

Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) Appeals

Executive Summary

The Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) program was an opportunity offered to local governments to review the accuracy of, and make revisions to, the U.S. Census Bureau's Master Address Files (MAF). The MAF is used to distribute Census forms for the decennial census. The Local Update of Census Addresses Appeals project was the second and final phase of the LUCA program. Similar to the first phase of LUCA, Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council (G/FLRPC) acted as the liaison for all participating counties and municipalities in the region. The intent of this program was to appeal addresses that were not accepted in the original LUCA process by confirming the existence of as many rejected addresses as possible. These addresses were then returned to the Census Bureau with proof/evidence of their existence.

G/FLRPC received files for eight out of the nine Counties in the G-FL Region (excluding Ontario County) on October 31st 2009. The Census Bureau originally gave reviewers 30 calendar days to complete the appeal, but later this deadline was extended to 45 days. The Ontario County files were received November 24th 2009.

Many of the addresses submitted to the Census Bureau during the original LUCA submission were accepted (see Table 1). It is important to note that all of the addresses accepted were not new addresses to be added to the Census Master Address File (MAF); many were already present in the original MAFs but were accepted as corrections.

A large number of addresses were not accepted from the first round of LUCA and were returned to G/FLRPC with the potential to be appealed (see Table 1). These addresses were rejected for a number of reasons. The two most common reasons were the Census Bureau not being able to find the location of the addresses during field verification, or the addresses did not appear to be residential properties. Some of these addresses should have been accepted, and would later be appealed. During the first round of LUCA, G/FLRPC chose to submit all addresses that had the potential of being accepted. The number of rejected addresses was inflated because the Census Bureau included many duplicate addresses in the files that were returned, which needed to be deleted because they were not able to be appealed. The Census Bureau also included addresses in the returned files that were deleted during address canvassing independent of the addresses originally submitted during the first phase of LUCA (see Table 1). The Census Bureau allowed these address deletions to be appealed during the process along with the rejected addresses.

In order to appeal addresses, the Census Bureau required the submission of quality address sources in order to prove that each of the addresses in question existed as residences. Before the Census materials arrived at G/FLRPC, the original LUCA address submission sources were reexamined to determine which were of a high enough quality to use in an appeal and which were not. Further information was collected and submitted to the Census in order to illustrate the strength and validity of each source. This source

information included frequency of updates, update methods, quality assurance measures, uses of data, and inclusion of property use labels. Some sources did not have enough information distinguishing residential addresses from other addresses, or mailing addresses from location addresses so they could not be used as proof. The sources that were used to file the appeal included County files such as Office of Real Property Services files, E911 files, voter registration files, and utility files, as well as a multitude of local municipal sources.

When the address files were received from the Census Bureau, G/FLRPC started the review process by first formatting the files and sources of proof to be consistent with each other. This was necessary in order to be able to use queries to compare the files. Next, as many duplicate addresses as possible were deleted.

In order to be able to submit the maximum amount of appeals with quality proof in the given time frame, G/FLRPC reached out to the county planning departments from across the Region to determine if they would be interested in giving some assistance in the process, as well as finding out if their municipalities could be involved individually. Some counties agreed to give us assistance, as did a number of municipalities. This local knowledge and proof that was gathered helped G/FLRPC to be able to appeal more addresses in addition to strengthening the appeal of other addresses.

G/FLRPC then reviewed the rejected addresses as well as the addresses deleted during canvassing and compared them to each of the address sources to determine which to appeal. The final step in the process consisted of combining the G/FLRPC appeals and proof with all of the local appeals done on the county and municipal levels including local proof. The final appeals were then sent back to the Census Bureau.

Table 1 – Address Counts of Census Returned Addresses and G/FLRPC Submitted and Appealed Addresses

County	Submitted	Returned to G/FLRPC			Appealed
		Accepted	Not Accepted	Deleted- Canvassing	
Genesee	9,503	2,714	6,779	1,790	4,489
Livingston	9,923	4,167	5,554	2,102	4,988
Monroe	32,781	13,036	19,671	12,197	16,354
Ontario	18,896	8,453	10,426	3,961	4,914
Orleans	8,611	3,385	5,154	1,168	1,706
Seneca	8,160	3,542	4,618	1,662	2,202
Wayne	7,912	3,753	4,155	2,536	2,072
Wyoming	6,558	2,224	4,330	1,599	1,225
Yates	4,331	1,144	3,154	1,214	727