

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
U.S. Department of Commerce
U.S. Census Bureau
Geographic Partnership Programs Generic Clearance
OMB Control Number 0607-0795

Part A. Justification

Question 1. Necessity of the Information Collection

The U.S. Census Bureau requests approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for a three-year extension of the generic clearance called the Geographic Partnership Programs (GPPs). OMB Control Number 0607-0795, with an expiration date of July 31, 2015, covers a number of activities needed to update or conduct research on the Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (MAF/TIGER) System. The information collected by these programs in cooperation with state, local, and tribal governments is essential to the mission of the Census Bureau and directly contributes to the successful outcome of censuses and surveys conducted by the Census Bureau. The generic clearance allows the Census Bureau to focus its resources on actual operational planning, development of procedures, and implementation of programs to update and improve the geographic and address information maintained in MAF/TIGER.

As part of this renewal request, Geography Division (GEO) will follow the protocol of past generic clearances: GEO will submit clearance requests at least two weeks before the planned start of each activity that give more exact details, examples of forms and related materials, and final estimates of respondent burden. GEO also will file a year-end summary with OMB after the close of each fiscal year giving results of each activity conducted.

GEO is providing a 12-month schedule of activities planned under this clearance (see Question 16), and GEO will submit schedule updates as necessary throughout the period covered by the clearance.

The following sections describe the programs to be included under the clearance.

Geographic Support System Initiative (GSS-I)

The GSS-I is an integrated program designed to improve address coverage, obtain continual spatial feature updates, and enhance the quality assessment and measurement for MAF/TIGER. The GSS-I builds on the accomplishments of the last decade's MAF/TIGER Enhancement Program (MTEP), which redesigned MAF/TIGER, improved the positional accuracy of TIGER spatial features, and emphasized quality measurement. The Census Bureau plans on a continual update process for MAF/TIGER throughout the decade to support Census Bureau surveys, including the American Community Survey (ACS). Major participants are the U. S. Census Bureau with state, local, and tribal governments. The Census Bureau will first send an advance notice letter to all state, local, and tribal governments introducing the GSS-I, detailing their respondent burden, and explaining how

the Census Bureau will maintain the confidentiality of their information. Following the advance notice letter, the Census Bureau will then contact state, local, and tribal governments to obtain files containing their geographic data, to explore data exchange opportunities, and share best practices. Governments can provide a file of their geographic data or provide data through the Community TIGER web-based application sponsored by the Census Bureau. Governments can choose the format and medium to provide their data directly to the Census Bureau, or may elect to standardize their data using Community TIGER.

Additional programs and activities may be performed under this generic clearance. GEO will follow the approved procedure when submitting any additional activities not specifically listed here.

The authority for conducting the activities in this document comes from Title 13 United States Code, Sections 16, 141, and 193.

Question 2. Needs and Uses

All activities described above directly support the Census Bureau's efforts to maintain MAF/TIGER in partnership with state, local, and tribal governments nationwide. Because state, local, and tribal governments have current knowledge of, and data about, where housing growth and change are occurring in their jurisdictions, their input into the overall development of geographic data for the Census Bureau makes a vital contribution to MAF/TIGER. Similarly, those governments are in the best position to work with local geographic boundaries, and they benefit from accurate address and geographic data.

Information quality is an integral part of the pre-dissemination review of the information disseminated by the Census Bureau. A full description of the Census Bureau's Information Quality Guidelines is available at the following web site:

<http://www.census.gov/quality/guidelines/index.html>.

Information quality is also integral to the data collection activities conducted by the Census Bureau, and is incorporated into the clearance process required by the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Question 3. Use of Information Technology

The Census Bureau collects information on geographic data updates, as well as legal and statistical boundary updates and other associated geographic information at the participating government's option in one of the following methods:

- Handwritten annotations on Census Bureau-supplied paper maps; or
- Electronic updates to Census Bureau-supplied digital shape files; or
- Partner-supplied digital file; or
- Web-based update system; or
- Block Equivalency files; or
- Shapefile output.

Question 4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

The information collected in these programs can be best obtained and updated from state, local, and tribal officials. These geographic data development-themed programs do not duplicate information requested or collected by any other agency. Further, there is no similar current information available on a consistent national basis that could be used or modified for these purposes.

Question 5. Minimizing Burden

The Census Bureau has devised several measures to minimize the response burden for governments participating in its geographic programs.

- Wherever possible, the Census Bureau offers options in program materials. The Census Bureau will supply participants with software options, which simplify the task of reviewing geographic materials, and allow for easy visual comparison of the government's own information to the Census Bureau data.
- The Census Bureau will supply its spatial data to participants in digital shape file format.
- The Census Bureau will accept partner-supplied digital files.

Question 6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

The Census Bureau is committed to maintaining the accuracy of MAF/TIGER to support current censuses and surveys. Less frequent collection would cause the accuracy of MAF/TIGER to suffer, causing increased costs for, and problems in, conducting censuses and surveys.

Question 7. Special Circumstances

The information collection will be conducted in a manner consistent with the OMB guidelines.

Question 8. Consultations Outside the Agency

The purpose, methodology, and problems of the GSS-I are discussed with state, local, and tribal officials, plus a network of frequent users of Census Bureau data, during periodical national and local meetings. Discrepancies in maps are periodically discussed with governmental officials during problem resolution. The following is a representative sample of the individuals we have consulted with for the GSS-I.

State of West Virginia
Mr. Jennings Starcher
GIS Manager
1900 Kanawha Blvd E
Charleston, WV 25305
304-558-5380
jennings.n.starcher@wv.gov

Fresno County, CA
Mr. Juan Witrago
Systems & Procedures Manager
2220 Tulare St.
Fresno, CA 93721
559-600-4470
jwitrago@co.fresno.ca.us

State of North Carolina
Mr. Joe Sewash
Services Program Manager
20322 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699
919-754-6590
joe.sewash@nc.gov

Boulder County, CO
Mr. Mark Mullane
GIS Coordinator
2045 13th St. East Wing
Boulder, CO 80302
303-441-3958
mmullane@co.boulder.co.us

State of New York
Ms. Cheryl Benjamin
GIS Project Manager
1220 Washington Ave.
Albany, NY 12207
518-242-5029
cbenjamin@dhses.ny.gov

Henderson County, NC
Mr. Curtis Griffin
Property Addressing Coordinator
100 N King St.
Hendersonville, NC 28792
828-694-6517
cgriffin@hendersoncountync.org

Stark County, ND
Mr. William Fahlsing
Emergency Manager
PO Box 130
Dickinson, ND 58601
701-456-7605
bfahlsing@starkcountynd.gov

Framingham, MA
Mr. Geoffrey Kovar
GIS Manager
150 Concord St.
Framingham, MA 01702
508-532-6017
gwk@framingham.gov

Blanco County, TX
Mr. Jonathan Pattiwael
GIS Analyst
6800 Burleson Rd.
Austin, TX 78744
512-916-6033
jpattiwael@capcog.org

New London, CT
Mr. Getachew Dires
System Analyst
181 State St.
New London, CT 06320
860-447-5212
gdires@ci.new-london.ct.us

During conversations with these individuals, comments were favorable and all issues are resolved.

The Federal Register Notice announcement publication date is on April 7, 2015 (FR Doc. 2015-07888). The Census Bureau received no comments during the consideration period ending June 8, 2015.

Question 9. Paying Respondents

GEO does not pay respondents nor provide them with gifts for responding to Census Bureau programs.

Question 10. Assurance of Confidentiality

All confidential information collected as part of these geographic programs will adhere to the data stewardship provisions of Title 13, United States Code, Section 9. Census Bureau staff will give notice to program participants working with this information that they are required to protect the confidentiality of those data and will set forth guidelines and procedures for their physical and information technology protection. Census Bureau field staff will use this notice to inform each program participant that any information given to the Census Bureau will be held in strict confidence and that participant participation is voluntary.

Question 11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

None of the questions asked during the activities described above are of a sensitive nature, and they should not pose any problem for respondents in that respect.

Question 12. Estimate of Hour Burden

The projected number of respondents/burden hours for GSS-I and Community TIGER for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 through FY 2017 are:

Estimated Number of Respondents:

FY 2015

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 1,000.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 500.
Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 200.
Community TIGER Updates: 200.

FY 2016 & FY 2017

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 2,000.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 1,000.
Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 500.
Community TIGER Updates: 500.

Grand Total Respondents all FYs

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 5,000.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 2,500.
Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 1,200.
Community TIGER Updates: 1,200.

Estimated Time per Response:

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 2 hours.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 10 hours.
Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 2 hours.
Community TIGER Updates: 40 hours.

Total Hours per Year:

FY 2015

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 2,000.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 5,000.
Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 400.
Community TIGER Updates: 8,000

FY 2016 & FY 2017

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 4,000.
GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 10,000.

Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 1,000.
 Community TIGER Updates: 20,000

Grand Total Hours All FYs

GSS-I Contact with Local Governments: 10,000.
 GSS-I Acquisition of Files and Data Content Clarification: 25,000.
 Community TIGER Contact with Local Governments: 2,400.
 Community TIGER Updates: 48,000

The maximum hour burden for any given year is 35,000 and is reflected on the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission form.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

Question 13. Estimate Cost Burden

The only expected cost to respondents is their time to respond or provide information. For state, local, and tribal governments, the information requested is of the type and scope normally available in records and no special hardware or accounting software or system is necessary to provide answers to this information collection. For some programs where software reduces the collection burden, free software is provided. Therefore, respondents are not expected to incur any capital and start-up costs or system maintenance costs in responding. Further, purchasing of outside accounting or information collection services, if performed by the respondent, is part of usual and customary business practices and not specifically required for this information collection.

Question 14. Cost to Federal Government

The estimate to conduct the GSS-I for one FY is approximately \$12,000,000. This estimate may fluctuate based on budgetary issues, changes in technology, or other factors unforeseen at this time.

Question 15. Reason for Change in Burden

The change in burden is due to an over estimation for GSS-I burden hours from the previously approved clearance. In addition, the School District Review Program (SDRP) and the Redistricting Data Program (RDP) have been removed from this generic clearance to their own specific clearance. A project specific clearance allows the Census Bureau to provide specific materials, burden hours, and procedures.

Question 16. Project Schedule

<u>GSS-I FY 2015 Schedule</u>	<u>Activity</u>
October	Start FY 2015 File Acquisition; Start FY 2015 Address & Spatial Data Updates.
November	Continue File Acquisition; Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates.
December	Continue File Acquisition; Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Start FY 2015 Feedback to Partners.
January	Continue File Acquisition; Continue Address &

	Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
February	Continue File Acquisition; Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
March	End FY 2015 File Acquisition; Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
April	Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
May	Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
June	Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners.
July	Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners; Begin FY 2015 Community TIGER.
August	Continue Address & Spatial Data Updates; Continue Feedback to Partners; Continue Community TIGER.
September	End FY 2015 Address & Spatial Data Updates; End FY 2015 Feedback to Partners; End FY 2015 Community TIGER.

Question 17. Request Not to Display Expiration Date

GEO will display the expiration date on the Information Collection Forms and on the Privacy Act Notice given to respondents.

Question 18. Exceptions to the Certification

There are no exceptions.

Attachments

- Community TIGER Advanced Letter
- Community TIGER Partnership Tool for Address and Spatial Data Sharing
- Community TIGER E-mail Template
- Community TIGER Quick Reference Guide
- Community TIGER Presentation
- Community TIGER User Guide