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Abstract:

This report documents the first qualitative testing of the Enumeration of Transitory Locations, a new Census operation for 2010. Transitory Locations are those where people often live or stay temporarily in between moving from place to place. Examples of these types of locations where people may be staying who have no other usual place to stay include Recreational Vehicle (RV) parks, campgrounds, hotels, motels, marinas, racetracks, circuses, fairs, and carnivals. The ETL form solicits information very similar to that of the mailout census form and the Enumerator Questionnaire used for Nonresponse Followup (NRFU). In this report, we describe how the ETL operation was tested and what results were found. The most significant finding was the considerable trouble interviewers had in gathering addresses of the transitory locations. Major changes were recommended to the layout of the ETL questionnaire and the other forms. Operational issues are also discussed.
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Introduction

Enumerating people that live in many different living situations requires the U. S. Census Bureau to count people in many different ways. While the majority of individuals receive their census questionnaire in the mail and are asked to mail it back, others necessitate different and tailored census operations. Examples of situations not conducive to a mailed form where individuals may have no usual place to stay include those who live in very rural areas, group housing such as college dormitories or nursing homes, locations that lack city-style addresses, and those who are experiencing homelessness. Another group, specific to this study, is those who live in “transitory” locations, such as RV parks and marinas.

This study centers around a new census operation in the 2010 Census, the Enumeration of Transitory Locations (ETL). The research reported here marks the first time this operation has been tested in the field. The ETL is a census field operation that enumerates individuals at Transitory Locations (TLs) who do not have a Usual Home Elsewhere (UHE). For this operation, TLs are locations where people are often living or staying temporarily (but sometimes permanently), often traveling from place to place. The Census Bureau has identified several types of places as TLs where people may be staying who have no other usual place to stay. These are Recreational Vehicle (RV) parks, campgrounds (commercial and public), hotels, motels (including those on Military bases), marinas, racetracks, circuses, fairs, and carnivals. These locations require a unique census operation because they house both people who do and do not have another permanent place to stay. Those with another primary place to stay (or UHE) should be counted elsewhere in the census. The Census Bureau estimated that, nationally, it would visit 45,000 TLs, housing approximately 716,000 transitory units as a part of the 2010 Census.

After three days of training, census interviewers will visit each TL as part of the 2010 Census. Interviewers will identify each unit (RV, tent, boat, etc.) at the TL to determine if the people at the unit have a UHE. In addition to determining the Census Day occupancy for each unit in the TL, interviewers also update address lists, contact information, and map details. Individuals determined to have no UHE will be counted in the census at the TL.

When at the TL, interviewers visit each unit at least once. If a respondent is not available at the time of first pass, one follow-up visit is made to the unit. Proxies are allowed under certain conditions, provided that they supply a sufficient amount of information towards the completion of the questionnaire. One visit to each TL will be made, making it important that the Census Bureau visit the TL at times when individuals are most likely to be at their unit.

The ETL questionnaire is an interviewer-administered paper questionnaire (the questionnaire as it was tested can be found in Appendix A). The questionnaire solicits information about the respondent and others living at the unit. Basic information, which is the same as gathered by the mailed 2010 Census, includes address, telephone number, number of individuals at the unit (without a usual home elsewhere), names, relationships, sexes, ages, races and origins. There are

---

1 To be clear, a “unit” is a domicile within the “transitory location.” For example, an RV is a unit and an RV Park is a transitory location.
questions designed to reduce under and over counting and another question that determines if the unit is owned or rented. The final form, after revisions, is found in Appendix B.

In addition to the form, there is an information sheet (Appendix C) that is given to respondents that informs them of the operation and the confidentiality of their answers. There are four lists on the sheet to serve as a visual aid to respondents when facing a long list of response categories or when additional information is needed to answer the questions. Next, there is a cover sheet (Appendix D) that contains information on the interviewer’s assignment and on the TL. There is also a verification page (as tested in Appendix E; a recommended version is found in Appendix F; the final version in Appendix G) that contains the important introduction question which asks whether respondents spend more time at their TL or at another home elsewhere. Last, there is a Listing Sheet (as tested in Appendix H; the final version in Appendix I) that interviewers use to keep track of sites visited and respondent’s answers to the screener questions, which we will discuss below.

The goal of this research was to improve the ETL operation to ensure that it gathers higher quality data with less interviewer and respondent burden. We did this by identifying potential issues with the ETL questionnaire and the other forms used for this operation as well as and operational difficulties that may arise. We discuss issues that interviewers might have in administering the form and difficulties that respondents might have in understanding and answering the questions asked. In additional to identifying potential problems, we also provide recommendations for resolving them. This report documents findings, recommendations and team decisions from this testing prior to implementation of the ETL operation in the 2010 Census.

**Methodology**

The qualitative testing on the ETL operation comprised two components. Both components involved live field interviews at TLs near the Census Bureau headquarters. In total, research was conducted at three RV parks and one marina. The first component involved training, accompanying, and debriefing two experienced Census Bureau survey interviewers one afternoon at an RV park. The interviewers were trained on the ETL form and enumerated a TL, as would happen in the actual operation. Researchers observed the interviews and also debriefed the interviewers about their experience and solicited their professional opinions on the process.

The second component of the qualitative testing involved respondent debriefing. This process involved four two-person research teams visiting two RV parks and one marina. These teams of two researchers split duties. One researcher, like the interviewer debriefing described above, interviewed respondents on location, allowing the team to experience the flow of the forms and the interview. The other debriefed the respondents to assess respondent understanding of the questions.

These two components together provided information about the usability of the form, the process of enumerating at TL and respondent understanding of the questions. Table 1 below describes the number of contacted units that had a UHE versus those that did not. Respondents who
reported no UHE completed the ETL form. In total, researchers knocked on 164 doors (154 at the RV parks and 10 at a marina) and spoke with individuals at 64 units (55 at the RV parks and 9 at the marina). Of the 100 units in which no interview was conducted, there were 91 no-answers and nine refusals (seven at the RV parks and two at the marina). These numbers represent small purposive samples near the Census Bureau headquarters and thus cannot be interpreted as representative samples of a general population or even the TL subpopulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents with</th>
<th>RV parks</th>
<th>Marina</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Usual Home Elsewhere</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Usual Home Elsewhere (Completed ETL)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

In this section we will discuss the results of qualitative testing on the forms as they existed at the time of testing. We will discuss findings, recommendations, and decisions ultimately made. The recommendations for changing the form based on the research reported here aim to improve coverage by correctly only counting those with no UHE and recording the addresses so that they can be accurately geocoded, that is, using geographical coordinates to place the unit on a map. The recommendations also aim to shorten the interview, thus reducing field costs. Other suggestions center on increased respondent understanding while decreasing both respondent and interviewer burden.

**The Unit Verification Page**

The goal of the Unit Verification Page (UVP) is to determine whether people at the unit should be counted at the TL or at another place for the census. This is a key function of this operation. The tested UVP is found in Appendix E. The UVP is intended to be used as a script and is paired closely with the Listing Sheet (described below).

1. **Problem:** The primary issue with the UVP had to do with form handling. Interviewers found the form itself to be difficult to use because of its size. The form was printed on 11x17” paper, which interviewers thought was too big. Some difficulty was reported because of the terrain at an RV park, but more issues were raised associated with marinas, such as wind off of the water, difficulty stepping onto boats, as well as the boats’ rocking motions.

   **Recommendation:** The research team developed a resized and reoriented version of the UVP (Appendix F). This new UVP was tested at the final TL site and was preferred by the testing group.

   **Decision:** The reformatted UVP was not accepted, and the larger form was used (see Appendix G for the final version of the UVP). It was found to be too inconsistent with the other materials in format and size.
2. **Problem**: The introductory statement was too long, causing at least one interviewer not to read it.

   **Recommendation**: We recommend dropping the third sentence that reads “But first we want to make sure people staying in these places do not have another residence where they usually live.” This recommended change is also reflected in the alternate UVP that was tested at our final location.

   **Decision**: This recommendation was accepted, and the third sentence was removed.

3. **Problem**: Another issue was that at least two respondents were not directed into the ETL form by the question path even though they spent most of their time in their RVs. What we suspect occurred is that respondents answered “yes” after hearing “another residence,” but before the “more than anywhere else” instruction.

   **Recommendation**: We recommend splitting this introduction question into two parts, first asking if they have another place they live, and second asking where they spend most of their time. One version of this suggested series was tested at the last site and is found in the alternative UVP.

   **Decision**: This recommendation was accepted and the questions are split on the final UVP.

4. **Problem**: The UVP requires interviewers to distinguish RVs from mobile homes, but the difference between the two is not explained on the sheet. This was a finding from an expert review not a problem that arose during testing.

   **Recommendation**: The researchers reworded the note to explain the difference. As such, the alternative UVP that was tested at the final location reads, “Note: *If you find the location has both RVs and Mobile Homes (trailers without wheels) on its property, mark an X in this box [   ].*”

   **Decision**: An explanation on how to distinguish an RV from a mobile home has been added to the final UVP.

**The Listing Sheet**

Many changes were made to the Listing Sheet throughout the testing process. The UVP and Listing Sheet act together, where questions and instructions are provided on the former, and interviewers’ record responses on the latter. The tested version of the Listing Sheet is found in Appendix H, and the final version recommended after testing is found in Appendix I. The Listing Sheet provides a row for each unit and columns to indicate if the unit is a housing unit, if the unit is the respondents’ primary residence, what the respondent’s name is, and if the respondent refused the interview or if no contact was made.
Most of the changes to the Listing Sheet were either to the formatting, or were related to the problems described above with the UVP. Therefore, this section will only list the recommended changes to the form. The first major change was to duplicate the scripted questions from the UVP on the Listing Sheet to minimize page turning on the “doorstep.”

Next, we recommended widening each column to provide more information to the interviewer. This led to having only one series of columns as opposed to the original Listing Sheet that had two (that is, the original had duplicate sets of columns). The header rows that describe the purpose of each column have been made more informative to the interviewer (see Appendix I).

The third column of the original Listing Sheet corresponded to the question that dictated whether the respondent should complete the ETL form or not. As described with the UVP, this has been broken into two questions, which are repeated in columns three and four of the new Listing Sheet. In this new format, the questions are repeated in their entirety on the Listing Sheet itself (as opposed to having them only on the UVP), allowing interviewers to administer these questions without flipping pages, a task made more difficult by the terrain of TLs (see Appendix I).

The columns for “No contact” and “Refusal” have been eliminated in favor of making these response options in the new column three (see Appendix I). The inclusion of response options is another major addition to the final Listing Sheet from the version that existed prior to testing. In testing, interviewers did not uniformly fill out the Listing Sheet because it was. The new Listing Sheet contains response check-boxes inside of the columns, repeated for each row.

The “unit number” row contains a box to be checked if the unit is a mobile home. Other questions provide skip instructions in each row, giving interviewers the information they need when and where they need it. The goal is to create a self-sufficient form, meaning that once an interviewer has become accustomed to the information contained on the Unit Verification Page, the Listing Sheet can be used more easily because fewer pages will have to be turned.

**The ETL Questionnaire**

The results of testing the ETL form will be presented by question in the order of the form as it was tested. The tested form appears in Appendix A, and the revised form appears in Appendix B. The ETL form was modeled after the Enumerator Questionnaire, used in Nonresponse Followup (NRFU). The interior portion of the questionnaire is identical and was tested more thoroughly in another test. See Childs et al. (2009) for those findings. Here we report findings on questions unique to the ETL questionnaire.

**Question S1:**

I will complete a census questionnaire for all the people staying at this (RV/boat/room/unit) who have no other place they usually live and sleep. This should take about 10 minutes. *(Hands respondent the Information Sheet.)* The first part explains that your answers are confidential. I’ll be referring to this handout while we fill out the questionnaire.
**Problem:** The interviewer was previously instructed to give the respondent the information sheet during the UVP/Listing Sheet process. Therefore, when the interviewer encounters the instruction to “Hand respondent the information sheet” in the middle of this question, he or she should already have completed this task, making this instruction superfluous.

**Recommendation:** We recommend that the redundant instruction *inside* this question be removed. In its place, we recommend that the interviewer note be placed above this question as a reminder in case the interviewer did not already provide the information sheet and the note should read, “Hand respondent Information Sheet if necessary.” Last, we recommend rewording this question to make it consistent with the NRFU questionnaire to read, “I will complete a census questionnaire for all the people staying at this (RV/boat/room/unit) who have no other place they usually live and sleep. This should take about 10 minutes. The first part of the Information Sheet explains that your answers are confidential. I’ll refer to the other parts later.” See Childs et al. (2009) for the reason behind this change.

**Decision:** The final introduction has an altered interviewer instruction, reading “Hand respondent the Information Sheet, if necessary.” However, the instruction remains within the introduction text and not outside of it, as recommended. Also, the last lines have been slightly modified to be consistent with the NRFU questionnaire. They now read, “The first part of this sheet explains that your answers are confidential. I’ll refer to the other parts later.”

**Question S2:**

*Including yourself, how many people are living or staying in this (RV/boat/room/unit) who have no other place that they usually live?*

No problems found in this testing. This question appeared to work as intended gathering the number of people who have no UHE.

**Question H1:**

*What is the address of this unit?*

**Problem:** Nearly all respondents were confused by being asked their address at the TL. Respondents were unsure if we are asking about the address of the TL or the designation of the particular space in which their unit was resting. However, at the marina, *nearly all* respondents knew their slip number and the address of the marina. The RV parks had a much different outcome. The most observed common behavior was for the respondent to not know any part of the address – either the site number or the address of the RV park. For those who do not know their site number, nonresponse for this question is high. Next most common was for the respondent to give just the RV park address, and a few respondents gave only a site number. Three RV park respondents knew both the site number and park address. We found that some respondents looked for paperwork that documents the address of the RV park and/or their particular site. Alternatively, a couple of respondents walked to whatever ground designation existed to indicate their particular site.
It is important to note that interviewers already have this information. They will have the TL address as a part of their case assignment and they are instructed to record the site/slip number on the listing sheet before speaking to the respondent. They should often have site maps that have all of these designations mapped for them. However, at least one RV park that the researchers visited also had distinct streets with street names, meaning that the TL address would include more than the RV park’s address and a slip number.

Another issue is that when a site number is offered by a respondent, interviewers are unsure where to record this information. The typical behavior was to write it in the “House No.” spaces. The site number was recorded in each of the “Apartment” and “Street” fields once. It does not seem that the form’s address fields capture the information needed for these types of units.

Besides respondent and interviewer frustration, another impact of this confusion is not garnering geocodable addresses. This means that housing units could be dropped due to the uncodable address, resulting in under coverage. Or, said differently, these individuals would not be included in the census.

**Recommendation:** Our first recommendation is to move this question to the back page where the notes are currently located, after the basic census questions. The current location interrupts the flow between the household count (S2) question and the household roster (Question 1). These two questions are intended to work together to assist the respondent in listing the appropriate people on the census form. Further discussion of this ordering issue will be provided below along with the associated decisions.

We recommend that interviewers ask for site, slip, or unit number separately, then ask for the address of the TL, e.g., an RV park or a marina. This would clear the respondent confusion mentioned above. Additionally, if interviewers already have sufficient address information, this question could simply be made an interviewer instruction to confirm TL address and unit number.

We recommend that the phrase “Apt. No or Location” on the form be replaced with “Unit Designation” and “Location Description.”

**Decision:** The question text has been eliminated and has been, per recommendations, replaced with the interviewer instruction, “Confirm location address and unit designation.” Again, per recommendations, the phrase “Apt. No.” is changed to “Unit Designation” and, also, there is an added “Location Description” field. See Appendix B for these changes.

**Question H2:**

Do you or does someone in this household own this (RV/boat/room/unit) with a mortgage or loan, including home equity loans; own it free and clear; rent it; or occupy it without having to pay rent?

No issues particular to the TL population were found.

**Roster (Question 1):**
I have a few questions about each of the people who are living or staying here. If an owner or renter of this (RV/boat/room/unit) lives here, please give me that person’s name first. If an owner or renter does not live here, start with the name of any adult living here.

**Problem:** This question does not actually ask the respondent to list the roster of people, and, about half of the time, respondents did not provide names without further prompting. When they did give a name, they sometimes did not give the whole list without further probing. The interviewers ad-libbed considerably for this question; one interviewer, nearly all of the time, asked respondents to start with the oldest person.

It might be the case that the source of some of the confusion on the part of the respondents is that the household count (S2) and roster questions are interrupted by the housing questions. This issue is addressed further below.

A potential impact of these issues could be a decrease in data quality and an increase in over-coverage by separating the household count question from the roster listing because the respondent may forget who should be included on this census form (only people who have no other UHE). Additionally, there is an increase in respondent burden due to the confusing wording and position of the address question between household count and roster questions. There is also an increase in interviewing time and costs due to interviewers having to do extra probing and prompting.

**Recommendation:** There are a number of instances above where testing found that the order questions on the form was unsatisfactory. Here, we summarize a recommended revision that we will call “option one.” Aware that such a redesign might be implausible, we also offer “option two,” which is not ideal, but seeks to solve some of the major order-related issues.

**Option One** includes all testing recommendations, and we believe this version would be optimal for producing good coverage of these TL, reducing interviewer and respondent burden, being consistent with the NRFU Questionnaire (see Appendix J for the ordering of the NRFU questions). We suggest that the housing questions (H1 and H2) be moved to the notes page, putting this roster question directly after the household count question. In addition to providing a more intuitive continuity to the questions, this additionally retains an ordering that has been shown to work well in the NRFU questionnaire testing (Childs, et al., 2009). Additionally, the questions that identify who to count on the form (S2, and Roster) will immediately follow the UVP, where the interviewer will explain the intent of the interview and that we need to count people with no other usual place to stay (or UHE). Maintaining this context without interruption is important in getting accurate coverage of this difficult-to-enumerate population.

To further borrow from what has been demonstrated to work in the NRFU testing (Childs, et al., 2009), Question 1 can be worded similarly: “Let’s make a list of all those people. Please start with the name of an owner or renter who lives here. Otherwise start with any adult who lives here.” This both simplifies the question and makes it consistent with the NRFU form.
Option Two provides the minimum amount of revisions required to fix the risk of having coverage errors due to separating the household count question from the roster question. In this option, we recommend reordering the four questions on the front page. Question S2 should be moved after question H2, creating a new order: S1, H1, H2, S2, followed by the Roster question (Question 1). In this case, the questions would need to be renumbered, but the continuity between the household count question and the roster question would be maintained.

However, it should be noted that option two is not ideal. A key component of the residence rules that needs to be applied during ETL is counting people living at each unit who have no other place where they usually live or sleep. This concept is introduced during the Unit Verification process and then continued during the introduction to the questionnaire itself. We are concerned that interrupting the sequence by asking or even confirming with the respondent complicated questions about their transient address and ownership status may impact the rostering process, potentially leading to over-coverage and possible duplication.

Decision: The ultimate decision regarding this issue, as is reflected in the final ETL form (Appendix B), is to remove the “introduction” and “housing” labels and to order the questions according to “option two” as S1, H1, H2 then S2. The revised questions are renumbered as S1, S2, S3 then S4.

Also, the wording for the roster question has been revised according to recommendations, to be “Let’s make a list of all those people. Please start with the name of an owner or renter who is living here. Otherwise, start with any adult living here.”

Questions 2 through 6 were exactly identical to the other interviewer-administered census questionnaires, and thus were not available for discussion or revision. See Childs et al. (2009) for testing of those items.

Question 7: Overcount: Does (Name) sometimes live or stay somewhere else for any of these reasons?

Problem: In the TL universe, this question confuses respondents, often to the point of noticeable frustration, because these respondents do typically stay somewhere else – this is the primary characteristic of their transitory living situation. They often stay at another place not for one of the reasons listed, but because they have a residence elsewhere. Because of this confusion, the question needs to be read multiple times and therefore causes undue interviewer and respondent burden. This happened in testing more than half of the time. It should be noted that the data collected by this question are not needed for the ETL operation and will not be used for followup as in other census operations.

This question increases interviewing cost due to the increased length of the interview, and it decreases data quality due to respondent burden.

Recommendation: We recommend removing this question from the form, which would make the right-most column on the page either blank or an interviewer note to continue on the next
This recommendation would also apply to the continuation forms for this operation. If creating a new continuation form is not possible, we suggest training interviewers not to ask this question on the rare occurrence of a continuation form being used for a unit at a TLs. (Continuation forms are necessary when more than five people are staying at a unit. However, though it is certainly possible, we suspect it will be rare to find more than five people staying in one of these units.)

We also recommend asking the respondent for another address where they might live. This might help garner information that would be important for the unduplication of respondents who, for instance, live eight months of the year in their RV and four at a house where they also completed a census return. Suggested wording: *(Ask or verify)* “*Do you have another residence?*” If yes, “*What is the address?*”

**Decision:** The tested question will not be removed from the form due to implications of changing the continuation form or having the two forms be different. Also, the additional question will not be asked because it would be a new data collection requirement.

**Record of Contact:**

The Record of Contact appears on the back page of the tested questionnaire, see Appendix A.

**Problem:** Our testing found that the Record of Contact appears out of place and in an inconsistent position with the NRFU Questionnaire (see Appendix J for the ordering of the NRFU questions). The interviewer should complete this after the interview has ended, but it placed between two questions that the interviewer has to ask the respondent (Question 7, the overcount question, and the question asking for the respondent’s name). In addition to causing interviewer burden, this placement could lead to item nonresponse for the questions that follow.

**Recommendation:** This issue can be solved by moving the Record of Contact above the Introduction on the front page, again, consistent with the NRFU Questionnaire form.

**Decision:** The placement of this question remained unchanged because it would have required drastic change to the form too late in the production schedule.

**Question R2, Phone:**

*What is your phone number and best time to call?*

**Problem:** Respondents are especially sensitive about giving phone numbers at TLs because they are increasingly likely to use only cell phones, which are often thought of as more private than landlines. Thus, this question leads to hesitation, additional questions, or refusals more than half of the time. While one-third of the RV sample refused to give a phone number, nearly the entire marina sample provided a phone number.

**Recommendation:** We recommend including either an interviewer note on the form, or stress in training *why* we are asking for this information. Respondents often ask about this and one interviewer that was observed in this test wanted to know what answer to give. An example of
the information needed might be similar to what will be found on the 2010 census form, “*We may call if we don’t understand an answer.*”

**Decision:** This question now has an additional sentence. It now reads, “*What is your phone number and best time to call? We may call if we don’t understand an answer.*”

**Additional Operational Questions and Issues**

According to the ETL Operational Plan, the ETL was planned to be conducted between March 19th and April 12th. Multiple respondents that were interviewed at RV parks noted that those living in RVs are likely moving north when northern parks open on or around April 1st. The respondents described this as “mass migration,” a caravan of RVs moving north. The implications are that southern states will have a larger count if the enumeration is conducted before April 1st, and northern states if done after. Because this operation is being scheduled at the same time as the most popular time to move, there is an increased possibility of both missing and duplicating people.

Also, there may be reason to question if all RV parks will be included in the ETL operation. Per comments made by those staying at TLs, some RV park owners might have incentive to say there are no permanent residents in the park because some parks have rules against having permanent RV residences. We doubt if the screener questions that bring parks into the ETL operation will still capture the people living at these parks.

Last, we recommended that Be Counted forms be provided at units in which no contact could be made. This would provide these respondents an additional opportunity to fill out a census questionnaire, which will reduce undercount at TLs and among the transitory population.
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Appendix C – Information Sheet (front)

Your Answers Are Confidential

Your answers are confidential and protected by law. All U.S. Census Bureau employees have taken an oath and are subject to a fine or a term of imprisonment if they disclose any information that could identify you or your household.

You have volunteered to take part in a survey to improve the questions that may be used on the 2010 Census. In order to have a complete record of your comments, with your permission, your interviewer session will be audio taped. We plan to use the tapes to improve the questionnaire. Only staff directly involved in the questionnaire design research project will have access to the tapes. Your participation is voluntary and your answers will remain strictly confidential.

This study is being conducted under the authority of Title 13 United States Code. The OMB control number for this study is 0894-0026. This valid approval number legally certifies this information collection.

Thank you for your cooperation. The U.S. Census Bureau appreciates your help.

Who to Count on April 1st

We need to count people where they live and sleep most of the time.

Do NOT INCLUDE these people: (They will be counted at the other place)

- College students who live away from this address most of the year
- Armed forces personnel who live away
- People who, on April 1, 2008, were in a:
  - Nursing home, mental hospital, etc.
  - Jail, prison, detention center, etc.

INCLUDE these people:

- Babies and children living here, including foster children
- Roommates
- Boarders
- People staying here on April 1, 2008 who have no other permanent place to live
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List B</th>
<th>List C</th>
<th>List D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>HISPANIC, LATINO, OR SPANISH ORIGIN</strong></td>
<td><strong>RACE</strong> <em>(Choose one or more races)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Husband or wife</td>
<td>□ No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td>□ White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Biological son or daughter</td>
<td>□ Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano</td>
<td>□ Black, African American, or Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adopted son or daughter</td>
<td>□ Yes, Puerto Rican</td>
<td>□ American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Stepson or stepdaughter</td>
<td>□ Yes, Cuban</td>
<td>□ Asian Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Brother or sister</td>
<td>□ Yes, of another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin – For example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.</td>
<td>□ Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Father or mother</td>
<td>□ Roomer or boeder</td>
<td>□ Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Grandchild</td>
<td>□ Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>□ Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parent-in-law</td>
<td>□ Unmarried partner</td>
<td>□ Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Son-in-law or daughter-in-law</td>
<td>□ Other relative</td>
<td>□ Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other relative</td>
<td>□ Roomer or boeder</td>
<td>□ Other Asian – For example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Roomer or boeder</td>
<td>□ Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>□ Native Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Unmarried partner</td>
<td>□ Other Pacific Islander – For example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.</td>
<td>□ Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other nonrelative</td>
<td>□ Some other race</td>
<td>□ Samoan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E - Tested Unit Verification Page (TVP)
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Enumerator Name: ___________________________ Page ______ of ______

D-691 (ETL) (01/08)

(UVP Alt 2)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

TRANSIENT LOCATION UNIT VERIFICATION PAGE

2010 CENSUS

NOTICE: Information given to the Census Bureau is confidential by law (Title 13, U.S. Code). It may be seen only by sworn Census Bureau employees and may be used only for statistical purposes.

1. IDENTIFICATION (LCO fills out)

   a. LCO No./Name
      ____________
   b. State                   c. County          d. AA Number
   e. TL Case ID No.

2. INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions will assist you in filling out the necessary information in Section 3, Listing Sheet, on the next page.

Column 1: Write in the unit number (occupied or unoccupied – except for hotels/motels where you will only write in the unit numbers provided by contact person).

Column 2: Is the site occupied? (For example, an RV, boat, tent, or camper is parked there.)

   • Enter ‘Y’ for yes or ‘N’ for no. If no, continue on to the next site. If yes, enter ‘Y’ in this column and knock on the door. Use the following script:

     Hello, I’m (your name) from the U.S. Census Bureau. (Show ID card.) To make sure we count everyone in the Census, we visit places like hotels, motels, RV parks, and marinas.

Column 3: Hand the respondent a D-1(F), Information Sheet, and allow time so they can read the Privacy Notice. Ask, Does everyone here have another place to live besides this (RV/boat/room/unit)?

   • If ‘Yes’, mark “Yes” in this column and go to the next column.
   • If “No, no other place to live,” mark “No” in this column. Then complete a D-15, Transitory Location Questionnaire, and fill in column 5 with the respondent’s name.
   • If the respondent refuses to give any additional information, enter ‘R’ in this column. Ask respondent only for the number of people living in the unit and complete a census questionnaire. Put the respondent’s name in Column 5.
   • If No one is available or not at home, mark ‘NC’ for No Contact in this column. Before leaving the location, do a 2nd visit to see if anyone arrived home. If someone is there, conduct an interview. If no one is home yet, your assignment is complete.

Column 4: Ask Do you (they) spend more time in this (RV/boat/room/unit) or at the other place?

   • If more time in this unit, mark ‘in this unit’ in this column. Then complete a D-15, Transitory Location Questionnaire, and fill in column 5 with the respondent’s name.
   • If more time at another residence, mark ‘other place’ in this column. Then say, You will be counted at the other place. Thank you. END THE INTERVIEW.

Column 5: Enter Last Name and First Name Initial of the respondent.

Note: If you find the location has both RV’s and Mobile Homes (trailers without wheels) on its property, mark an X in this box / .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
<th>Column 7</th>
<th>Column 8</th>
<th>Column 9</th>
<th>Column 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

**LISTING SHEET**

**Note:** The table above is an example of how data might be listed or counted. The columns and rows can be adjusted based on the specific requirements of the listing sheet.