

739 5th St - Rear
Oakmont, PA 15139
25 October 1989

Gil Alford
1403 Kingsford Dr
Florissant, MO 63031

Dear Gil,

I've let our correspondence get behind again so there are many different items to be in this letter.

I'm glad that things went well in Houston. Your turnout was great and I'm sure it was thrilling to meet so many Alford cousins. I'll be anxious to read the report in your next AFFA newsletter. Sorry not to be able to attend. We've been writing for so long, it would be nice to meet.

Thank you for the Texas census data. If the end result of all our ^{census} research looks that good, we will have produced a valuable resource. I am impressed and excited to see a "final" product.

Regarding Texas:

- 1) I have two references, one each from the 1850 and 1860 mortality schedules. I think they ought to be included in their respective census years. This will be the easiest way to keep them from getting lost. Usually you have a column for remarks or notations - use this to indicate the names are from the mortality schedules. - Or perhaps an asterisk by the age - to indicate age at death.
- 2) Do we have a census contact in Texas to help with the final clean-up? Should I contact Lucille Mehrkan?
- 3) I noticed on the final product that sometimes the Alford spelling variations were noted and sometimes not - can you explain? I just want to be consistent.
- 4) Do we want to have a separate tabulation for Alfords enumerated prior to 1850?
I think a comprehensive list would be appropriate.
- 5) Besides that, I think we are at 'B' quality for all of Texas, all years. ☺

You'll see the enclosed form letter* I've sent to all those you indicated showing interest in census data collection. I wrestled with the ~~prop~~, but efficiency won out over individual letters. Hope it doesn't hurt. I'll keep you posted as to how we're progressing.

Thanks for the IGI request copy. I'll extract the British Isles as soon as I can. — Perhaps before Christmas.

The data-set on my VIC-20 is the cassette recorder. Due to a malfunction between my keyboard and printer, everything must be recorded onto tape and then re-entered into the memory before printing (what a pain). This, however, I could live with, except now the cassette recorder won't record from the memory. I could buy another — they aren't that expensive, I just hate throwing good money after bad. Perhaps at income tax refund time, I can ~~get~~ get a PC. (That tax check has been spent several times over!)

I'll be sure to send Willie M. Alford a copy of the *form letter (for reference) with a note about Florida. Thanks for sending me his name. I'll also send it to Denna Cross and Ruth Moran, as well as the other names we already had.

I know you'll want another update for the next newsletter. I'll be sure to mention the Texas data w/ acknowledgement ~~of~~ contributors. Let me get this letter off first.

Given your understanding of the differentiation of the Alvord/Alford spelling, let us consider Alvord one of the ^{core} distinct spelling ~~var~~ variations:

1) Alford etc 2) Alvord 3) Halford etc 4) Olford etc

I agree that, at present, we should concentrate on ^{the} Alford, Allford, Alfred, Alford, Alfred etc variation as far as our current census collection efforts go. At some future time we can decide whether or not to include the others. The exception of course, would be where a member has reason

to believe that one of the other spellings ought to be included for a particular family — or where census takers arbitrarily chose one spelling for one year and another for the next. Of course we'll accept any offer to extract this ^{alternate} data.

Did you receive the census extraction forms? I forgot if I sent them to you or not. Likewise the info on census availability? FYI, but will be able to narrow our search where possible.

I'm glad that NC was chosen as the site of next year's conference. I'd be able to drive down!

I'll do some checking around to find out about the 1920 census availability.

I'm still not sure how to send you raw ~~data~~ census extraction data. I've done a bit myself ~~and made a copy for David's friend~~. Anyone else who needs copies of raw data? How about I send what I have and you put it in the computer at your leisure.... (I know... what leisure?). Q: How many sets of raw data notebooks exist?

You won't believe this... I have the notebooks you sent, the notebooks I've generated, and the envelopes with the Alfred Logo — but I can't find the letterhead! Could you please, next package, send me a dozen sheets? Thanks!

Don't worry about sending census information for my review before publishing in either ~~of the~~ newsletter. If truly is not necessary. My ego or sense of indispensability is not that big. If you want publish, go ahead. I trust that will be working closely enough to know the status of each set of records. That is, I can tell you what sets are currently being extracted, and you can tell me which ones you'd like readied for publication.

The trouble I have working between the notebooks and your computer lists is that I can't tell by looking at the computer lists if they are partial or complete. This is where the quality code will help. Enclosed is ~~an~~ a quality assessment tabulation. This is a current status list, as I see it, indicating the relative quality of the census collection. I realize you may know that some of the entries could or should be upgraded, but the tabulation shows the highest quality I can determine from the notebooks. In general, if I have a printed census index and you have extracted data, I can justify a 'B' grade, but without an index, I only see a 'C'.

Let me clarify the codes:

Census collection and quality codes:

- 8 A - Records extracted and verified
- 4 B - Records extracted
- 2 C - Index ~~and/or~~ partial extraction
- 1 D - Partial index only - scattered entries
- 0 Ø - Nothing researched (help!)
- N N - No Alford's present
- N/A - Ø - - Census not available

What do you think? I'd like to keep this relatively simple. Also I had intended to use the quality designation on sets of records (ie TX-1850-B) not on individual entries or counties. Will your "version" designation take alpha entry? That would be the perfect place for it!

This is enough to digest in one sitting.

I'll keep you posted.

Yours

Alicia Houston