AUGUST 1978
Number 78-11

statistical reporter

statistical reporter

Prepared Monthly by the Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards

CONTENTS

SUBSCRIPTIONS ($9.70 a year) should be sent to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Make checks payable to the Superintendent of Documents.

SUGGESTIONS, contributions, and inquires may be addressed to: Statistical Reporter, Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

STATISTICAL REPORTER is prepared primarily for the interchange of information among Government employees engaged in statistical and research activities. Views expressed in contributed notes or articles do not necessarily reflect the policy or opinions of the Department of Commerce.

Sources and availability are shown for each publication and requests should be made to the source indicated. If "GPO" is shown, order from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Planning and Coordination of the Federal Statistics System

By A. Ross Eckler and Thomas J. Mills

Committee on National Statistics, Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council

The Setting

Indicators of our economic and social condition—the products of the federal statistics system—affect, directly or indirectly, the daily lives of all citizens. If the statistics system produces misleading data or fails to respond to the challenges of new situations, we are all affected.

Our federal statistics system is complex and decentralized; it rests upon the actions of staff in over 100 separate agencies that conduct statistical inquiries in areas of particular interest. For optimal results, such a dispersed responsibility requires a central authority to plan, to give direction, to harmonize, to evaluate, and, in a word, to unify statistical results into a system.

Federal statistics practitioners call this unifying process "coordination," a term well understood by them but less well known to others. But by whatever name it is known, it is the keystone on which the other elements of the system depend for unity and cohesion. Thus, the importance of coordination goes well beyond the staff resources devoted to it, and its effectiveness is critical to the operation of the system. This paper is concerned with strengthening this coordinating function so that the system may function more efficiently and responsibly in providing the kind of information increasingly needed for public and private decision making.

Introduction

BACKGROUND

Within the past few years, a combination of developments has placed severe pressure on the federal statistics system. A growing population facing declining natural resources, an increasing national consciousness of discrimination and inequality, the limitations of an interdependent economy characterized by inflation and unemployment, and conflicting views of environmentalists and economic developers are some of the manifestations that have led to the search for better answers to national problems. Most would concur in the belief that given a knowledge of the facts, acceptable solutions will be found.

Thus, policy analysts look to the federal

Editor's Note.—As this report was being issued, the statistical policy function was transferred from the Office of Management and Budget to the Department of Commerce in October 1977. The reader should bear in mind that the statistical policy functions previously performed by the Statistical Policy Division are now the responsibility of the Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards. Where appropriate, this report has been edited to reflect this transfer of functions. At present, the Statistical Improvement Project, which is being undertaken by the President's Reorganization Project, is concerned with streamlining the Federal Statistical System and increasing its responsiveness to user needs. This report is reprinted here for the ideas it contains concerning statistical reorganization.

This paper was prepared by consultants to the Committee on National Statistics in response to the Committee's interest in promoting the effectiveness of the federal government's statistics system.

In 1976, the Committee was approached by the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Government Statistics to enlist its interest in a review of the system for planning and coordinating government statistics. The Joint Ad Hoc Committee, a group sponsored by a number of professional associations in the social sciences and statistics, had issued a report making recommendations for improving govern-

statistics system for evidence to help in selecting among options for action. Although the U.S. government's statistics are undoubtedly the world's most elaborate and detailed, users often find themselves confused and frustrated by the signals. This is so partly because they find apparently unresolved contradictions in data and partly because satisfactory answers lead to other questions until the limits of available data are reached. User reaction varies from vague dissatisfaction to highly vocal criticism of the system and its products in either case. On the other hand, firms and individuals who supply the information complain about unnecessary burdens and invasions of privacy.

Complaints about the United States statistics system are not a new feature of its history. The public has expressed dissatisfaction frequently through investigations conducted by study groups appointed by Congress or an Executive department. Such examinations of the organization and coordination of federal statistics have been reported "about once every 20 years since 1840."[1] The dissatisfaction continues, and the study groups report more frequently. In the past year or so, a half dozen rather sweeping examinations have produced (or shortly will) findings and recommendations critical of the planning and coordination features of the system.

The following abstracts show the general tenor of findings:

> Limited resources devoted to planning and coordination of federal statistics force consideration of organizational alternatives.
> *Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Government Statistics (August 1976)*

> An efficient government needs an efficient responsive and coordinated statistical system, but today information is the societal resource most poorly managed.
> *Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives (January 1977)*

> Collection and dissemination of vital information about the American economy is inadequately funded and poorly coordinated; interagency communication is poor; OMB has not taken a strong lead in construction of models or in setting standards. *Advisory Committee on National Growth Policy Processes (December 1976)*

> The Statistical Policy Division has sufficient authority to discharge important responsibilities involving the federal statistical program and should take additional steps to upgrade standards relating to data collection, analysis and dissemination.
> *National Commission on Supplies and Shortages (December 1976)*

> No index of federal data gathering programs to identify sources of data, survey design expertise, or duplication exists; excessive forms clearance documentation discourages responsible approaches to data collection.
> *Interagency Task Force on Higher Education Burden Reduction (December 1976)*

> An incomplete inventory shows about 5,500 federal data collecting forms, 5,000 approved by OMB and 500 by GAO, calling for more than 425 million annual responses, and requiring more than 200 million manhours—a full-time equivalent of more than 100,000 workers—to complete as

---

ment statistics. The first of its recommendations proposed strengthening the planning and coordination of federal statistics and called for an exploration of alternative ways of organizing the planning and coordination functions. (See *Statistical Reporter*, September 1976 and *Amstat News*, November 1976.) Recognizing our common interests in such explorations, the Committee on National Statistics agreed to join with the Joint Ad Hoc Committee in sponsoring the preparation of this paper.

The Committee on National Statistics and the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Government Statistics have reviewed the paper and believe that it presents a valuable discussion of issues and options. Neither Committee endorses any one of the options presented or necessarily rejects other options. Both Committees expect to give further consideration to questions of statistical planning and coordination and to that end would be pleased to receive comments from readers.

While supply lasts, single copies of *Planning and Coordination of the Federal Statistics System*, 1977 are available from the Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20418. The report is reprinted here with permission of the Committee on National Statistics.

---

[1] Testimony of Paul Feldman, former deputy staff director, President's Commission on Federal Statistics, before Subcommittee on Census and Population of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, 94th Congress, Serial No. 94-83, 1976.

of mid 1976; the challenge is how the federal system can meet genuine national needs more effectively, with less burden on the public.

Commission on Federal Paperwork (December 1976)

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL STATISTICS

The Present.—The federal statistics system has come of age in the past 50 years, particularly in the last 30. Before that time, the system featured the population census that fixed congressional representation, other periodic censuses, and a number of separate bodies of data collected by the several departments, which included data on foreign trade, agricultural production, education, labor, and other series flowing out of the work of the departments or collected in response to specific departmental needs. Since there was no central planning and coordination, the relationship among the different series were given little attention, and the quality of the output was spotty. By present standards, the series were in many cases incomplete, and the publication of results was delayed until well after the reference dates.

Since the 1930's, the statistics system developed parallel to the profound economic and social changes sweeping the nation. Most decisions, whether public or private, are based more or less directly upon information, much of which is provided from the ever-increasing volume of government statistics. Many of the revisions that have been made in federal data have made them more useful as measures of appraisal and guidance in coping with the new challenges that have emerged. Thus, those responsible for setting fiscal and economic policies have been able to call upon new and better series relating to monetary and fiscal matters, income, prices, wages, employment and unemployment, hours of work, and the like. The management decisions of government and industry are now made in the light of expanded data on production, trade, inventories, orders, prices, and other measures. Big business and labor negotiate wage settlements in the light of consumer price trends. The dependence of legislatures upon government data is apparent from the numerous statistical references in legislative hearings. And public health officials have used statistics as a basis for new health programs, for determining changes in the health status of the population, for validating the effects of immunization programs and for measuring the carcinogenic effects of new products. Similar applications could be cited for many other fields, such as education, law enforcement, recreation, communications, and transportation.

Federal statistics have become extremely important in our daily lives. Current indicators of prices and cost of living, employment and unemployment, rainfall and temperature, agricultural and industrial production, volume of domestic and foreign trade, interest rates, tax collections, and public expenditures are closely scrutinized by representatives of business, agriculture, governments, and academic communities as well as by the general public. We take some of these indicators—be they good or bad—into account in day-to-day decisions as to what to buy, how to vote, what to advise, and what alternative actions to take.

The Future.—Current social and economic problems suggest some of the future demands facing the federal statistics system:

Energy—alternatives, cost, supplies;

Environment—health considerations, trade-offs, costs;

Food—production, prospects, prices, foreign trade;

Raw materials—supplies, sources, utilization;

Societal—welfare, incomes policy, housing adequacy, crime, social mobility, social indicators; and

Local community issues—relation to federal data, revenue sharing.

Since public awareness of economic and social difficulties generally represents a reaction to something that has already occurred, there will be an increasing demand for sophisticated models to anticipate and forecast probable developments. Experience with government projections of economic trends and the anticipated outcomes of social experiments have been disappointing. Needed advances include better data with which to forecast and greatly improved simulation techniques. The broadening of statistical demands will accelerate the shift from relatively simple economic statistics to much more complicated measures of economic and

social trends. It will be necessary also to improve analytical treatment of data and to evaluate inadequacies.

Major Features of the Federal Statistics System

COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The Statistical Policy Division of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) [now the Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards] has identified 108 federal agencies conducting statistical inquiries, of which 38 have "a key role in developing and using statistical inquiries."[2] This decentralized statistics system includes:

14 multi-purpose collection agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service [now part of the Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service], the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Centers for Education and Health Statistics, the Department of the Treasury's Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Reserve System, and others;

5 multi-purpose analysis agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service [now part of the Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service], the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Social Security Administration's Office of Research and Statistics, and others; and

18 program collection and analysis agencies, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Food and Drug Administration and the National Institute of Education, the Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Veterans Administration, and others.

Each of these agencies conducts statistical operations within a sector of the federal government. Sometimes the statistical operations are the principal ones carried on in the agency and may have little relation to departmental programs, e.g., the Bureau of the Census; in other cases, data collection may be a small part of a much larger program, e.g., the Veterans Administration. Statistical operations may or may not involve data collection from the public; the findings may be widely publicized or used internally for program purposes. Agencies all share a belief that their work is valuable for an agency program or the public. It is inevitable that sectors of interest overlap and that conflicts lead to unnecessary reporting burdens, data inconsistencies, and inefficient methodology.

COORDINATION[3]

The Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards in the U.S. Department of Commerce (formerly the Statistical Policy Division (SPD) in OMB) acts as the central coordinating authority in the system. Without such coordination, it would scarcely be a system, since the word denotes orderly activity and connotes sanctions to keep it on track.

The [Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards] possesses a significant number of coordinating tools, actually more than are effectively used. They range from statutory to hortatory. Under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 as amended, data collections are subject to review an approval.[4] The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, Section 103, provides broad authority to establish programs for the improvement of federal statistics, including their "gathering, compiling, analyzing, publishing, and disseminating." Under this authority, OFSPS issues numerous standards and

---

[2] "Framework for Planning U.S. Federal Statistics, 1978-1989." Office of Management and Budget draft manuscript.

[3] The activities subsumed under the term "coordination," as used in this paper, are not limited to the familiar functions of forms clearance, establishment of classification standards, and review of agency statistical budget proposals. They include, among other elements, the more difficult tasks of central planning for the federal statistics program, the establishment of priorities among competing proposals, the promotion of improved statistical methodology throughout the government, and promoting training programs for statistical workers.

[4] Certain Department of the Treasury and banking data collections are exempt, and review of regulatory agencies' data collections was assigned to the General Accounting Office in 1973. [OMB retained responsibility for the Federal Reports Acts when the statistical policy function was transferred to the Department of Commerce. Agreement was reached with OMB whereby all requests for clearance of statistical surveys would be assigned to OFSPS.]

guidelines of good practice for agency use.[5] They include the well-known standard industrial classifications and standard metropolitan statistical area classifications; less well-known are others, such as the standard definition of payroll periods for employment reports and the guidelines for the release of principal economic indicators. Other important tools of coordination include the review and consolidation of the budgets of principal statistical agencies and the establishment of interagency conference groups concerned with exchange of information and discussion of selected problem areas.

The Role of Coordination

Within the decentralized statistics system, the role of the central planning and coordinating office is crucial. Without effective operations at this point, the system loses cohesion and becomes a series of disparate programs. It lacks consistency and comparability unless uniform standards are applied. It will lack balance, as each segment develops in response to its ability to secure resources with the help of a specialized constituency, unless firm control can be exercised with professional expertise from a strategic point.

But the coordinating role should be far more than that of a police officer enforcing rules of good practice. It must also be a leadership role to ensure that series important to one segment, but of trifling consequence to the producing agency, do not become lost or ignored. It is the point at which forward-looking practices should be encouraged. The role calls for alertness to the early signals of broad new data requirements and planning to meet them.

The task of coordination will become increasingly difficult in the years ahead, as has been recently pointed out by Claus Moser.[6] Because of the failure of resources to keep up with demands for information, central statistical offices will be forced to seek much greater efficiency and to determine priorities with greater precision. It will be more important than ever for such offices to promote the most advanced techniques for the collection, processing, and dissemination of data to ensure that important growing public needs are met as fully as possible.

This role requires adequate staff with broad experience and training, dedicated to the principles of cooperative action and sufficiently funded to permit continuous attention to high-priority matters. The staff must be comfortable in the leadership role and confident of the support of its agency on technical issues. The investigative study groups referred to earlier now direct much of their criticism of the system at the performance of the central coordinating role. It is inevitable that OFSPS is on the receiving end, since it has the responsibility for the planning and coordination of the system under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act.[7]

COORDINATION IN THE PAST 30 YEARS

*Downgrading of the Coordinating Role.**—The record of the past 30 years shows the downgrading of the coordinating role in terms of resources devoted to it and the organizational arrangements under which it functions. Table 1 shows total OMB staff, those employed in SPD (and predecessor bodies), and the SPD staff percentage of total at five-year intervals from 1947.

The data show a consistent reduction of staff in terms of both absolute number and relative to the OMB total. Although OMB officials have testified that staff of other divisions now assist in the statistical coordination activities of SPD and so represent additional staff for this work, the argument is not convincing.

Budget examiners have had an important share in this work since it was first placed within the Bureau of the Budget in 1939.

In 1947, the Division of Statistical Standards (the predecessor to SPD) was one of five divi-

---

[5] Office of Management and Budget Circular A-46, rev. May 3, 1974. [This circular was transferred to the Department of Commerce and reissued as Statistical Policy Directives.]

[6] Sir Claus Moser, "The Environment in which Statistical Offices will Work in Ten Years Time," UN Statistical Commission and Economic Commission for Europe, Conference of European Statisticians, March 1977.

[7] "Framework for Planning U.S. Federal Statistics, 1978-1989." Office of Management and Budget draft manuscript.

*This section has not been edited to reflect the transfer of the statistical policy function to the Department of Commerce.

Table 1. OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET STAFF

	Office of Management and Budget Total Staff	Statistical Policy Division Staff	
		Number	Percentage of Total
1947	585	69	11.8
1952	491	52	10.6
1957	431	37	8.6
1962	441	37	8.4
1967	495	33	6.7
1972	641	35	5.5
1977 (est.)	640	29	4.5

Source: Coordination in Federal Statistics Gathering Programs, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, 95th Congress. Committee Print No. 95-1. 1977.

sions headed by assistant directors reporting to the budget director. In early 1977, SPD, headed by a deputy associate director, is one of five management divisions reporting to an associate director, in turn reporting to a deputy director, who reports to the budget director. The organizational downgrading of the coordinating function is consistent with the decline in staff percentage of the total, as shown in Table 1.

Admittedly, over 30 years, staff should have learned to perform routine tasks more efficienty. A measure of work load is the number of report forms and plans submitted by the federal agencies to SPD for review and approval under the Federal Reports Act. While the overall volume submitted for review has not declined markedly, simple counts of numbers of forms can be misleading. It is necessary to take into account the growing complexity of forms in conformity with the increasing number of statistics agencies, their many interrelationships, and the program requirements growing out of new legislation. In addition, the coordinating load is substantially affected by the requirements of both the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974. During the same 30-year period that SPD staff declined nearly 60 percent, funding for the current statistical programs identified as the "Principal Federal Statistical Programs" in the OMB Special Analysis increased about 25 times.[8]

We cannot but conclude that, whether or not it has been conscious policy, the statistical coordinating role of OMB has been impaired by reductions in the staff and organizational status in the face of greater demands upon it.

Before noting some specific shortcomings in the planning and coordinating activity, we should note that SPD and its predecessors have worked hard and often quite successfully in coping with a growing work load, despite reduced resources in OMB. It has continued to perform the basic function of forms clearance and has encouraged additional efforts in areas of growing importance, such as health, education, law enforcement, pollution control, and energy. Particular credit should be granted the agency for its initiatives in such areas as social indicators, establishing publication standards for key series, and giving attention to the creation of a framework for long-range planning.

Division of Jurisdiction.—Certain Treasury and banking data collections were always exempt from the data-collection control of the Federal Reports Act. In 1973, the Congress transferred forms approval for regulatory agencies to the General Accounting Office (GAO) with reduced review authority. The GAO, recognizing the ambiguity of its role as a coordinator of statistics, has recommended that this authority be returned to OMB.

[8] From President's Commission on Federal Statistics, *Federal Statistics: Report of the President's Commission*, Vol. 1, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971; and Office of Management and Budget, "Special Analysis G: Principal Federal Statistical Programs," in *Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1978*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1977.

Presumably, the authority assigned to [OFSPS in the Department of Commerce] by the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act for statistical planning and coordination over all Executive agencies remains in full effect.

Inadequate Attention to Key Areas.—Insensitivity on the part of OMB to problems of federal statistics has meant inadequate attention devoted to planning and coordination in the following areas:

Central planning to meet current and anticipated data needs. Planning, such as there is, has devolved mainly upon the statistical agencies with specialized interests and inadequate consideration of overall national needs. The recent work of SPD [now OFSPS] in developing a framework for federal statistics recognizes the importance of the planning function as part of the coordinating role. The framework, however, does not constitute a plan for federal statistics, and even if one were available, the task of administering performance would require a staff much greater than any available in SPD [now OFSPS].

Monitoring performance of statistical series. Although occasional appraisals of series, such as prices (1959), employment and unemployment (1961), balance of payments (1963), and recent work on the national accounts, have shown their value, no systematic program of such appraisals or monitoring has been set up.

Developing procedures to establish statistical priorities. These are still largely individual agency decisions in relation to their own needs; although SPD [now OFSPS] has attempted to establish program priorities through reviewing budgets for statistical agencies, it has generally had little success in enforcing priorities where separate agencies' programs are involved.

Promoting closer federal-state statistical relationships. Federal agencies have developed arrangements independently, e.g., the Departments of Labor; Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; Commerce; and others, each concerned with its own needs.

Developing policies for statistical contract work. Federal agency arrangements with contractors for statistical work are increasing but without central policy direction with respect to contractor qualification, survey standards, monitoring, etc.

Congressional liaison has been inadequate. Legislative proposals have created unnecessary paperwork and difficulties when Congress is not advised of statistical implications.

Neglect of professional qualifications and standards for statistical staff. Except for occasional acknowledgement of their importance, federal statistical workers have been neglected in professional career development, educational opportunities, transfers among agencies, seminars, and recognition.

Promotion of advanced statistical techniques. Government is unique in its variety of statistics operations and opportunities, yet no coordinated systematic program exists for encouraging advanced techniques of sampling, response research, and survey methodology.

NECESSARY ELEMENTS FOR COORDINATION

The national statistical system now exists with generally understood broad objectives and a recognized institutional framework. Coordination is a necessary part of this system. We consider here some elements included in that role—tools, techniques, authority, and sanctions available to it.[9]

Planning and Determining Priorities.—In our decentralized system, agencies tend to establish statistical priorities primarily in relation to their

[9] For another view of coordination elements, the following quotation from a paper entitled "Organization by Subject Matter and by Function" by Simon A. Goldberg prepared for a UN Inter-regional Seminar on Statistical Organization in Ottawa, October 1973, is pertinent. Note that Goldberg uses the word "integration" as synonymous with "coordination."

> A list of major instruments required to make the integration process operative would include the following which are briefly discussed below:
>
> (a) standard classification systems;
> (b) central registers of businesses (and, in some countries, of individuals);
> (c) centralized questionnaire control;
> (d) the system of national accounts (and, at least in the future, the evolving system of social and demographic statistics).
>
> The field operation, already referred to, is a major instrument for the collection of integrated statistics. In addition, it is necessary to establish procedures for synchronizing revision policies and time and weight basing of indexes. As activities are computerized it is necessary to establish catalogues of computerized data files. The process of computerization or automation can itself be utilized as a powerful instrument for statistical integration . . . .

own requirements and only secondarily in relation to the broader statistical needs. When the two coincide, the system works well. However, the coordination office must be alert to implications of agency priorities and represent the national system interests as required. The extensive use of interagency committees can be a highly useful tool in achieving better balance among conflicting interests.

Standard Classifications and Definitions.—There can be little disagreement that developing uniform standards has to be the responsibility of the coordinating authority, discharged either with its own staff or elsewhere under its close supervision. Individual agencies are primarily interested in developing concepts and definitions that seem to fit best their own perceptions of program requirements, and may therefore pay too little attention to standards proposed by their own professional staff. Potentials for comparison usually become a secondary consideration. The result is likely to be an irritation to the analyst attempting to broaden the use of collected data as well as to the respondent wishing to avoid burdensome duplications.

The development and the promotion of standard classifications characterize an orderly system. The standards must be broadly based to accommodate the multi-agency demands placed upon them. The role of the coordination office is to identify in what areas standard definitions are required, organize the specialized resources necessary to develop them, and promote adoption.

Elimination of Unnecessary Respondent Burdens.—Duplication of statistical collection and processing is the most frequently expressed criticism of the system. The remedy extends beyond identifying and eliminating existing unnecessary burdens and preventing new ones from happening, to the more difficult area of anticipating where they are likely to arise. Effective liaison with congressional committee and regulatory commission staffs is useful to ensure that statistical collection and record-keeping implications are taken into account when legislation and regulations are debated. The coordination role must of course be circumspect in limiting its attention to statistics and unnecessary data burdens. It must be neutral toward the desirability of a legislative proposal.

Consideration of the respondent burden must include the impact of data collections upon the privacy of the individual as well as that of businesses or other organizations. Information collected should be authorized with due concern for individual privacy. One of the important tasks of coordination is to achieve a reasonable balance between needs for information and the sacrifice of some degree of individual privacy.

Standard classifications and definitions become useful tools for reducing the respondent burden as they become widely adopted by both statistical collection systems and respondents. As collecting agencies avoid non-standard specifications and respondents find that their own records conform, burdens may be reduced. The survey with non-standard specifications feels the pressure to conform. Duplication in collection becomes more easily identified as specifications move into agreement.

Scientific sampling provides reduction of total respondent burden and usually makes it possible to get more information per dollar of outlay. Such sampling provides as well powerful tools for efficient data collection operations, quality control, and evaluation at less cost and with greater guarantee of accuracy than judgmental methods still fequently used.

Programs to transfer information from collecting agencies to others are subject to problems of legally imposed confidentiality, data utilization, and mandatory reporting. The role of coordination is to determine and enforce the principles under which such transfers take place. They concern both good statistical practices and legal sanctions.

A sensible tool for avoiding duplication and maximizing the use of resources already available would be a central automated index of the total federal statistical system, administered by the coordination office and available to both data producers and users. Such an index would record data collected, availability, respondents, and agencies involved. The system is now much too large and complex to depend on human memory, as experienced as it may be.

Research and Development in Theory and Techniques.—The promotion of progressive statistical techniques through coordination falls short of its potential without the active encouragement of research and development in theory and practice. Resources under control of the coordination office should be devoted consist-

ently to this purpose. Most of such work could be carried out by other government agencies or, in some cases, by nonprofit institutes and universities.

Research might be profitably applied to the improvement of data delivery systems. Information management is an area in which there are great technical changes that could benefit both producers and consumers. Indeed, developments in this area may be the most promising means of responding to the difficulties—cited by numerous critics—raised by ever-rising publication costs and delays in the availability of important information.

Effective Coordinating Mechanisms.—Among the coordinating mechanisms are such elements as:

Review of data collecting and statistical recordkeeping requirements;

Designation of focal agencies to administer assigned segments of the statistics system;

Joint preparation with agencies, review, and presentation to OMB of coordinated budget estimates for the principal programs in the statistics system;

Representation of the statistics system on behalf of the government in dealing with statistical activities of the international agencies;

Staff development through formal training, negotiated transfers among agencies, seminars, professional standards, recognition, systematic recruiting, and governmental agency and university visit programs; and

Monitoring performance of statistical undertakings, systematic review of the published output of agencies, and audit of special segments as required.

Acceptance of the Importance of the Statistics System.—Finally, there is a coordinating element that provides an intangible support flowing from a recognition of the importance of the system to the government and the nation. Decisions of government and individuals more and more take into account the statistical indicators that are products of the system. Every prospect for the future forecasts this tendency to be continuing as the economy becomes more interdependent and people become more social-minded in the broad sense. The wisdom of collective decisions is greatly dependent on information.

Recognition of the key role of coordination in the system and improvement in the methods applied should confer an authority and status upon the activity commensurate with its importance. The coordinating agency must wholeheartedly believe in the importance of this activity and move decisively to exercise its authority and leadership.

*Restructuring The Coordinating Role***

SOME ORGANIZATIONAL ALTERNATIVES

The organization of the federal statistics system emphasizes the importance of the coordinating role in the broad meaning of the term; recent history demonstrates weakness in that role; and current developments suggest that now is an appropriate time to question and consider alternatives to the general structure, which has changed little over nearly 50 years.

The four organizational alternatives discussed below are selected from numerous possibilities and represent a broad range of alternatives. They are arranged in the order of the extent of change they would require in the existing system. We also recognize that many other proposals can be made, and differences of opinion on this topic among those familiar with the system are not infrequent.

Strengthening the Coordinating Role of OMB.—The performance of the [past] OMB coordinating role [was] unsatisfactory but [could have been] made more effective if OMB [had accepted] and provided resources for broad statistics coordination, just as it now does for the management and budgetary aspects of its role. The tangible evidence of such recognition would [have been] the assignment of additional staff resources to such neglected areas as program planning, statistical audits, standard classifications and specifications, encouragement of new techniques, and the like. Similarly, relocation of the function within the OMB organization to a level more comparable with its importance would [have shown] support of the coordinating role. But most important would [have been] a change in OMB thinking and acceptance

**The references to OMB in this section and the alternatives proposed for reorganizing the coordinating role do not take into account the transfer of statistical policy functions to the Department of Commerce

of the position that the federal statistics system is important and necessary, and that its nurture and development are a major responsibility.

An Independent Coordination Office.—This alternative involves some degree of organizational change, since it proposes removal of the function of coordination from OMB and placement in another organizational setting calculated to provide a more effective institutional climate in which to exercise this important role. The legal sanctions for coordination, such as the Federal Reports Act, that part of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act referring to statistics, and perhaps new ones, should accompany transfer of SPD to a new location. This reconstituted SPD might be an independent office within or outside the Executive Office of the President, or perhaps even be included in an existing agency other than OMB.

A Coordination Office Strengthened by Additional Supportive Elements.—Under this alternative, coordination would be the core function about which certain related statistical functions might be grouped. As visualized, such related functions would include some general purpose data collection, analysis, and service functions, such as collection and tabulation contract work for other agencies—none of which is now closely related to other agency programs.

The suggested principles for determining which functions should be aligned with central planning and coordination might include:

Coordination should be more closely associated with some general purpose statistical data collection and analysis, i.e., collection and analysis of data widely used and not closely associated with particular Executive department programs.

Restructuring should not seriously disrupt the present statistical system. The intent is to strengthen the coordination role and not to impose a centralized collection and analysis agency.

Respected statistical series developed by and closely related to department programs, even though of wider interest, should continue within such departments. Such statistical activity would of course be subject to central coordination.

The structure should provide the framework for further development rather than a detailed blueprint, i.e., the federal statistics system faces challenges to its methods, concepts, and coverage. With wisdom to forecast the future given to few, its development must be capable of flexibility to adjust to new demands.

The statistical activities that we feel would meet these criteria and be strongly supportive of the central coordinating role include the program and service agency functions of the Bureau of the Census and the collection and economic analysis program of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, both located in the Department of Commerce. These programs, together with those of SPD [now OFSPS] would make possible a more effective federal statistics system. This proposed Central Statistical Administration might be located either in the Executive Office of the President or as an independent agency of the Executive branch.

Centralizing Federal Statistical Activities.—This alternative would go well beyond the one immediately preceding by reorganizing and transferring the coordination function to a new agency, to which data collection activities throughout government would also be transferred. This new agency would have the primary responsibility for statistical data collections throughout the federal government and would perform a service role as appropriate for specialized administrative statistics collections. This alternative visualizes the coordinating role then becoming an internal agency function with interagency conflict minimized. This proposal amounts to a complete reorganization of the federal statistics system.

A BRIEF EVALUATION

As the well-known tale of the encounter of five blind men with the elephant relates, each of us is likely to settle on a few difficulties found in the statistics coordinating role and propose solutions for them. Our conclusion is that the principal problem has been the location of the responsibility in OMB. The weaknesses resulting from this fact include inadequate resources devoted to statistics, too great a removal of statistics operations from coordination, lack of government-wide statistics planning, insufficient experience with modern methods and technology, the inability to anticipate and plan ahead for emerging data needs, and a lack of imaginative and effective central leadership.

In this section, attention is given to the principal arguments for and against the organizational alternatives suggested in the previous section.

Strengthening the Coordinating Role of OMB.—As previously noted, the exercise of more effective OMB coordination is dependent upon its recognition of the importance of statistics to the government and the public. Given such recognition, it is reasonable to expect that more adequate staff resources and organizational realignment would follow. The system would suffer less disruption by reorganization and might better undergo necessary evolutionary changes as additional resources are devoted to program planning and development. The coordinating role would retain the prestige and intangible authority associated with location in OMB and proximity to the Chief Executive.

However, this alternative is attractive only if the necessary recognition is afforded on much more than a token basis. The OMB record is not good, and shows little promise of improving in this respect. The decline of experienced staff (previously noted) devoted to statistical work can scarcely be compensated for by occasional attention on the part of already overburdened budget examiners. Nor does the organizational location of the responsibility augur well for the coordinating role. The SPD supervision of the data collection activity has been described as "weak and haphazard," and OMB as tending "to overwhelm or ignore tasks not tightly tied to budgeting."[10] The apparent obstacles to the large increases required in the SPD staff and to the upgrading of its organizational status must be regarded as significant deficiencies of this alternative.

An Independent Coordination Office.—An arrangement of this type hold the promise of freeing statistics coordination from the overly dominating influence of the budget and permitting greater attention to statistical considerations rather than simply budgetary ones. Separation from OMB would free the office from the self-imposed restraints of the budget office and would permit its administrator to plan more realistically and seek the resources necessary to carry out the plan. Nor would such a divorce be without gain to OMB, which could then focus more sharply on its primary budgetary and managerial interests. By achieving a separate agency status, the coordinating office for the first time would be in a position to speak out for statistical interests or, if need be, appeal to the highest level of government without being suppressed by the OMB leadership. Such a move would improve the status of the entire national statistics system by providing the platform for its chief spokesman.

One sees possible disadvantages to such a move, depending on the perception of the authority and prestige that accure to the coordinating office through its association with OMB.[11] As a dominant force in the Executive Office, OMB may be regarded as the staff arm of the Chief Executive with broad responsibilities and authorities. To the extent that the statistics office loses this identity, its coordinating role may be weakened in dealing with other agencies. More importantly, its part in the development and review of the statistical agency budgets, now taken as a matter of course to be an important coordinating tool, would be changed. New ways would have to be found whereby the recommendations of the coordinating office could be effectively brought to bear on the OMB review of statistics budgets.

This alternative also poses certain location-related problems. As a small independent agency, either within or outside the Executive Office of the President, its influence and ability to secure staff and resources might be erratic. On the other hand, if located as a unit in an existing department or agency, it might simply exchange a set of more parochial constraints for present OMB ones.

A Coordination Office Strengthened by Additional Supportive Elements.—This alternative is attractive as a measure to enhance the coordination function, while also serving to reduce somewhat the fragmented character of the system. This is the alternative preferred by the authors, as we hope might be obvious from the arguments following each alternative.

Placing the coordination function in closer

[10] *Forging America's Future: Strategies for National Growth and Development.* Report of the Advisory Committee on National Growth Policy Processes. In *Challenge* (Jan/Feb 1977): 29-39.

[11] It may be noted, however, that in most other countries, the coordination function does not depend upon the authority exercised by the budgetary agency.

proximity to the general purpose data collection program of the Bureau of the Census and the general economic analysis program of the Bureau of Economic Analysis makes possible a reciprocal relationship not easily achieved where separate agencies are involved. Coordination decisions can be made realistically in the light of shared knowledge of practical operating problems faced by statistical data collectors and analysts. Similarly, the latter benefit from the greater awareness of larger considerations inherent in the system.

As noted in the report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Government Statistics, some of the coordination functions are performed now by other agencies, especially the Bureau of the Census. Among such functions are the development of methods of measuring statistical errors, promotion of the best procedures for the collection, processing, and tabulation of data, and the conduct of seminars to orient state and local officials in the scope and uses of federal statistics. In this connection, it may be noted that the report of the President's Commission on Federal Statistics in 1971 recommended that two central statistical functions be located in the Bureau of the Census, namely, the "creation and maintenance of directories and associated unit classifications where appropriate for use in gathering data for statistical purposes" and "the development of an all-agency catalog of federal statistics, including data holdings of operating agencies as well as data holdings of the statistical agencies."[12]

The relocation of the activities of the Bureau of the Census in a new Central Statistics Administration would provide an additional coordination dimension by facilitating the use of the Bureau as a statistical service agency, where appropriate. It is not generally realized that the Bureau's service facilities have some of the advantages of a central collection and processing agency. It is quite possible, however, that such contracting has been avoided in some cases because of the reluctance of an agency to contract for work to be done by another department with a substantially different focus of interest.

The location of the Bureau of the Census within a Central Statistics Administration has several advantages for the coordination office, which has long suffered because of remoteness from all kinds of statistical operations. As a major collection agency experienced in modern sampling and computation, it can provide these types of expertise to support the coordination office, from which they could quickly be transmitted to other statistics agencies. The coordinating office would benefit also from other opportunities to draw upon a much larger and more diversified staff. There would be available more assistance for the development of standard classifications and the auditing of statistical operations and publications.

Including the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) in a Central Statistics Administration would add a new dimension of analytical expertise to the support of coordination in the economic statistics area. As a user of all the economic series, both governmental and private, BEA is in a unique position in compiling the national income and product accounts to observe statistical discrepancies and gaps in component series. If BEA were a part of the coordinating agency, such knowledge could be quickly utilized to improve such series. The United Kingdom, the other major developed country with a decentralized statistics system, has located its national accounts compilations in the Central Statistics Office along with the coordination function. This has been found very valuable in establishing priorities and identifying statistical gaps in the economic area.

A further argument favoring this alternative is the resulting consolidation of some statistical activities. Practically all observers of the federal system, and even the firmest believers in the virtues of a decentralized system, agree that decentralization has gone too far and some consolidation is desirable. This solution would be a limited step in that direction.

Arguments against this alternative involve timing, the nature of the proposed agency, and its location. The announced intent of the Carter Administration to reduce the number of federal agencies would seem to run counter to the proposal to establish a new one. However, in the larger sense, the proposal represents a consolidation of three separate activities with complementary responsibilities that can be expected to lead to greater efficiency, rather than a net addition to the federal agency structure. Ini-

[12] President's Commission on Federal Statistics, *Federal Statistics: Report of the President's Commission*, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, page 180.

tially, there should be a modest increase in cost, as staff is provided to perform functions neglected in recent years. In the longer run, efficiencies made possible by combining related activities should result in lower unit costs. It also seems clear that the overall gains from a more effective coordination of federal statistics would result in a significant increase in the amount of useful information per dollar of the total budget for statistics.

There are legitimate questions as to which activities should be included in the proposed Central Statistics Administration. The proposal to include the functions of SPD, Census, and BEA are consistent with suggested principles that the coordinating agency should include activities not closely associated with the present parent agency or seriously disprupt the operating system.

But what other general purpose data collection and analysis programs, if any, should be considered? The flow of funds accounts and the index of industrial production of the Federal Reserve Board appear to be two activities that might be prime candidates for inclusion, as both are widely used and neither appears to be closely tied to the Board program. On the other hand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Statistical Reporting Service both appear to be too closely associated with departmental programs for placement within a Central Statistics Administration. Other activities might also be reviewed in the light of the principles proposed, bearing in mind the goal of strengthening the coordination function without creating a cumbersome statistics agency. None appears to make an overwhelming case.

Locating the proposed Central Statistics Administration in the Executive Office of the President troubles many who feel that location should be left to relatively small policy-making agencies employing dozens or hundreds rather than thousands. (The three agencies forming the proposed Central Statistics Administration now employ about 5,000.) Although such traditional offices as OMB, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the White House count staff positions in the hundreds, other agencies that employ thousands, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Emergency Planning, have functioned in that setting recently. Nor are the planning and coordination functions of a Central Statistics Administration, as they relate to the formulating and release of key economic and social indicators, so alien to the activities of the Executive Office as to automatically rule out this location.

Locating a Central Statistics Administration as an independent agency outside the Executive Office represents an option that retains most of the disadvantages without adding too seriously to disadvantages. The rather intangible authority accruing from proximity to the Chief Executive in the organizational sense would be the main loss. A location in an existing department does not appear a feasible alternative, since its mission is too little related to that of other agencies and its augmented role would be likely to influence unduly any organizational setting.

There are those who argue that location of the proposed Central Statistics Administration within the Executive Office may affect the impartiality of the statistics product under conditions of undue pressure arising from political considerations. Although the system has displayed highly commendable resistance to such pressures for the most part in the past, they are ever-present dangers regardless of the location. There is no location in government that could guarantee sanctuary; protection should be sought in an informed statistics constituency, alert to the dangers of interference and vocal in criticism when suspected.

Centralizing Federal Statistical Activities.— Central statistics offices with broad powers of data collection and analysis are the predominant pattern in national statistics systems around the world. They are especially useful in the developing countries, where resources and statistical activities are both limited, but they exist also in many developed countries, such as Germany, France, Canada, Australia, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands. Proponents argue that more efficient use may be made of skilled manpower resources, and economies of large-scale operations are possible when units are combined. Data inconsistencies and lack of comparability may be corrected more promptly within a single agency than when separate organizations are responsible. From a management point of view, responsibility for the system can be clearly fixed, difficult priorities more easily established, and managers held accountable.

Critics of the highly centralized statistics operation believe that problems of coordination do not disappear simply by placing conflicts and disparities within a single agency. Where they involve large and complex operations assigned to different units within a single agency, similar coordination problems emerge. The principal federal statistical programs appearing in the 1978 budget provide a ready estimate of approximate size for an agency exercising the centralized statistical role for the United States.[13] Together, current and periodic programs total almost $750 million, and permanent fulltime positions come to an estimated 20,000 to 25,000.

Perhaps a more serious criticism of the effectiveness of the centralized system is the charge that it is likely to be less responsive to the needs of departmental users as data collection becomes more remote from analytical and program requirements.

Finally, it is argued that it would be extremely difficult for the United States now to move directly to a reorganized system of this type. Considering that the evolution of the government's statistics programs for the past 30 to 40 years has been closely allied with program requirements for the most part, it seems clear that the possibilties for the creation of a central statistics office were much better in the 1930's than they are today. Certainly it would be a drastic action, which ought not be taken without painstaking examination of the implications to the system as a whole and to the ultimate disposition of the component elements.

SOME IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Methods of implementation of the reorganization proposals are numerous, depending on which one is being considered. The alternative of continuing and strengthening the coordination function in OMB can be accomplished by action of the OMB director. On the other hand, establishing either a strengthened separate coordination office (a Central Statistics Administration) or a centralized statistics office would require additional legislation.

The recently enacted Government Reorganization Act is a vehicle that would permit transfer of authority now assigned to the director of OMB under the Federal Reports Act and Section 103 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act for statistical coordination to an independent agency, either within or outside the Executive Office. Similarly, statistical and analytical programs of the Census and BEA, now the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce, could be moved into the new agency. Additional legislation would probably be required to return the GAO review responsibilities relating to statistics-gathering programs of the independent regulatory agencies to an Executive department.

Desirable additional authority for the coordination agency for which new legislation might be sought include (1) the development, in cooperation with statistics agencies, of an annual financial budget for major statistics programs for presentation to OMB and (2) the development of programs for the transfer of information, under appropriate safeguards with respect to confidentiality and respondent identification, from federal collecting and administrative agencies to other government agencies for statistical purposes.

In order to attract the best available talent to direct an independent coordination office, we propose further legislation to authorize a Presidential appointment at Executive level IV as in keeping with the responsibilities of this office. Consideration should also be given to a fixed term of office for the incumbent, perhaps six years, as a measure to remove the position from the turnover associated with new administrations.

In the event serious attention is given to the centralized statistics office alternative, a systematic and detailed review of the entire statistics system should be undertaken so that a rational division may be made between activities properly belonging to the new agency and those best left to program offices.

[13] Office of Management and Budget, "Special Analysis G: Principal Federal Statistical Programs," in *Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1978*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1977.

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Classification

Proposed Criteria for Defining Metropolitan Statistical Areas For New England

PREPARED BY FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

The May 1978 *Statistical Reporter* contained a draft of the proposed revised criteria for designating and defining metropolitan statistical areas outside of New England. At that time, the special criteria for New England, reflecting the relatively greater importance of the cities and towns as statistical reporting units in those States, was still under consideration by the Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Presented here are the Committee's proposed criteria for defining metropolitan statistical areas in New England. These criteria would follow immediately after Criterion 8 of the draft proposed criteria recently published in *Statistical Reporter* and the *Federal Register* (Vol. 43, No. 121, June 22, 1978, p. 26768). (The reader is referred to these documents for introductory remarks concerning changes in the criteria.)

The criteria for New England have incorporated changes analogous to those proposed earlier for metropolitan statistical areas in the States outside New England. The definition of the central core used to measure commuting has been changed to base it on the Bureau of the Census urbanized area, as was done for the other metropolitan statistical areas. The result is to enlarge somewhat the central cores of some New England metropolitan statistical areas, particularly Boston and Hartford; previously these central cores were limited to cities and towns directly contiguous to the central city or cities. On the other hand, the central cores of some other New England SMSA's have been reduced in size by omitting from the core some towns that do not have at least 50 percent of their population included in the urbanized area.

The criteria for including additional cities and towns in the metropolitan statistical area beyond the central core have been altered only slightly, to permit including towns with a population density between 60 and 100 per square mile if they have more than 30.00 percent of their workers commuting to the central core.

Effects of the Proposed Changes

The major effect of these changes would be to qualify several existing SMSA's for merger with others. The Brockton and Lowell SMSA's would qualify to be added to the Boston SMSA; the Hartford, New Britain, and Bristol SMSA's would qualify to be merged as Hartford-New Britain-Bristol; the New Haven and Meriden SMSA's would qualify to be merged as New Haven-Meriden; and the Norwalk and Stamford SMSA's would qualify to be added to the New York SMSA. In general, these mergers result because of a high level of commuting from the smaller SMSA to the larger SMSA's central core as newly defined. It should be noted that the urbanized areas of Boston and Brockton and Lowell were already contiguous in 1970, as were those of Hartford, New Britain, and Bristol, and those of New York, Stamford, and Norwalk. Moreover, the Brockton and New Britain SMSA's already qualified for merger as of 1970 under the current criteria (see the Office of Management and Budget publication *Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas 1975*, part VIII).

SMSA Titles

Criterion 6 of the criteria published earlier proposes certain changes in the rules for determining central cities and SMSA titles. Based on 1970 commuting data and 1975 population estimates, Auburn, ME; Holyoke, MA; Warwick, RI; and West Haven, CT would no longer qual-

ify as central cities. However, the mergers mentioned above would add New Britain and Bristol to the title of the Hartford SMSA and Meriden to the title of the New Haven SMSA.

Other Additions

According to 1970 data on commuting to the newly defined central cores, the following cities and towns would qualify to be added to SMSA's. To determine whether the population density requirements are met, the 1980 density was estimated by projecting 1970-75 estimated population growth to 1980. When 1980 commuting data become available, undoubtedly some additional cities and towns will qualify for inclusion. This list uses the new SMSA titles already mentioned. Places listed are towns unless designated as cities.

Boston, MA-NH	Additions in MA: Bolton, Boxborough, Carver, Dunstable, Essex, Gloucester city, Groton, Hopedale, Hopkinton, Hudson, Ipswich, Littleton, Mansfield, Marlborough city, Maynard, Mendon, Middleborough, Milford, Newbury, Newburyport city, Plymouth, Plympton, Raynham, Rockport, Rowley, Southborough, Stow
Bridgeport, CT	Ansonia city, Oxford, Seymour
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	Ashburnham, Ashby
Hartford-New Britain-Bristol, CT	East Haddam, Middlefield, Middletown city
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA-NH	Additions in NH: Danville, East Kingston, Sandown
Lewiston, ME	Greene, Mechanic Falls, Poland, Webster
Manchester, NH	Auburn, Candia, Raymond
Nashua, NH	Hollis, Litchfield
New Bedford, MA	Rochester
New Haven-Meriden, CT	Durham, Killingworth
New London-Norwich, CT-RI	Additions in CT: North Stonington, Salem
New York, NY-NJ-CT	Addition in CT: Ridgefield
Pittsfield, MA	Hinsdale, Richmond, West Stockbridge
Portland, ME	Buxton, Hollis, North Yarmouth, Standish
Providence-Pawtucket, RI-MA	Additions in RI: Exeter, Foster, Glocester
Springfield-Chicopee, MA	Huntington, Montgomery, Russell
Waterbury, CT	Bethlehem, Morris
Worcester, MA	Douglas, Princeton, Rutland

Deletions

A few cities and towns would no longer qualify for inclusion in an SMSA, based on 1970 commuting data to the central core as redefined. In many cases, 1980 data will probably show an increase in commuting such that the place will continue to qualify.

Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	Shirley
Manchester, NH	Derry
New Bedford, MA	Lakeville
New London-Norwich, CT-RI	Hopkinton, RI
Pittsfield, MA	Stockbridge
Portland, ME	Freeport, Saco city
Springfield-Chicopee, MA	Hadley, Warren
Worcester, MA	Berlin, Webster

Transfers

Using 1970 commuting data and the redefined central cores, several towns would be transferred from one SMSA to another. In a few cases, however, 1980 commuting data may confirm the present SMSA affiliation.

Town	*From*	*To*
Cheshire, CT	Waterbury	New Haven-Meriden
Georgetown, MA	Lawrence-Haverhill	Boston
Redding, CT	Danbury	New York
Somers, CT	Sringfield-Chicopee	Hartford-New Britain-Bristol
Southbury, CT	Waterbury	Bridgeport

Possible Additional Changes

Not reflected in the draft criteria and listings is a further proposal under consideration by the Federal Committee on SMSA's. This proposal would recognize the importance of commuting to cities smaller than the size cutoff required for recognition as an SMSA. Using 1970 data, the six New England towns listed below have a higher level of commuting to a nonmetropolitan city than they do to the SMSA central core with which they qualify according to the present draft criteria. If the commuting to the nonmet-

ropolitan city were recognized, these towns would not be included in any SMSA.

Town	*SMSA with which qualified under draft criteria*	*Nonmetropolitan city with which commuting ties are stronger than that to SMSA*
Allentown, NH	Manchester	Concord
Pembroke, NH	Manchester	Concord
Raynham, MA	Boston	Taunton
Jamestown, RI	Providence-Pawtucket	Newport
Portsmouth, RI	Fall River, MA-RI	Newport
Harwinton, CT	Hartford-New Britain-Bristol	Torrington

Comments

The draft of the proposed criteria for defining metropolitan statistical areas in New England are presented below for public review and comment. Comments on these proposals should be sent to Joseph W. Duncan, Director, Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230 by September 15, 1978.

Special Provisions For New England (Proposed Draft Criteria)

In New England, the cities and towns are administratively more important than the counties, and a wide range of data is compiled locally for these minor civil divisions. Therefore, cities and towns are the units used in defining metropolitan statistical areas. The units used are much smaller than the counties used to define metropolitan statistical areas in other States, and the definitions are based primarily on population density and commuting.

As a basis for measuring commuting and determining which places qualify for inclusion in a potential metropolitan statistical area, a *central core* is first defined for each Bureau of the Census urbanized area, consisting essentially of all contiguous cities and towns that have at least 50.00 percent of their population in the urbanized area, provided they have a specified degree of integration with the rest of the central core and are not more integrated with another central core.

To permit a systematic implementation of the criteria on commuting, *principal core cities* are identified following criteria like those used to identify metropolitan statistical area central cities (Criterion 6), and the central core is defined with respect to these cities.

9. For purposes of measuring commuting, a *central core* is defined in each urbanized area, comprising

(a) the largest city in the urbanized area, termed a *principal core city;*[1]

(b) contiguous cities and towns that have at least 50.00 percent of their population within the urbanized area or in a contiguous urbanized area, provided at least one of the three criteria of integration specified in Criterion 5 is met with respect to the principal core city (or cities);

(c) contiguous cities and towns that have at least 50.00 percent of their population within the urbanized area or in a contiguous urbanized area, provided at least one of the three criteria of integration specified in Criterion 5 is met with respect to the principal core city (or cities) plus the cities and towns qualifying for the central core under Criterion 9 (b).[2]

10. A "principal core city" for purposes of Criterion 9 is any city meeting criteria 9 (b) or (c) for inclusion in the central core which also meets Criterion 6 (b) for recognition as a central city with respect to the largest city of the core,

[1] A central core may include more than one principal core city; see Criterion 10.

[2] Cities and towns are also included in the central core if they are completely surrounded by cities and towns that qualify for inclusion in that core.

except that the limitation in Criterion 6 (b) to a maximum of three cities does not apply.[3]

11. A contiguous city or town adjacent to a central core as defined by Criterion 9 will be included in its metropolitan statistical area [4] if

(a) it has a population density of at least 60 persons per square mile, and at least 30.00 percent of the employed workers living in the city or town work in the central core; *or*

(b) it has a population density of at least 100 persons per square mile and

(1) at least 15.00 percent of the employed workers living in the city or town work in the central core, *or*

(2) the number of persons working in the city or town who live in the central core is equal to at least 15.00 percent of the employed workers living in the city or town; *or*

(3) the sum of the number of workers commuting to and from the central core is equal to at least 20.00 percent of the employed workers living in the city or town.

12. The potential metropolitan statistical area defined by criteria 9, 10, and 11 qualifies as a metropolitan statistical area provided it meets Criterion 1. Determination of the title and central cities of the metropolitan statistical area is made according to Criterion 6.[5]

---

[3] Recognition of a principal core city or cities is necessary to provide a basis for applying the criteria of integration, and does not necessarily result in recognition as a central city once the entire extent of the metropolitan statistical area is determined.

[4] Provided that the metropolitan statisical area as ultimately defined qualifies for recognition under Criterion 1.

[5] Because detailed commuting data are available to reflect degree of integration at the subcounty level, the provisions of Criterion 7 are not normally applied to New England metropolitan statistical areas.

1978 INDEX, JANUARY-JUNE

This index for *Statistical Reporter* lists the articles and news items which appeared in the issues from January through June 1978, Nos. 78-4 through 78-9. This listing is by agency. Where more than one agency was involved, the article is listed under each agency.

Agency listings are under headings: For example,

LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF
Bureau of Labor Statistics

Entries are shown by month and page. Feature articles are shown by agency as well as in a separate section.

Feature Articles

Agency Listing

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION INCOME

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently developed preliminary quarterly estimates of income and expenses for insured savings and loan associations that would provide more timely operating data than the current semiannual information. While the quarterly figures are still considered experimental, they will be made available for use by the Bureau of Economic Analysis in the Department of Commerce in preparing the current quarterly estimates of the national economic accounts. The report of the Gross National Product Data Improvement Project supported the preparation of these data for strengthening the early estimates of corporate profits in the economic accounts. (STEPHEN T. ZABRENSKI, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD, telephone (202) 377-6774.)

NEW IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION REPORT

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has released its *1976 Annual Report* covering the period July 1, 1975 to September 30, 1976. This report provides extensive statistical data on permanent resident aliens, nonimmigrant aliens, exclusions, deportations, required departures, naturalizations, and the Alien Address Report Program.

The data on permanent resident aliens admitted are by country of birth, country of last residence, sex, age, marital status, place of intended residence, class of admission, port of entry, and occupation. Nonimmigrant statistics are provided by country of birth, country of last permanent residence, class of admission, occupation (for temporary workers), and port of entry. Naturalization statistics are presented by provision of law, country of former allegiance, major occupation group, sex, age, place of residence, type of court, and year of entry.

Single copies are available from Statistics Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, 425 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20536. (STEPHEN SCHROFFEL, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, telephone (202) 376-8377.)

1977 POPULATION PROFILE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Bureau of the Census recently published its fourth annual summary of current demographic data in a report entitled, "Population Profile of the United States: 1977." These reports present information about population growth, social characteristics, geographic distribution, employment, occupation, and income. Most of the 31 tables provide comparable data for 1977 and 1970. The report also contains an announcement that the use of the terms "heads of household" and "head of family" are being phased out of Census Bureau reports.

The report shows that the population of the United States increased by an estimated 1.7 million, or 0.8 percent, during 1977, from 216.0 million on January 1, 1977, to 217.7 million on January 1, 1978. Recent declines in the birth rate have contributed to the increase in the median age of the population from 27.9 years in 1970 to 29.4 years in 1977.

Between 1970 and 1977 the proportion of women in their early twenties who had never married increased by one-fourth. The number of marriages in 1977, 2.2 million, was only twice the number of divorces, 1.1 million. Unmarried adults of opposite sex living together in 1977 numbered about 1.9 million, representing an increase of 83% since 1970. The proportion of women 18 and 19 years of age enrolled in college now exceeds that of men in this age range (36% versus 33%).

Nonmetropolitan areas now are growing more rapidly than metropolitan areas. Some 40% of the population growth in the 1970's has occurred in the "sunbelt States" of California, Florida, and Texas.

Median family income, in constant dollars, was 3% higher in 1976 than in 1975. White families in 1976 had a median family income of $15,540, as compared with $9,240 for Black families and $10,260 for Spanish families. The median income of men who were income recipients was lower by 4%, on a constant dollar basis, in 1976 than in 1970, whereas the comparable change for women was a 9% increase. About 25 million persons were below the poverty level in 1976; these persons constituted 12% of the population in 1976, the same proportion as in 1970.

In March 1977 there were about 24.5 million persons in the Black population and 11.3 million persons of Spanish origin (including 6.6 million persons of Mexican origin) in the United States.

Copies of the report, "Population Profile of the United States: 1977," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 324 (55 pp., $2.30) are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, or any Department of Commerce district office. (Paul C. Glick, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, telephone (301) 763-7030.)

CENSUS SOURCE DOCUMENT FOR WATER RESOURCE PLANNERS

The Bureau of the Census recently prepared a reference guide, entitled *Profile of Census Programs: Source Document for Water Resource Planners*, for the U.S. Army Engineer Institute for Water Resources. The publication covers the Bureau's programs and services that might be useful for planning-related activities.

The report is divided into six major sections: (1) general overview of the Bureau's programs and geographic areas; (2) a review of the 1970 decennial census with sources for information on the 1980 and mid-decade censuses; (3) brief discussions of the recurring economic, agriculture and government censuses; (4) a section describing recurring surveys; (5) a description of additional programs, including specialized publications and illustrative examples of maps; and (6) appendices, including addresses and contact persons for Summary Tape Processing Centers, and for participating organizations of the Federal and State Cooperative Program for Local Population Estimates. Names and telephone numbers of subject matter specialists at the Census Bureau, along with an alphabetical index, are also included. (Michael O'Dell, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, telephone (301) 763-2453.)

THE CONDITION OF EDUCATION, 1978 EDITION

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has submitted to Congress its annual report, *The Condition of Education*, as mandated by the Education Amendments of 1974.

The report consists of two parts. Part 1 is a statistical report on the condition of education in the United States. Part 2 describes NCES plans and program for FY 1978 and FY 1979.

In part 1, Statistical Report, data are presented on a wide variety of issues concerning educational institutions, participants, and personnel utilizing statistics from both governmental and nongovernmental sources. Data are displayed in a chartbook format with each entry consisting of a facing table and chart. An interpretive text introduces each chapter.

The statistical report is organized to reflect the characteristics of the education system and its relationship to the larger society. The first section reports on trends and developments affecting education at all levels, including demographic patterns. The second section focuses on issues involving education personnel, financing higher education, and youth education and labor force participation in the United States as compared with selected other industrial nations.

Part 2 of the report, NCES Plans and Program, provides an overview of the major program activities of NCES for fiscal year 1978 and 1979. It summarizes the Center's purpose, objectives, and programs of education statistics. It also describes the services the Center provides to ensure the collection of accurate and uniform information, the interpretation of the meaning and significance of that information, the timely reporting of the information in forms most appropriate to the users.

Copies of *The Condition of Education, 1978 Edition*, are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, for $6.25, Stock number is 017–080–01822–5. (O. Jean Brandes, National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, telephone (202) 472-5026.)

EDUCATION DIRECTORY, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1977–78

The 1977–78 edition of the *Education Directory, Colleges and Universities* published by NCES is now available. This new publication includes the location of the institution, identification codes, telephone number, year established, student body size, undergraduate tuition, control or affiliation, calendar system, highest level of offering, type of program, specific accreditations, and the chief administrative officers.

The 1977–78 volumes includes 3,130 institutions and branches listed alphabetically within each State. Tables at the front summarize some of the characteristics as well as indicate turnover of administrative personnel from the previous year. The appendices indicate the specific changes from the 1976–77 edition, the Statewide agencies of postsecondary education, and higher education associations among other items. The index includes all colleges and universities listed in the body and in the appendix of the publication.

The *Education Directory, Colleges and Universites* is available in hard copy for $7.00, GPO stock number 017–080–01861–6 from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. It is also available on magnetic tape from NCES EDSTAT Service Office. (O. Jean Brandes, National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, telephone (202) 472-5026.)

SSA RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

The findings of studies and analyses carried out or funded by Social Security's Office of Research and Statistics appear in a variety of technical publications. These include the monthly *Social Security Bulletin,* monographs issued as Research Reports on Staff Papers, several notes, technical papers, and a number of annual statistical releases.

A catalog designed to provide a convenient source of ORS publications has recently been updated. *Research Publications* contains a brief description of each article listed by title, number, and price under major areas of SSA research.

Copies of *Research Publications* (HEW Publication No. (SSA) 78–11925) are available from the Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, Room 1120, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. (Robert E. Robinson, Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, telephone (202) 673-5209.)

FEDERAL RESERVE ANNUAL REPORT

The 64th *Annual Report* of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations for the calendar year 1977, is available for distribution. Copies may be obtained upon request to Publications Services, Division of Administrative Services, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551. (Helen Hulen, Publications Services, Federal Reserve Board, telephone (202) 452-3244.)

FIVE NEW SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN REPORTS

The Office of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Administration has announced the availability of five new *Social Security Bulletin Reports* which are briefly described below.

1972 Survey of Disabled and Nondisabled Adults: Chronic Disease Injury, and Work Disability (Social Security Bulletin, April 1978).—The Social Security Administration 1972 Survey of Disabled and Nondisabled Adults showed that 15% of the total noninstitutionalized population aged 20–64 were disabled as a result of some chronic condition or impairment. Yet 48% reported that they suffered from one or more chronic health conditions. The diseases reported most frequently were cardiovascular and musculoskeletal disorders, each with prevalence rates of 200 persons per 1,000 population. The prevalence rate for neurological disorders was only 7 persons per 1,000; their disabling potential, however, was much greater than that for the diseases with the highest prevalence rates: 80 percent of those suffering from neurological disorders were also currently disabled.

Availability of Retired Persons for Work: Findings From the Retirement History Study (*Social Security Bulletin,* April 1978).—On the basis of three waves of longitudinal data from the Retirement History Study, an availability measure was constructed to provide estimates of how many recent retirees would be likely, given the opportu-

nity, to return to work. Incorporating information on perceived income adequacy and work attitudes, the measure is applied in this article to men and women aged 62 to 67 in 1973 who had retired since 1969. An initial screening to determine those with work limitations removed half the retirees from consideration, and the measure indicates that relatively few of those remaining would have been readily available to return to work.

Effects of Social Security on Saving: Review of Studies Using U.S. Time-Series Data, Social Security Bulletin, May 1978).—The past several years have seen a continuing debate on whether the social security system reduces private saving and capital formation. Reviewed here are the four major empirical studies that have investigated the effort of social security on aggregate private saving, using U.S. time-series data. The major conclusion of the review is that the empirical results of the four studies do not support the hypothesis that social security decreases private saving. It is argued, moreover, that further analysis of this question with the use of U.S. time-series data is unlikely to yield results that differ from those discussed here.

Worldwide Developments in Social Security, 1975–77 (*Social Security Bulletin,* May 1978).—Considerable program growth has occurred in most of the nearly 130 countries surveyed in Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1977. Additional programs and new program features are continually being introduced in response to changing economic, social, and demographic conditions. This article assesses recent developments in several areas: Adjustments for inflation and recession, retirement age, invalidity protection, health care benefits, coverage, and program costs. These developments reflect an increase in social security protection against the economic consequences of old-age, invalidity, sickness, work injury, unemployment, and death that is being afforded to larger segments of society worldwide.

Health Status Among Low-Income Elderly Persons: Rural-Urban Differences, (*Social Security Bulletin,* June 1978).—This research compares the health status of low-income elderly persons in rural and urban areas. The study demonstrates that the prevalence of many chronic disorders and impairments is significantly greater among the rural aged than for their cohorts in more urban areas. These differences persist after controls for age, sex, and race are introduced. No significant differences between the rural and urban elderly were apparent in the utilization of health services. The determinants of chronic health status of the elderly have already occurred, by and large, and an explanation of disorders and impairments cannot be found by examining current sociodemographic status. Such an explanation is contained in the accumulated effects of years of residence in differing social, economic, and physical environments. (ROBERT E. ROBINSON, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, telephone (202) 673-5576.)

RECENT NSF REPORTS

The National Science Foundation recently released the following reports which are briefly described below:

Federal Funds for Research, Development, and Other Scientific Activities, Fiscal Years 1976, 1977, and 1978, Volume XXVI (NSF 78–300).—This report provides data on Federal R&D funding as reflected in the 1978 budget and is the 26th in an annual series based on the budget document. The analysis includes historical background for the determination of trends and offers comparisons with a number of economic indicators outside the scope of the *Federal Funds* survey.

The data are distributed by character of work, performers, fields of science, and Federal R&D support by States. University-performed research by fields is also covered, and data are given on scientific and technical information.

Copies of this report are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for $2.50 per copy, stock number 038–000–00367–4.

"Hiring of Science and Engineering Faculty by 2- and 4-Year Colleges," *Science Resources Studies Highlights* (NSF 78–309) summarizes the results of a survey conducted by the Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education for the National Science Foundation.

The Council asked 2- and 4-year colleges belonging to the Panel how many full-time faculty they hired in 1976–77 in selected fields, the proportions of these hires who had doctorates,

and how these proportions might change in the future.

Copies of the *Highlights* are available gratis upon request from the Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550.

"A Comparison of National Industrial R&D Estimates With Actual NSF/Census Data," *Reviews of Data on Science Resources,* No. 31 (NSF 78–303).—The National Science Foundation annually reports information generated by one of its surveys on R&D expenditures by American industry, based on data collected by the Bureau of the Census. Other organizations publish data on industrial R&D expenditures collected by surveys or derived from secondary sources. Five of the seven data sources studied in this report use the NSF/Census data as a base. This report was prepared because of frequent inquiries which question the difference between NSF data and data published by these other organizations. The data are compared and methodologies described.

Copies of this report are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for 80 cents per copy. Request stock number 038–000–00368–2. (CHARLES E. FALK, DIVISION OF SCIENCE RESOURCES STUDIES, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, telephone (202) 634-4622.)

ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC DATA USERS PLANS 1978 ANNUAL MEETING

The third Annual Meeting of the Association of Public Data Users will be held September 21–22, 1978 at the DuPont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C.

In keeping with the theme of the conference, Data for the 80s, major sessions will cover the 1980 Census; Development in Planning for Federal Statistics; and Cataloging and Information Services for Machine-Readable Data Products.

Current data files of interest will be explored in sessions on the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Current Population Survey and the Consumer Expenditure Survey. A panel with representatives from the Census Bureau, National Center for Education Statistics, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other Federal agencies will discuss new and planned data files.

A working group session on Data Base Dictionaries and File Structure Standardization will involve conference participants in an exchange of ideas and will attempt to develop some guidelines.

Further information and registration forms for the Annual Meeting may be obtained from the Secretariat of the Association, by writing:

Karen Stroup, Secretariat
Association of Public Data Users
P.O. Box 9287, Rosslyn Station
Arlington, Virginia 22209

or by calling (703) 525-1480.

SCHEDULE OF RELEASE DATES FOR PRINCIPAL FEDERAL ECONOMIC INDICATORS

September 1978

Release dates scheduled by agencies responsible for principal economic indicators of the Federal Government are given below. *These are target dates* that will be met in the majority of cases. *Occasionally agencies may be able to release data a day or so earlier or may be forced by unavoidable compilation problems to release a report one or more days later.*

A similar schedule will be shown here each month covering release dates for the following month. The indicators are identified by the title of the releases in which they are included; the source agency; the release identification number where applicable; and the *Business Conditions Digest* series numbers for all BCD series included, shown in parentheses. Release date information for additional series can be found in publications of the sponsoring agencies.

(Any inquiries about these series should be directed to the issuing agency.)

Date	Subject	Data For
September 1	The Employment Situation (Press Release), Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (1, 21, 37, 40–44, 91, 340, 442, 444–448, 451–453)	August
1	Construction Expenditures (Press release), Census, C–30, (69)	July
6	Open Market Money Rates and Bond Prices, Federal Reserve Board (FRB) G. 13	August
6	Manufacturers' Export Sales and Orders, Census, M4–A	July
6	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72, 112)	Week Ending August 30
7	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 107, 108)	Week Ending August 30
7	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93, 94)	Week Ending September 6
7	Consumer Credit, FRB, G. 19 (66, 113)	July
7	Monthly Wholesale Trade (Press Release), Census, BW	July
7	Plant and Equipment Expenditures, BEA (61)	2 Q'78 and 1978
8	Producer Price Indexes (Press release), BLS (330–334)	August

Date	Subject	Data For
September 11	Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations, Federal Trade Commission	2 Q'78
11	Advance Monthly Retail Sales (Press release), Census (54)	August
12	Crop Production, Agriculture	September 1
13	Supply Demand Estimates, Agriculture	Current Marketing Season
13	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72, 112)	Week Ending September 6
14	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 107, 108)	Week Ending September 6
14	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93, 94)	Week Ending September 13
15	Food Assistance Programs Results, Agriculture	July
15	Industrial Production and Related Data, FRB, G.12.3 (47, 73–76)	August
15	Manufacturing and Trade: Inventories and Sales, (BEA) (31, 56, 71)	July
18	Yields on FHA Insured New Home 30-Year Mortgages, HUD (118)	September 1
18	Personal Income, BEA (223)	August
19	Housing Starts (Press Release), Census, C–20 (28, 29)	August
19	Output, Capacity, and Capacity Utilization, FRB, G.3 (82, 84)	August
20	Bank Rates on Short-Term Business Loans, FRB, E.2 (67)	August 1–15
20	Grain Stock Report, Agriculture (soy beans only)	September 1
20	Hogs and Pigs, Agriculture	September 1
20	Revised Corporate Profits and National Income, BEA	2 Q'78
20	Gross National Product (Second Revision), BEA (200, 205, 210)	2 Q'78
20	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72, 112)	Week Ending September 13
21	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 107, 108)	Week Ending September 13
21	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93, 94)	Week Ending September 20
22	Advance Report on Durable Goods, Manufacturers' Shipments and Orders (Press release), Census M3–1 (6, 24, 25, 96, 548)	August

Date	Subject	Data For
September 26	Export and Import Merchandise Trade, Census, FT–900 (602, 612)	August
26	Consumer Price Index (Press release), BLS (320–322)	August
26	Real Earnings (Press release), BLS (341)	August
27	Average Yields of Long-Term Bonds, Treasury Bulletin (115, 116)	July
27	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72, 112)	Week Ending September 20
28	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 107, 108)	Week Ending September 20
28	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks FRB, H.4.1	Week Ending September 27
28	Work Stoppages (Press Release), BLS	August
29	Labor Turnover in Manufacturing (Press release), BLS (2, 3, 4)	August
29	Composite Indexes of Leading, Coincident, and Lagging Indicators (Press release), BEA	August
29	Agricultural Prices, Angiculture	Mid-September

PERSONNEL NOTES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census: W. BRUCE RAMSAY has been appointed Associate Director for Electronic Data Processing. HOWARD N. HAMILTON has been designated as Assistant Director for EDP Operations.

A Journey-to-Work Statistics Staff was established within the Office of the Assistant Division Chief of Demographic and Social Statistics Programs of the Population Division. PHILIP N. FULTON has been designated Chief of the staff. CAMILLA A. BROOKS has been designated Chief, Research and Methods Branch, Construction Statistics Division. ROBERT L. ALLEN has been designated Manager of the Decennial Processing Office, Michoud Assembly Facility, New Orleans, Louisiana. NASH J. MONSOUR, JR., has been designated Assistant Division Chief for Research and Methodology in the Business Division. PAUL F. BERARD has been designated Chief, Current Durables Branch; and MALCOM BERNHARDT, Chief, Current Programs Development and Coordination Branch, Industry Division.

NINA PANEPINTO has been designated Chief, Census and Survey Methods Branch, International Statistical Programs Center. JESSE POLLOCK has been designated Assistant Chief for Research and Methodology in the Construction Statistics Division. WILLIAM C. MENTH has been designated Chief, Company Reports Branch; and RUTH A. RUNYAN, Chief, Manufacturers' Shipments, Inventories, and Orders Branch, Industry Division. DAVID D. CHAPMAN has been designated Chief, Research and Methods Branch, Agriculture Division.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Social Security Administration: ERMA BARRON, formerly with the Division of Supplemental Security Studies has joined the Division of OASI Statistics as Chief of the Earnings and Employment Statistics Branch.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Division of Research and Statistics: ANDREA KUSKO, formerly with the U.S. Senate Committee on the Budget, has joined the Board's staff as an economist in the National Income Section. MYRON KWAST and MICHAEL GOLDBERG, formerly Assistant Professors at University of Oklahoma and Indiana University, have joined the Board's Staff as economists in the Financial Studies Section.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: 85 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $9.70 domestic postpaid; $3.30 additional foreign mailing.

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES FOR DISTRIBUTION AND NEWS ITEMS

		Telephone
Agriculture:	Donald W. Barrowman Economics, Statistics & Cooperatives Service	447–6201
Commerce:	Tim Coss Office of Publications	377–4233
Census:	Harold Nisselson	763–2562
	Jeffrey Hall (news items)	763–7454
BEA:	Ago Ambre	523–0777
	Ann Winkler (personnel notes)	523–0890
Defense:	Mary Frances White, OSD Comptroller	695–6365
Energy:	Pamela H. Kacser	254–8725
HEW:	Wray Smith, Office of Sec	472–3113
PHS:	Gooloo Wunderlich, OAS for Health	472–7921
	Louise Kirby, NCHS (news items)	443–1202
	Evelyn W. Gordon, Food and Drug	443–4190
NCES:	O. Jean Brandes	472–5026
SSA:	John J. Carroll, Asst Comsnr for Research & Statistics (news items)	673–5602
	Robert Robinson, ORS (distribution)	673–5576
HUD:	Marilyn C. Fine	755–9083
IASI:	Susana Moncayo	381–8285
Interior:	William L. Kendig (distribution) Office of Management Consulting	343–2195
	Katherine Harding, Bureau of Mines (news items)	634–4770
Labor:	Joan Hall (distribution only) Office of the Secretary	961–2001

		Telephone
Labor:		
BLS:	Henry Lowenstern	523–1327
	Constance McEwen (news items)	523–1660
ETA:	Howard Rosen, Office of Manpower Research	376–7335
	Bernard Rein	376–7356
	Robert Yerger, Office of Research and Development	376–6456
Transportation:	Doris Groff Velona	426–4138
FHA:	Thomas Hyland, Public Affairs (news items)	426–0662
FAA:	Patricia Beardsley	462–3323
Treasury:	Ed Hartman, Printing Procurement (distribution only)	566–5381
	John Garmat (news items)	566–2825
IRS:	Robert Wilson (news items)	376–0211
Fed Reserve:	Robert M. Fisher, R & S	452–2871
NASA:	W. A. Greene	755–8439
NSF:	Charles E. Falk, Div. of Science Resources Studies	634–4634
	Mary M. Boyden	634–4622
U.S. Civil Serv. Comm.		
	Philip Schneider	632–6808
USPS:	Richard E. Deighton, Statistical Analysis Division	245–4195
VA:	Howard J. Sharon, Director of Reports and Statistics Service	DU9–2423

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF FEDERAL STATISTICAL
POLICY AND STANDARDS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20230

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
1st CLASS POSTAGE

SRE SERIA300SDISSDUE006R 1
SERIALS DEPT
SERIALS PROCESSING
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF FEDERAL STATISTICAL POLICY AND STANDARDS