

Census 2000 Special EEO Tabulation

Protecting Privacy

In preparing to publish data from Census 2000, the Census Bureau became extremely concerned that with the emergence of advanced computer technology that decodes information for areas by combining extremely detailed characteristics such as occupations with small geographic units, the possibility of revealing information on individual respondents would be greatly enhanced. To address this problem, the Census Bureau in 1995 created a Disclosure Review Board (DRB), specifically tasked with the responsibility to review specifications for all census data products, and to determine that no product format is approved that contains any degree of disclosure risk.

Previous versions of the Special EEO Tabulation, prepared from the 1980 and 1990 decennial censuses, were used throughout the country by employers and federal agencies to monitor compliance with federal law and regulations prohibiting employment discrimination. These files contained cross-tabulations of over 500 detailed occupational categories by six race/ethnicity groupings, sex, and other characteristics for all states, metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), and counties irrespective of population size, and for all places with populations of 50,000 or more.

In 1997 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) rescinded Statistical Policy Directive Number 15 (1977), covering the publication and use of data covering race and ethnicity. Based on OMB's Revised Standards (1997), the Special EEO Tabulation presents data for 12 race/ethnicity groups (15 in Hawaii) instead of six, including several dual-race combinations, such as Black/White and Black/Asian, among others.

These expanded race/ethnicity distinctions, combined with the increased ability to electronically match different data files, prompted the DRB to review in detail the potential disclosure risk related to the Special EEO Tabulation format. As a result, the DRB issued two rules in 2000 affecting the Census 2000 Special EEO Tabulation.

1. Any occupational category containing fewer than 10,000 people employed nationwide cannot be shown separately, and must be combined with related occupational categories to create aggregates containing 10,000 or more people.
2. Detailed occupational categories, when cross-tabulated by the 12 race/ethnicity categories (15 in Hawaii), cannot be shown for any geographic area containing fewer than 50,000 people. Geographic areas containing fewer than 50,000 people must be combined in such a way that the resulting aggregation:

- a. Contains 50,000 or more people, **and**
- b. The subtraction of any geographic subset from a larger, combined area does not reveal information for any area containing fewer than 50,000 people.

As a result of the above rules issued by the DRB, the Special EEO Tabulation is now configured in the following manner:

1. The number of detailed civilian occupational categories are reduced from the 509 in the Census 2000 classification system to 472/471.
2. For Datasets No. 1 and 2, containing cross-tabulations of detailed occupational categories (472 in Dataset 1 and 268 in Dataset 2) by the 12 race/ethnicity categories (15 in Hawaii), approximately 70 percent of all U.S. counties are combined to create combinations of counties (referred to as County Sets) containing no fewer than 50,000 people.
3. A further constraint is added to ensure compliance with Rule 2(b), above. That is, no County Set combination is permitted to cross state lines. Otherwise, the risk referenced in Rule 2(b) is unacceptably high that, by subtraction of particular counties across a state boundary, individual respondent information could be revealed.

As further protection, the DRB required that the following additional disclosure avoidance steps be taken with the Special EEO Tabulation:

1. All cells in the Census 2000 Special EEO Tabulation are rounded. The rounding schematic is:
 - 0 remains 0
 - 1-7 rounds to 4
 - 8 or greater rounds to nearest multiple of 5 (i.e., 864 rounds to 865, 982 rounds to 980)
 - Any number that already ends in 5 or 0 stays as is.

Any totals or subtotals are constructed before rounding. This assures that universes remain the same from dataset to dataset, and it is recognized that cells in a dataset will no longer be additive after rounding.

2. If geographic codes are shown, they are Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) codes rather than census codes.
3. For Worksite/Residence datasets, no flow is shown from a residence county or residence place unless there are 50 or more unweighted cases for all occupations in that county or place. If there are less than 50 unweighted cases, all cases go into the U.S. Balance flow category. All occupations in the U.S. Balance flow category are shown separately.

4. For Worksite/Residence datasets, no flow is shown from a residence county or worksite for a specific occupation unless there are 3 or more unweighted cases for that occupation in that county or place. If there are less than 3 unweighted cases for a specific occupation, the cases for that occupation go into the U.S. Balance flow category. All occupations in the U.S. Balance flow category are shown separately.
5. Seven metropolitan areas (MSAs and PMSAs) are not included in datasets 1 and 2 because to identify them in conjunction with identifying County Sets would result in showing data for an area of under 50,000 population. The seven areas are –

Arizona: Flagstaff AZ-UT MSA - FIPS MSA Code #2620
Arkansas: Fort Smith AR-OK MSA - FIPS MSA Code #2720
Maryland: Baltimore MD PMSA - FIPS PMSA Code #0720
New York: Newburgh NY-PA PMSA - FIPS PMSA Code #5660
North Dakota: Grand Forks ND-MN MSA - FIPS MSA Code 2985
Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh PA MSA - FIPS MSA Code #6280
Wisconsin: La Crosse WI-MN MSA - FIPS MSA Code #3870

However, all metropolitan areas (MSAs and PMSAs) are shown in datasets 3, 4, 5, and 7.

6. Sixty places with populations of 50,000 or more are not shown in datasets 14 through 19 because showing them in conjunction with data for the county they are in would result in the identification of a balance of the county that is under 50,000 population. However, all places of 50,000 or more are shown in datasets 3 through 6. The sixty places not shown are –

Alabama:

Dothan city
Montgomery city

Arkansas:

Fort Smith city
Jonesboro city
Pine Bluff city

Colorado:

Pueblo city

Florida

Jacksonville city

Georgia:

Albany city
Athens-Clarke County (balance)
Augusta-Richmond County (balance)
Columbus city (balance)

Idaho:

Idaho Falls city
Pocatello city

Illinois:

Decatur city

Indiana:

Terre Haute city

Iowa:

Ames city

Council Bluffs city

Dubuque city

Iowa City city

Sioux City city

Kansas:

Kansas City city

Lawrence city

Topeka city

Kentucky:

Owensboro city

Louisiana:

Bossier City city

Minnesota:

Rochester city

Missouri:

Kansas City city

St. Joseph city

Montana:

Billings city

Great Falls city

Missoula city

Nebraska:

Lincoln city

New Mexico:

Rio Rancho city

North Carolina:

Durham city

Rocky Mount city

North Dakota:

Bismarck city

Fargo city

Oklahoma:

Lawton city

Oregon:

Gresham city

Salem city

South Dakota:

Rapid City city

Sioux Falls city

Tennessee:

Clarksville city
Jackson city
Nashville-Davidson (balance)

Texas:
Abilene city
Amarillo city
Bryon city
Corpus Christi city
Laredo city
Longview city
Lubbock city
Midland city
Odessa city
San Angelo city
Victoria city
Wichita Falls city

West Virginia:
Huntington city

Wisconsin:
Eau Claire city

Wyoming:
Cheyenne city

7. Thirty-four places with populations of 100,000 or more are not shown in datasets 21 through 24 because showing them in conjunction with data for the county they are in would result in the identification of a balance of the county that is under 100,000 population. The thirty-four places not shown are

Alabama:
Montgomery city

Colorado:
Pueblo city

Florida:
Jacksonville city
Tallahassee city

Georgia:
Athens-Clarke County (balance)
Augusta-Richmond County (balance)
Columbus city (balance)

Illinois:
Peoria city
Springfield city

Indiana:
Evansville city
Indianapolis city (balance)

Iowa:

Cedar Rapids city
Kansas:
Kansas City city
Topeka city
Louisiana:
Lafayette city
Shreveport city
Michigan:
Lansing city
Mississippi:
Jackson city
Missouri:
Independence city
Kansas City city
Springfield city
Nebraska:
Lincoln city
Omaha city
North Carolina:
Durham city
South Dakota:
Sioux Falls city
Tennessee:
Clarksville city
Nashville-Davidsonville (balance)
Texas:
Abilene city
Amarillo city
Corpus Christi city
Laredo city
Lubbock city
Waco city
Wichita Falls city