

Xan Wedel (KS)  
*Chair*  
Annette Watters (AL)  
*Vice-Chair*  
Pam Harris (MT) and  
Pam Schenker (FL)  
*Secretary*

**NATIONAL  
STATE DATA CENTER  
STEERING COMMITTEE**

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

Julie Hoang (CA)  
Richard Rathge (ND)  
Carol Rogers (IN)  
Robert Scardamalia (NY)  
Jane Traynham (MD)

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

---

**State Data Center  
Mid-Year Meeting  
March 26-28, 2007 - New York City**

*Monday, March 26, 2007*

**Welcome and Introductions**

Renee Jefferson-Copeland, Acting Chief, Customer Liaison Office  
Enrique Lamas, Chief, Population Division  
Tony Farthing, Director, New York Regional Office  
Xan Wedel, Chair, State Data Center  
Linda Gage, Chair, Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates

The group welcomed the attendees and discussed the exciting and full agenda. They discussed the upcoming Census and the importance of the SDC network; support of the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) program in New York and New York City; the population estimates and the research being done with housing estimates; and welcomed new colleagues.

**Census Bureau Update**

Preston Jay Waite, Deputy Director

Jay began his remarks by reminding participants that it is an exciting time to be involved with the Census Bureau with the upcoming decennial census. Both Hermann Habermann and Louis Kincannon announced their resignations in the last few months. Marvin Raines also retired (was Associate Director of Field Operations). Jay replaced Hermann, the Bureau has identified a replacement for Marvin, and Teresa Angueira is acting in Jay's old position (Associate Director for Decennial Census).

He mentioned that the Census Bureau was very fortunate in regards to receiving a budget allocation that will support the upcoming Census. The Bureau is in a gear-up stage and can not plan and work towards 2010 Census under a continuing resolution mode. The Bureau received the full-presidents budget plus a bit more. The presidents' budget bill is on the hill for 2008 and there appears to be support for what the Census is doing. The Bureau is hoping to not operate under a continuing resolution, because that would inhibit planning and moving ahead with the 2010 Census.

Jay mentioned other programs, including partnership and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) including its replacement program, the Dynamics of Economic Well-Being System. The Bureau is starting dress-rehearsal in two sites (San Joaquin County, California and a nine-county area surrounding Fayetteville, N.C) with systems that the Bureau fully expects to use in the Census (with maybe very slight changes). Handheld computers will be used that were built especially for the Census Bureau. These computers can only be used for one purpose (nonresponse follow-up) and they are programmed with biometric passwords. Non-response follow-up is going to be based on a "real-time" list. For the dress rehearsal, address listing starts in May 2007 and non-response follow-up a year later.

Jay also outlined some of the changes in the LUCA program for 2010. The Bureau has eliminated the blue line (that identified city-style areas); developed software that can run on PCs; and are conducting special workshops that are going on currently throughout the country. He thanked the SDCs for their help in getting people to those workshops and emphasized that if your address is not on the list, then the chance that the Bureau will find and count you is not very high. He also discussed the LUCA timeline.

Jay emphasized that there are three parts to Census 2010 and that the Bureau is on schedule and on budget with the **MAF/TIGER enhancement**; Susan Schecter will discuss the **American Community Survey** (ACS), and that the **2010 Census** will be a short form only Census.

### ***American Community Survey Update***

Susan Schecter, Chief, American Community Survey Office

[http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/ACSupdate\\_content\\_test.ppt](http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/ACSupdate_content_test.ppt)

Susan discussed the ACS budget and content, Group Quarter (GQ) data collection, and plans for release for this summer. The good news is that the 2007 budget will allow for funding the ACS in the US and Puerto Rico and the 2007 methods panel test. She reviewed the three tests that are scheduled this year: grid vs. sequential (ACS has always been in a grid design); reduce postage cost while trying to maintain the response rate; add a field of degree question that would come after the educational attainment question (two versions – an open-ended one and one with 6-categories). If this new field of degree question works, then it would be added to 2009 ACS. Other activities that were funded are: training, products, and 2008 methods panel test. The 2008 methods panel test will focus on increasing response from non-English speaking households and mail response rates in Puerto Rico.

She reviewed the plans for the 2008 content test that is based on the results of the 2006 methods panel test. The Bureau will not make a change in ACS, unless there was a demonstrated improvement from the test. Every question on the decennial census is mandated or required through statutory language. The Bureau has reviewed questions to see if they measure what the statutes need / intended. This was informative especially in looking at the disability questions. The proposed 2008 ACS Content will look add 3 new questions (health insurance coverage, marital history, veterans service-connected disability), while 2 questions will be deleted (seasonal residence topic and veteran years of service). There are also 5 housing questions that will have proposed changes (year built; rooms and bedrooms; plumbing and kitchen facilities, telephone service; food stamp benefit; and property value). While there are 7 proposed detailed population questions for change: citizenship; school enrollment; educational attainment; residence one year ago; disability; employment status series; and weeks worked. The disability change will garner information on young children that have disabilities. For the marital status question, “separated” will not be on the survey form – since it has proven to be confusing for respondents.

Susan mentioned that the Census Bureau will be looking at how to bridge between the new changes and the past published questions. Seasonal questions were only supposed to be used for internal use and there was no statutory basis for asking them. Data on seasonal residence are currently in the 2005 PUMS and the Bureau is looking at removing them. For Census 2000 the disability questions were tested quickly and there may not have been a cohesive group of advocates to ensure that the question was asked of all individuals.

She also discussed that the plans call for publishing GQ in multi-year averages next year and that the ACS staff will estimate one-year of GQ for this product. There will be a multi-year estimate study released in April 2007 (2000 – 2005 for the 34 test sites) and this study will show the products that the Bureau will be releasing for the multi-year products.

### ***American Community Survey: Group Quarters and Data Comparisons***

Susan Schecter, Chief, American Community Survey Office

<http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/acsgroupquarters.ppt>

Susan reviewed the two pieces of the Group Quarter (GQ) data collection: GQ facilities and individual residents. Collection from GQ facilities uses an automated instrument, where paper questionnaires are used to collect person data. Susan reviewed the process for the collection of person data: personal interviews, telephone interviews, personal proxy (nurse); and administrative records. Susan reviewed reasons for non-interview in GQ data in 2006 and operation lessons that were learned.

Population data will be available in all tables where appropriate. Currently the plans are to publish GQ base tables for all levels of geography and to develop some GQ profiles for the US and some states where the sample is large enough.

Susan outlined some of the challenges for the 2007 data release, as the 2006 data will not be strictly comparable to the 2005 data. The Bureau is planning on putting together a section on the website that lists by item, by table, what you can and can not compare (with cautions). The goal is to develop a much more integrated communication plan in order to ensure that all user needs are being met. The Bureau has thought about providing an online tutorial, and proactive training tools. She also mentioned that the income and poverty data will again be released at the same time as ACS; and in anticipation of the multi-year estimates, the Bureau is considering delaying the estimate release until September.

### ***Partnership and Data Services Program Update***

Tim Olson, Assistant Division Chief for Partnerships and Data Services / ACS, Field Division

Tim discussed partnership and data services activities such as: dress-rehearsal, integrated communications campaign, early partnership activities, and tribal consultation meetings.

In regard to the dress rehearsal, address canvassing begins in the field in May 2007. Partnership efforts in the dress rehearsal site have the following three goals: to increase mail response, to decrease the differential undercount, and to increase respondent cooperation during non-response follow-up. Staff are developing partnerships with faith-based organizations, local government officials, school officials, etc. in order to achieve these goals.

The Bureau is striving for an integrated communications campaign for 2010, not an advertising campaign like was done for 2000. The contractor will be tasked with developing a campaign that includes marketing, advertising, public relations, and partnership. Proposals are currently being reviewed and by September 30, 2007, the vendor that is selected will be announced. The first task will be to develop the strategy – the hows, whens, etc.

Tim discussed the early partnership activities that are going on today. The Bureau is currently working with CLO to get on the agendas of major national organizations; such as the national associations of cities, counties, and towns / townships. We are working with major stakeholders and decision makers to get introduce them to the 2010 Census and gain their buy-in. At this point in the decade, all entities need to be thinking of 2010 to determine what kind of ‘resources’ are needed to ensure a good response rate for 2010, realizing that the last half of 2009 and January – April 2010 is the timeline to get the most impact from local resources. Tim would like us to emphasize the need to plan and budget for Census 2010 when speaking with local governments.

Currently the Census Bureau is delivering a series of tribal consultation meetings with federally-recognized tribal government throughout the US -13 meetings in total. Half of the agenda is dedicated to gathering input from federally-recognized tribal governments regarding partnership, recruiting issues, geographic issues (LUCA & BAS), etc. The other half of the agenda comes from the participants that are in attendance. A contractor is working with tribal leaders to arrange logistics and interface directly with the tribal governments.

Tim also reviewed the highlights of some of the current activities in the Regions.

### ***Population Estimates Update***

Victoria (Tori) Velkoff, Assistant Division Chief for Estimates and Projections, Population Division

Tori discussed some of the staff changes and mentioned that the Immigration Statistics Staff is now part of the Population and Estimates Area. She also discussed two major events that occurred in the last year regarding population estimates. The first was the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics (COPAFS) sponsored conference on July 19, 2006 regarding the Census Bureau's population estimates program. The second was testimony regarding getting population estimates right the first time, which calls for a broader partnership between local, state, and federal officials to the House Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census on September 6, 2006.

The COPAFS conference discussion centered on the consistency of population estimates by stakeholders, and outcomes of this meeting were that the Bureau needed to be more flexible, re-examine the housing unit method, and survey the states and look at the state level methodology and estimates. The FSCPE has done a survey of the states, which asked about the different methodologies and data sources used in state population estimates. Tori talked about the new research team on Housing Unit Based Estimates (HUBERT). The Bureau will be looking to their state partners to work with them as they move forward with this research on the housing unit approach. As part of the Congressional Hearing, the Bureau looked at the local government review process (challenge process). Tori also discussed the vintage 2006 data release schedule.

Tori mentioned that the population estimate group has been working with the ACS staff to look at how to release population estimates and ACS data, to avoid confusion about the use of official population estimates and ACS data. The Bureau is trying to get population estimates by demographic characteristics into American FactFinder for the 2006 release.

Tori indicated that the count review for 2010 will be tested in dress-rehearsal and that the Bureau is exploring ways to address incorporating count review into 2010 results. The Bureau is planning on inviting FSCPE participation in the count review again as it did in 2000. Louisa Miller will be in charge of count review.

***Population Estimates and Projections: Recent Research, "A Comparison of Housing Units Estimates to the American Community Survey Master Address File Extract"***

Andrew Jason Reese, Demographer Statistician, Local Government Estimates Processing Branch

[http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/MAF\\_HUresearch\\_J.Reese.ppt](http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/MAF_HUresearch_J.Reese.ppt)

Jason reviewed the research that he has been working on. The reason he used the ACS Master Address File (MAF) extract is because the ACS receives an extract of the MAF annually, the current filter has been in place since 2002, and the extract is as of July 1. This review looked at the change between 2002 and 2005 at the national, state, and county level and used loss functions to identify outliers.

***Importance of Population Estimates***

Annette Watters, Alabama SDC, Vice Chair of Steering Committee

Annette discussed the important uses of population estimates and how these uses make a difference to our local communities. These uses are: allocation of federal funds (ex. HUD – to set thresholds, BEA – per capita income, Census – poverty rates); selection of survey sample size in the American Community Survey; allocation of state funds (AL – library funds); and implementation of certain laws / rules (AL – liquor sales based on population thresholds). Other uses of population estimates are for marketing and economic development grants and projects that utilize population thresholds as requirements.

The population estimates group at the Bureau generates a national population estimate ensuring that the state estimates generated total to the national estimate, and that the sum of counties adds to the state totals. For estimates below the county level, the estimates are driven by building permits and the boundaries that are on file for the local jurisdiction. The BAS (Boundary Annexation Survey) enables the Bureau to have the correct boundaries for a local area. The State Data Centers assist with BAS nonresponse in order to ensure that the local jurisdictions are delineated correctly.

***Local Employment Dynamics Program Update***

Jeremy Wu, Assistant Division Chief for Data Integration and LEHD Program, Data Integration Division

[http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/LED\\_J.Wu.ppt](http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/LED_J.Wu.ppt)

Jeremy reviewed a map of the 44 states, including DC, that are currently participating (37 in production and 7 states in experimental production) in the Local Employment Dynamics (LED) program and indicated that New York will soon be joining the list. He also reviewed the updated release schedule for version 2 of the On The Map application. The overall goal of the LED program is to develop a national longitudinal frame of jobs. The Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) illustrates the dynamics of the local labor market. The products that are available through the program are: QWI Online, Industry Focus, On the Map, Profiles of Older Workers, and HotReports. Some of the changes for the new version of On the Map that will be released this coming year are: 12 additional states, multi-year reports, and cross-state patterns for all participating states. HotReports pull data from multiple sources (data types) and are prepared using data that are stored within the Data Ferret system.

Carol Rogers suggested that the Steering Committee recommend to Jay Waite that the Bureau take part of the FY07 funding that was in excess of the President's Budget Request and utilize it to improve the LED project by having the data processed in a more timely manner (2005).

***Integrating State Administrative Records from Different Sources (Unleashing the Power: Improving Indiana's Labor Market Intelligence)***

Carol Rogers, Indiana SDC

<http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/powerofrecords.pdf>

Carol reviewed a project that Indiana is doing where they are taking the stove pipe set up of data (many types of data that are not currently integrated) and using these sources to make intelligent decisions. The "id" that ties these information sources together is the Social Security Number (SSN). The initiative is called "Information for Indiana" and will increase awareness of and access to state administrative data, improve the usability of these data, and develop new data to answer the needs of policy makers. In order to develop this system, Indiana met with different stakeholders and are using Unemployment Insurance claims, wage records (UC-5), summary data (QCEW), and new hire data (I-9s). In addition, Indiana will also be using school record data and plans on adding vehicle registrations, driver's licenses, welfare records, etc. Indiana is trying to answer the question, what is government doing to or for its citizens.

***Tips and Strategies for Collecting Group Quarters Data***

Robert Scardamalia, New York SDC

Bob reviewed the challenges that New York has had with Group Quarters. These include: generating a complete inventory (not just the name of the dorm); identifying accurate pre-census location; maintaining accurate post-census location; and identifying changes in GQ living arrangements. In terms of inventory, New York would like to identify colleges, nursing homes, prisons (federal, state, local), hospitals, and military (some of this can be

identified from the state licensing agencies). Bob reviewed the SUNY Albany campus tabulation issues from the 2000 Census; and a prison that was tabulated 25-miles from its location. NY goes to the college website to determine which buildings are dorms, student apartments, etc. They have also looked at the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data to determine which schools have residential facilities (need to determine short / long-term facilities). New York has identified a 2010 Census Liaison for each educational facility that has residential facilities and is trying to assign latitude and longitude for all of the facilities.

The difficult part is to assign a city-style address to all of the facilities. Another type of facility that needs to be identified is a school that leases space from a private entity. New York is fortunate to have Cornell to assist with their population estimates program and enhanced group quarters inventory. New York has used Google Maps to map the facilities so affiliates can assist in identifying and help track changes group quarter facilities.

Bob discussed the variety of sources that New York has used to try to develop a complete group quarter inventory. He also indicated that New York would like to have their group quarter listing updated in time for LUCA.

Carol Rogers wondered why the Census Bureau isn't providing funding to the states for LUCA and group quarters in order to ensure a consistent database. Bob indicated that there has not been new funding from NY for this project, but his office has devoted a lot of man hours for this project. Renee Jefferson-Copeland reminded the group that this is a partnership which works together to ensure accurate data.

### ***Redistricting Update***

Cathy McCully, Chief, Census Redistricting Data Office

Cathy discussed the new State Legislative District Summary Files DVD that was released in January 2007 with Census 2000 data. She also mentioned that now that these boundaries have been collected, ACS data will also be released for these areas simultaneously with Census 2010.

Cathy mentioned that the second phase of the redistricting program is a two-part program (voting districts and block boundaries) to take advantage of the TIGER alignment. Typically the Census Bureau has produced prototype products for dress rehearsal. This will happen again, but what is different this time is that the Census Bureau will look at including school districts with the PL 94-171 data (this suggestion came from the states). The Census Bureau will most likely not use as much paper for maps and TIGER Line extract is coming to its end. There have been requests to have state legislative districts, state voting districts, and county blocks on the same maps. A goal is for the prototype product to be out by April 2009.

### ***Tuesday, March 27, 2007***

#### ***Welcoming Remarks***

Renee Jefferson-Copeland, Acting Chief, Customer Liaison Office

Xan Wedel, Chair, State Data Center

Both Renee and Xan welcomed the group to a day of LUCA.

#### ***2007 Economic Census Planning***

Paul Zeisset, Economic Planning and Process Improvement Staff

Paul reviewed the plans for the upcoming 2007 Economic Census. For the Economic Census, the reference period is the title, thus it is for calendar year 2007. Most companies (5 million) will get their surveys in December 2007. Self-employed and some partnerships with no employees do not get a form. Every business with 20 or more employees will get a survey form. Smaller firms are surveyed based on a sample and there are different cutoffs based on the industry sector. The 2007 Economic Census is due February 12, 2008. Some companies may not see the form, since the Bureau sends the form to the company headquarters.

Paul reviewed the history of the response rates and the difficulty that the Bureau has for the coming Census. Response rates increased from 1987 to 1992 and declined in 1997 and again in 2002 (still not as low as 1987). In 1992 the envelope had "Your Response is Required by Law". There has been more resistance on the part of the business community in responding to surveys and filling out government forms. Geographic responses are similar to the 2000 Census, but also differ based on industry, industry size, and race and ethnicity.

He also discussed some of the plans and changes for 2007. The Economic Census will make greater use of the Internet and put more reliance on trade media (this is the dominant source of influence on business information – as businesses try to filter out the glut of information). One of the ads / promotion will focus on getting people to the website that answers business-oriented questions, with industry snapshots (profiles). There will be a publicity information kit, similar to what was available in 2002, but it will be available electronically since businesses get too

much mail. The plan is to employ cartoon-style public service adds to try to get noticed. Messages will be time oriented – look for the census vs. fill it out.

The Bureau would like the SDCs to contact business groups, chambers of commerce, and put information up on our websites (banner ads that are developed), newsletters, etc. in order to help the Bureau ensure a good response rate for the 2007 Economic Census. Also, when talking to the press, Paul requested that we also mention the Economic Census and just generally get the word out. E-mails will start this summer from the Bureau with more background information and ideas on things that the SDC network can do.

### ***Census 2010 Geography***

Bob LaMacchia, Chief, Geography Division

<http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/2007-0327-SDCNewYork-LaMacchia.ppt>

Bob discussed major activities that are going on within the Geography Division. In particular he gave an update on: TIGER Realignment; Boundary Annexation Survey; ANSI Codes transition; statistical analysis programs; and geographic products.

#### *Update on TIGER Realignment*

In GFY 2006, 700 counties were completed by Harris Corporation in Melbourne, Florida for the MAF TIGER Accuracy Improvement Project (MTAIP). All counties will be completed by April 1, 2008 and the goal for this year is another 700 counties (year ending September 30, 2007). For the second cycle the Bureau is talking to Harris regarding updating some counties from imagery that were done early on. To date, 2,484 counties were delivered, of which 2,041 used local sources and 1,815 of those met the 7.6 meter standard or better, while 419 needed some enhancement. To see the status maps go to: [http://ftp2.census.gov/geo/maps/mtaip\\_status/](http://ftp2.census.gov/geo/maps/mtaip_status/) and select the “completed file”. One of the objectives of the project was not to duplicate efforts that were already underway.

#### *Boundary and Annexation Survey (BAS)*

The 2007 BAS survey (places of 2,500+) went out on time in early January and the response rate is currently over 71%. All places/MCDs/American Indian areas will be funded in 2008. In order to support the ACS, the Bureau needs to find a way to fund BAS every year starting in 2011. For decennial census support, boundary validation will occur in early 2010, when the Highest Elected Official (HEO) will receive a boundary validation form in order to ensure that the data will be tabulated properly for their jurisdiction.

#### *ANSI Code Transition*

In 2005, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) announced the withdrawal of the following Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) geographic entity codes: FIPS 5-2 (states, DC, and outlying areas of the US and associated areas), 6-4 (counties and equivalent entities of the US, its possessions, and associated areas), 8-6 (metropolitan areas – including MSAs, CMSAs, PMSAs, and NECMAs), 9-1 (congressional districts of the US), and 55-3 (named places, primary county divisions, and other locational entities of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the outlying areas). The Census Bureau is the maintenance agency for codes for states and equivalent entities, counties and equivalent entities, congressional districts, and MSAs; and these codes will not change substantially. The concern is that the US Geological Survey is the maintenance agency for codes for named populated places; primary divisions of counties; and other locational entities. The Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) ID characteristics are up to 8 digits in length and are permanent, but are not in alphabetic order when sorted. The GNIS will become the ANSI standards for these local entities.

The Bureau will store and move into the geographic files (TIGER) the GNIS codes for every where that there is a GNIS code (even states, counties, incorporated places, etc.). The Bureau will add these codes into the products and also maintain a “5” digit code (old FIPS) through at least 2012 to support 2010 Census and other tabulation program processing and products.

For example: 2010 will have the 5-digit code and 8-digit code for transitioning: statefp – 24; countyfp – 031; cousubns – 1929469; cousubfp – 91160; placens – 598146; placefp – 76650; name – Takoma Park.

#### *Statistical Areas Program*

The Federal Register notice (draft criteria) should be out soon. Participants can elect to use MAF/TIGER partnership software or any other software that generates shapefiles and exports them into the format the Bureau needs. The program will be an electronic-only program. ESRI will be releasing an extension to their software to support this program.

## *Geographic Products*

**Redistricting Data Program** – Cathy McCully discussed this yesterday

**School District** – boundaries are collected every 2 years and are funded by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

**Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ)** – looking for up-front funding from either the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (ASHTO) or the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

**TIGER/Line Files** – last edition is available and TIGER GML is out on the web, but the schema that was used is based on TIGER LINE and now the Bureau is re-evaluating based on newer technology. Eventually TIGER will be available over the Internet and can use data from HUD or other sources (your own). The Bureau would like eventually to move to a web feature server. Later this summer / early fall the Bureau will put up a number of shapefiles to support LUCA and it will have all the line work in a single layer and also in separate files.

**MAF / TIGER Partnership software** – LUCA and BAS components are finished. For the PSAS (public service administration areas) or school districts programs, users will have to reinstall the software. The data disk actually tells the software what business rules are to be used. MAF will need to support ACS and other surveys after 2010. TIGER will build upon the partnerships that have been established and the state and county GIS. The Bureau has built new software in-house to handle changes from the outside on an ongoing basis. Places that had non-city style addresses for Census 2000, and have been converted to city-style addresses, will be cleaned up after address canvassing in early 2009. The Bureau is planning to work with partners, private sector, etc. for post-2010 activities to keep the MAF up-to-date; may use imagery to spot change and GIS groups have put this forward to get funding.

### ***2010 LUCA Update***

Linda Franz, Assistant Division Chief, Geographic Partnerships Programs

David McCormack, Chief, Geographic Support Branch, Field Division

<http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/SDCLUCA3-27-07.ppt>

Linda reviewed some LUCA basics, such as: who can participate, the three LUCA options, LUCA tools, and the LUCA schedule. Regarding participation, new for 2010, states can participate in the LUCA program. The Bureau hopes that Option 1 “full-address review” will be the most popular option. Option 1 allows participants to review the MAF and make corrections to city-style addresses; or challenge the count of housing units on a block basis. Option 2 allows participants to provide to the Bureau its list of city-style address and the Bureau can match the MAF and local list; and the entity receives detailed feedback and can challenge. Option 3 is similar to Option 2, but participants do not agree to Title 13; and they do not receive the detailed feedback and can not challenge.

For LUCA the tools are shapefiles, address lists in paper form for governments with 6,000 or fewer addresses, and electronic address lists. The mail out of the advance letters to the Highest Elected Officials was completed in February, invitation letters go out in July, and the Bureau will mail materials specific to their registration selection after the responses are received. If a local entity signs up by October 31, 2007, then 2008 BAS can be combined with LUCA and in order to get the full 120 days to review. Local governments must sign up by November 19, 2007 to have a full 120-day review period.

Linda also reviewed a handout that listed the top 10 misconceptions about the 2010 LUCA program

David reviewed the handout that has a list of states that indicated that they would assist with the promotional workshops and technical workshops. He also discussed the list of 10 items that states can do to help with LUCA. Invitation letters go out in the middle of July and anything that we can do to get the word out and to inform the governmental entities would be helpful. The toll-free number is 866-511-LUCA (5862). There will also be another toll-free number to help with the materials later in the year.

David mentioned that there are 974 promotional workshops being scheduled between February and June 2007. To date, 104 of those that are scheduled will be conducted by the SDCs. The Bureau is also planning to conduct 846 technical workshops. Half of these sessions will be in this fiscal year (August and September 2007) and the other half in the next fiscal year (October and November 2007).

The Census Bureau is busy updating the geographical program participant database (GPPD). For the first mailout from the GPPD of the promotional information, 80% are coming back with corrections. May 14, 2007 is the cutoff for updates to the GPPD for the invitation letter and all of these changes need to be unduplicated. Between April 11 and April 22 states will be able to update the GPPD. Also, the SDCs will be added as “ccs” in the GPPD.

### ***Roundtable Session: LUCA Partnership from the SDC Perspective***

There were 3 roundtable discussions that were held.

#### ***Working with Regional Offices for LUCA***

Rebecca Picasso, Colorado, SDC

The Regional Office for Colorado is in Denver and the region consists of 10 states. Rebecca works in the state demography office so they were able to help the Regional Office find the contacts and the locations / timing for the LUCA promotional meetings. They helped the Regional Office strategize and were able to look at the Census Bureau's contact list and merge it with their own in order to determine the right people to contact and invite to the meetings. Becky indicated that it would be good to supplement the Census Bureau's mailing list with your own mailing list. Also, to ask attendees how did they hear about the meeting?

The SDCs are attending as many training sessions as possible. If you can not attend, then try to find someone from your staff and / or an affiliate to attend. Some local governments have a bitter taste from the last time – 2000 LUCA program. Chicago aggressively identified those that had problems in 2000 and made personal calls to those areas that have had difficulties in the past.

The group also discussed, the optimal travel distance to a meeting, the optimal number of local governments, and attendance rates in the promotional sessions that have already been held. There is great variation depending upon rural/urban, weather, etc.

#### ***Promoting LUCA: Working with Local Governments***

Barbara Ronnington, Minnesota SDC

Barbara shared what she has done in Minnesota and then the group shared what they have done. The Kansas City office suggested that they have stand-alone LUCA promotional meetings, but Barbara felt that it would be better to piggy-back on other meetings that were already set (cities / counties). She paired down the lengthy PowerPoint that came from the Census Bureau for her time allotted of only 15 minutes. Minnesota is motivated since they may lose a seat in 2010 and in 2000 there were places that were missed (and these places can not pay for a special census). Also, it is important to point out how the data are used: reapportionment, allocation of state funds, allocation of federal funds, and statistical data used by business and government. Their office has estimated the population of the legislative districts to show population shifts. She suggested that the presentation mention the time commitment and also discuss data security issues of LUCA. In Minnesota, up to a third of new citizens are refugees and are distrustful of government, therefore it is important to also emphasize the confidentiality of the census data (72 years before released and used for ancestry info). By traveling to these meetings it buys a lot of good will. While you are there, it is also good to promote other things that your office does and ways that you can help them.

#### ***Planning for 2010 LUCA in Georgia***

Robert Giacomini, Georgia SDC – in the Governor's Office of Policy and Budget

Robert discussed that Georgia's 2010 LUCA program is built upon what Georgia did for LUCA in Census 2000. In 2000, Georgia emphasized "how much is a second congressional seat worth to you?" Georgia gained two seats and the second one was the 432<sup>nd</sup> seat that was allocated. They worked with rural legislators to discuss the population shift to gain support of the program. Georgia allocated about \$1.5 million for LUCA efforts for Census 2000 and created a coordinated program between the state and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). DCA provided the manpower and the governor's office signed off on the funding. Georgia involved DCA since DCA oversees the Regional Development Councils that work with the counties, etc. In 2000, Georgia had about 90% involvement. They conducted train-the-trainer sessions and used a map of the state to see which local entities needed to be called and encouraged participation.

In preparing for 2010, Georgia was able to politic very early about how important it was to get funding (about a year ago) and had sign-off from the governor's office and put placeholders in the budget for this outreach effort going forward. There have been negotiations between the governor's office and DCA: DCA developed the budget (\$1.5 million) and will hire special staff with GIS skills. The program is developed such that if a local jurisdiction does not want to be involved, then they need to sign off that the county or RDC can submit on their behalf. DCA is ready to go forward and some of the funding will go towards statewide mapping.

**Wednesday, March 28, 2007**

***The 2010 Census Address List Lessons From 2000***

Joseph Salvo, City of New York, Department of City Planning (DCP), Population Division  
<http://www.sdcbidc.iupui.edu/documents/Census2010LUCASDCMeeting-JoeSalvo.ppt>

Joe reviewed what the Master Address File (MAF) is and he emphasized that the MAF is used to pinpoint and follow-up on housing units that do not respond. In 2000, the campaign to put census forms in Post Offices was aborted, because it would have been difficult to match and unduplicate the form and an address.

He discussed the local data sources that were used in NY in 2000: Bell Atlantic – “Living Units”; Con Edison Residential Electric Accounts, Finance Real Property Assessment Files, New York City Housing, etc. They did a summary for every building in the city and did a comparison between the different local sources and what the Census Bureau had. Then New York City did a sample survey of buildings to see if the city or the Bureau’s list was better; to see if they were going down the right path; and what their chances would be for an appeal. They asked the Bureau’s field representatives to probe, not just go with what a landlord may say. It is challenging to figure out the number of units in converted single-family homes and also it is challenging to try to label the units in a building.

The city compared the MAF and DCP housing unit counts and also compared buildings by type of density (high, middle, and low) and gave special consideration to the Bell Atlantic data. They did some validation tests on buildings where there were large discrepancies.

Joe discussed some MAF issues: verbal verification – truthfulness; apartment numbers and single mailbox; and lack of incentives to look during block canvassing (need incentive to probe – temporary employees). The city added 439,069 and after canvassing and after reconciliation the total declined to 284,288; but from appeals they added 85,620. Thus after block canvassing, reconciliation, and appeals, 84.2 percent were accepted for a total of 369,908 housing units. If NYC had not done LUCA, there would have been about 150,000 housing units that would not have been picked up by the Bureau by any means.

Joe discussed what the city learned from 2000. Primarily that preparing pays off; pooling resources helps; and exact addresses really do matter (building address and apartment number). In order to achieve success you need to build list of addresses beforehand, focus on most problematic addresses, and field check and document your addresses.

Joe also mentioned some issues for consideration: linking governments and confidentiality and the absence of good exact addresses in the MAF. In particular he pointed out that Title 13 protects data both received and submitted to the Census Bureau, but data that is prepared by local entities with the help of county and state governments beforehand is not protected. There may be concerns on the part of local entities that need help from larger governments but may be fearful of how lists will be used.

He also discussed the Bureau’s update / enumerate program that could be used in more areas. In this program, enumerators canvass their assignment areas using census maps and address registers that contain addresses and location information for housing units. The enumerators update the address lists and census maps by adding housing units not already listed, making corrections to address information, entering locations on maps for added units in rural areas, updating maps with feature changes, and deleting listings that do not exist. This method was identified in the Census 2000 Evaluation F.12, December 10, 2002, and it allows the Bureau to go directly to the field and saves time and money in areas where we have concerns about responsiveness and address integrity.

Also, since immigrants are spreading out into many more states, the hard to enumerate areas are not just limited to a few states. You need to go out and visit and talk to the occupants and send the message home about how the data are used and why we need to know what is going on in this building. He recommended that we emphasize that the funds will be used to fill the potholes, fund childcare, etc. and that the information will not be used for anything else.

***Plans in the State of New York***

***New York – Preparing for LUCA and the 2010 Census***

Robert Scardamalia – New York SDC

The work that New York City did makes it easier for the state. New York State allocated approximately \$75,000 in this fiscal year (April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007) for contracts with 15 affiliate data centers to deliver promotional training. They conducted over 50 sessions by March 31<sup>st</sup>. For the second phase, New York State will focus on technical training. Their budget is not final yet, but they are looking at approximately \$150,000 that they would channel through their affiliates.

For the promotional training, New York added about ½ to 1 hour introduction to the Bureau's training presentation and they are also doing the Bureau's training in its entirety. New York emphasizes the housing issues that may be encountered such as a single doorway with multiple mailboxes. This problem is not just in urban areas, and there is no evidence that these multiple units exist from the outside of the building. One of the goals of the training is to get local governments thinking about addresses (city / non-city style) and trying to find strategies to address these housing unit concerns.

Bob reviewed the points that they try to make in the ½ to 1 hour introduction and that they give to try to bring the message home. If address is in MAF, then the information will be captured in the census. They want locals to think about what the community looks like and what the Census Bureau's listing includes. Another purpose of New York's program is to get local government involvement into all of the partnership activities that are coming down the road for 2010. It is voluntary, but if you do not participate then you have no recourse later down the road. The introduction helps to set the stage for the rest of the presentation and makes them focus on what types of addresses that they have in their communities and the issues that may be present.

### ***Strategies for LUCA Activities***

Pamela Schenker – Florida SDC

Pam emphasized that LUCA is the first step toward a successful 2010 Census and a chance for your state to make a difference. She listed resources that can be used in building a state LUCA program, such as: staff, money, databases, and equipment and software. She also mentioned targeting different geographic areas in addition to identifying your partners and making sure that everyone is included. Training can take on many shapes – it can be the conventional training that is being done, computer based training that is planned, Internet, and even one-on-one. Overall to build a statewide LUCA program it involves working together and bringing everyone to the table.

State programs can vary. We have heard some examples at this meeting from New York, Georgia, Minnesota, and Colorado, to name a few. In addition, in 2000, Texas developed software to assist local governments with address matching. Florida is currently building their technical assistance grant program that will work in conjunction with Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and local governments.

No matter the size of your program or state, the most important message that we can get out is that this is an opportunity that should not be missed and that we should do everything we can to help ensure a complete and accurate Census 2010.

### ***Adjourn***

Frank Ambrose, Program Coordinator, State and Governmental Programs

Frank thanked everyone for attending and for making the SDC Mid-Year Meeting a success.