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## 2010 Census Mail Participation Rates in California

## What is the Mail Participation Rate?

In mid-March 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau mailed millions of 2010 Census questionnaires to the vast majority of households in the United States. Residents of those households were asked to answer ten simple questions for each person living in the household and mail the questionnaire back to the Census Bureau.

A census questionnaire was mailed to households in urban areas with city-style addresses that had mail delivery. In addition, census workers made personal visits to mainly rural households and dropped off a questionnaire to be completed and mailed back. In California, approximately 95 percent of all households received a questionnaire that they were to mail back. The remaining households will be visited by a census enumerator and are not included in the count of households receiving a form to mail back.

The Mail Participation Rate (MPR) is the percentage of forms mailed back by households that received them. The Census Bureau developed this new measure in 2010, in part because of the current economy and higher rates of vacant housing. The rate excludes households whose forms were returned by the U.S. Postal Service as "undeliverable," strongly suggesting the house was vacant. The Census Bureau will still follow up on all these housing units to ensure everyone is counted.

## Why is Mail Participation Significant?

The higher the number of households that send back their census questionnaire, the less it costs to conduct the 2010 Census. Each 1 percent increase in the national mail participation rate saves taxpayers $\$ 85$ million because census workers do not have to be sent door-to-door to collect information from nonresponsive households. It costs the Census Bureau 42 cents in postage for a household to mail back their form, compared with an average of $\$ 57$ per household for census enumerators to visit each home and collect census data.

Data collected in the 2010 Census will be used to distribute a substantial proportion of federal assistance, particularly in the form of grants, over the coming decade. State and local governments want to make sure their residents return their census forms to facilitate the best possible count of their population. This will contribute to jurisdictions getting their fair share of funding.

## Summary of Mail Participation Rates in California:

The 2010 national mail participation rate (MPR) is 72 percent, which is the same rate as the 2000 Census. In California, the final mail participation rate for the 2010 Census is 71 percent, a ranking of $29^{\text {th }}$ among all states and the District of Columbia. This rate is two percentage points lower than California's rate for the 2000 census (which was 73 percent).

Among all states, Wisconsin had the highest MPR, 81 percent. However, North and South Carolina both showed the greatest improvement over the 2000 Census by increasing their rates by 8 percentage points. See Tables 1 and 2 for MPR by state.

Since the MPR is a percentage, it can be affected by the size of the area for which it is calculated. It is easier for a small city, such as Beaconsfield, Iowa with 11 people in 2008, to reach 100 percent participation than it is for a large city like Los Angeles with
3.8 million residents. So when we compare MPR by geography type, we looked at size categories to analyze comparable areas. These comparisons are in Table 3.

In the United States, 959 out of 3,112 counties have a population of 50,000 or more (based on 2009 population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau). When this list of 959 counties is sorted by MPR, the county with the highest MPR is Monroe County, Florida, at 95 percent. There are no California counties until the $427^{\text {th }}$ rank, where five California counties have an MPR of 75 percent. Of the 574 U.S. counties with population over 100,000, the first California counties are at rank $253^{\text {th }}$.

Nine of the 41 U.S. counties with a population over one million people are in California. Of these 41 counties, Oakland County, Michigan has the highest MPR, 81 percent. The top California county is Santa Clara at rank $5^{\text {th }}$ with an MPR of 75 percent. Los Angeles County, the largest county in the nation with almost 10 million residents, has an MPR of 70 percent.

For places, the pattern for California is the same - the higher the population cutoff, the higher the ranking of the first California place. This may be because California has a higher proportion of larger places than other states. For places of 50,000 or more people, the first California place ranks 68 of 770 places; for places with populations of 100,000 plus, California ranks 18 of 276 places; and for 500,000 plus, 2 of 26 places.

Table 4 presents MPR rates for the 10 largest states, counties and places and then sorts by the 2010 MPR.

Of the 58 counties in California, Inyo County has the highest 2010 MPR at 76 percent. The lowest is Alpine County at 22 percent. It is likely that the low rate in Alpine County is due to the relatively large number of seasonal homes. The Post Office successfully delivered census forms to these homes but there was no one at the residence to complete the form.

When comparing the MPR from the 2010 Census to the 2000 Census, Lassen County in the Sierra Mountains was the most improved with an increase of 14 percentage points. This may reflect a change in the characteristic of the county from seasonal to a more permanent population as families move into the area with the draw of good jobs at expanding state and federal correctional facilities. We will need to wait for the data from the 2010 Census to confirm the reason for this shift.

Fourteen California counties improved their participation in 2010. An additional eight counties matched their 2000 Census MPR. See Table 5 for the 2000 and 2010 MPR by California county.

Of the top 25 largest cities by population in California, the City of Fremont in Alameda County has the highest 2010 MPR at 75 percent. Only five cities in this group matched or surpassed their MPR from the 2000 Census. The cities with the highest 2010 MPR ( 84 percent) are Laguna Woods in Orange County and Moraga in Contra Costa County. The Top 25 Cities are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

A complete listing for nation, states, counties, and places is available on request.
California Department of Finance
Demographic Research Unit
(916) 323-4086

Table 1 2010 Mail Participation Rates United States, States, and District of Columbia
(Sorted Alphabetically)

| State |  | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 72\% | -- |
| Alabama | 70\% | 31 |
| Alaska | 62\% | 52 |
| Arizona | 67\% | 40 |
| Arkansas | 67\% | 40 |
| California | 71\% | 29 |
| Colorado | 70\% | 31 |
| Connecticut | 74\% | 15 |
| Delaware | 69\% | 35 |
| District of Columbia | 69\% | 35 |
| Florida | 72\% | 26 |
| Georgia | 70\% | 31 |
| Hawaii | 66\% | 46 |
| Idaho | 75\% | 10 |
| Illinois | 75\% | 10 |
| Indiana | 78\% | 3 |
| Iowa | 78\% | 3 |
| Kansas | 75\% | 10 |
| Kentucky | 75\% | 10 |
| Louisiana | 64\% | 49 |
| Maine | 66\% | 46 |
| Maryland | 74\% | 15 |
| Massachusetts | 73\% | 22 |
| Michigan | 77\% | 5 |
| Minnesota | 80\% | 2 |
| Mississippi | 67\% | 40 |
| Missouri | 73\% | 22 |
| Montana | 67\% | 40 |
| Nebraska | 76\% | 6 |
| Nevada | 69\% | 35 |
| New Hampshire | 70\% | 31 |
| New Jersey | 72\% | 26 |
| New Mexico | 63\% | 51 |
| New York | 67\% | 40 |
| North Carolina | 74\% | 15 |
| North Dakota | 73\% | 22 |

Table 1
2010 Mail Participation Rates
United States, States, and District of Columbia
(Sorted Alphabetically)

|  | 2010 Mail <br> Participation <br> Rate | Rank |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| State | $76 \%$ | 6 |
| Ohio | $66 \%$ | 46 |
| Oklahoma | $74 \%$ | 15 |
| Oregon | $76 \%$ | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | $71 \%$ | 29 |
| Rhode Island | $73 \%$ | 22 |
| South Carolina | $75 \%$ | 10 |
| South Dakota | $74 \%$ | 15 |
| Tennessee | $69 \%$ | 35 |
| Texas | $74 \%$ | 15 |
| Utah | $67 \%$ | 40 |
| Vermont | $76 \%$ | 6 |
| Virginia | $74 \%$ | 15 |
| Washington | $64 \%$ | 49 |
| West Virginia | $81 \%$ | 1 |
| Wisconsin | $68 \%$ | 39 |

Table 2

## 2000 to 2010 Change in Mail Participation Rates <br> United States, States, and District of Columbia

(Sorted by Difference 2010 minus 2000)

|  | Mail Participation Rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | 2000 | 2010 | Difference |
| United States | 72\% | 72\% | 0\% |
| North Carolina | 66\% | 74\% | 8\% |
| South Carolina | 65\% | 73\% | 8\% |
| Kentucky | 70\% | 75\% | 5\% |
| Tennessee | 69\% | 74\% | 5\% |
| Alabama | 66\% | 70\% | 4\% |
| Virginia | 73\% | 76\% | 3\% |
| Florida | 69\% | 72\% | 3\% |
| District of Columbia | 66\% | 69\% | 3\% |
| Minnesota | 78\% | 80\% | 2\% |
| Indiana | 76\% | 78\% | 2\% |
| Illinois | 73\% | 75\% | 2\% |
| Utah | 72\% | 74\% | 2\% |
| Washington | 72\% | 74\% | 2\% |
| Vermont | 65\% | 67\% | 2\% |
| Hawaii | 64\% | 66\% | 2\% |
| Rhode Island | 70\% | 71\% | 1\% |
| Georgia | 69\% | 70\% | 1\% |
| New York | 66\% | 67\% | 1\% |
| Maine | 65\% | 66\% | 1\% |
| Delaware | 68\% | 69\% | 1\% |
| Texas | 68\% | 69\% | 1\% |
| Michigan | 77\% | 77\% | 0\% |
| Pennsylvania | 76\% | 76\% | 0\% |
| Idaho | 75\% | 75\% | 0\% |
| Kansas | 75\% | 75\% | 0\% |
| Oregon | 74\% | 74\% | 0\% |
| Maryland | 74\% | 74\% | 0\% |
| Nevada | 69\% | 69\% | 0\% |
| Mississippi | 67\% | 67\% | 0\% |
| Wisconsin | 82\% | 81\% | -1\% |
| Iowa | 79\% | 78\% | -1\% |
| Ohio | 77\% | 76\% | -1\% |
| Connecticut | 75\% | 74\% | -1\% |
| Missouri | 74\% | 73\% | -1\% |
| Massachusetts | 74\% | 73\% | -1\% |

Table 2
2000 to 2010 Change in Mail Participation Rates
United States, States, and District of Columbia
(Sorted by Difference 2010 minus 2000)

|  | Mail Participation Rates |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| State | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Difference |
| New Jersey | $73 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| New Hampshire | $71 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| Arkansas | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| Arizona | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| Louisiana | $65 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| California | $73 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $-\mathbf{- 2 \%}$ |
| West Virginia | $66 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $-2 \%$ |
| New Mexico | $65 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $-2 \%$ |
| Alaska | $64 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $-2 \%$ |
| Montana | $70 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Oklahoma | $69 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Nebraska | $79 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| South Dakota | $78 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| North Dakota | $76 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Colorado | $73 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Wyoming | $72 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $-4 \%$ |

Table 3

## 2010 Mail Participation Rates

Comparison of California to the Rest of the Nation
by Geography Type and Population Size

| Geography | Total Number of Areas in US | Highest California Areas (2010 MPR) | $\begin{array}{r} 2010 \text { MPR } \\ \text { Rank } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Counties (1): |  |  |  |
| Population 50,000+ | 959 | Marin County, CA (75\%) <br> Santa Clara County, CA (75\%) <br> Shasta County, CA (75\%) <br> Ventura County, CA (75\%) <br> Yolo County, CA (75\%) | 427 |
| Population 100,000+ | 574 | Marin County, CA (75\%) Santa Clara County, CA (75\%) Shasta County, CA (75\%) Ventura County, CA (75\%) Yolo County, CA (75\%) | 253 |
| Population 1,000,000+ | 41 | Santa Clara County, CA (75\%) | 5 |
|  |  | Contra Costa County, CA (74\%) | 7 |
|  |  | Orange County, CA (73\%) | 10 |
|  |  | Sacramento County, CA (73\%) | 10 |
|  |  | Alameda County, CA (72\%) | 12 |
|  |  | Los Angeles County, CA (70\%) | 22 |
|  |  | San Diego County, CA (70\%) | 22 |
|  |  | San Bernardino County, CA (69\%) | 26 |
|  |  | Riverside County, CA (68\%) | 34 |
| In Places (2): |  |  |  |
| Population 50,000+ | 770 | Cerritos city, CA (80\%) <br> Walnut Creek city, CA (80\%) Yorba Linda city, CA (80\%) | 68 |
| Population 100,000+ | 276 | Thousand Oaks city, CA (79\%) | 18 |
| Population 500,000+ | 26 | San Jose city, CA (74\%) | 2 |

(1) Based on the July 1, 2009 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau
(2) Based on the July 1, 2008 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau

Table 4

## 2010 Mail Participation Rates

## Top 10 Largest Areas in the Nation by Geography Type

(sorted by 2010 MPR)

|  | Mail Participation Rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geographic Type | 2000 | 2010 | Difference |
| United States | 72\% | 72\% | 0\% |
| States (1): |  |  |  |
| Michigan | 77\% | 77\% | 0\% |
| Pennsylvania | 76\% | 76\% | 0\% |
| Ohio | 77\% | 76\% | -1\% |
| Illinois | 73\% | 75\% | 2\% |
| North Carolina | 66\% | 74\% | 8\% |
| Florida | 69\% | 72\% | 3\% |
| California | 73\% | 71\% | -2\% |
| Georgia | 69\% | 70\% | 1\% |
| Texas | 68\% | 69\% | 1\% |
| New York | 66\% | 67\% | 1\% |
| Counties (1): |  |  |  |
| Orange County, CA | 77\% | 73\% | -4\% |
| Los Angeles County, CA | 72\% | 70\% | -2\% |
| Maricopa County, AZ | 69\% | 70\% | 1\% |
| San Diego County, CA | 75\% | 70\% | -5\% |
| Cook County, IL | 67\% | 69\% | 2\% |
| Harris County, TX | 67\% | 69\% | 2\% |
| Miami-Dade County, FL | 67\% | 69\% | 2\% |
| Dallas County, TX | 68\% | 69\% | 1\% |
| Queens County, NY | 56\% | 59\% | 3\% |
| Kings County, NY | 52\% | 55\% | 3\% |
| Places (2): |  |  |  |
| San Jose city, CA | 74\% | 74\% | 0\% |
| San Diego city, CA | 75\% | 71\% | -4\% |
| San Antonio city, TX | 72\% | 70\% | -2\% |
| San Francisco city, CA | 68\% | 69\% | 1\% |
| Los Angeles city, CA | 67\% | 68\% | 1\% |
| Phoenix city, AZ | 68\% | 68\% | 0\% |
| Chicago city, IL | 58\% | 63\% | 5\% |
| Philadelphia city, PA | 61\% | 63\% | 2\% |
| Detroit city, MI | 67\% | 62\% | -5\% |
| New York city, NY | 57\% | 60\% | 3\% |

(1) Based on the July 1, 2009 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau (2) Based on the July 1, 2008 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau

Table 5
2000 and 2010 Mail Participation Rates
California and Counties
(Sorted Alphabetically)

| County | Mail Participation Rates |  | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2010 |  | 2010 MPR <br> Rank |
| California | 73\% | 71\% | -2\% | -- |
| Alameda County <br> Alpine County <br> Amador County <br> Butte County <br> Calaveras County | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \% \\ & 67 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & 54 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \% \\ & 22 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & 57 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \% \\ -45 \% \\ 0 \% \\ 0 \% \\ 3 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 19 58 30 14 51 |
| Colusa County Contra Costa County Del Norte County El Dorado County Fresno County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 69 \% \\ & 76 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 66 \% \\ & 73 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 70 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 64 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 \% \\ -2 \% \\ 3 \% \\ -2 \% \\ -2 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}30 \\ 8 \\ 19 \\ 49 \\ 26 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Glenn County Humboldt County Imperial County Inyo County Kern County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 71 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & 65 \% \\ & 77 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 75 \% \\ & 66 \% \\ & 65 \% \\ & 76 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 4 \% \\ -5 \% \\ 0 \% \\ -1 \% \\ -1 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 45 \\ 47 \\ 1 \\ 30 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Kings County <br> Lake County <br> Lassen County <br> Los Angeles County <br> Madera County | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & 54 \% \\ & 52 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 75 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 70 \% \\ & 60 \% \\ & 66 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -3 \% \\ 6 \% \\ 14 \% \\ -2 \% \\ -3 \% \end{array}$ | 30 50 45 30 19 |
| Marin County <br> Mariposa County <br> Mendocino County <br> Merced County <br> Modoc County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 76 \% \\ & 60 \% \\ & 64 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 59 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 75 \% \\ & 57 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 56 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline-1 \% \\ -3 \% \\ 5 \% \\ -2 \% \\ -3 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 51 39 19 53 |
| Mono County Monterey County Napa County Nevada County Orange County | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 75 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & 77 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 67 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-3 \% \\ & -3 \% \\ & -1 \% \\ & -6 \% \\ & -4 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}57 \\ 39 \\ 8 \\ 44 \\ 14 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Placer County <br> Plumas County <br> Riverside County <br> Sacramento County <br> San Benito County | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \% \\ & 49 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \% \\ & 53 \% \\ & 68 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline-1 \% \\ 4 \% \\ -3 \% \\ -1 \% \\ 2 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 30 54 43 14 14 |

Table 5
2000 and 2010 Mail Participation Rates
California and Counties
(Sorted Alphabetically)

|  | Mail Participation Rates |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2010 MPR |
|  | 2000 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Difference | Rank |
| San Bernardino County | $72 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 39 |
| San Diego County | $75 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | 30 |
| San Francisco County | $68 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 39 |
| San Joaquin County | $73 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 30 |
| San Luis Obispo County | $74 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 8 |
| San Mateo County | $75 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | 8 |
| Santa Barbara County | $74 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 19 |
| Santa Clara County | $75 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 2 |
| Santa Cruz County | $70 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $2 \%$ | 19 |
| Shasta County | $75 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 2 |
| Sierra County | $49 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | 56 |
| Siskiyou County | $69 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 30 |
| Solano County | $74 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 26 |
| Sonoma County | $75 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | 8 |
| Stanislaus County | $77 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 14 |
| Sutter County | $74 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 8 |
| Tehama County | $73 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 26 |
| Trinity County | $57 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $-10 \%$ | 55 |
| Tulare County | $73 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 26 |
| Tuolumne County | $59 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $6 \%$ | 47 |
| Ventura County | $78 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 2 |
| Yolo County | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | 2 |
| Yuba County | $68 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $4 \%$ | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6

## 2000 and 2010 Mail Participation Rates <br> Top 25 Largest Cities in California

(Sorted by 2010 MPR - Largest to Smallest)

|  | Mail Participation Rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City (County) | 2000 | 2010 | Difference |
| California | 73\% | 71\% | -2\% |
| Fremont city (Alameda) San Jose city (Santa Clara) Irvine city (Orange) Glendale city (Los Angeles) Huntington Beach city (Orange) | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 76 \% \\ & 75 \% \\ & 78 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -1 \% \\ 0 \% \\ -2 \% \\ -1 \% \\ -4 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Modesto city (Stanislaus) <br> Sacramento city (Sacramento) <br> Rancho Cucamonga city (San Bernardino) <br> San Diego city (San Diego) <br> Anaheim city (Orange) | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 77 \% \\ & 75 \% \\ & 76 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline-5 \% \\ 2 \% \\ -5 \% \\ -4 \% \\ -5 \% \end{array}$ |
| Fontana city $\quad$ (San Bernardino) Fresno city (Fresno) Bakersfield city $\quad$ (Kern) Riverside city $\quad$ (Riverside) Chula Vista city $\quad$ (San Diego) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 74 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & 71 \% \\ & 75 \% \\ & 77 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 70 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-3 \% \\ & -1 \% \\ & -1 \% \\ & -5 \% \\ & -7 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| San Francisco city (San Francisco) <br> Long Beach city (Los Angeles) <br> Santa Ana city (Orange) <br> Ontario city (San Bernardino) <br> Los Angeles city (Los Angeles) | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \% \\ & 72 \% \\ & 75 \% \\ & 73 \% \\ & 67 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 69 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 69 \% \\ & 68 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 1 \% \\ -3 \% \\ -6 \% \\ -4 \% \\ 1 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oakland city (Alameda) } \\ & \text { Moreno Valley city (Riverside) } \\ & \text { Oxnard city (Ventura) } \\ & \text { Stockton city (San Joaquin) } \\ & \text { San Bernardino city (San Bernardino) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 74 \% \\ & 70 \% \\ & 69 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \% \\ & 68 \% \\ & 68 \% \\ & 67 \% \\ & 67 \% \end{aligned}$ | $3 \%$ $-6 \%$ $-6 \%$ $-3 \%$ $-2 \%$ |

Top 25 Cities based on the July 1, 2008 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 7
2000 and 2010 Mail Participation Rates
Top 25 Cities with Highest MPR in California
(Sorted by 2010 MPR - Largest to Smallest)

|  | Mail Participation Rate |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2008 |
| City (County) | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Difference | (1) |
| California | $73 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | -- |
| Laguna Woods city (Orange) | $87 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 18,170 |
| Moraga town (Contra Costa) | $86 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 17,050 |
| Saratoga city (Santa Clara) | $85 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 30,445 |
| Orinda city (Contra Costa) | $85 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 18,445 |
| Clayton city (Contra Costa) | $85 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 11,278 |
| Piedmont city (Alameda) | $86 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 10,481 |
| lone city (Amador) | $65 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $18 \%$ | 7,480 |
| Rio Vista city (Solano) | $81 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 7,804 |
| Los Altos city (Santa Clara) | $84 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 28,349 |
| Lafayette city (Contra Costa) | $80 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 25,011 |
| San Marino city (Los Angeles) | $85 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 12,808 |
| Cloverdale city (Sonoma) | $75 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $6 \%$ | 8,153 |
| Villa Park city (Orange) | $85 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 5,967 |
| Gustine city (Merced) | $83 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | 5,094 |
| Rolling Hills city (Los Angeles) | $84 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 1,908 |
| Yorba Linda city (Orange) | $84 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 65,717 |
| Walnut Creek city (Contra Costa) | $81 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | 63,486 |
| Cerritos city (Los Angeles) | $84 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 51,326 |
| Lincoln city (Placer) | $75 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $5 \%$ | 43,602 |
| Seal Beach city (Orange) | $83 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | 24,127 |
| La Canada Flintridge city (Los Angeles) | $85 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | 20,671 |
| Dixon city (Solano) | $79 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 17,412 |
| La Palma city (Orange) | $84 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | 15,603 |
| Rolling Hills Estates city (Los Angeles) | $85 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | 7,860 |
| Winters city (Yolo) | $81 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | 6,977 |

(1) Based on the July 1, 2008 Population Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau

