

# 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 Meeting – June 16-18, 2010

Participating Steering Committee members: Amy Bittner, Lenny Gaines, Pam Schenker, Barbara Ronningen, Jane Traynham, Sue Copella, Dan Veroff, and Julie Hoang.

**PowerPoint presentations and handouts are located on the State Data Center (SDC) website, <http://www.census.gov/sdc/10junesteer.html>**

Wednesday, June 16, 2010 – Census Bureau Headquarters

**Introduction and Opening Remarks – Barbara Harris, Customer Liaison and Marketing Services Office (CLMSO)**

- Introductions: Colleen Flannery as interim advisor of CICs; Pam Schenker, SDC Chair; and Rudy Wilson, Census Information Centers (CIC) Chair.
- There have been some staff changes: David Donovan was transferred to the Public Information Office (PIO), and Mark Tolbert is now a part of CLMSO. Burton Reist is now Assistant Director for Communications.

**Census Bureau's FY 2010 Corporate Priority Setting Process – Thomas L. Mesenbourg, Deputy Director (PowerPoint Presentation)**

- Census 2010 update – There was a good response rate for mail out. It is typical to see declining response rates for surveys, something that has generally been happening throughout the decade. The targeted and blanketed questionnaire mailing did drive up the response rate, which was the key to reaching a 72% participation rate for the U.S. The Census Bureau used the Enhanced Planning Database (EPD) and American Community Survey (ACS) data to help with the effort. In addition, the Census Bureau used the Center for Economic Studies to develop models to help achieve a good response rate.
- There are 500,000 enumerators for Non-Response Follow-Up (NRFU), visiting 47 million housing units. NRFU is 93-94% completed and is scheduled to end July 10.
- The cost for NRFU is \$2.2 billion and it is now 14% below budget expectations.
- Vacant/Delete check is the next operation after NRFU and will run June 28 – August 25.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 budget is in front of Congress right now. The Census Bureau's budget requests include programming expansions, increasing the ACS sample size, improving the quality of population estimates, continuous updates for the address file, and expanding administrative records research. The Census Bureau is the hub for expanded use of administrative records. There is also money requested for a supplementary measure of poverty.
- For FY 2012 the Dept. of Commerce is implementing new processes, a self-assessment of seven program areas. There will be a zero budget increase for two programs: population and housing and general economic studies (Center for Economic Studies), Local Employment Dynamics (LED).
- The Corporate Priority Setting Process is a cost efficiency process that will be instituted in the Census Bureau. It will help spur innovation and efficiencies. It will solicit proposals that address priorities. The proposals that are funded will be those that have the greatest opportunity to reduce costs and increase operational efficiency. The process is designed to be sustainable over time. Sustainability is important due to constrained budgets, new funding will be difficult, and it eliminates duplicate and unnecessary activities.
- FY 2012 – Identify proposals that will help with costs and efficiencies. These proposals will go through a review process.

- The key drivers of this initiative are the budget environment that the Census Bureau will be facing in 2012. There will be lots of challenges on the budget from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) because other agencies are vying for money, such as for defense and healthcare.
- For these processes a capital investment fund will be provided internally.
- The Census Bureau will identify processes that can be re-engineered or eliminated and it will improve internal and external collaboration.
- This process will help to break down the silos of the Census Bureau divisions so that ideas can freely flow.
- It has been recognized that the Census Bureau needs to solicit ideas from outside and eliminate the one-size fits all way of thinking. Looking for best practices.
- The Census Bureau will strive to simplify and standardize work processes such as the hiring process, administrative process, and implement a best practices system more broadly across the Bureau.
- The Census Bureau conducts surveys for other agencies such as the Dept. of Labor and the Dept. of Education. These organizations are demanding that the Census Bureau be more transparent about the costs associated with performing these surveys.
- In the coming years, there will be a huge culture change for the Census Bureau.
- Linking internal data will help with Census Bureau processes. The Center for Economic Studies is conducting an efficiency study from data collected during decennial census.
- What has been done before to make agencies more efficient? The Census Bureau talked with other Federal Statistical agencies about successes such as Statistics Canada. The Census Bureau needs to identify the major challenges it will face in the next 3-5 years.
- The focus in this year of the process is to identify cost efficiencies.
- So far, 200 proposals were submitted from Headquarters (HQ) staff and 460 from field staff. These proposals are currently under review.
- This is a great opportunity to start changing the culture of the Census Bureau.
- A question was asked as to whether ACS funding will be in jeopardy in the coming years. The FY 2011 proposed budget has ACS funding and it is assumed that FY 2012 will have the ACS funding. The Corporate Priority Setting Process is looking at lower priority programs within broader program lines.
- The Process is being used now to identify cuts for the FY 2012 budget.
- SDCs feel the same way about the priorities that the Census Bureau has identified. SDCs would like to see the 75 proposals. The Census Bureau provided copies of the proposals to Steering Committee members.
- Census 2010 data products are slated to be released through 2013. Will the budget for the delivery of these items be cut? The 2010 delivery of products is off the table and budget reductions will not impact creation and distribution of decennial products. The Census Bureau will meet the 2010 delivery schedule.
- One-size fits all and silo issues have been a problem that the SDCs have recognized for years.
- The research directorate will be re-established and the key part of this is reorganization within the Census Bureau. There is a huge research agenda for the 2020 Census. This will be another way in which to help break down the silos.
- The Census Bureau will welcome suggestions from SDCs about how to help with the cost cutting measures.
- This will be a continuous process. Will the Census Bureau accept proposals from SDCs and CICs? The Census Bureau is open to this.
- Funding for this process is a carrot and stick process. Approximately 0.5 to 1 percent is put into an internal capital investment fund. If a proposal is accepted, the Division will be given funds and staff to accomplish proposal.
- How to measure cost savings? Use an activity based cost model; develop a trend, and user satisfaction. Teams will be required to report quarterly. There are some high-risk projects, but these endeavors could have a high level of results.

**Post 2010 Census Awareness (Marketing)** – *Burton Reist, Assistant Director for Communications*  
(PowerPoint Presentation)

- The communications campaign was built around the Hard-to-Count (HTC) score, 12 variables.

- In the original planning for 2010 Census awareness, the Census Bureau did not foresee the unique housing situations like foreclosures and dislocated households that were spurred by the economic recession. Areas that were selected for Displaced Media include areas with high foreclosure rates, the South and Southwest. Created new and creative marketing for those people that were displaced. For certain areas and demographic groups, target media was geared towards Survey Response Intervention and Response Rate Intervention (see slide 4 for examples of each).
- The Census Bureau spent more money on the Partnership program than advertising.
- Continuous communication about census data and awareness over the decade is the key to future censuses. Census branding, continuously updating the communications program because it works better when people hear about the census and census data throughout the decade, keeping it fresh in people's minds.
- The Census Bureau is looking for ways to tap into the SDC expertise.

**2010 Census Experimental Forms – Joan Hill, Decennial Statistical Studies Division (DSSD), and Sonya Rastogi, Population Division (POP) (PowerPoint Presentation)**

- Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE) - Experimental forms were sent out as a part of a large content test during the 2010 Census for race and Hispanic Origin research.
- The AQE survey is the largest effort in looking forward to the race and Hispanic components of the 2020 Census.
- The goal is to identify strategies for improving race and Hispanic origin reporting by testing different questionnaire design strategies.
- This test will be used to improve race and Hispanic results by understanding how people self-report race and Hispanic Origin.
- Assess strategies to improve race and Hispanic Origin reporting. Attempt to reduce the number of missing race and Hispanic Origin responses.
- Experimental forms were mailed out to a national sample of housing units. There were 15 experimental panels with 30,000 housing units per panel.
- For non-respondents, a replacement questionnaire was sent and there was also a telephone re-interview study.
- The focus was on oversampling in census tracts with a high proportion of Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Black or African-American, Hispanic or Latino, and all other.
- It is a three-part survey: mail out survey, focus groups, and re-interview.
- There will be 50 focus groups with 10-12 participants in each group.
- The experimental forms tested different questionnaire design strategies, for example removing the term "Negro," clarifying the Asian and Pacific Islander category and limiting the use of the term "race."
- Questions were posed as to whether the Census Bureau is looking to have more detail presented under the race categories such as White and Black or African American. For example, under Black or African American, include Africans and under White, include Arab-Americans. It is something the Census Bureau is looking into for future censuses.
- The AQE was mailed out to areas with large concentration of various racial groups. But, what about the American Indian population? Areas with large concentrations of American Indians were not designated as mail out/mail back for the 2010 Census and therefore, did not receive an AQE. The Census Bureau said the American Indian population responses to the AQE would be captured in the focus groups.

**Lunch with SDCs and CICs – Joint Discussion**

- Previous discussions between the SDC and CIC Steering Committees focused on communication between the two groups.
- At present, there has been a liaison designated for each group to participate in monthly conference calls, but participation has been lax. Is having a liaison that participates in conference calls something that should continue? Yes, it is a good idea and it should be something that should be enforced. Perhaps each group could designate a second person as a back-up who could participate in the call if the liaison is unable.
- It was recommended that each group share meeting and conference call notes with the other.

- Topics and issues of concern: CICs have more input with Census Bureau on the front and back end of programs. Each group does have concerns about the dissemination of ACS 2010 and decennial 2010 data, that there will be conflicts with ACS and decennial data being released.
- Census data distribution: The SDCs are creating profiles for Summary File 1 (SF1) type data. Do the CICs have any input on the profiles? The CICs would be willing to review the profiles. Both groups are interested in a user friendly common medium.
- Comparison profiles with Census 2000 and ACS is something the CICs want to work on.
- A good start is to show CICs what profiles were created by the SDCs in 2000.
- The CICs expressed interest in data profiles for communities, not necessarily based on geography. For example, the African-American community.
- The CICs could help identify specific geographies that would be useful.

**ACS Informal Discussion** – *Susan Schechter, Chief, American Community Survey Office (ACSO) and other ACS staff (2 handouts)*

- The ACS staff is preparing for the release of the 5-year data. The ACS staff produces the data, but are not really in a position to solicit user advice about the data. There just is not a way for them to get this information. There is not a mechanism in place to obtain comments.
- There will be a user meeting regarding Summary File 4 (SF4) and the American Indian and Alaska Native file. The concern is that these files are too big to release every year. The meeting should include people that used or will use this file. ACS is doing this in order to meet the needs of data users.
- ASCO is putting together a release schedule similar to 2010 Census. One-year 2009 ACS will be released September 21. The ACS 5-year data will probably be released November 9 or December 14. The release of the 3-year data (2007-2009) will come after the release of the 5-year. For the 5-year data release, the Census Bureau is mixing things up a bit. All 5-year ACS will be released on American Fact Finder (AFF) the same day. The Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file and Summary files for ACS 5-year are proving to be a problem because of the size. It is not known when these will be released.
- The ACS survey form goes to 2.5% of the country every year, but the ACSO is not going to describe it this way anymore.
- The 5-year ACS estimates release will be down to tracts and block groups. The data products: detailed files, comparison profiles, and summary files. ACSO does not plan on releasing Selected Population Profiles for the 5-year data.
- Some geographic areas will not receive every product, for example, ACSO will not produce a narrative profile for a block group and there will be no subject tables for census tracts. But, every area will receive detailed tables.
- The tables that will be released for the 5-year estimates are the same as what was released for 3-year, almost the full set. The exception will be block groups. For the 5-year ACS estimates there will be no filtering for data reliability.
- All data will be accessible through AFF, but some data will only be available through the summary file. Data for block groups will not be in AFF. The reason for this is that ACSO thinks that block group data should be used as building blocks, should be used in aggregate.
- The current plan is to release the 5-year ACS estimates every year.
- Because the disability question was changed on the 2008 ACS survey, the 5-year estimates will not include any data on disability status.
- This summer ACSO is planning on releasing a list of all the tables that will be released for 5-year ACS data.
- Questions: Has the ACSO looked at different delivery mechanisms for the ACS questionnaire such as update/leave. Right now, the survey is only mailed out. ACSO did a cost-benefit analysis of doing update/leave for the ACS questionnaire in Puerto Rico. The Census Bureau found the cost was too high. Delivery of the questionnaire may not be an issue in the future because ACSO is testing the completion of the survey via Internet.
- Stratified sample - 7 sampling strata, rates assigned to smallest governmental units. Sampling rates are increased as size of area increases.
- For 2011 ACS, sample stratification has changed.

- How is the new sample stratification going to affect areas' eligibility for programs? Is there a concern about areas moving in and out of eligibility each year? ACS has not really looked into the program application.
- Coefficients of Variation (CV) for small areas could be improved by shifting the allocation from big areas to small areas (this was the drive for the improved sample stratification). ACSO felt doing this will improve the data reliability for small areas without affecting the reliability of large areas data.
- The sample stratification improvement is separate from the proposed increase in the ACS sample size.
- Rural Statistical Areas (RSAs) data for the third year of the pilot project will be released at the end of June. The report produced by SDCs should include a summary statement of how the data is useful to the state. Reports will be due September 30<sup>th</sup>. The most recent reports will be placed on the CLMSO website soon. *Note: The release of data for the third-year of the project has been delayed.*
- The third year is the last year of the project. The Steering Committee has sent a letter asking the Census Bureau to make RSAs a permanent data product. A question was raised as to whether an extension could be made in the pilot project so that there is not a gap in the time series of data. ACSO says it takes a lot of work to put out these special data tabulations and has no plans to do another year of the project.
- There is a concern from SDCs of how people might use ACS data for grant writing. Has the Census Bureau inquired from other Federal agencies about what data will be required for qualifications of Federal programs? No, the Census Bureau has not, it is a gray area. One idea is to create a Compass report for grant writers. The Census Bureau's job is to produce and disseminate data, not tell data users how to use it. The SDCs want to help ACSO with developing training for users.
- Race iterations of children's living arrangements are currently missing in ACS data.
- The SDCs want to help users with tools to understand the data. For example a MOE calculator. DADS II is supposed to provide a lot of enhancement and improvements in data. A color coded reliability indicator has been tested. The Census Bureau did developmental research for a reliability indicator, but the focus groups did not respond to it very well. Therefore, at this time, ACSO is not pursuing a reliability indicator for ACS data any further. Some Steering Committee members feel that the traffic light component should be revisited by ACSO because it could help casual data users. The people involved in the traffic light reliability study were more sophisticated users and may not have seen a need for it given their level of expertise.
- Are there any studies to compare Census 2010 and ACS data to see how well coverage has been? There are a lot of opportunities to look at ACS data coverage in comparison to Census 2010. ACSO is doing an ACS and Census 2010 match study. The match study will not start until March 2011 and results are expected in fall 2011.

**Special Tabulations (County-to-County Migration file) – Bob Kominski, Assistant Chief, Housing & Household Economic Statistics, (HHES) (PowerPoint Presentation)**

- 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses had county-to-county migration tables.
- ACS Migration Flow Products – standard products in AFF.
- The characteristics include age, sex, race, Hispanic Origin, citizenship, marital status, educational attainment, income, poverty status, and tenure.
- Tables with in-migration by characteristics since 2004 ACS in all publishable geographies and tables with out-migration by characteristics since 2007 ACS by limited geographies.
- There is not a unified table that shows all migration flows for all areas.
- Special product tabulation – state-to-state migration flow tables, published since 2005 ACS. No characteristics associated with these flows. This is not a standard product.
- The 5-year ACS estimates will be released, but AFF currently cannot support flow products, so tables will be limited.
- The limitations are due to smaller sample size and larger MOEs, fewer moves (residence 1 year ago vs. the decennial asked residence 5 years earlier); there is new data available every year, and disclosure issues.
- To prevent disclosure issues, there needs to be 50 unweighted cases that migrated out of a particular geography, if there are less than this, data will not be available for that area.
- Possible products: not only county-to-county, but what about place-to-place, MCD-to-MCD (Minor Civil Division), MCD-to-County, etc. It is unlikely that the Census Bureau can produce all the combinations.

- The complication with AFF is that a flow involves multiple geographies. AFF is designed to retrieve data for a specific geography. Similar problems in commuting and journey-to-work data.
- Journey-to-work: Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP): same problem as stated above. Currently working on preliminary ACS 3-year data. Number of crosses for flows minimized to 5 variables due to disclosure avoidance requirements.
- Disclosure issues will still be an issue for ACS 5-year CTPP products being planned.
- Create synthetic data set is the latest idea.
- Next steps: possible research on products using 2005-2009 ACS data. A file will be available in late 2010. It will be a flow table only, no characteristics.
- Question for the Steering Committee: What are SDCs greatest needs for migration data? Flow data by characteristics for rural areas and brain drain issues.
- Local Employment Dynamics (LED) will include commuting by occupation in 2012. The new LED that will be released in 2011 will include race and Hispanic Origin.

**Modernization and Re-Engineering of Census of Governments** – *Chris Pece, Assistant Division Chief, Recurring Programs Area* (PowerPoint Presentation and 2 handouts)

- The Governments Division programs provide economic statistics about governments, follow activity of governments over time, and it is the public counterpart to business, industry, and services economic data.
- Response to survey is voluntary; there are almost no confidentiality restrictions.
- Importance of data: it tells the story about economic conditions of state and local government of particular areas.
- Census of Governments contributes to the government component of the formula for Gross Domestic Product (GDP).
- Census of Governments: finance data, employment data, and organizational data.
- The modernization and re-engineering of the Census of Governments involves all facets; content, business analysis, information technology, infrastructure, dissemination, and outreach.
- Committee on National Statistics (CNStat) produced a report on how to improve the Census of Governments, supplied 21 recommendations.
- Broke up CNStat Recommendations into data quality, relevance, utility, dissemination, and timeliness.
- Local government finance is probably the most difficult area.
- There are numerous new publications available.
- The Governments division is looking to do a wider dissemination of products: build-a-table and website redesign.
- In the future, 2012 data will be in DataFerrett and AFF.
- Next steps with the modernization effort: work with user groups; work on definitions, tax and welfare, and participation in road trips to various members of state and local governments. Are also looking to revitalize product line.
- The Governments Division is looking to the SDCs for help in disseminating products, educating users, and increasing state and local government response. If the SDCs know when the survey is going out, the SDCs could send out notification to local governments. Is there a role for Governor's Liaisons?

**Building Permits Survey Partnership Evaluation (improvement for 2011)** – *Erica Filipek, Cheryl Cornish, and Salenna Nickerson, Manufacturing and Construction Division (MCD)* (handout)

- Previously, the Steering Committee and MCD worked together to develop a follow-up for the SDCs to perform for the annual Building Permits Survey (BPS). Unfortunately, participation by SDCs was extremely low. MCD provided the Steering Committee with a list of the states that participated and BPS reporting information.
- The BPS follow-up consisted of two parts: In the fall, MCD provided a list of local contacts to the SDCs. MCD asked the SDCs to contact the annual reporters that did not respond to the previous year's survey and monthly reporters that have been delinquent for five months or more. This portion of the follow-up involved SDCs providing MCD with updated local contact information. The next part of the follow-up occurred in March, where MCD provided a list of local governments that had not returned the BPS.
- The session was used to discuss how to improve the BPS follow-up by SDCs.

- The lack of participation may have been due to confusion on the SDCs part and also because the follow-up occurred during the height of decennial census activities.
- Building permits are important because they feed into the creation of the annual population estimates for cities and towns.
- The Steering Committee asked MCD to continue to provide SDCs with the opportunity to help with the BPS follow-up.
- One thing that may help with SDC participation is to have a timeline that shows when the information is available and when the follow-up should be completed.
- The Steering Committee could provide information and education to the SDCs at the October meeting about how important it is to collect this information.
- MCD staff did send e-mail notifications when files are available, when they are due, and when the survey is going out.
- MCD is willing to accept data in any format, whether they receive the BPS form directly or if a SDC reports the data back to them.
- For the BPS follow-up, two separate files have to be sent, monthly, and annual reporters. MCD staff cannot merge the files.
- Next step will be for the Steering Committee to put something together for the SDCs at the October meeting.
- A timeline will also be put together for when files will be sent, due dates, and when survey will be sent out.

Thursday, June 17, 2010

**Geography Update (PSAP-CDP criteria/acceptance issues)** – *Mike Ratcliffe, Assistant Division Chief, Geocartographic Products and Criteria, Geography Division (GEO)* (handout)

- GEO feels that the Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP) was successful. Tennessee changed from a County Census Divisions (CCDs) state to a state with MCDs.
- Originally in PSAP, 2,300 Census Designated Places (CDPs) were added, 231 were removed, and there were 20 new CDPs in the island areas. An additional 50 were inputted by the Census Bureau.
- Currently, the Census Bureau is in Phase 2 of PSAP, which added another 1,500 CDPs. Many of these additions were in rural areas.
- Approximately two-thirds of new CDPs were submitted by PSAP participants. The Census Bureau's criteria are things that clearly indicate that there is an area there. Result: Larger number of CDPs. ACS data will be tabulated for CDPs.
- Sample of edits: 85% edits of CDPs in Phase 1 were accepted by GEO. Of the ones submitted by the Census Bureau, 95% were accepted.
- Issues with PSAP: What constitutes a CDP? This was not always clear. There is more that the Census Bureau could have done in the documentation of defining a CDP. The problem is looking for something that people consider a place, but is it comparable in geography? The difficulty is what is considered a CDP in the East may not be the same as West.
- Continuity and comparability of geographies is what the Census Bureau is trying to accomplish. The Census Bureau takes a national perspective, which caused some issues because PSAP participants looked at it from a more local perspective and are not thinking of the needs of data users in other parts of the country.
- The Census Bureau is concerned with the continuity of data, for example, longitudinal studies.
- SDCs have been concerned about the delineation of CDPs because the Census Bureau's headquarters made changes from the original information that was submitted by local areas. There seems to be a communication problem between the Census Bureau and PSAP participants. The Census Bureau realizes there is much more that could have been done to alleviate the confusion. Lessons have been learned and will be used for improvement next time.
- The use of non-visible features as boundaries: the Census Bureau is excited about using this feature in the CDP program. This provides the ability to define boundaries more accurately. More PSAP participants elected to use this feature than what the Census Bureau had expected.

- Minimum population threshold: there is none for CDPs, but the Census Bureau was looking for a minimum population threshold during their review, 10 persons. The reason for this is that the Census Bureau was concerned about the quality of ACS data that would be tabulated for CDPs.
- A few observations from the Census Bureau in looking towards the future: the Census Bureau has an abundance of resources available to provide information about these areas. California and Texas also have handbooks available to aid the Census Bureau. These types of resources should be shared so the Census Bureau can check the information.
- There is the Geographic Names Information System, which is a repository of geographic names for Federal agencies. The problem is that this source is not always up-to-date. Sometimes different racial groups have different names for places.
- One thing that GEO is planning to do in the future is taking a look at the Census Bureau's place concept. There are some places that are technically unincorporated, but have boundaries and may have a local government. For example, CDPs in Hawaii have described boundaries. GEO should see what kinds of changes should be made to describe what people consider a place, but it does not follow the Census Bureau's current definition.
- A question was asked as to whether there will be opportunities to update CDPs throughout the decade because of the continual release of ACS? GEO does not have the funds to perform a continual update. Some changes will be made if over 50% of an area is annexed by a town or if a CDP is deleted. This is an issue that the Census Bureau does need to look at going forward. Because there is no funding available for continual updates, the Census Bureau is looking at conducting some pilot projects. There needs to be a mechanism in place to keep up with changing geographies.
- In reviewing the "place" concept, how does the Census Bureau envision this and how can the SDCs be partners? GEO thinks SDCs will need to have a role and be close to the process. A consistent definition is necessary across different data programs.
- DADS II will have a new feature that allows users to create user-defined areas. Does this mechanism provide a way to track areas that users create? Census Bureau has not thought of something as detailed as this.
- What about incorporated areas that dissolve, does it automatically become a CDP? Not always. The Census Bureau will look at all of these dissolutions and if it still resembles a community, they will classify it as a CDP, but the change to a CDP is not automatic. This may become a bigger issue for areas if economic hard times continue.

**Redistricting Update** – *Cathy McCully, Chief, Redistricting Data Office* (handouts)

- May 26: A letter was sent out to state legislators regarding the delivery addresses for the redistricting product that will be sent out in early 2011.
- There has been discussion about making SDCs official liaisons for Redistricting.
- The Redistricting Office is setting up an office to conduct the shipping of items.
- The maps will be on a DVD.
- There could be total of 4 deliveries. The block assignment file might be a 4<sup>th</sup> delivery.
- The first week of February is data delivery, which will take place Monday-Thursday. The Redistricting Office will contact recipients Tuesday-Friday to confirm that the data was received. After confirmation, the data will then be deployed on AFF.
- There will be no embargo for the data. SDC leads will be getting the data at the same time as the Governors and State Legislatures. The Redistricting Office is asking SDCs to wait to share data until the bi-partisan receipt of data is confirmed by the Redistricting Office. Information will be up on AFF the next day after confirmation. No confirmations will be done on Sundays.
- Within the data there will be new housing unit data and data for school districts.
- Suggestion: In October when all SDCs are meeting, have the Redistricting Office go over the details of delivery and when the data can be shared.
- An advanced table with Group Quarters (GQ) data will be released in May 2011. This release was driven by a grassroots effort to push the Census Bureau to reassign the prisoner population. Releasing the table early was the best that the Census Bureau could offer and it also helps the Count Question Resolution (CQR) effort.
- Users will have to go through the VTDs (voter districts) to get the GQ data by block. The information is downloadable on FTP site only, not AFF.

- Right now, two states have passed legislation to reassign the prisoner population for redistricting purposes.
- The Department of Justice (DOJ) has asked Census Bureau to produce Citizenship by Voting Age Population (CVAP) by race. The reason for this request is because the DOJ thought it would be a public service for community organizations and advocacy groups to have this information available. The availability will be through the DOJ.
- The PL 94-171 data format will be the same as 2000.
- The Redistricting Law 2010 is on the website of National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL). At the next NCSL meeting in Kentucky, there will be a 2 hour session where a handful of states will present their lessons learned and feedback on Phase 2 of Redistricting. Indiana, Illinois, and Maryland will be presenting.

#### **Remarks from the Director – Dr. Robert Groves**

- The Steering Committee would like to know the ways in which the SDC network can continue to help the Census Bureau.
- One way the SDCs would like help is in maintaining the Master Address File (MAF) throughout decade. The Director commented that right now this effort is not funded. There is great sentiment about changing the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) program for the future. The level of cooperation with LUCA is also a concern because local governments elected not to participate for 2010. There are a lot of ideas on the table, such as sample-based updating. There is hope that this endeavor will be funded. Getting funding for this will not be easy in this economic environment.
- Corporate Priority Setting Process - This is not trying to do things new and better, but rather improving the things the Census Bureau already does at a lower cost. The proposals are not innovative driven.
- The combined role of Regional Offices, SDCs, and CICs: Should there be a re-thinking of the roles of these groups? After each decennial census there seems to be a need to re-think the organization of the Regional Offices. Are there different functions for Regional Offices? What is sustainable and what is not?
- SDCs are concerned about ACS training. The Steering Committee thinks that it is important that the Census Bureau have people available for training. Maybe the Regional Offices could also help with training?
- The Steering Committee thinks it would be helpful to have talking points about 5-year ACS data. The Director thinks this is very important and there should be talking points available now for the SDCs.
- Director: Advertising for 2010 was successful and there is an idea that keeping census awareness through the decade would be beneficial, keeping the census subject out there. But, funding is not available for any big advertising during the decade.
- The Steering Committee reiterated that the embargo status is something that is very important for SDCs and hopes this issue will be resolved soon.
- What about SDCs listed as contact for ACS data questions? Currently, SDC contacts are listed on the Census Bureau's website for other data news releases.
- The Steering Committee also asked about an Advanced Query option and the Director said he has been briefed on this matter, but does not have much information about it and needs to get together with Tom Mesenbourg to follow-up on this concern.

#### **Planning the 2020 Census – Daniel Weinberg, Assistant Director for ACS and Decennial Census (PowerPoint Presentation and handout)**

- The Census Bureau has been working on planning for the 2020 Census since 2008.
- The rising costs associated with the 2010 census were due to the increase cost of operations. These costs were due to declining self-response rates, hiring a large field staff, paper-based and labor intensive methods requiring a large infrastructure. There was also a huge investment in address canvassing.
- A strategic plan has been developed with four major goals: 1) an accurate and complete census 2) embraced and valued results, 3) an efficient census, and 4) a well-managed census.
- There are 11 planning principles that are driving potential research projects: reduces costs, improve quality, reduce field timeline, tailored response modes, leverage ACS (internet testing for response

mode), supports continual frame updating, supports agile decision-making, reuses data, leverage systems and methods, leverages partnerships, and supports organizational solutions (see PowerPoint Presentation for details of each).

- Process: solicit ideas from Census Bureau staff and stakeholders, consolidate ideas, assess potential research projects against planning principles, and select and support research projects.
- Slide 7: Design concept, flow chart.
- Slide 8: Six operational design alternatives, designed by six alternative enumeration methods, modest change to radical change (read left-to-right).
- Key research areas: automated data collection, for example, how to integrate technology, reengineered field structure, use of administrative records, and general design questions.
- Early research is necessary to make design decisions, i.e. if targeted address canvassing is needed, or if there will be an internet response.
- Next steps: development of research agenda, working on program and system engineering strategies, look for opportunities to leverage work on other programs such as the ACS internet testing response.
- This presentation focuses on how the information is collected, not the content of the questionnaire. A separate process is used to determine content. OMB leads the effort on race and ethnicity measurement.
- A suggestion was put forth in regards to the enumeration of snowbirds in the future: put a usual residence question back on the decennial survey. This question was asked in previous decennial censuses.
- SDCs and CICs are one way the Census Bureau gathers stakeholders' concerns.
- It is critical to the Census Bureau to make it easy to respond, but also needs to make sure the right person is answering, and the response is associated with the right geography.

**Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMA) Delineation Plans/Training Update** – *April Avnayim and Colleen Joyce, GEO* (handout)

- In previous monthly conference calls, the Steering Committee and GEO talked about PUMA Delineation, where GEO proposed that the Delineation process could occur during the 2011 SDC annual meeting. After providing feedback, it has been determined that a three day time period would not be enough time.
- The Census Bureau would create an ArcGIS extension or MAF/Tiger Partnership Software (MTPS) standalone software to use for the delineation.
- The new idea for PUMA Delineation is a hybrid of previous suggestions: training during the annual meeting and getting started on the PUMA Delineation and then have the states finish up the work back in their home state. After the 2011 annual meeting, the states would have 2 months to complete the Delineation.
- A suggestion was proposed as to whether the states can see the software before they go to the training during the annual meeting and if there was a way for the states to take a training module back home, such as having it web based. The reason for this is because the person coming to the meeting for training may not be the only person working on the Delineation.
- Suggestions on boundaries to include in software: all geography boundaries and the 2000 PUMAs.
- The suggested PUMA criteria: build off county and tracts, not incorporated places. There is a concern about incorporated places because these boundaries change and if PUMA boundary changes are made, it creates issues with the data. Census tracts do not change throughout the decade. A handout was provided with information about the planned 2010 PUMA Delineation proposed criteria.
- Ask Tree States if they are familiar with MTPS, GIS, and who will be doing the PUMA Delineation. Maybe do a webinar?

**2010 Census Update (NRFU, Vacant/Delete Check)** – *Frank Vitrano, Decennial Management Division (DMD)*

- NRFU is the largest census operation and it began May 1. During the first week there were 586,000 workers and an initial workload of 48 million cases. June 15: 47 million cases. Approximately 470,000 addresses were added at the beginning of operations. At this point, \$1.5 billion has been spent on NRFU, which is 66% of total funds, which is lower than expected. It was expected that 83% would be used by this point.

- There was a backlog of completed cases due to the limited number of users that could be on the system, but the Census Bureau has worked through the backlog.
- NRFU re-interview started May 7, which would be about 5.5% of NRFU cases (1.5 million cases). Improvements: Computer matching of original interview and re-interview. So far, 1.2 million cases have been collected from the field. The budget for re-interview is close to what was expected to be used.
- It is expected that the NRFU operation will end on time.
- Vacant/Delete check is an independent follow-up on houses that were deemed vacant or non-existent during NRFU. Different enumerators will check the vacant houses, which are estimated to be 14-15 million households. The addresses that were added to the list after the list was created will also be checked. These new addresses include those from the United State Postal Service (USPS), Count Review, New Construction, LUCA Appeals late responders and those in Update/Leave areas. July 24 is when this operation will begin and it will end August 25.

#### **Field Verification Update (including Be Counted forms) – Maryann Chapin, DMD**

- The Field Verification operation is a final status check for certain address records from Non-ID and particular categories of housing-level cases identified through the person-matching that is performed for Coverage Follow-Up. The Field Verification operation is not an enumeration operation. This operation starts in August and ends in September.
- The Field Verification operation is managed out of the Local Census Offices (LCOs), but the system to control the work is run out of the Regional Census Centers (RCCs).
- If a Be Counted form did not match to an address already in the 2010 Census and the Census Bureau was able to geocode the form, it was included as part of the Field Verification workload and if the address is verified to exist in the block to which it was geocoded and was not a duplicate of another address already in the address list, the address was accepted.
- Would it be possible to get a flow chart on how Be Counted forms are processed? DMD will look into it. *On August 24, Frank Ambrose forwarded this flow chart to all Steering Committee members via e-mail.*
- A question was asked about how the Service-Based enumeration went. The Census Bureau thinks it went well. There were more outdoor locations than anticipated. The homeless population is counted at locations where they were counted, at that site.

#### **Count Question Resolution (Federal Register Notice Q&A) – Sharon Boyer, DMD (handout)**

- A copy of the Federal Register Notice for the 2010 Census Count Question Resolution Program (CQR) was provided.
- Island areas, overseas military population counts, and the population of individual housing units are not in scope for CQR.
- There are three categories that can be considered for a challenge through CQR: boundaries, geocoding issues, and coverage.
- Highest Elected Officials (HEOs) can submit a challenge, or designate a person to challenge for the particular area.
- For challenges that result in a correction, the Census Bureau will issue new certified official population counts for each affected government.
- The CQR corrected population counts will be incorporated in the base for the intercensal population estimates starting in December 2012.
- Corrected counts will be published in an errata report that will be revised on a flow basis and will include block level data, available on the Census Bureau's Web site and on AFF

#### **Count Review Update and Role of SDCs – Craig Cruse, POP (PowerPoint Presentation and handouts)**

- For the Housing Unit Review, 32 states participated and compared 32 million housing unit records. During the Review, states were asked to identify clusters of 30 or more missing housing units.
- 88,501 missing housing unit records were sent to GEO for further processing and 86,000 of these records were sent to Field Division for the Vacant/Delete operation.

- For the GQ Review that will occur in August, 42 states and Puerto Rico will be participating. Participants will see population counts for GQs and will identify missing or misallocated units.
- The GQ Review is limited to certain GQ types, such as dormitories, jails/prisons, nursing homes, and military quarters. These GQ types typically cover 80% of the GQ population. It is also easier to verify and corroborate data for these types of GQs. A handout was provided outlining the types of GQs that are in scope for the Review.
- If there are any unresolved GQs, they could go to CQR.

**Enhanced Planning Database (EPD) – A continuation of dialogue with DMD, needs going forward towards 2020 – Kevin Deardorff, DMD**

- Previously, the Steering Committee has participated in conference calls with DMD regarding EPD.
- The Hard-to-Count (HTC) score is the most important element of EPD.
- For the future, it would be beneficial if EPD has a mapping component. For example, Maryland downloaded HTC data and overlaid a map.
- The Steering Committee should solicit information from the SDCs about how they used the EPD and take that information to the annual meeting in October.
- California downloaded information from the EPD and put the information in a handbook for local governments and Complete Count Committees to use for Census 2010.
- Timing for EPD is critical because last time around the information was released too late for the SDCs to use in Census 2010 planning.
- The Steering Committee needs to get back to DMD about things that should be included in the EPD that are not in there now.
- New weights for HTC using Census 2010 data.
- Another item that would have been useful was to incorporate the mail participation rate into the EPD with a mapping component.

Friday, June 18, 2010

**Boundary Annexation Survey (BAS) Evaluation (improvement for 2011) – Laura Waggoner, GEO**

- For the 2010 BAS, there were a significant number of paper submissions and also a large number of digital.
- For the Boundary Validation Program (BVP), materials have been sent out only to places that sent in BAS. Not every local government will get BVP. In the BVP certifications received so far, a high percentage of them are no changes and all submissions are in paper format.
- Right now, BAS is in the midst of State Certification. State Certification involves the states that require boundary changes reported to a state agency to verify that the information received from BAS is correct. State Certification includes a list of annexations and keying dates.
- The BAS homepage has annexations listed on the website and the most current set of BAS maps.
- This fall, the 2011 BAS maps will be posted, possibly in October.
- Shape files are a new feature of the BAS website. But, they are not Tiger/Line, they are just for people to look at boundaries.
- BAS is required to get an 86% response rate on all materials shipped.
- BAS schedule: in years ending in 8, 9, and 10 all local governments are sent BAS. Years ending in 2 and 7, areas with 2,500 people or greater receive BAS, and geographies with 5,000 or more in population receive BAS in years ending in 1,3,4,5, and 6. All counties regardless of population size get BAS every year.
- One of BAS' biggest expenses is shipping and plotting to paper. To help alleviate some of the cost, BAS does have an Advanced Response method. This entails an e-mail, fax, or letter asking local governments if they have any changes to submit. BAS will e-mail first, then fax, and lastly, send a letter. Maps are available online for local governments to view. Two questions are asked in Advanced Response: Does the local government need materials sent to them and are there any contact changes for BAS or HEO? Both the BAS contact and HEO receive the Advanced Response in September-October. The Advanced Response is sent to every entity.

- There is a short turnaround on Advanced Response and this is the reason why SDCs do not help with an Advanced Response follow-up.
- The Advanced Response letter is an opt-out letter.
- In 2011, local governments are able to choose the medium for response mode.
- GEO would like to have e-mail addresses for every contact. The SDCs offered to help update the missing e-mail addresses. BAS said they could send an extract file of contacts with missing e-mail addresses.
- The deadline for BAS submissions will be March 1 from now on.
- Question: What about having a Regional Office geographer go to State municipalities to train them on BAS? This is a good idea, but Regional Offices may not have the funds to send geographers.
- BAS does send out notices about training sessions that are available for people performing the BAS review and will set up training locations.
- What about webinars for training? BAS is looking into it, perhaps have web based training videos.

#### **Evaluation of 2010 Census Operations Discussion – Pam Schenker, SDC Steering Committee Chair**

- The Steering Committee would like to send out an evaluation to all SDCs regarding the 2010 Census.
- Use the survey to gauge SDCs involvement in the 2010 Census; some may have been limited in how involved. What was the SDCs role in the 2010 Census?
- The Steering Committee needs to decide what types of questions will be asked and what the final product is going to be using the information obtained from the evaluation. One suggestion was broad summaries.
- CLMSO has sent a survey to SDCs gauging how they helped with Census 2010 promotions.
- The Steering Committee's evaluation will be done over a long period of time.
- Will use Google Docs to get topics going for the evaluation.
- Another suggestion was to use part of the evaluation to gauge the health of the SDC network.
- There was an idea of having focus groups during the annual meeting to gather information about the evaluation. Have Steering Committee members talk with their tree states during this time.

#### **SDC Network Planning and Steering Committee Business Meeting**

- Topics for discussion include Steering Committee elections, annual meeting planning, and review of by-laws.
- In regards to the creation of SF1 profiles, a survey was sent to SDC leads to gauge the need and help available for this endeavor.
- Twenty-two evaluations have been received so far. SF1 was the highest priority with ACS profiles next. Most SDCs wanted it based on popular items in either a PDF or Excel file format.
- July 9 is the due date for sending in evaluations.
- Based on the survey there is a lack of programming volunteers. The programmers for the 2010 SF1 profile will probably be the same that helped in 2000.
- One of the next steps for the SF1 profiles is to develop a timeline. Perhaps CICs can be involved in the process. Also, send out a design of profile and get comments from the SDCs.
- Since there is an interest in an ACS profile, New York has done a lot in table selection. If an ACS profile is created the focus should be on 5-year data.
- A Google Docs will be created for Steering Committee members to provide input on the meeting agenda for the annual meeting in October.
- DADS II training will be one of the items for the meeting. The SDCs will be able to test the new AFF. Frank Ambrose of CLMSO provided a copy of an e-mail that lists the sessions for DADS II training. There are a limited number of participants for each session. Multiple sessions will have to occur to ensure every state and territory has a chance to test the new system. The challenge is the limited number of participants in the training rooms. While states are in the computer labs, Steering Committee members can meet with their Tree States.
- ACS training should also be a session during the meeting.
- The Steering Committee has talked about creating a document that shows the building blocks of census data. How one set of data feeds into the development of other data and how important it is to have correct data.

- Another session could be used for presenting best practices and also time for networking.
- Other networking opportunities during the annual meeting include having a social event scheduled for the SDCs, perhaps dinner together.
- In regards to the format of the annual meeting, should the Steering Committee push for a more informal discussion format? The Steering Committee needs to decide what presentations should be more discussion, find a balance between presentations and discussion. Perhaps assign Steering Committee members to monitor time and Question & Answer (Q & A) sessions.
- During the annual meeting, have lunch with Census experts, census staff from various divisions such as Economics, International.
- Steering Committee elections are coming up. Sue Copella has volunteered to coordinate this effort. A SDC elections schedule was provided. The Missouri SDC will again provide the mechanism for states to vote.
- July 26 is the deadline for comments on the CQR Federal Register Notice. Should there be a joint response from the Steering Committee?
- In August, the Steering Committee should get a list of new SDC Leads from CLMSO. There was a suggestion to have Steering Committee members mentor the new SDC leads.
- The Steering Committee should review the by-laws to see if anything needs to be addressed or cleared up. Any potential changes should be forwarded to Lenny Gaines. He will be coordinating this effort.
- There is also a timing issue of changing the by-laws. Changes need to be voted on at the annual meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12 pm.