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## FINAL REPORT

This evaluation reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau. It is part of a broad program, the Census 2000 Testing, Experimentation, and Evaluation (TXE) Program, designed to assess Census 2000 and to inform 2010 Census planning. Findings from the Census 2000 TXE Program reports are integrated into topic reports that provide context and background for broader interpretation of results.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The response rate is a measure that represents the percentage of addresses eligible for Nonresponse Followup that returned questionnaires prior to the designation of the Nonresponse Followup universe. Response rates are the result of a combination of the level of respondent cooperation in Census 2000, the housing unit vacancy rate, and the quality of the Decennial Master Address File.

Preliminary analysis indicates that self-enumerated returns have a lower imputation rate than enumerator returns. ${ }^{1}$ Due to the higher level of data quality and the lower cost associated with self-enumerated responses relative to enumerator-collected responses, it is important for response rates to be as high as possible.

The mail response rate is defined as the number of mail returns received prior to the cut date for the Nonresponse Followup universe divided by the total number of housing units in mailback areas that were eligible for Nonresponse Followup. The final response rate is similar but includes all mail returns through the end of the year. Mail returns included in the response rates are actual paper questionnaires, interviews during the Telephone Questionnaire Assistance program, Internet data captures, Be Counted forms, and Coverage Edit Followup returns.

The mail response rate is different from the mail return rate. The mail return rate is essentially a measure of the percentage of occupied housing units that returned their questionnaires by April 18, 2000. It is a more useful rate for determining respondent cooperation and not as good as the response rate for measuring the Nonresponse Followup workload. The denominator of the mail return rate is calculated from the Hundred percent Census Edited File with the reinstated housing units. It includes all occupied housing units in mailback type of enumeration areas that were added to the address file prior to Nonresponse Followup and had addresses that were delivered by the United States Postal Service or during the Census Bureau delivery operation. The response rate denominator is larger than the return rate denominator, largely because the response rate denominator includes vacant housing units, Undeliverable As Addressed addresses, some addresses deleted in Update/Leave and Urban Update/Leave delivery, and deleted in either Nonresponse Followup or Coverage Improvement Followup.

[^0]
## What were the National Mail Response Rates?

The mail response rate as of April 18, 2000 was 64.3 percent, which was slightly lower than the 1990 mail response rate of 65.0 percent. ${ }^{2}$ This rate represents $75,608,035$ mail returns that were received by April 18, 2000 out of a response rate denominator of 117,661,748 households. Another 3,703,140 questionnaires were returned after April 18, resulting in a final response rate of 67.4 percent, as of December 31, 2000.

Reflecting the higher response burden of the long form questionnaire, the short form mail response rate of 66.4 percent was 12.5 percentage points higher than the long form mail response rate of 53.9 percent. In 1990, the mail response rate for short forms and long forms were 65.9 percent and 60.6 percent, respectively. ${ }^{3}$

Approximately 14.3 percent of mail returns were long forms, a substantially lower percentage than the overall 17.1 percent sampling rate. However, many residents with long forms held onto them and returned them after April 18. After that date, a larger proportion of long forms were returned than short forms. The final response rate was 69.1 percent for short forms and 59.4 percent for long forms.

Mailout/Mailback areas had a mail response rate of 65.4 percent, which is higher than either the Update/Leave areas mail response rate of 59.3 percent or the Urban Update/Leave areas mail response rate of 50.5 percent. Final response rates by type of enumeration area were 68.5 percent for Mailout/Mailback, 62.6 percent for Update/Leave, and 54.8 percent for Urban Update/Leave.

Most questionnaires were returned in the period between March 15, when questionnaires in Mailout/Mailback areas were mailed, and March 28. There were slight surges in the number of mail returns corresponding to the delivery of reminder postcards beginning on March 20 and on Census Day (April 1). These two surges in response were more pronounced for long forms than short forms.

Between the initial cut for the Nonresponse Followup universe on April 10 and the final cut on April 18, 2,535,382 questionnaires ( 2.2 percent) were received. Had the final Nonresponse Followup cut been on April 10, the Nonresponse Followup workload would have increased by this number of housing units.

[^1]The cut for the Nonresponse Followup universe was as of April 18; an additional 1,052,712 returns were received between April 18 and April 25, representing 28.4 percent of the mail returns checked in after April 18. These returns represent a potential decrease in the Nonresponse Followup workload of 2.5 percent, resulting in a potential cost savings of over $\$ 28.4$ million. Therefore, work needs to be done to determine what is the optimal date for determining the Nonresponse Followup universe, by considering the cost benefits versus the operational challenges to other operations. In addition, research should be conducted to determine a more efficient way of updating the Nonresponse Followup lists.

After April 18, the number of mail returns declined until very few forms were being received by May 6. For the total return rate, 3,703,140 mail returns were checked in after April 18. This was an increase in the return rate of 3.1 percentage points. The last date on which questionnaires were checked in was October 19, 2000. The last date on which enough forms were received that resulted in an increase in the rate was June 15 for short forms and June 29 for long forms.

The mail response rate was compared with the mail return rate. The mail return rate as of April 18, was 74.1 percent, 9.9 percentage points higher than the mail response rate. The difference between the two rates is greater for short forms than long forms and greater for Urban Update/Leave and Update/Leave areas than for Mailout/Mailback areas.

The final response rate was compared to the final return rate. The final return rate is similar to the mail return rate but includes all mail returns through the end of the year 2000. The total final return rate was 78.4 percent, 11.0 percentage points higher than the final response rate of 67.4 percent. This is a greater difference than the difference in the mail response and return rates. The difference between the final return and the final response rates for long forms is about the same as the difference for short forms. However, the difference between the final return rate and the final response rate is greater in Urban Update/Leave and Update/Leave areas than in Mailout/Mailback areas.

## 1. BACKGROUND

This evaluation provides the response rates for Census 2000 and an analysis of the rates at the national level. The mail response rate is a measure of the Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) workload that identifies the percentage of Census 2000 addresses on the address file for mailback areas that were eligible for NRFU and returned their questionnaires by April 18, 2000. The final response rate is similar but also includes mail returns through the end of the year. This report also examines response rate differentials for long and short forms and for different types of enumeration areas.

### 1.1 Previous Censuses

Mail response rates were first measured for the 1970 Census. In 1970, the mail response rate was 78.3 percent. The mail response rate by form type is not available for the 1970 Census.

In 1980, the mail response rate was 75.0 percent, which is a decrease from the 1970 mail return rate. Similar to 1970 , the mail response rate by form type is not available for the 1980 Census. The decrease in return rate from 1970 to 1980 was the beginning of a trend of decline in respondent cooperation, as a decrease in response rates also occurred between the 1980 and the 1990 censuses.

In the 1990 Census, the United States Postal Service (USPS) was the primary vehicle for delivering census questionnaires. Based on a master address list, the Census Bureau mailed questionnaires to about 86.2 million housing units in areas designated as being Mailout/Mailback (MO/MB). Occupants were asked to complete the forms and mail them back in the provided postage paid envelope. In areas designated as Update/Leave (U/L), enumerators visited approximately 10.3 million housing units, verified addresses, and left questionnaires for occupants to complete and mail back in the provided postage paid envelope (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999a).

In the 1990 Census, both a questionnaire and a mail reminder card were delivered to all housing units in the Mailout/Mailback universe. The reminder card was delivered on March 30, approximately seven days after the questionnaire mailout. Census Day was officially April 1.

The mail response rate was defined as the ratio of the number of housing units returning a census questionnaire by mail to the total number of housing units that were on the address file to receive a census questionnaire delivered by mail or by a census enumerator.

The date for the mail return rate varied by District Office (DO) type (Type 1, 2, 2A, and 3).
District Offices are similar to Local Census Offices in 2000. There were 449 stateside DOs in 1990. Of these, 103 were Type 1 DOs, which were located in urban areas. Type 2 DOs were located in small cities, suburbs, and rural areas, accounting for 276 of the 449 DOs.
Seventy-nine of these were Type 2A, which handled the Update/Leave operation in addition to
the Mailout/Mailback Questionnaires. Most of the 70 Type 3 DOs were located in rural, sparsely settled areas, and few were located in small cities. The date for the mail return rates in 1990 was April 19 for Type 1 DOs and April 28 for Type 2, 2A, and 3 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991).

For the 1990 Census the overall mail response rate was approximately 65.0 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). The mail response rate was 65.9 percent for short forms and 60.6 percent for long forms, resulting in a difference of 5.3 percentage points between form types (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991).

### 1.2 Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal

The Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal was conducted in three areas: Sacramento, California; Columbia, South Carolina, and 11 surrounding counties; and Menominee County, Wisconsin, including the Menominee American Indian Reservation. Each site was selected because of its demographic and geographic characteristics to provide experience with some of the expected Census 2000 environments. The Sacramento site was entirely Mailout/Mailback, South Carolina site was a mixture of Mailout/Mailback and Update/Leave addresses, and the Menominee site was entirely Update/Leave.

There were four components of the Mailout/Mailback delivery: an advance letter, an initial questionnaire, a reminder card, and a "blanket" replacement questionnaire (mailed to all addresses). These items used first-class postage and were distributed by the USPS as part of the regular postal routes. The advance letter was mailed to each address between March 24 and 27, 1998. The initial questionnaire was mailed between March 28 and 31. The reminder card was sent to housing units between April 3 and 6. Replacement questionnaires were mailed between April 15 and 17. Census Day was officially April 18.

The Update/Leave methodology involved Census Bureau enumerators delivering questionnaires at the same time they updated maps and the list of addresses. The Update/Leave delivery of questionnaires took place between March 14 and April 10, 1998. In ZIP codes that consisted entirely of Update/Leave housing units, the USPS delivered an advance letter to "postal patrons" using third-class postage.

Under both methodologies, respondents were asked to mail back their questionnaires in provided postage paid envelopes.

Short and long form questionnaires were included in both delivery methodologies. Every housing unit received either a short or a long form. The long form sampling rate for the dress rehearsal varied within site.

Response rate was defined to include in its numerator the number of housing units in the mailback universe that returned a questionnaire that was not blank. The response rate denominator included the number of housing units in the mailback universe that were either
mailed a questionnaire or - in Update/Leave areas - received one delivered by a census enumerator. Housing units with an undeliverable status were included in these denominators.

Table 1 contains the mail response rates for the three Dress Rehearsal test sites by form type (short versus long). Dress Rehearsal response rates are typically lower than those for the census. This is due to the fact that the dress rehearsal does not have a "census environment." A "census environment" allows for a higher response rate due to the publicity surrounding the census.

Table 1. Dress Rehearsal Mail Response Rates

|  |  | Form Type |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Total | Short | Long |
| Sacramento | $53.0 \%$ | $55.4 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ |
| South Carolina | $53.4 \%$ | $55.4 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ |
| Menominee | $39.4 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ | $32.4 \%$ |

### 1.3 Census 2000

In Census 2000, the questionnaire Mailout/Mailback system was the primary means of census taking. Cities, towns, and suburban areas with city-style addresses (house number and street name) as well as rural areas where city-style addresses are used for mail delivery comprised the Mailout/Mailback areas. Update/Leave areas consisted of addresses that are predominantly not city-style. Census enumerators delivered addressed questionnaires to Update/Leave housing units. Update/Leave enumerators also made any necessary corrections or additions to census maps and address lists as they delivered the questionnaires. In both delivery methodologies, the housing units were provided with first-class postage paid envelopes for returning their questionnaires.

### 1.3.1 Types of Mailback Questionnaires

Census 2000 included two types of questionnaires for mailback:

- A short form was delivered to approximately 83 percent of all housing units. This form allowed the respondent to list up to 12 household members. It provided space for reporting the basic population and housing data (i.e. name, relationship, age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, and tenure) for up to six household members and the housing unit.
- A long form was delivered to a sample - approximately 17 percent - of all housing units. This form allowed the respondent to list up to 12 household members. It included all the questions on the short form, as well as additional housing unit questions and additional person questions for up to six household members.

There is one difference between the Mailout/Mailback questionnaire and the Update/Leave questionnaire. The Update/Leave questionnaire gave the respondent the opportunity to correct address information.

### 1.3.2 Multiple Mailing Strategy

The Census Bureau used a mail strategy consisting of multiple contacts for Census 2000 in Mailout/Mailback areas. These contacts were:

- an advance notice letter to every mailout address that alerted households that the census form would be sent to them soon,
- a questionnaire to every mailout address, and
- a postcard to every mailout address that served as a thank you for respondents who had mailed back their questionnaire or as a reminder to those who had not.

This multiple mailing strategy used first-class postage for all mailing pieces in Mailout/Mailback areas. The volume for Mailout/Mailback areas was approximately 100 million pieces for each mailing.

There was also a mailout strategy used in Update/Leave areas for advance notice letters and reminder postcards. Advance notice letters were mailed to Update/Leave housing units that had "good" addresses using first-class mail. Reminder cards were sent to housing units in ZIP codes that consist entirely of Update/Leave housing units. The reminder postcards were addressed to "Residential Customer" and delivered using third-class postage. Consequently, some housing units received the advance notice letter and not the reminder card, some received the reminder card and not the advance notice letter, some received both, and some received neither. The expected volume for Update/Leave areas was about 22 million questionnaires (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001a).

### 1.3.3 Key Dates in Mailback Schedule

## Mailout/Mailback Enumeration Areas:

Event
Advance notice letter delivered
Mailout of Questionnaire
Delivery of Reminder Cards
Census Day
Cut for Nonresponse Followup (NRFU)
Late Cut for NRFU Late Cut for NRFU

Date
March 6 - March 8
March 13 - March 15
March 20 - March 22
April 1
April 11
April 18

Update/Leave Enumeration Areas:
Event
Delivery of Advance Notice Letters
Delivery of Questionnaires
Delivery of Reminder Cards
Census Day
Initial Cut for NRFU
Late Cut for NRFU

### 1.3.4 Delivery of Questionnaires in Other Languages

The Census Bureau mailed census forms in five other languages (Chinese, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese) to housing units that requested them. The advance notice letter provided the respondent with the opportunity to make this request.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The data files used to calculate the mail response rates are:

- Decennial Master Address File (DMAF)
- Decennial Response File - Stage 2 (DRF-2)


### 2.1 Decennial Master Address File (DMAF)

The primary file used to calculate the mail response rates was the DMAF. We used this file to identify the housing units to include in the response rates. The DMAF contained variables that were used to limit the response rate denominator to housing units in mailback areas which were NRFU eligible. The MAILD variable from the DMAF identifies the date on which a mail return questionnaire was checked into the Data Capture Centers (DCCs). The DMAF also contains information on which form type (short versus long) was designated for each address. The definitions of the DMAF variables can be found in Appendix A.

### 2.2 Decennial Response File Stage 2 (DRF-2)

The DRF-2 is the file representing the capture of questionnaire data from Census 2000 and was used to determine which housing units had a valid mail return. We created a variable called DC_DRF from the RSOURCE variable on the DRF-2 to identify those addresses with a mail return. The DC_DRF variable was created based on all returns for an address on the DRF-2. This variable was merged onto the Decennial Statistical Studies Division's (DSSD's) version of the DMAF in order to calculate the response rates. For information on how this variable was
defined, see Appendix B. The definitions of the DRF-2 variables used in calculating response rates can also be found in Appendix B.

### 2.3 Calculation of the Mail Response Rate

The mail response rate denominator included housing units in mailback areas that were eligible for NRFU. The mail response rate numerator included housing units in the denominator that had a valid mail return and a mail return check-in date of April 18, 2000 (the date of the cut for the NRFU universe) or earlier (variable MAILD, values of '0101' through ' 0418 ', inclusive). Addresses with a valid mail return but no MAILD date (MAILD values of '0000', '0099', and '2000') were included in the mail response rate numerator if they did not have a NRFU or Coverage Improvement Followup (CIFU) data capture as determined using the DRF-2. The mail response rate was calculated for the geographic levels of tract, county, and state by summing the housing units up to each geographic level, dividing the numerator by the denominator, and rounding to the nearest tenth of a percentage point. The national mail response rate was created by summing the state numerators and denominators to the national level.

### 2.3.1 Mail Response Rate Denominator

Several criteria were used to identify addresses on the DMAF for the mail response rate denominator. Only housing units ( $\mathrm{GQFLG}=0$ or 3 ) in mailback areas (Type of Enumeration Area (TEA) variable, values of $1,2,6,7$, or 9 ) were included in the denominator. Additionally, only addresses that were not pre-identified as having inadequate addresses for the mailout were included in the denominator (UAA variable $\neq 8$ ). One of the DMAF variables, NRFU Universe (NRU variable, values of $1,2,3$, or 4 ) was used to eliminate addresses not eligible for NRFU from the response rate denominator. The definitions of these DMAF variables can be found in Appendix A.

Separate mail response rate denominators were created for each of the three TEAs, for each of the two form types (short versus long), and for each TEA by form type. The three TEAs are Mailout/Mailback (TEA variable value of 1 or 6), Update/Leave (value of 2 or 9) and Urban Update Leave (UU/L) (value of 7). Questionnaire form type was determined using the ASAM variable (value of 1 for short form and 6 for long forms).

### 2.3.2 Mail Response Rate Numerator

For a housing unit to be in the mail response rate numerator, it had to be a mail return that was in the response rate denominator. Mail returns were determined using the DC_DRF variable from the DRF-2. An address had a valid mail return if this variable indicated that it had a data capture in the form of a paper mail return, an Internet return, a Be Counted form, a Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (TQA) return, or a Coverage Edit Followup (CEFU) return.

The MAILD variable from the DMAF was used to determine the date of a mail return's check-in. If the MAILD variable indicated that a return for the housing unit was received on or before April 18, 2000 ( ${ }^{6} 0101$ ' $\leq$ MAILD $\leq{ }^{\prime} 0418$ '), then the address also was in the mail response rate numerator.

There were some addresses with mail returns according to DC_DRF but no MAILD date (values of ' 0000 ', ' 0099 ', or ' 2000 '). These addresses were assigned to the mail response rate numerator based on whether or not they had data captures in the NRFU or CIFU operations (DC_DRF variable digits 6 or 7). Only addresses with no mail returns on April 18, 2000 were supposed to be included in those two followup operations. Therefore, addresses with neither a NRFU nor a CIFU data capture were assigned to the mail response rate numerator.

### 2.4 Calculation of the Final Response Rate

Like the mail response rate, the final response rate is a measure of respondent participation in Census 2000. The difference is that the final response rate is not restricted to mail returns received before the cut for the NRFU universe. As with the mail response rates, the final response rates were calculated by dividing the numerator by the denominator and rounding to the nearest tenth of a percentage point.

### 2.4.1 Final Response Rate Denominator

The final response rates have the same denominators calculated from the DMAF as the mail response rates (see Section 2.3.1).

### 2.4.2 Final Response Rate Numerator

The final response rate numerator was calculated by including all valid mail returns as determined by the DC_DRF variable from the DRF-2 that were in the response rate denominator. Most of these mail returns had MAILD check-in dates between January 1 and October 19, 2000 (October 19 was the last day we received a mail return). Mail returns with no MAILD date which the DC_DRF variable showed with NRFU or CIFU data captures were assigned to the final response rate and not the mail response rate.

### 2.5 Calculation of the Daily Response Rates

The daily response rates were calculated in a manner similar to the mail and final response rates. For the cumulative daily response rates, the denominators were the same for all rates. The numerators for each date of the year 2000 were calculated by limiting the numerators to addresses with mail return check-in dates on or before the particular date. For instance, the daily cumulative response rate numerator for May 5 was limited to addresses with a MAILD value less than or equal to ' 0505 '. As previously stated, the final date on which questionnaires with a MAILD date were received was October 19 (MAILD=‘1019’). To determine the daily increase
in the response rate, the numerators were calculated by limiting the numerators to addresses with mail return check-in dates on a particular date. For those mail returns in the denominator that did not have a valid MAILD date on the DMAF, we assigned a date of either April 18 or December 31 based on the existence of a NRFU or CIFU data capture. If these mail returns had neither a NRFU nor a CIFU data capture, then they were assigned a date of April 18. Those mail returns with either a NRFU or a CIFU data capture were assigned to the December 31 response rate.

### 2.6 Application of Quality Assurance Procedures

Quality Assurance procedures were applied to the design, implementation, analysis, and preparation of this report. A description of the procedures used is provided in the "Census 2000 Evaluation Program Quality Assurance Process."

## 3. LIMITATIONS

### 3.1 Missing Check-in Dates for Some Mail Returns

Appendix C shows a table with nineteen categories into which all addresses in the response rate denominator can be grouped based on their values for the DRF-2 variable DC_DRF and the DMAF variable MAILD. The rows of data in the table depend on the values of the DC_DRF variable from the DRF-2. The columns in the table are the values of MAILD on the DMAF.

There were 418,845 valid mail returns ( 0.4 percent of the response rate denominator) for which the DMAF variable MAILD did not indicate a check-in date (cells 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 6A, 6B, 7A, and 7B of the table). These returns were assigned to either the mail response rate or the final response rate based on whether or not their addresses also had a NRFU and CIFU return. Housing units with a valid mail return, no check-in date, and no data capture for NRFU or CIFU were assigned a date of April 18 and included in the mail response rate. These 11,188 mail returns are shown in cells $1 \mathrm{~A}, 2 \mathrm{~A}, 6 \mathrm{~A}$, and 7 A of the table. Mail returns without a valid MAILD value and with a data capture for NRFU or CIFU were assigned a date of December 31 and only included in the final response rate. These 407,657 housing units are shown in cells 1B, 2B, 6B, and 7B of the table. The other problem with the MAILD variable is that it only reflects the date of check-in at the DCC, not the date on which a questionnaire was completed, mailed, or even the date on which the form was received by the DCC.

### 3.2 No Precise Cut-off Date for Nonresponse Followup Universe

A housing unit was counted toward the mail response rate numerator if MAILD indicated a check-in date prior to the late cut for NRFU. That date was set at April 18, 2000 but users of the rates should keep in mind that there was some noise in the data with respect to the date since the NRFU universe was generated on a flow basis. That is, the NRFU universe of all housing units
was not set instantaneously at midnight of April 18. The actual cut might have fallen on either side of that date for some housing units.

### 3.3 Housing Units in Denominator Not in Mailout

Some housing units on the DMAF from Mailout/Mailback and Update/Leave areas were added after the mailback universe was set. Hence, they are being counted toward the response rate denominator but did not have a chance to respond by mailback means prior to the late cut for NRFU.

### 3.4 Issues with Comparison of Results to Previous Censuses

The definition of mail response rate for Census 2000 is not exactly the same as that from previous censuses. These differences are the following:

- The TEAs in previous censuses were defined differently than those in 2000 and included different parts of the country.
- The timing of the mailout and the cut for NRFU were different for each of the 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 censuses.

Specifically for comparing 2000 to 1990 :

- Like the 2000 final response rates, 1990 mail response rates at the state, county, and tract levels in 1990 were calculated based on all returns during the year. The 1990 national response rate was calculated with returns through the cut for NRFU.


### 3.5 Form Type of Mail Returns Based on Form Type in Mailout

Since this report does not analyze item non-response on valid mail returns, it is possible that some long forms that were returned did not contain complete data. The response rate analysis by form type was done based on which form the addresses were sent by the Census Bureau.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1 What were the Response Rates for the Nation?

The results presented in this report are for the fifty states and the District of Columbia. They do not include the response rate for Puerto Rico. There were 117,661,748 housing units in mailback areas in Census 2000 that were eligible for NRFU and to which the USPS or the Census Bureau attempted to deliver questionnaires. This number is the national response rate denominator. Of this number, $20,082,777$ housing units or 17.1 percent of the housing units received a long form
questionnaire. Thus, the sampling rate for the long forms was slightly above one in six or 16.7 percent.

Table 2 shows the total mail response rates and these rates by form type based on mail returns received on or before April 18, 2000. The data presented in the table are grouped into three TEAs - MO/MB (TEAs 1 and 6), U/L (TEAs 2 and 9), and UU/L (TEA 7). The national mail response rate was 64.3 percent, meaning that $75,608,035$ housing units returned their questionnaires in time to avoid the necessity of enumeration in Nonresponse Followup. This mail response rate is less than one percentage point below the mail response rate of 65.0 percent in the 1990 Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). The numerators and denominators for the mail response rates by TEA can be found in Appendix D.

The table shows that 66.4 percent or $64,792,554$ housing units who received short forms returned them by April 18, 2000. In contrast, only about 53.9 percent of housing units who were delivered long forms returned them by that date. This 12.5 percentage point discrepancy means that a higher proportion of the data was collected by Census Bureau interviewers in NRFU on long forms than was the case for short form households. For information about the quality of data collected during NRFU for long forms and short forms, see Census 2000 Evaluation B.1: Analysis of the Imputation Process for 100 Percent Household Population Item (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001b). Approximately 14.3 percent of mail returns were long forms, a substantially lower percentage than the overall 17.1 percent sampling rate.

Table 2. National Mail Response Rates as of April 18, 2000 by Form Type and Type of Enumeration Area for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  |  | Form Type |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Short | Long | Difference |
| TOTAL | $64.3 \%$ | $66.4 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Mailout/Mailback | $65.4 \%$ | $67.3 \%$ | $54.6 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ |
| Update/Leave | $59.3 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $51.9 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| Urban Update/Leave | $50.5 \%$ | $52.2 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.

The difference in response rates by form type is not surprising, given the difference in response burden between the short form and the long form. The short form only included seven questions. Person one was asked for name, age, sex, race, Hispanic ethnicity, and tenure. In addition to name, age, sex, race, and Hispanic ethnicity, persons two through six were also asked relationship to person one. In comparison, the long form had a total of 53 questions on a variety of topics including income, utilities, ancestry, and occupation. This gap between short form mail response rates and long form mail response rates varies by TEA, with MO/MB households having the greatest difference in response rates by form type and households in U/L areas having the smallest gap.

Another noticeable variation in response rates is that housing units in MO/MB areas returned a much greater proportion ( 65.4 percent) of their forms than those in U/L ( 59.3 percent) and, especially, UU/L ( 50.5 percent) areas. One explanation for this difference is that $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ areas are generally more prosperous and have greater exposure to media advertising the census than more sparsely populated U/L areas and inner-city UU/L areas. Another potential explanation is the delivery schedule for $U / L$ and $U U / L$ areas is longer than the schedule for MO/MB (March 3-30 vs. March 13-15). Residents in U/L and UU/L areas that received their questionnaires at the end of the delivery schedule had less time to fill them out then residents in $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ areas that received their questionnaires at the end of the $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ schedule. Additionally, there are often problems with postal delivery in UU/L and U/L areas and those households were less likely to receive the advance notice and reminder postcard. As a result of this discrepancy, a smaller proportion of residents of U/L and UU/L areas were self-enumerated than residents of primarily urban and suburban $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ areas with city-style addresses. For the mail response rates by form type for each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002b.

Table 3 shows the final response rates as of December 31, 2000 by TEA and form type. The number of households in mailback areas that returned their questionnaires after April 18, 2000 was $3,703,140$, increasing the final response rate by 3.1 percentage points over the mail response rate. The final response rate of 67.4 percent indicates the percentage of addresses in mailback areas that returned their questionnaires by the end of the year. Note the last form which was received and processed was October 19, 2000.

Table 3. National Final Mail Response Rates as of December 31, 2000 by Form Type and Type of Enumeration Area for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

Form Type

| Type of Enumeration | Total | Short | Long | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | $67.4 \%$ | $69.1 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Mailout/Mailback | $68.5 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Update/Leave | $62.6 \%$ | $64.6 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ |
| Urban Update/Leave | $54.8 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.
Most of the patterns in the response rates revealed in Table 3 are similar to those in Table 2, though final response rates for all groups are, of course, higher. Short form final response rates (69.1 percent) are higher than long form final response rates (59.4 percent) and this difference is greatest in MO/MB areas. The MO/MB areas have the highest final response rate ( 68.5 percent) among TEAs and UU/L areas have the lowest ( 54.8 percent). One noteworthy difference between final and mail response rates is that the discrepancy between short form response rates and long form response rates is substantially lower for final response rates ( 9.6 percent) than for mail response rates ( 12.5 percent). Many households with long forms returned those forms at a
later date than households who received short forms. The form type gap decline in the final response rates was true for all TEAs.

Table 4 compares the mail response rates and the final response rates for the national total and for each of the three TEAs. The data reveal that there was a greater increase in UU/L and U/L areas between April 18 and the end of the year than in MO/MB areas. Thus, the gap among the TEAs that is evident in the mail response rates is not as great for the final response rates. The $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ mail response rate is 6.1 percentage points higher than the $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{L}$ mail response rate, while the $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ final response rate is about 5.9 percentage points higher than the $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{L}$ final response rate.

Table 4. Comparison of Mail Response Rates as of April 18, 2000 and Final Response Rates as of December 31, 2000 by Type of Enumeration Area for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  | As of: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of Enumeration | $\mathbf{4 / 1 8 / 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 / 3 1 / 2 0 0 0}$ | Difference |
| TOTAL | $64.3 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| Mailout/Mailback | $65.4 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| Update/Leave | $59.3 \%$ | $62.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Urban Update/Leave | $50.5 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |
| Sran |  |  |  |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.

In Table 5, we compare mail response rates and final response rates by TEA for short forms. The patterns of these data are similar to those observed in Table 4, although the increase from mail response rates to final response rates ( 2.7 percent) is smaller for short forms than for the overall response rates ( 3.1 percent).

Table 5. Comparison of Mail Response Rates as of April 18, 2000 and Final Response Rates as of December 31, 2000 for Short Forms by Type of Enumeration Area for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  | As of: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{4 / 1 8 / 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 / 3 1 / 2 0 0 0}$ | Difference |
| TOTAL | $66.4 \%$ | $69.1 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Mailout/Mailback | $67.3 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Update/Leave | $61.9 \%$ | $64.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |
| Urban Update/Leave | $52.2 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |

## Source: DMAF and DRF-2.

Table 6 shows the same rates as Tables 4 and 5, but for long forms. It is clear that a particularly large proportion of long form households in all areas returned mailback questionnaires after April 18, as compared to the short forms (Table 5).

Table 6. Comparison of Mail Response Rates as of April 18, 2000 and Final Response Rates as of December 31, 2000 for Long Forms by Type of Enumeration Area for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  | As of: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{4 / 1 8 / 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 / 3 1 / 2 0 0 0}$ | Difference |
| TOTAL | $53.9 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| Mailout/Mailback | $54.6 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| Update/Leave | $51.9 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |
| Urban Update/Leave | $41.2 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.

### 4.2 What were the Daily Response Rates?

Figure 1, as shown in Appendix E, shows the cumulative mail response rates by form type for each day from March 3 until April 18, 2000. These dates correspond to the start of questionnaire delivery by Census Bureau staff in U/L areas and the cut for the NRFU universe, respectively. Addresses for which mail returns were received after April 18 were still visited by enumerators in NRFU. The $x$-axis on the figure shows the date and the $y$-axis shows the cumulative response rate for each date. The light-shaded line indicates the response rates for long forms, the medium-shaded line for short forms, and the thickest and darkest line is the total cumulative daily response rate. The data for Figures 1-4 can be found in Appendices F and G. Appendix F shows the daily increase and cumulative mail returns for both the response rate numerator and the response rate, as well as key census dates. Appendix G-1 shows the same data for short forms and Appendix G-2 for long forms.

As indicated by Figure 1, the response rates gradually increased after the beginning of U/L delivery until about March 15. On that date, the mailout of questionnaires (March 13 through 15) in MO/MB areas caused a surge in the response rates as a large majority of households received their questionnaires and many began to return them. Due to the time required for the USPS to deliver mail, there is approximately a two day lag between the date that householders mailed their forms and their check-in at the DCCs. As expected, based on the lower overall response rates for long forms, the line indicating long form response rates increases more gradually than the lines for total and short form response rates. Within a week of the mailout of questionnaires, a substantial gap is evident between long form response rates and the higher short form and total response rates. Since most questionnaires are short forms, it is not surprising that the pattern of returns for short forms is parallel but slightly higher than that for the total response rate.

Aside from the initial surge in mail returns beginning March 15, the general pattern evidenced in Figure 1 is one in which the response rate increased rapidly for a few weeks and then began to level off. A second period of accelerated returns after the March 15 to 17 period occurred around March 20 with declines in the slope of the lines after March 23 and March 28. By the cut for the

NRFU universe on April 18, the increase in the response rates has become gradual, indicating that most households who are likely to return their forms had done so on that date.

Figure 2 (see Appendix E) better reveals some of the patterns mentioned above. This figure shows the daily increase of the response rates rather than the cumulative rates for each date from March 3 through April 18, 2000. As in Figure 1, different lines indicate the mail returns for the total and for each form type. This figure reveals certain interesting patterns in the daily return of questionnaires. As described before, a higher proportion of short form mail returns were received at earlier dates. Due to the greater amount of time and effort in filling out the long form, many long form households took longer to return their questionnaires. The initial peak period of returns after the mailout was much greater for short forms than long forms and occurred on earlier days. On March 15, 2.8 percent of short forms were returned and 1.0 percent of long forms were checked in. Two days later, on March 17, 4.6 percent of short forms were checked in and 1.9 percent of long forms were received.

As Figures 1 and 2 show, most short form mail returns came in between March 15 and March 28. Long forms were returned in the greatest numbers between March 20 and April 1. In fact, contrary to the short form pattern, the March $27 / 28$ spike in returns was relatively much greater for long forms than the March $16 / 17$ spike. For most of the period after March 28, long forms were actually being returned at a higher rate than short forms and the gap between the cumulative response rates for the two form types decreased. This is clear in Figure 2 which shows the line for long forms to be higher than that for short forms for almost every date after March 28. This indicates that a late cut for NRFU (April 18) resulted in a lower long form workload for NRFU, as compared to an April 10 date, and resulted in reducing the respondent burden. However, the rate of returns for both form types was well below one percent for every date after April 10.

The data indicate an increase in mail returns after the reminder postcards were mailed between March 20 and March 22. For both long forms and short forms, the greatest increase in mail response rates occurred on these dates and the days immediately following. The DCCs received short form returns at an especially high rate from March 20 through 23, with a peak daily increase of 5.2 percentage points on March 22, 2000. For long forms, this peak occurred from March 21 through 24 with the greatest daily increase of 4.2 percentage points on March 23 and 24.

Figure 2 also indicates that households, particularly those with long forms, exhibited some tendency to hold their questionnaires until Census Day (April 1, 2000). Figure 2 shows a major spike in long form returns and a smaller increase in short form returns on April 3 and 4, two days after Census Day. Between the initial cut for NRFU on April 10 and the final cut on April 18, households continued to send in mail returns at a substantial, though relatively low and dwindling, rate. During that period, 626,467 long forms or 3.1 percent of long forms were returned and $1,908,915$ short forms or 2.0 percent of short forms were checked in. Without a final NRFU universe cut on April 18, the NRFU workload would have been increased by this number of housing units.

Figure 3 (see Appendix E) shows the increase in response rates by form type for the entire year of 2000. The left side of this figure is the same as Figure 1, but Figure 3 extends the timeline of cumulative mail returns from April 18 to December 31. The figure reveals that the response rates leveled off after April 18 with a gradually flattening slope for all three lines. The pattern was similar for the different form types although the gap in rates between long and short forms gradually narrowed as time passed. For the total response rate, $3,703,140$ mail returns were checked in after April 18. These forms resulted in an increase in the response rate of 3.1 percentage points. Between April 18 and the end of the year, the short form response rate increased by 2.6 percentage points ( $2,588,285$ housing units) and the long form increased by 5.6 percentage points ( $1,114,855$ housing units). For nearly every single date after March 28, the daily percentage increase in response rate was greater for long forms than for short forms. As Appendices F and G show, the last confirmed date on which questionnaires were checked in was October 19, 2000, when three short forms were received. Prior to that day, 50 short forms and 13 long forms were checked in to the DCCs on September 15. The last date for which we have check-ins which resulted in a rate increase was June 15 for short forms when the short form response rate reached 68.7 percent. For long forms, this date was June 29 when the long form response rate leveled off at 58.9 percent.

Figure 4, as shown in Appendix E, is an extension of Figure 2 through the end of 2000. It shows the daily increase in the response rates by form type for the entire year. After April 18, the number of mail returns continued to decline until very few forms were being received by May 6. As noted above, a relatively higher increase was observed for long forms than short forms for these mail returns in late April, May, and June. The figure shows several small weekly peaks on Fridays in May when a substantial number of forms were checked in to the DCCs. It appears that shipments of mail returns may have arrived at the DCCs on Fridays or that the DCC staff may have held mail returns during the week to check in on Friday. The largest single-day receipt of mail returns after April 18 was on June 15 when 95,721 long forms and 146,022 short forms were checked in.

The final increase in the response rates that appears on Figure 4 is on December 31, 2000. Those 407,657 questionnaires are the mail returns for which no mail return check-in date was recorded and for which there was a NRFU or CIFU data capture in addition to a mail return data capture. Since only mail returns received after April 18 could be in the NRFU or CIFU workloads, we determined that these mail returns came in after that date. We assigned a check-in date of December 31 to these mail returns and they were included in the final response rate. Mail returns without a check-in date that were not in the NRFU and CIFU universe were assigned a date of April 18 and included in the mail response rate.

The data presented in Figure 4 and in Appendices F and G show the potential effect on the NRFU workload of using a later cut date for the NRFU universe. In between April 19 and April 25, 1,052,712 mail returns were checked in, representing 28.4 percent of the returns received after April 18. If the final NRFU cut had occurred one week later, around April 25 instead of April 18, then the NRFU workload would have been reduced by $1,052,712$ housing
units, or about 2.5 percent of the NRFU workload. This reduction in the workload would have saved close to $\$ 28.4$ million, given that the cost of enumerating one housing unit in NRFU is just under $\$ 27$ (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002c). Since mail returns that were received after April 18 were disproportionately long forms, the savings were potentially even greater. If the cut for the NRFU universe had been delayed one more week until May 2, then the NRFU workload would have been reduced by approximately 598,000 additional housing units. However, a later start of the NRFU operation, despite a lower workload, could result in greater scheduling challenges.

Some of the daily fluctuation of mail returns observed in Figures 2 and 4 can be explained by the effect of the day of the week. More questionnaires were checked in on Thursdays (17.7 percent of all mail returns during the year), Fridays ( 16.4 percent), and Wednesdays ( 16.3 percent) than on other days of the week. Relatively few questionnaires came in on Sundays ( 9.3 percent) and Saturdays ( 11.0 percent). The dearth of check-ins on Sunday is probably the result of the fact that the USPS does not normally deliver mail on Sunday and that the DCCs worked fewer hours on weekends and thus checked in fewer forms on those days. Also, if respondents held their questionnaires until the beginning of a work week (Monday) to mail, then their forms would likely have arrived Wednesday or Thursday at the DCCs, explaining the increase in check-ins on those days.

### 4.3 How much did the Response Rates Differ from Census 2000 Return Rates?

Table 7 compares the mail response rates for Census 2000 to the mail return rates. Mail return rate is essentially a measure of the percentage of occupied housing units that returned their questionnaires by April 18, 2000. It is a more useful rate for determining respondent cooperation and not as good as the response rate for measuring the NRFU workload. The denominator of the mail return rate is calculated from the Hundred percent Census Edited File with the reinstated housing units (HCEF_D'). It includes all occupied housing units in mailback TEAs that were added to the address file prior to NRFU and had addresses that were delivered by the USPS or during the Census Bureau delivery operation. The March 2001 MAF extract provided information on which addresses were added prior to NRFU. The response rate denominator ( $117,661,748$ housing units) is larger than the return rate denominator $(101,398,131)$, largely because the response rate denominator includes vacant housing units, Undeliverable As Addressed (UAA) addresses, some addresses deleted in U/L and UU/L delivery, and deleted in either NRFU or CIFU. The return rate numerator ( $75,163,020$ housing units) is calculated similarly to the response rate numerator ( $75,608,035$ housing units). For more information on mail return rates and their calculation see U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002b.

The first column of data in Table 7 shows the mail response rates broken down by total, form type, TEA, and form type and TEA. The next column shows the equivalent mail return rates and the last column shows the difference between the two rates. The total national mail return rate was 74.1 percent, 9.9 percentage points higher than the mail response rate. The difference
between the two rates is greater for short forms than long forms and greater for UU/L and U/L than for $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ areas.

Table 7. Mail Response and Mail Return Rates as of April 18, 2000 by Form Type and Type of Enumeration for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  |  | Rate |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Response | Return | Difference |
| TOTAL |  | $64.3 \%$ | $74.1 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Form Type | Short | $66.4 \%$ | $76.4 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
|  | Long | $53.9 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |
| Type of | Mailout/Mailback | $65.4 \%$ | $75.1 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| Enumeration | Update/Leave | $59.3 \%$ | $69.6 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
|  | Urban Update/Leave | $50.5 \%$ | $63.7 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Form Type | Short |  |  |  |
| and Type of | Mailout/Mailback | $67.3 \%$ | $77.2 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Enumeration | Update/Leave | $61.9 \%$ | $72.3 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ |
|  | Urban Update/Leave | $52.2 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ |
|  | Long |  |  |  |
|  | Mailout/Mailback | $54.6 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |
|  | Update/Leave | $51.9 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
|  | Urban Update/Leave | $41.2 \%$ | $52.3 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |

Source: HCEF_D', DMAF, DRF-2, and March 2001 MAF Extract.
Table 8 compares the final return and final response rates by form type and TEA. The final return rate is similar to the mail return rate but includes all mail returns through the end of the year 2000. The total final return rate was 78.4 percent ( $79,530,100$ housing units), 11.0 percentage points higher than the 67.4 percent $(79,311,175)$ final response rate. This is a greater difference than the difference in the mail response and return rates. The differences between final return and response rates are about the same for both form types and are greater in $\mathrm{UU} / \mathrm{L}$ and $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{L}$ areas than in $\mathrm{MO} / \mathrm{MB}$ areas.

Table 8. Final Response and Final Return Rates as of December 31, 2000 by Form Type and Type of Enumeration for the Fifty States and the District of Columbia

|  | Rate |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Response | Return | Difference |
| TOTAL |  | $67.4 \%$ | $78.4 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |
| Form Type | Short | $69.1 \%$ | $80.1 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ |
|  | Long | $59.4 \%$ | $70.5 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
| Type of | Mailout/Mailback | $68.5 \%$ | $78.6 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
| Enumeration | Update/Leave | $62.6 \%$ | $77.9 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ |
|  | Urban Update/Leave | $54.8 \%$ | $70.8 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ |
| Form Type | Short |  |  |  |
| and Type of | Mailout/Mailback | $70.0 \%$ | $80.1 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
| Enumeration | Update/Leave | $64.6 \%$ | $79.9 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ |
|  | $\quad$ Urban Update/Leave | $56.1 \%$ | $72.3 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ |
|  | Long |  |  |  |
|  | $\quad$ Mailout/Mailback | $60.4 \%$ | $69.9 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
|  | Update/Leave | $57.0 \%$ | $72.1 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ |
|  | Urban Update/Leave | $47.5 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |

Source: HCEF_D', DMAF, DRF-2, and March 2001 MAF Extract.
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## Appendix A: Decennial Master Address File (DMAF) Variable Definitions

| ST | Collection FIPS State Code |
| :---: | :---: |
| COU | Collection FIPS County Code |
| TRACT | Collection Census Tract |
| MAFID | MAF and DMAF ID <br> characters $1-2=$ state code when the MAF characters $3-5=$ county code when the MAF characters 6-12 $=$ control ID |
| TEA | Type of Enumeration Area <br> $1=$ Mailout Mailback <br> $2=$ Update Leave <br> 3 = List Enumerate <br> 4 = Remote List Enumerate <br> $5=$ Rural Update Enumerate <br> $6=$ Military in Update Leave Area <br> 7 = Urban Update Leave <br> $8=$ Urban Update Enumerate <br> $9=$ Update Leave (converted from TEA 1) |

GQFLG Group Quarters Housing Unit Flag
$0=$ Housing Unit
1 = Special Place
2 = Group Quarters
3 = GQ Embedded Housing Unit
ASAM
A Priori Sample
1 = Short Form
$6=$ Long Form
NRU Nonresponse Followup Universe
$0=$ Universe not set
$1=$ Not in NRFU; data received (This indicates that a form was checked in; it does not guarantee that the form has any data.)
$2=$ Not in NRFU; but NRD, NRS, NRC and NRPOP will be set by
Update/Enumerate or List/Enumerate
3 = In NRFU, Nonresponse
4 = In NRFU, Too late for mailout

## DC_DRF(12) Source of Data Capture ${ }^{4}$

$0=$ None
1 = Some Data Capture
The types of data capture for housing units are -
(1) Mail Return (RSOURCE: 1, 4-10)
(2) Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (TQA) (RSOURCE: 31)
(3) Internet (RSOURCE: 30)
(4) Be Counted Form (BCF) (RSOURCE: 11, 12)
(5) CEFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 34-36)
(6) NRFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 17-21)
(7) CIFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 22-24)
(8) TQA/BCF (RSOURCE: 3, 32, 33)
(9) List Enumerate/Update Enumerate (RSOURCE: 13-16)
(10) Group Quarters (RSOURCE: 25-29)
(11) Orphans (RSOURCE: 37)
(12) Other (RSOURCE: -1)

MAILD | Mail Return Check-in Month and Day |
| :--- |
| $0000=$ No Mail Return Check-in |
| $0099=$ Reverse Check-in |
| $0101-1231=$ Check-in Day of $1^{\text {st }}$ Return |
| 2000 = Check-in, Date Unknown |

${ }^{4}$ This is a DRF2 variable and is based on the RSOURCE variable from the DRF-2. It was appended to the DMAF SAS dataset produced by the DSSD.

## Appendix B: Decennial Response File Stage 2 (DRF-2) Variable Definitions

RST Collection FIPS State Code
RUID Unit ID Number (DMAF)
characters 1-2 $=$ state (when MAF ID was assigned)
characters 3-5 = county
characters $6-12=$ sequence ID

## RSOURCE Source of Return

$-1=$ Not Computed
$1=$ Paper mail back questionnaire from mail out
$2=$ Paper mail back questionnaire from TQA mail out WITH ID
3 = Paper mail back questionnaire from TQA mail out with NO ID
4 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Update Leave
5 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Update Leave ADD
6 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Update Leave SUBSTITUTE
7 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Urban Update Leave
8 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Urban Update Leave ADD
9 = Paper mail back questionnaire from Urban Update Leave SUBSTITUTE
$10=$ Paper mail back questionnaire from Request for Foreign Language
11 = Paper mail back questionnaire from BCF marked as whole household
$12=$ Paper mail back questionnaire from BCF partial household (i.e., NOT marked as whole household)
13 = Paper enumerator questionnaire from List Enumerate
14 = Paper enumerator questionnaire from Update Enumerate
$15=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from Update Enumerate ADD
$16=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from Update Enumerate SUBSTITUTE
17 = Paper enumerator questionnaire from Nonresponse Followup (NRFU)
$18=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from NRFU ADD
$19=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from NRFU SUBSTITUTE
$20=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from NRFU Whole Household Usual
Home Elsewhere (WHUHE)
$21=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from NRFU In-mover
$22=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from Coverage Improvement Followup
(CIFU)
$23=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from CIFU ADD
24 = Paper enumerator questionnaire from CIFU SUBSTITUTE
$25=$ Paper enumerator questionnaire from T-Night
$26=$ Paper questionnaire for UHE from Service-based Enumeration (SBE)
(Individual Census Questionnaire (ICQ))
27 = Paper questionnaire for UHE from Group Quarters (GQ) enumeration (Individual Census Questionnaire (ICQ))
$28=$ Paper questionnaire for UHE from Military GQ enumeration (Military Census Report (MCR))
$29=$ Paper questionnaire for UHE from Shipboard GQ enumeration (Shipboard Census Report (SCR))
$30=$ Electronic short form from IDC
31 = Electronic TQA reverse-CATI short form
$32=$ Electronic TQA reverse-CATI BCF for whole household
$33=$ Electronic TQA reverse-CATI BCF for partial household
34 = Electronic Coverage Edit Followup (CEFU) from long or short form
$35=$ Electronic CEFU from BCF for whole household
$36=$ Electronic CEFU from IDC
37 = Paper enumerator continuation form - unlinked "orphan"

## DC_DRF(12) Source of Data Capture

$0=$ None
1 = Some Data Capture
The types of data capture for housing units are -
(1) Mail Return (RSOURCE: 1, 4-10)
(2) Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (TQA) (RSOURCE: 31)
(3) Internet (RSOURCE: 30)
(4) Be Counted Form (BCF) (RSOURCE: 11, 12)
(5) CEFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 34-36)
(6) NRFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 17-21)
(7) CIFU Data Capture (RSOURCE: 22-24)
(8) TQA/BCF (RSOURCE: 3, 32, 33)
(9) List Enumerate/Update Enumerate (RSOURCE: 13-16)
(10) Group Quarters (RSOURCE: 25-29)
(11) Orphans (RSOURCE: 37)
(12) Other (RSOURCE: -1)

Appendix C: Nineteen Response Categories of Housing Units in the Response Rate Denominator

| Data Capture Flag (DC_DRF from DRF-2) |  | Mail Check in Date (MAILD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No Mail Check in (0000 or 2000) |  | Reverse Check in (0099) |  | Mail Returns <br> Jan 1 - Apr 10 <br> (0101-0410) | Late Mail Returns Apr 11 - Apr 18 (0411-0418) | Late Late Mail Returns <br> Apr 19 - Dec 31 <br> (0419-1231) | Total |
| Mail <br> Returns | Paper Mail Return or TQA or Internet or Be Counted or TQA/Be Counted | $1 \mathrm{~A}^{*}$ | 1B* | $2 A^{*}$ | $2 B^{*}$ | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 1,939 | 401,666 | 8,657 | 2,646 | 71,943,511 | 2,460,317 | 3,247,472 | 78,066,208 |
|  |  | 6A* | 6B* | 7A* | 7B* | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |
|  | CEFU | 13 | 2,592 | 579 | 753 | 1,129,142 | 63,877 | 48,011 | 1,244,967 |
| Non- <br> Mail <br> Returns | NRFU or CIFU or No Data Capture or Other Data Capture | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |
|  |  | 28,2 | ,977 | 987,902 |  | 122,671 | 6,020 | 8,963,003 | 38,350,573 |
|  | Total | 28,677,187 |  | 1,000,537 |  | 73,195,324 | 2,530,214 | 12,258,486 | 117,661,748 |

[^2]|  | State | Numerator-April 18, 2000 |  |  | Numerator-December 31, 2000 |  |  | Denominator |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Form Type |  | Total | Form Type |  | Total | Form Type |  |
|  |  |  | Short | Long |  | Short | Long |  | Short | Long |
| Type of Enumeration | TOTAL | 75,608,035 | 64,792,554 | 10,815,481 | 79,311,175 | 67,380,839 | 11,930,336 | 117,661,748 | 97,578,971 | 20,082,777 |
|  | Mailout/ <br> Mailback | 62,890,520 | 54,955,537 | 7,934,983 | 65,887,892 | 57,119,451 | 8,768,441 | 96,184,164 | 81,658,117 | 14,526,047 |
|  | Update/ Leave | 12,591,087 | 9,726,223 | 2,864,864 | 13,286,080 | 10,142,192 | 3,143,888 | 21,227,339 | 15,708,543 | 5,518,796 |
|  | Urban Update/ Leave | 126,428 | 110,794 | 15,634 | 137,203 | 119,196 | 18,007 | 250,245 | 212,311 | 37,934 |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2
Note: National totals do not include Puerto Rico.

Appendix E: Four Figures Illustrating the Mail Response Rates as of April 18, 2000 and the Final Mail Response Rates as of December 31, 2000 by Day and Form Type and Daily Percentage Increase in Response Rates by Day and Form Type


Figure 2. Daily Percentage Increase in Mail Response Rates by Form Type
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Figure 3. Response Rates by Date by Form Type


Figure 4. Daily Percentage Increase in Response Rates by Form Type
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Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Thursday | 03/02/2000 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| Friday | 03/03/2000 | 1,397 | 1,397 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | U/L delivery begins |
| Saturday | 03/04/2000 | 65 | 1,462 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 03/05/2000 | 52 | 1,514 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| Monday | 03/06/2000 | 149,634 | 151,148 | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | Advance notice delivery begins |
| Tuesday | 03/07/2000 | 62,469 | 213,617 | 0.1\% | 0.2\% |  |
| Wednesday | 03/08/2000 | 176,971 | 390,588 | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | Advance notice delivery ends |
| Thursday | 03/09/2000 | 235,918 | 626,506 | 0.2\% | 0.5\% |  |
| Friday | 03/10/2000 | 422,723 | 1,049,229 | 0.4\% | 0.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 03/11/2000 | 180,427 | 1,229,656 | 0.2\% | 1.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 03/12/2000 | 217,372 | 1,447,028 | 0.2\% | 1.2\% |  |
| Monday | 03/13/2000 | 756,539 | 2,203,567 | 0.6\% | 1.9\% | Questionnaire mailout delivery begins |
| Tuesday | 03/14/2000 | 550,444 | 2,754,011 | 0.5\% | 2.3\% |  |
| Wednesday | 03/15/2000 | 2,915,464 | 5,669,475 | 2.5\% | 4.8\% | Questionnaire mailout delivery ends |
| Thursday | 03/16/2000 | 4,269,016 | 9,938,491 | 3.6\% | 8.4\% |  |
| Friday | 03/17/2000 | 4,851,766 | 14,790,257 | 4.1\% | 12.6\% |  |
| Saturday | 03/18/2000 | 3,454,841 | 18,245,098 | 2.9\% | 15.5\% |  |
| Sunday | 03/19/2000 | 2,923,374 | 21,168,472 | 2.5\% | 18.0\% |  |
| Monday | 03/20/2000 | 5,262,381 | 26,430,853 | 4.5\% | 22.5\% | Reminder card delivery begins |
| Tuesday | 03/21/2000 | 5,326,760 | 31,757,613 | 4.5\% | 27.0\% |  |
| Wednesday | 03/22/2000 | 5,791,069 | 37,548,682 | 4.9\% | 31.9\% | Reminder card delivery ends |
| Thursday | 03/23/2000 | 5,250,239 | 42,798,921 | 4.5\% | 36.4\% |  |
| Friday | 03/24/2000 | 3,627,566 | 46,426,487 | 3.1\% | 39.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 03/25/2000 | 2,420,556 | 48,847,043 | 2.1\% | 41.5\% |  |
| Sunday | 03/26/2000 | 2,511,970 | 51,359,013 | 2.1\% | 43.7\% |  |
| Monday | 03/27/2000 | 2,993,679 | 54,352,692 | 2.5\% | 46.2\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Tuesday | 03/28/2000 | 3,141,074 | 57,493,766 | 2.7\% | 48.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 03/29/2000 | 1,939,206 | 59,432,972 | 1.6\% | 50.5\% |  |
| Thursday | 03/30/2000 | 1,829,908 | 61,262,880 | 1.6\% | 52.1\% | U/L delivery ends |
| Friday | 03/31/2000 | 1,744,944 | 63,007,824 | 1.5\% | 53.6\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/01/2000 | 1,365,370 | 64,373,194 | 1.2\% | 54.7\% | Census Day |
| Sunday | 04/02/2000 | 943,350 | 65,316,544 | 0.8\% | 55.5\% |  |
| Monday | 04/03/2000 | 1,490,946 | 66,807,490 | 1.3\% | 56.8\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/04/2000 | 1,320,770 | 68,128,260 | 1.1\% | 57.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/05/2000 | 1,034,302 | 69,162,562 | 0.9\% | 58.8\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/06/2000 | 1,233,153 | 70,395,715 | 1.0\% | 59.8\% |  |
| Friday | 04/07/2000 | 800,075 | 71,195,790 | 0.7\% | 60.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/08/2000 | 765,257 | 71,961,047 | 0.6\% | 61.2\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/09/2000 | 419,715 | 72,380,762 | 0.4\% | 61.5\% |  |
| Monday | 04/10/2000 | 691,891 | 73,072,653 | 0.6\% | 62.1\% | Initial NRFU cut |
| Tuesday | 04/11/2000 | 342,541 | 73,415,194 | 0.3\% | 62.4\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/12/2000 | 411,695 | 73,826,889 | 0.3\% | 62.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/13/2000 | 302,181 | 74,129,070 | 0.3\% | 63.0\% |  |
| Friday | 04/14/2000 | 523,441 | 74,652,511 | 0.4\% | 63.4\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/15/2000 | 305,789 | 74,958,300 | 0.3\% | 63.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/16/2000 | 167,706 | 75,126,006 | 0.1\% | 63.8\% |  |
| Monday | 04/17/2000 | 352,030 | 75,478,036 | 0.3\% | 64.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/18/2000 | 129,999 | 75,608,035 | 0.1\% | 64.3\% | Late mail return NRFU cut |
| Wednesday | 04/19/2000 | 210,358 | 75,818,393 | 0.2\% | 64.4\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/20/2000 | 209,631 | 76,028,024 | 0.2\% | 64.6\% |  |
| Friday | 04/21/2000 | 215,905 | 76,243,929 | 0.2\% | 64.8\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/22/2000 | 68,345 | 76,312,274 | 0.1\% | 64.9\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Sunday | 04/23/2000 | 81,653 | 76,393,927 | 0.1\% | 64.9\% |  |
| Monday | 04/24/2000 | 175,577 | 76,569,504 | 0.1\% | 65.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/25/2000 | 91,243 | 76,660,747 | 0.1\% | 65.2\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/26/2000 | 207,548 | 76,868,295 | 0.2\% | 65.3\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/27/2000 | 108,341 | 76,976,636 | 0.1\% | 65.4\% | NRFU begins |
| Friday | 04/28/2000 | 90,307 | 77,066,943 | 0.1\% | 65.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/29/2000 | 28,058 | 77,095,001 | 0.0\% | 65.5\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/30/2000 | 1,157 | 77,096,158 | 0.0\% | 65.5\% |  |
| Monday | 05/01/2000 | 139,211 | 77,235,369 | 0.1\% | 65.6\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/02/2000 | 23,404 | 77,258,773 | 0.0\% | 65.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/03/2000 | 76,067 | 77,334,840 | 0.1\% | 65.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/04/2000 | 92,806 | 77,427,646 | 0.1\% | 65.8\% |  |
| Friday | 05/05/2000 | 126,560 | 77,554,206 | 0.1\% | 65.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/06/2000 | 29,679 | 77,583,885 | 0.0\% | 65.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/07/2000 | 1,912 | 77,585,797 | 0.0\% | 65.9\% |  |
| Monday | 05/08/2000 | 24,577 | 77,610,374 | 0.0\% | 66.0\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/09/2000 | 9,107 | 77,619,481 | 0.0\% | 66.0\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/10/2000 | 15,482 | 77,634,963 | 0.0\% | 66.0\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/11/2000 | 40,721 | 77,675,684 | 0.0\% | 66.0\% |  |
| Friday | 05/12/2000 | 190,053 | 77,865,737 | 0.2\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/13/2000 | 4,321 | 77,870,058 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/14/2000 | 8,041 | 77,878,099 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Monday | 05/15/2000 | 3,937 | 77,882,036 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/16/2000 | 11,945 | 77,893,981 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/17/2000 | 17,286 | 77,911,267 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/18/2000 | 34,993 | 77,946,260 | 0.0\% | 66.2\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Friday | 05/19/2000 | 134,413 | 78,080,673 | 0.1\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/20/2000 | 28,279 | 78,108,952 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/21/2000 | 6,373 | 78,115,325 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Monday | 05/22/2000 | 9,765 | 78,125,090 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/23/2000 | 8,310 | 78,133,400 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/24/2000 | 18,270 | 78,151,670 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/25/2000 | 33,353 | 78,185,023 | 0.0\% | 66.4\% |  |
| Friday | 05/26/2000 | 98,298 | 78,283,321 | 0.1\% | 66.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/27/2000 | 13,414 | 78,296,735 | 0.0\% | 66.5\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/28/2000 | 6,801 | 78,303,536 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Monday | 05/29/2000 | 1,057 | 78,304,593 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/30/2000 | 7,864 | 78,312,457 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/31/2000 | 7,935 | 78,320,392 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/01/2000 | 17,131 | 78,337,523 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Friday | 06/02/2000 | 67,302 | 78,404,825 | 0.1\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/03/2000 | 14,539 | 78,419,364 | 0.0\% | 66.6\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/04/2000 | 6,880 | 78,426,244 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Monday | 06/05/2000 | 9,015 | 78,435,259 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 06/06/2000 | 9,931 | 78,445,190 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 06/07/2000 | 24,731 | 78,469,921 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/08/2000 | 32,955 | 78,502,876 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Friday | 06/09/2000 | 17,698 | 78,520,574 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/10/2000 | 8,450 | 78,529,024 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/11/2000 | 5,937 | 78,534,961 | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |  |
| Monday | 06/12/2000 | 20,851 | 78,555,812 | 0.0\% | 66.8\% |  |
| Tuesday | 06/13/2000 | 10,689 | 78,566,501 | 0.0\% | 66.8\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Wednesday | 06/14/2000 | 11,928 | 78,578,429 | 0.0\% | 66.8\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/15/2000 | 241,743 | 78,820,172 | 0.2\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Friday | 06/16/2000 | 9,857 | 78,830,029 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/17/2000 | 3,672 | 78,833,701 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/18/2000 | 3,127 | 78,836,828 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Monday | 06/19/2000 | 4,632 | 78,841,460 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Tuesday | 06/20/2000 | 3,883 | 78,845,343 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Wednesday | 06/21/2000 | 3,705 | 78,849,048 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/22/2000 | 3,425 | 78,852,473 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Friday | 06/23/2000 | 2,496 | 78,854,969 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/24/2000 | 1,067 | 78,856,036 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/25/2000 | 493 | 78,856,529 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Monday | 06/26/2000 | 2,612 | 78,859,141 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% | NRFU complete |
| Tuesday | 06/27/2000 | 1,953 | 78,861,094 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Wednesday | 06/28/2000 | 2,239 | 78,863,333 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/29/2000 | 24,147 | 78,887,480 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Friday | 06/30/2000 | 1,580 | 78,889,060 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/01/2000 | 765 | 78,889,825 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/02/2000 | 127 | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Monday | 07/03/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/04/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/05/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/06/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Friday | 07/07/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/08/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/09/2000 | - | 78,889,952 | 0.0\% | 67.0\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Monday | 07/10/2000 | 2,146 | 78,892,098 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/11/2000 | - | 78,892,098 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/12/2000 | - | 78,892,098 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/13/2000 | 349 | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 07/14/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/15/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/16/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 07/17/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/18/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/19/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/20/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 07/21/2000 | - | 78,892,447 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/22/2000 | 6,552 | 78,898,999 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/23/2000 | 1,107 | 78,900,106 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 07/24/2000 | - | 78,900,106 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/25/2000 | - | 78,900,106 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/26/2000 | - | 78,900,106 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/27/2000 | - | 78,900,106 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 07/28/2000 | 501 | 78,900,607 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/29/2000 | - | 78,900,607 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/30/2000 | - | 78,900,607 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 07/31/2000 | 133 | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/01/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/02/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/03/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 08/04/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Saturday | 08/05/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/06/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 08/07/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/08/2000 | - | 78,900,740 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/09/2000 | 602 | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/10/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 08/11/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/12/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/13/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 08/14/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/15/2000 | - | 78,901,342 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/16/2000 | 289 | 78,901,631 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/17/2000 | - | 78,901,631 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 08/18/2000 | 715 | 78,902,346 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/19/2000 | 957 | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/20/2000 | - | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 08/21/2000 | - | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/22/2000 | - | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/23/2000 | - | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/24/2000 | - | 78,903,303 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 08/25/2000 | 8 | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/26/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/27/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 08/28/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/29/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/30/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Thursday | 08/31/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 09/01/2000 | - | 78,903,311 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/02/2000 | 141 | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/03/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 09/04/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/05/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/06/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/07/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 09/08/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/09/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/10/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 09/11/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/12/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/13/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/14/2000 | - | 78,903,452 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 09/15/2000 | 63 | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/16/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/17/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 09/18/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/19/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/20/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/21/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 09/22/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/23/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/24/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 09/25/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |

Appendix F: Mail Response Numerators and Rates by Day

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Mail Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Tuesday | 09/26/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/27/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/28/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 09/29/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/30/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/01/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 10/02/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/03/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/04/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/05/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 10/06/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/07/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/08/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 10/09/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/10/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/11/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/12/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Friday | 10/13/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/14/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/15/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Monday | 10/16/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/17/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/18/2000 | - | 78,903,515 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/19/2000 | 3 | 78,903,518 | 0.0\% | 67.1\% | Last mail return with check-in date received |
| Sunday | 12/31/2000 | 407,657 | 79,311,175 | 0.3\% | 67.4\% |  |

## Source: DMAF and DRF-2.

Note: Rates are based on a response rate denominator of $117,661,748$ housing units.
Note: No forms with a valid check-in date were received after October 19, 2000. Mail returns from addresses which also were enumerated in NRFU or CIFU with no check-in date were assigned a date of December 31, 2000.
Note: Rates do not include Puerto Rico.

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  |  | Response Rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Day | Date | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase | Cumulative |  |  |
| Thursday | $03 / 02 / 2000$ | - | - | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | Key dates |  |
| Friday | $03 / 03 / 2000$ | 1,392 | 1,392 | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Saturday | $03 / 04 / 2000$ | 65 | 1,457 | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | U/L delivery begins |  |
| Sunday | $03 / 05 / 2000$ | 52 | 1,509 | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Monday | $03 / 06 / 2000$ | 132,094 | 133,603 | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | Advance notice delivery begins |  |
| Tuesday | $03 / 07 / 2000$ | 54,851 | 188,454 | $0.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |  |  |
| Wednesday | $03 / 08 / 2000$ | 157,425 | 345,879 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | Advance notice delivery ends |  |
| Thursday | $03 / 09 / 2000$ | 207,263 | 553,142 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |  |  |
| Friday | $03 / 10 / 2000$ | 365,553 | 918,695 | $0.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Saturday | $03 / 11 / 2000$ | 156,911 | $1,075,606$ | $0.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Sunday | $03 / 12 / 2000$ | 187,111 | $1,262,717$ | $0.2 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Monday | $03 / 13 / 2000$ | 642,139 | $1,904,856$ | $0.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | Questionnaire mailout delivery begins |  |
| Tuesday | $03 / 14 / 2000$ | 477,701 | $2,382,557$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |  |  |
| Wednesday | $03 / 15 / 2000$ | $2,717,701$ | $5,100,258$ | $2.8 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | Questionnaire mailout delivery ends |  |
| Thursday | $03 / 16 / 2000$ | $3,929,051$ | $9,029,309$ | $4.0 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Friday | $03 / 17 / 2000$ | $4,462,221$ | $13,491,530$ | $4.6 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Saturday | $03 / 18 / 2000$ | $3,226,454$ | $16,717,984$ | $3.3 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Sunday | $03 / 19 / 2000$ | $2,710,376$ | $19,428,360$ | $2.8 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Monday | $03 / 20 / 2000$ | $4,825,753$ | $24,254,113$ | $4.9 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | Reminder card delivery begins |  |
| Tuesday | $03 / 21 / 2000$ | $4,785,396$ | $29,039,509$ | $4.9 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Wednesday | $03 / 22 / 2000$ | $5,107,438$ | $34,146,947$ | $5.2 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | Reminder card delivery ends |  |
| Thursday | $03 / 23 / 2000$ | $4,412,890$ | $38,559,837$ | $4.5 \%$ | $39.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Friday | $03 / 24 / 2000$ | $2,790,988$ | $41,350,825$ | $2.9 \%$ | $42.4 \%$ |  |  |
| Saturday | $03 / 25 / 2000$ | $2,080,348$ | $43,431,173$ | $2.1 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Sunday | $03 / 26 / 2000$ | $2,200,925$ | $45,632,098$ | $2.3 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Monday | $03 / 27 / 2000$ | $2,553,064$ | $48,185,162$ | $2.6 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  |  | Response Rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Day | Date | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase |  | Cumulative |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Sunday | 04/23/2000 | 61,795 | 65,373,976 | 0.1\% | 67.0\% |  |
| Monday | 04/24/2000 | 111,230 | 65,485,206 | 0.1\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/25/2000 | 75,580 | 65,560,786 | 0.1\% | 67.2\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/26/2000 | 157,419 | 65,718,205 | 0.2\% | 67.3\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/27/2000 | 78,608 | 65,796,813 | 0.1\% | 67.4\% | NRFU begins |
| Friday | 04/28/2000 | 62,802 | 65,859,615 | 0.1\% | 67.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/29/2000 | 27,293 | 65,886,908 | 0.0\% | 67.5\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/30/2000 | 932 | 65,887,840 | 0.0\% | 67.5\% |  |
| Monday | 05/01/2000 | 109,058 | 65,996,898 | 0.1\% | 67.6\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/02/2000 | 20,264 | 66,017,162 | 0.0\% | 67.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/03/2000 | 62,649 | 66,079,811 | 0.1\% | 67.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/04/2000 | 75,532 | 66,155,343 | 0.1\% | 67.8\% |  |
| Friday | 05/05/2000 | 61,303 | 66,216,646 | 0.1\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/06/2000 | 24,327 | 66,240,973 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/07/2000 | 1,246 | 66,242,219 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Monday | 05/08/2000 | 13,180 | 66,255,399 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/09/2000 | 7,161 | 66,262,560 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/10/2000 | 13,167 | 66,275,727 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/11/2000 | 26,125 | 66,301,852 | 0.0\% | 67.9\% |  |
| Friday | 05/12/2000 | 146,001 | 66,447,853 | 0.1\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Saturday | 05/13/2000 | 2,697 | 66,450,550 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 05/14/2000 | 3,434 | 66,453,984 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Monday | 05/15/2000 | 2,699 | 66,456,683 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Tuesday | 05/16/2000 | 8,423 | 66,465,106 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 05/17/2000 | 11,631 | 66,476,737 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 05/18/2000 | 21,719 | 66,498,456 | 0.0\% | 68.1\% |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  | Response Rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Day | Date | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase | Cumulative | Key dates |
| Friday | $05 / 19 / 2000$ | 91,378 | $66,589,834$ | $0.1 \%$ | $68.2 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |
| Saturday | $05 / 20 / 2000$ | 14,615 | $66,604,449$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Sunday | $05 / 21 / 2000$ | 3,953 | $66,608,402$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Monday | $05 / 22 / 2000$ | 5,180 | $66,613,582$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Tuesday | $05 / 23 / 2000$ | 4,344 | $66,617,926$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Wednesday | $05 / 24 / 2000$ | 11,828 | $66,629,754$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Thursday | $05 / 25 / 2000$ | 22,708 | $66,652,462$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.3 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $05 / 26 / 2000$ | 59,220 | $66,711,682$ | $0.1 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Saturday | $05 / 27 / 2000$ | 8,691 | $66,720,373$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Sunday | $05 / 28 / 2000$ | 3,811 | $66,724,184$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Monday | $05 / 29 / 2000$ | 755 | $66,724,939$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Tuesday | $05 / 30 / 2000$ | 4,966 | $66,729,905$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Wednesday | $05 / 31 / 2000$ | 4,865 | $66,734,770$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Thursday | $06 / 01 / 2000$ | 9,096 | $66,743,866$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $06 / 02 / 2000$ | 39,681 | $66,783,547$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Saturday | $06 / 03 / 2000$ | 6,885 | $66,790,432$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| Sunday | $06 / 04 / 2000$ | 4,099 | $66,794,531$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Monday | $06 / 05 / 2000$ | 5,358 | $66,799,889$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Tuesday | $06 / 06 / 2000$ | 6,827 | $66,806,716$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Wednesday | $06 / 07 / 2000$ | 14,982 | $66,82,698$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Thursday | $06 / 08 / 2000$ | 16,036 | $66,837,734$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $06 / 09 / 2000$ | 8,888 | $66,846,622$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Saturday | $06 / 10 / 2000$ | 4,308 | $66,850,930$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Sunday | $06 / 11 / 2000$ | 2,981 | $66,853,911$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Monday | $06 / 12 / 2000$ | 13,022 | $66,866,933$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
| Tuesday | $06 / 13 / 2000$ | 5,597 | $66,872,530$ | $0.0 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Wednesday | 06/14/2000 | 7,890 | 66,880,420 | 0.0\% | 68.5\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/15/2000 | 146,022 | 67,026,442 | 0.1\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 06/16/2000 | 4,348 | 67,030,790 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/17/2000 | 2,280 | 67,033,070 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/18/2000 | 1,281 | 67,034,351 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 06/19/2000 | 1,531 | 67,035,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 06/20/2000 | 2,168 | 67,038,050 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 06/21/2000 | 2,270 | 67,040,320 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/22/2000 | 2,300 | 67,042,620 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 06/23/2000 | 1,388 | 67,044,008 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 06/24/2000 | 687 | 67,044,695 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 06/25/2000 | 269 | 67,044,964 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 06/26/2000 | 1,695 | 67,046,659 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% | NRFU complete |
| Tuesday | 06/27/2000 | 1,217 | 67,047,876 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 06/28/2000 | 1,557 | 67,049,433 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 06/29/2000 | 11,067 | 67,060,500 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 06/30/2000 | 980 | 67,061,480 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/01/2000 | 620 | 67,062,100 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/02/2000 | 67 | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 07/03/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/04/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/05/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/06/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 07/07/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/08/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/09/2000 | - | 67,062,167 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Monday | 07/10/2000 | 1,886 | 67,064,053 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/11/2000 | - | 67,064,053 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/12/2000 | - | 67,064,053 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/13/2000 | 232 | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 07/14/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/15/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/16/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 07/17/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/18/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/19/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/20/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 07/21/2000 | - | 67,064,285 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/22/2000 | 4,660 | 67,068,945 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/23/2000 | 754 | 67,069,699 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 07/24/2000 | - | 67,069,699 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/25/2000 | - | 67,069,699 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/26/2000 | - | 67,069,699 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/27/2000 | - | 67,069,699 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 07/28/2000 | 316 | 67,070,015 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/29/2000 | - | 67,070,015 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/30/2000 | - | 67,070,015 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 07/31/2000 | 82 | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/01/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/02/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/03/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 08/04/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Saturday | 08/05/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/06/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 08/07/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/08/2000 | - | 67,070,097 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/09/2000 | 350 | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/10/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 08/11/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/12/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/13/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 08/14/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/15/2000 | - | 67,070,447 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/16/2000 | 209 | 67,070,656 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/17/2000 | - | 67,070,656 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 08/18/2000 | 519 | 67,071,175 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/19/2000 | 548 | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 008/20/2000 | - | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 08/21/2000 | - | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/22/2000 | - | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/23/2000 | - | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/24/2000 | - | 67,071,723 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 08/25/2000 | 5 | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/26/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/27/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 08/28/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/29/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/30/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Thursday | 08/31/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 09/01/2000 | - | 67,071,728 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/02/2000 | 104 | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/03/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 09/04/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/05/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/06/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/07/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 09/08/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/09/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/10/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 09/11/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/12/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/13/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/14/2000 | - | 67,071,832 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 09/15/2000 | 50 | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/16/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/17/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 09/18/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/19/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/20/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/21/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 09/22/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/23/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/24/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 09/25/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |

Appendix G-1: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Short Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Tuesday | 09/26/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/27/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/28/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 09/29/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/30/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/01/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 10/02/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/03/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/04/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/05/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 10/06/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/07/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/08/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 10/09/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/10/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/11/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/12/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Friday | 10/13/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/14/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/15/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Monday | 10/16/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/17/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/18/2000 | - | 67,071,882 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/19/2000 | 3 | 67,071,885 | 0.0\% | 68.7\% | Last mail return with check-in date received |
| Sunday | 12/31/2000 | 308,954 | 67,380,839 | 0.3\% | 69.1\% |  |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.
Note: Short form return rates are based on a denominator of $97,578,971$.
Note: No forms with a valid check-in date were received after October 19, 2000. Mail returns from addresses which also were enumerated in NRFU or CIFU with no check-in date were assigned a date of December 31, 2000.
Note: Rates do not include Puerto Rico.

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  |  |  |  | Response Rate |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily <br> Increase | Cumulative |  |  |  |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Saturday | 04/01/2000 | 316,255 | 8,090,620 | 1.6\% | 40.3\% | Census Day |
| Sunday | 04/02/2000 | 208,044 | 8,298,664 | 1.0\% | 41.3\% |  |
| Monday | 04/03/2000 | 377,193 | 8,675,857 | 1.9\% | 43.2\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/04/2000 | 326,288 | 9,002,145 | 1.6\% | 44.8\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/05/2000 | 262,493 | 9,264,638 | 1.3\% | 46.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/06/2000 | 287,715 | 9,552,353 | 1.4\% | 47.6\% |  |
| Friday | 04/07/2000 | 192,905 | 9,745,258 | 1.0\% | 48.5\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/08/2000 | 171,743 | 9,917,001 | 0.9\% | 49.4\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/09/2000 | 105,375 | 10,022,376 | 0.5\% | 49.9\% |  |
| Monday | 04/10/2000 | 166,638 | 10,189,014 | 0.8\% | 50.7\% | Initial NRFU cut |
| Tuesday | 04/11/2000 | 68,847 | 10,257,861 | 0.3\% | 51.1\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/12/2000 | 99,058 | 10,356,919 | 0.5\% | 51.6\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/13/2000 | 85,917 | 10,442,836 | 0.4\% | 52.0\% |  |
| Friday | 04/14/2000 | 130,572 | 10,573,408 | 0.7\% | 52.6\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/15/2000 | 82,222 | 10,655,630 | 0.4\% | 53.1\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/16/2000 | 27,499 | 10,683,129 | 0.1\% | 53.2\% |  |
| Monday | 04/17/2000 | 96,730 | 10,779,859 | 0.5\% | 53.7\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/18/2000 | 35,622 | 10,815,481 | 0.2\% | 53.9\% | Late mail return NRFU cut |
| Wednesday | 04/19/2000 | 50,815 | 10,866,296 | 0.3\% | 54.1\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/20/2000 | 57,075 | 10,923,371 | 0.3\% | 54.4\% |  |
| Friday | 04/21/2000 | 62,668 | 10,986,039 | 0.3\% | 54.7\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/22/2000 | 14,054 | 11,000,093 | 0.1\% | 54.8\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/23/2000 | 19,858 | 11,019,951 | 0.1\% | 54.9\% |  |
| Monday | 04/24/2000 | 64,347 | 11,084,298 | 0.3\% | 55.2\% |  |
| Tuesday | 04/25/2000 | 15,663 | 11,099,961 | 0.1\% | 55.3\% |  |
| Wednesday | 04/26/2000 | 50,129 | 11,150,090 | 0.2\% | 55.5\% |  |
| Thursday | 04/27/2000 | 29,733 | 11,179,823 | 0.1\% | 55.7\% | NRFU begins |
| Friday | 04/28/2000 | 27,505 | 11,207,328 | 0.1\% | 55.8\% |  |
| Saturday | 04/29/2000 | 765 | 11,208,093 | 0.0\% | 55.8\% |  |
| Sunday | 04/30/2000 | 225 | 11,208,318 | 0.0\% | 55.8\% |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Response Rate |  |  |
| Day | Date | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily |  |
| Increase | Cumulative | Key dates |  |  |  |
| Monday | $05 / 01 / 2000$ | 30,153 | $11,238,471$ | $0.2 \%$ | $56.0 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $05 / 02 / 2000$ | 3,140 | $11,241,611$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.0 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $05 / 03 / 2000$ | 13,418 | $11,255,029$ | $0.1 \%$ | $56.0 \%$ |
| Thursday | $05 / 04 / 2000$ | 17,274 | $11,272,303$ | $0.1 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ |
| Friday | $05 / 05 / 2000$ | 65,257 | $11,337,560$ | $0.3 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |
| Saturday | $05 / 06 / 2000$ | 5,352 | $11,342,912$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |
| Sunday | $05 / 07 / 2000$ | 666 | $11,343,578$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |
| Monday | $05 / 08 / 2000$ | 11,397 | $11,354,975$ | $0.1 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $05 / 09 / 2000$ | 1,946 | $11,356,921$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $05 / 10 / 2000$ | 2,315 | $11,359,236$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |
| Thursday | $05 / 11 / 2000$ | 14,596 | $11,373,832$ | $0.1 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |
| Friday | $05 / 12 / 2000$ | 44,052 | $11,417,884$ | $0.2 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Saturday | $05 / 13 / 2000$ | 1,624 | $11,419,508$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Sunday | $05 / 14 / 2000$ | 4,607 | $11,424,115$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Monday | $05 / 15 / 2000$ | 1,238 | $11,425,353$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $05 / 16 / 2000$ | 3,522 | $11,428,875$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $05 / 17 / 2000$ | 5,655 | $11,434,530$ | $0.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Thursday | $05 / 18 / 2000$ | 13,274 | $11,447,804$ | $0.1 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ |
| Friday | $05 / 19 / 2000$ | 43,035 | $11,490,839$ | $0.2 \%$ | $57.2 \%$ |
| Saturday | $05 / 20 / 2000$ | 13,664 | $11,504,503$ | $0.1 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ |
| Sunday | $05 / 21 / 2000$ | 2,420 | $11,506,923$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ |
| Monday | $05 / 22 / 2000$ | 4,585 | $11,511,508$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $05 / 23 / 2000$ | 3,966 | $11,515,474$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $05 / 24 / 2000$ | 6,442 | $11,521,916$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.4 \%$ |
| Thursday | $05 / 25 / 2000$ | 10,645 | $11,532,561$ | $0.1 \%$ | $57.4 \%$ |
| Friday | $05 / 26 / 2000$ | 39,078 | $11,571,639$ | $0.2 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ |
| Saturday | $05 / 27 / 2000$ | 4,723 | $11,576,362$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ |
| Sunday | $05 / 28 / 2000$ | 2,990 | $11,579,352$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ |
| Monday | $05 / 29 / 2000$ | 302 | $11,579,654$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $05 / 30 / 2000$ | 2,898 | $11,582,552$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

|  |  | Mail Response Numerator |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Response Rate |  |  |
| Day | Increase | Cumulative | Key dates |  |  |
| Wednesday | $05 / 31 / 2000$ | 3,070 | $11,585,622$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ |
| Thursday | $06 / 01 / 2000$ | 8,035 | $11,593,657$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ |
| Friday | $06 / 02 / 2000$ | 27,621 | $11,621,278$ | $0.1 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ |
| Saturday | $06 / 03 / 2000$ | 7,654 | $11,628,932$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ |
| Sunday | $06 / 04 / 2000$ | 2,781 | $11,631,713$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ |
| Monday | $06 / 05 / 2000$ | 3,657 | $11,635,370$ | $0.0 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $06 / 06 / 2000$ | 3,104 | $11,638,474$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $06 / 07 / 2000$ | 9,749 | $11,648,223$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| Thursday | $06 / 08 / 2000$ | 16,919 | $11,665,142$ | $0.1 \%$ | $58.1 \%$ |
| Friday | $06 / 09 / 2000$ | 8,810 | $11,673,952$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.1 \%$ |
| Saturday | $06 / 10 / 2000$ | 4,142 | $11,678,094$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Sunday | $06 / 11 / 2000$ | 2,956 | $11,681,050$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Monday | $06 / 12 / 2000$ | 7,829 | $11,688,879$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $06 / 13 / 2000$ | 5,092 | $11,693,971$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $06 / 14 / 2000$ | 4,038 | $11,698,009$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Thursday | $06 / 15 / 2000$ | 95,721 | $11,793,730$ | $0.5 \%$ | $58.7 \%$ |
| Friday | $06 / 16 / 2000$ | 5,509 | $11,799,239$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Saturday | $06 / 17 / 2000$ | 1,392 | $11,800,631$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Sunday | $06 / 18 / 2000$ | 1,846 | $11,802,477$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Monday | $06 / 19 / 2000$ | 3,101 | $11,805,578$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $06 / 20 / 2000$ | 1,715 | $11,807,293$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $06 / 21 / 2000$ | 1,435 | $11,808,728$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Thursday | $06 / 22 / 2000$ | 1,125 | $11,809,853$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Friday | $06 / 23 / 2000$ | 1,108 | $11,810,961$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Saturday | $06 / 24 / 2000$ | 380 | $11,811,341$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Sunday | $06 / 25 / 2000$ | 224 | $11,811,565$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Monday | $06 / 26 / 2000$ | 917 | $11,812,482$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Tuesday | $06 / 27 / 2000$ | 736 | $11,813,218$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Wednesday | $06 / 28 / 2000$ | 682 | $11,813,900$ | $0.0 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| Thursday | $06 / 29 / 2000$ | 13,080 | $11,826,980$ | $0.1 \%$ | $58.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Friday | 06/30/2000 | 600 | 11,827,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/01/2000 | 145 | 11,827,725 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/02/2000 | 60 | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 07/03/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/04/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/05/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/06/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 07/07/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/08/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/09/2000 | - | 11,827,785 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 07/10/2000 | 260 | 11,828,045 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/11/2000 | - | 11,828,045 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/12/2000 | - | 11,828,045 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/13/2000 | 117 | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 07/14/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/15/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/16/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 07/17/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/18/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/19/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/20/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 07/21/2000 | - | 11,828,162 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/22/2000 | 1,892 | 11,830,054 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 07/23/2000 | 353 | 11,830,407 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 07/24/2000 | - | 11,830,407 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 07/25/2000 | - | 11,830,407 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 07/26/2000 | - | 11,830,407 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 07/27/2000 | - | 11,830,407 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 07/28/2000 | 185 | 11,830,592 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 07/29/2000 | - | 11,830,592 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Increase } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cumulative |  |
| Sunday | 07/30/2000 | - | 11,830,592 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 07/31/2000 | 51 | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/01/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/02/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/03/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 08/04/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/05/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/06/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 08/07/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/08/2000 | - | 11,830,643 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/09/2000 | 252 | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/10/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 08/11/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/12/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/13/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 08/14/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/15/2000 | - | 11,830,895 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/16/2000 | 80 | 11,830,975 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/17/2000 | - | 11,830,975 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 08/18/2000 | 196 | 11,831,171 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/19/2000 | 409 | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/20/2000 | - | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 08/21/2000 | - | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 08/22/2000 | - | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/23/2000 | - | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/24/2000 | - | 11,831,580 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 08/25/2000 | 3 | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 08/26/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 08/27/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 08/28/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Tuesday | 08/29/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 08/30/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 08/31/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 09/01/2000 | - | 11,831,583 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/02/2000 | 37 | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/03/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 09/04/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/05/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/06/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/07/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 09/08/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/09/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/10/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 09/11/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/12/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/13/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/14/2000 | - | 11,831,620 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 09/15/2000 | 13 | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/16/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/17/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 09/18/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/19/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/20/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 09/21/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 09/22/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/23/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 09/24/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 09/25/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 09/26/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 09/27/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |

Appendix G-2: Mail Response Numerators and Rates for Long Forms

| Day | Date | Mail Response Numerator |  | Response Rate |  | Key dates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Increase | Cumulative | Daily Increase | Cumulative |  |
| Thursday | 09/28/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 09/29/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 09/30/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/01/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 10/02/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/03/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/04/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/05/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 10/06/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/07/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/08/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 10/09/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/10/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/11/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/12/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Friday | 10/13/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Saturday | 10/14/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Sunday | 10/15/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Monday | 10/16/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Tuesday | 10/17/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Wednesday | 10/18/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% |  |
| Thursday | 10/19/2000 | - | 11,831,633 | 0.0\% | 58.9\% | Last mail return with check-in date received |
| Sunday | 12/31/2000 | 98,703 | 11,930,336 | 0.5\% | 59.4\% |  |

Source: DMAF and DRF-2.
Note: Long form return rates have a denominator of 20,082,777.
Note: No forms with a valid check-in date were received after October 19, 2000. Mail returns from addresses which also were enumerated in NRFU or CIFU with no check-in date were assigned a date of December 31, 2000.
Note: Rates do not include Puerto Rico.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001b, Study Plan for B.1: Evaluation of the Analysis of the Imputation Process for 100 Percent Household Population Items, Decennial Statistical Studies Division Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series \#Y-1, October 1, 2001.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1990 Census Mailback Questionnaire Check-in Rates, Decennial Planning Division, March 14, 1991.
    ${ }^{3}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1990 Census Mailback Questionnaire Check-in Rates, Decennial Planning Division, March 14, 1991.

[^2]:    * A - Neither NRFU nor CIFU data capture

    B-Either NRFU or CIFU data capture

