**Dataset:** \_\_\_\_\_\_[Troubled Property Analysis](https://data.montgomerycountymd.gov/Consumer-Housing/Troubled-Properties-Analysis/bw2r-araf)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Comment on the quality of the data.

* Geolocations often zeroed
* occasional misspelling of cities, perhaps other values in error
* No apparent reason for doubt

1. What are the primary columns of interest?

* Case number hopefully links to Housing Code Violations
* Property Address: street, city, zip
* Inspection Frequency
* Severity Index

1. What are the filters of relevance?

* Correct for misspellings: look at frequency of cities, zip codes
* Pair with Housing Code Violations dataset.
* Impute geolocation from street address

1. Give potential visualization options.

* Overlay location on map with household income, size from US Census
* Barchart of number of dwelling units (x) and number of violations (y)
* Barchart of number of dwelling units (x) and number of units inspected (y)

1. Discuss any limitations of the dataset.

* May be difficult to join with Housing Code Violations or MD Parcel Database
* No values for Next Inspection Date column
* Only indicates violations for mold and infestations, not specific county code
* No problems indicated for many properties, what makes them troubled?

1. Give ideas for how the dataset can be improved/expanded/deepened.

* Using MD Parcel Database may be possible to identify owners, census tract and block
* May be possible to assess history using Housing Code Violations dataset.
* Interesting to see if properties with similar histories are not considered troubled.