DATA BULLETIN 89-1

ESTIMATED 1980 CENSUS UNDERCOUNT FOR NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS

APRIL, 1989



northeastern illinois planning commission

Northeastern Illinois is diverse in its land use and complex in its political structure. It has some of the most productive farms on earth — also one of the world's greatest cities. It contains 3,714 square miles of land and 38 square miles of water. It is home to 7 million people, organized in more than 1,250 units of government.

In 1957, following a decade of rapid urbanization in the Chicago suburban area, the Illinois General Assembly created the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) to conduct comprehensive planning for the six-county greater Chicago region.

The Commission has three statutory charges: conduct research and collect data for planning; assist local government; and prepare comprehensive plans and policies to guide the development of the counties of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will.

By necessity, regional planning deals with general development policies not local land use detail. NIPC supports and coordinates county and municipal planning. The Commission has advisory powers only and relies upon voluntary compliance with its plans and policies.

northeastern illinois planning commission

400 West Madison Street Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312)454-0400

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charlie A. Thurston
President

Sheila H. Schultz
Vice President

Elizabeth L. Hollander
Secretary

Donna P. Schiller
Treasurer

Eleanor S. Rostron
Vice President for Planning and Policy Development

Edward W. Paesel
Vice President for Governmental Services

Constance C. Zimmermann
Vice President for Water Quality Management

Dean C. Cunat
Past Commission President

Edgar Vanneman Jr.
Past Commission President

Lawrence B. Christmas
Executive Director

COMMISSIONERS

Appointed by the Governor of Illinois

Robert G. Biesel *Retired President, General American International*

Glenn P. Coburn *Member, Will County Board*

Donna P. Schiller *Executive Director, Project Merit Selection of Judges*

Charlie A. Thurston *Vice President, Northern Illinois Gas Company*

Edgar Vanneman Jr. *General Attorney and Assistant Secretary, Brunswick Corporation and Former Mayor, City of Evanston*

Appointed by the Mayor of Chicago

Lawrence S. Bloom *Alderman, 5th Ward, Chicago*

Ed H. Smith *Alderman, 28th Ward, Chicago*

David D. Orr *Alderman, 49th Ward, Chicago*

Elizabeth L. Hollander *Commissioner, Chicago Department of Planning*

Robert L. Anderson *Administrative Assistant to the Mayor City of Chicago*

Elected by the Assembly of Mayors

Alan D. Cornue *Councilman, City of Woodstock*

Mary T. Latta *President Village of Plainfield*

Edward W. Paesel *Mayor, Village of Sauk Village*

David L. Pierce *Mayor, City of Aurora*

Margaret P. Price *Mayor, City of Naperville*

Sheila H. Schultz *President, Village of Wheeling*

Edward P. Tomkowiak *President, Village of Wadsworth*

Appointed by the County Board Chairmen

Jerry Butler
Cook County Board of Commissioners

Irene C. Hernandez
Cook County Board of Commissioners

Joseph P. Mathewson
Cook County Board of Commissioners

Constance C. Zimmermann *Member, DuPage County Board*

Nick P. Kerasiotis *Member, Kane County Board*

Eleanor S. Rostron *Member, Lake County Board*

Dean C. Cunat *Member, McHenry County Board*

Mary Ann Gearhart *Member, Will County Board*

Appointed by the Board of the Regional Transportation Authority

Kathleen K. Parker

Appointed by the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority

Appointment Pending

Appointed by the Board of Metra

Donald A. Udstuen

Appointed by the Board of Pace

Glenn Warning

Appointed by the Board of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago

Joanne H. Alter

Appointed by the Board of the Illinois Association of Park Districts

Ralph Cianchetti

Appointed by the Board of the Chicago Park District

Walter A. Netsch

ESTIMATION OF THE UNDERCOUNT IN THE 1980 CENSUS FOR NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS

DATA BULLETIN 89-1

APRIL, 1989

Max Dieber
Director, Research Services

Funding for the preparation of this document has been provided, in part, by a grant from the Joyce Foundation, and in part, from the contributions of local governments in northeastern Illinois.

Research Services Department
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
400 W. Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 454-0400

I. Preface

This data bulletin contains alternative estimates of a hypothetical 1980 Census undercount allocated to municipalities and Chicago community areas. To illustrate only the possible impact of the undercount, estimating methods used with some relevance at the national level have been applied to areas within northeastern Illinois. The purpose here is not to define the undercount for 1980 but to demonstrate to the region's citizens and local officials the importance of an accurate 1990 count. The undercount estimates contained herein, given their basis in less than definitive national estimates, must not themselves be considered definitive. Indeed, the Commission cannot verify that the results shown here are an accurate representation of the actual undercount for any specific municipality, community area, or population subgrouping. Accordingly, readers should direct their attentions not to the certainty of these estimates but rather to the importance of promoting as complete a 1990 count as possible.

II. Background

As set forth in the U.S. Constitution, the primary purpose of the Decennial Census is to determine the distribution of the seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the states. It also is used as the basis for state and local political redistricting programs. To these ends alone, the importance of an accurate, or at least equitable, Census count cannot be overstated. But the accuracy of the enumeration is equally important for a variety of other uses:

> Billions of dollars of federal funds are distributed annually to state and local governments based on Census results; a recent analysis done for the City of Chicago by the Financial Resources Advisory Committee (FRAC)

conservatively concluded for those federal programs where funds are clearly distributed on a per capita basis to the City (and excluding funds for non-City functions such as education, transit and parks), 100,000 Chicagoans missed by the Census would cost $6.96 million per year!

State and local governments also use Census results to guide the distribution of funds to locations and to specific programs. In one recent year the State of Illinois distributed to each municipality approximately $30 per person in state income tax monies and $17.50 per person in motor fuel tax funds. Over a ten year period, any municipality undercounted by, say, 1000 people could lose $475,000 if such transfer payments remained stable over the decade.

Apart from the direct distribution of funds, the information flowing from each Decennial Census becomes the basis for many public and private planning and investment decisions. It is difficult to quantify this impact but, certainly, it is no less significant than those mentioned above.

In 1980, an estimated 1.4% of the national population was uncounted. The fact that different population groups, and hence particular portions of the urban landscape, were missed more often than others is of greater concern. While the Bureau did generate estimates of the undercount for the Black and White/Other populations, these were not generated for metropolitan areas or places. This technical paper will present alternative undercount estimates for community areas within the City of Chicago and for municipalities in northeastern Illinois. The focus is on the Black and Latino populations because there is more information

upon which to base estimates than for other groups. We do not mean to suggest that possible undercounts in these other groups are not important.

III. Summary of Findings

A critical finding in the work leading up to the preparation of this document was the lack of reliable estimates or even good guesses for certain population groups and subnational geographies. For example, efforts to find a useful estimate of the Latino undercount were frustrated by first, the unknowable size of the undocumented alien population, and second, the unreliability of Hispanic identifications in vital statistics necessary to calculate an estimated population.

Apparently, others share in this frustration. The Bureau's own most definitive calculation of the overall 1980 undercount presents four possibilities based entirely on different assumptions concerning the number of undocumented workers.[1] Although the preferred rate for the entire resident population seems to be 1.4%, the range is from 1% to 2.2%.[2] The Bureau does present differential undercount estimates, but only for the Black and non-Black population. One of the alternative estimates of the Latino

---

[1] The Coverage of Population in the 1980 Census, Evaluation and Research Reports, PHC80-E4; Fay, Passel and Robinson; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; February, 1988.

[2] The 1.4% undercount rate is based on the assumption that on Census Day in 1980, 3 million undocumented aliens resided in the United States. Of this amount, the Bureau estimates that 2.06 million were counted. References in the balance of this document to the "preferred" rate imply the 1.4% figure plus these assumptions concerning the undocumented resident population. Although the Bureau considers other possibilities, the preference for these assumptions are based on Bureau estimates that the true undocumented population was somewhere in the range of 2.5 to 3.5 million. Independently, the National Academy of Sciences suggest the range is from 2 to 4 million.

undercount presented in this paper is based on a calculation using these Census estimates. These computations suggest a feasible range for the Hispanic undercount of from 0.32% to 15.63%.

A review of discussions of the size of the Latino undercount uncovered a range of estimates. In an American Demographics article from August 1985, Thomas Exter states the Census Bureau estimated the Hispanic undercount to be 7.4% (supporting documentation for this claim has not been found). TerriAnn Lowenthal, the Staff Director of the House Subcommittee on Census and Population, has offered an estimate of 5% (again, no supporting documentation is available). A recent monograph issued by the Population Reference Bureau suggests that the true Hispanic undercount is somewhere between 3% and 6%.[3] An article by Greg Diffendal of the Bureau of the Census, reporting on the results of the 1986 test of adjustment related operations in Central Los Angeles County, reveals an estimated inner city Latino undercount of 9.8%.[4]

The second important finding is that, based on reasonably conservative assumptions, the 1980 undercount in northeastern Illinois was most likely in a range from 133,000, or 1.8%, to 174,000, or 2.4%. For the sake of the argument presented in the balance of this bulletin the 174,000 total will be assumed. This total is roughly the equivalent of forgetting to count McHenry County, or missing Aurora, Evanston and Blue Island. The estimated undercount for the City of Chicago of 125,400 (4%) approximates the entire combined 1980 populations of the Near West Side and Humboldt Park, or Hyde Park, Woodlawn and Uptown!

---

[3] U.S. Hispanics: Challenging Issues for the 1990s; Valdivieso and Davis; Population Reference Bureau, December 1988.

[4] "The 1986 Test of Adjustment Related Operations in Central Los Angeles County" Survey Methodology; Diffendal, Statistics Canada, June 1988.

Because the undercount is most associated with the minority community, the largest undercount is found within the City of Chicago. Although only 42% of the region's residents live in the City of Chicago, an estimated 72% of the missed population were Chicago residents. Stated differently, for every suburbanite missed, it is believed that 2.5 Chicagoans were not counted. Within Chicago, the largest estimated undercounts are found in Austin, West Town, South Lawndale, Logan Square, Humboldt Park and South Shore. In Austin alone an estimated 7400 persons were not counted! The highest rates of undercount are estimated for South Lawndale (8%), Lower West Side (7.9%), South Chicago (6.8%), West Town (6.4%), and Humboldt Park (6.3%).

Significant undercounts can be found in selected suburbs, however. Phoenix (5.6%), Maywood (4.7%), Markham (4.4%), Dixmoor (4.2%), and Harvey (4.2%) all show estimated undercount rates greater than the rate estimated for the City of Chicago as a whole. The largest estimated numbers of people missed are found in Aurora, Waukegan, Joliet, Harvey, Evanston, Maywood, Chicago Heights, Elgin, North Chicago, Cicero, Oak Park, and Markham.

The implications of these estimates are important. First, while these estimates are good enough to demonstrate the importance of an accurate 1990 Census, they are not developed with assumptions uniquely determined for each community. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to proclaim a corrected 1980 population count for any particular municipality or community area using the data presented here. Second, assuming the methods and assumptions used herein are reasonably sound, the budget implications for local units of government and local taxpayers suggest that it is certainly in the interest of the undercounted communities to minimize the 1990 undercount. The FRAC estimates cited in the introduction imply that for just one year in the decade, the undercount reduced

federal revenues for the City of Chicago by perhaps as much as $8.7 million. While the dollar amounts are not as dramatic, the loss in revenues is no less significant for many suburban communities. For example, assuming each suburb received $47.50 per year per person from the State of Illinois (combined approximate total of income and motor fuel tax rebates in FY88), the estimated Aurora undercount of 2281, if accurate, cost that City $1.1 million in intergovernmental transfers from just the State of Illinois during the 1980s. Of course, if all communities had a more accurate and higher count, and the total "pool" of funds was unchanged, each might just get fewer dollars per person and not necessarily more dollars overall. Efforts to improve the count in those communities with the highest undercounts would then be only an equity issue, since relative funding effectively would be shifted from the relatively well counted to the previously undercounted. We can appreciate that not all communities would welcome this. Nonetheless, there are indeed important reasons for all communities to support an improved count. First, all parts of Illinois potentially can benefit if we have a strong congressional delegation. It is estimated that the State will lose two seats in Congress after 1990. A better count might minimize this possibility. Second, a higher statewide population total could result in more federal funds flowing to the state budget - funds that potentially could be spent anywhere within the state. Concerning the position of the State of Illinois relative to the other states, then, what is good for Austin and Humboldt Park is good for Naperville and Winnetka, and vice-versa!

IV. Methodology

Table 1 presents for each suburban municipality and the City of Chicago as a whole, the 1980 population counts by race and Spanish origin as presented in the PL94-171 computer files. Due to significant respondent error in the interpretation of the race

question in the 1980 questionnaire, these data do not provide an accurate indication of the racial distribution.[5] The problem is particularly acute for the information shown for whites (under-represented) and other (over-represented) populations. However, the methodology used to derive the undercount estimates here minimizes the impact of this problem since the undercount derivations focused on the Black, non-Black, and Latino population groupings.

Table 2 presents alternative estimates, including a selected calculation of the undercount for each municipality in the region, for the unincorporated portion of northeastern Illinois, and for the region as a whole. Columns A-E present one undercount alternative for the Black population, two alternatives for the Latino population, one alternative for the non-Black, non-Hispanic population (identified as "Balance"), and one alternative for the non-Black population as a whole. The basis for the undercount rates used in Columns A-E is described below. The logical ways in which these components might be combined are shown in the Columns collectively identified as "Undercount Alternatives." Alternative #1 applies just the "preferred" rates calculated nationwide by the Bureau of the Census for the Black and non-Black populations. Alternative #2 disaggregates the non-Black population into its Hispanic and non-Hispanic components and applies appropriate rates (see discussion below on derivation of rates). Alternative #3 substitutes a higher Latino undercount rate for the one used in Alternative #2. The column labeled "Assumed" shows the undercount assumed in the generation of the 174,000 undercount and used in the maps in this document. In most cases, it is equivalent to Alternative #1. Alternative #3 was substituted for

---

[5]This problem, with adjustments given for the regional, Chicago and suburban county populations, is presented in the NIPC staff document, "Adjustments in the Racial Distribution of the 1980 Census," February 1983.

those municipalities where the 1980 enumerated Latino population equaled or exceeded 8.2%, the regionwide average.

Table 3 shows the 1980 Black, Latino and non-Black, non-Latino populations by Community Area within the City of Chicago. The undercount calculations for each of these three groups and the total undercount for each area is also shown. The assumptions used here and the resulting total undercount for the City of Chicago are consistent with the Alternative #3 results for Chicago shown in Table 2.

The accompanying maps display the undercount and undercount rates associated with the 174,000 regionwide undercount total for suburban municipalities and community areas, and for community areas alone.

The primary source providing the bases for the estimates presented in this document is the Census Bureau's February 1988 Research and Evaluation report PHC80-E4, The Coverage of Population in the 1980 Census, supplemented by Bureau conclusions from the Los Angeles 1986 test of adjustment related operations. In applying these estimates to northeastern Illinois subregions, the central assumptions are:

(1) The estimated undercount rate for the Black population throughout northeastern Illinois is equal to the nationwide calculation of 5.93%. Given the expectation that undercounts might be higher in inner city areas, and the fact that the Black population's share of total Chicago population is four times greater than the share nationwide, it is likely that this 5.93% figure underestimates the Chicago undercount of Blacks, overestimates the suburban undercount of Blacks,

and underestimates the undercount for the Black population in the region as a whole.

(2) The nationwide Latino undercount rate, excluding any uncounted, undocumented aliens, initially is assumed equal to that for the non-Black population as a whole. Without further modification, this would be an extremely conservative assumption. The apparently "preferred" Census Bureau assumption is that 1 million undocumented aliens were not counted (this is consistent with the oft-quoted nationwide all inclusive undercount estimate of 1.4%). The estimates prepared here assume that of that number, 852,000 are Latino. The derived nationwide Latino undercount is then 5.8%.

(3) Using the Census "preferred" assumption of 1 million uncounted, undocumented aliens, the national non-Black undercount including Latinos was 0.74%. Applying the derived national Latino undercount estimate of 5.8% results in an estimated non-Black, non-Latino undercount rate of 0.32%. For the northeastern Illinois estimates, the 0.74% figure was applied to the total non-Black population in the those suburbs in which the Latino population did not exceed 8.2% of the community's total population. In such cases a separate Latino undercount was not derived. When the Latino population did equal or exceed 8.2% of total population, a higher Latino undercount rate, as explained below, was used. In such cases, and for all community areas in the City of Chicago, the assumed undercount

rate for the non-Black, non-Hispanic population was assumed to be 0.32%. The 8.2% cutoff is equal to the Hispanic proportion of total regional population. While the selection of such a cutoff is, admittedly, arbitrary, it reflects the assumption that the undocumented Latino population is more likely to be found in areas with a significant Hispanic population.

(4) The Census Bureau Los Angeles test in 1986 determined an inner city Hispanic undercount of 9.8%. This rate was used for all community areas within the City of Chicago and for those suburbs where the Latino population equaled or exceeded 8.2% of the total population.

Table 4 presents the basis for the nationwide undercount estimates. The columns labeled "Census Bureau Estimates" are derived from PHC80-E4. The NIPC estimated undercount for the Latino population under Option 1 is derived by assuming the same undercount for the Latino population as for the non-Black population as a whole. In proceeding from Option 1 through Option 4, this estimate is raised incrementally by amounts equal to the increments estimated by the Census Bureau for the non-Black population as a whole; i.e., all the increase in the non-Black uncounted population due to increases in the assumed uncounted undocumented alien count is Latino.

Table 5 presents the Census estimates of the undercount (and in the case of negative values, the overcount) of the Black and non-Black population by gender and age for the U.S. as a whole. These assumptions were not used in the estimates prepared for northeastern Illinois and are presented here for information only.

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
ADDISON	28836	27084	246	791	715	1695
ALGONQUIN	5834	5773	2	22	37	67
ALSIP	17134	16666	101	148	219	441
ANTIOCH	4419	4365	1	26	27	34
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS	66116	64124	288	1255	449	1149
AURORA	81293	65583	8459	473	6778	14482
BANNOCKBURN	1316	1216	35	53	12	25
BARRINGTON	9029	8908	10	66	45	111
BARRINGTON HILLS	3631	3582	2	35	12	23
BARTLETT	13254	12412	130	550	162	346
BATAVIA	12574	11703	584	90	197	397
BEDFORD PARK	988	971	0	4	13	30
BEECHER	2024	2003	0	4	17	16
BELLWOOD	19811	11982	6956	291	582	1105
BENSENVILLE	16124	15295	44	432	353	1353
BERKELEY	5467	5373	0	61	33	88
BERWYN	46849	46155	13	319	362	1128
BLOOMINGDALE	12659	12032	213	355	59	267
BLUE ISLAND	21855	18942	1077	108	1728	3469
BOLINGBROOK	37261	32504	2539	1546	672	1689
BRAIDWOOD	3429	3392	15	5	17	50
BRIDGEVIEW	14155	13836	44	94	181	488
BROADVIEW	8618	5744	2625	169	80	196
BROOKFIELD	19395	19085	11	178	121	351
BUFFALO GROVE	22230	21477	142	487	124	345
BULL VALLEY	509	500	3	5	1	4
BURBANK	28462	27952	5	182	323	887
BURLINGTON	442	439	0	1	2	3
BURNHAM	4030	3842	35	20	133	362
BURR RIDGE	3833	3632	8	170	23	41
CALUMET CITY	39673	36467	2360	179	667	1511
CALUMET PARK	8788	5622	2636	27	503	1016
CAROL STREAM	15472	14096	618	446	312	618
CARPENTERSVILLE	23272	22097	224	170	781	2141
CARY	6640	6603	2	18	17	117
CHANNAHON	3734	3683	7	11	33	50
CHICAGO	3005072	1490217	1197000	69191	248664	422061
CHICAGO HEIGHTS	37026	24093	10651	92	2190	4205
CHICAGO RIDGE	13473	13272	17	63	121	263
CICERO	61232	58557	74	356	2245	5271
CLARENDON HILLS	6857	6722	29	70	36	85
COUNTRY CLUB HILLS	14676	12359	1750	429	138	353
COUNTRYSIDE	6538	6444	10	44	40	132
CREST HILL	9252	7963	1005	99	185	314
CRESTWOOD	10712	10221	307	73	111	201
CRETE	5417	5346	53	6	12	39
CRYSTAL LAKE	18590	18312	15	116	147	242
DARIEN	14968	13684	66	1030	188	259
DEER PARK	1368	1303	4	17	44	53
DEERFIELD	17430	17116	44	194	76	223
DES PLAINES	53568	51161	160	1473	774	2139

Source: 1980 Census PL94171 Tapes

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
DIXMOOR	4175	1376	2765	4	30	83
DOLTON	24766	23760	487	222	297	731
DOWNERS GROVE	39274	37607	448	904	315	537
EAST DUNDEE	2618	2587	1	13	17	42
EAST HAZEL CREST	1362	1304	17	3	38	117
ELBURN	1224	1211	2	8	3	4
ELGIN	63798	55748	4206	646	3198	6529
ELK GROVE VILLAGE	28907	26895	226	1440	346	741
ELMHURST	44251	42721	186	1024	320	945
ELMWOOD PARK	24016	23782	8	122	104	405
ELWOOD	814	810	0	0	4	12
EVANSTON	73706	54926	15801	2004	975	1715
EVERGREEN PARK	22260	21963	53	161	83	229
FLOSSMOOR	8423	7819	297	262	45	114
FORD HEIGHTS	5347	29	5252	2	64	91
FOREST PARK	15177	13385	636	861	295	447
FOREST VIEW	764	761	0	2	1	12
FOX LAKE	6831	6739	8	26	58	83
FOX RIVER GROVE	2515	2475	0	11	29	50
FOX RIVER VALLEY GARDENS	541	535	2	2	2	2
FRANKFORT	4357	4319	4	16	18	33
FRANKLIN PARK	17507	16396	15	159	937	1543
GENEVA	9881	9760	37	54	30	135
GILBERTS	263	263	0	0	0	0
GLEN ELLYN	23649	22827	245	431	146	272
GLENCOE	9200	8641	379	77	103	143
GLENDALE HEIGHTS	23163	20388	377	2040	358	850
GLENVIEW	30842	29426	277	957	182	451
GLENWOOD	10538	9340	1009	69	120	221
GODLEY	373	370	1	1	1	0
GOLF	482	460	0	9	13	11
GRAYSLAKE	5260	5196	1	50	13	67
GREEN OAKS	1415	1407	0	5	3	7
GURNEE	7179	6903	99	121	56	109
HAINESVILLE	187	159	0	1	27	27
HAMPSHIRE	1735	1702	1	4	28	39
HANOVER PARK	28850	26531	390	1089	840	1748
HARVARD	5126	5000	0	5	121	228
HARVEY	35810	11306	23491	65	948	1643
HARWOOD HEIGHTS	8228	8040	3	92	93	138
HAWTHORN WOODS	1658	1639	6	2	11	12
HAZEL CREST	13973	11955	1662	228	128	329
HEBRON	786	779	2	0	5	6
HICKORY HILLS	13778	13526	4	109	139	275
HIGHLAND PARK	30611	29240	547	391	433	837
HIGHWOOD	5452	4831	277	99	245	640
HILLSIDE	8279	8032	27	123	97	186
HINSDALE	16726	16164	72	387	103	197
HODGKINS	2005	1855	0	7	143	299
HOFFMAN ESTATES	38258	35765	505	1484	504	1203
HOLIDAY HILLS	802	800	0	0	2	15

Source: 1980 Census PL94171 Tapes

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
HOMETOWN	5324	5295	1	6	22	50
HOMEWOOD	19724	19065	424	155	80	132
HUNTLEY	1646	1632	1	4	9	50
INDIAN CREEK	236	235	1	0	0	1
INDIAN HEAD PARK	2915	2814	15	70	16	44
INVERNESS	4046	3951	3	86	6	36
ISLAND LAKE	2293	2256	2	3	32	81
ITASCA	7948	7528	75	192	153	267
JOLIET	77956	57714	15672	355	4215	6565
JUSTICE	10552	9211	1102	81	158	285
KENILWORTH	2708	2660	6	37	5	27
KILDEER	1609	1595	0	10	4	11
LAGRANGE	15681	14422	1036	132	91	246
LAGRANGE PARK	13359	13182	19	105	53	122
LAKE BARRINGTON	2320	2309	2	1	8	14
LAKE BLUFF	4434	4342	24	44	24	27
LAKE FOREST	15245	14729	218	198	100	166
LAKE IN THE HILLS	5651	5597	12	10	32	107
LAKE VILLA	1462	1421	13	14	14	24
LAKE ZURICH	8225	8003	43	79	100	348
LAKEMOOR	723	722	0	1	0	9
LAKEWOOD	1254	1252	1	0	1	11
LANSING	29039	28440	321	88	190	598
LEMONT	5640	5552	1	36	51	111
LIBERTYVILLE	16520	15923	28	348	221	327
LINCOLNSHIRE	4151	4095	28	27	1	41
LINCOLNWOOD	11921	11003	12	768	138	254
LINDENHURST	6220	6087	17	72	44	85
LISLE	13625	12761	402	366	96	192
LOCKPORT	9017	8868	48	45	56	150
LOMBARD	37295	35972	220	894	209	575
LONG GROVE	2013	1947	7	31	28	41
LYNWOOD	4195	3936	167	21	71	173
LYONS	9925	9701	2	89	133	322
MANHATTAN	1944	1933	0	2	9	17
MAPLE PARK	637	622	0	6	9	12
MARENGO	4361	4139	0	21	201	316
MARKHAM	15172	4439	10592	24	117	217
MATTESON	10223	8485	1266	328	144	333
MAYWOOD	27998	6038	21015	112	833	1893
MCCOOK	303	299	0	0	4	12
MCCULLOM LAKE	947	929	1	2	15	25
MCHENRY	11949	11799	5	75	70	108
MELROSE PARK	20735	19327	46	308	1054	3060
MERRIONETTE PARK	2054	2040	0	13	1	30
METTAWA	330	327	2	1	0	4
MIDLOTHIAN	14274	14032	25	80	137	321
MINOOKA	1565	1563	0	1	1	14
MOKENA	4578	4537	0	13	28	43
MONEE	993	986	0	1	6	11
MONTGOMERY	3363	3211	64	11	77	138

Source: 1980 Census PL94171 Tapes

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
MORTON GROVE	23747	21834	31	1520	362	440
MOUNT PROSPECT	52634	50302	331	1490	511	1225
MUNDELEIN	17053	16224	16	174	639	1287
NAPERVILLE	42330	40881	314	921	214	418
NEW LENOX	5792	5715	2	18	57	74
NILES	30363	29160	63	888	252	495
NORRIDGE	16483	16262	6	158	57	148
NORTH AURORA	5205	4905	139	45	116	190
NORTH BARRINGTON	1475	1466	0	8	1	5
NORTH CHICAGO	38774	26018	10495	949	1312	1963
NORTH RIVERSIDE	6764	6710	0	34	20	56
NORTHBROOK	30735	29583	73	897	182	533
NORTHFIELD	5807	5654	18	103	32	42
NORTHLAKE	12166	11335	21	266	544	1013
OAK BROOK	6641	6032	21	507	81	167
OAK FOREST	26096	25109	522	253	212	443
OAK LAWN	60590	59577	38	525	450	753
OAK PARK	54887	46738	5929	1492	728	1364
OAKBROOK TERRACE	2285	2204	16	48	17	41
OAKWOOD HILLS	1255	1248	0	2	5	11
OLD MILL CREEK	84	84	0	0	0	0
OLYMPIA FIELDS	4146	3737	207	160	42	65
ORLAND HILLS	2784	2720	0	19	45	106
ORLAND PARK	23045	22250	24	622	149	328
PALATINE	32166	31209	106	506	345	618
PALOS HEIGHTS	11096	10708	17	272	99	87
PALOS HILLS	16654	15979	261	250	164	452
PALOS PARK	3150	3096	1	43	10	14
PARK CITY	3673	3465	52	60	96	224
PARK FOREST	26222	22219	3178	380	445	626
PARK RIDGE	38704	37957	60	501	186	334
PEOTONE	2832	2827	0	1	4	16
PHOENIX	2850	136	2655	3	56	43
PINGREE GROVE	183	182	0	0	1	5
PLAINFIELD	4485	4463	3	7	12	35
POSEN	4642	4499	85	18	40	175
PRAIRIE GROVE	680	667	0	1	12	22
PROSPECT HEIGHTS	11808	11017	218	281	292	630
RICHMOND	1068	1064	0	0	4	19
RICHTON PARK	9403	8421	688	177	117	338
RIVER FOREST	12392	11967	106	195	124	188
RIVER GROVE	10368	10188	1	77	102	202
RIVERDALE	13233	13012	36	38	147	321
RIVERSIDE	9236	9155	0	45	36	133
RIVERWOODS	2804	2730	18	47	9	25
ROBBINS	8119	114	7985	5	15	59
ROCKDALE	1913	1803	4	3	103	235
ROLLING MEADOWS	20167	19018	249	523	377	1303
ROMEOVILLE	15519	14508	244	106	661	1401
ROSELLE	16948	15924	141	702	181	312
ROSEMONT	4137	3898	20	132	87	317

Source: 1980 Census PL94171 Tapes

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
ROUND LAKE	2644	2562	11	10	61	120
ROUND LAKE BEACH	12921	12369	28	57	467	985
ROUND LAKE HEIGHTS	1192	1117	1	6	68	88
ROUND LAKE PARK	4032	3862	2	12	156	239
SAUK VILLAGE	10906	10411	154	65	276	830
SCHAUMBURG	52319	49660	643	1570	446	986
SCHILLER PARK	11458	11032	72	158	196	751
SHOREWOOD	4714	4618	29	28	39	59
SKOKIE	60278	54726	613	4242	697	1612
SLEEPY HOLLOW	2000	1958	5	17	20	16
SOUTH BARRINGTON	1168	1132	0	29	7	1
SOUTH CHICAGO HEIGHTS	3932	3779	9	5	139	312
SOUTH ELGIN	6218	6005	55	33	125	252
SOUTH HOLLAND	24977	24382	120	308	167	395
SPRING GROVE	571	569	0	2	0	6
ST CHARLES	17492	17157	78	82	175	474
STEGER	9269	7945	1028	8	288	640
STICKNEY	5893	5769	43	30	51	146
STONE PARK	4273	3425	7	189	652	1272
STREAMWOOD	23456	22224	172	536	524	1213
SUGAR GROVE	1366	1335	0	1	30	14
SUMMIT	10110	7650	1637	84	739	2022
SUNNYSIDE	1432	1423	1	0	8	14
SYMERTON	120	120	0	0	0	1
THIRD LAKE	222	222	0	0	0	2
THORNTON	3022	3000	6	2	14	52
TINLEY PARK	26171	25317	463	213	178	405
TOWER LAKES	1177	1172	0	2	3	0
UNION	622	618	0	0	4	14
UNIVERSITY PARK	6245	3338	2765	40	102	116
VERNON HILLS	9827	9099	107	464	157	334
VILLA PARK	23185	22416	102	466	201	456
WADSWORTH	1104	1092	0	7	5	21
WARRENVILLE	7519	7248	78	134	59	103
WAUCONDA	5688	5599	1	18	70	135
WAUKEGAN	67653	49024	12484	1228	4917	9253
WAYNE	940	937	0	3	0	1
WEST CHICAGO	12550	11199	202	132	1017	2094
WEST DUNDEE	3502	3463	4	19	16	56
WESTCHESTER	17730	17449	14	222	45	182
WESTERN SPRINGS	12876	12713	19	98	46	115
WESTMONT	16718	15544	293	715	166	328
WHEATON	43043	40833	1068	742	400	615
WHEELING	23266	22121	188	487	470	1282
WILLOW SPRINGS	4147	4024	2	63	58	59
WILLOWBROOK	4953	4450	44	398	61	80
WILMETTE	28229	27209	95	763	162	337
WILMINGTON	4424	4376	15	11	22	17
WINFIELD	4422	4352	16	42	12	22
WINNETKA	12772	12500	62	151	59	120
WINTHROP HARBOR	5438	5323	2	60	53	85

Source: 1980 Census PL94171 Tapes

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS MUNICIPALITIES

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	OTHER	LATINO
WONDER LAKE	752	745	0	0	7	7
WOOD DALE	11251	10766	11	248	226	611
WOODRIDGE	22322	20542	864	719	197	516
WOODSTOCK	11725	11452	23	62	188	392
WORTH	11592	11460	4	32	96	180
ZION	17861	13985	3146	244	486	665
TOTAL INCORPORATED	6540057	4675081	1414565	133931	316480	564938
SUBURBAN INCORPORATED	3534985	3184864	217565	64740	67816	142877
SUBURBAN UNINCORPORATED	563567	535147	13261	7418	7741	15671
REGIONWIDE TOTAL	7103624	5210228	1427826	141349	324221	580609

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E	#1	#2	#3		
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%					
ADDISON	15	104	81	214	184	230	201	280	230	0.8%
ALGONQUIN	0	4	17	44	7	44	22	25	44	0.7%
ALSIP	6	27	50	128	48	134	83	104	134	0.8%
ANTIOCH	0	2	13	33	4	33	15	17	33	0.7%
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS	18	71	194	494	125	512	283	337	512	0.8%
AURORA	533	892	175	546	1573	1079	1600	2281	2281	2.7%
BANNOCKBURN	2	2	4	10	3	12	8	9	12	0.9%
BARRINGTON	1	7	27	68	12	68	34	39	68	0.8%
BARRINGTON HILLS	0	1	11	27	2	27	12	13	27	0.7%
BARTLETT	8	21	38	98	38	107	68	84	107	0.8%
BATAVIA	37	24	35	90	43	127	96	115	127	1.0%
BEDFORD PARK	0	2	3	7	3	7	5	6	7	0.7%
BEECHER	0	1	6	15	2	15	7	8	15	0.7%
BELLWOOD	438	68	35	96	120	535	542	593	535	2.6%
BENSENVILLE	3	83	44	121	147	123	130	194	194	1.2%
BERKELEY	0	5	16	41	10	41	22	26	41	0.7%
BERWYN	1	69	137	351	123	352	207	260	352	0.7%
BLOOMINGDALE	13	16	37	93	29	107	66	79	107	0.8%
BLUE ISLAND	68	214	52	156	377	224	333	497	497	2.2%
BOLINGBROOK	160	104	99	260	183	420	363	442	420	1.1%
BRAIDWOOD	1	3	10	26	5	27	14	16	27	0.8%
BRIDGEVIEW	3	30	41	106	53	109	74	97	109	0.8%
BROADVIEW	165	12	17	45	21	210	195	204	210	2.4%
BROOKFIELD	1	22	57	145	38	146	79	96	146	0.7%
BUFFALO GROVE	9	21	65	166	37	175	95	112	175	0.8%
BULL VALLEY	0	0	2	4	0	4	2	2	4	0.8%
BURBANK	0	55	83	213	96	214	138	179	214	0.7%
BURLINGTON	0	0	1	3	0	3	2	2	3	0.7%
BURNHAM	2	22	11	30	39	32	35	52	52	1.3%
BURR RIDGE	1	3	11	29	4	29	14	16	29	0.8%
CALUMET CITY	149	93	107	280	164	429	349	420	429	1.1%
CALUMET PARK	166	63	15	46	110	212	244	292	292	3.2%
CAROL STREAM	39	38	43	111	67	150	120	149	150	1.0%
CARPENTERSVILLE	14	132	63	173	233	187	209	309	309	1.3%
CARY	0	7	20	50	13	50	27	32	50	0.7%
CHANNAHON	0	3	11	28	5	28	15	17	28	0.8%
CHICAGO	75411	25999	4158	13561	45836	88972	105568	125405	125405	4.0%
CHICAGO HEIGHTS	671	259	67	198	457	869	997	1194	1194	3.1%
CHICAGO RIDGE	1	16	40	101	29	102	57	69	102	0.8%
CICERO	5	325	168	459	572	463	497	745	745	1.2%
CLARENDON HILLS	2	5	20	51	9	53	27	31	53	0.8%
COUNTRY CLUB HILLS	110	22	38	97	38	207	170	186	207	1.4%
COUNTRYSIDE	1	8	19	49	14	50	28	34	50	0.8%
CREST HILL	63	19	24	62	34	125	106	121	125	1.3%
CRESTWOOD	19	12	31	78	22	97	62	72	97	0.9%
CRETE	3	2	16	40	4	44	22	24	44	0.8%
CRYSTAL LAKE	1	15	55	139	26	140	71	82	140	0.7%
DARIEN	4	16	44	112	28	116	64	76	116	0.8%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E	#1	#2	#3		
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%					
DEER PARK	0	3	4	10	6	10	7	10	10	0.8%
DEERFIELD	3	14	51	130	24	133	68	78	133	0.8%
DES PLAINES	10	132	154	401	232	411	296	396	411	0.8%
DIXMOOR	174	5	4	11	9	185	183	187	185	4.2%
DOLTON	31	45	71	182	79	213	146	181	213	0.9%
DOWNERS GROVE	28	33	115	291	58	319	176	201	319	0.8%
EAST DUNDEE	0	3	8	20	5	20	10	12	20	0.7%
EAST HAZEL CREST	1	7	4	10	13	11	12	17	17	1.2%
ELBURN	0	0	4	9	0	9	4	4	9	0.8%
ELGIN	265	402	159	447	709	712	826	1133	1133	1.7%
ELK GROVE VILLAGE	14	46	84	215	80	229	144	179	229	0.8%
ELMHURST	12	58	129	330	103	342	199	244	342	0.8%
ELMWOOD PARK	1	25	71	180	44	181	96	115	181	0.7%
ELWOOD	0	1	2	6	1	6	3	4	6	0.7%
EVANSTON	995	106	169	434	186	1430	1270	1350	1430	1.9%
EVERGREEN PARK	3	14	66	167	25	170	83	94	170	0.8%
FLOSSMOOR	19	7	24	61	12	80	50	55	80	0.9%
FORD HEIGHTS	331	6	0	1	10	332	336	341	332	5.8%
FOREST PARK	40	28	42	109	49	149	110	131	149	1.0%
FOREST VIEW	0	1	2	6	1	6	3	4	6	0.7%
FOX LAKE	1	5	20	51	9	52	26	30	52	0.8%
FOX RIVER GROVE	0	3	7	19	5	19	10	13	19	0.7%
FOX RIVER VALLEY GARDENS	0	0	2	4	0	4	2	2	4	0.8%
FRANKFORT	0	2	13	33	4	33	15	17	33	0.7%
FRANKLIN PARK	1	95	48	131	168	132	144	216	216	1.2%
GENEVA	2	8	29	74	15	76	40	46	76	0.8%
GILBERTS	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	0.7%
GLEN ELLYN	15	17	69	176	30	191	102	114	191	0.8%
GLENCOE	24	9	26	66	16	90	59	65	90	1.0%
GLENDALE HEIGHTS	24	52	66	171	92	195	142	182	195	0.8%
GLENVIEW	17	28	90	229	49	247	136	157	247	0.8%
GLENWOOD	64	14	28	71	24	135	105	115	135	1.3%
GODLEY	0	0	1	3	0	3	1	1	3	0.8%
GOLF	0	1	1	4	1	4	2	3	4	0.7%
GRAYSLAKE	0	4	16	39	7	40	20	23	40	0.7%
GREEN OAKS	0	0	4	11	1	11	5	5	11	0.7%
GURNEE	6	7	21	53	12	59	34	39	59	0.8%
HAINESVILLE	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	3	3	1.6%
HAMPSHIRE	0	2	5	13	4	13	8	9	13	0.7%
HANOVER PARK	25	108	80	213	190	238	212	295	238	0.8%
HARVARD	0	14	15	38	25	38	29	39	38	0.7%
HARVEY	1480	101	32	92	178	1572	1613	1690	1572	4.2%
HARWOOD HEIGHTS	0	9	24	62	15	62	33	39	62	0.7%
HAWTHORN WOODS	0	1	5	12	1	13	6	7	13	0.8%
HAZEL CREST	105	20	36	92	36	197	161	176	197	1.4%
HEBRON	0	0	2	6	1	6	3	3	6	0.8%
HICKORY HILLS	0	17	40	103	30	104	58	71	104	0.7%
HIGHLAND PARK	34	52	88	225	91	260	174	213	260	0.8%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E					
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	#1	#2	#3		
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
HIGHWOOD	17	39	14	39	70	56	70	101	101	1.8%
HILLSIDE	2	11	24	62	20	64	37	46	64	0.8%
HINSDALE	5	12	49	125	21	129	66	75	129	0.8%
HODGKINS	0	18	5	15	32	15	24	38	38	1.9%
HOFFMAN ESTATES	32	74	110	283	131	315	216	272	315	0.8%
HOLIDAY HILLS	0	1	2	6	2	6	3	4	6	0.7%
HOMETOWN	0	3	16	40	5	40	19	21	40	0.7%
HOMEWOOD	27	8	58	145	14	171	92	99	171	0.9%
HUNTLEY	0	3	5	12	5	12	8	10	12	0.7%
INDIAN CREEK	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	0.8%
INDIAN HEAD PARK	1	3	9	22	5	23	12	14	23	0.8%
INVERNESS	0	2	12	30	4	31	14	16	31	0.7%
ISLAND LAKE	0	5	7	17	9	17	12	16	17	0.7%
ITASCA	5	16	23	59	29	64	44	57	64	0.8%
JOLIET	987	404	167	467	713	1454	1559	1867	1867	2.3%
JUSTICE	69	18	27	71	31	140	114	128	140	1.3%
KENILWORTH	0	2	8	20	3	21	10	11	21	0.8%
KILDEER	0	1	5	12	1	12	5	6	12	0.7%
LAGRANGE	65	15	43	110	27	175	124	135	175	1.1%
LAGRANGE PARK	1	8	40	100	13	101	48	54	101	0.8%
LAKE BARRINGTON	0	1	7	17	2	18	8	9	18	0.7%
LAKE BLUFF	2	2	13	33	3	35	16	18	35	0.8%
LAKE FOREST	14	10	45	113	18	126	69	76	126	0.8%
LAKE IN THE HILLS	1	7	17	42	12	43	24	29	43	0.8%
LAKE VILLA	1	1	4	11	3	12	7	8	12	0.8%
LAKE ZURICH	3	21	24	61	38	64	48	64	64	0.8%
LAKEMOOR	0	1	2	5	1	5	3	3	5	0.7%
LAKEWOOD	0	1	4	9	1	9	4	5	9	0.7%
LANSING	20	37	84	215	65	236	141	170	236	0.8%
LEMONT	0	7	17	42	12	42	23	29	42	0.7%
LIBERTYVILLE	2	20	48	124	36	125	70	86	125	0.8%
LINCOLNSHIRE	2	3	12	31	4	33	17	18	33	0.8%
LINCOLNWOOD	1	16	35	89	28	90	51	63	90	0.7%
LINDENHURST	1	5	18	47	9	48	25	29	48	0.8%
LISLE	25	12	39	99	21	124	76	85	124	0.9%
LOCKPORT	3	9	26	67	16	70	39	46	70	0.8%
LOMBARD	14	35	110	278	62	292	159	186	292	0.8%
LONG GROVE	0	3	6	15	4	15	9	11	15	0.8%
LYNWOOD	11	11	12	30	19	41	33	41	41	1.0%
LYONS	0	20	29	74	35	75	49	64	75	0.7%
MANHATTAN	0	1	6	15	2	15	7	8	15	0.7%
MAPLE PARK	0	1	2	5	1	5	3	3	5	0.7%
MARENGO	0	19	12	33	34	33	32	46	33	0.7%
MARKHAM	667	13	13	34	24	702	694	704	702	4.4%
MATTESON	80	21	26	67	36	147	126	142	147	1.4%
MAYWOOD	1324	117	15	52	206	1376	1456	1545	1376	4.7%
MCCOOK	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	0.7%
MCCULLOM LAKE	0	2	3	7	3	7	4	6	7	0.8%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E					
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	#1	#2	#3		
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
MCHENRY	0	7	36	90	12	90	42	48	90	0.7%
MELROSE PARK	3	188	53	155	332	158	244	388	388	1.8%
MERRIONETTE PARK	0	2	6	15	3	15	8	9	15	0.7%
METTAWA	0	0	1	2	0	3	1	2	3	0.8%
MIDLOTHIAN	2	20	42	107	35	108	63	78	108	0.8%
MINOOKA	0	1	5	12	2	12	6	6	12	0.7%
MOKENA	0	3	14	34	5	34	16	18	34	0.7%
MONEE	0	1	3	7	1	7	4	4	7	0.7%
MONTGOMERY	4	9	9	25	15	29	22	29	29	0.8%
MORTON GROVE	2	27	70	178	48	180	99	120	180	0.8%
MOUNT PROSPECT	21	75	153	392	133	413	250	307	413	0.8%
MUNDELEIN	1	79	47	128	140	129	128	188	129	0.7%
NAPERVILLE	20	26	125	315	45	335	170	190	335	0.8%
NEW LENOX	0	5	17	43	8	44	22	25	44	0.7%
NILES	4	30	89	227	54	231	124	147	231	0.8%
NORRIDGE	0	9	49	124	16	124	58	65	124	0.7%
NORTH AURORA	9	12	15	38	21	47	35	44	47	0.9%
NORTH BARRINGTON	0	0	4	11	1	11	5	5	11	0.7%
NORTH CHICAGO	661	121	79	212	213	873	861	953	873	2.2%
NORTH RIVERSIDE	0	3	20	51	6	51	24	26	51	0.7%
NORTHBROOK	5	33	90	230	58	235	128	153	235	0.8%
NORTHFIELD	1	3	17	43	5	45	21	23	45	0.8%
NORTHLAKE	1	62	33	91	110	92	97	145	145	1.2%
OAK BROOK	1	10	19	50	18	51	31	39	51	0.8%
OAK FOREST	33	27	75	192	48	225	136	156	225	0.9%
OAK LAWN	2	46	179	454	82	457	228	264	457	0.7%
OAK PARK	374	84	143	367	148	741	600	664	741	1.3%
OAKBROOK TERRACE	1	3	7	17	4	18	10	12	18	0.8%
OAKWOOD HILLS	0	1	4	9	1	9	4	5	9	0.7%
OLD MILL CREEK	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0.7%
OLYMPIA FIELDS	13	4	12	30	7	43	29	32	43	1.0%
ORLAND HILLS	0	7	8	21	12	21	15	20	21	0.7%
ORLAND PARK	2	20	68	173	36	174	90	105	174	0.8%
PALATINE	7	38	94	240	67	247	139	168	247	0.8%
PALOS HEIGHTS	1	5	33	83	9	84	39	43	84	0.8%
PALOS HILLS	16	28	48	123	49	139	92	113	139	0.8%
PALOS PARK	0	1	9	24	2	24	10	11	24	0.7%
PARK CITY	3	14	10	27	24	30	27	38	30	0.8%
PARK FOREST	200	39	67	173	68	373	306	335	373	1.4%
PARK RIDGE	4	21	115	290	36	294	139	155	294	0.8%
PEOTONE	0	1	8	21	2	21	9	10	21	0.7%
PHOENIX	167	3	0	1	5	169	170	172	169	5.6%
PINGREE GROVE	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.7%
PLAINFIELD	0	2	13	34	4	34	16	17	34	0.7%
POSEN	5	11	13	34	19	40	29	38	40	0.8%
PRAIRIE GROVE	0	1	2	5	2	5	3	4	5	0.7%
PROSPECT HEIGHTS	14	39	33	87	68	101	85	115	101	0.8%
RICHMOND	0	1	3	8	2	8	4	5	8	0.7%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E					
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	#1	#2	#3		
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
RICHTON PARK	43	21	25	65	37	109	89	105	109	1.1%
RIVER FOREST	7	12	36	92	20	99	55	63	99	0.8%
RIVER GROVE	0	12	30	78	22	78	43	52	78	0.7%
RIVERDALE	2	20	39	99	35	101	61	76	101	0.8%
RIVERSIDE	0	8	27	69	14	69	36	42	69	0.7%
RIVERWOODS	1	2	8	21	3	22	11	12	22	0.8%
ROBBINS	503	4	0	1	6	504	507	510	504	5.8%
ROCKDALE	0	14	5	14	26	15	20	31	31	1.6%
ROLLING MEADOWS	16	80	56	149	142	165	152	213	165	0.8%
ROMEOVILLE	15	86	42	115	152	130	143	209	209	1.3%
ROSELLE	9	19	49	126	34	135	78	92	135	0.8%
ROSEMONT	1	20	11	31	34	32	32	47	32	0.8%
ROUND LAKE	1	7	8	20	13	20	16	21	20	0.8%
ROUND LAKE BEACH	2	61	36	97	107	98	98	144	98	0.8%
ROUND LAKE HEIGHTS	0	5	3	9	10	9	9	13	9	0.7%
ROUND LAKE PARK	0	15	11	30	26	30	26	37	30	0.7%
SAUK VILLAGE	10	51	30	81	90	90	91	130	90	0.8%
SCHAUMBURG	41	61	152	388	107	428	253	300	428	0.8%
SCHILLER PARK	5	46	32	85	82	90	83	118	90	0.8%
SHOREWOOD	2	4	14	35	6	37	19	22	37	0.8%
SKOKIE	39	99	174	447	175	486	312	388	486	0.8%
SLEEPY HOLLOW	0	1	6	15	2	15	7	8	15	0.8%
SOUTH BARRINGTON	0	0	4	9	0	9	4	4	9	0.7%
SOUTH CHICAGO HEIGHTS	1	19	11	29	34	30	31	45	30	0.8%
SOUTH ELGIN	3	16	18	46	27	50	37	49	50	0.8%
SOUTH HOLLAND	8	24	73	186	43	194	105	124	194	0.8%
SPRING GROVE	0	0	2	4	1	4	2	2	4	0.7%
ST CHARLES	5	29	51	131	51	136	85	107	136	0.8%
STEGER	65	39	23	62	70	127	127	157	127	1.3%
STICKNEY	3	9	17	44	16	47	29	36	47	0.8%
STONE PARK	0	78	9	32	138	32	88	148	148	3.3%
STREAMWOOD	11	75	66	175	132	185	152	209	185	0.8%
SUGAR GROVE	0	1	4	10	2	10	5	6	10	0.7%
SUMMIT	103	125	19	64	220	167	247	342	342	3.3%
SUNNYSIDE	0	1	4	11	2	11	5	6	11	0.7%
SYMERTON	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0.7%
THIRD LAKE	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	0.7%
THORNTON	0	3	9	23	6	23	12	15	23	0.8%
TINLEY PARK	29	25	76	193	44	222	130	149	222	0.8%
TOWER LAKES	0	0	4	9	0	9	4	4	9	0.7%
UNION	0	1	2	5	2	5	3	3	5	0.7%
UNIVERSITY PARK	174	7	10	26	13	200	191	197	200	3.1%
VERNON HILLS	7	21	28	73	36	80	55	71	80	0.8%
VILLA PARK	6	28	68	173	50	180	102	124	180	0.8%
WADSWORTH	0	1	3	8	2	8	5	6	8	0.7%
WARRENVILLE	5	6	22	56	11	61	33	38	61	0.8%
WAUCONDA	0	8	17	43	15	43	25	31	43	0.7%
WAUKEGAN	786	570	138	414	1005	1200	1494	1929	1929	2.8%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 2
CALCULATION OF UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES BY MUNICIPALITY

	...ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS OF UNDERCOUNT..					.....UNDERCOUNT ALTERNATIVES....				
	A	B	C	D	E	#1	#2	#3		
	BLACK	LATINO	"BALANCE"	NON-BLK	LATINO	A+D	A+C+B	A+C+E	ASSUMED	%
	@5.9%	@5.8%	@0.3%	@0.7%	@9.8%					
WAYNE	0	0	3	7	0	7	3	3	7	0.7%
WEST CHICAGO	13	129	31	93	227	105	172	271	271	2.1%
WEST DUNDEE	0	3	10	26	6	26	14	17	26	0.8%
WESTCHESTER	1	11	53	133	20	134	65	73	134	0.7%
WESTERN SPRINGS	1	7	38	96	12	98	47	52	98	0.8%
WESTMONT	18	20	48	123	36	142	87	102	142	0.8%
WHEATON	67	38	124	315	67	382	229	258	382	0.9%
WHEELING	12	79	65	173	139	185	156	216	185	0.8%
WILLOW SPRINGS	0	4	12	31	6	31	16	19	31	0.7%
WILLOWBROOK	3	5	14	37	9	40	22	26	40	0.8%
WILMETTE	6	21	83	211	37	217	110	126	217	0.8%
WILMINGTON	1	1	13	33	2	34	15	16	34	0.8%
WINFIELD	1	1	13	33	2	34	16	17	34	0.8%
WINNETKA	4	7	38	95	13	99	49	55	99	0.8%
WINTHROP HARBOR	0	5	16	41	9	41	21	25	41	0.7%
WONDER LAKE	0	0	2	6	1	6	3	3	6	0.7%
WOOD DALE	1	38	32	84	66	85	70	99	85	0.7%
WOODRIDGE	54	32	63	161	56	215	149	173	215	1.0%
WOODSTOCK	1	24	34	88	43	89	60	78	89	0.8%
WORTH	0	11	34	87	20	87	46	54	87	0.7%
ZION	198	41	42	110	72	309	281	313	309	1.7%
TOTAL INCORPORATED	89118	34800	13682	38441	61352	130122	137302	162724	168922	2.5%
SUBURBAN INCORPORATED	13707	8801	9524	24881	15516	40246	33977	40407	43517	1.2%
SUBURBAN UNINCORPORATED	835	965	1604	4127	1702	4963	3405	4141	4963	0.9%
REGIONWIDE TOTAL	89953	35766	15286	42568	63054	132522	141004	168293	173885	2.4%

Note: "Balance" in Column C refers to the non-Black, non-Hispanic population

TABLE 3
UNDERCOUNTED 1980 CHICAGO POPULATION BY COMMUNITY AREA
Consistent With Regional Alternative of 174,000 Uncounted

COMMUNITY AREA	TOTAL ENUMER POP	ENUMER BLACK POP	MISSED BLACK @5.9%	ENUMER LATINO POP	MISSED LATINO @9.8%	ENUMER POP REMAINING	MISSED REMAINING @0.3%	TOTAL MISSED	%
1 ROGERS PARK	55525	5225	329	6621	719	43679	131	1179	2.1%
2 WEST RIDGE	61129	442	28	2266	246	58421	175	449	0.7%
3 UPTOWN	64414	9703	611	14984	1627	39727	119	2358	3.5%
4 LINCOLN SQUARE	43954	236	15	4973	540	38745	116	671	1.5%
5 NORTH CENTER	35161	412	26	6684	726	28065	84	836	2.3%
6 LAKE VIEW	97519	6757	426	18333	1991	72429	217	2634	2.6%
7 LINCOLN PARK	57146	4909	309	5991	651	46246	139	1099	1.9%
8 NEAR NORTH SIDE	67167	22000	1386	1944	211	43223	130	1727	2.5%
9 EDISON PARK	12457	0	0	120	13	12337	37	50	0.4%
10 NORWOOD PARK	40585	7	0	390	42	40188	121	163	0.4%
11 JEFFERSON PARK	24583	5	0	395	43	24183	73	116	0.5%
12 FOREST GLEN	18991	11	1	295	32	18685	56	89	0.5%
13 NORTH PARK	15273	143	9	846	92	14284	43	144	0.9%
14 ALBANY PARK	46075	279	18	9074	985	36722	110	1113	2.4%
15 PORTAGE PARK	57349	51	3	1486	161	55812	167	332	0.6%
16 IRVING PARK	49489	63	4	4267	463	45159	135	603	1.2%
17 DUNNING	37860	183	12	613	67	37064	111	189	0.5%
18 MONTCLARE	10793	0	0	179	19	10614	32	51	0.5%
19 BELMONT CRAGIN	53371	43	3	3072	334	50256	151	487	0.9%
20 HERMOSA	19547	74	5	6101	663	13372	40	707	3.5%
21 AVONDALE	33527	60	4	6863	745	26604	80	829	2.4%
22 LOGAN SQUARE	84768	2236	141	43829	4760	38703	116	5017	5.6%
23 HUMBOLDT PARK	70879	25215	1589	28872	3135	16792	50	4774	6.3%
24 WEST TOWN	96428	8671	546	54693	5940	33064	99	6585	6.4%
25 AUSTIN	138026	101831	6415	8148	885	28047	84	7384	5.1%
26 WEST GARFIELD PARK	33865	33475	2109	278	30	112	0	2139	5.9%
27 EAST GARFIELD PARK	31580	31263	1970	263	29	54	0	1998	6.0%
28 NEAR WEST SIDE	57305	42810	2697	5705	620	8790	26	3343	5.5%
29 NORTH LAWNDALE	61534	59370	3740	1653	180	511	2	3921	6.0%
30 SOUTH LAWNDALE	75204	6476	408	55700	6049	13028	39	6496	8.0%
31 LOWER WEST SIDE	44951	477	30	34867	3787	9607	29	3845	7.9%
32 LOOP	6462	1231	78	222	24	5009	15	117	1.8%
33 NEAR SOUTH SIDE	7243	6819	430	108	12	316	1	442	5.8%
34 ARMOUR SQUARE	12475	3162	199	603	65	8710	26	291	2.3%
35 DOUGLAS	35700	30905	1947	313	34	4482	13	1994	5.3%
36 OAKLAND	16748	16647	1049	97	11	4	0	1059	5.9%
37 FULLER PARK	5832	5757	363	71	8	4	0	370	6.0%
38 GRAND BOULEVARD	53741	53391	3364	350	38	0	0	3402	6.0%
39 KENWOOD	21974	17024	1073	241	26	4709	14	1113	4.8%
40 WASHINGTON PARK	31935	31726	1999	205	22	4	0	2021	6.0%
41 HYDE PARK	31198	11610	731	721	78	18867	57	866	2.7%
42 WOODLAWN	36323	34759	2190	285	31	1279	4	2225	5.8%
43 SOUTH SHORE	77743	73929	4658	917	100	2897	9	4766	5.8%
44 CHATHAM	40725	40113	2527	271	29	341	1	2558	5.9%
45 AVALON PARK	13792	13258	835	109	12	425	1	848	5.8%
46 SOUTH CHICAGO	46422	22186	1398	18229	1980	6007	18	3395	6.8%
47 BURNSIDE	3942	3491	220	100	11	351	1	232	5.6%
48 CALUMET HEIGHTS	20505	17795	1121	1481	161	1229	4	1286	5.9%

TABLE 3
UNDERCOUNTED 1980 CHICAGO POPULATION BY COMMUNITY AREA
Consistent With Regional Alternative of 174,000 Uncounted

COMMUNITY AREA	TOTAL ENUMER POP	ENUMER BLACK POP	MISSED BLACK @5.9%	ENUMER LATINO POP	MISSED LATINO @9.8%	ENUMER POP REMAINING	MISSED REMAINING @0.3%	TOTAL MISSED	%
49 ROSELAND	64372	62749	3953	550	60	1073	3	4016	5.9%
50 PULLMAN	10341	7896	497	642	70	1803	5	573	5.2%
51 SOUTH DEERING	19400	10631	670	4763	517	4006	12	1199	5.8%
52 EAST SIDE	21331	25	2	2678	291	18628	56	348	1.6%
53 WEST PULLMAN	44904	40701	2564	2309	251	1894	6	2821	5.9%
54 RIVERDALE	13539	13089	825	176	19	274	1	845	5.9%
55 HEGEWISCH	11572	29	2	718	78	10825	32	112	1.0%
56 GARFIELD RIDGE	37935	5186	327	1566	170	31183	94	590	1.5%
57 ARCHER HEIGHTS	9708	8	1	354	38	9346	28	67	0.7%
58 BRIGHTON PARK	30770	34	2	4539	493	26197	79	574	1.8%
59 MCKINLEY PARK	13248	5	0	2129	231	11114	33	265	2.0%
60 BRIDGEPORT	30923	40	3	6584	715	24299	73	790	2.5%
61 NEW CITY	55860	12239	771	19945	2166	23676	71	3008	5.1%
62 WEST ELSDON	12797	7	0	297	32	12493	37	70	0.5%
63 GAGE PARK	24445	163	10	2701	293	21581	65	368	1.5%
64 CLEARING	22584	5	0	916	99	21663	65	165	0.7%
65 WEST LAWN	24748	52	3	599	65	24097	72	141	0.6%
66 CHICAGO LAWN	46568	4782	301	4940	536	36846	111	948	2.0%
67 WEST ENGLEWOOD	62069	60882	3836	686	74	501	2	3912	5.9%
68 ENGLEWOOD	59075	58395	3679	497	54	183	1	3733	5.9%
69 GREATER GRAND CRS	45218	44660	2814	266	29	292	1	2843	5.9%
70 ASHBURN	40477	1084	68	905	98	38488	115	282	0.7%
71 AUBURN GRESHAM	65132	64093	4038	463	50	576	2	4090	5.9%
72 BEVERLY	23360	3178	200	308	33	19874	60	293	1.2%
73 WASHINGTON HEIGHTS	36453	35778	2254	177	19	498	1	2275	5.9%
74 MOUNT GREENWOOD	20084	93	6	154	17	19837	60	82	0.4%
75 MORGAN PARK	29315	18320	1154	280	30	10715	32	1217	4.0%
76 O'HARE	11068	165	10	288	31	10615	32	74	0.7%
77 EDGEWATER	58561	6514	410	7805	848	44242	133	1391	2.3%
TOTAL CHICAGO	3005072	1197033	75413	422063	45836	1385976	4158	125407	4.0%

Source for 1980 Enumerated Populations is 1980 Census STF 1;
Totals vary only slightly from PL94171 figures in Table 1

TABLE 4
CALCULATION OF ALTERNATIVE U.S. UNDERCOUNT RATES FOR 1980
IN 000s

	CENSUS BUREAU ESTIMATES				NIPC EST*
	TOTAL	BLACK	NON-BLACK	UNDOC	LATINO
AS ENUMERATED	226546	26495	200051	2057	14609
% OF TOTAL	100.00%	11.70%	88.30%	0.91%	6.45%
OPTION 1 - ALL UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS COUNTED					
UNDERCOUNT	2227	1579	649	0	47
RATE	0.97%	5.62%	0.32%	0.00%	0.32%
OPTION 2 - 1 MILLION UNCOUNTED UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS					
UNDERCOUNT	3171	1669	1501	944	899
RATE	1.38%	5.93%	0.74%	31.46%	5.80%
OPTION 3 - 2 MILLION UNCOUNTED UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS					
UNDERCOUNT	4171	1766	2405	1944	1803
RATE	1.81%	6.25%	1.19%	48.59%	10.99%
OPTION 4 - 3 MILLION UNCOUNTED UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS					
UNDERCOUNT	5171	1862	3309	2944	2707
RATE	2.23%	6.57%	1.63%	58.87%	15.63%

* All figures in column, with exception of 1980 enumerated Latino population are estimates prepared by NIPC

Source for Census Estimates: Census Bureau, PHC80-E4, February 1988

TABLE 5

U.S. UNDERCOUNT (IN 000) AND UNDERCOUNT RATE

BASED ON ASSUMPTION OF 3 MILLION UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS

	TOTAL UNDERCOUNT		BLACK UNDERCOUNT		OTHER UNDERCOUNT	
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
0 - 4	172	153	132	121	40	32
5 - 9	134	118	83	74	51	44
10 -14	17	24	25	24	-8	0
15 -19	13	-35	4	-2	9	-33
20 -24	323	38	129	42	194	-4
25 -29	425	91	160	45	265	46
30 -34	284	-18	135	25	149	-43
35 -39	289	32	133	32	156	0
40 -44	269	38	129	42	140	-4
45 -49	261	43	117	33	144	10
50 -54	212	-11	95	12	117	-23
55 -59	174	-37	57	10	117	-47
60 -64	103	-20	28	2	75	-22
65 -69	-20	-93	-9	-28	-11	-65
70 -74	-9	-19	-4	-8	-5	-11
75 +	33	193	2	32	31	161
TOTAL	2675	496	1213	456	1462	40

	TOTAL RATE		BLACK RATE		OTHER RATE	
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
0 - 4	2.0%	1.9%	9.7%	9.1%	0.6%	0.5%
5 - 9	1.5%	1.4%	6.2%	5.7%	0.7%	0.6%
10 -14	0.2%	0.3%	1.8%	1.8%	-0.1%	0.0%
15 -19	0.1%	-0.3%	0.3%	-0.1%	0.1%	-0.4%
20 -24	2.9%	0.4%	9.0%	2.9%	2.0%	0.0%
25 -29	4.2%	0.9%	12.9%	3.5%	3.0%	0.5%
30 -34	3.2%	-0.2%	13.4%	2.4%	1.9%	-0.5%
35 -39	4.0%	0.4%	16.7%	3.9%	2.5%	0.0%
40 -44	4.5%	0.6%	18.5%	5.8%	2.7%	-0.1%
45 -49	4.6%	0.7%	18.5%	5.0%	2.9%	0.2%
50 -54	3.6%	-0.2%	15.8%	1.9%	2.2%	-0.4%
55 -59	3.1%	-0.6%	10.9%	1.7%	2.3%	-0.9%
60 -64	2.2%	-0.4%	6.8%	0.4%	1.7%	-0.4%
65 -69	-0.5%	-1.9%	-2.8%	-6.7%	-0.3%	-1.5%
70 -74	-0.3%	-0.5%	-1.7%	-2.5%	-0.2%	-0.3%
75 +	0.9%	2.9%	0.7%	6.4%	0.9%	2.6%
TOTAL	2.4%	0.4%	8.8%	3.2%	1.5%	0.0%

SOURCE: CENSUS BUREAU, PHC80-B4, FEBRUARY 1988

Map A

Estimated 1980 Census Undercount

By Suburban Municipality and Chicago Community Areas



The estimates of the 1980 undercount are far from definitive. Using a variety of assumptions, the region-wide undercount is likely to be in a range from 133,000 (1.8%) to 174,000 (2.4%). Data presented here are consistent with the higher figure.

Boundaries are generalized and represent municipalities and Chicago community areas as of September 1988.

Digital boundary file is copyrighted by NIPC, 1988

Research Services Department
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
12 April 1989

Map B

Estimated 1980 Census Undercount

By Suburban Municipality and Chicago Community Areas



The estimates of the 1980 undercount are far from definitive. Using a variety of assumptions, the region-wide undercount is likely to be in a range from 133,000 (1.8%) to 174,000 (2.4%). Data presented here are consistent with the higher figure.

Boundaries are generalized and represent municipalities and Chicago community areas as of September 1988.

Digital boundary file is copyrighted by NIPC, 1988

Research Services Department
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
12 April 1989

Map C

Estimated 1980 Census Undercount

By Chicago Community Areas



The estimates of the 1980 undercount are far from definitive. Using a variety of assumptions, the region-wide undercount is likely to be in a range from 133,000 (1.8%) to 174,000 (2.4%). Data presented here are consistent with the higher figure.

Boundaries are generalized and represent Chicago community areas as of Sept. 1988.

Digital boundary file is copyrighted by NIPC, 1988

Research Services Department
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
12 April 1989

Map D

Estimated 1980 Census Undercount

By Chicago Community Areas



The estimates of the 1980 undercount are far from definitive. Using a variety of assumptions, the region-wide undercount is likely to be in a range from 133,000 (1.8%) to 174,000 (2.4%). Data presented here are consistent with the higher figure.

Boundaries are generalized and represent Chicago community areas as of Sept. 1988.

Digital boundary file is copyrighted by NIPC, 1988

Research Services Department
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
12 April 1989

MUNICIPALITIES IN NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS



NOTE: This map shows municipalities as of January 1, 1982. Since that time, several communities have changed their names. The former Village of Sunrise Ridge is now known as Wonder Lake. The former Village of Park Forest South is now known as University Park. The former Village of East Chicago Heights is now known as Ford Heights. The former Village of Westhaven is now known as Orland Hills. Additionally, the new Village of Beach Park, not shown on the map, has been created. It is located between Waukegan and Zion in northeast Lake County.

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS PLANNING COMMISSION


COMMUNITY AREAS
AS OF 1980 U.S. CENSUS
CITY OF CHICAGO
EUGENE SAWYER
ACTING MAYOR
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
ELIZABETH L. HOLLANDER
COMMISSIONER
COMMUNITY AREA NAMES
1. ROGERS PARK
2. WEST RIDGE
3. UPTOWN
4. LINCOLN SQUARE
5. NORTH CENTER
6. LAKE VIEW
7. LINCOLN PARK
8. NEAR NORTH SIDE
9. EDISON PARK
10. NORWOOD PARK
11. JEFFERSON PARK
12. FOREST GLEN
13. NORTH PARK
14. ALBANY PARK
15. PORTAGE PARK
16. IRVING PARK
17. DUNNING
18. MONTCLARE
19. BELMONT CRAGIN
20. HERMOSA
21. AVONDALE
22. LOGAN SQUARE
23. HUMBOLDT PARK
24. WEST TOWN
25. AUSTIN
26. WEST GARFIELD PARK
27. EAST GARFIELD PARK
28. NEAR WEST SIDE
29. NORTH LAWNDALE
30. SOUTH LAWNDALE
31. LOWER WEST SIDE
32. LOOP
33. NEAR SOUTH SIDE
34. ARMOUR SQUARE
35. DOUGLAS
36. OAKLAND
37. FULLER PARK
38. GRAND BOULEVARD
39. KENWOOD
40. WASHINGTON PARK
41. HYDE PARK
42. WOODLAWN
43. SOUTH SHORE
44. CHATHAM
45. AVALON PARK
46. SOUTH CHICAGO
47. BURNSIDE
48. CALUMET HEIGHTS
49. ROSELAND
50. PULLMAN
51. SOUTH DEERING
52. EAST SIDE
53. WEST PULLMAN
54. RIVERDALE
55. HEGEWISCH
56. GARFIELD RIDGE
57. ARCHER HEIGHTS
58. BRIGHTON PARK
59. McKINLEY PARK
60. BRIDGEPORT
61. NEW CITY
62. WEST ELSDON
63. GAGE PARK
64. CLEARING
65. WEST LAWN
66. CHICAGO LAWN
67. WEST ENGLEWOOD
68. ENGLEWOOD
69. GREATER GRAND CROSSING
70. ASHBURN
71. AUBURN GRESHAM
72. BEVERLY
73. WASHINGTON HEIGHTS
74. MOUNT GREENWOOD
75. MORGAN PARK
76. O'HARE
77. EDGEWATER
65 COMMUNITY AREA NUMBER AND BOUNDARY
LAKE MICHIGAN
CHICAGO O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
BRYN MAWR
FOSTER
LAWRENCE
MONTROSE
IRVING PARK
ADDISON
BELMONT
WELLINGTON
DIVERSEY
FULLERTON
ARMITAGE
NORTH
DIVISION
CHICAGO
KINZIE
MADISON
HARRISON
ROOSEVELT
CERMAK
PERSHING
HOWARD
TOUHY
PRATT
DEVON
PETERSON
HIGGINS
EAST RIVER ROAD
CUMBERLAND
PACIFIC
ORIOLE
OZANAM
HARLEM
NEWCASTLE
NAGLE
AUSTIN
CENTRAL
LARAMIE
CICERO
KOSTNER
PULASKI
CENTRAL PARK
KEDZIE
CALIFORNIA
WESTERN
DAMEN
ASHLAND
OAK PARK
NARRAGANSETT
16th
26th
31st
35th
43rd
47th
51st
55th
59th
63rd
65th
67th
71st
75th
79th
83rd
87th
91st
95th
99th
103rd
107th
111th
115th
119th
123rd
127th
131st
135th
138th
HALSTED
STEWART
RACINE
STATE
KING DRIVE
COTTAGE GROVE
WOODLAWN
STONY ISLAND
JEFFERY
YATES
MUSKEGON
BRANDON
EWING
AVENUE O
STATE LINE

Computerized maps were prepared by Nina Savar. Eva Wurm completed the map composition and prepared the cover design. Ike Hunter did his usually fine job of printing the document.