14.871	HUD	\$926,672,000
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	93.558	HHS	\$585,056,960
Very Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans	10.410	USDA	\$309,755,034
Title I Grants to LEAs	84.010	ED	\$682,473,823
State Children's Health Insurance Program	93.767	HHS	\$406,234,000
National School Lunch Program	10.555	USDA	\$462,430,000
Special Education Grants	84.027	ED	\$518,151,872
Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program	14.195	HUD	\$577,672,564
Federal Transit Formula Grants	20.507	DOT	\$665,084,000
Head Start	93.600	HHS	\$371,806,665
Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	10.557	USDA	\$228,504,000
Title IV-E Foster Care	93.658	HHS	\$192,514,554
Health Care Centers	93.527/224	HHS	\$185,439,292
School Breakfast Program	10.553	USDA	\$139,126,000
Rural Electrification Loans and Loan Guarantees	10.850	USDA	\$0
Public and Indian Housing	14.850	HUD	\$240,899,000
Low Income Home Energy Assistance	93.568	HHS	\$166,338,155
Child and Adult Care Food Program	10.558	USDA	\$146,784,000
Vocational Rehabilitation Grants to the States	84.126	ED	\$112,743,914
Child Care Mandatory and Matching Funds	93.596	HHS	\$123,961,000
Unemployment Insurance Administration	17.225	DOL	\$158,078,000
Federal Transit - Capital Investment Grants	20.500	DOT	\$209,207,504
Child Care and Development Block Grant	93.575	HHS	\$95,660,000
Adoption Assistance	93.659	HHS	\$79,787,829
Community Facilities Loans and Grants	10.766	USDA	\$15,065,200
Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants	84.367	ED	\$98,039,040
Crime Victim Assistance	16.575	DOJ	\$87,163,624
Community Development Block Grants/Entitlement Grants	14.218	HUD	\$122,994,870
Public Housing Capital Fund	14.872	HUD	\$116,674,000

Block Grants for the Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse	93.959	HHS	\$67,645,777
Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Rural Communities	10.760	USDA	\$73,132,300
Social Services Block Grant	93.667	HHS	\$63,645,969
Rural Rental Assistance Payments	10.427	USDA	\$29,827,867
Business and Industry Loans	10.768	USDA	\$432,000
Career and Technical Education - Basic Grants to States	84.048	ED	\$40,259,027
Homeland Security Grant Program	97.067	DHS	\$84,775,583
WIOA Dislocated Worker Formula Grants	17.278	DOL	\$57,705,690
Home Investment Partnerships Program	14.239	HUD	\$40,194,840
State Community Development Block Grant	14.228	HUD	\$26,552,917
WIOA Youth Activities	17.259	DOL	\$40,003,397
WIOA Adult Activities	17.258	DOL	\$41,165,194
Employment Service/Wagner-Peyser Funded Activities	17.207	DOL	\$29,145,545
Community Services Block Grant	93.569	HHS	\$33,621,110
Special Programs for the Aging, Title III, Part C, Nutrition Services	93.045	HHS	\$25,682,336
Cooperative Extension Service	10.500	USDA	\$12,157,605
Native American Employment and Training	17.265	DOL	\$0
2) Federal Tax Expenditures (2)			\$464,807,970
Low Income Housing Tax Credit			\$345,749,925
New Markets Tax Credit			\$119,058,045
3) Federal Procurement Programs (1)			\$80,601,547
HUBZones Program			\$80,601,547

¹ Newsroom Archive, US Census Bureau, "\$1.6 Billion in 2010 Census Savings Returned," August 10, 2010, https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010_census/cb10-cn70.html.

² Associated Press, "Census Says Its 2010 Count Was Close, but Not Perfect," *New York Times* (New York, NY), May 22, 2012, <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/23/us/census-says-its-2010-count-was-close-but-not-perfect.html>.

³ Marisa Hotchkiss and Jessica Phelan, US Census Bureau, *Uses of Census Bureau Data in Federal Funds Distribution: A New Design for the 21st Century*, September 2017, <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf>.

⁴ National Conference of State Legislators, "2010 Census: Gains and Losses in Congressional Seats," <http://www.ncsl.org/research/redistricting/spotlight-census-2010.aspx>

⁵ Maria Ines Zamudio, "Population Loss In Illinois Is Driven By Larger Numbers Of People Leaving For Other States," *WBEZ* (Chicago, IL), January 15, 2019, <https://www.wbez.org/shows/wbez-news/population-loss-in-illinois-is-driven-by-larger-numbers-of-people-leaving-for-other-states/f1bf43a4-0e93-407c-8240-7c3b9d58547b>.

⁶ Committee on the Budget, "These Are Our Numbers – The Importance of the 2020 Census," January 31, 2019, <https://budget.house.gov/sites/democrats.budget.house.gov/files/documents/Census%20Report%201.31.19.pdf>.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ NAACP, "NAACP Makes Public New Documents About Census 2020 Preparations," February 25, 2019, <https://www.naacp.org/latest/naacp-makes-public-new-documents-2020-census-preparations/>.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Committee on the Budget, "These Are Our Numbers."

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Jacqueline Thompson, "Census Bureau's Chief Scientist Warned Secretary in Memo Against Adding Citizenship Question," *The Hill* (Washington, D.C.), June 10, 2018, <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/391527-census-bureau-official-warned-in-memo-against-adding-citizenship>.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Hazel, "April 5, 2019 Opinion by U.S. District Judge George Hazel - Document Viewer : NPR, <https://apps.npr.org/documents/document.html?id=5796349-April-5-2019-Opinion-by-U-S-District-Judge.>"

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ US Census Bureau, History, "Title 13, US Code," https://www.census.gov/history/www/reference/privacy_confidentiality/title_13_us_code.html

¹⁷ Committee on the Budget, "These Are Our Numbers."

¹⁸ Hansi Lo Wang, "Restrictions on Deployed US Troop Data Could Put 2020 Census 'At Risk'," *NPR WBEZ* (Chicago, IL), February 25, 2019, <https://www.npr.org/2019/02/25/697315761/restrictions-on-deployed-u-s-troop-data-could-put-2020-census-at-risk>.

¹⁹ Pew Research Center, "Public Trust in Government: 1958 – 2019," <https://www.people-press.org/2019/04/11/public-trust-in-government-1958-2019/>.

²⁰ Sarah Evans, et al., United States Census Bureau, *2020 Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators Study (CBAMS) Focus Group Final Report: A New Design for the 21st Century*, January 24, 2019.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Andrew Reamer, GW Institute of Public Policy, The George Washington University, "Counting for Dollars 2020: The Role of the Decennial Census in the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds: Illinois," https://gwipp.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2181/f/downloads/IPP-1819-3%20CountingforDollars_IL.pdf.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Andrew Reamer, GW Institute of Public Policy, The George Washington University, "Counting for Dollars 2020: 16 Large Federal Assistance Programs That Distribute Funds on Basis of Decennial Census-Derived Statistics (Fiscal Year 2015): Illinois," <https://gwipp.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2181/f/downloads/Illinois%2008-18-17.pdf>."

⁵⁶ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "Counting For Dollars: Why It Matters," <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/census/CountingForDollars-Intro.pdf>."

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Reamer, "Counting for Dollars: Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds."

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Reamer, "Counting for Dollars: Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds: Illinois."

⁶⁴ Hotchkiss and Phelan, *Uses of Census Bureau Data in Federal Funds Distribution*.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

-
- ⁶⁶ Andrew Reamer, GW Institute of Public Policy, The George Washington University, "Counting for Dollars 2020: Federal Funding for Rural America: The Importance of the Decennial Census," December 2018, <https://gwipp.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2181/f/downloads/Counting%20for%20Dollars%233%20Federal%20Funds%20for%20Rural%20America%2012-18.pdf>.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ US Census Bureau, Data, "2010 Census Participation Rates," <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2010/dec/2010-participation-rates.html>.
- ⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁷² Sombiri Enwemeka, Krista Mar, and Robert Deng, "Hard to Count 2020: Visualizing Hard to Count Communities for the US 2020 Census," http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~sombiri/final_proj/.
- ⁷³ Ibid.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ NAACP, "NAACP Makes Public New Documents About 2020 Census Preparations."
- ⁷⁸ Enwemeka, et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ US Census Bureau, "2010 Census Participation Rates."
- ⁸¹ Newsroom Archive, US Census Bureau, "Census Bureau Releases Estimates of Undercount and Overcount in the 2010 Census," May 22, 2010.
- ⁸² "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of African Americans (Race Alone or in Combination*) Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**," 1.
- ⁸³ Enwemeka, et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁸⁴ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Places Ranked by Number of African Americans (Race Alone or in Combination*) Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁸⁵ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of African Americans (Race Alone or in Combination*) Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁸⁶ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Places Ranked by Number of African Americans (Race Alone or in Combination*) Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁸⁷ Enwemeka, et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁸⁸ Office, "Census Bureau Releases Estimates of Undercount and Overcount in the 2010 Census - 2010 Census - Newsroom - U.S. Census Bureau."
- ⁸⁹ Evans et al., 2020 CBAMS Focus Groups.
- ⁹⁰ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of Hispanics* Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁹¹ Enwemeka et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁹² The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Places Ranked by Number of Hispanics* Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁹³ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of Hispanics* Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁹⁴ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Places Ranked by Number of Hispanics* Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts**."
- ⁹⁵ Enwemeka et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁹⁶ US Census Bureau, *Investigating the 2010 Undercount of Young Children – Summary of Recent Research*, February 14, 2019, <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/final-analysis-reports/2020-report-2010-undercount-children-summary-recent-research.pdf>.
- ⁹⁷ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of Children Under Age 5 Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts."
- ⁹⁸ Enwemeka et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ⁹⁹ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Cities (Places) Ranked by Number of Children Under Age 5 Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts."
- ¹⁰⁰ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 1a: States Ranked by Number of Children Under Age 5 Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts."
- ¹⁰¹ The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "TABLE 2a: 100 Largest Cities (Places) Ranked by Number of Children Under Age 5 Living in Hard-to-Count (HTC) Census Tracts."
- ¹⁰² Enwemeka et al., "Hard to Count 2020."
- ¹⁰³ "About the Decennial Census." Retrieved online from: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/why.html>
- ¹⁰⁴ Kyle McGeeney et al., US Census Bureau "2020 Census Barriers Attitudes and Motivators Study Survey Report: A New Design for the 21st Century," January 24, 2019, <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/final-analysis-reports/2020-report-cbams-study-survey.pdf>; Evans, 2020 CBAMS Focus Groups.
- ¹⁰⁵ Prepared by Andrew Reamer, GW Institute of Public Policy, George Washington University; Program spending data research by Sean Moulton, Project on Government Oversight; released December 2018.