Technical Document: Data Cleaning and Generation Process Albemarle and Charlottesville Eviction Data Cases Filed From July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2021

Jacob Goldstein-Greenwood, Michael Salgueiro, and Michele Claibourn

10/1/2021

We begin with data scraped from Virginia Judiciary Online Case Information System for the General District Courts.

The 2018 Q3/Q4, 2020, and 2021 data were gathered with a scraper developed by civic programmer Ben Schoenfeld; the code for that tool is available at the following link: https://github.com/bschoenfeld/va-court-scraper. Anonymized data are posted periodically to virginiacourtdata.org, and de-anonymized data—which we used to develop the eviction database—can be requested from Schoenfeld.

The 2021 Q1/Q2 data were gathered with a scraper developed by the University of Viginia (UVa) Legal Data Lab (LDL).

From the combined data, we subset unlawful detainer (eviction) cases filed in the Albemarle and Charlottesville General District Courts that have filing dates from 2018-07-01 to 2021-06-30.

We apply an aggregation and cleaning process to the data to improve the accuracy and reliability of later analyses. Each element of the process is documented and commented in the code files delivered to KAG/TJPDC, and we describe the steps below. Further, as part of the cleaning process, we generate a number of new fields reflecting key details about the cases (e.g., presence of defense attorney; total costs awarded; etc.).

Aggregation and cleaning

- 1. We first aggregate data up to the case level such that 1 row = 1 case
- 2. We clean and standardize the names of the primary (i.e., first-listed) plaintiff and defendant in each case: These are the defendant_1_standardized and plaintiff_1_standardized columns
 - Differences in court clerk data-entry styles, as well as typographical errors, threaten the baseline accuracy of analyses that involve grouping on or aggregating by plaintiffs/defendants (for example, one case may list a plaintiff as "SMITH-JONES PROPERTIES, L.L.C," and another may list that same plaintiff as "SMITH JONES PROPERTIES LLC"
 - To the best of our ability, we want to ensure that those cases can be associated with the same entity, and we therefore apply the following standardization process to plaintiff and defendant names:
 - Remove "T/A" and "D/B/A" tags (e.g., "JANE DOE LEASING T/A DOE LEASING" -> "JANE DOE LEASING")
 - Correct comma misplacements (e.g., "SMITH PROPERTIES , INC." -> "SMITH PROPERTIES, LLC")
 - Remove dashes, slashes, and periods (e.g., "SUPER-HOME APARTMENTS, L.L.C" -> "SUPER HOME APARTMENTS, LLC")

- Remove trailing commas at the ends of names (e.g., "DOWNTOWN APARTMENTS," -> "DOWNTOWN APARTMENTS")
- Remove all errant double, triple, etc. spaces (e.g., "MIDTOWN LEASING" -> "MIDTOWN LEASING")
- Apply a standardization routine that converts common alternative spellings of certain words into one form (e.g., "MGMT/MGT/MTG" -> "MANAGEMENT")
- Apply a set of typo corrections specific to these data (e.g., "OWNER" is misspelled as "OWENER")
- Remove commas and semicolons that come before a business entity identifier (e.g., "WILLIAMS, LLC" -> "WILLIAMS LLC")
- Note that we also store original plaintiff/defendant names, exactly as they are read from court websites, in the database: These are the defendant_1_unmodified and plaintiff_1_unmodified fields
- We also generate fields containing further-simplified versions of defendant and plaintiff names by removing middle initials, JR/SR, I/II/III/IV, odd punctuation marks, etc.: These are the defendant_1_simplified and plaintiff_1_simplified columns
- 3. We then extract and clean defendant and plaintiff ZIP Codes from case records: These are the defendant_1_zip and plaintiff_1_zip columns
 - We treat as the primary ZIP Code for a given case the ZIP Code associated with the *first-listed* (primary) defendant (defendant_1_zip)
 - Note that publicly available data do not include the exact address of the property under dispute; instead, the data include an address for each defendant and plaintiff in a given case, granular to the level of ZIP Code + locality (e.g., "22902 CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA")
 - We convert non-VA and invalid ZIPs to NA so that they do not disrupt by-ZIP tabulations
 - We treat ZIPs within the following sets to be valid VA ZIPs: [20100, 20199] and [22000, 24699]
- 4. We then identify and remove true duplicates (e.g., errant double-entries by court clerks and errant double-downloads by data scrapers)
 - When we find multiple cases with the same filing date, judgment, costs, attorney fees, principal value, other awarded amount, primary plaintiff, primary defendant, and defendant ZIP, we remove all but one of the cases

Generation of new data fields

- 1. We identify and flag serial cases
 - Associated column in data: serial_filings_by_plaintiff_against_defendant (values: TRUE or FALSE)
 - We define serial cases as: Multiple cases in a 12-month period in which a plaintiff (plaintiff_1) filed against a defendant (defendant_1) within ZIP Code (defendant_1_zip)
 - When we identify a chain of serial cases associated with a given plaintiff/defendant/defendant ZIP combination, we flag that combination's cases with TRUE values in the serial_filings... column referenced above
- 2. We generate a column indicating whether a defense attorney is present in the case
 - Associated column in data: defense_attorney_present (values: TRUE or FALSE)
- 3. We generate a column indicating whether each plaintiff is likely a management company/business entity/quasi-governmental organization as opposed to an individual person (or a set of individuals; e.g., a couple)

- Associated column in data: mgmt_company_plaintiff (values: TRUE or FALSE)
- We identify likely management company/business entity/quasi-governmental organization plaintiffs using a regular-expression pattern developed in-house (see the tjpdc-mgmt-company-regex.R file)
- 4. We add a column indicating whether a judgment has been issued in the case by the end of the study period of interest (2021-06-30)
 - Associated column in data: judgment_issued (values: TRUE or FALSE)
- 5. We generate a column indicating whether the case only has one hearing associated with it
 - Associated column in data: single_hearing (values: TRUE or FALSE)
- 6. We determine the total dollar amount of judgments
 - There are five relevant columns in the scraped data: Costs, AttorneyFees, PrincipalAmount, OtherAmount, and OtherAwarded
 - The first four contain numeric values (e.g., 403.50)
 - The fifth (OtherAwarded) contains character strings in which additional awards/award details can be communicated (e.g., "\$201.00 FOR DAMAGES")
 - * We extract numeric values from OtherAwarded and place them in a column called OtherAwardedVal
 - We then sum the Costs, AttorneyFees, PrincipalAmount, OtherAmount, and OtherAwardedVal columns to generate a total_judgment_amount column (numeric)
 - Note that the OtherAwarded column sometimes doubles the information in OtherAmount (e.g., OtherAmount = 89.00; OtherAwarded = '\$89.00 FOR DAMAGES')
 - When we detect identical values in those two columns, we exclude OtherAwardedVal when when calculating total_judgment_amount
- 7. We generate a column containing the writ of eviction filing dates, when available, for cases
 - Associated column in data: writ_issued_date (yyyy-mm-dd)
- 8. We generate a column indicating whether each defendant is likely to be a residential defendant ("JOHN SMITH") or a non-residential entity (business, government body, etc.; e.g., "JONH SMITH INC."; "STATE OF VIRGINIA"; etc.)
 - Associated column in data: non_residential_defendant (values: TRUE or FALSE)
 - $\hbox{\bf We identify likely non-residential defendants using a regular-expression pattern developed in-house (see the {\tt tjpdc-non-residential-regex.R file)} \\$

We write out two CSVs containing cleaned data:

- 1. cases.csv, which contains all cases
- $2. \ \ cases_residential_only.csv, which contains only those cases with {\tt FALSE} \ in the {\tt non_residential_defendant} \\ \ \ field$

Our full code for cleaning and summarizing data is available in the file tjpdc-clean.R.