City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Human Services Department
Catherine Lester, Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 30, 2016

To: Councilmember Lorena Gonzalez

Cc: Councilmember Bruce Harrell
              Councilmember Tim Burgess
              Councilmember Sally Bagshaw

From: Audrey Buehring, Deputy Director of Operations, Human Services Department (HSD)
              Ali Peters, Data Team Manager, HSD
              Diana Canzoneri, Demographer & Sr. Policy Analyst, Office of Planning & Community Development

Subject: Demographic Data Task Force Report (Resolution 31613)

Introduction

In 2015, Resolution 31613 established the Demographic Data Task Force. The Task Force was charged with developing recommendations and strategies for standardizing the disaggregation of demographic data across City departments. As outlined in the resolution, the scope of work for the task force included the following:

- *Inventory existing demographic data collection and perform gap analysis where demographic data is lacking or insufficient for the City to make data-driven decisions*
- *Recommend new data collection methods based on gap analysis*
- *Explore best practices and models to increase standardization of demographic data collection and analysis among departments.*
- *Evaluate the barriers to disaggregating data and recommend strategies to overcome the barriers.*
- *Propose a mechanism for demographic data to be centralized and easily accessed.*
- *Determine fiscal implications and timeline for implementation for proposed strategies.*

The City of Seattle has long been a leader in advancing racial equity including establishment in 2004 of the Race and Social Justice Initiative. The collection of disaggregated data collection allows the City to further this initiative and home in on communities that have great need but are masked within larger data categories. For example, about one-third of Cambodian and Vietnamese Americans do not graduate high school across the nation. However, since they are grouped in a larger category as Asian Americans – and Asian Americans as a whole have much higher graduation rates – the needs of Cambodian and Vietnamese Americans are hidden. Similarly, the masking of needs due to the aggregation of racial data categories also occurs for others including Arab, African, African American, Middle Eastern, and Eastern European populations. The Task Force was created to examine how to better serve these communities through disaggregated data.

The Task Force regarded one of its fundamental charges as recommending data disaggregation specifically for the City's collection of demographics for client service and public outreach. In practical terms, this involves identifying the questions and specifying the particular data categories that we recommend the City use on instruments such as client-intake forms and public engagements surveys to gather demographic data for the people we serve.

The Task Force focused on disaggregation of race and ethnicity data for multiple reasons. As the City's Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI) indicates, many equity issues stem from institutional and structural racism. To address this, RSJI guides the City of Seattle to ensure we begin with race in addressing equitable services. By focusing our data disaggregation recommendations on race and ethnicity, the Task Force also ensured the delivery of recommendations within the schedule for the Task Force's work. While our work focused on race and ethnicity, the Task Force also acknowledges that many other demographic elements in addition to race and ethnicity are important for data analysis and guiding City services.

A more detailed understanding of Seattle's diverse racial and ethnic groups requires the City to collect more detailed data and improve its use of population-level data collected from broader sources. For example, the U.S. Census Bureau provides the most comprehensive and commonly used sources of population-level data available on race, ethnicity, and related characteristics. When viewed alongside the demographic data the City collects, population-level data also provide a key tool for understanding how well the City is doing in serving and involving these communities.

Two leads were assigned to coordinate development of the Task Force's recommendations: (1) Ali Peters, Data Team Manager at HSD, who led the client level recommendations, and (2) Diana Canzoneri, Demographer and Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of Community Planning and Development, who led the population level recommendations. The Task Force comprised representatives from fourteen City departments, two volunteer graduate students from the University of Washington who assisted the Task Force with research, and was joined by community partners who identified interest in participating in making recommendations. The larger Task Force convened four times. Two subcommittees—one focusing on client-level data disaggregation collection and one focusing on population-level data disaggregation – met multiple times to review best practices and develop recommendations which they submitted for consideration to the larger Task Force to review.

This memorandum outlines the actions taken by the Task Force and recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations
The Task Force recommends a two-year (2017-2018) approach in implementing race/ethnicity disaggregation categories in order to align with the 2020 census and allows for internal and external outreach, communication, and collaboration for fidelity of disaggregation categories.

2017
- Pilot the client-level recommended race/ethnicity/primary language categories (see Tables 1-3) with at least 4 projects (2 programs and 2 one-time surveys) within the Human Services Department, Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), and Department of Neighborhoods (DON). The program pilots will require coordination with Seattle IT on privacy issues and software system changes.
- Conduct additional outreach and community engagement to ensure the City's efforts meet the community needs.
- Address outstanding concerns with recommended categories for client-level data collection. The two main concepts that were not able to be addressed are as follows:

1. Addressing religions that have become an ethnic identity to be included as a category. In particular, a Task Force member urged that Jewish be included.
2. The lack of consistency in the basis on which racial categories are identified, for example, with some categories referring to countries of origin/ancestry, some describing ethnicity, and others referencing outward features.

- Provide guidance for finding and using disaggregated data on race, ethnicity, and related characteristics (population level) to both internal and external audiences.
- Have all City leadership assess whether their departments or oversight areas provide equitable services and evaluate this service delivery. Example inquiries are as follows:
    1. Please provide a more-detailed demographic description of who is being served.
    2. Does this match the target audience you were seeking to serve?
    3. In your analysis, are there particular racial or other socio-economic populations who are currently underserved? Why?
    4. What is your plan to reach out to these underserved audiences?
    5. What would a racially equitable participant baseline look like, and what will it take to achieve this?

2018
- Review and identify lessons learned from internal City data collection pilot results (client-level).
- Adjust the City's categories for disaggregated data collection to assure they align well with 2020 Census race/origin categories and federal OMB requirements for federally funded programs (client-level). (Categories for the 2020 Census will be released in 2018.) The importance of this step is described further below.
- Prepare case studies documenting the City's efforts to integrate best practices for using disaggregated data with population level data.
- Create a citywide policy and write a citywide implementation plan for race/ethnicity and language demographic data collection.
- Communicate internally and externally the new client-level data collection standards.
- Start citywide implementation to begin collecting recommended data elements (Jan 2019).

2018 – 2020
- Plan a City partnership to create a local Complete Count Committee for the 2020 Census and promote adequate federal funding and enhanced outreach for the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

Actions and Analysis
I. Inventory existing demographic data collection and perform gap analysis where demographic data is lacking or insufficient for the City to make data-driven decisions

The Task Force conducted a survey in order to inventory and better understand how City departments are currently collecting race and ethnicity data. Each department represented in the Task Force was requested to submit at least one dataset for the inventory resulting in 17 complete datasets from 10 different City departments.

The survey responses demonstrated significant variation in how race/ethnicity is collected, which results in a large gap in the ability to analyze service data at an aggregated level. Of the 17 data sets, 15 collected data on race and ethnicity. Out of the 15 that collect race and ethnicity, 11 of the datasets allow for an individual to

identify as multiracial – and only 7 of those 11 allow for multiracial persons to specify the races with which the person identifies. Similarly, 10 data sets allowed for a person to identify as 'other', while just 2 of those 10 allow for identification of their specific race.

II. *Recommend new data collection methods based on gap analysis*

The Task Force recommends the following questions and answer choice categories for Hispanic or Latino origin (Table 1) and for race (Table 2) be included on a standard basis in the City's client-intake forms, public outreach questionnaires, and related instruments. The categories we are recommending include several additional categories for Hispanic or Latino origin and many additional categories for race compared with the categories listed in the most recent Census and American Community Survey questionnaires.

The Task Force also recommends the collection of "primary language spoken at home" (Table 3) with the specific categories to be included on a standard basis along with the race and ethnicity items as described in Tables 1 and 2. The language question response will enhance the City's understanding of the disaggregated race and ethnicity data and help the City to better understand the language assistance needs of the populations our programs serve.

Concepts of race and ethnicity are evolving social constructs and very difficult to categorize. Some areas did not have clear agreement within the Task Force or community around a specific concept in the recommendation. Time constraints did not allow for full evaluation in addressing these. These topics should be priorities for community outreach prior to identification of categories for full implementation in 2019. The selection of approach and categories for asking about race/origin in the 2020 U.S. Census may also help to provide some guidance on these issues.

The two areas identified to continue outreach and engagement on are, addressing religions that have become an ethnic identity to be included as a category (in particular, a Task Force member urged Jewish be included) and the lack of consistency in the basis on which racial categories are identified (for example, with some categories referring to countries of origin/ancestry, some describing ethnicity, and others referencing outward features).

Table 1.

Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?
No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
Mexican, Mexican American
Puerto Rican
Cuban
Other Hispanic/Latino/Spanish origin (specify:_____)
Guatemalan
Salvadoran
Other Central American (specify: _____)
South American (specify:_____)
Spaniard

Table 2.

What is your race? (check all that apply)	
Amhara	Laotian
Eritrean	Thai
Oromo	Vietnamese
Tigre	Other Asian (specify:_____)
Somali	Native Hawaiian
Black/African American	Guamanian or Chamorro
Western African	Samoan
Other African (specify:_____)	Polynesian
Asian Indian	Other Pacific Islander (specify:_____)
Chinese	Middle Eastern or North African
Cambodian	White or Caucasian
Filipino	American Indian/Alaska Native
Hmong	Other (specify:_____)
Japanese	
Korean	

Table 3

Do you speak a language other than English at home?	[If yes] What is the primary language you speak at home?
Yes	Amharic
No	Arabic
	Bhutanese
	Burmese/Karen
	Chinese - Cantonese
	Chinese - Toisanese
	Chinese - Taiwanese
	Chinese - Mandarin
	Chinese other (specify: _____)
	Congolese
	Farsi
	Japanese
	Korean
	Laotian
	Mon Khmer/Cambodian
	Oromo
	Nepali
	Pashto/Dari
	Russian
	Somali

	Spanish
	Filipino - Ilokano
	Filipino – Pangasinan
	Filipino -Tagalog
	Thai
	Tigrinya
	Ukrainian
	Vietnamese
	Other (please specify: _____)

III. Explore best practices and models to increase standardization of demographic data collection and analysis among departments.

The Client Level Subcommittee, coordinated by Ali Peters, examined best practices and use cases with respect to the collection of disaggregated race and ethnicity data. While collection of disaggregated data has become a recommended practice across the nation, most work has been centered on advocacy for specific populations and has stopped short of using a standard list of disaggregated race/ethnicity categories. For example, at the federal and local levels, the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) community has a long history of advocating for categories to move toward disaggregation. Accordingly, the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders Interagency Working Group Data and Research Subcommittee released a best practices document for disaggregation of Federal Data on AAPI[1]. Advocacy efforts have also blossomed around disaggregation in the East African, Middle Eastern, and Hispanic/Latino communities, but these populations lack clear and commonly agreed upon best practice standards. The Data Advisors Group[2] for the Road Map Project is an example of looking at disaggregated race and ethnicity data collection to improve student outcomes, utilizing the Office of Superintendent of Public Instructions race/ethnicity data categories.

All use cases and best practices point to federal race and ethnicity categories as a starting point and recommend disaggregating within those categories to ensure continuity for federal reporting. Best practices also indicate that "language spoken" can be collected concurrently with race and ethnicity as an additional disaggregation tool.

Keeping the research findings in mind, the Task Force took great care to ensure these questions and categories align with the Census Bureau's instruments and with other related federal standards. For example, we recommend Hispanic/Latino origin be asked separately from race in order to align with the U.S. Census and federal guidance. We have also taken care to ensure the response categories we are recommending are able to nest under categories the U.S. Census Bureau is currently using, as well as categories the federal Office for Management and Budget and many other federally funded programs require.

The Population-Level Subcommittee, coordinated by Diana Canzoneri, researched best practices for analyzing disaggregated data from entities such as the Census Bureau to understand differences in the population, characteristics, and needs of individual racial and ethnic groups. This subcommittee also examined the challenges analysts at the City face in obtaining, analyzing, and reporting such data. The population-level recommendations below synthesize the insights obtained from the sub-committee's research and discussions

---

[1] http://sites.ed.gov/aapi/files/2013/03/WHIAAPI-Best-Practices-for-Disaggregation-of-Federal-Data-on-AAPIs.pdf
[2] http://www.roadmapproject.org/collective-action/project-hub/data-advisors-work-group/

on both of these fronts. These recommendations also extend to enhancing participation in the decennial Census and American Community Survey to help ensure these programs provide representative data for analyzing local population characteristics.

We summarize population-level recommendations within this section because these recommendations are all fundamentally aimed at facilitating best-practice analysis of disaggregated demographic data. Several of the population-level recommendations are interrelated and will contribute to one another. For example, sharing guidance and collaborating on training on accessing disaggregated data is one way the City can help plant early seeds for community partnerships on the 2020 Census Complete Count.

Population-level work should include the following:
1. Provide guidance for finding and using disaggregated data on race, ethnicity, and related characteristics – fall 2016 to spring 2017. The City Demographer should develop and post guidance online for finding and using disaggregated data on race, ethnicity, and related characteristics. To make this information accessible to both internal and external audiences, this guidance should be included alongside the race and ethnicity estimates available on the City's Population and Demographics website.[3] The guidance should include annotated links to make it easier to find data, as well as practical tips, and best practice examples.

   In particular, the guidance should outline how to access the estimates and cross-tabulations that are available from Census Bureau on detailed races, ethnicities, languages spoken at home, and places of birth. "Deep links" or "special query files" should provide direct access to key data for disaggregated racial, ethnic, language, and national population groups. Importantly, the guidance should also describe the challenges that analysts are likely to encounter and provide tips for working with those challenges. For example, the number and variety of detailed population groups for which profiles are available is quite limited. The Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) collects data on place of birth ("nativity") for foreign born persons, and publishes Special Population Profiles tabulating social, economic, and housing characteristics by nativity. However, the countries of birth for which these profiles are available is limited given ACS sampling rates and population thresholds for meeting minimum standards of reliability.[4]

   Another important resource to highlight is the National Equity Atlas.[5] This is an online database and tool featuring an array of race and social equity indicators. Developed by PolicyLink and the USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity, the Atlas recently started including city-level estimates with data disaggregated by detailed race/ethnicity categories for many indicators.

   In compiling data sources and guidance, the Demographer should work closely with other departments to integrate relevant data. For example, the City's Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs studies and maintains links on their website to the Washington State Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance on how many refugees have entered the state each month from different countries of origin.

---

[3] http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/populationdemographics/default.htm
[4] For example, the Special Population Profiles available for Seattle do not include disaggregated estimates for persons born in Africa, let alone individual countries in Africa; nor do these profiles include data on individual countries on other continents. To find Special Population Profiles for these nativities, a data user needs to broaden his or her search from Seattle to include King County or larger geographies.
[5] http://nationalequityatlas.org/

This online guidance will be a valuable resource, helping data users to locate and analyze disaggregated data that may otherwise be difficult to find or interpret properly. To maximize the usefulness of this resource, the Demographer should continue to collaborate with, and seek input on data needs from stakeholders inside and outside of the City organization. Once this guidance is posted, the Demographer, should also work with internal and community partners to ensure that data users know about it.

Collaboration on development and dissemination should include City officials, City staff, and community organizations who have been involved in the work of the Data Disaggregation Task Force; the interdepartmental Data Collaboration Team founded by the Demographer; departmental RSJI Change Teams; the Department of Neighborhood's Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons, and relevant Boards and Commissions including the Immigrant and Refugee Commission. Priority should be placed on partnering with Race and Social Justice Initiative staff in the Office for Civil Rights to integrate with the Racial Equity Toolkit.[6]

This guidance should be updated periodically to include the most useful tools and sources that emerge and should become part of trainings offered on demographic data and RSJI-related resources.

2. Prepare at least 4 case studies documenting the City's efforts to integrate best practices for using disaggregated data – fall 2016 to spring 2018. The case studies we are recommending would document efforts by the Demographer and other analysts at the City to incorporate best practices for analyzing and reporting on detailed race and ethnicity categories as part of already programmed research and analysis projects. These case studies would articulate the benefits of incorporating disaggregated data, describe the analysts' goals for doing so, document the challenges encountered, and indicate the extent to which the analyst was ultimately able to obtain and include disaggregated data in the project. Retrospective examination performed sometime after completion of these analyses could further identify whether and how these analyses influenced policy decisions or priorities.

    These case studies will start to develop a body of local best practice examples for population-level data disaggregation. These case studies will also provide valuable information for the Demographic Data Disaggregation Task Force to review when it reconvenes in 2018 to solidify its longer-term recommendations.

3. Start planning as soon as possible for the City's partnership in promoting a Complete Count for the 2020 Census – spring 2018 to summer 2020. Information collected in the decennial Census determines how many seats each state gets in the U.S. House of Representatives and guides the allocation of much of the funding that the federal government provides at state and local levels. Ensuring a complete count of Seattle's population in the 2020 Census is vital, both to help ensure receipt of needed funding and to obtain data that reflect our community's demographic characteristics and diversity as accurately as possible.

---

[6] The Racial Equity Toolkit helps departments consider and address potential impacts on race and social justice early in the development of policies, programs, initiatives and budget proposals.

The City spearheaded creation of the 2010 Seattle Complete Count Committee to reach out to historically hard-to-count populations and increase awareness of the importance of participation in the Census.[7] The 2010 Complete Count campaign was a partnership with the U.S. Census Bureau, and with leaders from businesses, community-based organizations, faith-based groups, schools, ethnic media outlets and others. A member of the Mayor's Office Staff devoted a large share of his work to supporting the committee over approximately one year. Other City staff, including staff in the Mayor's Office, the City Demographer, and staff from multiple departments also helped to work with the community. Seattle achieved a 77% mail participation rate on the 2010 Census, beating the national average by several percentage points.

In order to implement this kind of successful grass roots campaign for the 2020 Census, the City will need to plan proactively and allocate a similar level of leadership, resources, and staffing as it did in preparation for the 2010 Census. The City's heightened focus on race and social equity and its increasing experience implementing inclusive public engagement will aid in this effort. The City should look for opportunities to leverage existing programs to promote the Complete Count where related goals can create mutual synergies.

4. Build on the 2020 Complete Count partnership to promote adequate funding and enhanced outreach for the American Community Survey – spring 2018 to end of 2020. The ACS has replaced the old long-form portion of the decennial Census. As such, the ACS is the most comprehensive data source available on the socioeconomic characteristics and wellbeing of local population groups. To understand differences in the needs of Seattle's population groups and understand the extent to which we are making progress in reducing disparities, we need the ACS to reflect our community's populations as accurately as possible. Yet, the level of outreach the Census Bureau conducts to promote participation in the ACS is very low in comparison to that done for the decennial Census.

The City should look for ways to build on the 2020 Census Complete Count partnerships to promote participation among Seattle's diverse populations in the ACS. The City's Office of Intergovernmental Affairs should also track funding and advocate for larger ACS sample sizes to improve the ability of the ACS to represent, and provide more detailed data on, smaller racial and ethnic population groups in local communities including Seattle.

IV. *Evaluate the barriers to disaggregating data and recommend strategies to overcome the barriers.*

There are multiple barriers that span this topic. One of the major barriers is ensuring community members have enough trust in the process in which they are asked about their race/ethnicity/language. A key component in recommending an extended timeline is to further engage target populations for feedback on proposed categories. While there has been communication and engagement with community members via Task Force meetings, correspondence, and convening, not all community partners accepted invitations to provide input. We believe further outreach, such as utilizing the Public Outreach Engagement Liaisons through the Department of Neighborhoods and intentional event planning, would solidify the categories to be used. This engagement will build trust in the process and "buy in" from the community and thus help the quality of the disaggregated data for analysis.

---

[7] See http://www.seattle.gov/census2010/committee.htm; https://www.facebook.com/Seattle-Complete-Count-Committee-for-2010-Census-Its-in-Our-Hands-274037842222/

Privacy concerns will need to be addressed if or when data is released to entities external to a department or work group that regularly handles the data. The Task Force recommends only aggregate data be reported while following any basic Personally Identifiable Information (PII) best practices. The current PII best practice is to ensure that any data released, including when data elements are combined, could not potentially identify a specific individual. This does not mean a specific set of data elements are "stripped" from a report; rather, each data element should be reviewed as a collective. Every release of client-level data including race/ethnicity categories among other identifying traits should be reviewed by the Seattle IT Privacy Officer.

Task Force discussions identified there would be staffing and associated fiscal implications when implementing the collection and analysis of disaggregated data. Specifically, with respect to client-level data collection, staff hours are required to ensure the new categories are implemented on paper forms, which includes reformatting (which can be from allocating space from 5 categories to 25), reprinting, and retraining staff who help collect this information. On the technical side, there are database implications for collection, including changing the categories while ensuring integrity of past categories, allowing for multi-select on races, capturing written "other" categories, and reporting and analysis capabilities that align with the new categories. These changes will include every database that collects demographic data and comes with costly Seattle IT and/ or vendor contracted resources. Because there are varied barriers per City department, piloting the recommended race/ethnicity/language categories will allow for better understanding of costs associated with implementation.

There are also challenges involved in finding and analyzing population-level data at disaggregated level. Limited sampling sizes included in national surveys including the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) are a major barrier. As described earlier, the ACS offers the most comprehensive data source available on the socioeconomic characteristics and wellbeing of local population groups. However, ACS sampling rates are not high enough to produce reliable estimates for many racial and ethnic population groups at the local level. City-level estimates regarding the characteristics and conditions of population groups meet reliability thresholds only for the detailed race and ethnic groups who are the most populous. To gain insights into smaller population groups, analysts must extend their search for data to a broader geography, or must use data pooled over several years. The case studies the City Demographer and other analysts will be developing based on Task Force recommendations will further describe the challenges involved in obtaining, analyzing, and presenting disaggregated data from population-level sources such as the ACS.

V. *Propose a mechanism for demographic data to be centralized and easily accessed.*
   This year, the Human Services Department (HSD) proposed a project to centralize its data. The Data-to-Decision project, included in the Mayor's proposed budget, would start mid-2017 with the hiring of a consultant to take stock of the various data sets within HSD and propose a solution for one centralized location for the data for analysis and reporting. Once cost and resources have been identified, the implementation within HSD will take effect in 2018, which aligns well with the two-year recommended plan that will allow the City to scale this project in 2019 for a system that will allow race/ethnicity/language data available across City departments.

VI. *Determine fiscal implications and timeline for implementation for proposed strategies.*
    The Census Bureau is considering proposing substantial changes in the way it asks about race and ethnicity for the 2020 Census. The federal Office for Management and Budget will be reviewing the U.S. Census Bureau's proposed categories and issuing its decisions on these categories by spring of 2018. To ensure the City is able to use demographic data to inform policy and program work in effective ways, it will be essential for the categories the City uses for collection of client-level data continue to align well with the 2020 Census race/origin categories and any revised requirements from the federal Office for Management and Budget. This

may require changes to the categories the Task Force has recommended for the City's data disaggregation pilot.

Thus, the Task Force recommends using 2017 as a year to pilot utilizing the HSD, DEEL, OCR, and DON have volunteered to pilot the recommended categories on race, ethnicity, and language spoken at home in multiple projects ranging from surveys to programs with intake forms requiring database changes. Having disaggregated data is imperative in ensuring investments in these departments follow the RSJI principles. These departments historically collect the most client level demographic information and focus on serving the hardest to reach communities.

Piloting the recommended categories in these departments also allows the City to be better prepared to implement a sustainable policy citywide. Combined with further community outreach, ensuring the ability to have full review of feedback on effectiveness and inclusiveness of the category lists is necessary to ensure RSJI principles are followed. Piloting with surveys and intake forms allows for lessons learned on the practical side of implementation. Recording of implications associated with changing paper intake forms, database changes, reporting and client level to population level analysis will assist in formulating a citywide implementation plan.

Conclusion

The City should implement a standard for race and ethnicity data collection as well as require collection of 'primary language spoken at home'. This will allow for a more complete analysis on whether departments are serving the needs of all communities – specifically those racial and ethnic communities whose disparities have been masked by the larger race and ethnicity categories.

A central entity should be assigned to coordinate and implement the client-level recommendations for finalizing and fully implementing a standardized set of race and ethnicity categories. Each City department that will pilot the recommended categories should work within the resources allocated within their department.

Access to population-level data sources can be improved in order for the City to obtain a more detailed understanding of Seattle's diverse racial and ethnic communities. The City's Demographer in OPCD should (1) develop and share guidance for finding and using disaggregated population-level data, and (2) collaborate with colleagues to prepare case studies document efforts to integrate best practices for disaggregating population level data. This will include identifying, for further consideration, the benefits and challenges associated with conducting this level of detailed analysis.

Finally, the Task Force recognizes a need to plan ahead to ensure a complete count for the 2020 Census. The 2010 Complete Count was coordinated out of the Mayor's office and required substantial resources.