

Test Project Plan

Hard to Capture/Enumerate Addresses

What – project purpose and description?
<p>Overall Goal (broad intention/ not tangible/ cannot be validated) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine how to best list addresses so that hidden/hard-to-label addresses are placed on the address list and done in such a way as to make them useful for enumeration • Explore the implications of a targeted address canvassing strategy for capturing these addresses
<p>Objectives (narrow and precise/ tangible and measurable/ can be validated/contribute to the fulfillment of specified goal):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a pilot that would provide input to the Census Bureau on how to continuously update hard to capture address data • Inform the effort to identify the attributes of areas that will/will not need an address canvass in 2019 • Inform the effort to better determine the modes of census data collection that will be needed for hidden/hard-to-label units • Inform the feasibility of a targeted address canvassing for capturing these units in the decennial enumeration (with implications for the American Community Survey)
<p>Scope (things explicitly included or excluded such as geographic entities, levels of entities, types of data):</p> <p>The geographic scope of addresses that are hidden/hard-to-label crosscuts urban and rural areas, so the scope needs to include test cases in cities, suburbs and rural areas. “Hidden units” occur in the attics and basements of large-city multi-unit buildings, as well as in the “units” that house migrant farm workers in rural area.</p> <p>While the actual enumeration of units may not be a “geographic” issue, fact is that the pilot needs to include consideration related to the methods used to count units, especially related to Type of Enumeration Area (TEA)</p>
<p>Project Tasks/ Summary of Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a cross section of hard to count addresses, stratifying by a series of variables to be determined. • Tackle the high-level definitional issues in the creation of MAF addresses for hidden and hard-to-label units – how are these addresses currently listed?

Group Members: Joe Salvo, Eileen Jacobs, Jack Baker, Carol Rogers, Shoreh Elhami, Walter Schwarm, Maryann Chapin, Karen Owens

- **“Trace” the group of addresses that are deemed to be good examples of different types of problems through the multi-year path from initial LUCA, through address canvass and into and out of the 2010 enumeration. How were these addresses treated in the past? How were they labeled? What kind of TEA was assigned? How were the data collected in the enumeration? Learn what happened and then move forward.**
- **On the ground, attempt to define/ID/label categories of hard to count addresses – buildings/units with no good access, no good TIGER/MAF addresses etc.**
- **Reality-test solutions using Census Bureau evaluation of the *Job Aid* for labeling hard-to-count units, the history uncovered in this exercise, the results of the enumeration, and, most important, the on-the-ground knowledge of local partners.**
- **Explore how best to pass on the information gained above to the Census Bureau on a regular basis.**
- **Explore the results of the analysis of the cross-section on the historic capture of these units (or lack thereof) to inform the Bureau's understanding of the implications of these processes for the feasibility of targeted address canvassing**

Success Criteria (How will success be measured? Is there consideration for whether the objectives have been met and if goal has been fulfilled? Can the pilot be considered a success if only a portion of the objectives are met?):

- **Do we have a better understanding of the criteria for an on-the-ground definition of residence?**
- **Did we provide information on the best way to list hidden/hard-to-label addresses, so that they have a fair shot at being enumerated?**
- **Did we reality-test criteria that may be used to determine whether areas will receive an address canvass in 2019?**
- **Do we have a better description of the process of capture for these units and the implications**

for the concept of a targeted address canvassing?

Why –pros/cons/overall implications

Positive Impacts Expected from conducting project:

- **Learn how to list addresses that are hidden/hard-to-label such that they can be successfully enumerated**
- **Determine areas where an abundance of these addresses exist, so that a strategy can be constructed to canvass these places in 2019 (and not canvass those areas where simple city – style addresses are the norm)**
- **Provide guidance to the Census Bureau on how to structure partnerships to share the burden of efforts to identify places with hidden/hard-to-label addresses**
- **Put in place the initial stages of a continuous address list update operation with localities**
- **Pilot partners can help the Census Bureau assemble a list of local groups that may possess vital information that can be used to improve the enumeration through a better address list**
- **Assess the feasibility of a targeted address canvassing operation for capturing hard to capture addresses**

Negative Impacts Expected from conducting project:

None

Constraints (policy barriers/ perceived funding shortcomings/ political considerations/other):

- **Title13 - Pilot partners would need to get special sworn status and their relationship with local community groups can create confidentiality concerns regarding**

Group Members: Joe Salvo, Eileen Jacobs, Jack Baker, Carol Rogers, Shoreh Elhami, Walter Schwarm, Maryann Chapin, Karen Owens

<p>undocumented immigrants and illegal housing units</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the state of municipal budgets and those of other partners, the pilot effort would likely require financial support beyond the provision of in-kind services • Address list work could take place through the RDC network, which may be difficult for some

<p>How – basic requirements to make the project possible</p>
<p>Participants (direct, indirect, and peripheral participants):</p>
<p>Resources Required (time/people – expertise/technology/funding/other):</p>
<p>Administrative Infrastructure (What/Whom are needed to <u>manage</u> the project start-to-finish?):</p>

Notes from Hard to Capture Addresses Presentation

- **Goal/Objectives**
 - Implement a pilot that would provide input to the Census Bureau on how to continuously update hard to capture address data
 - Start with a cross section of hard to count addresses
 - Focus on creating a listing of housing units
 - Tackle high-level definitional issues all the way down to details like how to get past the doorman
 - On the ground, attempt to define/ID/label categories of hard to count addresses
- **Project Tasks**

Group Members: Joe Salvo, Eileen Jacobs, Jack Baker, Carol Rogers, Shoreh Elhami, Walter Schwarm, Maryann Chapin, Karen Owens

- Compare 2 MAFs. Follow a set of hard to capture addresses over time
- Perform damage assessment
- Engage with pilot partners on these hard to count addresses
- Positive Impacts
 - Provide guidance to the Census Bureau on how to structure partnerships
 - Create criteria for a targeted address canvas
 - Provide input to a continuously updated address process

Discussion – Hard to Capture Addresses

There was initially some concern about how pilot partners could participate given Title 13 constraints. This will need to be worked out, though special sworn status-type options are available.

Tim Trainor asked if this pilot proposal is just LUCA-like, or works toward something more. The group answered that no, this is not LUCA, it's a continuously updated census address list. It will also be distinguishable from LUCA because of the emphasis in the pilot to engage with non-traditional partners like non-profits and charitable organizations. In addition to creating criteria and categories for hard to count populations, the pilot will create a list of groups and local partners who know about these populations.