

**NATIONAL
STATE DATA CENTER
STEERING COMMITTEE**

Pam Schenker (FL), *Chair*
Leonard Gaines (NY), *Vice Chair*
Sue Copella (PA), *Co-Secretary*
Amy Bittner (WY), *Co-Secretary*

*Representing a Network of 1,800
SDC/BIDC Data Centers and Affiliates Nationwide*

Julie Hoang (CA)
Jane Traynham (MD)
Barbara Ronningen (MN)
Will Sawyer (VT)
Dan Veroff (WI)

We Bring Value-Added Census Data and Education to the User

Steering Committee Conference Call with Geography

December 1, 2009

Present on the call:

Steering Committee: Jane Traynham, Lenny Gaines, Pam Schenker, Chip Sawyer, Barbara Ronningen, Amy Bittner
CLMSO: Frank Ambrose, Barbara LaFleur, Nelson Colon
Geography: Linda Franz, John McKay
Field Division: Karen Field

Discussion:

Linda Franz opened the discussion with some remarks about the feedback that the Census Bureau has received. Feedback sent to LUCA participants reflects the Census Bureau initial process of LUCA submissions and actions on the address list with specific corrections and changes. Address canvassing got an updated list from LUCA.

Listers walked each block to ensure that all addresses and addresses they could see were on the list. Listers were instructed to inquire whether there were multiple units in structures as well as the number of units in those structures. If an address on the list was found to be a commercial address, it was to be noted as non-residential. Listers were asked to flag addresses associated with group quarters (other living quarters), i.e., not housing units. These OLQs were flagged for group quarters validation (GQV) a process that was just finished.

Address canvassing corrected geocoding problems, especially making sure that addresses were in the correct blocks. Addresses were deleted in the incorrect block and added to the correct block (moved).

Addresses that LUCA participants did not add but which address canvassers deleted are highlighted in feedback materials with an X1 code.

Most questions concern addresses with codes of A8 – LUCA participant added but not validated in address canvassing, and X1 – no comment from the LUCA participant but address canvassing deleted.

Most cases of A8 and X1 which are good addresses are actually on the full address list.

Reasons for these codes 1) strict address matching was required, e.g., the address was moved from one block to another, a process called “delete add”, but because of minor differences the addresses were not matched up and linked; 2) duplicate addresses in 2 different blocks, one of which will be coded A8 in the incorrect block; 3) most A8 and X1 are units in multi-unit buildings; 4) listers deleted incorrect address and added correct addresses; 5) listers encountered commercial addresses which they deleted rather than reclassify as code A10.

Suggested review strategy is to use the detailed feedback address count challenge list to focus on blocks where there was a net loss of addresses.

Linda noted that there were errors, so it is a good idea to review the feedback materials.

Jane Traynham asked how listers were instructed to determine whether storefront properties had living units above. Karen Field said that listers were trained to look for them and to ask when there were indications of living quarters.

Lenny Gaines asked if there was any easy way to check for A8 or X1 addresses included elsewhere in the full MAF. He said that it is difficult to do a computer match. Linda Franz said that there is really no easy way. Best to start at the block level with blocks with net loss of addresses.

Barbara Ronningen asked if there is any follow-up in areas where large numbers of good addresses had been missed or deleted. Linda Franz said that vacant-delete check will visit such addresses. There is no way to identify such areas or canvassers. Karen Field added that the quality control operations should have found any such areas.

Pam Schenker asked about listers' actions especially with adding addresses. There appears to be no way to tell which addresses that a lister may have added. Linda Franz said that they were not flagged; one option would be to review the initial full address list with the full feedback address list.

Jane Traynham asked what percentage of LUCA participants have returned appeals. Linda Franz said that since appeals go to an Appeals Office, and not the Census Bureau, they really don't have that information.

Chip Sawyer asked how to address feedback to Option 3 participants where the count of addresses in the initial MAF had more addresses than the feedback file. Is there a way to aggregate by code category that is TITLE XIII acceptable? John McKay said not at this time. Chip responded that it's hard to explain the results to local governments.

Barbara Ronningen asked about a community where vacant lots in a mobile home park were deleted from the list. Karen Field responded that those lots should still be on the list if the lots have hookups.

Pam Schenker asked about new construction program materials in the field now. John McKay said that about 20% of packets are out. Deadline for delivery of all packets is January 4, 2010.