

Y 4 . P 84/10:94-89

1022

9444  
P84/10  
94-89

# CENSUS—PLACE OF RESIDENCE

GOVERNMENT

Storage

10V 20 1976



HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON  
OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 15, 1976

Serial No 94-89

Printed for the use of the  
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1976

Y 4 9 84/10:04-82

CENSUS—PLACE OF RESIDENCE

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina, *Chairman*  
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona, *Vice Chairman*

- |                                       |                                 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey       | EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois   |
| ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania        | ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania |
| JAMES M. HANLEY, New York             | JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California   |
| CHARLES H. WILSON, California         | ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California   |
| RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas               | JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas         |
| WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan             | GENE TAYLOR, Missouri           |
| WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri         | BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York    |
| PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado          | ROBIN L. BEARD, Tennessee       |
| WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida               | TRENT LOTT, Mississippi         |
| GLADYS N. SPELLMAN, Maryland          |                                 |
| STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina       |                                 |
| HERBERT E. HARRIS, Virginia           |                                 |
| WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD, Michigan         |                                 |
| PAUL SIMON, Illinois                  |                                 |
| NORMAN Y. MINETA, California          |                                 |
| JOHN W. JENRETTE, Jr., South Carolina |                                 |
| STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York           |                                 |

JOHN H. MARTINY, *Chief Counsel*  
VICTOR C. SMIRLODO, *Staff Director and Counsel*  
THEODORE J. KAZY, *Associate Staff Director*  
ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *Counsel*  
J. PIERCE MYERS, *Assistant Counsel*  
DAVID MINTON, *Associate Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

- |   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado, <i>Chairwoman</i> |                               |
| WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida                         | JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California |
| STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina                 | ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California |
| GLADYS N. SPELLMAN, Maryland                    |                               |
| WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD, Michigan                   |                               |
| PAUL SIMON, Illinois                            |                               |

*Ex Officio Voting Members*

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina   | EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois |
| (DONALD F. TERRY, <i>Assistant Counsel</i> , Room 601, HOB Annex—Ext. 56741) |                               |



## CONTENTS

---

Statement of—

Hagan, Robert L., Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, accompanied by David L. Kaplan, Assistant Director, Demographic Censuses, and Daniel B. Levine, Associate Director, Demographic Fields.....	Page 1
--	-----------

# CONTENTS

Introduction ..... 1  
Chapter I. The History of the ..... 10  
Chapter II. The Theory of the ..... 20  
Chapter III. The Practice of the ..... 30  
Chapter IV. The Results of the ..... 40  
Chapter V. The Conclusions of the ..... 50

## CENSUS—PLACE OF RESIDENCE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1976

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION,  
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a.m. in room 304, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Patricia Schroeder (chairwoman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. This morning, the subcommittee is meeting to consider the residence rules which the Bureau of the Census proposes to apply to the 1980 census.

These rules principally deal with the proper allocation to particular jurisdiction of so-called temporary populations such as college students or military personnel.

We will be happy to hear what the Bureau intends to do so that we may inform other Members of Congress who may wish to comment on these proposals.

We have with us this morning Mr. Robert Hagan, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Census.

Welcome.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. HAGAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID L. KAPLAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR DEMOGRAPHIC CENSUSES AND DANIEL B. LEVINE, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR DEMOGRAPHIC FIELDS**

Mr. HAGAN. Thank you, Congresswoman Schroeder.

I have with me, as witnesses, David Kaplan and Dan Levine, who are principally responsible for the planning of the decennial census.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Would you like to submit your statement for the record?

Mr. HAGAN. That would be fine with me. We can just begin with discussion of points of interest with one preliminary comment in that obviously, these represent the status of our planning at present, and we will continue to review these rules as conditions develop.

So we can begin with the discussion at any time you wish.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Why don't you go along and just kind of summarize the history of where it was and what the current planning is? I think if we just did a fast summary, that would be helpful.

Mr. HAGAN. Fine.

Of course, the place of residence issue really concerns the components of the population who have unusual living arrangements. And there are several groups of the population for which special rules are developed and followed in census operations.

Typically, of course, in practice, this dates back to the earliest census. We have counted each person under what we call the usual place of residence rule. This is where the person lives and sleeps most of the time. This place is not necessarily, then, the same as the legal residence or voting residence or domicile.

The population groups that really present unusual problems with regard to application of these kinds of rules, of course, include the Armed Forces residing in the United States. Our practice has been to count the members where they are at the time of the census.

There have been some challenges to this practice. In 1970, the Borough of Bethel Park, Pa., challenged the residence rules in court, and the Bureau's practices were upheld.

Another population group that has been the subject of discussion and some contention in the past, of course, is college students. Beginning in 1950 and continuing through 1960 and 1970, the Bureau has counted college students at the place where they attend school and where they are living for most of the year.

Prior to that time, we had attempted to allocate the college students back to their original residence or the residence of their parents where they entered college. We plan to continue to count the college students at the location of the college where they are living.

The students below college level, we do not plan a change in that area. They will be counted as residents of the parental household from which they have entered the school. So that that would not represent any different plan.

Persons in institutions are another group. And, of course, we distinguish between individuals who are in institutions where they usually stay a long period of time from those who are in an institution on a temporary basis. Again, the 1980 plan would follow the 1970 practice.

There are other mobile population groups for which we develop rules. And these are persons with no usual place of residence, truly a transient population component. As a general rule, such persons in that group were counted at the place they were staying at the time of the census to insure coverage in the census.

We have procedures that are tailored to develop the best possible coverage for that population group. We include people staying in hotels, motels, the YM and YWCA's and similar places. It also includes persons in missions, jails and other types of transient quarters. Basically, they are enumerated where they are found.

#### AMERICANS ABROAD

Following the 1970 census plan, we are going to make special provision for enumeration of persons abroad, including members of the Armed Forces, their dependents. This is a difficult group to enumerate. And it requires unusual types of arrangements with military officials, with the Civil Service Commission, with others in order to insure adequate coverage of that population group.

However, in the 1970 census because of the large number of Americans overseas, principally American military and civilian personnel and dependents who were then overseas because of the Vietnam conflict, we did allocate the population totals for Armed Forces personnel back to the home state of record for purposes of congressional apportionment. That was not done in any previous census.

Our proposal for 1980 is to return again to the practice that we followed in 1960 and earlier censuses for this population group. We have some reasons for following this practice.

First of all, traditionally they have not been included in the apportionment population of any other census except the one in 1970. And we included them in 1970 because of the large build-up in the Armed Forces overseas during the 1960's, not because of any change in constitutional requirements or other laws governing the apportionment procedure.

In addition, there is some problem in the data that we obtain on home State of those who are overseas. It is of an unknown reliability.

In fact, a recent study conducted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with recommendations for the Congress has shown that some servicemen may select as their home State one with low or no income taxes rather than their true home State. So there is a bias introduced into the computations.

And finally, I think it should be noted that a large factor in our planning is that the number overseas has been reduced very greatly and has come down from about 1.6 million in 1970 to about 900,000 at the present time.

In addition, of course, one is concerned about the impact of either including them or not including them on congressional apportionment.

In 1970, it developed that by including this population, it did affect the last seat in Congress, and in fact would have, as indicated in our appendix here, if they had been not included caused one of the seats that was allocated to Oklahoma or apportioned to Oklahoma to go to Connecticut.

Now, using 1975 estimates and using the same formula that would be used for 1980, there is no effect at this point, although we are not able to say for certain, that this would continue to 1980.

That is a brief summary of the plans that we have made.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions, Counsel?

Mr. TERRY. The only question that I have is in regard to military personnel. And the rationale, I expect, if I understand it correctly, is that you choose to count people where they live or sleep, other than their actual legal residence, because they have greater ties to that community where they are sleeping and living than their domicile.

Would this rationale apply equally to trainees areas with high numbers of trainees who are coming through for perhaps as little as 6 weeks?

I don't know how many people are at, say, Fort Dix, N.J., perhaps up to 100,000 being processed through at any particular time. Those people don't have any particular tie to that community. Usually, they don't even get off the base. If they get off the base, it is to go home.

Those people are counted as residents of Fort Dix, N.J.?

Mr. HAGAN. Where they are at the time of the census.

Mr. TERRY. The rationale, I don't think would hold up in that type instance. Is it that it is just administratively impossible for you to separate out people who are going to be assigned to a particular base for a period of time and, therefore, will be living in that area and spread out as opposed to those people who are just temporarily at a particular—

Mr. HAGAN. It would be a great difficulty in attempting to do that kind of separation.

I think there is another issue to be considered here. And that is that even though trainees may have a 6-week tour at Fort Dix or some other base for training purposes, it does impose a level of services, and that same group of trainees would be replaced by another group in the subsequent 6-week period, so that the communities surrounding Fort Dix would have the impact of a population level resulting from the Armed Forces being located there.

Mr. TERRY. You mean the trainees who don't bring their families with them for that period of time, don't really get off the base, are not subject to additional school taxes?

Mr. HAGAN. I think there is a very good case to be made for the city officials who are concerned with the counts that are developed for revenue-sharing purposes and the fact that this population is there, and they are not wholly confined to the base, I don't think, particularly with the Volunteer Army concept that we have now.

And I would think that the most equitable way of handling that population component is to allocate them to the location at the time of the census.

And I think it is also an established fact that with a young population component of that sort, there is great mobility, and the probability of their returning to their parental residence, if you will, or the place from where they entered service is not very great. I think those factors have to be considered.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank you very much.

The subcommittee will adjourn at this time.

[Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.]

[The statement submitted by Mr. Hagan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. HAGAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Madam Chairwoman, I appreciate your invitation to appear before this Subcommittee to provide you with background information concerning the Census Bureau's current plans relating to the "place of residence" concept for the enumeration of the population in the 1980 census.

In conducting the decennial population census of the United States, the Bureau of the Census has the responsibility to enumerate every person in the United States, insofar as possible. Title 2, Section 2a, of the United States Code, concerning the use of decennial census figures as the basis for the reapportionment of Representatives, states that "the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State . . . as ascertained under . . . each subsequent decennial census of the population, and the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled . . .".

In determining the "whole number of persons in each State", the Bureau of the Census counts each person as an inhabitant of a place of residence that is defined as the person's usual place of residence. The Act of 1790 providing for the first decennial census stated that persons were to be enumerated at their "usual place of abode" and that persons "without a settled place of residence," shall be counted "where he or she shall be" on census day and that "every person occasionally absent at the time of the enumeration" shall be counted "as belonging to that place in which he usually resides."

In the 1970 census, the Census Bureau, in accordance with practice dating back to 1790, counted each person enumerated as an inhabitant of his usual place of abode or residence. The concept of usual place of residence is generally construed to mean the place where the person lives and sleeps most of the time. This place is not necessarily the same as the person's legal residence, voting residence, or domicile.

In order to implement the policy of counting persons as inhabitants of their usual place of residence, it has been necessary to establish specific residence rules for certain categories of persons whose usual place of residence is not immediately clear.

I have attached to my statement a table of residence rules which was used by enumerators in 1970. In general, persons were counted as members of the household where they were living on census day. Also included as members of the household on that date were persons who were staying or visiting there who had no other home, and persons who usually lived in the household but who were temporarily absent on a visit, business trip, vacation, etc.

These rules of residence are being reexamined now, as the Census Bureau makes its plans for the conduct of the 1980 census. For most of the population, the residence rules, which are given in a summary form on the census questionnaire, are easy to understand and apply. However, I wish now to review what our current plans are for some unique population groups.

*Armed Forces residing in the United States.*—In the 1970 census, as in every previous census, members of the Armed Forces living on military installations in the United States were counted as resident of the area in which the installation was located. Similarly, members of the Armed Forces who were living off the military installations were counted as residents of the area in which they were living. Counting the members of the Armed Forces in this manner is in accord with the usual-place-of-residence concept since these persons were enumerated at the place in which they usually eat and sleep.

This method of enumerating Armed Forces was challenged in court in 1970. The Borough of Bethel Park, Pennsylvania, brought a suit which raised questions regarding the propriety of certain procedures established by the Bureau of the Census for taking the 1970 census. The procedures questioned related to the enumeration of members of the Armed Forces, college students, and inmates of institutions. Regarding Armed Forces, the plaintiffs questioned the procedure whereby members of the Armed Services stationed in the United States were enumerated as inhabitants of the specific location where they were living at the time of the census, rather than in the States which such individuals considered their legal residence. However, the United States Court of Appeals held that the Bureau of the Census properly enumerated members of Armed Services stationed in the United States as inhabitants of the place where they were living at the time of the census, *Borough of Bethel Park v. Stans* (449 F 2d 575 (1971)). I have attached to my statement a copy of the Court's decision.<sup>1</sup>

Since the enumeration of Armed Forces in the United States as residents of the area where they are stationed has been the practice in every decennial census, and is in accord with the usual-place-of-residence concept, the Census Bureau plans to continue to follow this same procedure in the 1980 census.

However, the Bureau is proposing a revision of one procedure that was used in the 1970 census for the enumeration of certain members of the Armed Forces. In 1970, crews of U.S. Navy vessels, excluding those deployed to the overseas fleet, were counted as living on board the ship and the entire ship's crew was counted as resident of the home port of the vessel. Since some members of the ship's crew may be actually living in the home port or an adjacent area with their families when the ship is docked at the home port, rather than on board ship, more equitably distributed population counts for these areas would result if these crew members are counted as residents of the specific areas rather than aboard ship. The Bureau is now investigating the feasibility of making this change in enumeration procedures.

*College students.*—In the censuses of 1950, 1960, and 1970, college students were enumerated as inhabitants of the localities in which they were living while attending college. Prior to the 1950 census, most college students were enumerated as inhabitants of the States in which their parents maintained their homes. The change in procedures was made, beginning with the 1950 census, based on the recommendation of a study conducted in 1948 by the Bureau's Technical Advisory Committee on General Population Statistics which considered the impact of the sharp increase in the number of college students, both in total and in the number living at college, on the census count. It was found that under the procedure used prior to the 1950 census, the census failed to count a number of college students who were not reported at either their parental home or at their college.

Another reason for the change from counting college students at their parental home to counting them where they lived while attending college was to eliminate

<sup>1</sup> Not included in this print.

the inconsistency between the way college students were enumerated and the way all the other major population categories were enumerated.

Counting college students at their parental homes rather than at their usual residence while attending college would provide unrealistic results for many college towns where thousands of students spend a major part of the year. The students live in the community, draw on its resources, rely on its public services, and patronize its business establishments.

In an opinion of the Attorney General, dated March 25, 1950 (41 op. Atty. Gen. 59 (1950)) it was held that the judgment and discretion which the statutes have reposed in the Director of the Census, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, were broad enough to permit the adoption of a procedure whereby a student who was away from home attending college would be considered and enumerated as a resident of the enumeration district in which the student lived while attending college.

In the aforementioned suit brought by the Borough of Bethel Park, Pennsylvania, regarding the procedures used by the Census Bureau for taking the 1970 census, the plaintiffs challenged the Bureau's policy of enumerating college students where they lived while attending college rather than at their legal residence. However, it was the opinion of the court that the decision of the Bureau concerning the enumeration of college students was reasonable, since such students usually eat, sleep, and work in the State where the college is located.

For the 1980 Census, the Bureau plans to continue to count college students as residents of the locality in which they live while attending college.

*Students below college level.*—Students who were away from home attending school below the college level, except those at institutional-type schools, were counted as residents of their parental household in the 1970 census. In the Court's opinion in the Borough of Bethel Park case, this method was found to be acceptable since these students below the college level could properly be ascribed to a parental home, whereas older college students, at a transitional state of their lives, could not be. Moreover, the Court noted that: "It is unlikely that the number of students in a school below the college level who are in attendance in a state other than that of their parental home will have an appreciable effect upon the population of either state or even the respective political subdivisions."

For the 1980 census, the Bureau plans to continue to count students attending boarding schools away from home as part of their parental household.

*Persons in institutions.*—In the 1970 census, persons residing in institutions where individuals usually stay for long periods of time, such as penitentiaries, mental institutions, homes for the needy or aged, or hospitals for the chronically ill, were enumerated as residents of the locality where the institution was located. People in this category, as distinguished from, for example, those in a hospital for a short period, often have no other fixed place of abode, and the length of their institutional stay is often indefinite. Patients in short-term wards of general hospitals were not counted at the hospital if they had a usual place of residence elsewhere. This procedure of enumerating persons in institutions is in accord with the concept of usual place of residence, and in connection with the suit brought by the Borough of Bethel Park, it was the opinion of the Court "that the decision of the Bureau as to the place of counting institutional inmates has a reasonable basis."

For the 1980 census, the Census Bureau plans to continue to count persons living in institutions as residents of the localities where the institutions are located.

*Mobile population groups.*—Persons with no usual place of residence and certain mobile populations groups present unique problems. As the general rule, such persons were counted in 1970 at the place they were staying at the time of the census to ensure their coverage in the census. Examples of our procedures for different groups are as follows. Persons staying in hotels, motels, YMCA's, and similar places were asked if they have a usual residence elsewhere. If they did not, they were enumerated where found. Persons in missions, jails, and similar places were also enumerated where found. Persons in places with shifting populations, such as construction camps and camps for migratory agricultural workers, were also enumerated where they were located at the time of the census. The Bureau plans to follow this same procedure in the 1980 census to be sure that this segment of the population is enumerated as completely as possible. Because of our concern with full coverage for these difficult groups, I should add that the Bureau plans to explore and test a wide variety of approaches to be sure, insofar as we can, that these mobile groups, such as migrant workers, are aware of the census, are aware of the need to be counted, and have the opportunity to be counted.

*Americans abroad.*—As in the 1970 census we plan again to make special provision for the enumeration of persons abroad including members of the Armed Forces, their dependents, civilian American citizens employed by the Federal Government, their dependents, and crews of merchant marine vessels at sea. In addition, in 1970 an effort was made to obtain reports for private citizens who were living abroad for long periods of time; however, of necessity such reporting was on a voluntary basis and thus not as complete as for the other groups. Accordingly, we plan to explore approaches which might permit us to obtain a much wider representation of this group in 1980. As noted earlier, persons who were only temporarily abroad were to have been reported by their families or neighbors in the United States.

Because of the large number of Americans overseas at the time of the 1970 census, American military and civilian personnel working for the Federal Government and the dependents of these groups who were abroad were allocated to their home State for purposes of congressional apportionment. This was not done in any previous census.

However, we do not believe that it is necessary to allocate this population group back to their home State for apportionment purposes in 1980 for the following considerations:

1. They were not included in the apportionment population in any census other than 1970.
2. They were included in 1970 only because of the large build-up in the Armed Forces overseas during the 1960's because of the Vietnam conflict and not because of any change in the constitutional requirements or other laws governing the apportionment procedure.
3. The data on "home State" of those overseas are of an unknown reliability. In fact, a recent study conducted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with recommendations for the Congress, has shown that some servicemen may select as their "home State" one with low or no income taxes rather than their "true" home State.<sup>1</sup>
4. Finally, it should be noted that the number overseas has been cut almost in half from 1.6 million in 1970 to about 900,000 in 1975.

I have prepared a more complete statement concerning this matter which, with your permission, I should like to have inserted into the record. In this more complete statement, there is a description of the influence on apportionment of the inclusion of the overseas population. In 1970, their inclusion only affected the 435th seat, and based on current estimates of the population of the States and the population overseas, their inclusion makes no change in the apportionment of the Representatives among the States.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, for the opportunity to present this statement. I will be pleased to answer any questions which you may have.

---

#### THE APPORTIONMENT POPULATION IN 1980

In defining the apportionment population for the 1980 census, it must be determined if the American military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government and their dependents who are counted abroad in the 1980 census should be allocated to their home States and included in the population of those States for the purposes of apportionment, as they were for the first time in 1970, or if they should be excluded from the apportionment population as they were in previous years.

For a number of important reasons, the Bureau is now planning to return to the traditional approach in 1980 and not include the American overseas population in the apportionment population for 1980.

In 1970, the apportionment population in each State was redefined to also include (for the first time) all American military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government from that State who were counted abroad as of April 1,

---

<sup>1</sup> *State Taxation of Military Income and Store Sales, A Commission Report A-50, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, July 1976.*

1970, and their dependents who were with them. This overseas population was allocated to "home State" for purposes of congressional apportionment.<sup>1</sup>

The decision to include these selected segments of the population overseas in the apportionment population was based primarily on the fact that unprecedently large numbers of Federal Government military and civilian personnel would be overseas at the time of the 1970 census, and followed discussion with committees of the Congress. The decision was not made because of any new specific constitutional interpretation or requirement, or other law. In 1949, for example, the exclusion of the population overseas in the apportionment population had been deemed acceptable by the Attorney General (41 op. Atty. Gen. 31 (1949)).

Adding the 1.6 million Americans overseas to the counts of the States for apportionment purposes in 1970 made very minor changes in the population counts of the individual States. The addition of these selected groups abroad to the resident population for the purposes of apportionment increased the resident population by 0.8 percent. The relative increase for the individual States ranged from a high of 1.9 percent for the State of Hawaii to a low of 0.5 percent for the State of New York.

In 1970, the ratio of the apportionment population to Representatives was 469,088 persons, and the ratio of the resident population to Representatives was 465,468 persons. The attached table shows that the number of persons abroad allocated back to their home States in 1970 ranged from 145,729 persons for the State of California to 1,894 persons for the State of Alaska. The only State besides California to which more than 100,000 persons were added was Texas, which was increased by 102,057 persons.

The absolute number of persons overseas who were allocated back to their home States for the purposes of apportionment in 1970 was relatively small for any one State. The relative distribution of the population among the States was virtually the same both for the resident population and for the apportionment population, as adding Americans overseas to the counts of the States for apportionment purposes in 1970 did not change the percent distribution of the population among the States at the one decimal level, except for rounding (see attached table).<sup>2</sup>

However, the assignment of the population overseas back to their home States did make a difference in the number of Representatives apportioned among the States. If the 1970 apportionment had been based on the resident population only, excluding the overseas population, Connecticut would have had one more seat (for a total of 7) and Oklahoma one less seat (total of 5) than resulted from the official apportionment based on the resident population plus the overseas population.

As of September 30, 1975, the number of Americans overseas in the Armed Forces, working as civilian employees of the Federal Government, or as dependents of the Armed Forces or of civilian employees has been cut almost in half from 1.6 million to approximately 930,000.

If the apportionment calculation were based on Census Bureau estimates of the population of States for 1975 and the estimated 930,000 Americans overseas (assuming that those overseas were distributed among the States in the same proportions as in 1970), then there would be no difference in the apportionment of Representatives among the States whether the apportionment population included or excluded the overseas population.

To obtain information on the home of record of the overseas population and to tabulate the information secured for each State was a complicated process in 1970 which required a considerable expenditure of time and funds to complete. The data were collected from various sources and forms needed to count the overseas population. Department of Defense tabulations of "home of record" for members of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps stationed overseas provided a part of the needed data. Census forms were used to obtain information from the overseas land-based Navy personnel, military dependents, and Federal employees and their dependents living abroad for an extended period. Other

<sup>1</sup> For most members of the Armed Forces, "home State" meant their "home of record" as it appeared on military records; for other members of the Armed Forces and for civilians overseas it meant the "home State" reported on the 1970 overseas census report form. The phrase "home State" was used by Americans overseas to designate their area of usual residence in the United States which may be their present or last voting residence, legal residence, the "home" specified in their official records, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Although the figures in the attached table appear to indicate that Arkansas and California differed by 0.1 between their proportion of the apportionment population and their proportion of the resident population, this is due only to rounding. The actual difference for Arkansas was 0.002 and the difference for California was 0.005.

census forms were used to obtain information from members of the Armed Forces living in barracks in Puerto Rico and the outlying areas of the United States and from members of the Armed Forces stationed on U.S. Navy and Coast Guard ships at sea.

All of these forms had to be hand-sorted as they were received from military sources and from the U.S. diplomatic and consular posts. They were also checked off against various control cards indicating ships and locations from which returns were expected. A staff of 25 to 30 clerks worked for several months to hand-process the hundreds of thousands of questionnaires. Finally, counts of the number of persons according to "home State" were made from the assembled forms, and these counts, along with counts of the military abroad received on tape from the Department of Defense, were added to the State totals for apportionment purposes. All of this processing had to be completed prior to the transmittal of the apportionment figures to the President.

In 1970, the allocation of Americans overseas back to their home States affected the apportionment for only the last Congressional seat. At the present time, the apportionment would be the same whether those overseas were included or excluded, based on current estimates of the population in each of the States and current estimates of the overseas population. (The exact effect upon the apportionment of Representatives among the States of including or excluding the overseas population in 1980 are unknown and cannot be determined at this time. These effects are dependent upon the interaction of the exact distribution of the resident and overseas population among the States and the operation of the particular mathematical formula, known as the method of equal proportions, used to compute the apportionment.)

We do not believe that it is necessary or desirable to allocate the overseas population back to their home State for apportionment purposes in 1980. The following considerations lead us to this conclusion:

1. Americans abroad were not included in the apportionment population in any census except 1970.

2. Americans abroad were included in the apportionment population in 1970 only because of the very large number who were overseas at that time, following the build-up in the Armed Forces overseas in the 1960's because of the Vietnam conflict, and not because of any change in the constitutional requirements or other laws governing the apportionment procedure.

3. The data on "home State" of those overseas are of an unknown reliability. In fact, a recent study conducted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, with recommendations for the Congress, has shown that some servicemen may select as their "home State" one with low or no income taxes rather than their "true" home State.<sup>3</sup>

4. The number of Americans abroad has been cut in half—from 1.6 million in 1970 to 930,000 as of September 30, 1975.

In view of the extra costs and complexities, technical uncertainties, and minimal (if any) impact, the Bureau plans to resume in 1980 the traditional approach of not including Americans overseas in the apportionment population.

<sup>3</sup> *State Taxation of Military Income and Store Sales*, A Commission Report A-50, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, July 1976.

## COMPONENTS OF THE APPORTIONMENT POPULATION: 1970

States	Apportionment population	Resident population	United States population abroad 1/	Popu- lation abroad as a percent of the resident population	Percent distribution		
					Appor- tionment popu- lation	Resi- dent popu- lation	United States popu- lation abroad
UNITED STATES...	204,053,325	202,478,788	1,574,537	0.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alabama.....	3,475,885	3,444,165	31,720	0.9	1.7	1.7	2.0
Alaska.....	304,067	302,173	1,894	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1
Arizona.....	1,787,620	1,772,482	15,138	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0
Arkansas.....	1,942,303	1,923,295	19,008	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.2
California.....	20,098,863	19,953,134	145,729	0.7	9.8	9.9	9.3
Colorado.....	2,226,771	2,207,259	19,512	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.2
Connecticut.....	3,050,693	3,032,217	18,476	0.6	1.5	1.5	1.2
Delaware.....	551,928	548,104	3,824	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.2
Florida.....	6,855,702	6,789,443	66,259	1.0	3.4	3.4	4.2
Georgia.....	4,627,306	4,589,575	37,731	0.8	2.3	2.3	2.4
Hawaii.....	784,901	769,913	14,988	1.9	0.4	0.4	1.0
Idaho.....	719,921	713,008	6,913	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
Illinois.....	11,184,320	11,113,976	70,344	0.6	5.5	5.5	4.5
Indiana.....	5,228,156	5,193,669	34,487	0.7	2.6	2.6	2.2
Iowa.....	2,846,920	2,825,041	21,879	0.8	1.4	1.4	1.4
Kansas.....	2,265,846	2,249,071	16,775	0.7	1.1	1.1	1.1
Kentucky.....	3,246,481	3,219,311	27,170	0.8	1.6	1.6	1.7
Louisiana.....	3,672,008	3,643,180	28,828	0.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Maine.....	1,006,320	993,663	12,657	1.3	0.5	0.5	0.8
Maryland.....	3,953,698	3,922,399	31,299	0.8	1.9	1.9	2.0
Massachusetts.....	5,726,676	5,689,170	37,506	0.7	2.8	2.8	2.4
Michigan.....	8,937,196	8,875,083	62,113	0.7	4.4	4.4	3.9
Minnesota.....	3,833,173	3,805,069	28,104	0.7	1.9	1.9	1.8
Mississippi.....	2,233,848	2,216,912	16,936	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.1
Missouri.....	4,718,034	4,677,399	40,635	0.9	2.3	2.3	2.6
Montana.....	701,573	694,409	7,164	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.5
Nebraska.....	1,496,820	1,483,791	13,029	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.8
Nevada.....	492,396	488,738	3,658	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2
New Hampshire.....	746,284	737,681	8,603	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.5
New Jersey.....	7,208,035	7,168,164	39,871	0.6	3.5	3.5	2.5
New Mexico.....	1,026,664	1,016,000	10,664	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.7
New York.....	18,338,055	18,241,266	96,789	0.5	9.0	9.0	6.1
North Carolina.....	5,125,230	5,082,059	43,171	0.8	2.5	2.5	2.7
North Dakota.....	624,181	617,761	6,420	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.4
Ohio.....	10,730,200	10,652,017	78,183	0.7	5.3	5.3	5.0
Oklahoma.....	2,585,486	2,559,253	26,233	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.7
Oregon.....	2,110,810	2,091,385	19,425	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.2
Pennsylvania.....	11,884,314	11,793,909	90,405	0.8	5.8	5.8	5.7
Rhode Island.....	957,798	949,723	8,075	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.5
South Carolina.....	2,617,320	2,590,516	26,804	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.7
South Dakota.....	673,247	666,257	6,990	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.4
Tennessee.....	3,961,060	3,924,164	36,896	0.9	1.9	1.9	2.3
Texas.....	11,298,787	11,196,730	102,057	0.9	5.5	5.5	6.5
Utah.....	1,067,810	1,059,273	8,537	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5
Vermont.....	448,327	444,732	3,595	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.2
Virginia.....	4,690,742	4,648,494	42,248	0.9	2.3	2.3	2.7
Washington.....	3,443,487	3,409,169	34,318	1.0	1.7	1.7	2.2
West Virginia.....	1,763,331	1,744,237	19,094	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.2
Wisconsin.....	4,447,013	4,417,933	29,080	0.7	2.2	2.2	1.8
Wyoming.....	335,719	332,416	3,303	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.2

(See footnotes on next page.)

- 1/ Includes military and civilian Federal employees and their dependents who (a) were living in outlying areas of the United States and reported a State as their "home of record," or (b) were living in a foreign country and were American citizens or reported a State as their home of record.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, Vol. I, Characteristics of the Population, U.S. Summary, Section 2, table A, p. App-3.

## APPENDIX A, TABLE OF RESIDENCE RULES

This table is divided into two columns. The type of person (student, member of the Armed Forces, etc.) is described in the left-hand column. The right-hand column tells you whether the person is a resident of this household or some other place.

<u>Type of person</u>	<u>Resident of</u>
1. Lives in this household but is temporarily absent on a visit, business trip, vacation, in connection with job (bus driver, traveling salesman, canal or river vessel crewman and the like).	This household
2. Lives in this household on weekends only. Works most of the week in another place and maintains a room or apartment there.	The other place
3. Lives in this household but is in a general or VA hospital, including new babies in the hospital who have not yet been brought home.	This household (Unless in a psychiatric, TB, chronic ward, etc; if so, count in the hospital)
4. Member of the Armed Forces:	
a. Living on military installation	The military installation
b. Stationed on nearby installation but living off post in this household	This household
c. Assigned to a military vessel	The vessel
5. Officer or crew member of merchant vessel, vessel engaged in coastwise, intercoastal, or foreign transportation (including Great Lakes)	The vessel
6. Officer or crew member of a merchant vessel engaged in inland waterway transportation	This household
7. College student	
a. Away at college on Census Day or here only on vacation	The college
b. Attending college but living in this household	This household

<u>Type of person</u>	<u>Resident of --</u>
8. Student away attending school below college level (other than students at institutional-type schools).	This household
9. Nurse living in hospital, nurses' home, etc.	Hospital, nurses' home
10. Family members working and living away from home	Place where they live while working away from home
11. Person who has more than one home and divides time between them.	List at place where he spends largest part of the calendar year.
12. Person who lives in this household most of the time because he works nearby but has a home elsewhere where he stays weekends or less frequently	This household
13. American citizen abroad:	
a. Temporarily on vacation or away in connection with his work	This household
b. Employed by U.S. Government with place of duty abroad or member of the family of such person living with him.	This is a special case. DO NOT LIST
c. Any other American working or living abroad for extended period of time.	DO NOT LIST
14. Person in institution where people usually stay for long periods of time such as correctional or penal institutions, penitentiaries, jails, workhouses, reformatories, convict camps, schools for delinquents (regardless of length of sentence or stay); mental institutions; homes for needy or aged; hospitals and asylums for the chronically ill and handicapped; homes or schools for the deaf, blind, or mentally retarded.	The institution
15. Members of religious orders living in a monastery, convent, etc.	The monastery or convent.

<u>Type of Person</u>	<u>Resident of --</u>
16. Persons in places which have shifting populations composed mainly of persons with no fixed residence, such as convict camps, railroad camps, highway and other construction camps, and camps for migratory agricultural workers.	The camp
17. Citizen of foreign country:	
a. Studying or working in the United States or members of family of such person living with him	This household
b. Temporarily traveling or visiting in the United States	Not to be counted
c. Living on the premises of an Embassy, Ministry, Legation, Chancellery, or Consulate	Not to be counted
18. Domestic servants who "live in"	Determine if the servant occupies a housing unit separate from the main household. If YES, list on separate questionnaire.
	If NO, should be listed on the household questionnaire.
19. Visitors	Ask if there is someone at home to report him to a census taker. If not, follow the instructions for Item 12. DO NOT LIST in question 1 for this household.



