

2020 Census Program Management Review

2020 Census Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) Program

Brian Timko
Decennial Directorate

April 8, 2015

Outline

- LUCA Background
- LUCA Improvement Research
- LUCA Improvement Recommendations
- Current Activities/Next Steps

LUCA Background

The LUCA program was designed based on requirements specified by the [Census Address List Improvement Act of 1994 \(Public Law 103-430\)](#) which provides an opportunity for designated representatives of local, state, and tribal governments to review the addresses used to conduct the decennial census.

Background (continued)

LUCA 1998/99: First opportunity for tribal and local governments to review and update the Census Bureau's address list.

2010 LUCA: Based on Census 2000 feedback, three participation options were offered:

- Option 1: Title-13 Full Address List Review (similar to LUCA 1998)
- Option 2: Title-13 review, full address list submission
 - Partners provide their entire residential address list with access to Title-13 addresses
- Option 3: Non-Title-13, full address list submission
 - Partners provide their entire residential address list without access to Title-13 addresses

Comparing LUCA 1998 and 2010 LUCA

- The 2010 Census LUCA program provided over six times as many addresses than the 2000 Census LUCA program.
- The 2010 Census LUCA program provided nearly twice as many “new to census” addresses than the 2000 Census LUCA program.
- The 2000 Census LUCA Program provided more “new to census” enumerated LUCA records than the 2010 program.

Comparing LUCA 1998 and 2010 LUCA

LUCA 1998	2010 LUCA
6.2 Million addresses submitted by 6,230 participants	41.7 Million addresses submitted by 7,641 participants
0.9 Million matched to existing MAF records	32.6 Million matched to existing MAF records
5.3 Million new addresses added to the MAF	9.1 Million new addresses added to the MAF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.4 Million addresses enumerated (63.2 percent) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.9 Million addresses enumerated (31.8 percent)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.9 Million deleted addresses (36.8 percent deleted) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.2 Million deleted addresses (68.2 percent deleted)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 63.2 percent enumeration rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.8 percent enumeration rate

2020 LUCA Improvement Research

- To develop potential alternative designs for LUCA 2020 based on research by four subteams
 - Looking Back at 2010 (assessments, surveys, lessons learned)
 - Impact of Geographic Support System Initiative (GSS-I) on LUCA (utilizing address data, software and processes for LUCA)
 - Reengineered Address Canvassing's impact on LUCA (in-office validation)
 - Focus Groups

LUCA Recommendations

1. Continue the 2010 Census LUCA Program improvements that were successful
 - Continue to provide a 120-day review time for participants.
 - Continue the six month advance notice about the LUCA program registration
 - Continue a comprehensive communication program with participants
 - Continue to provide a variety of LUCA media types
 - Continue to improve the partnership software application
 - Continue State participation in the LUCA program
2. Eliminate the full address list submission options that were available in 2010 LUCA (Options 2 and 3). This will:
 - Reduce the number of deleted LUCA records in field verification activities
 - Reduce the burden and cost of processing addresses and LUCA address validation

LUCA Recommendations (continued)

3. Reduce the complexity of the Local Update of Census Addresses Program
4. Include census housing unit location coordinates in the census address list and allow partners to return their housing unit location coordinates as part of their submission
5. Provide any ungeocoded United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File addresses to State and County partners
6. Provide the address list in more standard formats
7. Conduct an in-office validation of LUCA submitted addresses
8. Utilize GSS-I data and tools to validate LUCA submissions

LUCA Recommendations (continued)

9. Encourage governments at the lowest level to work with higher-level governments to consolidate their submission.
10. Eliminate the Block Count Challenge
11. Eliminate the use of the asterisk (*) designation for multi-units submitted without unit designations
12. Encourage LUCA participants to identify addresses used for mailing, location, or both

Current Activities/Next Steps

- In-office validation processes, procedures, and tools development.
 - Current small scale testing with the In-Office Verification Group (consisting of LUCA, Non-ID Processing, and In-Office Canvassing staff)
 - Larger test using partner-supplied addresses prior to the 2017 Census Test and comparing the results to the Address Canvassing results
 - Define relationship between Administrative Records and LUCA and determine whether Administrative Records can be used as an independent source of validating LUCA submitted addresses
- Define relationship between Address Canvassing and LUCA, taking into consideration the timing of LUCA feedback and the appeals operation.

Current Activities/Next Steps (continued)

- Investigate the technical recommendations for 2020 LUCA:
 - Use of background imagery on paper maps
 - Ability to provide structure locations within LUCA materials
 - Feasibility of web based registration
- Develop and test LUCA component of the Geographic Update Partnership Software (GUPS) software
- Determine feasibility of using areas where we have planned field activities to validate LUCA records
- Work with OMB to develop a 2020 LUCA Appeals process, defining the appropriate appeals office will largely depend on the design of LUCA and the design of Address Canvassing and how Address Canvassing will be used to validate LUCA submissions.
- Determine the relationship between late decade GSS-I and LUCA.

Questions

census.2020.program.management.review@census.gov