



This document was prepared by and for Census Bureau staff to aid in future research and planning, but the Census Bureau is making the document publicly available in order to share the information with as wide an audience as possible. Questions about the document should be directed to Kevin Deardorff at (301) 763-6033 or kevin.e.deardorff@census.gov

July 12, 2012

2010 CENSUS PLANNING MEMORANDA SERIES

No. 215

MEMORANDUM FOR The Distribution List

From: Burton Reist *[signed]*
 Acting Chief, Decennial Management Division

Subject: 2010 Census New Construction Assessment Report

Attached is the 2010 Census New Construction Assessment Report. The Quality Process for the 2010 Census Test Evaluations, Experiments, and Assessments was applied to the methodology development and review process. The report is sound and appropriate for completeness and accuracy.

If you have any questions about this document, please contact Scott Davidson at (301) 763-7985.

Attachment

2010 Census New Construction Assessment Report

U.S. Census Bureau standards and quality process procedures were applied throughout the creation of this report.

Scott Davidson and Brian Timko
Geography Division

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background.....	1
2.1	Census 2000 New Construction	1
2.2	2008 Census Dress Rehearsal New Construction	2
2.3	2010 Census New Construction	2
3	Methodology.....	5
4	Limitations.....	5
5	Results	6
5.1	Invitation and Registration	6
5.1.1	How many eligible entities were invited and registered to participate in the 2010 Census NC program and what are their characteristics?	6
5.1.2	How many eligible entities were invited and registered to participate in the 2010 Census 2010 Census NC Program and what are their characteristics?.....	8
5.1.3	How many eligible governments were invited and did not register to participate in the 2010 Census NC program, and what are their characteristics?	17
5.1.4	What were the map media choices of registered participants?	26
5.2	Characteristics of Addresses and Returns	30
5.2.1	How many active participants submitted an address list and/or spatial returns?	30
5.3	Detailed Processing Results	37
5.3.1	How many participant address files and addresses were processed and what were the processing results and characteristics of the address records?	37
5.4	Schedule Deviations.....	62
5.4.1	How did baseline start and finish dates compare with actual start and finish dates in the 2010 Master Activity Schedule (MAS)?	62
6	Help Desk Call Statistics	64
6.1	New Construction Questions to the Technical Help Desk	64
7	Key Lessons Learned, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	67
7.1	Key Lessons Learned	67
7.2	Conclusions.....	68
7.3	Recommendations	73
8	References	74
	Attachment A: Types of Enumeration Area (TEA).....	75
	Attachment B: Detailed Tables.....	76
	Attachment C: 2010 Census NC Program Lessons Learned	116
	Attachment D: Geographic Partnerships Help Desk Lessons Learned.....	121

List of Tables

Table 1.	Registered Participants by Type and Size	6
Table 2.	Distribution of 2010 Census NC Participation Registered Participants by Type and Size.....	7
Table 3.	Registered Entities That Dropped Out	8
Table 4.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Dropped Out.....	10
Table 5.	Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out	11
Table 6.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out.....	12
Table 7.	Entities Returning a Submission	13
Table 8.	Distribution of Entities Returning a Submission.....	14
Table 9.	Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late	15
Table 10.	Distribution of Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late.....	16
Table 11.	Eligible Entities Officially Declining Registration	17
Table 12.	Distribution Breakout of Eligible Entities Officially Declining Registration	18
Table 13.	Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration	19
Table 14.	Distribution of Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration.....	20
Table 15.	Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register.....	21
Table 16.	Distribution of Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register	22
Table 17.	Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media	26
Table 18.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media.....	27
Table 19.	Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media	28
Table 20.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media	29
Table 21.	Usability of NC Files	31
Table 22.	Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time.....	32
Table 23.	Distribution of Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time	33
Table 24.	Entities Returning Feature Updates	34
Table 25.	Entities Sent Past Due Letters.....	36
Table 26.	Addresses Received at RCCs.....	37
Table 27.	Processed Address Lists.....	38
Table 28.	Addresses Rejected in RCCs Preprocessing	39
Table 29.	Addresses Sent to and Processed by HQ	40
Table 30.	New Unmatched Addresses	41
Table 31.	Number of Addresses Enumerated With NC As Initial Source	42
Table 32.	NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses.....	43
Table 33.	NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses Enumerated Via Late Mailing	44
Table 34.	NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract	45
Table 35.	NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract.....	46
Table 36.	NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract That Were Enumerated.....	47
Table 37.	Enumerated NC Addresses Matching an Address Not In the Enumeration Extract	48
Table 38.	NC Addresses Whose Residence Returned a Questionnaire from Late Mail-out Operation	49
Table 39.	NC Addresses Included in Enumeration Extract	50
Table 40.	NC Addresses Sent to and Not Found During Enumeration.....	51
Table 41.	NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Vacant During Enumeration	52
Table 42.	NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Duplicate During Enumeration	53
Table 43.	NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Non-Residential During Enumeration.....	54
Table 44.	Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated	55
Table 45.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated	56
Table 46.	Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing.....	57
Table 47.	Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Values in ADDUP	58
Table 48.	Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Block Numbers	59
Table 49.	Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Duplicate Record In The File.....	60
Table 50.	Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Matched to Existing In-Census Records	61
Table 51.	High-level Summary Of NC Activities.....	62
Table 52.	NC Schedule and Possible Deviations.....	63

Table 53.	NC Help Desk Incoming Calls	64
Table 54.	Duration of NC Calls Received By Help Desk.....	66
Table 55.	Incoming Calls by Type.....	66
Table 56.	Percentage Enumeration Success.....	70
Table 57.	Map Media Selection.....	71
Table 58.	Geocoding Success	72
Table 59.	Distribution of 2010 Census NC Participation Registered Participants by Type and Size	76
Table 60.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Dropped Out	77
Table 61.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out	78
Table 62.	Distribution of Entities Returning a Submission	79
Table 63.	Distribution of Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late.....	80
Table 64.	Distribution of Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration.....	81
Table 65.	Distribution of Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register	82
Table 66.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media.....	83
Table 67.	Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media	84
Table 68.	Distribution of Usability of NC Files.....	85
Table 69.	Distribution of Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time	86
Table 70.	Distribution of Entities Returning Feature Updates.....	87
Table 71.	Distribution of Entities Sent Past Due Letters	88
Table 72.	Distribution of Addresses Received at RCCs	89
Table 73.	Distribution of Processed Address Lists	90
Table 74.	Distribution of Addresses Rejected In RCCs Preprocessing	91
Table 75.	Distribution of Addresses Sent to and Processed By HQ	92
Table 76.	Distribution of New Unmatched Addresses.....	93
Table 77.	Distribution of NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses	94
Table 78.	Distribution of NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract	95
Table 79.	Distribution of NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract	96
Table 80.	Distribution of NC Addresses Whose Residence Returned a Questionnaire From Late Mail-out Operation	97
Table 81.	Distribution of NC Addresses Included In Enumeration	98
Table 82.	Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found During Enumeration	99
Table 83.	Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Not Found During Enumeration	100
Table 84.	Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found Not Marked Vacant During Enumeration.....	101
Table 85.	Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Duplicate During Enumeration.....	102
Table 86.	Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Non-Residential During Enumeration	103
Table 87.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated.....	104
Table 88.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing	105
Table 89.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Values In ADDUP....	106
Table 90.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Block Numbers...107	107
Table 91.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Duplicate Record In File108	108
Table 92.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Matched to Existing In-Census Records.....	109
Table 93.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Noncity-style Address Info In The Street Name	110
Table 94.	Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Noncity-style Address Info In The Street Name	111
Table 95.	2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons	112
Table 96.	2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons Continued.....	113
Table 97.	Distribution of 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons.....	114
Table 98.	Distribution of 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons Continued.....	115

List of Figures

Figure 1.	Eligible NC Entities Reasons For Declining By Type.....	24
Figure 2.	Eligible NC Entities Reasons For Declining By Size	25
Figure 3.	Incoming Calls by Type.....	65
Figure 4.	Registered Entities by Type and Size	68
Figure 5.	Entities of 1,000 or Fewer in Size: Reasons For Declining	69

Executive Summary

The 2010 New Construction program was an integral part of the 2010 Census activities that utilized the expertise of tribal and local governments to improve the accuracy and completeness of the address list used to take the census. The purpose of the program was to account for new housing units built after the 2010 Census Address Canvassing Operation was completed.

This assessment documents the results of the program focusing on the following components:

1. Invitation and registration
2. Characteristics of addresses and returns
3. Detailed processing results
4. Schedule deviations
5. Help Desk call statistics
6. Lessons learned

The U.S. Census Bureau enlisted government participation by inviting the highest elected officials from the 28,683 eligible jurisdictions to participate in the program.

Nearly 21 percent of eligible governments participated in the program. To assist in assigning Census tract and block codes (also known as “geocoding”) for each submitted address, forty-one percent of registrants selected Portable Document Format maps and 59 percent of registrants selected shapefile data.

Of the 5,952 entities that registered, 44 percent or 2,634 returned submissions. Only two percent of submissions were unusable, therefore all other submissions were usable or usable after Regional Census Center staff reviewed them and worked with participants to resolve problems as needed.

Lower level governments such as American Indian Reservations, Places, and Minor Civil Divisions had a higher percentage of submitted new and unmatched addresses than counties. Governmental size played a factor on the enumeration success of New Construction addresses. The smaller the governmental entity the more likely the address that entity submitted would be found and enumerated.

Of the 503,489 addresses submitted for New Construction, a total of 291,627 addresses were sent to enumeration. Of the addresses sent to enumeration, 117,287 addresses were enumerated in the 2010 Census.

The 2010 New Construction program had only minor schedule deviations. Of the 26 high-level activities, 18 activities started on time or earlier and 19 activities finished on time or earlier. The scheduled activity with the largest deviation was related to obtaining clearance from the Office of Management and Budget to conduct the operation, which started 32 days late.

The help desk for the 2010 New Construction program handled 1,099 incoming calls from participants. Of the incoming calls, 994 calls were handled by the Help Desk and the remaining calls were transferred to Regional Census Centers or Census Bureau headquarters staff for appropriate resolutions.

The Decennial Management Division organized multiple lessons learned sessions in order to gather information regarding aspects of program efficacy and areas needing improvement for future New Construction programs. Stakeholders from Geography Division, Field Division, and the contractor staff from the Geographic Partnership Programs Technical Help Desk participated in these sessions. From these lessons learned sessions, Decennial Management Division compiled a document of lessons learned that included the issues being discussed as well as any potential resolutions or recommendations.

For future New Construction programs, there are three recommendations. Encourage governments at the lowest level to either participate or work with larger governments to consolidate their submissions in order to increase the quality of data received for New Construction programs. Communicate and design partnership programs with government size in mind. Update the Master Address File through partnership programs in order to increase the Census Bureau's ability to geocode addresses from the United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File.

1 Introduction

The U.S. Census Bureau conducted the 2010 Census New Construction (NC) program for the 2010 Decennial Census. The 2010 Census NC program provided an opportunity for officials of tribal and local governments to submit a list of city-style addresses for housing units for which basic construction began during or after March 2009 and completion was expected by Census Day, April 1, 2010. The 2010 Census NC program was offered to all jurisdictions that contained areas where the 2010 Census questionnaires would be delivered and returned by mail and had at least one block that is either Type of Enumeration Areas (TEA) 1 or 6 (see Attachment A for a description of the 2010 Census Types of Enumeration Areas). New addresses for units outside the mailout/mailback areas were added to the address list at the time field staff delivered questionnaires.

The Census Bureau, using the participant supplied addresses, either mailed a questionnaire or visited and attempted to enumerate each newly constructed housing unit that was identified as missing from the address list with the purpose of accounting for new housing units built after the 2010 Census Address Canvassing Operation was completed.

The purpose of this assessment is to document the results of the 2010 Census NC program focusing on the following components:

1. Invitation and registration
2. Characteristics of addresses and returns
3. Detailed processing results
4. Schedule deviations
5. Help Desk call statistics
6. Lessons learned

2 Background

The Census Address List Improvement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-430) strengthened the Census Bureau's partnership capabilities with participating governments by expanding the methods the Census Bureau could use to collect address information from tribal and local governments.

2.1 Census 2000 New Construction

The Census 2000 NC program offered local and tribal governments a final opportunity to review the Census 2000 address list and to add new housing unit (HU) and group quarters (GQ) addresses that qualified as missing under program criteria. The NC program was offered only to jurisdictions that had census blocks in which Census 2000 questionnaires were delivered by the U.S. Postal Service, which were the same areas covered by the Local Update of Census

Addresses (LUCA) 1998 program (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). In addition, to participate in the Census 2000 NC program an entity had to have participated in the LUCA 98 program.

NC program participants that participated in the LUCA 98 program could not submit any addresses they disputed during the LUCA program address appeals process. The exception was those addresses not found to exist during the LUCA program, but completed basic construction after the Census 2000 canvassing operation. Special place addresses (i.e., the entity that controls the operations of one or more group quarters) were not included in this program (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Participants were given either a paper or electronic address list for their jurisdiction and could make additions to that list (Vitranò, 2007). They could also make additions and changes to the Census Bureau maps where the street or road associated with the new address was missing or shown incorrectly. The program did not allow for address deletions or corrections or for changes to the governmental unit legal boundaries shown on the maps (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

2.2 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal New Construction

The NC program planned for the 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal was intended to be implemented in the same way as the 2010 Census NC program would be. However, it was removed from the Dress Rehearsal for budgetary reasons (2010 Planning and Coordination Staff, 2007). Due to the cut, the Census Bureau was unable to test improvements made to the program in order to assess how the improvements impacted participation and the quality of addresses for newly constructed housing units.

2.3 2010 Census New Construction

The 2010 Census NC program was similar in scope and operation to the NC program conducted for Census 2000 with the following exceptions:

- The 2010 Census NC program did not include a Title 13 address list because local and tribal governments were already given the opportunity to review Census address lists in the 2010 Census LUCA program. The 2010 Census NC program was a separate program designed exclusively for the purpose of collecting newly constructed housing units built since the 2010 Census Address Canvassing Operation. This change meant that a government did not have to participate in the LUCA program in order to participate in the 2010 Census NC program (2010 Census Detailed Operation Plan for New Construction Operation Group, 2009).
- The 2010 Census NC program excluded paper participation due to time constraints. The time available for receiving and processing addresses into the Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding Referencing System Database (MAF/TIGER DB) for subsequent inclusion in the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup Vacant Delete Check (NRFU VDC) operation was too narrow. Specifically, there was not enough time in the few months of the program to include an address keying operation; all address lists had to be submitted electronically to maintain the schedule (2010 Census Detailed Operation Plan for New Construction Operation Group, 2009).

- The 2010 Census NC program excluded GQ addresses (places where people live or stay in a group living arrangement that is owned or managed by an entity or organization providing housing and/or services for the residents). For the 2010 Census, the Census Bureau had a series of operations, starting in the fall of 2009, designed to capture new GQ addresses, including but not limited to, Group Quarters Validation, Group Quarters Advanced Visit, Group Quarters Enumeration, and the Count Review program (2010 New Construction Program, 2009).
- The 2010 Census NC program excluded feature updates due to time constraints and program scope. There was not enough time for receiving and processing participant updates for their eventual display on maps to support the VDC operation. Therefore, the 2010 Census NC program was exclusively an address update program since feature updates could not be captured in time to benefit the decennial operations (2010 Census Detailed Operation Plan for New Construction Operation Group, 2009).

The 2010 Census NC program was offered to local and tribal jurisdictions that contained census blocks where the Census Bureau planned to mail questionnaires to the HUs. In order to be eligible for the program, entities needed at least one block that is either TEA 1 or 6 (see Attachment A for a description of the 2010 Census Types of Enumeration Areas). Similar to the Census 2000 NC program, state governments were not eligible to participate, since addresses for newly constructed HUs are assigned at a local level of government. Most state governments are not likely to have current, on-the-ground knowledge of construction recently completed or in progress. Nonetheless, local governments wishing to enlist their state governments to assist were free to do so or could indicate to the Census Bureau that their 2010 Census NC program materials should be sent to a state contact. Governments that elected to participate filled out a registration form and designated a 2010 Census NC program liaison to submit their addresses. The Census Bureau then sent the liaison their The 2010 Census NC program materials.

Participants in the 2010 Census NC program were given an address list template record layout on CD-ROM. This template was used to format their local address file for submission. The reference maps were offered in Portable Document Format (PDF) files or the participant could elect to receive the spatial data in shapefile format that required a Geographic Information System (GIS) software application for viewing. For those governments without GIS software, the Census Bureau provided the MAF/TIGER Partnership Software (MTPS). The MTPS is a desktop tool that makes participation easier for jurisdictions without a GIS system. For governments choosing maps in PDF, the Census Bureau provided Adobe Reader software to view the maps. The maps or spatial data were used as a reference for assigning Census tract and block codes (also known as “geocoding”) for each submitted address. Address lists submitted must have included geocoding information in order to be accepted (2010 New Construction Program, 2009).

The 2010 Census NC program liaison then submitted a list of geocoded city-style addresses to the Census Bureau in a predefined format. Only addresses of newly constructed or in-progress housing units not yet in existence at the time of the 2010 Census Address Canvassing Operation could be included and all must have been assigned to a census block within the participant's jurisdiction.

The Census Bureau's program responsibilities included providing the necessary materials to participants, providing technical assistance, and processing and verifying new addresses submitted by 2010 Census NC program participants. In addition, the Census Bureau was responsible for enumerating NC addresses. Any NC address that matched an existing ungeocoded Census address (an address in the Census Bureau's MAF/TIGER database without a Tract/Block code) were included in a late mailout operation for addresses that could not be included in the initial enumeration universe.¹ All other NC addresses were included in the 2010 Census NRFU VDC operation. Geography Division (GEO) responsibilities included coordinating the working group that designed and planned the program, providing materials, providing technical assistance, and processing NC updates from participants. The National Processing Center (NPC) responsibilities included creating data CDs and assembling and shipping participant materials. The Field Division (FLD) responsibilities included providing support to participants and preprocessing incoming addresses.

Participant responsibilities in the 2010 Census NC program included selecting their 2010 Census NC program liaison, signing and returning the registration form, ensuring that everyone working on the program understood the procedures, requirements, terminology, and concepts relevant to participating in the program (2010 New Construction Program, 2009).

Participants were required to complete the registration form and submit it to the Census Bureau by October 8, 2009. The Census Bureau began shipping materials in November 2009. Participants had 45 calendar days from receipt of materials to submit their addresses.

¹ See the 210 Census Late Adds Mailout Assessment and the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup Operations (NRO) Assessment for additional information on the tallies regarding the NC inputs.

3 Methodology

All assessment data tables include a national total in addition to the subtotals described below.

Subtotals are shown by the following government types: federally recognized American Indian Reservations (AIR) tribal governments with reservation and/or trust lands, state, county, incorporated place, and Minor Civil Division (MCD). Also, subtotals will be shown by the size of governments based on the number of addresses within each jurisdiction. In addition, a distribution by media selection will be included where applicable. For example:

- Number and percent of participants by government type, HU count, and media type:
 - AIR, County, Place, and MCD each shown by the number of residential addresses:
 - * 1,000 or fewer
 - * 1,001 – 6,000
 - * 6,001 – 50,000
 - * 50,001 – 100,000
 - * 100,001 – 1,000,000
 - * 1,000,001 or more

The 2010 Census NC program assessment answers questions utilizing files and information from:

1. The 2010 Census NC program Production Control System (PCS) for submission data
2. The Geographic Programs Participant system (GPP) for registration and entity data
3. Data queries run by the GEO programming staff against the Master Address File (MAF) and Address Update Files (ADDUPs) and various product databases related to NC, such as the Final Tabulation Collection product database
4. The 2010 Census Master Activity Schedule (MAS)
5. Lessons learned

4 Limitations

- Not Available

5 Results

The following questions were selected and presented in the 2010 Census NC Assessment Study Plan. Each question is immediately followed by a brief answer, and then more detailed information and analysis is provided, including supporting data tables.

5.1 Invitation and Registration

5.1.1 How many eligible entities were invited and registered to participate in the 2010 Census NC program and what are their characteristics?

a. How many entities were eligible to participate in the 2010 Census NC program?

- 28,683 eligible governments were invited
 - 122 AIRs
 - 2,593 Counties
 - 13,001 Places
 - 12,967 MCDs

b. How many and what percentage of entities registered?

- 5,952 or 20.75 percent of eligible entities registered

A total of 28,683 entities were eligible for participation in the 2010 Census NC program including 122 AIRs, 2,593 Counties, 13,001 Places, and 12,967 MCDs. Of the eligible entities invited to participate, 5,952 or 20.75 percent registered for participation. Registered participants included 15 AIRs, 990 Counties, 3,602 Places, and 1,345 MCDs.

Table 1. Registered Participants by Type and Size

Government Type	Eligible Entities		Registered Entities		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	122	0.43	15	12.30	0.05
County	2,593	9.04	990	38.18	3.45
Place	13,001	45.33	3,602	27.71	12.56
MCD	12,967	45.21	1,345	10.37	4.69
Total	28,683	100.00	5,952		20.75
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	15,239	53.13	1,060	6.96	3.70
1,001 - 6,000	8,368	29.17	2,314	27.65	8.07
6,001 - 50,0000	4,423	15.42	2,113	47.77	7.37
50,001 - 100,000	342	1.19	237	69.30	0.83
100,001 - 1,000,000	303	1.06	221	72.94	0.77
1,000,001 - or more	8	0.03	7	87.50	0.02
Total	28,683	100.00	5,952		20.75

Data Source: Geography Division

Of the 5,952 registered participants, Counties had the highest percentage of participation at 38.18 percent and Places had the largest number of participants at 3,602. MCDs had the lowest percentage of participation at 10.37 percent of total eligible MCDs, but the second largest number of participants at 1,345.

Entities with 1,000 or fewer residential addresses represent the largest number and percentage, 15,239 or 53.13 percent of the total 28,683 eligible entities invited to participate. Although these entities had the largest number and percentage of eligible entities, they had the lowest percentage of registrants at 3.70 percent of total eligible entities. Also by size, entities of 1,000,001 or more addresses had the highest percentage of registrants at 87.50 percent of eligible participants registering but that included only seven total participants. Entities in the 1,001-6,000 address range had the largest number of participants at 2,314 with a 27.65 percent of entities this size registering. See Tables 1 and 2 for additional data.

Table 2. Distribution of 2010 Census NC Participation Registered Participants by Type and Size

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Registered Entities		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	8	8.70	0.03
	1,001 - 6,000	17	13.93	5	29.41	0.02
	6,001 - 50,0000	13	10.66	2	15.38	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	15		0.05
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	1	7.14	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	509	19.63	91	17.88	0.32
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,626	62.71	602	37.02	2.10
	50,001 - 100,000	211	8.14	138	65.40	0.48
	100,001 - 1,000,000	228	8.79	154	67.54	0.54
	1,000,001 - or more	5	0.19	4	80.00	0.01
County Total		2,593	100.00	990		3.45
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	687	10.50	2.40
	1,001 - 6,000	4,288	32.98	1,530	35.68	5.33
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,989	15.30	1,222	61.44	4.26
	50,001 - 100,000	110	0.85	96	87.27	0.33
	100,001 - 1,000,000	71	0.55	64	90.14	0.22
	1,000,001 - or more	3	0.02	3	100.00	0.01
Place Total		13,001	100.00	3,602		12.56
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	364	4.24	1.27
	1,001 - 6,000	3,553	27.40	688	19.36	2.40
	6,001 - 50,0000	796	6.14	287	36.06	1.00
	50,001 - 100,000	21	0.16	3	14.29	0.01
	100,001 - 1,000,000	4	0.03	3	75.00	0.01
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	1,345		4.69
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	5,952		20.75

Data Source: Geography Division

5.1.2 How many eligible entities were invited and registered to participate in the 2010 Census 2010 Census NC Program and what are their characteristics?

- c. How many and what percentage of total entities registered, but officially dropped out after registering?**
 - 295 entities or 4.96 percent of entities officially dropped out of the 2010 Census NC program.
- d. How many and what percentage of entities dropped out before receiving materials?**
 - One entity dropped out before receiving materials.
- e. How many and what percentage of entities dropped out after receiving materials?**
 - 294 entities or 4.94 percent dropped out after receiving materials.

Of the 5,952 registered participants, there were 295 or 4.96 percent of entities that dropped out of the 2010 Census NC program. Only one entity dropped out before receiving materials while the rest of the entities (294 or 4.94 percent of entities) that dropped out did so after receiving materials. See Table 3 for additional data.

Table 3. Registered Entities That Dropped Out

Government Type	Registered Participants			Dropped Out After Receiving Materials			Total Entities Dropped Out After Registering		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total by Type or Size	% of Total	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	2	13.33	0.03	2	13.33	0.03
County	990	38.18	3.45	22	2.22	0.37	22	2.22	0.37
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	177	4.91	2.97	177	4.91	2.97
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	93	6.91	1.56	94	6.99	1.58
Total	5,952		20.75	294		4.94	295		4.96
Size (addresses)									
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	112	10.57	1.88	112	10.57	1.88
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	107	4.62	1.80	108	4.67	1.81
6,001 – 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	67	3.17	1.13	67	3.17	1.13
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	4	1.69	0.07	4	1.69	0.07
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	4	1.81	0.07	4	1.81	0.07
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	294		4.94	295		4.96

Data Source: Geography Division

Places had the highest total number of entities dropping out at 177. AIRs had the lowest number of dropouts at 2, but the highest percent of dropouts at 13.33 percent of registered AIRs. Counties had the lowest percentage of dropouts with only 2.22 percent of registered counties dropping out.

Entities with 1,000 or fewer residential addresses had the highest total number and total percent of dropouts at 112 total dropouts or 1.88 percent of total registered entities. Those with 1,001-6,000 residential addresses had the second highest total number and total percent of dropouts at 108 or 1.81 percent of total eligible entities. Entities of 1,000,001 or more had the lowest total number and percentage of dropouts at zero. See Table 4 for a distribution of these data.

Table 4. Distribution of Registered Entities That Dropped Out

		Registered Entities			Dropped Out After Receiving Materials			Total Entities Dropped Out After Registering after Registered		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
Government Type	Size (addresses)									
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	1	12.50	0.02
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02	1	20.00	0.02
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	2		0.03	2		0.03
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	4	4.40	0.07
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	12	1.99	0.20	12	1.99	0.20
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	3	2.17	0.05	3	2.17	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	3	1.95	0.05	3	1.95	0.05
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	22		0.37	22		0.37
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	64	9.32	1.08	64	9.32	1.08
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	65	4.25	1.09	65	4.25	1.09
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	46	3.76	0.77	46	3.76	0.77
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	1	1.04	0.02	1	1.04	0.02
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	1	1.56	0.02	1	1.56	0.02
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	177		2.97	177		2.97
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	47	12.91	0.79	47	12.91	0.79
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	37	5.38	0.62	38	5.52	0.64
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	9	3.14	0.15	9	3.14	0.15
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	93		1.56	94		1.58
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	294		4.94	295		4.96

Data Source: Geography Division

f. How many and what percentage of registered participants did not drop out of the program?

- 5,657 or 95.04 percent of participants did not drop out of the program.

Of the registered participants, a total number of 5,657 participants or 95.04 percent did not drop out of the program. Counties had the highest percentage of retention in the 2010 Census NC program with 97.78 percent of Counties remaining in the program. Places had the second highest percentage at 95.09 percent of all places remaining in the program. Also, Places had the highest total number of entities not dropping out at 3,425. See Table 5 for additional data. AIRs had the lowest percentage and number of entities that did not dropout at 86.67 percent or 13 AIRs remaining in the program. One AIR of 1,000 or fewer addresses and one AIR of 1,000-6,000 addresses dropped out. See Table 6 for a distribution of these data.

Table 5. Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out

Government Type	Registered Entities			Dropped Out After Registering			Did Not Drop Out		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	2	13.33	0.03	13	86.67	0.22
County	990	38.18	3.45	22	2.22	0.37	968	97.78	16.26
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	177	4.91	2.97	3,425	95.09	57.54
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	94	6.99	1.58	1,251	93.01	21.02
Total	5,952		20.75	295		4.96	5,657		95.04
Size (addresses)									
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	112	10.57	1.88	948	89.43	15.93
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	108	4.67	1.81	2,206	95.33	37.06
6,001 – 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	67	3.17	1.13	2,046	96.83	34.38
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	4	1.69	0.07	233	98.31	3.91
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	4	1.81	0.07	217	98.19	3.65
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	7	100.00	0.12
Total	5,952		20.75	295		4.96	5,657		95.04

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 6. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out

Govt Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Dropped Out After Registered			Did Not Drop Out		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	7	87.50	0.12
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02	4	80.00	0.07
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	2	100.00	0.03
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	2		0.03	13		0.22
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	1	100.00	0.02
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	87	95.60	1.46
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	12	1.99	0.20	590	98.01	9.91
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	3	2.17	0.05	135	97.83	2.27
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	3	1.95	0.05	151	98.05	2.54
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	22		0.37	968		16.26
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	64	9.32	1.08	623	90.68	10.47
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	65	4.25	1.09	1,465	95.75	24.61
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	46	3.76	0.77	1,176	96.24	19.76
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	1	1.04	0.02	95	98.96	1.60
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	1	1.56	0.02	63	98.44	1.06
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	177		2.97	3,425		57.54
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	47	12.91	0.79	317	87.09	5.33
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	38	5.52	0.64	650	94.48	10.92
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	9	3.14	0.15	278	96.86	4.67
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1345		4.69	94		1.58	1251		21.02
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	295		4.96	5657		95.04

Data Source: Geography Division

g. How many and what percentage of registered participants returned a submission?

- 2,634 or 44.25 percent of registered participants returned a submission.

A total of the 2,634 or 44.15 percent of the 5,952 entities registered returned a submission. AIRs had the highest submission percentage rate at 60 percent of all AIRs. Counties had the second highest percentage of submissions at 57.98 percent of all counties returning a submission, and the second highest total number of submissions at 574 of all counties returning a submission.

Table 7. Entities Returning a Submission

Government Type	Registered Entities			Did Not Drop Out			Returned A Submission		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered By Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	13	86.67	0.22	9	60.00	0.15
County	990	38.18	3.45	968	97.78	16.26	574	57.98	9.64
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	3,425	95.09	57.54	1,578	43.81	26.51
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	1,251	93.01	21.02	467	34.72	7.85
Total	5,952		20.75	5,657		95.04	2,628		44.15
Size (addresses)									
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	948	89.43	15.93	274	25.85	4.60
1,001 - 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	2,206	95.33	37.06	861	37.21	14.47
6,001 - 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	2,046	96.83	34.38	1,148	54.33	19.29
50,001 - 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	233	98.31	3.91	164	69.20	2.76
100,001 - 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	217	98.19	3.65	174	78.73	2.92
1,000,001 - or more	7	87.50	0.02	7	100.00	0.12	7	100.00	0.12
Total	5,952		20.75	5,657		95.04	2,628		44.15

Data Source: Geography Division

It is notable that Counties had the smallest proportion of dropouts in the program. Places had the highest number of participants returning a submission at 1,578 and the third highest percentage with 43.81 percent of all places returning a submission. See Table 7 for additional data. All Counties of 1,000,001 - or more addresses in size and 100 percent of places with 1,000,001 - or more addresses returned submissions. See Table 8 for a distribution of these data.

Table 8. Distribution of Entities Returning a Submission

		Registered Entities			Did Not Drop Out			Returned A Submission		
Govt Type	Size (addresses)	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered By Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered By Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	7	87.50	0.12	4	50.00	0.07
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	4	80.00	0.07	4	80.00	0.07
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	2	100.00	0.03	1	50.00	0.02
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	13		0.22	9		0.15
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	1	100.00	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	87	95.60	1.46	29	31.87	0.49
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	590	98.01	9.91	334	55.48	5.61
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	135	97.83	2.27	91	65.94	1.53
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	151	98.05	2.54	116	75.32	1.95
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	4	100.00	0.07	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	967		16.25	574		9.64
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	623	90.68	10.47	181	26.35	3.04
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	1,465	95.75	24.61	591	38.63	9.93
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	1,176	96.24	19.76	674	55.16	11.32
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	95	98.96	1.60	73	76.04	1.23
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	63	98.44	1.06	56	87.50	0.94
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	3	100.00	0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	3,424		57.53	1,578		26.51
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	317	87.09	5.33	89	24.45	1.50
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	650	94.48	10.92	237	34.45	3.98
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	278	96.86	4.67	139	48.43	2.34
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	2	66.67	0.03
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	1,251		21.02	467		7.85
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	5,657		95.04	2,628		44.15

Data Source: Geography Division

h. How many invitees attempted to register for the program late?

- 211 or 3.55 percent of invitees attempted to register for the 2010 Census NC program after the deadline for registration.

The majority of entities interested in participating in the 2010 Census NC program registered on time. There were 211 or 3.55 percent of entities invited to participate that attempted to register late. MCDs had the highest total number and percentage of entities attempting to register late at 123 or 2.07 percent of total eligible entities. See Table 9 for additional data. The vast majority of entities attempting to register late were those with 1,000 addresses or fewer. See Table 10 for a distribution of these data.

Table 9. Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late

Government Type	Registered Entities			Eligible Entities Attempting To Register Late		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible By Type or Size	% of Total Eligible
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	1	6.67	0.02
County	990	38.18	3.45	11	1.11	0.18
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	76	2.11	1.28
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	123	9.14	2.07
Total	5,952		20.75	211		3.55
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	154	14.53	2.59
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	44	1.90	0.74
6,001 – 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	9	0.43	0.15
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	2	0.84	0.03
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	2	0.90	0.03
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	211		3.55

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 10. Distribution of Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Eligible Entities Attempting To Register Late		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible By Type or Size	% of Total Eligible
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	1		0.02
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	3	3.30	0.05
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	4	0.66	0.07
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	2	1.45	0.03
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	2	1.30	0.03
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	11		0.18
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	52	7.57	0.87
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	20	1.31	0.34
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	4	0.33	0.07
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	76		1.28
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	102	28.02	1.71
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	20	2.91	0.34
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	1	0.35	0.02
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	123		2.07
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	211		3.55

Data Source: Geography Division

5.1.3 How many eligible governments were invited and did not register to participate in the 2010 Census NC program, and what are their characteristics?

a. How many and what percentage of non-registered entities officially declined to register?

- 8,698 or 30.32 percent of entities officially declined to register.

Of the 28,683 eligible entities, 8,698 entities officially declined to register. Entities could decline to register by filling out a form and selecting the most appropriate reason for declining to register. Eligible entities were also able to call Regional Census Centers (RCCs) and notify RCC staff of the reason for declining registration. RCC staff would subsequently fill out a form on behalf of the eligible entity. Reasons for declining registration are highlighted in this document.

Table 11. Eligible Entities Officially Declining Registration

Government Type	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Declining Registration		
	Total	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Total Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	122	0.43	24	19.67	0.08
County	2,593	9.04	594	22.91	2.07
Place	13,001	45.33	3,912	30.09	13.64
MCD	12,967	45.21	4,168	32.14	14.53
Total	28,683	100.00	8,698		30.32
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	15,239	53.13	5,463	35.85	19.05
1,001 - 6,000	8,368	29.17	2,412	28.82	8.41
6,001 - 50,000	4,423	15.42	761	17.21	2.65
50,001 - 100,000	342	1.19	27	7.89	0.09
100,001 - 1,000,000	303	1.06	35	11.55	0.12
1,000,001 - or more	8	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
Total	28,683	100.00	8,698		30.32

Data Source: Geography Division

MCDs had the highest total number and percentage of eligible entities declining participation at 4,168 or 14.53 percent. Places followed closely behind with the second highest total number and percentage of eligible entities declining participation at 3,912 or 13.64 percent. See Table 11 for additional data.

Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest total number of entities declining registration at 5,463 or 19.05 percent of the total eligible entities. See Table 12 for a distribution of these data.

Table 12. Distribution Breakout of Eligible Entities Officially Declining Registration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Declining Registration		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Total Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	19	20.65	0.07
	1,001 - 6,000	17	13.93	2	11.76	0.01
	6,001 - 50,0000	13	10.66	3	23.08	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	24		0.08
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	5	35.71	0.02
	1,001 - 6,000	509	19.63	183	35.95	0.64
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,626	62.71	359	22.08	1.25
	50,001 - 100,000	211	8.14	16	7.58	0.06
	100,001 - 1,000,000	228	8.79	31	13.60	0.11
	1,000,001 - or more	5	0.19	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		2,593	100.00	594		2.07
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	2,531	38.70	8.82
	1,001 - 6,000	4,289	32.99	1,142	26.63	3.98
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,988	15.29	233	11.72	0.81
	50,001 - 100,000	110	0.85	3	2.73	0.01
	100,001 - 1,000,000	71	0.55	3	4.23	0.01
	1,000,001 - or more	3	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		13,001	100.00	3,912		13.64
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	2,906	33.82	10.13
	1,001 - 6,000	3,553	27.40	1,086	30.57	3.79
	6,001 - 50,0000	796	6.14	167	20.98	0.58
	50,001 - 100,000	21	0.16	8	38.10	0.03
	100,001 - 1,000,000	4	0.03	1	25.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	4,168		14.53
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	8,698		30.32

Data Source: Geography Division

b. How many and what percentage of non-registered entities did not respond to the invitation to participate in the program?

- 14,033 or 48.92 percent of eligible entities did not respond to the invitation to participate in the program.

Nearly half of the 28,683 eligible entities did not respond to the invitation to register with a total of 14,033 or 48.92 percent not responding. By entity type, AIRs had the highest percentage of non-respondents at 68.03 percent or 83 of 122 AIRs not responding. By total eligible entities, MCDs had the highest percentage of non-respondents at 25.99 percent of the 28,683 total eligible entities. See Table 13 for additional data.

Table 13. Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration

Government Type	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Responding To Registration		
	Total	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Total Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	122	0.43	83	68.03	0.29
County	2,593	9.04	1,009	38.91	3.52
Place	13,001	45.33	5,487	42.20	19.13
MCD	12,967	45.21	7,454	57.48	25.99
Total	28,683	100.00	14,033		48.92
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	15,239	53.13	8,716	57.20	30.39
1,001 – 6,000	8,368	29.17	3,642	43.52	12.70
6,001 – 50,000	4,423	15.42	1,549	35.02	5.40
50,001 – 100,000	342	1.19	78	22.81	0.27
100,001 – 1,000,000	303	1.06	47	15.51	0.16
1,000,001 – or more	8	0.03	1	12.50	0.00
Total	28,683	100.00	14,033		48.92

Data Source: Geography Division

Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest percentage of total eligible entities not responding at 30.39 percent of the 28,683 total eligible entities. More than half (57.20 percent) of all invited entities with 1,000 or fewer addresses did not respond to the invitation and this was the highest percentage. See Table 14 for a distribution of these data.

Table 14. Distribution of Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Responding To Registration		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	65	70.65	0.23
	1,001 – 6,000	17	13.93	10	58.82	0.03
	6,001 – 50,0000	13	10.66	8	61.54	0.03
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	83		0.29
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	8	57.14	0.03
	1,001 – 6,000	509	19.63	235	46.17	0.82
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,626	62.71	665	40.90	2.32
	50,001 – 100,000	211	8.14	57	27.01	0.20
	100,001 – 1,000,000	228	8.79	43	18.86	0.15
	1,000,001 – or more	5	0.19	1	20.00	0.00
County Total		2,593	100.00	1,009		3.52
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	3,319	50.75	11.57
	1,001 – 6,000	4,288	32.98	1,619	37.76	5.64
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,989	15.30	534	26.85	1.86
	50,001 – 100,000	110	0.85	11	10.00	0.04
	100,001 – 1,000,000	71	0.55	4	5.63	0.01
	1,000,001 – or more	3	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		13,001	100.00	5,487		19.13
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	5,323	61.95	18.56
	1,001 – 6,000	3,553	27.40	1,779	50.07	6.20
	6,001 – 50,0000	796	6.14	342	42.96	1.19
	50,001 – 100,000	21	0.16	10	47.62	0.03
	100,001 – 1,000,000	4	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	7,454		25.99
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	14,033		48.92

Data Source: Geography Division

- c. **How many and what percentage of non-registered entities did not register by officially declining or not responding to the invitation to participate?**
- 22,731 or 79.25 percent of eligible entities did not register by officially declining or not responding to the invitation to participate.

There were 28,683 entities eligible for the 2010 Census NC program. Of the eligible entities, there were 22,731 or 79.25 percent that did not register. MCDs had the highest percentage and total number of eligible entities not registering at 40.52 percent or 11,622. Places had the second highest percentage and number of total eligible entities not registering at 32.77 percent or 9,399. Of eligible entities by type, MCDs had the highest percentage of non-registrants at 89.63 percent followed by AIRs at 87.70 percent. See Table 15 for additional data.

Table 15. Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register

Government Type	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Registering		
	Total	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	122	0.43	107	87.70	0.37
County	2,593	9.04	1,603	61.82	5.59
Place	13,001	45.33	9,399	72.29	32.77
MCD	12,967	45.21	11,622	89.63	40.52
Total	28,683	100.00	22,731		79.25
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	15,239	53.13	14,179	93.04	49.43
1,001 – 6,000	8,368	29.17	6,054	72.35	21.11
6,001 – 50,0000	4,423	15.42	2,310	52.23	8.05
50,001 – 100,000	342	1.19	105	30.70	0.37
100,001 – 1,000,000	303	1.06	82	27.06	0.29
1,000,001 – or more	8	0.03	1	12.50	0.00
Total	28,683	100.00	22,731		79.25

Data Source: Geography Division

By size, entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest total percentage of eligible entities not registering at 49.43 percent for a total number of 14,179. Entities of 1,001 – 6,000 addresses had the second highest percentage of total eligible entities not registering at 21.11 percent or a total number of 6,054. The more addresses that an entity had the more likely the entity was to register. See Table 16 for a distribution of these data.

Table 16. Distribution of Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register

		Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Registering		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities
Government Type	Size (addresses)					
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	84	91.30	0.29
	1,001 – 6,000	17	13.93	12	70.59	0.04
	6,001 – 50,0000	13	10.66	11	84.62	0.04
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	107		0.37
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	13	92.86	0.05
	1,001 – 6,000	509	19.63	418	82.12	1.46
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,626	62.71	1,024	62.98	3.57
	50,001 – 100,000	211	8.14	73	34.60	0.25
	100,001 – 1,000,000	228	8.79	74	32.46	0.26
	1,000,001 – or more	5	0.19	1	20.00	0.00
County Total		2,593	100.00	1,603		5.59
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	5,850	89.45	20.40
	1,001 – 6,000	4,288	32.98	2,762	64.41	9.63
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,989	15.30	767	38.56	2.67
	50,001 – 100,000	110	0.85	14	12.73	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	71	0.55	7	9.86	0.02
	1,000,001 – or more	3	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		13,001	100.00	9,400		32.77
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	8,229	95.76	28.69
	1,001 – 6,000	3,553	27.40	2,865	80.64	9.99
	6,001 – 50,0000	796	6.14	509	63.94	1.77
	50,001 – 100,000	21	0.16	18	85.71	0.06
	100,001 – 1,000,000	4	0.03	1	25.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	11,622		40.52
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	22,731		79.25

Data Source: Geography Division

d. What were the reasons for non-participation by invited entities?

The following are the reasons provided by entities that declined to participate, along with counts of each and their proportion out of all entities that declined:


- Insufficient staff: 3,623 or 41.65 percent of entities declining to register.
- Lack of funds: 2113 or 24.29 percent of entities declining to register.
- No time/too busy: 1,704 or 19.59 percent of entities declining to register.
- No local address list available: 925 or 10.63 percent of entities declining to register.
- Unable to provide electronic submissions: 1,555 or 17.88 percent of entities declining to register.
- No new addresses: 4,606 or 52.95 percent of entities declining to register.
- Other reason: 1,474 or 16.95 percent of entities declining to register.
- No reason: 69 or 0.79 percent of entities declining to register.

Entities eligible to participate in the 2010 Census NC program were given the option to officially decline registration by filling out a form enclosed in the invitation package and submitting the form to the Census Bureau. Seven options were provided for eligible entities to select when declining to participate: insufficient staff, lack of funds, no time/too busy, no local address list available, unable to provide electronic submissions, no new addresses, and other reasons. The eligible entity was not limited to selecting only one reason for declining participation. The eligible entity was able to choose as many of the seven reasons listed on the form as desired.

The most common selected reason for entities to decline participation was “No new addresses.” A total of 4,606 or 52.95 percent of the entities declining listed this reason as one of the reasons they would not participate. “Insufficient staff” was the next most common reason listed by entities declining participation at 3,623 or 12.63 percent of all eligible entities.

Within specific entity type grouping, though, the main reason for declining differed. The top reason selected by the 2,570 or 29.55 percent Census Places declining participation was “No new addresses.” However, the top reason for 24 or 100 percent of AIRs declining participation was “no time/too busy.” A total of 2,008 or 48.18 percent of MCDs chose “insufficient staff” as the top reason for declining. Likewise, 312 or 52.53 percent of Counties chose “insufficient staff” as the top reason for declining.


Figure 1. Eligible NC Entities Reasons For Declining By Type



Data Source: Geography Division

Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses in size selected “no new addresses” as the top reason for declining participation at 3,127 or 57.24 percent of eligible entities of this size. Likewise, entities of 1,001 to 6,000 addresses in size chose “no new addresses” as the top reason for not participating at 1,184 or 49.09 percent of eligible entities of this size. Entities of 6,001 to 50,000 addresses chose “insufficient staff” as the top reason for declining participation at 349 or 45.86 percent of declining entities of this size. Entities of 50,001 to 100,000 addresses selected “other reason” as the top reason for declining participation at 19 or 70.37 percent of the declining entities of this size. Entities of 100,001 to 1,000,000 addresses chose “other reason” as the top reason for declining participation at 23 or 65.71 percent of the declining participants of this size. Lastly, entities of 1,000,001 or more addresses made no selections for declining participation. See Tables 95 through 98 in Attachment B for additional data including a distribution of these data.

Figure 2. Eligible NC Entities Reasons For Declining By Size



Data Source: Geography Division

5.1.4 What were the map media choices of registered participants?

a. How many and what percentage of participating entities selected PDF maps for map media type?

- 2,427 or 40.78 percent of registered entities that did not drop out selected PDF Map Media.

Of the 5,952 registered entities, a total of 2,427 or 40.78 percent selected PDF map media to assist in geocoding 2010 Census NC program file submissions. Places had the highest total number and percentage of total registered entities selecting PDF map media at 1,499 or 25.18 percent. By type of entity, MCDs had the highest percentage of registered entities selecting PDF map media at 52.71 percent. AIRs had the lowest percentage by type selecting PDF map media at 20 percent and by percentage of total registered entities at 0.05 percent. See Table 17 for additional data.

Table 17. Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media

Government Type	Registered Entities			Selected PDF Maps		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total by Size or Type	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	3	20.00	0.05
County	990	38.18	3.45	216	21.82	3.63
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	1,499	41.62	25.18
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	709	52.71	11.91
Total	5,952		20.75	2,427		40.78
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	638	60.19	10.72
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	1,172	50.65	19.69
6,001 – 50,000	2,113	47.77	7.37	577	27.31	9.69
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	21	8.86	0.35
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	19	8.60	0.32
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	2,427		40.78

Data Source: Geography Division

Entities of 1,001- 6,000 addresses in size had the highest percentage of total registered entities selecting PDF map media at 19.69 percent. Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest percentage of registered entities selecting PDF map media at 60.19 percent. See Table 18 for a distribution of these data.

Table 18. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Selected PDF Maps		
		Total Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total by Size or Type	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	3	37.50	0.05
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	3		0.05
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	44	48.35	0.74
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	147	24.42	2.47
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	12	8.70	0.20
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	13	8.44	0.22
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	216		3.63
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	410	59.68	6.89
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	765	50.00	12.85
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	314	25.70	5.28
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	6	6.25	0.10
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	4	6.25	0.07
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	1,499		25.19
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	225	61.81	3.78
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	363	52.76	6.10
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	116	40.42	1.95
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	3	100.00	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	2	66.67	0.03
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	709		11.91
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	2,427		40.78

Data Source: Geography Division

b. How many and what percentage of participating entities selected shapefiles for map media type?

- 3,524 or 59.21 percent of registered entities that did not drop out selected shapefile map media type.

Of the 5,952 registered entities, a total of 3,525 or 59.21 percent selected shapefile map media. Places had the highest total number and percentage of total registered entities that selected shapefile map media at 35.33 percent or 2,103. By entity type, AIRs had the highest percentage selecting shapefile map media with 80 percent of all AIRs. Seventy-eight percent of all registered Counties selected shapefile media making counties the second highest percentage of registered entities selecting shapefiles based on type. See Table 19 for additional data.

Table 19. Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media

Government Type	Registered Entities			Selected Shapefile Maps		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total by Size or Type	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	12	80.00	0.20
County	990	38.18	3.45	773	78.08	12.99
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	2,103	58.38	35.33
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	636	47.29	10.69
Total	5,952		20.75	3,524		59.21
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	422	39.81	7.09
1,001 - 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	1,142	49.35	19.19
6,001 - 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	1,535	72.65	25.79
50,001 - 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	216	91.14	3.63
100,001 - 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	202	91.40	3.39
1,000,001 - or more	7	87.50	0.02	7	100.00	0.12
Total	5,952		20.75	3,524		59.21

Data Source: Geography Division

Based on entity type, the greater the size of the entity type the more likely the entity was to select shapefiles. Of entities with 1,000,001 or more addresses in size, one hundred percent of registered entities selected shapefiles, while 91.40 percent of entities of 100,001-1,000,000 addresses and 91.14 percent of entities with 50,001-100,000 addresses selected shapefiles. See Table 20 for a distribution of these data.

Table 20. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Selected Shapefile Maps		
		Total Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total by Type or Size	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	5	62.50	0.08
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	5	100.00	0.08
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	2	100.00	0.03
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	12		0.20
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	1	100.00	0.02
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	47	51.65	0.79
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	454	75.42	7.63
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	126	91.30	2.12
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	141	91.56	2.37
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	773		12.99
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	277	40.32	4.65
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	765	50.00	12.85
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	908	74.30	15.26
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	90	93.75	1.51
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	60	93.75	1.01
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	3		0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	2,103		35.33
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	139	38.19	2.34
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	325	47.24	5.46
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	171	59.58	2.87
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	1	33.33	0.02
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	636		10.69
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	3,524		59.21

Data Source: Geography Division

5.2 Characteristics of Addresses and Returns

5.2.1 How many active participants submitted an address list and/or spatial returns?

- a. How many and what percentage of entities returned usable NC address files?
 - 1,359 or 51.71 percent of participants returned a usable address file.
- b. How many and what percentage of entities returned unusable NC addresses?
 - 57 or 2.17 percent of participants returned an unusable address file.
- c. How many and what percentage of entities returned an address list that was usable after fixing?
 - 1,212 or 46.12 percent of participants returned an address list that was usable after fixing.

A total of 2,628 or 44.15 percent of registered participants returned a NC address file. The Census Bureau placed each submission into one of three categories: usable, unusable, and usable after fixing. Usable files did not require any changes from participants. Unusable files were not accepted by the Census Bureau because the files did not meet required standards. Files usable after fixing required corrections after the initially submitted file.

Of the 2,628 submitted files, 1,359 or 51.71 percent of entities submitted a usable NC address file. Places had the highest percentage of usable files at 32.53 percent of total files submissions. The smaller the entity size, the higher the percentage of an entity returning a usable NC file. See Table 21 and 22 for a distribution of these data.

Only 57 or 2.17 percent of total entities returning a submission submitted a file that was unusable. Files were deemed unusable if they were submitted in the unspecified format. Two or 28.57 percent of the entities with 1,000,001 or more addresses returned a submission deemed unusable. See Tables 21 and 22 for a distribution of these data.

Of the 2,628 submitted files, 1,212 or 46.12 percent of entities submitted a usable NC file after fixing. To fix the file the RCCs worked with the entities to make the file meet the required format. Places had the highest percentage of usable NC files after fixing at 26.83 percent of the total files submissions. By entity type, all types were within the 40 percent range of being usable after fixing. See Table 21 for additional data and Table 68, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 21. Usability of NC Files

Government Type	Registered Entities			Returned a NC File Submission			Returning Usable NC Files			Returning Unusable NC Files			Usable NC Files After Fixing		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total By Size Or Type	% of Total	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size Or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File By Government Type	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size Or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File By Government Type	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size Or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File By Government Type
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	9	60.00	0.15	5	55.56	0.19	0	0.00	0.00	4	44.44	0.15
County	990	38.18	3.45	574	57.98	9.64	271	47.21	10.31	17	2.96	0.65	286	49.83	10.88
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	1,578	43.81	26.51	855	54.18	32.53	18	1.14	0.68	705	44.68	26.83
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	467	34.72	7.85	228	48.82	8.68	22	4.71	0.84	217	46.47	8.26
Total	5,952		20.75	2,628		44.15	1,359		51.71	57		2.17	1,212		46.12
Size (addresses)															
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	274	25.85	4.60	160	58.39	6.09	10	3.65	0.38	104	37.96	3.96
1,001 - 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	861	37.21	14.47	469	54.47	17.85	24	2.79	0.91	368	42.74	14.00
6,001 - 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	1,148	54.33	19.29	582	50.70	22.15	17	1.48	0.65	549	47.82	20.89
50,001 - 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	164	69.20	2.76	76	46.34	2.89	2	1.22	0.08	86	52.44	3.27
100,001 - 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	174	78.73	2.92	70	40.23	2.66	2	1.15	0.08	102	58.62	3.88
1,000,001 - or more	7	87.50	0.02	7	100.00	0.12	2	28.57	0.08	2	28.57	0.08	3	42.86	0.11
Total	5,952		20.75	2,628		44.15	1,359		51.71	57		2.17	1,212		46.12

Data Source: Geography Division

d. How many and what percentage of entities returned an address list, but not on time, and we were still able to process?

- 659 or 11.07 percent of participants returned an address list not on time but the Census Bureau was still able to process the files.

e. How many and what percentage of entities returned an address list, but not on time and too late to process?

- 17 or 0.29 percent of participants returned an address list not on time and the Census Bureau was not able to process the files.

659 or 11.07 percent of the total number of participants (5,952) returned a NC file late but we were still able to process the late file. Twenty percent of AIRs did not return an address file on time and Census staff was still able to process their file. This was the highest percentage by entity type. Entities of 1,000,001 or more addresses had no such cases. See Table 22 for additional data.

Table 22. Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time

Government Type	Registered Entities			Returning NC Files Late But Able To Process			Returning NC Files Late And Unable To Process		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	% of Total Registered
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	3	20.00	0.05	0	0.00	0.00
County	990	38.18	3.45	175	17.68	2.94	2	0.20	0.03
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	361	10.02	6.07	11	0.31	0.18
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	120	8.92	2.02	4	0.30	0.07
Total	5,952		20.75	659		11.07	17		0.29
Size (addresses)									
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	70	6.60	1.18	3	0.28	0.05
1,001 - 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	198	8.56	3.33	4	0.17	0.07
6,001 - 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	285	13.49	4.79	8	0.38	0.13
50,001 - 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	41	17.30	0.69	1	0.42	0.02
100,001 - 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	65	29.41	1.09	1	0.45	0.02
1,000,001 - or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	659		11.07	17		0.29

Data Source: Geography Division

Seventeen or 0.29 percent of the total number of participants (5,952) returned a NC file late and the Census Bureau was unable to process this file. AIRs had the lowest total number at zero. See Table 23 for a distribution of these data.

Table 23. Distribution of Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time

Government Type And Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Returning NC Files Late But Able To Process			Returning NC Files Late And Unable To Process		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	% of Total Registered
AIR									
1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	2	40.00	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total	15		0.05	3		0.05	0		0.00
County									
1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	0	0.00	0.00
6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	103	17.11	1.73	0	0.00	0.00
50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	25	18.12	0.42	1	0.72	0.02
100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	43	27.92	0.72	1	0.65	0.02
1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total	990		3.45	175		2.94	2		0.03
Place									
1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	51	7.42	0.86	2	0.29	0.03
1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	127	8.30	2.13	3	0.20	0.05
6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	146	11.95	2.45	6	0.49	0.10
50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	16	16.67	0.27	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	21	32.81	0.35	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total	3,602		12.56	361		6.07	11		0.18
MCD									
1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	18	4.95	0.30	1	0.27	0.02
1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	65	9.45	1.09	1	0.15	0.02
6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	36	12.54	0.60	2	0.70	0.03
50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	1	33.33	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total	1,345		4.69	120		2.02	4		0.07
Overall Total	5,952		20.75	659		11.07	17		0.29

Data Source: Geography Division

- f. **How many and what percentage of entities that selected PDF maps, and contrary to program guidelines returned feature updates?**
 - 3 or 0.05 percent of PDF participants returned feature updates.
- g. **How many and what percentage of entities that selected shapefiles, and contrary to program guidelines returned feature updates?**
 - 15 or 0.25 percent of shapefile participants returned feature updates.

Due to the program scope, time allotted to conduct program, and staffing, the 2010 Census NC program did not accept feature updates. Contrary to program guidelines a few registered entities returned feature updates. Of the registered entities selecting PDF maps, 3 or 0.05 percent of PDF participants returned feature updates. Of the registered entities selecting shapefiles, 15 or 0.25 percent of shapefile participants returned feature updates. See Tables 24 for additional data and Table 70, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 24. Entities Returning Feature Updates

Government Type	Registered Entities			PDF Participants Returning Feature Updates			Shapefile Participants Returning Feature Updates		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered by Size or Type
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County	990	38.18	3.45	0	0.00	0.00	4	0.07	0.40
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	2	0.03	0.06	11	0.18	0.31
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	1	0.02	0.07	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	3	0.05		15	0.25	
Size (addresses)									
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	1	0.02	0.09	2	0.03	0.19
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	0	0.00	0.00	1	0.02	0.04
6,001 – 50,000	2,113	47.77	7.37	2	0.03	0.09	8	0.13	0.38
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	0.84
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	0.90
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	3	0.05		15	0.25	

Data Source: Geography Division

- h. **How many and what percentage of registered shapefile participants did not submit an address list and were sent a NC Past Due letter.**
 - 1,645 or 27.64 percent of shapefile participants were sent a NC Past Due Letter.
- i. **How many and what percentage of registered PDF participants did not submit an address list and were sent a NC Past Due letter.**
 - 1,369 or 23 percent of PDF participants were sent a NC Past Due Letter.

1,645 or 27.64 percent of entities selecting shapefile map media were sent a NC Past Due Letter because their NC files were not received by the Census Bureau by the allotted deadline. The distribution of entities sent past due letters by type was evenly distributed with each entity type composing 26 percent to 28 percent of the total registered participants that selected shapefiles. See Table 25 for additional data.

1,369 or 23 percent of entities selecting PDF map media were sent a NC Past Due Letter because their NC files were not received by the Census Bureau by the allotted deadline. MCDs had the highest percentage of total entities selecting PDF map media that were sent a letter at 30.33 percent. See Table 71, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Another difficulty reported by entities with PDF map media was the inability to distinguish between tract and census blocks due to similar line coloring. This may have impacted entities with PDF maps from returning an accurate address list.

Table 25. Entities Sent Past Due Letters

Government Type	Registered Entities			Governments Sent Past Due Letters			PDF Entities Sent Past Due Letters			Shapefile Entities Sent Past Due Letters		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered by Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered by Size or Type
AIR	15	12.30	0.05	4	0.07	26.67	0	0.00	0.00	4	0.07	26.67
County	990	38.18	3.45	394	6.62	39.80	107	1.80	10.81	287	4.82	28.99
Place	3,602	27.71	12.56	1,842	30.95	51.14	854	14.35	23.71	988	16.60	27.43
MCD	1,345	10.37	4.69	774	13.00	57.55	408	6.85	30.33	366	6.15	27.21
Total	5,952		20.75	3,014		50.64	1,369		23.00	1,645		27.64
Size (addresses)												
1,000 or fewer	1,060	6.96	3.70	669	11.24	63.11	381	6.40	35.94	288	4.84	27.17
1,001 – 6,000	2,314	27.65	8.07	1,340	22.51	57.91	681	11.44	29.43	659	11.07	28.48
6,001 – 50,0000	2,113	47.77	7.37	893	15.00	42.26	289	4.86	13.68	604	10.15	28.58
50,001 – 100,000	237	69.30	0.83	69	1.16	29.11	11	0.18	4.64	58	0.97	24.47
100,001 – 1,000,000	221	72.94	0.77	43	0.72	19.46	7	0.12	3.17	36	0.60	16.29
1,000,001 – or more	7	87.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	5,952		20.75	3,014		50.64	1,369		23.00	1,645		27.64

Data Source: Geography Division

5.3 Detailed Processing Results

5.3.1 How many participant address files and addresses were processed and what were the processing results and characteristics of the address records?

a. What is the number of addresses received at the regional census centers (RCCs)?

- 503,489 addresses were received at the RCCs.

Registered participants submitted 2,628 files containing 503,489 addresses. Entities with 100,001-1,000,000 addresses submitted the most addresses at 203,528 or 40.42 percent of total addresses submitted. Entities of 6,001-50,000 addresses submitted the second most addresses at 165,890 or 32.95 percent of total addresses submitted. See Table 26 for additional data and Table 72 within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 26. Addresses Received at RCCs

Government Type	Returned a NC File Submission			Addresses Received at RCCs	
	Total	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Returning a NC File
AIR	9	60.00	0.15	158	0.03
County	574	57.98	9.64	185,587	36.86
Place	1,578	43.81	26.51	299,082	59.40
MCD	467	34.72	7.85	18,662	3.71
Total	2,628		44.15	503,489	100.00
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	274	25.85	4.60	3,508	0.70
1,001 – 6,000	861	37.21	14.47	31,550	6.27
6,001 – 50,0000	1,148	54.33	19.29	165,890	32.95
50,001 – 100,000	164	69.20	2.76	58,903	11.70
100,001 – 1,000,000	174	78.73	2.92	203,528	40.42
1,000,001 – or more	7	100.00	0.12	40,110	7.97
Total	2,628		44.15	503,489	100.00

Data Source: Geography Division

b. What is the number and percent of participants that submitted address list updates that were processed?

- 2,563 submitted address lists were processed.

Of the 2,628 address lists submitted a total of 2,563 address lists were processed equaling 97.53 percent of submitted address lists. One hundred percent of the AIR submitted address lists were processed. Reasons for not processing address lists include address lists submitted too late and/or incorrect formatting. See Tables 27 for additional data and Table 73, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 27. Processed Address Lists

Government Type	Returned a NC File Submission			Participants Submitted Address Lists That Were Processed		
	Total	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Returning A NC File	% of Total Returning A NC File By Size or Type
AIR	9	60.00	0.15	9	0.34	100.00
County	574	57.98	9.64	553	21.04	96.34
Place	1578	43.81	26.51	1,558	59.28	98.73
MCD	467	34.72	7.85	443	16.86	94.86
Total	2,628		44.15	2,563	97.53	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	274	25.85	4.60	261	9.93	95.26
1,001 – 6,000	861	37.21	14.47	839	31.93	97.44
6,001 – 50,0000	1,148	54.33	19.29	1,126	42.85	98.08
50,001 – 100,000	164	69.20	2.76	162	6.16	98.78
100,001 – 1,000,000	174	78.73	2.92	170	6.47	97.70
1,000,001 – or more	7	100.00	0.12	5	0.19	71.43
Total	2,628		44.15	2,563	97.53	

Data Source: Geography Division

c. **What is the number and percent of addresses rejected in preprocessing by the RCCs?**

- 61,984 or 12.32 percent of the total addresses received were rejected in preprocessing by the RCCs.

Of the 503,489 addresses received at the RCCs a total of 61,984 or 12.32 percent were ultimately rejected in preprocessing by the RCCs. The main reason for rejection was missing address information such as block codes and failing to follow the required format. As time permitted, RCCs staff attempted to contact those participants submitting unusable address lists in hopes of participants fixing their submission. See Table 28 for additional data and Table 74, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 28. Addresses Rejected in RCCs Preprocessing

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Addresses Rejected in RCCs Preprocessing		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs by Type or Size
AIR	158	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
County	185,587	36.86	19010	3.78	10.24
Place	299,082	59.40	39423	7.83	13.18
MCD	18,662	3.71	3551	0.71	19.18
Total	503,489	100.00	61984	12.32	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	260	0.05	7.41
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	5,031	1.00	15.95
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	13,447	2.67	8.11
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	2,612	0.52	4.43
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	37,724	7.49	18.54
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	2,910	0.58	7.26
Total	503,489	100.00	61,984	12.32	

Data Source: Geography Division

d. What is the number and percent of addresses sent to and processed by headquarters (HQ)?

- 441,505 addresses were sent to and processed by HQ.

Of the 503,489 addresses received at the RCCs, 441,505 or 87.69 percent of total addresses received passed pre-processing by the RCCs and were sent to and processed by HQs. Reasons for address rejection during HQ processing include duplicate addresses found in the MAF. See Table 29 for additional data and Table 75, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 29. Addresses Sent to and Processed by HQ

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Addresses Processed Sent to and Processed by HQ		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received at RCCs by Type or Size
AIR	158	0.03	158	0.03	100.00
County	185,587	36.86	166,577	33.08	89.76
Place	299,082	59.40	259,659	51.57	86.82
MCD	18,662	3.71	15,111	3.00	80.97
Total	503,489	100.00	441,505	87.69	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	3,248	0.65	92.59
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	26,519	5.27	84.05
6,001 – 50,000	165,890	32.95	152,443	30.28	91.89
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	56,291	11.18	95.57
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	165,804	32.93	81.46
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	37,200	7.39	92.74
Total	503,489	100.00	441,505	87.69	

Data Source: Geography Division

e. **What is the number and percent of new unmatched addresses received from NC participants?**

- 148,592 or 29.51 percent of addresses received were new and unmatched of the 503,489 addresses received at the RCCs.

A total of 148,592 or 29.51 percent of addresses initially received from participants did not match to an existing MTdb record and were thus determined to be new addresses. Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest percentage of new and unmatched addresses by size at 42.79 percent or 1,501. Lower level governments such as AIRs, Places, and MCDs had a higher percentage of submitted new and unmatched addresses than counties. See Table 30 for additional data and Table 76, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 30. New Unmatched Addresses

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		New Unmatched Addresses Received		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs by Type or Size
AIR	158	0.03	93	0.02	58.86
County	185,587	36.86	49,822	9.90	26.85
Place	299,082	59.40	92,287	18.33	30.86
MCD	18,662	3.71	6,390	1.27	34.24
Total	503,489	100.00	148,592	29.51	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	1,501	0.30	42.79
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	10,931	2.17	34.65
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	55,399	11.00	33.40
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	18,515	3.68	31.43
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	49,325	9.80	24.23
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	12,921	2.57	32.21
Total	503,489	100.00	148,592	29.51	

Data Source: Geography Division

Of the 148,592 new unmatched addresses received, a total of 42,346 or 28.50 percent were enumerated. Places had the highest total number of addresses enumerated with NC as the initial source at 23,911 or 16.09 percent of the total. The smaller the government size the more likely the new unmatched address received was enumerated. This has significant implications on the differences of address accuracy between large-sized government and small-sized governments. See Table 31 for additional data.

Table 31. Number of Addresses Enumerated With NC As Initial Source

Government Type	Number Of Addresses With NC As Initial Source	Number Of Addresses Enumerated With NC As Initial Source		
	Total	Total	% of Total Number Of Addresses With NC As Initial Source	% of Total Number Of Addresses With NC As Initial Source By Type Or Size
AIR	93	13	0.01	13.98
County	49,822	16,589	11.16	33.30
Place	92,287	23,911	16.09	25.91
MCD	6,390	1,833	1.23	28.69
Total	148,592	42,346	28.50	
Size (addresses)				
1,000 or fewer	1,501	631	0.42	42.04
1,001 – 6,000	10,931	4,363	2.94	39.91
6,001 – 50,000	55,399	18,115	12.19	32.70
50,001 – 100,000	18,515	5,733	3.86	30.96
100,001 – 1,000,000	49,325	11,459	7.71	23.23
1,000,001 – or more	12,921	2,045	1.38	15.83
Total	148,592	42,346	28.50	

Data Source: Geography Division

f. What is the number and percent of existing ungeocoded delivery sequence file (DSF) addresses in the MAF assigned a block code by NC?

- 7,115,942 addresses are currently in the MAF. The 2010 Census NC program assigned a block code to 33,187 or 0.47 percent of the addresses currently in the MAF.

g. What is the number and percent of NC addresses that matched existing ungeocoded DSF addresses in the MAF?

- 33,187 or 6.59 percent of the total addresses received matched an existing ungeocoded address.

33,187 or 6.59 percent of NC addresses received at the RCCs matched an existing ungeocoded address. The significance of these addresses is that 33,187 previously ungeocoded addresses contained in the MAF received block-level geocodes due to NC. The smaller the entity the higher the percentage that the submitted address was going to match an existing ungeocoded address. This will be discussed later in the document. See Table 32 for additional data and Table 77, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 32. NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses

	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs by Type or Size
Government Type					
AIR	158	0.03	13	0.00	8.23
County	185,587	36.86	13,326	2.65	7.18
Place	299,082	59.40	18,772	3.73	6.28
MCD	18,662	3.71	1,076	0.21	5.77
Total	503,489	100.00	33,187	6.59	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	325	0.06	9.26
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	2,594	0.52	8.22
6,001 – 50,000	165,890	32.95	11,925	2.37	7.19
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	4,941	0.98	8.39
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	11,623	2.31	5.71
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	1,779	0.35	4.44
Total	503,489	100.00	33,187	6.59	

Data Source: Geography Division

Of the 33,187 NC addresses matching an existing ungecoded address, a total of 30,053 or 90.56 percent were enumerated. Based on government type, the percentage of acceptance was similar for all governments with a range of 89 percent to 94 percent acceptance. See Table 33 for additional data.

Table 33. NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungecoded Addresses Enumerated Via Late Mailing

Government Type	NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungecoded Addresses			NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungecoded Addresses Enumerated Via Late Mailing		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received	% of Total Addresses Received by Type of Size	Total	% of Total NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungecoded Addresses	% of Total NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungecoded Addresses By Type Or Size
AIR	13	0.00	8.23	12	0.04	92.31
County	13,326	2.65	7.18	12,269	36.97	92.07
Place	18,772	3.73	6.28	16,756	50.49	89.26
MCD	1,076	0.21	5.77	1,016	3.06	94.42
Total	33,187	6.59	6.59	30,053	90.56	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	325	0.06	9.26	305	0.92	93.85
1,001 – 6,000	2,594	0.52	8.22	2,454	7.39	94.60
6,001 – 50,0000	11,925	2.37	7.19	10,534	31.74	88.34
50,001 – 100,000	4,941	0.98	8.39	4,605	13.88	93.20
100,001 – 1,000,000	11,623	2.31	5.71	10,462	31.52	90.01
1,000,001 – or more	1779	0.35	4.44	1,693	5.10	95.17
Total	33,187	6.59	6.59	30,053	90.56	

Data Source: Geography Division

h. What is the number and percent of NC addresses provided to the late mail-out operation of census questionnaires (as opposed to field enumeration)?

- The 2010 Census NC program assigned a block code to 33,187 or 0.47 percent of the matching MAF addresses which had previously had no block geocode. These 33,187 addresses were provided to the late mail-out operation of census questionnaires.

i. What is the number and percent of NC addresses that matched a LUCA record that is in the enumeration extract?

- 48,362 addresses that were submitted matched a LUCA record in the enumeration extract.

48,362 or 16.58 percent matched one of the 291,627 LUCA addresses included in the enumeration extract. The enumeration extract is a list of residential addresses on which the 2010 Census was based. Any address to be enumerated is included in the enumeration extract and this included late-mailout operations. Counties had the highest number of addresses matching a LUCA record in the enumeration extract at 22,641 of 7.76 percent of the extract total. See Table 34 for additional data and Table 78, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 34. NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract		
	Total	% of Total	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type and Size
AIR	158	0.03	14	0.003	8.86
County	185,587	36.86	22641	4.50	12.20
Place	299,082	59.40	24069	4.78	8.05
MCD	18,662	3.71	1638	0.33	8.78
Total	503,489	100.00	48362	9.61	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	301	0.06	8.58
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	1,709	0.34	5.42
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	14,305	2.84	8.62
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	5,423	1.08	9.21
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	24,469	4.86	12.02
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	2,155	0.43	5.37
Total	503,489	100.00	48,362	9.61	

Data Source: Geography Division

j. What is the number and percent of NC addresses that matched a LUCA record that is not in the enumeration extract?

- 52,653 addresses matched a LUCA record not in the enumeration extract.

52,653 of the 503,489 addresses received from 2010 Census NC program participants matched a LUCA record not included in the enumeration extract. The larger the entity, the more likely a submitted address matched a LUCA record not contained in the enumeration extract. See Table 35 for additional data and Table 79, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 35. NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract		
	Total	% of Total	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type of Size
AIR	158	0.03	3	0.001	1.90
County	185,587	36.86	15,532	3.08	8.37
Place	299,082	59.40	36,220	7.19	12.11
MCD	18,662	3.71	898	0.18	4.81
Total	503,489	100.00	52,653	10.46	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	260	0.05	7.41
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	2,330	0.46	7.39
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	17,388	3.45	10.48
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	5,208	1.03	8.84
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	14,355	2.85	7.05
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	13,112	2.60	32.69
Total	503,489	100.00	52,653	10.46	

Data Source: Geography Division

Of the 52,653 NC addresses matching a LUCA record not in the enumeration extract, 20,855 or 39.61 percent of addresses were enumerated. At 7,184 addresses or 46.26 percent, Counties were most likely to have a NC address matching a LUCA record which was not in the enumeration extract but were enumerated nonetheless. See Table 36 for additional data.

Table 36. NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract That Were Enumerated

Government Type	NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract			NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract That Were Enumerated		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type of Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	3	0.001	1.90	0	0.00	0.00
County	15,532	3.08	8.37	7,184	13.64	46.25
Place	36,220	7.19	12.11	13,308	25.27	36.74
MCD	898	0.18	4.81	363	0.69	40.42
Total	52,653	10.46	10.46	20,855	39.61	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	260	0.05	7.41	146	0.28	56.15
1,001 – 6,000	2,330	0.46	7.39	1,388	2.64	59.57
6,001 – 50,0000	17,388	3.45	10.48	8,259	15.69	47.50
50,001 – 100,000	5,208	1.03	8.84	2,747	5.22	52.75
100,001 – 1,000,000	14,355	2.85	7.05	7,295	13.85	50.82
1,000,001 – or more	13,112	2.60	32.69	1,020	1.94	7.78
Total	52,653	10.46	10.46	20,855	39.61	

Data Source: Geography Division

There was 57,195 NC addresses matching a non-LUCA record not in the enumeration extract. Of the 57,195 addresses, a total of 24,033 or 42.02 percent were enumerated. AIRs were most likely to be enumerated at 100 percent with the remaining governments following in the range of 41 percent to 42 percent. See Table 37 for additional data.

Table 37. Enumerated NC Addresses Matching an Address Not In the Enumeration Extract

Government Type	NC Addresses Matching An Address Not In The Enumeration Extract	Enumerated NC Addresses Matching An Address Not In The Enumeration Extract		
	Total	Total	% of Total NC Addresses Matching An Address Not In The Enumeration Extract	% of Total NC Addresses Matching An Address Not In The Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1	1	0.00	100.00
County	23,046	9,715	16.99	42.15
Place	32,650	13,688	23.93	41.92
MCD	1,498	629	1.10	41.99
Total	57,195	24,033	42.02	
Size (addresses)				
1,000 or fewer	277	159	0.28	57.40
1,001 – 6,000	3,308	1,481	2.59	44.77
6,001 – 50,0000	18,964	7,540	13.18	39.76
50,001 – 100,000	9,018	4,282	7.49	47.48
100,001 – 1,000,000	21,083	8,788	15.36	41.68
1,000,001 – or more	4,542	1,783	3.12	39.26
Total	57,195	24,033	42.02	

Data Source: Geography Division

k. **What is the number and percent of NC addresses whose residence returned a questionnaire provided in the late mail operation (as opposed to field enumeration)?**

- 30,053 returned a questionnaire from late mail-out operations.

30,053 addresses returned a questionnaire from the late mail-out operations. A total of 33,187 addresses were included in the late mail-out operation and thus 90.55 percent of addresses returned a questionnaire. NC addresses included in the late mail-out operations were composed of the submitted NC addresses matching an existing ungeocoded DSF addresses in the MAF. See Table 38 for additional data and Table 80, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 38. NC Addresses Whose Residence Returned a Questionnaire from Late Mail-out Operation

Government Type	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Returned a Questionnaire From Late Mail-Out		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs by Type of Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract by Type or Size
AIR	110	0.022	69.62	12	0.004	10.91
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	12,269	4.21	12.06
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	16,756	5.75	9.31
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	1,016	0.35	10.30
Total	291,627	57.92		30,053	10.31	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2363	0.47	67.36	305	0.10	12.91
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	2,454	0.84	12.81
6,001 – 50,0000	103,676	20.59	62.50	10,534	3.61	10.16
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	4,605	1.58	12.22
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	10,462	3.59	10.85
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	1,693	0.58	5.23
Total	291,627	57.92		30,053	10.31	

Data Source: Geography Division

l. What is the number and percent of undeliverable late mail-out operation NC addresses?

- At this time, the Census Bureau does not have this information.

m. What is the number and percent of addresses that were included in enumeration?

- 291,627 addresses were included in enumeration.

Of the 503,489 addresses received, 291,627 or 57.92 percent of the addresses were included in the enumeration extract. The enumeration universe was made of the following addresses: 148,592 addresses initially received from participants not matching an existing MTdb record, 33,187 NC addresses matching an existing ungeocoded MAF record, 52,653 addresses matching a LUCA record not included in the enumeration extract, and 57,195 addresses matching a non-LUCA record not in the enumeration extract.

By type, AIRs had the highest percentage of addresses included in the enumeration extract at 69.62 percent followed by Places at 60.16 percent. Places also had the highest total number of addresses included in the enumeration extract at 179,927. See Table 39 for additional data and Table 81, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 39. NC Addresses Included in Enumeration Extract

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs by Type Or Size
AIR	158	0.03	110	0.022	69.62
County	185,587	36.86	101,726	20.20	54.81
Place	299,082	59.40	179,929	35.74	60.16
MCD	18,662	3.71	9,862	1.96	52.85
Total	503,489	100.00	291,627	57.92	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	2,363	0.47	67.36
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	19,163	3.81	60.74
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	103,676	20.59	62.50
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	37,685	7.48	63.98
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	96,386	19.14	47.36
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	32,354	6.43	80.66
Total	503,489	100.00	291,627	57.92	

Data Source: Geography Division

n. What is the number of addresses sent to enumeration that were found during enumeration?

- See question “s” for an answer to this question.

o. What is the number of addresses sent to enumeration that were not found during enumeration?

- 61,797 addresses in the enumeration extract were not found in enumeration.

A total of 61,797 or 21.19 percent of the 291,627 addresses included in the enumeration extract were not found in enumeration. Based on the data represented in Table 40, the larger the entity the more likely that a submitted addresses would not be found during enumeration. Places had the highest total number of addresses not found in enumeration at 41,433, including the highest total percentage at 14.21 percent and highest total percentage by type at 23.03 percent. AIRs had the least amount of addresses not found in enumeration at 4 or 3.64 percent of all AIR addresses sent to enumeration. See Table 40 for additional data and Table 83, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 40. NC Addresses Sent to and Not Found During Enumeration

Government Type	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent and Not Found In Enumeration		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received	% of Total Addresses Received By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	110	0.02	69.62	4	0.00	3.64
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	19,197	6.58	18.87
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	41,433	14.21	23.03
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	1,163	0.40	11.79
Total	291,627	57.92		61,797	21.19	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2,363	0.47	67.36	131	0.04	5.54
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	2,297	0.79	11.99
6,001 – 50,000	103,676	20.59	62.50	15,954	5.47	15.39
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	6,699	2.30	17.78
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	21,179	7.26	21.97
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	15,537	5.33	48.02
Total	291,627	57.92		61,797	21.19	

Data Source: Geography Division

p. What is the number of addresses sent to enumeration that were found but marked vacant during enumeration?

- 91,834 or 31.49 percent addresses sent to enumeration were found but marked vacant during enumeration.

91,834 or 31.49 percent of the 291,627 addresses included in the enumeration extract were found but marked vacant during enumeration. By type, addresses submitted by Places were least likely to be found but marked vacant during enumeration. By size, entities of 1,000,001 or more addresses were less likely to be found and marked vacant. See Table 41 for additional data and Table 84, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 41. NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Vacant During Enumeration

	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Vacant In Enumeration		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
Government Type						
AIR	110	0.022	69.62	77	0.03	70.00
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	29,270	10.04	28.77
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	58,438	20.04	32.48
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	4,049	1.39	41.06
Total	291,627	57.92		91,834	31.49	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2,363	0.47	67.36	916	0.31	38.76
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	6,151	2.11	32.10
6,001 – 50,0000	103,676	20.59	62.50	37,016	12.69	35.70
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	12,000	4.11	31.84
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	29,935	10.26	31.06
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	5,816	1.99	17.98
Total	291,627	57.92		91,834	31.49	

Data Source: Geography Division

q. What is the number of addresses sent to enumeration that were found but marked duplicate during enumeration?

- 7,725 or 2.65 percent of entities sent to enumeration were found but marked duplicate during enumeration.

Of the 291,627 addresses included in enumeration, 7,725 or 2.65 percent were found but marked duplicate during enumeration. AIRs were less likely to be found but marked duplicate during enumeration. By type, addresses submitted by MCDs were most likely to be found but marked duplicate during enumeration. By size, based on percentage of total addresses or percentage of addresses by size the percentages were relatively even. See Table 42 for additional data and Table 85, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 42. NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Duplicate During Enumeration

	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Duplicate In Enumeration		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
Government Type						
AIR	110	0.022	69.62	3	0.001	2.73
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	2,329	0.80	2.29
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	4,731	1.62	2.63
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	662	0.23	6.71
Total	291,627	57.92		7,725	2.65	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2,363	0.47	67.36	22	0.01	0.93
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	739	0.25	3.86
6,001 – 50,000	103,676	20.59	62.50	2,893	0.99	2.79
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	405	0.14	1.07
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	3,394	1.16	3.52
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	272	0.09	0.84
Total	291,627	57.92		7,725	2.65	

Data Source: Geography Division

r. What is the number of addresses sent to enumeration that were found to be non-residential during enumeration?

- 12,984 or 4.45 percent of addresses sent to enumeration were found to be non-residential during enumeration.

12,984 or 4.45 percent of the 291,627 addresses included in the enumeration extract were found and marked non-residential during enumeration. By size, entities of 1,000,001 or more addresses were more likely to submit non-residential addresses, followed by entities of 100,001 – 1,000,000 addresses. AIRs did not have any addresses included in the enumeration extract that were found to be non-residential. MCDs were the second lowest in this same category with 1.49 percent of their addresses included in the enumeration extract found to be non-residential. 5.09 percent of addresses submitted by places and included in the enumeration extract were found to be non-residential. This is the highest percentage by government type. See Table 43 for additional data and Table 86, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 43. NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Non-Residential During Enumeration

Government Type	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Non-Residential In Enumeration		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	110	0.022	69.62	0	0.00	0.00
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	5,173	1.77	5.09
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	7,664	2.63	4.26
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	147	0.05	1.49
Total	291,627	57.92		12,984	4.45	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2,363	0.47	67.36	53	0.02	2.24
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	290	0.10	1.51
6,001 – 50,0000	103,676	20.59	62.50	3,365	1.15	3.25
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	1,214	0.42	3.22
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	3,874	1.33	4.02
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	4,188	1.44	12.94
Total	291,627	57.92		12,984	4.45	

Data Source: Geography Division

s. **What is the number of addresses found and enumerated?**

- 117,287 or 40.22 percent were found and enumerated.

The 2010 Census NC program included 291,627 addresses in the enumeration extract. 117,287 or 40.22 percent of addresses sent to enumeration were found and enumerated. Places produced the most addresses at 67,663. Counties produced the second most addresses at 45,757. Based on type, counties had the highest percentage of addresses found that were sent to enumeration at 44.98 percent. Places had the highest total percentage of addresses found and enumerated at 23.98 percent of total addresses included in enumeration. See Table 44 for additional data and Table 87, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 44. Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated

Government Type	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	110	0.022	69.62	26	0.01	23.64
County	101,726	20.20	54.81	45,757	15.69	44.98
Place	179,929	35.74	60.16	67,663	23.20	37.61
MCD	9,862	1.96	52.85	3,841	1.32	38.95
Total	291,627	57.92		117,287	40.22	
Size (addresses)						
1,000 or fewer	2,363	0.47	67.36	1,241	0.43	52.52
1,001 – 6,000	19,163	3.81	60.74	9,686	3.32	50.55
6,001 – 50,000	103,676	20.59	62.50	44,448	15.24	42.87
50,001 – 100,000	37,685	7.48	63.98	17,367	5.96	46.08
100,001 – 1,000,000	96,386	19.14	47.36	38,004	13.03	39.43
1,000,001 – or more	32,354	6.43	80.66	6,541	2.24	20.22
Total	291,627	57.92		117,287	40.22	

Data Source: Geography Division

Based on size, the smaller the entity the more likely the address would be found and enumerated. Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had 52.52 percent of their enumeration extract addresses found during enumeration which is the highest. The lowest percentage came from the largest entities at 1,000,001 or more addresses with 20.22 percent of their enumeration extract addresses found during enumeration. Entities between 6,001 – 50,000 addresses produced the highest number of addresses found and enumerated at 44,448. Entities of 100,001-1,000,000 addresses produced the second highest number of addresses found and enumerated at 38,004. See Table 45 for a distribution of these data.

Table 45. Distribution of Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	12	0.004	66.67
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	14	0.005	22.58
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02	0.03	26	0.01	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	221	0.08	48.04
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	13,228	4.54	42.27
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	8,748	3.00	46.82
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	19,496	6.69	44.26
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	4,064	1.39	56.12
County Total		101,726	20.20	36.86	45,757	15.69	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	1,113	0.38	51.62
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	7,580	2.60	54.47
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	29,408	10.08	43.49
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	8,619	2.96	45.37
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	18,466	6.33	35.43
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	2,477	0.85	9.86
Place Total		179,929	35.74	59.40	67,663	23.20	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	116	0.04	61.38
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	1,871	0.64	39.59
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	1,812	0.62	38.27
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	42	0.01	19.81
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96	3.71	3,841	1.32	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		117,287	40.22	

Data Source: Geography Division

t. What is the number and percent of addresses rejected during pre-processing by HQs?

- 142,640 or 28.33 percent of addresses received by the RCCs were rejected during pre-processing.
 - 181 or 0.04 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs were rejected for illegal values in the address update files.
 - 90 or 0.02 percent of the total addresses received at RCCs were rejected during pre-processing for illegal block numbers.
 - 11 or 0.002 percent of total addresses received at the RCCs were rejected during pre-processing for a duplicate record in the file.
 - 142,358 or 28.27 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs were rejected during pre-processing because the addresses matched to an existing in-census record.
 - Zero addresses were rejected during pre-processing because noncity-style address information was in the street name.

A total of 503,489 addresses were received at the RCCs, of which, 142,640 or 28.22 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs were rejected during HQs pre-processing. See Table 46 for additional data and Table 88, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data. There are several reasons why addresses were rejected during pre-processing: illegal value, illegal block number, duplicate record within file, address matched to existed in-census records, and noncity-style address information in the street name. Each of these reasons will be analyzed in Tables 47 to 50.

Table 46. Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Rejected During Pre-processing		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	158	0.03	48	0.01	30.38
County	185,587	36.86	61,691	12.25	33.24
Place	299,082	59.40	75,839	15.06	25.36
MCD	18,662	3.71	5,062	1.01	27.12
Total	503,489	100.00	142,640	28.33	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	842	0.17	24.00
1,001 - 6,000	31,550	6.27	6,969	1.38	22.09
6,001 - 50,0000	165,890	32.95	46,042	9.14	27.75
50,001 - 100,000	58,903	11.70	17,072	3.39	28.98
100,001 - 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	67,188	13.34	33.01
1,000,001 - or more	40,110	7.97	4,527	0.90	11.29
Total	503,489	100.00	142,640	28.33	

Data Source: Geography Division

Places had the highest total number of addresses rejected during pre-processing at 75,839 or 15.06 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs. Counties had the second highest total of addresses rejected during pre-processing at 61,691 or 12.25 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs. Based on type, AIRs were most likely to have submitted addresses rejected during pre-processing at 30.38 percent of the total addresses submitted by AIRs and received at the RCCs. See Table 46 for additional data and Table 88 for a distribution of these data.

Rejected For Illegal Values

A total of 181 or 0.04 percent of the total addresses received at RCCs were rejected during HQs pre-processing for having an illegal value(s) in the address update files. Places had the highest total number of rejections at 153. Entities with 1,000,001 or more addresses had the highest total number of rejections at 141. See Table 89, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 47. Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Values in ADDUP

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Illegal Values Rejects		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs by Type of Size
AIR	158	0.03	20	0.004	12.66
County	185,587	36.86	6	0.001	0.003
Place	299,082	59.40	153	0.03	0.05
MCD	18,662	3.71	2	0.0004	0.01
Total	503,489	100.00	181	0.04	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	21	0.004	0.60
1,001 - 6,000	31,550	6.27	5	0.001	0.02
6,001 - 50,0000	165,890	32.95	8	0.002	0.005
50,001 - 100,000	58,903	11.70	1	0.0002	0.002
100,001 - 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	5	0.001	0.002
1,000,001 - or more	40,110	7.97	141	0.03	0.35
Total	503,489	100.00	181	0.04	

Data Source: Geography Division

Rejected For Illegal Block Number

Of the 503,489 addresses received at the RCCs a total of 90 or 0.02 percent of addresses were rejected during HQs pre-processing for illegal block numbers. Counties had the highest total number of addresses rejected during pre-processing for illegal block numbers at 82 followed by places at 8. By size, entities of 6,001-50,000 addresses had the highest total number rejected during pre-processing for illegal block numbers with 69 of the 90 total addresses rejected for illegal block numbers. See Table 48 for additional data and Table 90, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 48. Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Block Numbers

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Illegal Block Numbers		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	158	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
County	185,587	36.86	82	0.02	0.04
Place	299,082	59.40	8	0.00	0.00
MCD	18,662	3.71	0	0.00	0.00
Total	503,489	100.00	90	0.02	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	1	0.0002	0.03
1,001 - 6,000	31,550	6.27	9	0.002	0.03
6,001 - 50,000	165,890	32.95	69	0.01	0.04
50,001 - 100,000	58,903	11.70	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	11	0.002	0.005
1,000,001 - or more	40,110	7.97	0	0.00	0.00
Total	503,489	100.00	90	0.02	

Data Source: Geography Division

Rejected For A Duplicate Record In The File

Eleven or 0.002 percent of the total addresses received at the RCCs were rejected during HQs pre-processing for a duplicate record in the file. Counties and Places were the highest with both having 5 addresses rejected. Based on size, entities of 50,001-100,000 addresses had the most at five rejections followed by entities with 100,001-1,000,000 addresses at four rejections. It should be noted, the number of duplicate records is low due to a macro developed by RCC staff. The macro was used prior to pre-processing and the macro checked for duplicate records in the file before uploading to HQ providing substantial cleanup of participant submissions. The RCCs did not keep a record of how many duplicate records were removed due to utilizing the macro. See Table 49 for additional data and Table 91, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 49. Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Duplicate Record In The File

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Duplicate Record		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	158	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
County	185,587	36.86	5	0.001	0.00
Place	299,082	59.40	5	0.001	0.00
MCD	18,662	3.71	1	0.0002	0.01
Total	503,489	100.00	11	0.002	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	0	0.00	0.00
1,001 - 6,000	31,550	6.27	1	0.0002	0.00
6,001 - 50,0000	165,890	32.95	1	0.0002	0.00
50,001 - 100,000	58,903	11.70	5	0.001	0.01
100,001 - 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	4	0.001	0.002
1,000,001 - or more	40,110	7.97	0	0.00	0.00
Total	503,489	100.00	11	0.00	

Data Source: Geography Division

Rejected Because Addresses Matched To An Existing In-Census Record

Of the 503,489 addresses received at the RCCs, 142,358 or 28.27 percent of addresses were rejected during HQ pre-processing because the address matched to an existing in-census record. Places had the highest total rejections at 75,673 followed by counties at 61,598. Counties were most likely to have an address match an existing in-census record with 33.19 percent of all addresses from counties received at the RCCs. Based on size, addresses from entities of 100,001 - 1,000,000 addresses had a 33 percent pre-processing rejection rate due to addresses matching an existing in-census record. See Table 50 for additional information and Table 92, within Attachment B, for a distribution of these data.

Table 50. Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Matched to Existing In-Census Records

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Matched to Existing In-Census Records		
	Total	% of Total	Total	% of Total Addresses	% of Total Addresses Received by Type of Size
AIR	158	0.03	28	0.01	17.72
County	185,587	36.86	61,598	12.23	33.19
Place	299,082	59.40	75,673	15.03	25.30
MCD	18,662	3.71	5,059	1.00	27.11
Total	503,489	100.00	142,358	28.27	
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	820	0.16	23.38
1,001 - 6,000	31,550	6.27	6,954	1.38	22.04
6,001 - 50,0000	165,890	32.95	45,964	9.13	27.71
50,001 - 100,000	58,903	11.70	17,066	3.39	28.97
100,001 - 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	67,168	13.34	33.00
1,000,001 - or more	40,110	7.97	4,386	0.87	10.93
Total	503,489	100.00	142,358	28.27	

Data Source: Geography Division

Rejected For Non-city Style Address Information In The Street Name

Zero addresses were rejected during HQs pre-processing because noncity-style address information was in the street name.

5.4 Schedule Deviations

5.4.1 How did baseline start and finish dates compare with actual start and finish dates in the 2010 Master Activity Schedule (MAS)?

- a. How many activities started on time or early?
 - 18 activities finished on time or early.
- b. How many activities started 1-5 days late?
 - 1 activity started 1-5 days late.
- c. How many activities started more than 5 days late?
 - 7 activities started more than 5 days late.
- d. How many activities finished on time or early?
 - 19 activities finished on time or early.
- e. How many activities finished 1-5 days late?
 - 3 activities finished 1-5 days late.
- f. How many activities finished more than 5 days late?
 - 4 activities finished more than 5 days late.

Of the 26 major 2010 Census NC program activities from the MAS, 18 started on time or early. Eight activities started one or more days late with the activity of receiving OMB clearance the latest at 32 days later than planned. Nineteen activities finished on time or early. Seven activities finished one or more days late with the activity to print, assemble, and ship 2010 Census NC program invitation letters and enclosures the latest at 23 days. See Tables 51 and 52 for additional data.

Table 51. High-level Summary Of NC Activities.

Activities	Started On-Time or Early	Started 1-5 Days Late	Started More Than 5 Days Late	Finished On-Time or Early	Finished 1-5 Days Late	Finished More Than 5 Days Late
26	18	1	7	19	3	4

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 52. NC Schedule and Possible Deviations

Activity Name	Baseline Start	Actual Start	# Days Late	Baseline Finish	Actual Finish	# Days Late
Prepare/Publish Federal Register Notice for New Construction	1/5/2009	1/5/2009		7/8/2009	6/1/2009	
Receive OMB Clearance for New Construction	9/1/2009	10/19/2009	32		10/19/2009	
Prepare 2010 New Construction Invitation Letter and Enclosures	3/23/2009	11/3/2008		5/1/2009	5/1/2009	
External Review and Update 2010 New Construction Invitation Letter	5/4/2009	4/10/2009		5/29/2009	5/1/2009	
Receive Director's Approval for 2010 New Construction Invitation Letter	6/1/2009	5/27/2009		6/26/2009	6/1/2009	
Receive Division Chief's Approval for 2010 New Construction Invitation Enclosures	7/1/2009	5/11/2009		6/26/2009	5/15/2009	
Receive from ACSD Final 2010 New Construction Invitation Letter and Enclosures	6/15/2009	1/3/2009		6/1/2009	6/6/2009	2
Print, Assemble & Ship 2010 New Construction Invitation Letter and Enclosures	7/6/2009	7/29/2009	18	6/13/2009	8/17/2009	23
Prepare/Deliver Customer Requirements for 2010 NC ShapeFiles	3/2/2009	2/12/2009		3/31/2009	4/2/2009	2
Prepare/Deliver Customer Requirements for 2010 New Construction Large Format Maps (Map Request Form)	3/31/2009	3/17/2009		4/6/2009	3/31/2009	
Prepare/Review/Approve Participant Instructions for 2010 New Construction Review Materials	3/31/2009	3/31/2009		9/29/2009	9/29/2009	
Burn, Assemble and Ship 2010 New Construction Review Materials to Registered Participants	11/9/2009	11/2/2009		1/22/2010	12/16/2009	
Prepare/Deliver 2010 New Construction Address Update Requirements	3/31/2009	3/31/2009		10/29/2009	10/29/2009	
Receive Invitation Responses and Register 2010 New Construction Participants	7/15/2009	8/11/2009	19	10/16/2009	10/16/2009	
2010 New Construction Participants Review and Submit New Addresses	11/12/2009	11/9/2009		3/12/2010	3/12/2010	
RCCs Review 2010 New Construction Submissions and Post Results for Processing	11/27/2009	11/20/2009		3/22/2010	3/16/2010	
Receive Map Request Form for 2010 New Construction Large Format Map Files	4/6/2009	4/1/2009		4/6/2009	4/1/2009	
Develop/Test Software for 2010 New Construction Large Format Maps	8/24/2009	8/24/2009		10/26/2009	11/10/2009	11
Deliver 2010 New Construction Large Format Map Files	11/5/2009	11/16/2009	6	1/16/2010	12/11/2009	
Create 2010 New Construction Large Format Map Files	11/2/2009	11/10/2009	6	1/15/2010	12/10/2009	
Receive Final Requirements for 2010 New Construction Shapefiles	3/31/2009	4/3/2009	3	3/31/2009	4/3/2009	3
Develop/Test Software for 2010 New Construction Shapefiles	5/13/2009	4/24/2009		8/20/2009	5/5/2009	
Create/Deliver 2010 New Construction Shapefiles	8/31/2009	9/17/2009	12	10/2/2009	9/29/2009	
Receive Final Requirements for 2010 New Construction Address Update Software	11/3/2009	11/3/2009		11/3/2009	11/3/2009	
Develop/Test Software for 2010 New Construction Addresses	11/13/2009	11/13/2009		2/11/2010	2/22/2010	6
Update M/T With 2010 New Construction Addresses (and geocode to 2010 Cell Blocks)	2/12/2010	2/22/2010	5	4/12/2010	3/23/2010	

Data Source: Geography Division

6 Help Desk Call Statistics

6.1 New Construction Questions to the Technical Help Desk

- **How many incoming calls were received by the NC Help Desk?**
 - 1,099 incoming calls were received by the NC Help Desk.
- **How many and what percent of incoming calls were resolved by the NC Help Desk?**
 - 994 or 90 percent of incoming calls were resolved by the NC Help Desk.
- **How many and what percent of incoming calls were forwarded on to the RCCs?**
 - 102 incoming calls were transferred to the RCCs.
- **What was the average call duration?**
 - The average call duration was between 3 and 15 minutes.
- **How many and what percent of the incoming calls fall into the following categories:**
 - i. Encryption: 19 or 1.7 percent
 - ii. File Conversion: 626 or 56 percent
 - iii. Data CD: 20 or 1.8 percent
 - iv. MTPS Software: 50 or 4.5 percent
 - v. MTPS Procedures: 176 or 16 percent
 - vi. Maps: 34 or 3 percent
 - vii. Transfer: RCCs: 102 or 9.2 percent
 - viii. Transfer Other: 5 or less than 1 percent
 - ix. Other: 67 or 6 percent

The 2010 Census NC program had a Technical Help Desk staffed to assist registered entities participating in the 2010 Census NC program. The staff handled 1,099 incoming calls. Ninety-four percent or 994 of the 1,099 calls were resolved by the NC Help Desk. The remaining calls were solved by the RCCs or Tribal/Local Geographic Partnerships Branch (TLGPB). Of the incoming calls, 102 were transferred to the RCCs. See Table 53 and Figure 3 for additional data.


Table 53. NC Help Desk Incoming Calls

Total Number of Calls	Calls Resolved By Help Desk (Incoming calls - transferred calls)	Calls Transferred To RCCs	Calls Transferred To TLGPB	Calls Transferred To HQ Non-NC Call
1099	994	102	2	1

Data Source: Geography Division

Based on a sampling of incoming calls, the average call duration received by the NC Help Desk was between 3 and 15 minutes. Fifty-seven percent or 626 of the incoming calls dealt with file conversion. If the Census Bureau moves towards a more standard file format such as Excel then file conversion would be less of an issue thus potentially lowering the amount of incoming calls by up to 50 percent. MTPS Procedures were the next most common inquiry at 16 percent or 176 calls received. See Tables 54 and 55 for additional data.

Figure 3. Incoming Calls by Type



Data Source: Geography Division

Minutes	Total Number of Calls Received By Help Desk By Duration	% Call Received By Help Desk by Duration
3-5	54	12.36
5-10	128	29.29
10-15	112	25.63
15-20	57	13.04
20-25	37	8.47
25-30	18	4.12
30-35	12	2.75
35-40	6	1.37
40-60	8	1.83
60-80	1	0.23
80-100	1	0.23
100-120	1	0.23
120-140	2	0.46
Total	437	

Data Source: Geography Division

Call Type	Total Number Of Calls Received By Type	% of Calls Received By Type
File Conversion	626	57
MTPS Procedures	176	16
Transfer: RCCs	102	9
Other	67	6
MTPS Software	50	5
Maps	34	3
Data CD	20	2
Encryption	19	2
Transfer: Other	5	0.5
Total	1,099	

Data Source: Geography Division

7 Key Lessons Learned, Conclusions, and Recommendations

7.1 Key Lessons Learned

What worked well, and what needs improvement for future NC programs?


- The Decennial Management Division (DMD) organized multiple lessons learned sessions in order to gather information regarding aspects of program efficacy and areas needing improvement for future New Construction programs. Stakeholders from GEO, Field Division and the Technical Help Desk participated in these sessions. Out of these lessons learned sessions, DMD compiled a seven page document of lessons learned that included the issues being discussed as well as potential resolution or recommendation. That lessons learned document is located in Attachment C.
- The Geographic Partnerships Help Desk created a lessons learned document focusing on aspects of program efficacy. That lessons learned document is located in Attachment D.

7.2 Conclusions

Government Size

According to the results of the data provided in this assessment, government size was the most significant factor in determining participation and the quality of the data received. According to Figure 4, the percentage of registered participants increased with the size of the government from 6.96 percent of governments registering with 1,000 or fewer addresses to 87.50 percent of governments with 1,000,001 or more addresses registering.


Figure 4. Registered Entities by Type and Size



Data Source: Geography Division

Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had the highest number and percentage of eligible entities but the lowest percentage of registrants at 3.70 percent of total eligible entities. Entities of this size that returned a form declining participation indicated the highest reason for non-participation was due to no new addresses at 58.24 percent. Entities could choose more than one reason for non-participation.

Figure 5. Entities of 1,000 or Fewer in Size: Reasons For Declining



Data Source: Geography Division

Overall, no new addresses were the reason for the highest total number for entities declining participation at 4,606 with 3,127 or 57.24 percent coming from entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses. Insufficient staff was the reason with the second highest total number of entities declining participation at 3,623 or 41.65 percent of entities returning a form selecting this reason.

Entity size was a factor for the enumeration success of 2010 Census NC program addresses. The smaller the entity the more likely the address would be found and enumerated. Entities of 1,000 or fewer addresses had 52.52 percent of their enumeration extract addresses found during enumeration, which is the highest. The lowest percentage came from the largest entities at 1,000,001 or more addresses with 20.22 percent of their enumeration extract addresses found during enumeration.

Table 56. Percentage Enumeration Success

Government Type	% Of Enumeration Success
AIR	23.64
County	44.98
Place	37.61
MCD	38.95
Government Size (addresses)	
1,000 or fewer	52.52
1,001 - 6,000	50.55
6,001 - 50,0000	42.87
50,001 - 100,000	46.08
100,001 - 1,000,000	39.43
1,000,001 - or more	20.22

Data Source: Geography Division

Map Media Selection

Entities had the choice of selecting PDF maps or shapefiles. Of entities with a size of 1,000 or fewer addresses, 39 percent selected shapefiles. Likewise, 49 percent of entities of 1,001-6,000 addresses selected shapefiles. These statistics suggest many smaller sized entities are technically capable of utilizing a GIS.

Table 57. Map Media Selection

Government type	Selected Shapefile Maps		Selected PDF Maps	
	Total	% of Total Registered Entities	Total	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	12	0.20	3	0.05
County	773	12.99	216	3.63
Place	2,103	35.33	1,499	25.18
MCD	636	10.69	709	11.91
Total	3,524	59.21	2,427	40.78
Size (addresses)				
1,000 or fewer	422	7.09	638	10.72
1,001 - 6,000	1,142	19.19	1,172	19.69
6,001 - 50,0000	1,535	25.79	577	9.69
50,001 - 100,000	216	3.63	21	0.35
100,001 - 1,000,000	202	3.39	19	0.32
1,000,001 - or more	7	0.12	0	0.00
Total	3,524	59.21	2,427	40.78

Data Source: Geography Division

Pre-processing

Of the total addresses received, only 11 or 0.002 percent were rejected during HQ pre-processing for a duplicate record in the file. The duplicate record is low due to an Excel macro developed by RCC staff. The macro was used prior to pre-processing and the macro checked for duplicate records in the file before uploading the file to HQ. The RCCs did not keep a record of how many duplicate records were removed due to utilizing the macro. The innovation of this macro assisted in the efficacy of the 2010 Census NC program.

Geocoding Addresses

An unexpected benefit of the 2010 Census NC program was the ability of NC participants to provide addresses that allowed the Census Bureau to geocode 33,187 ungeocoded MAF addresses. In addition, the enumeration for addresses that geocoded to previously ungeocoded MAF addresses was 90.56 percent rate of addresses found. Specifically, of the 33,187 sent to late mail-out operations, a total of 30,053 addresses returned a questionnaire. This suggests a highly successful mailout operation.

According to Table 58, there was no significant difference between government type or size in the ability of the Census Bureau to enumerate existing ungeocoded addresses in the MAF that were geocoded by the Census Bureau using information supplied by 2010 Census NC program participants.

Table 58. Geocoding Success

Government Type	Percentage of Enumeration Success
AIR	92.31
County	92.07
Place	89.26
MCD	94.42
Government Size (addresses)	
1,000 or fewer	93.85
1,001 - 6,000	94.60
6,001 - 50,000	88.34
50,001 - 100,000	93.20
100,001 - 1,000,000	90.01
1,000,001 - or more	95.17

Data Source: Geography Division

7.3 Recommendations

- **Encourage governments at the lowest level to either participate or work with larger governments to consolidate their submission in order to increase the quality of data received for the 2010 Census NC program.**

Addresses are generally assigned at the lowest level of government and statistics show that the lower level governments, especially those with smaller populations provide better NC updates than higher-level governments. This poses a problem in that working with the lowest level government increases the amount of governments needed to cover the entire nation. Working at the state or county level would lower the number of governments needed to cover the nation but may not provide the most accurate data. Another solution would be to encourage the sharing of address data from those that assign addresses at the lowest level of governments to higher-level governments such as counties or states in order to maximize coverage.

- **Communicate and design partnership programs with government size in mind.**

Governments of similar sizes generally have more in common with each other than governments of the same type but of different sizes. For example, a small place would have more in common with a small county or small MCD than a large place. Likewise, a large place would have more in common with a State government than they would with a small place.

The similarities between small governments are seen with the participation rates. Smaller governments were less likely to participate for reasons such as no new addresses or insufficient staff.

When developing partnership programs (coordinating communication with partners, designing how to implement the programs), it is important to recognize the differences in size in governments more so than the type of governments. Tribal governments would be the exception due to the unique relationships with Federal Partnership programs that must be considered when developing these programs.

- **Update the MAF through partnership programs in order to increase the Census Bureau's ability to geocode addresses from the USPS Delivery Sequence File.**

Using partnership files to geocode existing ungeocoded addresses results in a high rate of enumeration. This not only adds value to the address in the MAF with the geocode, but provides a means to verify that the address exists. In addition, using partnership files to geocode existing ungeocoded addresses is another method for highlighting blocks where the Census Bureau may be missing roads and or address ranges.

8 References

- Alblinger, Carrie. "Customer Requirements Document for 2010 Census Primary Type of Enumeration Area (TEA) Delineations," Version 1.0, April 14, 2008.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2000), "2000 New Construction Program technical guide (Form No. D-1583)," 2000.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2007), "2008 Census Dress Rehearsal: Operation and System Plan," 2007.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2008), "Final Procedures for Participation in the 2010 Decennial Census Local Update of Census Addresses Program, 75 Fed. Reg. 12369," March 7, 2008.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009a), "2010 Census Detailed Operation Plan for New Construction Operation Group," 2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009b), "2010 Census New Construct Program [Flyer] (Form No. D-1745)," 2009
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009c), "2010 New Construction Program: PDF and Shapefile User Guide (Form D-1772)," 2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009d), "MAF/TIGER Partnership Software,"2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009e), "Procedures for Participating in the 2010 Decennial Census New Construction Program, 74 Fed. Reg. 56820," November 3, 2009.
- "Title 13 – Census," 13 U.S.C. 1158, 68 Stat. 1012, 1954.
- Vitrano, Frank A. (2007), "2008 Census Dress Rehearsal detailed operation and system plans for New Construction," 2008 Census Dress Rehearsal Memoranda Series: No 26, 1-14, 2009.

Attachment A: Types of Enumeration Area (TEA)

In order to determine how to enumerate housing units within a collection block for the 2010 Census, Field Division's Regional Offices assigned each collection block within the United States, Puerto Rico, and the island areas a TEA code.

Of the eight TEA codes used for the 2010 Census, there are five codes relevant to the 2010 Census NC program including:

TEA 1 – Mailout/Mailback (MO/MB): Containing the largest majority of housing units, these blocks include city-style mailing addresses to which the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) delivers the census questionnaires. Residents are asked to complete and mail back the questionnaire.

TEA 2 – Update Leave (U/L): Typically, Update Leave (U/L) enumeration is conducted in blocks that are predominantly noncity-style addresses (i.e., rural route, P.O. Box numbers) that the USPS does not mail to. Enumerators deliver an addressed census questionnaire to each housing unit, update the census address (and map features, if necessary), and ask the resident to complete and mail back the questionnaire.

TEA 5 – Update Enumerate (U/E): These areas are considered to have special enumeration needs including rural areas that historically have lower rates of questionnaire returns and seasonal housing with a high number of vacant housing units. Enumerators visited each housing unit in these areas to update the census address (and map features, if necessary) and directly enumerate the household. Addresses in U/E areas were not eligible for NonResponse FollowUp.

TEA 6 – Military: The Military TEA includes areas that are part of military installations for planning and evaluation purposes only. These areas are primarily Mailout/Mailback.

TEA 7 – Urban Update/Leave (UU/L): This TEA delineates urban areas with city-style addresses where the Census Bureau may be unsure of accurate mail delivery to individual housing units such as multi-unit buildings with a central mail drop-off point and communities where residents receive their mail at post office boxes. Enumerators deliver an addressed census questionnaire to each housing unit, update the census address (and map features, if necessary), and ask the resident to complete and mail back the questionnaire.

Attachment B: Detailed Tables

Table 59. Distribution of 2010 Census NC Participation Registered Participants by Type and Size

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Registered Entities		
		Total Number Eligible	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total Number Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	8	8.70	0.03
	1,001 - 6,000	17	13.93	5	29.41	0.02
	6,001 - 50,0000	13	10.66	2	15.38	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	15		0.05
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	1	7.14	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	509	19.63	91	17.88	0.32
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,626	62.71	602	37.02	2.10
	50,001 - 100,000	211	8.14	138	65.40	0.48
	100,001 - 1,000,000	228	8.79	154	67.54	0.54
	1,000,001 - or more	5	0.19	4	80.00	0.01
County Total		2,593	100.00	990		3.45
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	687	10.50	2.40
	1,001 - 6,000	4,288	32.98	1,530	35.68	5.33
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,989	15.30	1,222	61.44	4.26
	50,001 - 100,000	110	0.85	96	87.27	0.33
	100,001 - 1,000,000	71	0.55	64	90.14	0.22
	1,000,001 - or more	3	0.02	3	100.00	0.01
Place Total		13,001	100.00	3,602		12.56
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	364	4.24	1.27
	1,001 - 6,000	3,553	27.40	688	19.36	2.40
	6,001 - 50,0000	796	6.14	287	36.06	1.00
	50,001 - 100,000	21	0.16	3	14.29	0.01
	100,001 - 1,000,000	4	0.03	3	75.00	0.01
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	1,345		4.69
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	5,952		20.75

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 60. Distribution of Registered Entities That Dropped Out

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Dropped Out After Receiving Materials			Total Entities Dropped Out After Registering after Registered		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	1	12.50	0.02
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02	1	20.00	0.02
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	2		0.03	2		0.03
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	4	4.40	0.07
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	12	1.99	0.20	12	1.99	0.20
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	3	2.17	0.05	3	2.17	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	3	1.95	0.05	3	1.95	0.05
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	22		0.37	22		0.37
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	64	9.32	1.08	64	9.32	1.08
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	65	4.25	1.09	65	4.25	1.09
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	46	3.76	0.77	46	3.76	0.77
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	1	1.04	0.02	1	1.04	0.02
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	1	1.56	0.02	1	1.56	0.02
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	177		2.97	177		2.97
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	47	12.91	0.79	47	12.91	0.79
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	37	5.38	0.62	38	5.52	0.64
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	9	3.14	0.15	9	3.14	0.15
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	93		1.56	94		1.58
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	294		4.94	295		4.96

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 61. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did Not Drop Out

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Dropped Out After Registered			Did Not Drop Out		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered by Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	7	87.50	0.12
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02	4	80.00	0.07
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	2	100.00	0.03
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	2		0.03	13		0.22
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	1	100.00	0.02
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	87	95.60	1.46
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	12	1.99	0.20	590	98.01	9.91
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	3	2.17	0.05	135	97.83	2.27
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	3	1.95	0.05	151	98.05	2.54
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	22		0.37	968		16.26
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	64	9.32	1.08	623	90.68	10.47
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	65	4.25	1.09	1,465	95.75	24.61
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	46	3.76	0.77	1,176	96.24	19.76
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	1	1.04	0.02	95	98.96	1.60
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	1	1.56	0.02	63	98.44	1.06
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	177		2.97	3,425		57.54
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	47	12.91	0.79	317	87.09	5.33
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	38	5.52	0.64	650	94.48	10.92
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	9	3.14	0.15	278	96.86	4.67
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.05
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	94		1.58	1,251		21.02
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	295		4.96	5,657		95.04

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 62. Distribution of Entities Returning a Submission

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Did Not Drop Out			Returned A Submission		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered By Type or Size	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered By Type or Size	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	7	87.50	0.12	4	57.14	0.07
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	4	80.00	0.07	4	100.00	0.07
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	2	100.00	0.03	1	50.00	0.02
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	13		0.22	9		0.16
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	1	100.00	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	87	95.60	1.46	29	33.33	0.51
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	590	98.01	9.91	334	56.61	5.90
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	135	97.83	2.27	91	67.41	1.61
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	151	98.05	2.54	116	76.82	2.05
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	4	100.00	0.07	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	967		16.25	574		10.15
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	623	90.68	10.47	181	29.05	3.20
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	1,465	95.75	24.61	593	40.48	10.48
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	1,176	96.24	19.76	676	57.48	11.95
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	95	98.96	1.60	73	76.84	1.29
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	63	98.44	1.06	56	88.89	0.99
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	3	100.00	0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	3,424		57.53	1,582		27.97
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	317	87.09	5.33	89	28.08	1.57
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	650	94.48	10.92	239	36.77	4.22
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	278	96.86	4.67	139	50.00	2.46
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	2	66.67	0.04
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	1,251		21.02	469		8.29
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	5,657		95.04	2,634		46.56

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 63. Distribution of Eligible Entities Attempting to Register Late

		Registered Entities			Eligible Entities Attempting To Register Late		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible By Type or Size	% of Total Eligible
Government Type	Size (addresses)						
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	1	20.00	0.02
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	1		0.02
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	3	3.30	0.05
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	4	0.66	0.07
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	2	1.45	0.03
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	2	1.30	0.03
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	11		0.18
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	52	7.57	0.87
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	20	1.31	0.34
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	4	0.33	0.07
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	76		1.28
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	102	28.02	1.71
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	20	2.91	0.34
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	1	0.35	0.02
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	123		2.07
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	211		3.55

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 64. Distribution of Entities That Did Not Respond to Invitation to Registration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Responding To Registration		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Eligible By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	65	70.65	0.23
	1,001 – 6,000	17	13.93	10	58.82	0.03
	6,001 – 50,0000	13	10.66	8	61.54	0.03
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total		122	100.00	83		0.29
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	8	57.14	0.03
	1,001 – 6,000	509	19.63	235	46.17	0.82
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,626	62.71	665	40.90	2.32
	50,001 – 100,000	211	8.14	57	27.01	0.20
	100,001 – 1,000,000	228	8.79	43	18.86	0.15
	1,000,001 – or more	5	0.19	1	20.00	0.00
Total		2,593	100.00	1,009		3.52
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	3,319	50.75	11.57
	1,001 – 6,000	4,288	32.98	1,619	37.76	5.64
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,989	15.30	534	26.85	1.86
	50,001 – 100,000	110	0.85	11	10.00	0.04
	100,001 – 1,000,000	71	0.55	4	5.63	0.01
	1,000,001 – or more	3	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Total		13,001	100.00	5,487		19.13
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	5,323	61.95	18.56
	1,001 – 6,000	3,553	27.40	1,779	50.07	6.20
	6,001 – 50,0000	796	6.14	342	42.96	1.19
	50,001 – 100,000	21	0.16	10	47.62	0.03
	100,001 – 1,000,000	4	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total		12,967	100.00	7,454		25.99
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	14,033		48.92

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 65. Distribution of Total Eligible Entities That Did Not Register

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities		Eligible Entities Not Registering		
		Total Eligible	% of Total Eligible	Total	% of Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	92	75.41	84	91.30	0.29
	1,001 – 6,000	17	13.93	12	70.59	0.04
	6,001 – 50,0000	13	10.66	11	84.62	0.04
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		122	100.00	107		0.37
County	1,000 or fewer	14	0.54	13	92.86	0.05
	1,001 – 6,000	509	19.63	418	82.12	1.46
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,626	62.71	1,024	62.98	3.57
	50,001 – 100,000	211	8.14	73	34.60	0.25
	100,001 – 1,000,000	228	8.79	74	32.46	0.26
	1,000,001 – or more	5	0.19	1	20.00	0.00
County Total		2,593	100.00	1,603		5.59
Place	1,000 or fewer	6,540	50.30	5,850	89.45	20.40
	1,001 – 6,000	4,288	32.98	2,762	64.41	9.63
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,989	15.30	767	38.56	2.67
	50,001 – 100,000	110	0.85	14	12.73	0.05
	100,001 – 1,000,000	71	0.55	7	9.86	0.02
	1,000,001 – or more	3	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		13,001	100.00	9,400		32.77
MCD	1,000 or fewer	8,593	66.27	8,229	95.76	28.69
	1,001 – 6,000	3,553	27.40	2,865	80.64	9.99
	6,001 – 50,0000	796	6.14	509	63.94	1.77
	50,001 – 100,000	21	0.16	18	85.71	0.06
	100,001 – 1,000,000	4	0.03	1	25.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		12,967	100.00	11,622		40.52
Overall Total		28,683	100.00	22,731		79.25

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 66. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected PDF Map Media

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Selected PDF Maps		
		Total Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total By Size or Type	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	3	37.50	0.05
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	3		0.05
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	44	48.35	0.74
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	147	24.42	2.47
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	12	8.70	0.20
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	13	8.44	0.22
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	216		3.63
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	410	59.68	6.89
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	765	50.00	12.85
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	314	25.70	5.28
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	6	6.25	0.10
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	4	6.25	0.07
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	1,499		25.19
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	225	61.81	3.78
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	363	52.76	6.10
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	116	40.42	1.95
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	3	100.00	0.05
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	2	66.67	0.03
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	709		11.91
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	2,427		40.78

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 67. Distribution of Registered Entities That Did or Did Not Drop Out That Selected Shapefile Map Media

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Selected Shapefile Maps		
		Total Registered	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total By Type or Size	% of Total Registered Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	5	62.50	0.08
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	5	100.00	0.08
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	2	100.00	0.03
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	12		0.20
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	1	100.00	0.02
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	47	51.65	0.79
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	454	75.42	7.63
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	126	91.30	2.12
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	141	91.56	2.37
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	4	100.00	0.07
County Total		990		3.45	773		12.99
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	277	40.32	4.65
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	765	50.00	12.85
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	908	74.30	15.26
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	90	93.75	1.51
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	60	93.75	1.01
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	3		0.05
Place Total		3,602		12.56	2,103		35.33
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	139	38.19	2.34
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	325	47.24	5.46
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	171	59.58	2.87
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	1	33.33	0.02
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	636		10.69
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	3,524		59.21

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 68. Distribution of Usability of NC Files

Govt Type And Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Returned a NC File Submission			Returning Usable NC Files			Returning Unusable NC Files			Usable NC Files After Fixing		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File by Government Type	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File by Government Type	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File by Government Type	Total	% of Total Returned a NC File by Size or Type	% of Total Returned a NC File by Government Type
AIR															
1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	4	50.00	0.07	2	50.00	0.08	0	0.00	0.00	2	50.00	0.08
1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	4	80.00	0.07	2	50.00	0.08	0	0.00	0.00	2	50.00	0.08
6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	1	50.00	0.02	1	100.00	0.04	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total	15		0.05	9		0.15	5		0.19	0		0.00	4		0.15
County															
1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	29	31.87	0.49	18	62.07	0.68	1	3.45	0.04	10	34.48	0.38
6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	334	55.48	5.61	160	47.90	6.09	10	2.99	0.38	164	49.10	6.24
50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	91	65.94	1.53	43	47.25	1.64	2	2.20	0.08	46	50.55	1.75
100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	116	75.32	1.95	49	42.24	1.86	2	1.72	0.08	65	56.03	2.47
1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	4	100.00	0.07	1	25.00	0.04	2	50.00	0.08	1	25.00	0.04
County Total	990		3.45	574		9.64	271		10.31	17		0.65	286		10.88
Place															
1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	181	26.35	3.04	107	59.12	4.07	4	2.21	0.15	70	38.67	2.66
1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	591	38.63	9.93	333	56.35	12.67	13	2.20	0.49	245	41.46	9.32
6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	674	55.16	11.32	361	53.56	13.74	1	0.15	0.04	312	46.29	11.87
50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	73	76.04	1.23	33	45.21	1.26	0	0.00	0.00	40	54.79	1.52
100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	56	87.50	0.94	20	35.71	0.76	0	0.00	0.00	36	64.29	1.37
1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	3	100.00	0.05	1	33.33	0.04	0	0.00	0.00	2	66.67	0.08
Place Total	3,602		12.56	1,578		26.51	855		32.53	18		0.68	705		26.83
MCD															
1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	89	24.45	1.50	51	57.30	1.94	6	6.74	0.23	32	35.96	1.22
1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	237	34.45	3.98	116	48.95	4.41	10	4.22	0.38	111	46.84	4.22
6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	139	48.43	2.34	60	43.17	2.28	6	4.32	0.23	73	52.52	2.78
50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	2	66.67	0.03	1	50.00	0.04	0	0.00	0.00	1	50.00	0.04
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total	1,345		4.69	467		7.85	228		8.68	22		0.84	217		8.26
Overall Total	5,952		20.75	2,628		44.15	1,359		51.71	57		2.17	1212		46.12

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 69. Distribution of Entities Returning NC Files Not On Time

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Returning NC Files Late But Able To Process			Returning NC Files Late And Unable To Process		
		Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	% of Total Registered
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	1	12.50	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	2	40.00	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	3		0.05	0		0.00
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	4	4.40	0.07	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	103	17.11	1.73	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	25	18.12	0.42	1	0.72	0.02
	100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	43	27.92	0.72	1	0.65	0.02
	1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	175		2.94	2		0.03
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	51	7.42	0.86	2	0.29	0.03
	1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	127	8.30	2.13	3	0.20	0.05
	6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	146	11.95	2.45	6	0.49	0.10
	50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	16	16.67	0.27	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	21	32.81	0.35	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	361		6.07	11		0.18
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	18	4.95	0.30	1	0.27	0.02
	1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	65	9.45	1.09	1	0.15	0.02
	6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	36	12.54	0.60	2	0.70	0.03
	50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	1	33.33	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	120		2.02	4		0.07
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	659		11.07	17		0.29

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 70. Distribution of Entities Returning Feature Updates

		Registered Entities			PDF Participants Returning Feature Updates			Shapefile Participants Returning Feature Updates		
		Total Registered	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type
AIR	1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		15		0.05	0	0.00		0	0.00	
County	1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	0.33
	50,001 – 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	1.30
	1,000,001 – or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		990		3.45	0	0.00		4	0.07	
Place	1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	0.29
	1,001 – 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	0	0.00	0.00	1	0.02	0.07
	6,001 – 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	2	0.03	0.16	6	0.10	0.49
	50,001 – 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.03	2.08
	100,001 – 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,602		12.56	2	0.03		11	0.18	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	1	0.02	0.27	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.0	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		1,345		4.69	1	0.02		0	0.00	
Overall Total		5,952		20.75	3	0.05		15	0.25	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 71. Distribution of Entities Sent Past Due Letters

Government Type And Size (addresses)	Registered Entities			Governments Sent Past Due Letters			PDF Entities Sent Past Due Letters			Shapefile Entities Sent Past Due Letters		
	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size or Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	Total	% of Total Registered	% of Total Registered By Size or Type
AIR												
1,000 or fewer	8	8.70	0.03	3	0.05	37.50	0	0.00	0.00	3	0.05	37.50
1,001 - 6,000	5	29.41	0.02	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
6,001 - 50,0000	2	15.38	0.01	1	0.02	50.00	0	0.00	0.00	1	0.02	50.00
50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total	15		0.05	4	0.07		0	0.00		4	0.07	
County												
1,000 or fewer	1	7.14	0.00	1	0.02	100.00	0	0.00	0.00	1	0.02	100.00
1,001 - 6,000	91	17.88	0.32	59	0.99	64.84	28	0.47	30.77	31	0.52	34.07
6,001 - 50,0000	602	37.02	2.10	255	4.28	42.36	68	1.14	11.30	187	3.14	31.06
50,001 - 100,000	138	65.40	0.48	44	0.74	31.88	7	0.12	5.07	37	0.62	26.81
100,001 - 1,000,000	154	67.54	0.54	35	0.59	22.73	4	0.07	2.60	31	0.52	20.13
1,000,001 - or more	4	80.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total	990		3.45	394	6.62		107	1.80		287	4.82	
Place												
1,000 or fewer	687	10.50	2.40	440	7.39	64.05	243	4.08	35.37	197	3.31	28.68
1,001 - 6,000	1,530	35.68	5.33	873	14.67	57.06	447	7.51	29.22	426	7.16	27.84
6,001 - 50,0000	1,222	61.44	4.26	500	8.40	40.92	161	2.70	13.18	339	5.70	27.74
50,001 - 100,000	96	87.27	0.33	22	0.37	22.92	1	0.02	1.04	21	0.35	21.88
100,001 - 1,000,000	64	90.14	0.22	7	0.12	10.94	2	0.03	3.13	5	0.08	7.81
1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total	3,602		12.56	1,842	30.95		854	14.35		988	16.60	
MCD												
1,000 or fewer	364	4.24	1.27	225	3.78	61.81	138	2.32	37.91	87	1.46	23.90
1,001 - 6,000	688	19.36	2.40	409	6.87	59.45	206	3.46	29.94	203	3.41	29.51
6,001 - 50,0000	287	36.06	1.00	136	2.28	47.39	60	1.01	20.91	76	1.28	26.48
50,001 - 100,000	3	14.29	0.01	3	0.05	100.00	3	0.05	100.00	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 - 1,000,000	3	75.00	0.01	1	0.02	33.33	1	0.02	33.33	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total	1,345		4.69	774	13.00		408	6.85		366	6.15	
Overall Total	5,952		20.75	3,014	50.64		1,369	23.00		1,645	27.64	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 72. Distribution of Addresses Received at RCCs

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Returned a NC File Submission			Addresses Received at RCCs	
		Total	% of Total Registered By Size or Type	% of Total Registered	Total	% of Total Returning a NC File
AIR	1,000 or fewer	4	50.00	0.07	46	0.01
	1,001 - 6,000	4	80.00	0.07	82	0.02
	6,001 - 50,0000	1	50.00	0.02	30	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
AIR Total		9		0.15	158	0.03
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	29	31.87	0.49	659	0.13
	6,001 - 50,0000	334	55.48	5.61	49,174	9.77
	50,001 - 100,000	91	65.94	1.53	32,032	6.36
	100,001 - 1,000,000	116	75.32	1.95	92,270	18.33
	1,000,001 - or more	4	100.00	0.07	11,452	2.27
County Total		574		9.64	185,587	36.86
Place	1,000 or fewer	181	26.35	3.04	3181	0.63
	1,001 - 6,000	591	38.63	9.93	21827	4.34
	6,001 - 50,0000	674	55.16	11.32	107,606	21.37
	50,001 - 100,000	73	76.04	1.23	26,871	5.34
	100,001 - 1,000,000	56	87.50	0.94	110,939	22.03
	1,000,001 - or more	3	100.00	0.05	28658	5.69
Place Total		1,578		26.51	299,082	59.40
MCD	1,000 or fewer	89	24.45	1.50	281	0.06
	1,001 - 6,000	237	34.45	3.98	8,982	1.78
	6,001 - 50,0000	139	48.43	2.34	9,080	1.80
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	2	66.67	0.03	319	0.06
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
MCD Total		467		7.85	18,662	3.71
Overall Total		2,628		44.15	503,489	100.00

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 73. Distribution of Processed Address Lists

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Returned a NC File Submission			Participants Submitted Address Lists That Were Processed		
		Total	% of Total By Size or Type	% of Total	Total	% of Total	% of Total By Size Or Type
AIR	1,000 or fewer	4	50.00	0.07	4	0.15	100.00
	1,001 – 6,000	4	80.00	0.07	4	0.15	100.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	1	50.00	0.02	1	0.04	100.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		9		0.15	9	0.34	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	29	31.87	0.49	28	1.07	96.55
	6,001 – 50,0000	334	55.48	5.61	322	12.25	96.41
	50,001 – 100,000	91	65.94	1.53	89	3.39	97.80
	100,001 – 1,000,000	116	75.32	1.95	112	4.26	96.55
	1,000,001 – or more	4	100.00	0.07	2	0.08	50.00
County Total		574		9.64	553	21.04	
Place	1,000 or fewer	181	26.35	3.04	175	6.66	96.69
	1,001 – 6,000	591	38.63	9.93	580	22.07	98.14
	6,001 – 50,0000	674	55.16	11.32	671	25.53	99.55
	50,001 – 100,000	73	76.04	1.23	73	2.78	100.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	56	87.50	0.94	56	2.13	100.00
	1,000,001 – or more	3	100.00	0.05	3	0.11	100.00
Place Total		1,578		26.51	1,558	59.28	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	89	24.45	1.50	82	3.12	92.13
	1,001 – 6,000	237	34.45	3.98	227	8.64	95.78
	6,001 – 50,0000	139	48.43	2.34	132	5.02	94.96
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	2	66.67	0.03	2	0.08	100.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		467		7.85	443	16.86	
Overall Total		2,628		44.15	2,563	97.53	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 74. Distribution of Addresses Rejected In RCCs Preprocessing

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Addresses Rejected in RCCs Preprocessing		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	0	0.00	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	42	0.01	6.37
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	2,357	0.47	4.79
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	2,032	0.40	6.34
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	11,909	2.37	12.91
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	2,670	0.53	23.31
County Total		185,587	36.86	19,013	3.78	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	248	0.05	7.80
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	2,696	0.54	12.35
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	9,857	1.96	9.16
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	580	0.12	2.16
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	25,802	5.12	23.26
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	240	0.05	0.84
Place Total		299,082	59.40	39,423	7.83	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	12	0.00	4.27
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	2,293	0.46	25.53
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	1,233	0.24	13.58
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	13	0.00	4.08
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	3,580	0.71	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	61,984	12.32	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 75. Distribution of Addresses Sent to and Processed By HQ

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Addresses Processed Sent to and Processed by HQ		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	46	0.01	100.00
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	82	0.02	100.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	30	0.01	100.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	158	0.03	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	617	0.12	93.63
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	46,817	9.30	95.21
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	30,000	5.96	93.66
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	80,361	15.96	87.09
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	8,782	1.74	76.69
County Total		185,587	36.86	166,577	33.08	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	2,933	0.58	92.20
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	19,131	3.80	87.65
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	97,749	19.41	90.84
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	26,291	5.22	97.84
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	85,137	16.91	76.74
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	28,418	5.64	99.16
Place Total		299,082	59.40	259,659	51.57	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	269	0.05	95.73
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	6,689	1.33	74.47
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	7,847	1.56	86.42
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	306	0.06	95.92
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	15,111	3.00	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	441,505	87.69	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 76. Distribution of New Unmatched Addresses

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		New Unmatched Addresses Received		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	5	0.001	10.87
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	58	0.01	70.73
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	30	0.01	100.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	93	0.02	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	375	0.07	56.90
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	17,926	3.56	36.45
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	9,185	1.82	28.67
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	20,551	4.08	22.27
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	1,785	0.35	15.59
County Total		185,587	36.86	49,822	9.90	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	1,381	0.27	43.41
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	7,052	1.40	32.31
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	34,784	6.91	32.33
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	9,330	1.85	34.72
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	28,604	5.68	25.78
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	11,136	2.21	38.86
Place Total		299,082	59.40	92,287	18.33	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	115	0.02	40.93
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	3,446	0.68	38.37
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	2,659	0.53	29.28
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	170	0.03	53.29
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	6,390	1.27	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	148,592	29.51	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 77. Distribution of NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses

		Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching Existing Ungeocoded Addresses		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
Government Type	Size (addresses)					
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	12	0.002	26.09
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	1	0.0002	1.22
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	13	0.00	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	47	0.01	7.13
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	3,420	0.68	6.95
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	2,311	0.46	7.21
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	5,950	1.18	6.45
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	1,598	0.32	13.95
County Total		185,587	36.86	13,326	2.65	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	274	0.05	8.61
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	2,046	0.41	9.37
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	7,984	1.59	7.42
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	2,630	0.52	9.79
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	5,657	1.12	5.10
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	181	0.04	0.63
Place Total		299,082	59.40	18,772	3.73	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	39	0.01	13.88
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	500	0.10	5.57
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	521	0.10	5.74
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	16	0.00	5.02
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	1,076	0.21	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	33,187	6.59	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 78. Distribution of NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record in Enumeration Extract		
		Total	% of Total Participants Returning A NC File	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	8	0.002	17.39
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	6	0.001	7.32
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	14	0.003	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	16	0.003	2.43
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	3,320	0.66	6.75
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	3,579	0.71	11.17
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	15,408	3.06	16.70
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	318	0.06	2.78
County Total		185,587	36.86	22,641	4.50	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	284	0.06	8.93
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	1,336	0.27	6.12
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	9,717	1.93	9.03
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	1,844	0.37	6.86
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	9,051	1.80	8.16
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	1,837	0.36	6.41
Place Total		299,082	59.40	24,069	4.78	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	9	0.002	3.20
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	351	0.07	3.91
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	1,268	0.25	13.96
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	10	0.00	3.13
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	1,638	0.33	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	48,362	9.61	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 79. Distribution of NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Matching LUCA Record Not in Enumeration Extract		
		Total	% of Total Participants Returning A NC File	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type of Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	1	0.0002	2.17
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	2	0.0004	2.44
	6,001 – 50,000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	3	0.00	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	7	0.00	1.06
	6,001 – 50,000	49,174	9.77	4,328	0.86	8.80
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	2,926	0.58	9.13
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	7,961	1.58	8.63
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	310	0.06	2.71
County Total		185,587	36.86	15,532	3.08	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	244	0.05	7.67
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	2,094	0.42	9.59
	6,001 – 50,000	107,606	21.37	12,409	2.46	11.53
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	2,282	0.45	8.49
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	6,389	1.27	5.76
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	12,802	2.54	44.67
Place Total		299,082	59.40	36,220	7.19	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	15	0.003	5.34
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	227	0.05	2.53
	6,001 – 50,000	9,080	1.80	651	0.13	7.17
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	5	0.001	1.57
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	898	0.18	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	52,653	10.46	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 80. Distribution of NC Addresses Whose Residence Returned a Questionnaire From Late Mail-out Operation

		NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Returned a Questionnaire From Late Mail-Out		
Government Type	Size (addresses)	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	11	0.004	61.11
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	1	0.000	1.61
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		12	0.004%	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	45	0.015	9.78
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	3,026	1.038	9.67
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	2,176	0.746	11.65
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	5,498	1.885	12.48
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	1,524	0.523	21.04
County Total		101,726	20.20		12,269	4.207	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	259	0.089	12.01
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	1,932	0.662	13.88
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	7,019	2.407	10.38
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	2,429	0.833	12.78
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	4,948	1.697	9.49
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	169	0.058	0.67
Place Total		179,929	35.74		16,756	5.746	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	35	0.012	18.52
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	476	0.163	10.07
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	489	0.168	10.33
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	16	0.005	7.55
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		1,016	0.348	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		30,053	10.31	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 81. Distribution of NC Addresses Included In Enumeration

		Addresses Received at RCCs		NC Addresses Included In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
Government Type	Size (addresses)					
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	18	0.004	39.13
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	62	0.0123	75.61
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	30	0.01	100.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	110	0.02	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	460	0.09	69.80
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	31,291	6.21	63.63
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	18,686	3.71	58.34
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	44,047	8.75	47.74
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	7,242	1.44	63.24
County Total		185,587	36.86	101,726	20.20	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	2,156	0.43	67.78
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	13,915	2.76	63.75
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	67,620	13.43	62.84
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	18,999	3.77	70.70
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	52,127	10.35	46.99
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	25,112	4.99	87.63
Place Total		299,082	59.40	179,929	35.74	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	189	0.04	67.26
	1,001 – 6,000	8982	1.78	4,726	0.94	52.62
	6,001 – 50,0000	9080	1.80	4,735	0.94	52.15
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	212	0.042	66.46
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	9,862	1.96	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	291,627	57.92	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 82. Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found During Enumeration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent and Found In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	12	0.004	66.67
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	14	0.005	22.58
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		26	0.009	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	221	0.08	48.04
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	13,228	4.54	42.27
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	8,748	3.00	46.82
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	19,496	6.69	44.26
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	4,064	1.39	56.12
County Total		101,726	20.20		45,757	15.69	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	1,113	0.38	51.62
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	7,580	2.60	54.47
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	29,408	10.08	43.49
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	8,619	2.96	45.37
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	18,466	6.33	35.43
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	2,477	0.85	9.86
Place Total		179,929	35.74		67,663	23.20	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	116	0.04	61.38
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	1,871	0.64	39.59
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	1,812	0.62	38.27
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	42	0.01	19.81
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		3,841	1.32	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		117,287	40.22	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 83. Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Not Found During Enumeration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent and Not Found In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received	% of Total Participants Returning A NC File	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type of Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	1	0.00	5.56
	1,001 - 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	3	0.001	4.84
	6,001 - 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		4	0.001	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	39	0.01	8.48
	6,001 - 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	6,570	2.25	21.00
	50,001 - 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	2,893	0.99	15.48
	100,001 - 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	8,296	2.84	18.83
	1,000,001 - or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	1,399	0.48	19.32
County Total		101,726	20.20		19,197	6.58	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	109	0.04	5.06
	1,001 - 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	1,442	0.49	10.36
	6,001 - 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	9,115	3.13	13.48
	50,001 - 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	3,806	1.31	20.03
	100,001 - 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	12,823	4.40	24.60
	1,000,001 - or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	14,138	4.85	56.30
Place Total		179,929	35.74		41,433	14.21	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	21	0.01	11.11
	1,001 - 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	813	0.28	17.20
	6,001 - 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	269	0.09	5.68
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	60	0.02	28.30
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		1,163	0.40	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		61,797	21.19	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 84. Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found Not Marked Vacant During Enumeration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Vacant In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received	% of Total Participants Returning A NC File	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Of Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	2	0.0007	11.11
	1,001 - 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	45	0.02	72.58
	6,001 - 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	30	0.01	100.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02	0.03	77	0.03	70.00
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	181	0.06	39.35
	6,001 - 50,0000	31291	6.21	9.77	9099	3.12	29.08
	50,001 - 100,000	18686	3.71	6.36	5800	1.99	31.04
	100,001 - 1,000,000	44047	8.75	18.33	12571	4.31	28.54
	1,000,001 - or more	7242	1.44	2.27	1619	0.56	22.36
County Total		101726	20.20	36.86	29270	10.04	28.77
Place	1,000 or fewer	2156	0.43	0.63	873	0.30	40.49
	1,001 - 6,000	13915	2.76	4.34	4418	1.51	31.75
	6,001 - 50,0000	67620	13.43	21.37	25496	8.74	37.70
	50,001 - 100,000	18999	3.77	5.34	6200	2.13	32.63
	100,001 - 1,000,000	52127	10.35	22.03	17254	5.92	33.10
	1,000,001 - or more	25112	4.99	5.69	4197	1.44	16.71
Place Total		179929	35.74	59.40	58438	20.04	32.48
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	41	0.01	21.69
	1,001 - 6,000	4726	0.94	1.78	1507	0.52	31.89
	6,001 - 50,0000	4735	0.94	1.80	2391	0.82	50.50
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	110	0.04	51.89
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9862	1.96	3.71	4049	1.39	41.06
Overall Total		291,627	57.29		91,834	31.49	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 85. Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Duplicate During Enumeration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Duplicate In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	3	0.001	16.67
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		3	0.001	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	9	0.003	1.96
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	566	0.19	1.81
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	223	0.08	1.19
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	1,453	0.50	3.30
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	78	0.03	1.08
County Total		101,726	20.20		2,329	0.80	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	12	0.004	0.56
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	294	0.10	2.11
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	2,108	0.72	3.12
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	182	0.06	0.96
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	1,941	0.67	3.72
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	194	0.07	0.77
Place Total		179,929	35.74		4,731	1.62	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	7	0.002	3.70
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	436	0.15	9.23
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	219	0.08	4.63
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		662	0.23	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		91,834	31.49	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 86. Distribution of NC Addresses Sent to and Found But Marked Non-Residential During Enumeration

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Addresses Sent, Found, and Marked Non-Residential In Enumeration		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		0	0.00	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	10	0.00	2.17
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	1,828	0.63	5.84
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	1,022	0.35	5.47
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	2,231	0.77	5.07
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	82	0.03	1.13
County Total		101,726	20.20		5,173	1.77	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	49	0.02	2.27
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	181	0.06	1.30
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	1,493	0.51	2.21
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	192	0.07	1.01
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	1,643	0.56	3.15
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	4,106	1.41	16.35
Place Total		179,929	35.74		7,664	2.63	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	4	0.001	2.12
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	99	0.03	2.09
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	44	0.02	0.93
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		147	0.05	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		12,984	4.45	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 87. Distribution of Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated

Government Type	Size (addresses)	NC Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract			Number of Addresses Found and Enumerated		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size	Total	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract	% of Total Addresses Included In Enumeration Extract By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	18	0.004	0.01	12	0.004	66.67
	1,001 – 6,000	62	0.0123	0.02	14	0.005	22.58
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		110	0.02		26	0.01	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	460	0.09	0.13	221	0.08	48.04
	6,001 – 50,0000	31,291	6.21	9.77	13,228	4.54	42.27
	50,001 – 100,000	18,686	3.71	6.36	8,748	3.00	46.82
	100,001 – 1,000,000	44,047	8.75	18.33	19,496	6.69	44.26
	1,000,001 – or more	7,242	1.44	2.27	4,064	1.39	56.12
County Total		101,726	20.20		45,757	15.69	
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,156	0.43	0.63	1,113	0.38	51.62
	1,001 – 6,000	13,915	2.76	4.34	7,580	2.60	54.47
	6,001 – 50,0000	67,620	13.43	21.37	29,408	10.08	43.49
	50,001 – 100,000	18,999	3.77	5.34	8,619	2.96	45.37
	100,001 – 1,000,000	52,127	10.35	22.03	18,466	6.33	35.43
	1,000,001 – or more	25,112	4.99	5.69	2,477	0.85	9.86
Place Total		179,929	35.74		67,663	23.20	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	189	0.04	0.06	116	0.04	61.38
	1,001 – 6,000	4,726	0.94	1.78	1,871	0.64	39.59
	6,001 – 50,0000	4,735	0.94	1.80	1,812	0.62	38.27
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	212	0.042	0.06	42	0.01	19.81
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		9,862	1.96		3,841	1.32	
Overall Total		291,627	57.92		117,287	40.22	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 88. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Rejected During Pre-processing		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	28	0.006	60.87
	1,001 - 6,000	82	0.02	20	0.004	24.39
	6,001 - 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	48	0.01	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	659	0.13	153	0.03	23.22
	6,001 - 50,0000	49,174	9.77	14,986	2.98	30.48
	50,001 - 100,000	32,032	6.36	10,247	2.04	31.99
	100,001 - 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	35,047	6.96	37.98
	1,000,001 - or more	11,452	2.27	1,258	0.25	10.98
County Total		185,587	36.86	61,691	12.25	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	739	0.15	23.23
	1,001 - 6,000	21,827	4.34	4,916	0.98	22.52
	6,001 - 50,0000	107,606	21.37	28,043	5.57	26.06
	50,001 - 100,000	26,871	5.34	6,825	1.36	25.40
	100,001 - 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	32,047	6.36	28.89
	1,000,001 - or more	28,658	5.69	3,269	0.65	11.41
Place Total		299,082	59.40	75,839	15.06	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	75	0.01	26.69
	1,001 - 6,000	8982	1.78	1,880	0.37	20.93
	6,001 - 50,0000	9080	1.80	3,013	0.60	33.18
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	319	0.06	94	0.02	29.47
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	5,062	1.01	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	142,640	28.33	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 89. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Values In ADDUP

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Illegal Values Rejects		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	20	0.004	43.48
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	20	0.004	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	5	0.001	0.76
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	1	0.0002	0.001
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		185,587	36.86	6	0.00	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	1	0.0002	0.03
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	6	0.001	0.01
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	1	0.0002	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	4	0.001	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	141	0.03	0.49
Place Total		299,082	59.40	153	0.03	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	2	0.0004	0.02
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	2	0.00	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	181	0.04	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 90. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Illegal Block Numbers

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Illegal Block Numbers		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	82	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	0	0.000	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	659	0.13	2	0.0004	0.30
	6,001 - 50,0000	49,174	9.77	69	0.01	0.14
	50,001 - 100,000	32,032	6.36	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	11	0.002	0.012
	1,000,001 - or more	11,452	2.27	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		185,587	36.86	82	0.02	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	1	0.0002	0.03
	1,001 - 6,000	21,827	4.34	7	0.001	0.03
	6,001 - 50,0000	107,606	21.37	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	26,871	5.34	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	28,658	5.69	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		299,082	59.40	8	0.00	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	8,982	1.78	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,0000	9,080	1.80	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	319	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	0	0.00	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	90	0.02	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 91. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing For Duplicate Record In File

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Duplicate Record		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	AIR Total		158	0.03	0	0.000
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	1	0.0002	0.003
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	4	0.001	0.004
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		185,587	36.86	5	0.001	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	0	0.0000	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	1	0.0002	0.005
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	4	0.001	0.01
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		299,082	59.40	5	0.001	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	1	0.0002	0.01
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	1	0.0002	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	11	0.00	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 92. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Matched to Existing In-Census Records

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Matched to Existing In-Census Records		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	8	0.002	17.39
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	20	0.004	24.39
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	28	0.01	
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	146	0.03	22.15
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	14,917	2.96	30.34
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	10,246	2.03	31.99
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	35,031	6.96	37.97
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	1,258	0.25	10.98
County Total		185,587	36.86	61,598	12.23	
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	737	0.15	23.17
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	4,908	0.97	22.49
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	28,037	5.57	26.06
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	6,820	1.35	25.38
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	32,043	6.36	28.88
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	3,128	0.62	10.91
Place Total		299,082	59.40	75,673	15.03	
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	75	0.01	26.69
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	1,880	0.37	20.93
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	3,010	0.60	33.15
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	94	0.02	29.47
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	5,059	1.00	
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	142,358	28.27	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 93. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Noncity-style Address Info In The Street Name

Government Type	Addresses Received at RCCs		Noncity-style		
	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	158	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
County	185,587	36.86	0	0.00	0.00
Place	299,082	59.40	0	0.00	0.00
MCD	18,662	3.71	0	0.00	0.00
Total	503,489	100.00	0	0.00	0.00
Size (addresses)					
1,000 or fewer	3,508	0.70	0	0.00	0.00
1,001 – 6,000	31,550	6.27	0	0.00	0.00
6,001 – 50,0000	165,890	32.95	0	0.00	0.00
50,001 – 100,000	58,903	11.70	0	0.00	0.00
100,001 – 1,000,000	203,528	40.42	0	0.00	0.00
1,000,001 – or more	40,110	7.97	0	0.00	0.00
Total	503,489	100.00	0	0.00	0.00

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 94. Distribution of Number of Addresses Rejected During Pre-processing Because Noncity-style Address Info In The Street Name

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Addresses Received at RCCs		Noncity-style		
		Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	Total	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs	% of Total Addresses Received At RCCs By Type Or Size
AIR	1,000 or fewer	46	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	82	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	30	0.01	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		158	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
County	1,000 or fewer	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	659	0.13	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	49,174	9.77	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	32,032	6.36	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	92,270	18.33	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	11,452	2.27	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		185,587	36.8	0	0.00	0.00
Place	1,000 or fewer	3,181	0.63	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	21,827	4.34	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	107,606	21.37	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	26,871	5.34	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	110,939	22.03	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	28,658	5.69	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		299,082	59.40	0	0.00	0.00
MCD	1,000 or fewer	281	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 – 6,000	8,982	1.78	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 – 50,0000	9,080	1.80	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 – 100,000	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 – 1,000,000	319	0.06	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 – or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total		18,662	3.71	0	0.00	0.00
Overall Total		503,489	100.00	0	0.00	

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 95. 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons

Government Type	Eligible Entities That Declined	Reason: Insufficient Staff			Reason: Lack Of Funds			Reason: No Time/Too Busy			Reason: No Local Address List Available		
	Total	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	24	2	8.33	0.02	1	4.17	0.011	24	100.00	0.28	1	4.17	0.01
County	594	312	52.53	3.59	177	29.80	2.035	168	28.28	1.93	101	17.00	1.16
Place	3912	1,301	33.26	14.96	704	18.00	8.094	515	13.16	5.92	191	4.88	2.20
MCD	4168	2,008	48.18	23.09	1,231	29.53	14.153	997	23.92	11.46	632	15.16	7.27
Total	8698	3,623	41.65	41.65	2,113	24.29	24.293	1,704	19.59	19.59	925	10.63	10.63
Size (addresses)													
1,000 or fewer	5463	2,273	41.61	26.13	1,441	26.38	16.567	1,041	19.06	11.97	611	11.18	7.02
1,001 - 6,000	2412	992	41.13	11.40	472	19.57	5.427	459	19.03	5.28	210	8.71	2.41
6,001 - 50,0000	761	349	45.86	4.01	192	25.23	2.207	196	25.76	2.25	92	12.09	1.06
50,001 - 100,000	27	6	22.22	0.07	3	11.11	0.034	3	11.11	0.03	5	18.52	0.06
100,001 - 1,000,000	35	9	25.71	0.10	5	14.29	0.057	5	14.29	0.06	7	20.00	0.08
1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	8698	3,629	41.72	41.72	2,113	24.29	24.293	1,704	19.59	19.59	925	10.63	10.63

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 96. 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons Continued

Government Type	Eligible Entities That Declined	Reason: Unable To Provide Electronic Submission			Reason: No New Addresses			Reason: Other Reason			Reason: No Reason Given		
	Total	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities by Type or Size	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	24	0	0.00	0.00	18	75.00	0.21	1	4.17	0.01	4	16.67	0.05
County	594	77	12.96	0.89	172	28.96	1.98	134	22.56	1.54	3	0.51	0.03
Place	3912	453	11.58	5.21	2,570	65.70	29.55	515	13.16	5.92	25	0.64	0.29
MCD	4168	1,025	24.59	11.78	1,846	44.29	21.22	824	19.77	9.47	37	0.89	0.43
Total	8698	1,555	17.88	17.88	4,606	52.95	52.95	1,474	16.95	16.95	69	0.79	0.79
Size (addresses)													
1,000 or fewer	5463	1,113	20.37	12.80	3,127	57.24	35.95	827	15.14	9.51	44	0.81	0.51
1,001 - 6,000	2412	350	14.51	4.02	1,184	49.09	13.61	431	17.87	4.96	16	0.66	0.18
6,001 - 50,0000	761	90	11.83	1.03	284	37.32	3.27	174	22.86	2.00	7	0.92	0.08
50,001 - 100,000	27	2	7.41	0.02	6	22.22	0.07	19	70.37	0.22	1	3.70	0.01
100,001 - 1,000,000	35	0	0.00	0.00	5	14.29	0.06	23	65.71	0.26	1	2.86	0.01
1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total	8698	1,555	17.88	17.88	4,606	52.95	52.95	1,474	16.95	16.95	69	0.79	0.79

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 97. Distribution of 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities That Declined	Reason: Insufficient Staff			Reason: Lack of Funds			Reason: No Time/Too Busy			Reason: No Local Address List Available		
			Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	19	1	5.26	0.01	1	5.26	0.0115	19	100.00	0.22	1	5.26	0.01
	1,001 - 6,000	2	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	2	100.00	0.02	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,000	3	1	33.33	0.01	0	0.00	0.0000	3	100.00	0.03	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total		24	2	1.64	0.007	1	0.82	0.0035	24	19.67	0.08	1	0.82	0.003
County	1,000 or fewer	5	2	40.00	0.02	2	40.00	0.0230	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	183	97	53.01	1.12	50	27.32	0.5748	57	31.15	0.66	30	16.39	0.34
	6,001 - 50,000	359	201	55.99	2.31	119	33.15	1.3681	105	29.25	1.21	61	16.99	0.70
	50,001 - 100,000	16	3	18.75	0.03	1	6.25	0.0115	1	6.25	0.01	3	18.75	0.03
	100,001 - 1,000,000	31	9	29.03	0.10	5	16.13	0.0575	5	16.13	0.06	7	22.58	0.08
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
County Total		594	312	12.03	1.08	177	6.83	0.61	168	6.48	0.59	101	3.90	0.35
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,531	880	34.77	10.12	515	20.35	5.9209	325	12.84	3.74	139	5.49	1.60
	1,001 - 6,000	1,142	359	31.44	4.13	158	13.84	1.8165	148	12.96	1.70	45	3.94	0.52
	6,001 - 50,000	233	62	26.61	0.71	31	13.30	0.3564	42	18.03	0.48	7	3.00	0.08
	50,001 - 100,000	3	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total		3,912	1,301	10.01	4.53	704	5.41	2.45	515	3.96	1.80	191	1.47	0.67
MCD	1,000 or fewer	2,906	1,390	47.83	15.98	923	31.76	10.6116	697	23.98	8.01	471	16.21	5.42
	1,001 - 6,000	1,086	536	49.36	6.16	264	24.31	3.0352	252	23.20	2.90	135	12.43	1.55
	6,001 - 50,000	167	79	47.31	0.91	42	25.15	0.4829	46	27.54	0.53	24	14.37	0.28
	50,001 - 100,000	8	3	37.50	0.03	2	25.00	0.0230	2	25.00	0.02	2	25.00	0.02
	100,001 - 1,000,000	1	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.0000	0	0.00%	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total	Total	4,168	2,008	15.49	7.00	1,231	29.53	4.29	997	7.69	3.48	632	4.87	2.20
Overall Total		8698	3,629		41.72	2,113		24.293	1,704		19.59	925		10.63

Data Source: Geography Division

Table 98. Distribution of 2010 Census NC Invited Entities that Officially Declined to Participate and Reasons Continued

Government Type	Size (addresses)	Eligible Entities That Declined	Reason: Unable to Provide Electronic Submission			Reason: No New Addresses			Reason: Other Reason			Reason: No Reason Given		
			Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities	Total	% of Total Eligible Entities By Size and Type	% of Total Eligible Entities
AIR	1,000 or fewer	19	0	0.00	0.00	15	78.95	0.17	1	5.26	0.011	3	15.79	0.03
	1,001 - 6,000	2	0	0.00	0.00	1	50.00	0.01	0	0.00	0.000	1	50.00	0.01
	6,001 - 50,000	3	0	0.00	0.00	2	66.67	0.02	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
	50,001 - 100,000	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
AIR Total	Total	24	0	0.00	0.00	18	14.75	0.06	1	0.82	0.003	4	3.28	0.01
County	1,000 or fewer	5	0	0.00	0.00	3	60.00	0.03	1	20.00	0.011	0	0.00	0.00
	1,001 - 6,000	183	27	14.75	0.31	72	39.34	0.83	24	13.11	0.276	0	0.00	0.00
	6,001 - 50,000	359	49	13.65	0.56	90	25.07	1.03	77	21.45	0.885	1	0.28	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	16	1	6.25	0.01	2	12.50	0.02	13	81.25	0.149	1	6.25	0.01
	100,001 - 1,000,000	31	0	0.00	0.00	5	16.13	0.06	19	61.29	0.218	1	3.23	0.01
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
County Total	Total	594	77	2.97	0.27	172	6.63	0.60	134	5.17	0.47	3	0.12	0.01
Place	1,000 or fewer	2,531	332	13.12	3.82	1,725	68.15	19.83	294	11.62	3.380	16	0.63	0.18
	1,001 - 6,000	1,142	105	9.19	1.21	710	62.17	8.16	171	14.97	1.966	4	0.35	0.05
	6,001 - 50,000	233	16	6.87	0.18	134	57.51	1.54	45	19.31	0.517	5	2.15	0.06
	50,001 - 100,000	3	0	0.00	0.00	1	33.33	0.01	2	66.67	0.023	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	3	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	3	100.00	0.034	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
Place Total	Total	3,912	453	3.48	1.58	2,570	19.77	8.96	515	3.96	1.80	25	0.19	0.09
MCD	1,000 or fewer	2,906	781	26.88	8.98	1,384	47.63	15.91	531	18.27	6.105	25	0.86	0.29
	1,001 - 6,000	1,086	218	20.07	2.51	401	36.92	4.61	236	21.73	2.713	11	1.01	0.13
	6,001 - 50,000	167	25	14.97	0.29	58	34.73	0.67	52	31.14	0.598	1	0.60	0.01
	50,001 - 100,000	8	1	12.50	0.01	3	37.50	0.03	4	50.00	0.046	0	0.00	0.00
	100,001 - 1,000,000	1	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	1	100.00	0.011	0	0.00	0.00
	1,000,001 - or more	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.000	0	0.00	0.00
MCD Total	Total	4,168	1,025	7.90	3.57	1,846	14.24	6.44	824	6.35	2.87	37	0.29	0.13
Overall Total		8698	1,555		17.88	4,606		52.95	1,474		16.95	69		0.79

Data Source: Geography Division

Attachment C: 2010 Census NC Program Lessons Learned

2010 New Construction Program Lessons Learned

Category: Communication

Issue/Situation	Resolution/Recommendation (Lesson Learned)
Issues that were discussed between FLD and GEO were not documented consistently in a central repository for reference for all stakeholders.	Maintain a log of issues.
Lack of stakeholder review across programs when decisions are made (Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP) and block suffixing).	A better exchange of information between program areas.
Although Geographic Support Branch (GSB) of FLD Division primarily relayed issues between the RCCs and GEO, there needs to be a direct line of communication between GEO and RCCs.	GEO and GSB created a process to communicate directly with RCCs for certain issues.

Category: Program Design

No way to tell what software was used by participant for file processing (MTPS, ESRI, Excel, Maptitude, etc.).	Determine a way to uniquely identify the sources of file processing/delivery.
Could not use kml (participants wanted to use Google Earth).	Investigate accommodating additional technologies into the program.

Category: Project Management

GEO NC Project Manager was not involved in funding process (budget formulation and execution); DMD played a middleman, which slowed the process.	GEO NC Project Manager needs to be more involved in the funding process. If DMD is willing to let GEO run the programs, then they need to let them perform all actions related to the program.
--	--

The physical separation between assembly area and shipping at NPC added extra time to get the materials out.

Plan for the time needed for the movement of packages between buildings at NPC in any scheduling reports.

Category: Schedule

Master Activity Schedule (MAS) contained only high-level activities, not completely appropriate for running a program.

The internal branch schedule worked well.

Census Bureau sufficiently communicated to participants that they would have to be flexible about when materials could be delivered.

Build in extra time for the generalized schedules given to the participants. Additionally, advise them of what types of situations may alter the schedule. If a situation arises to alter the schedule, inform them as soon as possible.

Lack of accountability for deadlines by participants (program deadlines).

Deadlines need to set by headquarters with strict enforcement of late submissions. Correspondence should state that submissions may not be processed if they arrive late.

Category: Staffing

Lack of sufficient GEO programming staff (e.g., Workflow Control Branch (WCB) for Production Control System (PCS)).

GEO needs dedicated staff to PCS programming that are not tasked with competing priorities. WCB staff needed the time to review requirements and provide feedback - the "best practices" software development lifecycle.

Tribal/Local Geographic Partnerships Branch (TLGPB) lacked the expertise to write Software Requirement Specifications (SRS) for control systems. TLGPB drafted SRS, and then got feedback from programmers, and then TLGPB updated the draft in an iterative process until software met user needs.

Either staff from another branch should be writing SRSs or TLGPB needs resources with the proper skill sets to write an SRS.

Category: Control Systems

Entity status can change during implementation.

Control systems need to be able to incorporate status changes.

Production Control System (PCS) reports were not able to meet all of FLD's management needs. It is not possible to produce reports that will meet everyone's needs.

Continue training on Oracle Discoverer so FLD GSB and RCCs can produce their own reports.

Category: Mailings

Poor public perception regarding the means for delivery (FedEx over USPS).

FedEx was used because it cost less to ship and needed to track deliveries. Need to educate participants why we use FedEx as part of initial communication.

Did not capture the tracking number for return labels for materials during both initial phase and Detailed Feedback (DF).

Revisit the idea of capturing return tracking numbers and associating with the entity before packages are sent out. Would help with tracking returns that may or may not have ever happened.

Category: Materials

When used as PDFs, the NC maps design made distinguishing between block and tract boundaries difficult.

Do not use the weight of a line to differentiate between two different types of boundaries in a map that will be used as PDFs.

NPC color coding printed material for shipping was effective (e.g. distinguish between programs, phases, Highest Elected Official/Carbon Copy (HEO/CC), etc.).

Recommended for future programs.

Category: Materials Tracking

No capture of tracking numbers for return materials.

During package assembly, require NPC to data capture return tracking numbers that were given to the participants. 2. Print an insert informing participants to keep track of any return tracking information.

Materials tracking were not in real-time due to there being no link between FedEx and the PCS.

Continue the practice of shipping area maintaining tracking numbers in a spreadsheet as a backup and implementing a process to insert updates into the PCS. 2. Work directly with FedEx to develop and test process for loading scanned information directly into the PCS before production.

Category: MAF/TIGER Partnership Software (MTPS)

MTPS operating system compatibility.

Ongoing evaluation of operating systems used by partners.

MTPS was successful overall.

Continue evolving/using MTPS for future.

MTPS load time, particularly small entities adjacent to large areas. Allow for entity-level data (e.g. place vs. county) or limit fringe loaded if possible to prevent performance issues.

MTPS does not geocode. The ability to geocode should be added for future programs.

Category: Procedures

Co-authoring of RCC procedures between TLGPB and GSB worked out well, as did multiple update releases. In the future would repeat the process, preferably with larger chunks in each release.

Digital participants were not sure how to correctly sort their address lists Provide detailed directions on how to correctly sort address lists using different types of software.

Category: Processing Returns

Notepad, the basic text editing software provided to the regions and to HQ staff working with the regions on address review, was very basic. It did not allow users to easily identify problems or manipulate address list data without formatting. Identify better software for editing, analyzing, and versioning. Look into licensing for UltraEdit and UltraCompare for both GEO and FLD.

There were version control problems in the RCCs for address file submissions, which led to the wrong files being posted. Preprocessing Upload Reporting System (PURS) needs a file editing tool and a version management tool. 2. Provide a macro for checking files before PURS. 3. Allocate more time to the development of the PURS system.

Category: QC

LUCA Feedback and NC adapted from the LUCA Initial CD creation by including a 100 percent QC. The QC plan was inadequate for electronic media at NPC. The QC Plan did not account for situation when the CD media changed vendors. QC plan needs a 100 percent review of the CDs when software or media changes.

Did not know what the performance abilities of equipment were (e.g., Rimage, printers, etc), so did not know how to establish criteria/thresholds for production and quality. Require (with insistence) said specifications.

Category: Training

Identifying, describing, and correcting participant file format errors required a lot of experience or detailed training of processing staff.

Allow participants to utilize Macro like software before submission. Provide training on processing files (e.g., have Help Desk staff conduct training tutorials).

Category: Update Processing

Updated address records were rejected during preprocessing for MAF update.

Allow TLGPB to review processing results from MTdb clone ("Test Can") before giving the go ahead to upload to live MTdb.

Category: User Guide

Participants do not read or use the user guides.

In New Construction, the "Quick Start" document was helpful in supplementing user guide.

Could not reference trademarked products in user guides or training material (Excel, Access, etc.).

Enlist the help of legal staff to insert statements notifying participants that the uses of the names in the products are not endorsements. 2. Suggest the use of certain products, making sure to use the trademark symbol.

Attachment D: Geographic Partnerships Help Desk Lessons Learned

Geographic Partnerships Help Desk (GPHD) GPHD-16 New Construction (NC)

Project Lessons Learned

Date: May 10, 2010.

Branch: Tribal / Local Geographic Partnerships Branch (TLGPB).

Document Owner:

Project Role: The New Construction program is the final opportunity for participants to submit new city-style housing unit addresses for which basic construction (closing the structure to the elements) started by March 1, 2009 and will be completed by Census Day on April 1, 2010. The role of the GPHD is to resolve technical support requests from participants that are related to this process.

Product or Process: Remedy tickets, Call Reports, Call Statistics, and Escalated Calls Report.

Version	Date	Author	Change Description
Final	3/17/10	Ruth Olson	Deliverables: Remedy tickets, Call Reports, Call Statistics, Escalated Calls Report.

Lessons learned objective

The GPHD resolved 1,099 calls requesting technical support for the New Construction program between November 16, 2009 and March 30, 2010.

The objective of this report is to present relevant information about project successes, shortcomings, and solutions as well as to formulate recommendations for future projects that will minimize risks and maximize successful strategies.

GPHD-16 New Construction Project Highlights

Significant Project Successes

Project Success	Factor That Supported Success
The Geographic Programs Help Desk (GPHD) team was successful in resolving 100 percent of the technical requests in a timely manner and received many accolades from the branch and from participants.	The Wiki developed by the team leads was very valuable as a knowledge base for the whole team.
The Tribal/Local Geographic Partnerships Branch (TLGPB) provided consistent support to the GPHD team.	The TLGPB invited the team leads to the NC conference, which provided a very informative overview of the program. The TLGPB also provided training and sample materials before the beginning of the program.
The call data compiled in Remedy were thorough and accurate.	The Remedy Category-Type-Items (CTIs) were very effective once in place.
The participants were able to submit their NC address lists quickly and easily.	The participants were eventually allowed to return their data in Microsoft Excel format without having to convert it to text.

Project Shortcomings and Solutions

Project Shortcoming	Team Solution
The Remedy Category-Type-Items (CTIs) were not available at the beginning of the program; this was confusing when creating the tickets.	The team standardized the CTIs as much as possible in the meantime and provided detailed descriptions on the tickets.
Some participants complained that the user guides were lengthy and incomplete; they contained some conflicting instructions to convert and save the data.	The team provided step-by-step instructions over the phone and also emailed / faxed Technical Support Documents to the participants.
Some participants experienced difficulties converting the address list headers template from text format to Microsoft Excel.	The team provided step-by-step instructions over the phone and also emailed / faxed Technical Support Documents to the participants.
Some participants complained that the change in the return file format (from text only, to either text or Excel) was not communicated in a timely manner.	The team provided clear explanations to the participants regarding how to manage their materials and the technical support to perform the necessary format conversions.

Recommendations for Improvement

Strategy	Expected Result
Set up Remedy CTIs before the beginning of the program.	The calls will be categorized in a standard manner.
Continue to use the Wiki as a knowledgebase for the GPHD team.	The GPHD team members will have all the information they need to resolve technical requests in a very accessible and accurate library of official information and procedural documents. Make this resource available to all involved with the program, including RCC staff.
Simplify the user guides and include relevant procedures, such as those explained in the Technical Support Documents.	The number and length of calls will be reduced if the participants have technical materials that are readily available and easier to understand.
Provide the address list headers template in Excel in addition to text format.	This will simplify the participants' task by avoiding a complicated conversion process.
Allow the return of data in formats other than text (for example, in Microsoft Excel) to simplify the complicated file conversion process. Communicate this program change to the participants in a timely manner.	The participants will save time, money, and avoid confusion because their task will be simplified.

Approvals

Prepared by: Ruth Olson