## 2020 Census Self-Response Rates by Risk of Undercounting Young Children October 8, 2020 to October 16, 2020

Table 1. Average 2020 Census Self-Response Rates and Average Change in Self-Response Rates Across Census Tracts, by Risk of Undercounting Young Children, October 8, 2020 to October 16, 2020

Average percentage-

|  | Average percentage- <br> point change in |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average tract- <br> level response <br> response rate (10/8- <br> rate (10/16) | 66.8 | 0.21 |
| All Census Tracts in the United States | 68.6 | 0.23 |
| All Census Tracts in Large Counties* | 73.9 | 0.18 |
| Census Tracts with a Low Risk of Undercounting Young Children | 70.0 | 0.22 |
| Census Tracts with a High Risk of Undercounting Young Children | 61.7 | 0.29 |
| Census Tracts with a Very High Risk of Undercounting Young Children |  |  |

*Large counties are 689 counties that had at least 5,000 children ages 0-4 in 2010.

Table 2a. Twenty Counties With the Largest Numbers of Young Children Living in Very-High-Risk Census Tracts and 2020 Census Self-Response Rates in Those Counties, October 16, 2020


| Average 2020 Census Response Rates Across <br> Census Tracts, by County |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| All census tracts in the U.S. | $\mathbf{6 6 . 8}$ |
| Los Angeles County, California | 65.1 |
| Harris County, Texas | 62.0 |
| Miami-Dade County, Florida | 64.7 |
| Cook County, Illinois | 66.1 |
| Kings County, New York | 57.9 |
| Queens County, New York | 61.3 |
| Bronx County, New York | 61.5 |
| Dallas County, Texas | 64.5 |
| Broward County, Florida | 65.0 |
| Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania | 57.0 |
| Maricopa County, Arizona | 68.4 |
| Hidalgo County, Texas | 55.4 |
| Orange County, California | 77.4 |
| Wayne County, Michigan | 65.4 |
| San Diego County, California | 74.0 |
| San Bernardino County, California | 66.7 |
| El Paso County, Texas | 65.6 |
| Santa Clara County, California | 78.1 |
| Bexar County, Texas | 66.6 |
| Riverside County, California | 67.5 |
| Note: Green shading = At or above the national average. |  |
| Red shading = below the national average. |  |

[^0]Table 2b. Twenty Counties with the Largest Shares of Young Children Living in Very-High-Risk Census Tracts and $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Census Self-Response Rates in Those Counties, October 16, 2020


| Average 2020 Census Response Rates Across <br> Census Tracts, by County |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| All census tracts in the U.S. | $\mathbf{6 6 . 8}$ |
| Starr County, Texas | 48.2 |
| Miami-Dade County, Florida | 64.7 |
| Bronx County, New York | 61.5 |
| Apache County, Arizona | 24.3 |
| Webb County, Texas | 50.9 |
| Hidalgo County, Texas | 55.4 |
| El Paso County, Texas | 65.6 |
| Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania | 57.0 |
| Suffolk County, Massachusetts | 60.9 |
| Broward County, Florida | 65.0 |
| Queens County, New York | 61.3 |
| Richmond city, Virginia | 62.9 |
| Portsmouth city, Virginia | 64.9 |
| Baltimore city, Maryland | 55.7 |
| Passaic County, New Jersey | 67.1 |
| Essex County, New Jersey | 61.0 |
| Hudson County, New Jersey | 60.2 |
| Cameron County, Texas | 54.0 |
| Orleans Parish, Louisiana | 58.8 |
| Cumberland County, New Jersey | 64.2 |

Note: Green shading = At or above the national average. Red shading = below the national average.

## About these estimates:

The estimated risk of undercount for young children is based on PRB's analysis of ACS estimates and the U.S. Census Bureau's Revised 2018 Experimental Demographic Analysis Estimates for young children. Data are based on 2020 Census tract boundaries.

For a detailed description of the methods and data sources used to predict child undercount risk, please refer to William P. O'Hare, Linda A. Jacobsen, Mark Mather, \& Alicia VanOrman, Predicting Tract-level Net Undercount Risk for Young Children report available on PRB's website:
https://www.prb.org/new-strategies-to-reduce-undercount-of-young-children-in-2020-census/
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