

del Pinei, Jorge H.; Taguba, Leah M.; Cresce, Arthur R.; Morning, Ann

**Working Paper**

## Reporting of two or more races in the 1999 American community survey

Working Paper, No. 329

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

*Suggested Citation:* del Pinei, Jorge H.; Taguba, Leah M.; Cresce, Arthur R.; Morning, Ann (2001) : Reporting of two or more races in the 1999 American community survey, Working Paper, No. 329, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/31522>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

---

## Working Paper No. 329

### Reporting of Two or More Races in the 1999 American Community Survey

by  
Jorge H. del Pinal\*  
Leah M. Taguba\*  
Arthur R. Cresce\*  
Ann Morning\*\*  
Population Division,  
\*U.S. Census Bureau  
and  
\*\*Princeton University

May 2001

This paper reports research and analysis undertaken by Census Bureau staff. It has undergone a more limited review than do official Census Bureau publications. Its purposes are to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. This paper was originally presented at the Levy Institute conference "Multiraciality: How Will the New Census Data Be Used?" September 22–23, 2000, Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.

#### INTRODUCTION

On October 30, 1997, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released its new standards for the collection and reporting of racial and ethnic data by Federal Agencies (OMB 1997). Three of the changes are of particular interest here. First, respondents are allowed to select more than one racial category. Second, the former "Asian and Pacific Islander" category was split into an "Asian" category and a "Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander" category. Third, Federal Agencies were asked to have the Hispanic/Latino origin<sup>1</sup> question precede the race question in survey collection efforts. In addition, the new standards specified some terminological changes to the categories. As a result, OMB has specified a minimum of five racial categories:

1. American Indian and Alaska Native
2. Asian
3. Black or African American
4. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
5. White

And two ethnic categories:

6. Hispanic or Latino
7. Not Hispanic or Latino

The Census Bureau received an exemption to include "Some other race" as a category in the race question. As a result, these six categories and all the possible combinations of the six add up to 63 possibilities. For the purposes of this discussion, then, "two or more races" refers to the 57 possible combinations of the six categories. Thus, a response of "White" and "Asian" is considered a two-race response, while a response of "Chinese" and "Vietnamese" is not because the latter contains two responses that fall in the "Asian" category.

#### CENSUS 2000 DRESS REHEARSAL

As a result of these significant changes, there is great interest about the extent to which these changes will affect the distributions by race and Hispanic/Latino origin. The first major test of these standards was the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal in 1998.

The Census Bureau conducted the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal in three sites: 1) Sacramento, California; 2) Columbia, South Carolina and 11 surrounding counties; and 3) Menominee County, Wisconsin. The resulting data provided us with an opportunity to preview what could happen in the Census 2000 of Population and Housing. Each dress rehearsal site was selected to allow the Census Bureau to test different data collection methodologies in areas with a range of demographic and geographic characteristics that may be encountered in the Census 2000 environment.

Although the sites were selected to represent a variety of environments, the sites were not representative of the nation's diversity. Further, the results in Census 2000 may differ from those in the dress rehearsal because of differences in data collection and processing procedures between the two data collection efforts. With these cautions in mind, the key findings in dress rehearsal were as follows:

1. Reporting of two or more races ranged from 5.4 percent in Sacramento to 0.8 percent in South Carolina and 1.2 percent in Menominee.
2. Nearly nine of every ten people reporting two or more races reported only two races.
3. People of Hispanic/Latino origin were much more likely to report two or more races than were non-Hispanics. However, to a great extent one of the races reported by Latinos was "Some other race" which resulted directly in most cases from Latinos providing an Hispanic ethnicity in the question on race. Hispanics were also more likely not to answer the race question than were non-Hispanics.

#### AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY

Another preview of what may emerge in Census 2000 is the 1999 American Community Survey (ACS). In 1999, the U.S. Census Bureau conducted the ACS in 36 counties across the country. Twenty-one sites had large enough samples for the Census Bureau to report results separately (U.S.

Department of Commerce).<sup>2</sup> The ACS was first launched in 1996 in four counties and has included regularly all the items of the Census long (sample) form including race, Spanish/Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, ancestry, place of birth, educational attainment, income, and occupation.<sup>3</sup> Prior to 1999, the ACS questionnaire featured a race question that allowed respondents to select the option "Multiracial" and then write in the relevant racial groups. This information was never separately published, but was included in the "Some other race" category.

In 1999, however, respondents were instructed to "mark one or more races," the same instruction given for the question on race in Census 2000. This change was made as a result of the Office of Management and Budget's 1997 revision of federal racial and ethnic classification standards, and the desire

to make the race question in the 1999 ACS the same as in Census 2000.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the 1999 ACS results may offer a preview of the extent to which multiple-race reporting will appear in Census 2000. However, we should keep in mind that the ACS sample is not nationally representative or even representative of the states from which the samples were drawn. In this paper, we discuss the 1999 ACS data published from the 21 sites on July 28, 2000 (U.S. Department of Commerce 2000). Summaries and tabulations of the 1999 ACS data are available on the Census Bureau's Internet site (U.S. Census Bureau n.d. 2, n.d. 3). Narrative and tabular profiles for each survey site are readily available along with more than 100 detailed tables (U.S. Census Bureau n.d. 4).

## DISTRIBUTION BY RACE

The racial estimates<sup>5</sup> and percentage distributions for the 21 ACS sites are shown in Tables 1A and 1B. It is quite clear that these sites demonstrated a tremendous range in racial reporting. The proportion reporting White alone varied from a high of 98 percent in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, and Sevier County, Tennessee, to a low of 21 percent in the Bronx Borough, New York. Only in the Bronx, New York and San Francisco County, California, were Whites less than the majority reported. The proportion reporting as Black or African American alone ranged from highs around 46 percent in Madison County, Mississippi, and Jefferson County, Arkansas to zero percent in Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas. The highest percentage of American Indians and Alaska Natives was about 7 percent in Flathead /Lake Counties, Montana followed by Yakima County, Washington (about 5 percent) and Pima County, Arizona, (about 3 percent). Elsewhere there were proportionately few American Indian and Alaska Natives reported. The highest proportion reporting as Asian was about 35 percent in San Francisco County, California, followed by about 6 percent in Rockland County, New York, and Fort Bend/Harris Counties, Texas, and about 5 percent in Multnomah County, Oregon. There were very few people reporting as Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone in any of the sites. San Francisco County, California had less than 1 percent even though it had the highest concentration. The reporting of two or more races ranged from about 4.5 percent in Yakima, Washington, to 0.2 percent in Madison County, Mississippi. The reporting of two or more races will be discussed in more detail in the next section of the paper.

Table 1C shows the distribution of the population by Hispanic/Latino origin. The proportion reporting Hispanic or Latino ranged from a high of about 96 percent in Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas, to a low of less than 1 percent in Madison County, Mississippi. Tables 1D and 1E show the racial estimates and distribution for the non-Hispanic population and Tables 1F and 1G show the same information for the Latino population. In many sites, the non-Hispanic population demonstrated a racial distribution similar to that for the total population. Hispanics, by contrast, had a much different pattern of reporting race in most ACS sites with Hispanics reporting in either the "White" or "Some other race" categories. Just as in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal, Hispanics tended to have proportionately more reporting of two or more races.

## REPORTING OF TWO OR MORE RACES

Table 2A shows the estimated number and percentage of people reporting two or more races in each ACS site along with a 90-percent confidence interval around the estimated percentage. As noted above, the highest proportion reported was for Yakima, Washington, with 4.5 percent. The 90-percent confidence interval around this estimate ranges from 3.7 to 5.3 percent, which was statistically indistinguishable from the 3.3 to 4.2 percent range around the 3.8 percent estimate in the Bronx. Madison, Mississippi appeared to have the lowest proportion (0.2 percent) but this percentage was not significantly different from that for Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania (0.6 percent).

### Number of Races Reported

Table 2B shows the number of races reported by individuals by ACS site. In almost all ACS sites (as in Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal sites) at least nine of every ten people who reported two or more races provided exactly two races. One exception was Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania where about 78 percent of the multi-race responses consisted of two races and 22 percent consisted of three races. Other exceptions were Franklin County, Ohio and Multnomah County, Oregon, where almost 88 percent reported exactly two races and 11 percent reported exactly three races.

### Reporting "Some other Race"

One of the reasons multiple-race reporting among Hispanics is higher is that they very frequently reported their Hispanic or Latino origin in the race question along with another racial category. In Census 2000, virtually all Hispanic or Latino ethnic responses to the question on race will be coded as "Some other race". Table 2C shows the number and percent of the population providing two or more races. Those estimates can be broken into two groups: 1) combinations of exactly two races which include "Some other race" as one of the races, and 2) all other combinations of two or more races.

If we are not as interested in combinations that include "ethnic" responses as races, then the last three columns, which exclude combinations including "Some other race" represent a better measure of multiple-race reporting. Yakima County, Washington, and Multnomah County, Oregon, appeared to show the highest proportions of multiple-race reporting with about 3 percent, but these percentages were not statistically different from that for Flathead/Lake Counties, Montana - 2.2 percent. On the other hand, Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas, would have no multiple race reported if "Some other race" was not included in the determination of multiple race.

### Combinations of Race Reported

On March 9, 2000 the Office of Management and Budget issued a bulletin entitled "Guidance on Aggregation and Allocation of Data on Race for Use in Civil Rights Monitoring and Enforcement" (OMB 2000). This bulletin offered the following guidance:

**Aggregation Guidance** : Census 2000 will provide 63 categories of data on the population by race; these data will be available by April 1, 2001, at the national, state, local, and census tract levels. Data collected by Federal enforcement agencies often are provided by businesses and institutions in aggregate form. To facilitate agency efforts to work with data on race, an aggregation method is presented below. This method keeps intact the five single race categories, and includes the four double race combinations most frequently reported in recent studies. The method also provides for the collection of information on any multiple race combinations that comprise more than one percent of the population of interest. Based on data from Census 2000, responsible agencies will determine which additional combinations meet the one-percent threshold for the relevant jurisdictions. A balance category is provided to report those individual responses that are not included in (1) one of the five single race categories or four double race combinations or (2) other combinations that represent more than one percent of the population in a jurisdiction. The following example illustrates this guidance:

1	American Indian and Alaska native
2	Asian
3	Black or African American
4	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
5	White
6	American Indian or Alaska Native and White
7	Asian and White
8	Black or African American and White
9	American Indian or Alaska Native and Black or African American
10	> 1 percent: Fill in if applicable(1)_____
11	> 1 percent: Fill in if applicable_____
12	Balance of individuals reporting more than one race
13	Total

Table 3A and 3B show estimates and percentage distributions of the four double-race combinations specified by OMB and other double combinations of OMB racial categories. From Table 3B it is clear that for about half of the ACS sites, the four doubles selected by OMB were the most significant combinations although only in rare cases did any combination exceed one percent of the total population. In addition, Asian and Black, and possibly Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander and White, turned out to be significant as well although in these sites these combinations never reached the one percent threshold level suggested by OMB. No other combinations were even close to the one-percent threshold (with possible exception of doubles that include "Some other race" as part of the combination).

#### "Minimum" and "Maximum" Racial Distributions

As can be seen in Tables 4A and 4B, the number and proportion of the population in each racial category varied by tabulation method. The "single race" definition, also known as the "minimum" distribution, includes only those responding to a single racial category. The "All-Inclusive" definition, also known as the "maximum" distribution, refers to those who responded to a particular category whether or not other categories were reported. For example, the White population in San Francisco County, California, ranged from 313,600 to 333,100 depending on the tabulation method chosen (and excluding variation due to sampling which could also increase the range). Accordingly, the percentage of Whites varied from about 42 to 45 percent in Table 4B. The percentage of Blacks ranged from 10.2 to 10.9 (corresponding estimates ranged from 76,300 to 81,400); American Indians ranged from 0.5 to 1.3 percent (corresponding estimates ranged from 3,500 to 9,900); Asian ranged from 34.6 percent to 35.8 percent (corresponding estimates ranged from 258,300 to 267,700); and Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders ranged from 0.7 to 0.8 percent (corresponding estimates ranged from 5,500 to 6,300).

Obviously, the effect of the difference from "minimum" to "maximum" on small racial categories can be quite large. For example, the proportion of American Indians and Alaska Natives in San Francisco County, California changed by 160 percent (from 0.5 to 1.3 percent) and 14 percent for Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders, compared to a change of six percent for Whites, seven percent for Blacks and African Americans, and three percent for Asians. These proportions varied by ACS site; but as a general rule, the percentage for the smaller racial categories varied substantially.

#### NON-RESPONSE TO RACE

One of the concerns expressed about placing the question on Hispanic/Latino origin ahead of the question on race was that it might cause the response to the race question to decline. As in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal, Table 5 shows that, except for Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas and Madison County, Mississippi, Hispanics/Latinos were less likely than non-Hispanics to provide a race. With the exception of Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas, the non-response to race among non-Hispanics was less than one percent. In Calvert County, Maryland, and San Francisco County, California, about 10 percent of Hispanics did not answer the question on race.

#### Non-Response to Hispanic/Latino Origin

The main reason suggested by OMB for placing the question on Hispanic/Latino origin ahead of the question on race was to reduce non-response to the question on Hispanic/Latino origin. There was very low non-response in all ACS sites compared to the national average of 10 percent non-response in the 1990 Census (see Table 6). These results were similar to those experienced in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal. Given that the non-response rate was lower for the White population than that for the total population, it appears that non-White respondents were more likely not to complete the question on Hispanic/Latino origin than were non-Hispanic White respondents. For example, 19 percent of Black respondents in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania did not provide a response to the question on Hispanic/Latino origin. In Douglas County, Nebraska, 12 percent did not provide a response to this question. Very high percentages of American Indians and Alaska Natives and Asians in Jefferson County, Arkansas did not respond to this question, but the denominators were very small (226 and 250, respectively).

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This examination of the 1999 ACS data confirms many of the findings of the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal. The 1999 ACS results show the following:

- 1) The highest proportion of two or more races reported appeared to be 4.5 percent in Yakima, Washington, but this was not significantly different from that for Bronx Borough, New York -- 3.8 percent. The lowest percentage appeared to be 0.2 percent in Madison, Mississippi, but this percentage was not statistically different from that for Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania-0.6 percent. Also, Hispanics/Latinos were much more likely to report two or more races, usually two races, of which one race was "Some other race."
- 2) In most sites, about 90 percent of people who were of two or more races reported only two races. The one notable exception was Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, where about 78 percent of the multi-race responses were doubles and 22 percent were triples. The great majority of the balance of the responses was three races, and very few reported higher-order combinations. If we exclude doubles that involve "Some other race," then the percentage of multiple-race responses declines substantially. Yakima County, Washington, and Multnomah County, Oregon, showed the highest proportions of multiple-race reporting with about 3 percent. Excluding combinations with "Some other race," Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas had no multiple-race reported. The most frequent race combinations reported were American Indian and White; Asian and White; Black and White; and American Indian and Black. In addition, the ACS data suggest that Asian and Black, and possibly Native

Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander and White, may turn out to be significant two or more race populations as well, although in these sites they never reached the one-percent threshold level.

3. 3) Overall, the differences between the "single race" (or "minimum") distribution and the "all-inclusive race" (or "maximum") distribution was not great because the reporting of two or more races is very low. However, the differences were much larger for smaller racial groups such as American Indians and Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders.
4. 4) The race non-response rates were generally quite low, and even lower among non-Hispanic respondents. Latinos were much more likely not to answer the race question, except in Madison County, Mississippi and Starr/Zapata Counties, Texas.
5. 5) Non-response to the question on Hispanic/Latino origin was dramatically lower in the 21 ACS sites than the national average 10 percent non-response in the 1990 Census. This result is, in all likelihood, due to placing the question on Hispanic/Latino origin ahead of the question on race and to a better understanding of the meaning of the question on Hispanic/Latino origin among the general population. On the other hand, many respondents, and Hispanics in particular, perceive race and ethnicity differently from the way the concepts are currently used in the Census and other federal surveys. Overall, across the 21 sites, about equal proportions of Hispanics/Latinos selected "Some other race" or "White" as their only race (about 45 and 47 percent, respectively), and usually reported their Hispanic or Latino origin in the race question.

In sum, these findings suggest, despite the lack of national representativeness of the 1999 ACS data, that the reporting of two or more races in Census 2000 may not be as extensive as some have thought. The ACS sites, overall, are probably more diverse than the national population, but do not include states such as New Mexico, Hawaii or the District of Columbia that have very high minority proportions. There were also few areas with large American Indian and Alaska Native populations. In addition, the survey did not include other well-known multiracial communities such as Oak Park/Chicago, Illinois and Columbia/Baltimore, Maryland where the extent of multiracial reporting could be much higher than for the nation as a whole. Furthermore, the awareness of the options to choose "one or more races" may not have been as pronounced in the 1999 ACS as it was in Census 2000, leading to a lack of awareness by the population at large of the possibility of this type of reporting.

Additionally, the order reversal of the race and Hispanic/Latino questions appears not to have affected adversely the response rates to these questions. It is clear that Hispanics are more likely to report multiple races, but a large proportion of them tend to repeat their Hispanic or Latino origin as one of the responses to race.

Although there are 57 possible combinations of the six major categories, it appears that about nine of every ten people reporting multiple races report only two races, and most of the balance are reports of three races. This lack of complexity may make it easier for data users to analyze and interpret the responses to these questions.

## REFERENCES

Office of Management and Budget. 1997. "Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity." Federal Register Notice. Oct. 30. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/fedreg/ombdir15.html>

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. "Data Released from Census Bureau Survey that May Replace Next Census Long Form." Press Release. July 28. <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2000/cb00cn49.html>

U.S. Census Bureau. nd1. "About the American Community Survey." [http://www.census.gov/CMS/ssss/index\\_a.htm](http://www.census.gov/CMS/ssss/index_a.htm)

U.S. Census Bureau. nd2. "Notice About Using the American Community Survey Estimates." [http://www.census.gov/CMS/www/index\\_c.htm](http://www.census.gov/CMS/www/index_c.htm)

U.S. Census Bureau. nd3. *American Community Survey*. <http://www.census.gov/acs/www>

U.S. Census Bureau. nd4. *American Fact Finder*. <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/BasicFactsServlet>

Office of Management and Budget. 2000. "Guidance on Aggregation and Allocation of Data on Race for Use in Civil Rights Monitoring and Enforcement." <http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/bulletins/b00-02.html>

## NOTES

1. In this paper, we will use the terms "hispanic" and "Latino" interchangeably. The question itself will be referred to as the "Hispanic/Latino Origin" question.
  2. These 21 sites include 3 sets of combined counties because they were not large enough to be reported separately.
  3. See U.S. Census Bureau (n.d. 1) for additional information about the American Community Survey.
  4. For additional changes made in the American Community Survey questionnaires see U.S. Census Bureau (n.d. 2).
  5. Each estimate has a standard error associated with as reported in the tables shown at U.S. Census Bureau (n.d. 4).
-

**Table 1A: Race by American Community Survey Site: 1999**

Site	Total Population	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	803,618	618,252	29,192	25,761	13,719	377	92,097	24,220
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	41,661	37,164	226	250	-	369	1,115
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	313,596	76,290	3,543	258,349	5,540	64,477	24,982
Tulare County, CA	358,470	221,238	8,846	6,507	12,843	990	98,771	9,275
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	1,150,817	279,869	3,929	29,339	408	43,109	27,997
Lake County, IL	617,975	524,871	43,231	1,545	19,569	34	21,297	7,428
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	107,367	8,660	206	830	196	994	1,706
Calvert County, MD	73,748	56,812	14,235	219	997	-	163	1,322
Hampden County, MA	438,279	352,122	36,779	1,209	8,114	365	29,246	10,444
Madison County, MS	74,562	39,013	34,452	97	750	-	96	154
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	88,030	93	7,061	678	74	474	2,248
Douglas County, NE	446,277	363,394	51,168	2,368	6,823	139	16,836	5,549
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	253,447	483,848	8,489	40,696	465	362,122	45,032
Rockland County, NY	284,022	221,305	29,845	208	17,039	151	9,396	6,078
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	798,238	179,890	1,699	24,940	195	6,551	16,308
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	518,429	43,499	5,552	33,955	2,322	10,872	18,595
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	146,164	1,029	21	451	-	294	829
Sevier County, TN	65,783	63,629	157	661	403	-	-	933
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	2,210,050	709,432	8,495	214,115	650	392,251	69,108
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	42,773	-	191	88	-	24,254	707
Yakima County, WA	220,785	138,382	2,006	10,289	2,167	123	57,868	9,950

Table 1B: Race Distribution by American Community Survey Site: 1999

Site	Total	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	100.0%	76.9%	3.6%	3.2%	1.7%	0.0%	11.5%	3.0%
Jefferson County, AR	100.0%	51.6%	46.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	1.4%
San Francisco County, CA	100.0%	42.0%	10.2%	0.5%	34.6%	0.7%	8.6%	3.3%
Tulare County, CA	100.0%	61.7%	2.5%	1.8%	3.6%	0.3%	27.6%	2.6%
Broward County, FL	100.0%	74.9%	18.2%	0.3%	1.9%	0.0%	2.8%	1.8%
Lake County, IL	100.0%	84.9%	7.0%	0.3%	3.2%	0.0%	3.4%	1.2%
Black Hawk County, IA	100.0%	89.5%	7.2%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.8%	1.4%
Calvert County, MD	100.0%	77.0%	19.3%	0.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.2%	1.8%
Hampden County, MA	100.0%	80.3%	8.4%	0.3%	1.9%	0.1%	6.7%	2.4%
Madison County, MS	100.0%	52.3%	46.2%	0.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	100.0%	89.2%	0.1%	7.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.5%	2.3%
Douglas County, NE	100.0%	81.4%	11.5%	0.5%	1.5%	0.0%	3.8%	1.2%
Bronx Borough, NY	100.0%	21.2%	40.5%	0.7%	3.4%	0.0%	30.3%	3.8%
Rockland County, NY	100.0%	77.9%	10.5%	0.1%	6.0%	0.1%	3.3%	2.1%
Franklin County, OH	100.0%	77.7%	17.5%	0.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.6%	1.6%
Multnomah County, OR	100.0%	81.9%	6.9%	0.9%	5.4%	0.4%	1.7%	2.9%
Schuylkill County, PA	100.0%	98.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%
Sevier County, TN	100.0%	96.7%	0.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	100.0%	61.3%	19.7%	0.2%	5.9%	0.0%	10.9%	1.9%
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	100.0%	62.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	35.7%	1.0%
Yakima County, WA	100.0%	62.7%	0.9%	4.7%	1.0%	0.1%	26.2%	4.5%

Table 1C: Hispanic/Latino Origin by American Community Survey Site: 1999

Site	Total Population	Not Hispanic /Latino	Hispanic /Latino	Percent Not Hispanic /Latino	Percent Hispanic /Latino
Pima County, AZ	803,618	565,920	237,698	70.4%	29.6%
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	79,882	903	98.9%	1.1%
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	620,334	126,443	83.1%	16.9%
Tulare County, CA	358,470	189,395	169,075	52.8%	47.2%
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	1,338,919	196,549	87.2%	12.8%
Lake County, IL	617,975	554,086	63,889	89.7%	10.3%
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	117,844	2,115	98.2%	1.8%
Calvert County, MD	73,748	72,977	771	99.0%	1.0%
Hampden County, MA	438,279	380,305	57,974	86.8%	13.2%
Madison County, MS	74,562	74,170	392	99.5%	0.5%
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	97,286	1,372	98.6%	1.4%
Douglas County, NE	446,277	421,799	24,478	94.5%	5.5%
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	615,408	578,691	51.5%	48.5%
Rockland County, NY	284,022	260,102	23,920	91.6%	8.4%
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	1,014,897	12,924	98.7%	1.3%
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	598,992	34,232	94.6%	5.4%
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	147,521	1,267	99.1%	0.9%
Sevier County, TN	65,783	65,068	715	98.9%	1.1%
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	2,611,779	992,322	72.5%	27.5%
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	2,619	65,394	3.9%	96.1%
Yakima County, WA	220,785	148,297	72,488	67.2%	32.8%



**Table 1D: Race of Non-Hispanics by American Community Survey Site: 1999**

Site	Total Population	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	565,920	489,881	27,931	20,508	13,486	345	1,626	12,143
Jefferson County, AR	79,882	41,212	37,102	226	250	-	28	1,064
San Francisco County, CA	620,334	267,800	73,774	1,863	256,667	5,232	2,063	12,935
Tulare County, CA	189,395	154,647	8,572	5,352	12,455	686	2,397	5,286
Broward County, FL	1,338,919	1,004,956	276,333	3,605	28,957	340	7,555	17,173
Lake County, IL	554,086	483,036	43,201	1,409	19,494	34	2,008	4,904
Black Hawk County, IA	117,844	106,261	8,642	206	830	196	114	1,595
Calvert County, MD	72,977	56,182	14,235	164	997	-	77	1,322
Hampden County, MA	380,305	328,137	35,380	643	8,058	365	984	6,738
Madison County, MS	74,170	38,802	34,271	97	750	-	96	154
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	97,286	87,466	93	6,591	678	74	176	2,208
Douglas County, NE	421,799	355,653	50,894	2,203	6,742	139	1,753	4,415
Bronx Borough, NY	615,408	126,462	428,358	2,264	38,793	465	7,931	11,135
Rockland County, NY	260,102	207,479	29,478	149	16,998	124	1,346	4,528
Franklin County, OH	1,014,897	791,273	179,318	1,590	24,884	166	2,379	15,287
Multnomah County, OR	598,992	497,487	42,789	5,196	33,547	2,166	1,699	16,108
Schuylkill County, PA	147,521	145,517	988	21	451	-	52	492
Sevier County, TN	65,068	62,914	157	661	403	-	-	933
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	2,611,779	1,640,539	706,165	6,492	212,050	650	12,509	33,374
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	2,619	2,428	-	29	57	-	105	-
Yakima County, WA	148,297	127,532	1,765	9,585	2,059	123	1,091	6,142

- Represents zero population

**Table 1E: Race Distribution of Non-Hispanics by American Community Survey Site: 1999**

Site	Total	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	100.0%	86.6%	4.9%	3.6%	2.4%	0.1%	0.3%	2.1%
Jefferson County, AR	100.0%	51.6%	46.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
San Francisco County, CA	100.0%	43.2%	11.9%	0.3%	41.4%	0.8%	0.3%	2.1%
Tulare County, CA	100.0%	81.7%	4.5%	2.8%	6.6%	0.4%	1.3%	2.8%
Broward County, FL	100.0%	75.1%	20.6%	0.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.6%	1.3%
Lake County, IL	100.0%	87.2%	7.8%	0.3%	3.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.9%
Black Hawk County, IA	100.0%	90.2%	7.3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%	1.4%
Calvert County, MD	100.0%	77.0%	19.5%	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%	1.8%
Hampden County, MA	100.0%	86.3%	9.3%	0.2%	2.1%	0.1%	0.3%	1.8%
Madison County, MS	100.0%	52.3%	46.2%	0.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	100.0%	89.9%	0.1%	6.8%	0.7%	0.1%	0.2%	2.3%
Douglas County, NE	100.0%	84.3%	12.1%	0.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.4%	1.0%
Bronx Borough, NY	100.0%	20.5%	69.6%	0.4%	6.3%	0.1%	1.3%	1.8%
Rockland County, NY	100.0%	79.8%	11.3%	0.1%	6.5%	0.0%	0.5%	1.7%
Franklin County, OH	100.0%	78.0%	17.7%	0.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.2%	1.5%
Multnomah County, OR	100.0%	83.1%	7.1%	0.9%	5.6%	0.4%	0.3%	2.7%
Schuylkill County, PA	100.0%	98.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Sevier County, TN	100.0%	96.7%	0.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	100.0%	62.8%	27.0%	0.2%	8.1%	0.0%	0.5%	1.3%
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	100.0%	92.7%	0.0%	1.1%	2.2%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Yakima County, WA	100.0%	86.0%	1.2%	6.5%	1.4%	0.1%	0.7%	4.1%

Table 1F: Race of Hispanics/Latinos by American Community Survey Site: 1999

Site	Total Population	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	237,698	128,371	1,261	5,253	233	32	90,471	12,077
Jefferson County, AR	903	449	62	-	-	-	341	51
San Francisco County, CA	126,443	45,796	2,516	1,680	1,682	308	62,414	12,047
Tulare County, CA	169,075	66,591	274	1,155	388	304	96,374	3,989
Broward County, FL	196,549	145,861	3,536	324	382	68	35,554	10,824
Lake County, IL	63,889	41,835	30	136	75	-	19,289	2,524
Black Hawk County, IA	2,115	1,106	18	-	-	-	880	111
Calvert County, MD	771	630	-	55	-	-	86	-
Hampden County, MA	57,974	23,985	1,399	566	56	-	28,262	3,706
Madison County, MS	392	211	181	-	-	-	-	-
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	1,372	564	-	470	-	-	298	40
Douglas County, NE	24,478	7,741	274	165	81	-	15,083	1,134
Bronx Borough, NY	578,691	126,985	55,490	6,225	1,903	-	354,191	33,897
Rockland County, NY	23,920	13,826	367	59	41	27	8,050	1,550
Franklin County, OH	12,924	6,965	572	109	56	29	4,172	1,021
Multnomah County, OR	34,232	20,942	710	356	408	156	9,173	2,487
Schuylkill County, PA	1,267	647	41	-	-	-	242	337
Sevier County, TN	715	715	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	992,322	569,511	3,267	2,003	2,065	-	379,742	35,734
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	65,394	40,345	-	162	31	-	24,149	707
Yakima County, WA	72,488	10,850	241	704	108	-	56,777	3,808

**Table 1G: Race Distribution of Hispanics/Latinos by American Community Survey Site: 1999**

Site	Total	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	100.0%	54.0%	0.5%	2.2%	0.1%	0.0%	38.1%	5.1%
Jefferson County, AR	100.0%	49.7%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	5.6%
San Francisco County, CA	100.0%	36.2%	2.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.2%	49.4%	9.5%
Tulare County, CA	100.0%	39.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	57.0%	2.4%
Broward County, FL	100.0%	74.2%	1.8%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	18.1%	5.5%
Lake County, IL	100.0%	65.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	30.2%	4.0%
Black Hawk County, IA	100.0%	52.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.6%	5.2%
Calvert County, MD	100.0%	81.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%
Hampden County, MA	100.0%	41.4%	2.4%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	48.7%	6.4%
Madison County, MS	100.0%	53.8%	46.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	100.0%	41.1%	0.0%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	2.9%
Douglas County, NE	100.0%	31.6%	1.1%	0.7%	0.3%	0.0%	61.6%	4.6%
Bronx Borough, NY	100.0%	21.9%	9.6%	1.1%	0.3%	0.0%	61.2%	5.9%
Rockland County, NY	100.0%	57.8%	1.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	33.7%	6.5%
Franklin County, OH	100.0%	53.9%	4.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	32.3%	7.9%
Multnomah County, OR	100.0%	61.2%	2.1%	1.0%	1.2%	0.5%	26.8%	7.3%
Schuylkill County, PA	100.0%	51.1%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	26.6%
Sevier County, TN	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	100.0%	57.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	38.3%	3.6%
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	100.0%	61.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	36.9%	1.1%
Yakima County, WA	100.0%	15.0%	0.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	78.3%	5.3%

Table 2A: Two or More Races by American Community Survey Site: 1999

				90 % confidence level	
Site	Total Population	Two or more races	Percent Two or more races	Lower bound percent	Upper bound percent
Yakima County, WA	220,785	9,950	4.5	3.72	5.30
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	45,032	3.8	3.33	4.21
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	24,982	3.3	2.97	3.72
Pima County, AZ	803,618	24,220	3.0	2.71	3.31
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	18,595	2.9	2.62	3.26
Tulare County, CA	358,470	9,275	2.6	2.17	3.01
Hampden County, MA	438,279	10,444	2.4	2.00	2.76
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	2,248	2.3	1.56	2.99
Rockland County, NY	284,022	6,078	2.1	1.67	2.61
Sevier County, TN	65,783	1,336	2.0	1.20	2.86
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	69,108	1.9	1.69	2.14
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	27,997	1.8	1.62	2.02
Calvert County, MD	73,748	1,322	1.8	0.99	2.60
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	16,308	1.6	1.37	1.81
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	1,115	1.4	0.76	2.00
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	1,706	1.4	1.01	1.84
Lake County, IL	617,975	7,428	1.2	0.99	1.41
Douglas County, NE	446,277	5,549	1.2	1.03	1.46
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	707	1.0	0.40	1.68
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	829	0.6	0.28	0.83
Madison County, MS	74,562	154	0.2	0.05	0.36

Table 2B: Number of Races by American Community Survey Site: 1999

Site	Total Population	One race	Two races	Three races	Four or more races	Two races as a percent of two or more	Three races as a percent of two or more
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	147,959	644	185	-	77.7	22.3
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	1,011,513	14,292	1,847	169	87.6	11.3
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	614,629	16,460	2,109	26	88.5	11.3
Yakima County, WA	220,785	210,835	8,857	1,093	-	89.0	11.0
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	721,795	23,084	1,482	416	92.4	5.9
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	118,253	1,592	88	26	93.3	5.2
Pima County, AZ	803,618	779,398	22,735	1,210	275	93.9	5.0
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	3,534,993	65,040	4,068	-	94.1	5.9
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	1,507,471	26,452	1,484	61	94.5	5.3
Hampden County, MA	438,279	427,835	9,874	533	37	94.5	5.1
Rockland County, NY	284,022	277,944	5,835	187	56	96.0	3.1
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	1,149,067	43,647	1,175	210	96.9	2.6
Lake County, IL	617,975	610,547	7,219	146	63	97.2	2.0
Douglas County, NE	446,277	440,728	5,421	128	-	97.7	2.3
Tulare County, CA	358,470	349,195	9,118	157	-	98.3	1.7
Calvert County, MD	73,748	72,426	1,300	22	-	98.3	1.7
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	79,670	1,115	-	-	100.0	0.0
Madison County, MS	74,562	74,408	154	-	-	100.0	0.0
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	96,410	2,248	-	-	100.0	0.0
Sevier County, TN	65,783	64,850	933	-	-	100.0	0.0
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	67,306	707	-	-	100.0	0.0

Table 2C: Two or More Races by American Community Survey Site: 1999

			Two races including "Some other race"		All other combinations of two or more races		
Site	Two or more races	As a percent of the total population	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	As a percent of two or more races
Yakima County, WA	9,950	4.5	3,419	1.5	6,531	3.0	65.6
Multnomah County, OR	18,595	2.9	2,251	0.4	16,344	2.6	87.9
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	2,248	2.3	101	0.1	2,147	2.2	95.5
San Francisco County, CA	24,982	3.3	10,554	1.4	14,428	1.9	57.8
Pima County, AZ	24,220	3.0	11,136	1.4	13,084	1.6	54.0
Rockland County, NY	6,078	2.1	1,688	0.6	4,390	1.5	72.2
Calvert County, MD	1,322	1.8	243	0.3	1,079	1.5	81.6
Tulare County, CA	9,275	2.6	4,298	1.2	4,977	1.4	53.7
Hampden County, MA	10,444	2.4	4,165	1.0	6,279	1.4	60.1
Sevier County, TN	1,336	2.0	403	0.6	933	1.4	69.8
Franklin County, OH	16,308	1.6	1,726	0.2	14,582	1.4	89.4
Jefferson County, AR	1,115	1.4	93	0.1	1,022	1.3	91.7
Black Hawk County, IA	1,706	1.4	93	0.1	1,613	1.3	94.5
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	69,108	1.9	34,294	1.0	34,814	1.0	50.4
Broward County, FL	27,997	1.8	13,154	0.9	14,843	1.0	53.0
Douglas County, NE	5,549	1.2	1,212	0.3	4,337	1.0	78.2
Bronx Borough, NY	45,032	3.8	35,440	3.0	9,592	0.8	21.3
Lake County, IL	7,428	1.2	2,323	0.4	5,105	0.8	68.7
Schuylkill County, PA	829	0.6	201	0.1	628	0.4	75.8
Madison County, MS	154	0.2	33	0.0	121	0.2	78.6
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	707	1.0	707	1.0	0	0.0	0.0

**Table 3A: Selected Combinations of Two or More Races by American Community Site, 1999**

Site	Total Population	WB	WI	WA	BI	BA	WN	IA	AN	IN	BN	Two including "Some other race"	Three or more races
Pima County, AZ	803,618	2,120	6,352	1,467	996	132	422	77	33	-	-	11,136	1,485
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	419	362	32	173	29	7	-	-	-	-	93	-
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	1,142	3,478	5,826	1,174	382	130	-	398	-	-	10,554	1,898
Tulare County, CA	358,470	622	2,940	830	55	-	103	77	193	-	-	4,298	157
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	5,204	2,477	3,299	504	1,672	76	-	28	-	38	13,154	1,545
Lake County, IL	617,975	1,506	1,365	1,627	177	36	77	-	108	-	-	2,323	209
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	871	445	134	18	14	17	-	-	-	-	93	114
Calvert County, MD	73,748	183	427	81	-	226	45	95	-	-	-	243	22
Hampden County, MA	438,279	2,245	1,855	771	646	49	119	-	24	-	-	4,165	570
Madison County, MS	74,562	-	32	-	45	-	44	-	-	-	-	33	-
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	30	1,915	53	58	-	-	-	91	-	-	101	-
Douglas County, NE	446,277	2,001	1,364	439	205	90	64	-	46	-	-	1,212	128
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	3,305	608	821	1,432	1,770	14	184	-	-	73	35,440	1,385
Rockland County, NY	284,022	1,598	562	1,132	352	402	101	-	-	-	-	1,688	243
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	5,432	2,522	1,853	1,930	534	85	210	-	-	-	1,726	2,016
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	2,732	5,205	3,664	514	265	1,081	252	222	242	32	2,251	2,135
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	115	187	132	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	201	185
Sevier County, TN	65,783	101	654	178	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX+A46	3,604,101	11,680	7,138	9,061	2,102	622	-	143	-	-	-	34,294	4,068
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	707	-
Yakima County, WA	220,785	677	3,213	911	158	22	108	202	67	80	-	3,419	1,093

**Note** : W=White; B=Black or African American; I=American Indian and Alaska Native; A=Asian; N=Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.



Table 4A: "Single" and "All-Inclusive" Race Estimates by American Community Survey Site: 1999											
Site	Total Population	White		Black or African American		American Indian and Alaska Native		Asian		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	
		Single Race	All-inclusive	Single Race	All-inclusive	Single Race	All-inclusive	Single Race	All-inclusive	Single Race	All-inclusive
Pima County, AZ	803,618	618,252	638,252	29,192	34,113	25,761	35,664	13,719	16,528	377	1,165
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	41,661	42,532	37,164	37,827	226	761	250	311	-	7
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	313,596	333,115	76,290	81,430	3,543	9,909	258,349	267,676	5,540	6,266
Tulare County, CA	358,470	221,238	229,203	8,846	9,787	6,507	9,858	12,843	14,514	990	1,418
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	1,150,817	1,172,649	279,869	291,084	3,929	7,432	29,339	36,119	408	733
Lake County, IL	617,975	524,871	531,481	43,231	45,436	1,545	3,424	19,569	21,429	34	252
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	107,367	109,041	8,660	9,651	206	719	830	1,004	196	213
Calvert County, MD	73,748	56,812	57,681	14,235	14,776	219	763	997	1,421	-	45
Hampden County, MA	438,279	352,122	360,053	36,779	41,747	1,209	4,198	8,114	9,285	365	573
Madison County, MS	74,562	39,013	39,104	34,452	34,515	97	174	750	750	-	44
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	88,030	90,110	93	181	7,061	9,034	678	841	74	165
Douglas County, NE	446,277	363,394	368,302	51,168	53,845	2,368	4,005	6,823	7,421	139	249

**Note:** "Single" or "minimum" refers to an estimate of the number of persons who selected one race category, while "all-incluvisse" or "maximum" refers to a race category that is selected alone or in combination with any other race category.

- Represents zero population

Table 5: Non-response to Race by Hispanic/Latino Origin and American Community Survey Site: 1999

		Percent with no answer to race		
Site	Total Population	Total 1/	Not Hispanic /Latino	Hispanic /Latino
Pima County, AZ	803,618	3.4	0.4	7.8
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	1.6	0.6	6.4
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	2.7	0.6	10.0
Tulare County, CA	358,470	4.1	0.4	6.4
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	1.7	0.4	3.2
Lake County, IL	617,975	1.4	0.5	4.2
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	0.9	0.2	5.1
Calvert County, MD	73,748	0.7	0.0	10.5
Hampden County, MA	438,279	2.0	0.3	6.6
Madison County, MS	74,562	1.5	0.7	0.0
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	1.5	0.5	5.2
Douglas County, NE	446,277	1.4	0.3	6.5
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	5.3	0.5	8.0
Rockland County, NY	284,022	1.4	0.6	2.6
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	1.1	0.4	4.4
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	1.4	0.4	5.7
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	1.0	0.2	2.2
Sevier County, TN	65,783	1.1	0.0	3.5
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	2.2	0.4	4.2
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	2.0	2.2	1.5
Yakima County, WA	220,785	4.0	0.3	6.7

1/ Includes people who did not answer the question on Spanish/Hispanic/Latino origin.

Table 6: Non-response to Hispanic/Latino Origin by Race and American Community Survey Site: 1999

		Percent with no answer to Hispanic Origin													
Site	Total Population	Total	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaian and Other Pacific Islander	Some other race	Two or more races
Pima County, AZ	803,618	2.2	1.1	2.2	4.1	1.7	-		618,252	29,192	25,761	13,719	377	92,097	24,220
Jefferson County, AR	80,785	3.2	2.5	2.2	83.5	94.8	NA		41,661	37,164	226	250	-	369	1,115
San Francisco County, CA	746,777	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0		313,596	76,290	3,543	258,349	5,540	64,477	24,982
Tulare County, CA	358,470	2.1	1.2	-	2.0	2.4	-		221,238	8,846	6,507	12,843	990	98,771	9,275
Broward County, FL	1,535,468	2.3	1.2	1.7	4.3	1.5	14.0		1,150,817	279,869	3,929	29,339	408	43,109	27,997
Lake County, IL	617,975	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	-		524,871	43,231	1,545	19,569	34	21,297	7,428
Black Hawk County, IA	119,959	1.9	1.1	3.8	-	9.3	-		107,367	8,660	206	830	196	994	1,706
Calvert County, MD	73,748	1.9	1.0	2.6	-	-	NA		56,812	14,235	219	997	-	163	1,322
Hampden County, MA	438,279	2.2	1.1	3.8	9.0	2.0	-		352,122	36,779	1,209	8,114	365	29,246	10,444
Madison County, MS	74,562	3.0	0.5	3.7	-	-	NA		39,013	34,452	97	750	-	96	154
Flathead/Lake Counties, MT	98,658	2.5	1.5	-	2.4	-	-		88,030	93	7,061	678	74	474	2,248
Douglas County, NE	446,277	2.3	1.2	3.5	11.7	1.8	-		363,394	51,168	2,368	6,823	139	16,836	5,549
Bronx Borough, NY	1,194,099	3.7	2.2	2.9	3.6	3.5	-		253,447	483,848	8,489	40,696	465	362,122	45,032

Rockland County, NY	284,022	2.7	1.9	1.8	-	1.8	-	221,305	29,845	208	17,039	151	9,396	6,078
Franklin County, OH	1,027,821	2.0	1.1	2.4	1.1	2.2	11.3	798,238	179,890	1,699	24,940	195	6,551	16,308
Multnomah County, OR	633,224	2.4	1.2	3.1	3.4	3.6	9.3	518,429	43,499	5,552	33,955	2,322	10,872	18,595
Schuylkill County, PA	148,788	2.3	1.3	19.0	-	19.5	NA	146,164	1,029	21	451	-	294	829
Sevier County, TN	65,783	2.3	1.1	-	7.7	18.1	NA	63,629	157	661	403	-	-	933
Ft Bend/Harris Counties, TX	3,604,101	2.2	0.9	2.4	1.8	3.5	-	2,210,050	709,432	8,495	214,115	650	392,251	69,108
Starr/Zapata Counties, TX	68,013	1.4	0.6	NA	-	-	NA	42,773	-	191	88	-	24,254	707
Yakima County, WA	220,785	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	-	138,382	2,006	10,289	2,167	123	57,868	9,950

NA - Not Applicable - denominator is zero  
- Represents numerator of percent is zero