

Appendix B. Source and Accuracy of the Data

SAMPLE DESIGN	App-39
American Housing Survey metropolitan sample	App-39
Designation of AHS-MS sample housing units for the 1987 survey	App-40
1987 AHS-MS original sample selection for the 1970-based area sample of the metropolitan areas	App-41
Sample from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe	App-41
Sample from the 1970-based new construction universe	App-41
Sample from the 1970-based nonpermit universe	App-42
Sample selection for the AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program	App-42
1987 AHS-MS sample reduction and sample reinstatement	App-42
AHS-MS sample selection for the 1980-based area sample of the metropolitan areas	App-43
Sample from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe	App-43
Sample selection from the 1980-based new construction universe	App-43
Sample from the 1980-based nonpermit universe	App-44
AHS-National sample selection	App-44
ESTIMATION	App-44
AHS-MS	App-45
Type M noninterview adjustment	App-45
Type A noninterview adjustment	App-45
AHS-MS ratio estimation procedure (1970-based permit-issuing universe)	App-45
AHS-MS ratio estimation procedure (1980-based permit-issuing universe)	App-46
AHS-National	App-46
COMBINED SAMPLE WEIGHTING	App 46
Introduction	App-46
Weighting factor adjustment	App-46
Combined sample ratio estimation procedures	App-47
ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES	App-47
Nonsampling errors	App-47

AHS-MS content errors	App-47
AHS-National content errors	App 48
Coverage errors	App-48
Rounding errors	App-49
Sampling errors for the AHS-combined sample estimate	App-49
Illustration of the use of the standard error tables	App-50
Differences	App-50
Illustration of the computation of the standard error of a difference	App-50
Medians	App-50
Illustration of the computation of the 90-percent confidence interval of a median	App-51
Standard error tables	App-52

SAMPLE DESIGN

American Housing Survey metropolitan sample. The estimates for each of the 11 metropolitan areas in this report are based on data collected from the 1987 American Housing Survey metropolitan sample (AHS-MS), which was conducted by the Bureau of the Census acting as collection agent for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The sample areas covered for metropolitan areas that remained in the AHS sample after survey year 1983 are consistent with the 1983 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA), consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA), or primary metropolitan statistical area (PMSA). In some instances, a given metropolitan area is a combination of primary metropolitan statistical areas and will be referred to as PMSA's. In addition to adding new areas to some metropolitan samples to comply with the 1983 definitional changes, some new metropolitan areas have been added. Thus, each of the 1987 metropolitan areas will fall into one of three categories:

- a. Areas of the same geographic area as defined for surveys prior to 1984 (i.e., areas in which the 1970 OMB definition of a standard metropolitan statistical area is the same as the 1983 MSA, PMSA, or CMSA definition, 1970-based area)—San Diego, CA MSA; and Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA.

- b. Areas consisting of new area in addition to the 1970-based area—Atlanta, GA MSA; Baltimore, MD MSA; Chicago, IL area PMSA's; Columbus, OH MSA; Hartford, CT CMSA; New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's; Northern NJ area PMSA's, and St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA.
- c. Areas that are strictly 1980-based—Houston, TX area PMSA's.

The metropolitan areas selected for the 1987 AHS-MS are interviewed on a rotating basis once every 4 years. Each metropolitan area had an expected sample size of 4,250 housing units, uniformly distributed throughout nine panels (panels 4 through 12). Because of budget constraints, panels 4 and 5 were dropped from sample in all metropolitan areas. Interviewing was scheduled for June 1987 through December 1987 in all metropolitan areas except for New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's; and the Northern NJ area PMSA's. In the New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's, interviewing was scheduled for April 1987 through December 1987; and in the Northern NJ area PMSA's, interviewing was scheduled for April 1987 through February 1988.

Table 1 on page App-52 summarizes the data on interviews for AHS-MS and AHS-National in 1987. In these metropolitan areas, 34,398 AHS-MS housing units were eligible for interview. Of these sample housing units, 1,847 interviews were not obtained because, for occupied sample units, the occupants refused to be interviewed, were not at home after repeated visits, or were unavailable for some other reason; or, for vacant units, no informed respondent could be found after repeated visits. In addition to the AHS-MS housing units eligible for interview, 2,067 AHS-MS units were visited but were not eligible for interview because they were condemned, unfit, demolished, converted to group quarters use, etc.

The AHS-National sample is interviewed biennially in odd-numbered years. It was conducted from July 1987 through December 1987. The sample covers 878 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In order to increase the reliability of the AHS-MS sample estimates, information from the AHS-National sample units was used in the estimation process. For each metropolitan area, interviewed AHS-National units that were located within the 1987 AHS-MS definition area were used for this procedure. In these metropolitan areas, 7,609 AHS-National units were used.

Designation of AHS-MS sample housing units for the 1987 survey. The sample housing units designated to be interviewed in the 1987 survey consisted of the following categories, which are described in the following sections:

Housing units that were in the 1970-based area include the following:

- a. All sample housing units that were interviewed in the previous survey and remained in sample after the 1987 reduction. This sample includes housing units that were selected as part of the 1976-1981 Coverage Improvement Program. These Coverage Improvement cases represented most of the housing units that, until these procedures were implemented, did not have a chance of selection.
- b. All sample housing units that were type A noninterviews (i.e., units eligible to be interviewed) or type B noninterviews (i.e., units not eligible for interview at the time of the survey but which could become eligible in the future) in the previous survey and remained in sample after the 1987 reduction. (For a list of reasons for type A noninterviews, see the facsimile of the 1987 AHS questionnaire, page App-11.)
- c. All sample housing units selected from a listing of new residential construction building permits issued since the previous survey that remained in sample after the 1987 reduction. This sample represented the housing units built in permit-issuing areas since the previous survey.
- d. All sample housing units that were added since the previous survey in sample segments from the nonpermit universe that remained in sample after the 1987 reduction. This sample represented additions to the housing inventory since the previous survey in nonpermit-issuing areas.
- e. In the 1970-based areas of the Baltimore, MD MSA; Chicago, IL area PMSA's; Hartford, CT CMSA; and St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA, all housing units selected from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing.
- f. All sample housing units reinstated in sample in 1987. This sample represents units that had been dropped from sample because of previous sample reductions.

Housing units within new areas added to the metropolitan area in 1980, and for metropolitan areas that are in sample for the first time (1980-based area):

- a. All housing units selected from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing.
- b. All housing units that were selected from a list of new residential construction building permits. This sample represented the housing units built in permit-issuing areas since the 1980 census.
- c. All sample housing units that were selected in sample segments added from the nonpermit universe. This sample represents units enumerated in the 1980 census as well as additions to the housing inventory in nonpermit-issuing areas since the 1980 census.

The following table shows the percent of the AHS-MS old construction sample that is 1970-based and 1980-based for each metropolitan area:

Metropolitan area	Percent 1970-based area	Percent 1980-based area
Atlanta, GA MSA	83.4	16.6
Baltimore, MD MSA	97.7	2.3
Chicago, IL area PMSA's	98.6	1.4
Columbus, OH MSA	80.4	19.6
Hartford, CT CMSA	61.8	38.2
Houston, TX area PMSA's	0.0	100.0
New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's	97.0	3.0
Northern NJ area PMSA's	55.9	44.1
St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA	95.8	4.2
San Diego, CA MSA	100.0	0.0
Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA	100.0	0.0

1987 AHS-MS original sample selection for the 1970-based area sample of the metropolitan areas. The 1987 AHS-MS original sample for the 1970-based area of the metropolitan areas that were 100-percent permit-issuing in 1970 was selected from two frames:

- Housing units enumerated in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing in areas under the jurisdiction of permit issuing offices (the 1970-based permit-issuing universe).
- Housing units constructed in permit-issuing areas since the 1970 census (the 1970-based new construction universe).

In addition, the sample for those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing in 1970 included a sample selected from a third frame: housing units located in areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (the 1970-based non-permit universe).

In 1970, the Hartford, CT CMSA; New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's; Northern NJ area PMSA's; and San Diego, CA MSA were the only metropolitan areas that were 100-percent permit-issuing.

Sampling operations, described in the following paragraphs, were performed separately within the central city and balance, using the 1970 OMB definitions of the central city of each metropolitan area for each of the sample frames. The overall sampling rate used to select the sample for each metropolitan area was determined by the size of the sample. Each metropolitan area had a sampling rate about the same for the central city and the balance, since the sample was distributed proportionately between the two, according to the corresponding distribution of total housing units.

Sample from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe.

The major portion of the sample in each of the metropolitan areas was selected from a file that represented the

20-percent sample of housing units enumerated in permit-issuing areas of the metropolitan areas during the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. This file contained records for occupied housing units, vacant housing units, and housing units in certain special places or group quarters. Sampling operations were done separately for the special place and group quarters records and for the occupied and vacant housing unit records. Before the sample was selected from the occupied and vacant housing unit records, the records were stratified by race of the head of household (non-Black/Black), and the vacant records were stratified into four categories pertaining to the value or rent associated with the vacant housing units. The occupied housing unit records were further stratified so that each unit was assigned to 1 of 50 strata according to its tenure (owner/renter), family size, and family income category as illustrated by the following table:

Family income	Tenure									
	Owner family size					Renter family size				
	1	2	3	4	5+	1	2	3	4	5+
Under \$3,000										
\$3,000 to \$5,999										
\$6,000 to \$9,999										
\$10,000 to \$14,999										
\$15,000 and over										

Thus, the occupied housing unit records from the permit-issuing universe were assigned to 1 of 100 strata for either the central city or for the balance, and the vacant housing unit records were assigned to 1 of the 4 vacant strata for either the central city or for the balance of the metropolitan areas. A sample selection procedure was then instituted that would produce one-half of the desired sample. However, whenever a record was selected to be in sample, the housing unit record adjacent to it on the file was also selected to be in sample, thereby insuring the necessary designated sample size.

Before the sample was selected from the group quarters and special place records, the records were stratified by census tract and census enumeration district (ED) within the central city and within the balance of the metropolitan areas. A sample of special place records was then selected by a procedure that produced one-quarter of the desired sample size. However, at the time of the survey, the housing units at each of the special places were listed and subsampled at a rate that produced an expected four sample units, thereby insuring the necessary designated sample size.

Sample from the 1970-based new construction universe. The second frame from which the metropolitan area sample was selected was a list of new construction building permits issued since 1970 (i.e., the new construction universe). The sample selection from the list of new

construction building permits was an independent operation within the metropolitan area. Under clerically selected procedures, the list of permits was stratified by the date the permits were issued, and clusters of an expected four (usually adjacent) housing units were formed. These clusters were then sampled for inclusion at the overall sampling rate. In February 1984, the new construction sampling operation for the 1970-based and 1980-based areas were combined into one computerized system. The universe sampled in the computerized system will be referred to in the estimation section as the 1980-based permit universe. Under these procedures, prior to sample selection, the list of permits was stratified by the date of issue, State, 1980 central city and balance, county or minor civil division, and permit office. Clusters of an expected four (usually adjacent) housing units were formed. These clusters were then sampled for inclusion at twice the overall sampling rate. The housing units within each of the clusters were then subsampled so that two of the four housing units originally selected were kept in sample.

Sample from the 1970-based nonpermit universe. For those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing, the remainder of the AHS-MS sample was selected from a frame consisting of areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (i.e., the nonpermit universe). The first step in the sampling operation for the nonpermit universe was the selection of a sample of census enumeration districts. Prior to this sample selection, the ED's were stratified by census tract within the central city and within the balance of the metropolitan area. The probability of selection of an ED was proportionate to the following:

$$\frac{\text{Number of housing units in 1970 census ED} + \frac{\text{Group quarters population in 1970 census ED}}{3}}{4}$$

The sample ED's were then divided into segments (i.e., small land areas with well-defined boundaries having an expected size of four, or a multiple of four, housing units). At the time of the survey, those segments that did not have an expected size of four were further subdivided to produce an expected four sample housing units. The next step was the selection of one of these segments within each sample ED. All housing units in existence at the time of interview in these selected segments were eligible for sample. Thus, housing units enumerated in the 1970 census as well as housing units built since the 1970 census were included.

Sample selection for the AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program. The AHS-MS Coverage Improvement Program was undertaken to correct certain deficiencies in the AHS-Metropolitan area sample from the 1970 permit-issuing universe and the 1970 new construction universe within the 1970-based area. The coverage deficiencies included the following units:

- a. New construction from building permits issued prior to January 1970 but completed after April 1, 1970.
- b. Mobile homes placed in parks either missed during the 1970 census or established since the 1970 census.
- c. Housing units missed in the 1970 census.
- d. Housing units converted to residential use that were nonresidential at the time of the 1970 census.
- e. Houses that have been moved onto their present site since the 1970 census.
- f. Mobile homes placed outside parks since the 1970 census or vacant at the time of the 1970 census.

For a detailed description of the coverage improvement sample selection process, see earlier reports in the H170 series for the years 1976 through 1981.

1987 AHS-MS sample reduction and sample reinstatement. The 1987 AHS-MS sample reduction dropped units from sample, whereas the 1987 AHS-MS sample reinstatement added enumerated units which were previously dropped from sample. The universes involved were (a) the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, (b) the 1970-based new construction universe, and (c) the 1970-based nonpermit universe.

Sample reduction and reinstatement involved dropping or adding (a) individual housing units from the permit-issuing universe, (b) whole clusters from the new construction universe, and (c) whole segments from the non-permit universe.

The reduction/reinstatement was implemented to achieve two criteria:

- a. A sample size of 4,250 in all metropolitan areas.
- b. A sample having an equal number of owners and renters.

To achieve these results, each unit was classified according to the original panel number (the original sample was divided into 12 panels, with one-twelfth of the sample being in each panel) and 1987 tenure (each housing unit was given a 1987 tenure based on the previous year's tenure status). To simplify field procedures, panels 1-3 (i.e., a random one-fourth of the original sample) were

dropped from sample whenever possible. More sample reductions were implemented separately for each 1987 tenure group (using different selection rates) across the remaining panels.

AHS-MS sample selection for the 1980-based area sample of the metropolitan areas. The sample for new areas added to the 1970 metropolitan areas, and metropolitan areas in sample for the first time that, in 1980, were 100-percent permit-issuing, was selected from two frames:

- a. Housing units enumerated in the 1980 Census of Population and Housing in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (the 1980-based permit-issuing universe).
- b. Housing units constructed in permit-issuing areas since the 1980 census (1980-based new construction universe).

In addition, the sample for those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing in 1980 included a sample from a third frame: housing units not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (1980-based non-permit universe). In 1980, the Hartford, CT CMSA was the only metropolitan area that added new areas that were 100-percent permit-issuing. To satisfy confidentiality requirements in the Baltimore, MD MSA; Chicago, IL area PMSA's; Hartford, CT CMSA; and St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA, it was necessary to supplement the existing sample within the 1970-based area. The additional housing units were selected separately for each metropolitan area from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe.

Sample from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe.

The major portion of the sample in each metropolitan area was selected from a file that represented all the housing units enumerated in permit-issuing areas during the 1980 Census of Population and Housing. This file contained records for occupied housing units, vacant housing units, and housing units in group quarters. Sampling operations were done separately for noninstitutionalized group quarters and for all other housing units in permit-issuing areas. In addition, in order that an equal number of owner and renter housing units were selected in each metropolitan area, a selection rate that differed by tenure group was used. Before the sample was selected, the housing units that were not classified as group quarters were stratified into 60 categories by tenure, contract rent, value, and number of rooms as illustrated by the following table:

Contract rent and value	Number of rooms		
	1-3	4-5	6+
RENTER			
Contact Rent:			
Less than \$100			
\$100 to \$149			
\$150 to \$199			
\$200 to \$249			
\$250 to \$299			
\$300 to \$349			
\$350 to \$399			
\$400 or more			
Not available			
OWNER			
Value:			
Less than \$20,000			
\$20,000 to \$29,999			
\$30,000 to \$34,999			
\$35,000 to \$39,999			
\$40,000 to \$49,999			
\$50,000 to \$64,999			
\$65,000 to \$79,999			
\$80,000 to \$99,999			
\$100,000 to \$149,999			
\$150,000 or more			
Not available			

The group quarters housing units were grouped into two strata: (1) institutionalized group quarters; and (2) noninstitutionalized group quarters.

The following sample selection procedures were then implemented separately within the 1980 central city and balance of the metropolitan area. For the Baltimore, MD MSA; Chicago, IL area PMSA's; Hartford, CT CMSA; and St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA, the sample selections were implemented separately by the 1970-based and 1980-based areas. All units were sorted by the 1980 central city and balance, stratum, State, district office, ED, and census serial number. The sample selection procedure was then implemented separately for (a) institutionalized group quarters and nongroup quarters housing units, and (b) noninstitutionalized group quarters.

Individual housing units were selected for the nongroup quarters, but each institutionalized group quarters had one chance of selection. Before the sample selection for the noninstitutionalized group quarters was implemented, the following measure of size was calculated for each record:

$$(1/4) \times \frac{\text{Total group quarters population}}{2.75}$$

The noninstitutionalized group quarters were then selected proportionate to the measure of size.

Sample selection from the 1980-based new construction universe. The second frame from which the metropolitan area sample was selected was a list of new construction building permits issued since 1980 (i.e., the new construction universe). The sample selection from the

list of new construction building permits was an independent operation within each metropolitan area. This operation was described in the discussion of the 1970-based new construction universe.

The following table shows the percent of the new construction sample that was clerically selected since the previous survey (i.e., cluster size = 4) and computer selected (i.e., cluster size = 2) for each metropolitan area:

Metropolitan area	Percent clerically selected	Percent computer selected
Atlanta, GA MSA	14.8	85.2
Baltimore, MD MSA	38.6	61.4
Chicago, IL area PMSA's	28.5	71.5
Columbus, OH MSA	18.5	81.5
Hartford, CT CMSA	5.5	94.5
Houston, TX area PMSA's	0.0	100.0
New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's	5.3	94.7
Northern NJ area PMSA's	1.7	98.3
St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA	34.0	66.0
San Diego, CA MSA	14.6	85.4
Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA	14.4	85.6

Sample from the 1980-based nonpermit universe. For those metropolitan areas that were not 100-percent permit-issuing, the remainder of the AHS-MS sample was selected from a frame consisting of areas not under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices (i.e., the 1980-based nonpermit universe). The first step in the sampling operation for the nonpermit universe was the selection of a sample of census ED's within these areas (using the overall sampling rate). Prior to this sample selection, the ED's were sorted by State, district office and enumeration district number. The probability of selection of an ED was proportionate to the following:

$$\frac{\text{Number of housing units in 1980 census ED} + \frac{\text{Noninstitutionalized group quarters population in 1980 census ED}}{2.75}}{4}$$

The sample ED's were then divided into segments (i.e., small land areas with well-defined boundaries having an expected size of four, or a multiple of four, housing units). At the time of the survey, those segments that did not have an expected size of four housing units were further subdivided to produce an expected four sample housing units. Following the division, a segment from each sample ED was selected. All housing units in existence at the time of interview in these selected segments were eligible for sample. Thus, housing units enumerated in the 1980 census as well as housing units built since the 1980 census are included.

AHS-National sample selection. This sample was set up as a multistage design in which the United States was divided into areas made up of counties and independent cities called primary sampling units (PSU's). These PSU's were grouped into strata consisting of one or more PSU's, and then one PSU was selected from each stratum to represent all PSU's in that stratum.

Selection from the 1980 census. Sample units were selected from 1980 census units in these PSU's at an overall sampling rate of 1 in 2,148. The procedure for sampling housing units in a given area depended on the completeness of addresses and the degree of monitoring of new construction by permits. In areas where addresses were mostly complete and where new construction is monitored by permits, a sample was selected from a list of housing units that received the long-form questionnaire in the 1980 census. This list was based on housing and geographic information on the housing unit.

In areas where at least 4 percent of the addresses were incomplete or inadequate, or where new construction was not monitored by building permits (most rural areas), a sample of 1980 "long-form questionnaire" census units was selected in several steps:

- The areas were grouped, and a sample of areas was chosen.
- A segment was selected within each sample area.
- A sample of housing units that received 1980 census long forms was selected within the segment.

Selection of housing units added since 1980 census. The sample of permit new construction was selected from building permits issued for units expected to be completed after April 1, 1980. The sampling procedure was similar to that of AHS-MS; however, the subsampling rate was 1 in 4.

Housing units added to the inventory since the 1980 census were represented using two methods:

- Identification of within-structure additions, which are units in structure that contained at least one unit enumerated in the 1980 census.
- Identification of whole-structure additions, which include units in structures that contained no units enumerated in the 1980 census.

Additional information concerning the 1987 AHS-National survey is available in the Current Housing Report series H150/87.

ESTIMATION

The 1987 AHS-Metropolitan area sample produced estimates pertaining to characteristics of the housing inventory at the time of the interview (i.e., the 1987 housing

inventory). The combined estimates used information from both the AHS-MS and AHS-National samples (i.e., the combined sample estimates).

AHS-MS. The AHS estimates of characteristics of the 1987 housing inventory were produced using a multistage ratio estimation procedure. Before the implementation of the ratio estimation procedure, the basic weight (i.e., the inverse of the probability of selection) for each interviewed sample housing unit was adjusted to account for Type M and Type A noninterviews.

Type M noninterview adjustment. The Type M noninterviews are sample units that were dropped because of selection by another survey or because of permit unavailability. These noninterviews occur in (a) the 1980-based permit-issuing area universe, (b) the 1980-based nonpermit-issuing area universe, and (c) the 1980-based new construction universe.

The adjustment was done separately for the above universes for the central city and balance for each metropolitan area. The adjustment was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1980 housing units in the cell} + \text{Weighted count of Type M noninterviewed housing units}}{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1980 housing units in the cell}}$$

Type A noninterview adjustment. Type A noninterviews are sample units for which (a) occupants were not home, (b) occupants refused to be interviewed, or (c) occupants were unavailable for some other reason.

The adjustment was done on occupied units and was computed separately for (a) units in the 1980-based permit-issuing area universe; (b) new construction, and (c) all other housing units (this includes the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, the 1970-based and 1980-based nonpermit-issuing universes and the 1970-based new construction housing units built before the last survey).

For units in the 1980-based permit-issuing universe, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was computed separately for each of the 62 strata used in the sample selection process, by 1980 central city and balance. For new construction units, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was computed separately by tenure for each of the central city and balance. For all other units, a Type A noninterview adjustment factor was calculated separately by tenure and 1970 central city and balance for each of the following:

- a. Twenty-four noninterview cells for sample housing units from the permit-issuing universe (each cell was derived from one or more of the 50 different strata used in the 1970-based permit-issuing universe, illustrated earlier).

- b. One noninterview cell for new construction housing units.
- c. One noninterview cell for mobile homes or trailers from the nonpermit-issuing universe.
- d. One noninterview cell for units that were not mobile homes or trailers from the nonpermit-issuing universe.
- e. Three noninterview cells for units from the coverage improvement universe.
- f. One noninterview cell for units classified as vacants at the time of the 1970 census.
- g. One noninterview cell for units classified as group quarters at the time of the 1970 census.

Within a given cell, the Type A noninterview adjustment factor was equal to the following ratio using the basic weight times the Type M noninterview adjustment factor for the sample weight:

$$\frac{\text{Weighted count of interviewed housing units} + \text{Weighted count of Type A noninterviewed housing units}}{\text{Weighted count of interviewed housing units}}$$

AHS-MS ratio estimation procedure (1970-based permit-issuing universe.) The following ratio estimation procedure was employed for all sample housing units from the permit-issuing universe. This factor was computed separately for all sample housing units within each 1970-based permit-issuing universe noninterview cell mentioned previously. The ratio estimation factor for each cell was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{1970 census count of housing units from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}{\text{AHS-MS sample estimate of 1970 housing units from the permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}$$

For each metropolitan area, the numerators of the ratios were obtained from the 1970 Census of Population and Housing 20 percent file of housing units enumerated in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices.

The denominators of the ratio estimation factors were then obtained from weighted estimates of all the AHS-MS sample housing units from the 1970-based permit-issuing universe within the corresponding ratio estimate categories, using the existing weights (i.e., the basic weight times the Type A noninterview adjustment). The computed ratio estimation factor was then applied to the existing weight for each sample housing unit within the corresponding ratio estimation cells. This ratio estimation procedure was introduced to correct the probabilities of selection for

samples in each of the strata used in the sample selection of the 1970-based permit-issuing universe. Prior to the AHS sample selection within each metropolitan area, housing units already selected for other Census Bureau surveys were deleted from the permit-issuing universe. The same probability of selection was then applied to the remaining units to select the AHS sample. Since the number of housing units deleted from the AHS universe frame was not necessarily proportional among all strata, some variation in the actual probability of selection between strata was introduced during the sample selection process.

AHS-MS ratio estimation procedure (1980-based permit-issuing universe). The following ratio estimation procedure was employed for all sample units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe. This factor was computed separately for all metropolitan areas excluding the San Diego, CA MSA; and Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA, within each 1980-based permit-issuing universe noninterview cell mentioned previously. The ratio estimation factor was equal to the following:

$$\frac{\text{1980 census count of housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}{\text{AHS sample estimate of 1980 housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell}}$$

AHS sample estimate of 1980 housing units from the 1980-based permit-issuing universe in the corresponding cell

For each metropolitan area, the numerator of the ratio was obtained from the 1980 Census of Population and Housing 100 percent file of housing units enumerated in areas under the jurisdiction of permit-issuing offices. The denominator of the ratio was obtained from weighted estimates of all the AHS sample housing units within the corresponding ratio estimation categories using the existing weight (i.e., the basic weight times the Type M noninterview adjustment factor times the Type A noninterview adjustment factor).

The computed ratio estimation factor was then applied to the existing weight for each sample housing unit within the corresponding ratio estimation categories.

This ratio estimation procedure was introduced to adjust the sample estimate in each of the strata used in the sample selection of the 1980-based permit issuing universe to an independent estimate (1980 census count) for the strata. This adjustment was necessary since some sample units were dropped during the processing procedures.

AHS-National. Before implementing estimation procedures using the AHS-National units for the combined sample, the AHS-National sample units were assigned a weight that reflected the probability of selection for the unit. The AHS-National weighting procedure then made adjustments for units that could not be interviewed for a variety of reasons. For each of these adjustments, a factor was computed and applied to the appropriate units.

The first of these adjustments was done in permit segments only, to account for permits that could not be sampled and units that could not be located. These were represented by all other units in permit segments including both interviews and noninterviews (excluding "unable to locate" noninterviews).

The second of these adjustments was done for units in structures built before April 1, 1980. It was done to account for units that could not be located. The unlocatable units were represented by both interviews and noninterviews excluding "unable to locate" noninterviews.

The last of these adjustments was done to account for units which could not be interviewed because either no one was home after repeated visits or the respondent refused to be interviewed. When 1987 AHS or 1980 census data were available, this information was used to determine the noninterview adjustment cell. The cells included characteristics such as tenure, geography, units in structure, and number of rooms. When these data were not available, adjustment factors were computed separately using more general characteristics such as type of area and type of housing unit (i.e., mobile home, nonmobile home). Additional information on the AHS-National weighting procedure can be found in the current housing reports H150/87 series.

COMBINED SAMPLE WEIGHTING

Introduction. The estimates for the combined sample were obtained by summing the sample weights of interviewed AHS-MS and AHS-National units. For AHS-MS sample units, the starting weight was obtained after the AHS-MS ratio estimation procedure. For AHS-National units, the starting weight was obtained after the Type A noninterview adjustment. To account for the use of two different samples representing one metropolitan area, weighting factors were assigned to each unit prior to the combined sample ratio estimation procedures.

Weighting factor adjustment. The weighting factor adjustment was computed separately for each metropolitan area by sample design (AHS-MS or AHS-National) according to "new construction" or "old construction" classification. New construction was defined as units built in permit-issuing areas since the 1980 census; old construction units were then categorized by tenure classification (renter/owner)

For a given characteristic, the AHS-MS weighting factor adjustment was a function of the sample size in each survey and the variance associated with each surveys estimates.

The corresponding weighting factor was then applied to the existing weight of each AHS-MS and AHS-National sample unit, and the weights were then combined according to characteristic (i.e., AHS-MS new construction + AHS-National new construction, etc.).

Combined sample ratio estimation procedures. The following ratio estimation procedure was applied in all metropolitan areas. The metropolitan areas were subdivided into geographic areas consisting of a combination of counties or minor civil divisions. This procedure involved the ratio estimation of the weighted sample estimate of the September 15, 1987, housing inventory in each geographic area for each metropolitan area to an independent estimate of total housing units for the corresponding cell. This ratio estimation factor equaled the following:

$$\frac{\text{Independent estimate of the September 15, 1987, housing unit inventory for the corresponding geographic area of the metropolitan area}}{\text{AHS-metropolitan area sample estimate of the occupied housing inventory for the corresponding geographic area of the metropolitan area}}$$

AHS-metropolitan area sample estimate of the occupied housing inventory for the corresponding geographic area of the metropolitan area

The independent estimates of total housing units that were used as the numerator of this ratio are described below. The denominator of this ratio was obtained from the weighted estimate of the AHS-Metropolitan Area sample housing units using the existing weight.

Independent estimates were derived for the September 15, 1987, occupied housing inventory for each geographic area within each metropolitan area. For all metropolitan areas excluding the Hartford, CT MSA; and San Diego, CA MSA, the estimates were based on the following ratio:

$$\frac{1987 \text{ estimate of total population excluding group quarters in the county}}{1987 \text{ estimate of total population per household excluding group quarters in the county}}$$

1987 estimate of total population per household excluding group quarters in the county

For the Hartford, CT CMSA, the estimate was based on the following ratio:

$$\frac{1987 \text{ estimate of total population excluding group quarters in the minor civil division}}{1987 \text{ estimate of total population per household excluding group quarters in the minor civil division}}$$

The methodology used to derive the independent estimates for all metropolitan areas excluding the San Diego, CA MSA was based on the population-per-household method as described in the *Proceedings of the Bureau of the Census Second Annual Research Conference*, March 23-26, 1986, pages 83-110. This method is based on the national trend of the total population per household and assumes that this trend is uniform throughout the country.

For the San Diego, CA MSA, the independent estimates were obtained from the State of California, Department of Finance. In this metropolitan area, the population-per-household method could not be applied since the national population-per-household trend underestimated the true population per household in this metropolitan area.

The AHS sample estimate of the housing inventory for the corresponding geographic area was obtained using the existing weight.

The computed ratio estimation factors were then applied to all housing units (including vacant units) in the corresponding geographic area of each metropolitan area, and the resulting product was used as the final weight for tabulation purposes.

The effect of this ratio estimation procedure was to reduce the sampling error for most statistics below what would have been obtained by simply weighting the results of the sample by the inverse of the probability of selection. Since the housing population of the sample differed somewhat, by chance, from the metropolitan area as a whole, it can be expected that the sample estimates will be improved when the sample housing population, or different portions of it, is brought into agreement with known good estimates of the metropolitan area housing population.

ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

There are two types of possible errors associated with estimates based on data from sample surveys—nonsampling and sampling errors. The following is a description of the nonsampling and sampling errors associated with the AHS sample estimates.

Nonsampling errors. In general, nonsampling errors can be attributed to many sources: inability to obtain information about all cases; definitional difficulties; differences in the interpretation of questions; inability or unwillingness of respondents to provide correct information; mistakes in recording or coding the data; other errors of collection, response, processing, and coverage; and estimation for missing data. Nonsampling errors are not unique to sample surveys since they can, and do, occur in complete censuses as well.

Obtaining a measurement of the total nonsampling error associated with the estimates from a survey is very difficult, considering the number of possible sources of error. However, an attempt was made to measure some of the nonsampling errors associated with the estimates for the 1987 AHS-Metropolitan Area sample. The following sections discuss the major sources of nonsampling errors.

AHS-MS content errors. A content reinterview program was done for the 1987 AHS-Metropolitan area sample units. A sample of these units was revisited and answers to some of the questions on the questionnaire were obtained again. The original interview and reinterview were assumed to be two independent readings and, thus, were the basis for the measurement of the accuracy of the data collected from interviewed units.

The 1987 content reinterview program served solely as an interviewer quality check. All interviewers were selected for the quality check, which reviewed the interviewers'

proficiency in properly evaluating the following items: (1) correct unit visited; (2) area segment coverage; (3) living quarters classification; (4) tenure; (5) interview status; and (6) household composition.

Past reinterview programs have shown that certain items are likely to produce moderate or high response variability. Response variability is defined as a measure of consistency between the original survey response to an item and the reinterview response to that item. Moderate levels of variability indicate that the response error is not insignificant in comparison to the standard error. High variability indicates that the response errors are very significant in relation to the standard errors with which they are associated; therefore, caution should be used when considering estimates of these characteristics. The 1985 Content Reinterview Program had five items that exhibited high variability: (1) major repairs over \$500 each; (2) payments the same throughout mortgage; (3) area lived at age 16; (4) preferred place to live in 5 years; and (5) size of lot. For more information on the 1985 Content Reinterview Program, refer to the Census Bureau publication series H170/85. In addition, prior year results for the 1987 metropolitan areas can be found in the Census Bureau publication series H-170 for the years 1981 through 1983.

AHS-National content errors. A content reinterview program was conducted for the AHS-National households as well. A subsample of the original households was revisited, and certain questions from the original questionnaire were asked again. The original and reinterview were assumed to be two independent readings and thus were the basis for the measurement of the response error of these AHS estimates.

The reinterview also served as a check for interviewer evaluation and quality control. The AHS-National reinterview program performed an interviewer quality check using questions similar to those described above. The reinterview study for survey questions was done for three groups of items. They are units in structure and description of structure, number and type of rooms, and appliances including the age and fuel of the appliances. For reinterview results, refer to the current housing reports H150/87 series.

Reinterview studies were also conducted in conjunction with previous AHS-National and AHS-MS enumerations. These studies included items dealing primarily with poor housing quality, attitudes about the neighborhood, and certain housing costs. The following table shows the items that had higher levels of inconsistency. Although these questions were not included in the 1987 reinterview studies, questions from previous enumerations were not altered enough to lead one to believe that the level of inconsistent responses would change.

Survey items	Level of inconsistency
Mice and rats	Moderate
Real estate taxes	Moderate
Cost of real estate taxes	Moderate
Prefer to live in same area or somewhere else	Moderate
Open cracks or holes on inside of building	Moderate to High
Holes in floors	Moderate to High
Blown fuses/tripped circuit breakers	Moderate to High
Neighborhood conditions: street noise; roads in need of repair; crime; trash, litter, junk in streets or on properties; boarded-up/abandoned structures; nonresidential activities; odors, smoke, gas	Moderate to High
Satisfactory neighborhood services: police protection; hospitals/health clinic; public transportation; shopping; elementary schools shopping; elementary schools	Moderate to High
Electricity cost	Moderate to High
Oil, coal, kerosene, wood or other fuel cost	Moderate to High
Fire/hazard insurance	Moderate to High
Cost of garbage collection	Moderate to High
Broken plaster or peeling paint on ceiling and walls	High
Working electric outlet in all rooms	High
Concealed wiring	High
Gas cost	High
Cost of water supply and sewage disposal	High
Gross income	High

A possible explanation for the results of the reinterview studies, as well as the surveys themselves, is that respondents may lack precise information. Also, since the results of the reinterview studies are derived from sample surveys, there is sampling error associated with these estimates of nonsampling error. The possibility of such errors should be taken into account when considering the results of these studies.

Coverage errors. In errors of coverage and estimation for missing data, the AHS new construction sample had deficiencies in the representation of conventional (nonmobile home or trailer) new construction. Because of time constraints, only those building permits issued more than 7 months before the survey ended were eligible to be sampled to represent conventional new construction in permit-issuing areas for this metropolitan area. However, those permits issued during the last 7 months of the survey do not necessarily represent missed housing units. Because of the relatively short time span involved, it is possible that construction of these housing units was not completed at the time the survey was conducted, in which case, they would not have been eligible for interview. In addition to these deficiencies, new construction in special places that do not require building permits, such as military bases, is not adequately represented.

AHS misses a significant portion of new mobile homes. It is believed that most of the difference is because of poor coverage of mobile home parks in address ED's. Undercoverage exists for those mobile homes built between the time of the last coverage improvement procedure and the

1980 census. It has been estimated that on a national level as much as 25 percent of those mobile homes built after January 1, 1980, may be missed.

Deficiencies also exist in ED's where area sampling methods are used. It had been assumed that all housing units located inside these ED's would be represented in the sample. However, it has been established that the AHS sample missed as much as 2 percent of all housing units in these ED's because they were not listed during the canvassing. It should be noted that since these ED's were recanvassed each time this metropolitan area was surveyed, the number of missed housing units may be considerably less for the 1987 survey.

The final ratio estimation procedure corrects for these deficiencies as far as the count of total housing is concerned (i.e., it adjusts to the best available estimate). However, biases of subtotals would still remain.

Rounding errors. For errors associated with processing, rounding of estimates introduces another source of error in the data, the severity of which depends upon the statistics being measured. The effect of rounding is significant relative to the sampling error only for small percentages or small medians when these figures are derived from relatively large bases (e.g., median number of persons per household). This means that confidence intervals formed from the standard errors given may be distorted, and this should be taken into account when considering the results of the survey.

Sampling errors for the AHS combined sample estimates. The particular sample used for this survey is one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Even if the same questionnaires, instructions, and interviewers were used, estimates from each of the different samples would differ from one another. The sampling error of a survey estimate provides a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and, thus, is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a sample approximates the average result of all possible samples.

One common measure of the sampling error is the standard error. As calculated for this report, the standard error reflects the variation in the estimates because of sampling and nonsampling errors, but it does not measure as such any systematic biases in the data. Therefore, the accuracy of the estimates depends upon the standard error, biases, and any additional nonsampling errors not measured by the standard error. The sample estimate and its estimated standard error enable one to construct interval estimates in which the interval includes the average result of all possible samples with a known probability. For example, if all possible samples were selected, each of these surveyed under essentially the same general conditions, and an estimate and its estimated standard error were calculated from each sample, then—

Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.6 standard errors below the estimate to 1.6 standard errors above the estimate would include the average result of all possible samples.

The average result of all possible samples either is or is not contained in any particular computed interval. However, for a particular sample, one can say with specified confidence that the average result of all possible samples is included in the constructed interval.

The figures presented in the tables that follow are approximations to the standard errors of various estimates shown in this report for these metropolitan areas. To derive standard errors that would be applicable to a wide variety of items and also could be prepared at a moderate cost, a number of approximations were required. As a result, the tables of standard errors provide an indication of the order of magnitude of the standard errors rather than precise standard errors for any specific item.

Tables 2a through 12a present the standard errors applicable to estimates of characteristics of the 1987 housing inventory. Linear interpolation should be used to determine the standard errors for estimates not specifically shown in this table.

The reliability of an estimated percentage, computed by using the sample data for both numerator and denominator, depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the total upon which the percentage is based. Estimated percentages are relatively more reliable than the corresponding estimates of the numerators of the percentages, particularly if the percentages are 50 percent or more.

Tables 2b through 12b present the standard errors of estimated percentages for the 1986 housing inventory. Two-way interpolation should be used to determine standard errors for estimated percentages not specifically shown in these tables.

Included in tables 2a through 12a and 2b through 12b are estimates of standard errors for estimates of zero and zero percent. These estimates of standard errors are considered as overestimates of the true standard errors and should be used primarily for construction of confidence intervals for characteristics when estimates of zero are obtained.

For ratios, $100(x/y)$, where x is not a subclass of y , tables 2a through 12a underestimate the standard error of the ratio when there is little or no correlation between x and y . For this type of ratio, a better approximation of the standard error may be obtained by letting the standard error of the ratio be approximately equal to the following:

$$(100) \frac{x}{y} \sqrt{\left(\frac{S_x}{x}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{S_y}{y}\right)^2}$$

where: x = the numerator of the ratio
 y = the denominator of the ratio
 s_x = the standard error of the numerator
 s_y = the standard error of the denominator

Illustration of the use of the standard error tables.

Table 1-1 of this report shows that in Baltimore, MD there were 442,900 units occupied by married couples. Interpolation using table 3a of this appendix shows that the standard error of an estimate of this size is approximately 8,330. The following interpolation procedure was used.

The information presented in the following table was extracted from table 3a. The entry for "x" is the one sought.

Size of estimate	Standard error
400,000	8,330
442,900	X
500,000	8,340

The entry of "x" is determined as follows by vertically interpolating between 8,330 and 8,340.

$$\begin{aligned}
 442,900 - 400,000 &= 42,900 \\
 500,000 - 400,000 &= 100,000 \\
 8,330 + \frac{42,900}{100,000} (8,340 - 8,330) &= 8,330
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval, as shown by these data, is from 429,570 to 456,230 housing units. Therefore, a conclusion that the average estimate, derived from all possible samples, of 1987 units occupied by married couples lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 90 percent of all possible samples.

Table 1-1 also shows that of 442,900 units occupied by married couples, 117,600 or 26.6 percent had six rooms. Interpolation using table 3b of this appendix (i.e., interpolation on both the base and percent) shows that the standard error of the 26.6 percent is approximately 1.2 percentage points. The following interpolation procedure was used.

The information presented in the following table was extracted from table 3b.

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage		
	25 or 75	26.6	50
400,000	1.2	a	1.4
442,900		p	
500,000	1.1	b	1.2

1. The entry for cell "a" is determined by horizontal interpolation between 1.2 and 1.4.

$$\begin{aligned}
 26.6 - 25.0 &= 1.6 \\
 50.0 - 25.0 &= 25.0 \\
 1.2 + \frac{1.6}{25.0} (1.4 - 1.2) &= 1.2
 \end{aligned}$$

2. The entry for cell "b" is determined by horizontal interpolation between 1.1 and 1.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
 26.6 - 25.0 &= 1.6 \\
 50.0 - 25.0 &= 25.0
 \end{aligned}$$

$$1.1 + \frac{1.6}{25.0} (1.2 - 1.1) = 1.1$$

3. The entry for "p" is then determined by vertical interpolation between 1.2 and 1.1.

$$\begin{aligned}
 442,900 - 400,000 &= 42,900 \\
 500,000 - 400,000 &= 100,000
 \end{aligned}$$

$$1.2 + \frac{42,900}{100,000} (1.1 - 1.2) = 1.2$$

Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval, as shown by these data, is from 24.7 to 28.5 percent.

Differences. The standard errors shown are not directly applicable to differences between two sample estimates. They are quite accurate for the difference between estimates of the same characteristics in two different metropolitan areas or the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics in the same metropolitan area. If there is a high positive correlation between the two characteristics, the formula will overestimate the true standard error; but if there is a high negative correlation, the formula will underestimate the true standard error.

Illustration of the computation of the standard error of a difference. Table 1-1 of this report shows that in Baltimore, MD, there were 117,600 occupied housing units with six rooms and 80,100 occupied housing units with seven rooms. Thus, the apparent difference, as shown by these data, between occupied housing units with six rooms and occupied housing units with seven rooms is 37,500. Table 3a, with interpolation, shows that the standard error of 117,600 is approximately 5,600, and the standard error of 80,100 is approximately 4,750. Therefore, the standard error of the estimated difference of 37,500 is about 7,340.

$$7,340 = \sqrt{(5,600)^2 + (4,750)^2}$$

Consequently, the 90-percent confidence interval for the 37,500 difference is from 25,760 to 49,240 housing units. Therefore, a conclusion that the average estimate derived from all possible samples, of this difference, lies within a range computed in this way would be correct for roughly 90 percent of all possible samples. Thus, we can conclude with 90-percent confidence that the number of 1987 occupied housing units with six rooms is greater than the number of occupied units with seven rooms since the 90-percent confidence interval does not include zero or negative values.

Medians. For medians presented in certain tables, the sampling error depends on the size of the base and on the distribution upon which the median is based. An approximate method for measuring the reliability of the estimated

median is to determine an interval about the estimated median so that there is a stated degree of confidence that the average median from all possible samples lies within the interval. The following procedure may be used to estimate confidence limits of a median based on sample data:

1. From any of the tables 2b through 12b, determine the standard error of a 50-percent characteristic on the base of the median.
2. Add to and subtract from 50 percent the standard error determined in step 1.
3. Using the distribution of the characteristics, determine the confidence interval corresponding to the two points established in step 2. To find the lower endpoint of the confidence interval, it is necessary to know into which interval of the distribution the lower percentage limit falls. Similarly, to find the upper endpoint of the confidence interval, it is necessary to know into which interval of the distribution the upper percentage limit falls. Note that these distribution intervals could be different, although this will not happen very often.

A 1.6 standard error confidence interval may be determined by finding the values corresponding to 50 percent plus and minus 1.6 times the standard error determined in step 1. For about 90 out of 100 possible samples, the average median from all possible samples would lie between these two values.

Illustration of the computation of the 90-percent confidence interval of a median. Table 1-2 of this report shows the median monthly housing cost for all occupied units in Baltimore, MD, is \$430. After excluding the "no cash rent" and "mortgage payment not reported" categories, the base of the distribution from which this median was determined is 783,300 housing units.

1. Interpolation using table 3b and the applied factor (from footnote) shows that the standard error of 50 percent on a base of 783,300 is approximately 1.0 percentage points.
2. To obtain a 90-percent confidence interval on the estimated median, initially add to and subtract from 50 percent 1.6 times the standard error determined in step 1. This yields percentage limits of 48.4 and 51.6.
3. From the distribution for monthly housing costs in table 1-2, the \$400 to \$450 interval contains the 48.4 percent determined in step 2. Approximately 358,500 housing units, or 45.8 percent, fall below this interval, and 54,300 housing units, or 6.9 percent, fall within this interval. By linear interpolation, the lower limit of the 90-percent confidence interval is found to be about \$419.

$$400 + (450 - 400) \frac{48.4 - 45.8}{6.9} = 419$$

4. Similarly, the \$400 to \$450 interval also contains the 51.6 percent derived in step 2. As stated before, 358,500 housing units, or 45.8 percent, fall below this interval, and 54,300 housing units, or 6.9 percent, fall within this interval. The upper limit of the 90-percent confidence interval is found to be about \$442.

$$400 + (450 - 400) \frac{51.6 - 45.8}{6.9} = 442$$

Thus, the 90-percent confidence interval ranges from \$419 to \$442.

5. Finally, note that the medians shown in this report are calculated from unrounded data and then rounded. Thus, they may differ from the medians calculated from the grouped data in the tables of this report.

Table 1. Description of the American Housing Survey: 1987 AHS-MS and AHS-National Samples

Metropolitan area	Total sample	AHS National units	Ineligible AHS-MS units ¹	Units eligible	
				Interviewed	Not interviewed ²
Total	44,074	7,609	2,067	32,551	1,847
Atlanta, GA	1,312	530	252	2,944	318
Baltimore, MD	1,015	411	193	2,993	131
Chicago, IL	2,674	1,257	160	3,047	181
Columbus, OH	714	268	178	2,976	131
Hartford, CT	523	198	127	3,117	137
Houston, TX	1,524	655	214	2,758	113
New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY	4,189	1,993	203	2,979	198
Northern New Jersey	2,141	994	153	2,932	283
St Louis, MO-IL	1,136	444	248	2,938	123
San Diego, CA	982	412	158	2,979	95
Seattle-Tacoma, WA	1,075	447	181	2,888	137

¹Sample units were visited but did not provide information relevant to the housing inventory. This category includes sample units that were found not to be in the sampling frame.

²Sample units were visited but occupants were not at home after repeated visits or were unavailable for some other reason; or, for vacant housing units, no informed respondent could be found.

Table 2a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Atlanta, GA MSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ¹
0	390	430	370
500	440	460	430
700	520	550	510
1,000	630	650	610
2,500	990	1,030	970
5,000	1,400	1,460	1,370
10,000	1,970	2,060	1,930
25,000	3,090	3,240	3,030
50,000	4,330	4,530	4,230
75,000	5,240	5,480	5,120
100,000	5,970	6,250	5,840
150,000	7,130	7,460	6,980
200,000	8,020	8,390	7,840
250,000	8,720	9,120	8,530
300,000	9,270	9,700	9,070
400,000	10,030	10,500	9,810
500,000	10,410	10,890	10,170
600,000	10,440	10,920	-
700,000	10,120	10,590	-
800,000	9,440	-	-
900,000	8,290	-	-
1,000,000	6,420	-	-
1,117,700	-	-	-

¹Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

²The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

³The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 2b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Atlanta, GA MSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
500	42.4	42.4	42.4	42.4	42.4	42.9
700	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	36.3
1,000	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	30.3
2,500	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	16.6	19.2
5,000	6.9	6.9	6.9	8.1	11.7	13.6
10,000	3.5	3.5	4.2	5.8	8.3	9.6
25,000	1.5	1.5	2.6	3.6	5.3	6.1
50,000	0.7	0.9	1.9	2.6	3.7	4.3
75,000	0.5	0.7	1.5	2.1	3.0	3.5
100,000	0.4	0.6	1.3	1.8	2.6	3.0
150,000	0.2	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.1	2.5
200,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.3	1.9	2.1
250,000	0.15	0.4	0.8	1.2	1.7	1.9
300,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.8
400,000	0.09	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.5
500,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
600,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
700,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
800,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
900,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
1,000,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
1,117,700	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.0.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply

Table 3a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Baltimore, MD MSA Standard Error

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	310	320	300
300	310	320	300
500	390	400	390
700	470	480	460
1,000	560	570	550
2,500	880	900	860
5,000	1,240	1,270	1,220
10,000	1,750	1,790	1,720
25,000	2,750	2,810	2,690
50,000	3,830	3,920	3,750
75,000	4,620	4,730	4,530
100,000	5,260	5,380	5,150
150,000	6,240	6,380	6,100
200,000	6,960	7,110	6,810
250,000	7,500	7,670	7,340
300,000	7,890	8,070	7,730
400,000	8,330	8,510	8,150
500,000	8,340	8,520	-
600,000	7,920	8,100	-
700,000	7,010	-	-
800,000	5,360	-	-
900,000	1,170	-	-
904,400	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1 for owner housing units, 1.2 for renter housing units, and 1.1 for the combined owner and renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 3b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Baltimore, MD MSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
300	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8
500	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	38.6
700	29.8	29.8	29.8	29.8	29.8	32.6
1,000	22.9	22.9	22.9	22.9	23.6	27.3
2,500	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	14.9	17.3
5,000	5.6	5.6	5.6	7.3	10.6	12.2
10,000	2.9	2.9	3.8	5.2	7.5	8.6
25,000	1.2	1.2	2.4	3.3	4.7	5.5
50,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.3	3.3	3.9
75,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.7	3.2
100,000	0.3	0.5	1.2	1.6	2.4	2.7
150,000	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.9	2.2
200,000	0.15	0.4	0.8	1.2	1.7	1.9
250,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.7
300,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.6
400,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
500,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
600,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
700,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
800,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
900,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
904,400	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

Table 4a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Chicago, IL area PMSA's

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	760	770	780
700	760	770	780
1,000	870	880	880
2,500	1,380	1,390	1,390
5,000	1,950	1,960	1,970
10,000	2,750	2,770	2,780
25,000	4,340	4,370	4,390
50,000	6,110	6,150	6,180
75,000	7,450	7,500	7,530
100,000	8,560	8,630	8,660
150,000	10,390	10,470	10,510
200,000	11,890	11,980	12,030
250,000	13,170	13,270	13,320
300,000	14,290	14,400	14,460
400,000	16,190	16,310	16,370
500,000	17,740	17,870	17,940
600,000	19,030	19,170	19,250
700,000	20,110	20,260	20,340
800,000	21,010	21,170	21,250
900,000	21,760	21,920	22,010
1,000,000	22,360	22,540	22,620
1,200,000	23,200	23,380	23,470
1,400,000	23,570	23,750	-
1,600,000	23,500	23,680	-
1,800,000	22,980	-	-
2,000,000	21,990	-	-
2,200,000	20,450	-	-
2,400,000	18,230	-	-
2,600,000	15,020	-	-
2,800,000	9,920	-	-
2,900,000	5,190	-	-
2,936,000	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 4b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Chicago, IL Area PMSA's

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
700	52.6	52.6	52.6	52.6	52.6	52.6
1,000	43.7	43.7	43.7	43.7	43.7	44.0
2,500	23.7	23.7	23.7	23.7	24.1	27.9
5,000	13.4	13.4	13.4	13.4	17.1	19.7
10,000	7.2	7.2	7.2	8.4	12.1	13.9
25,000	3.0	3.0	3.8	5.3	7.6	8.8
50,000	1.5	1.5	2.7	3.7	5.4	6.2
75,000	1.0	1.0	2.2	3.1	4.4	5.1
100,000	0.8	0.9	1.9	2.6	3.8	4.4
150,000	0.5	0.7	1.6	2.2	3.1	3.6
200,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.7	3.1
250,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8
300,000	0.3	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.2	2.5
400,000	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.9	2.2
500,000	0.15	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
600,000	0.13	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.8
700,000	0.11	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.7
800,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.6
900,000	0.09	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.3	1.5
1,000,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
1,200,000	0.06	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3
1,400,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2
1,600,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
1,800,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0
2,000,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
2,200,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
2,400,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
2,600,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.9
2,800,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8
2,900,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8
2,936,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

Table 5a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Columbus, OH MSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	200	210	200
200	200	210	200
500	310	320	320
700	370	380	380
1,000	450	460	450
2,500	700	720	710
5,000	990	1,010	1,000
7,500	1,210	1,240	1,220
10,000	1,400	1,430	1,410
25,000	2,180	2,230	2,200
50,000	3,000	3,070	3,030
75,000	3,580	3,660	3,620
100,000	4,030	4,120	4,070
150,000	4,650	4,750	4,700
200,000	5,020	5,130	5,070
250,000	5,190	5,310	5,250
300,000	5,190	5,300	-
350,000	5,000	5,110	-
400,000	4,620	-	-
450,000	3,980	-	-
500,000	2,920	-	-
546,900	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1 for owner housing units, renter housing units, and combined owner and renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 5b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Columbus, OH MSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
200	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8	49.8
500	28.4	28.4	28.4	28.4	28.4	31.5
700	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	23.1	26.6
1,000	16.6	16.6	16.6	16.6	19.3	22.3
2,500	7.4	7.4	7.4	8.5	12.2	14.1
5,000	3.8	3.8	4.3	6.0	8.6	10.0
7,500	2.6	2.6	3.5	4.9	7.0	8.1
10,000	1.9	1.9	3.1	4.2	6.1	7.0
25,000	0.8	0.9	1.9	2.7	3.9	4.5
50,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.7	3.2
75,000	0.3	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.2	2.6
100,000	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.9	2.2
150,000	0.13	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.8
200,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.6
250,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
300,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3
350,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2
400,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
450,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
500,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
546,900	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

Table 6a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Hartford, CT CMSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units	Renter housing units
0	140	160	120
200	160	180	150
500	260	280	240
700	310	330	290
1,000	370	400	340
2,500	580	630	540
5,000	820	890	770
10,000	1,150	1,240	1,080
25,000	1,790	1,930	1,670
50,000	2,440	2,640	2,290
75,000	2,890	3,130	2,710
100,000	3,210	3,480	3,010
150,000	3,620	3,910	3,390
200,000	3,770	4,080	3,540
250,000	3,710	4,010	-
300,000	3,420	3,700	-
350,000	2,820	-	-
400,000	1,630	-	-
420,700	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1 for owner housing units and combined owner and renter housing units, and 1.2 for renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 6b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Hartford, CT CMSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
200	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	38.6
500	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	21.1	24.4
700	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	17.9	20.6
1,000	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	14.9	17.3
2,500	4.5	4.5	4.8	6.5	9.5	10.9
5,000	2.3	2.3	3.4	4.6	6.7	7.7
10,000	1.2	1.2	2.4	3.3	4.7	5.5
25,000	0.5	0.7	1.5	2.1	3.0	3.5
50,000	0.2	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.1	2.4
75,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
100,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.7
150,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
200,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
250,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.1
300,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
350,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
400,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.9
420,700	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.2. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor of 1.0.

Table 7a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Houston, TX area PMSA's

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	490	570	440
500	500	570	470
1,000	700	750	660
2,500	1,110	1,190	1,050
5,000	1,570	1,680	1,480
10,000	2,210	2,370	2,090
25,000	3,480	3,730	3,290
50,000	4,890	5,230	4,610
75,000	5,940	6,350	5,600
100,000	6,800	7,270	6,420
150,000	8,180	8,750	7,720
200,000	9,270	9,930	8,760
250,000	10,180	10,890	9,610
300,000	10,930	11,700	10,320
400,000	12,110	12,960	11,430
500,000	12,940	13,840	12,210
600,000	13,480	14,430	12,730
700,000	13,780	14,740	13,010
800,000	13,840	14,810	13,060
900,000	13,670	14,630	-
1,000,000	13,260	-	-
1,200,000	11,600	-	-
1,400,000	8,250	-	-
1,553,000	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1 for renter housing units, and 1.0 for owner housing units and for combined owner and renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 7b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Houston, TX area PMSA's

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
500	46.8	46.8	46.8	46.8	46.8	46.9
700	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6	39.6
1,000	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	33.2
2,500	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	18.2	21.0
5,000	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.9	12.8	14.8
10,000	4.2	4.2	4.6	6.3	9.1	10.5
25,000	1.7	1.7	2.9	4.0	5.7	6.6
50,000	0.9	0.9	2.0	2.8	4.1	4.7
75,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.3	3.3	3.8
100,000	0.4	0.7	1.4	2.0	2.9	3.3
150,000	0.3	0.5	1.2	1.6	2.3	2.7
200,000	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.4	2.0	2.3
250,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.3	1.8	2.1
300,000	0.15	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.7	1.9
400,000	0.11	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.7
500,000	0.09	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.3	1.5
600,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
700,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.3
800,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2
900,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
1,000,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0
1,200,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
1,400,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
1,553,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor of 1.0.

Table 8a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's

Size of estimate	Standard error		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ¹	Owner housing units ²	Renter housing units ³
0	1,070	960	1,090
1,000	1,070	980	1,090
2,500	1,640	1,550	1,650
5,000	2,310	2,190	2,330
10,000	3,270	3,090	3,300
25,000	5,160	4,890	5,200
50,000	7,280	6,890	7,340
75,000	8,890	8,420	8,960
100,000	10,230	9,690	10,320
150,000	12,470	11,810	12,570
200,000	14,320	13,560	14,440
250,000	15,920	15,080	16,060
300,000	17,340	16,420	17,490
400,000	19,800	18,750	19,970
500,000	21,880	20,720	22,070
600,000	23,680	22,430	23,880
700,000	25,270	23,930	25,490
800,000	26,680	25,260	26,910
900,000	27,930	26,450	28,170
1,000,000	29,060	27,520	29,310
1,200,000	30,970	29,330	31,240
1,400,000	32,490	30,770	32,770
1,600,000	33,680	31,890	33,970
1,800,000	34,570	32,730	34,860
2,000,000	35,180	33,310	35,480
2,200,000	35,520	33,640	35,830
2,400,000	35,610	-	35,920
2,600,000	35,450	-	35,750
2,800,000	35,020	-	35,330
3,000,000	34,340	-	-
3,200,000	33,360	-	-
3,400,000	32,080	-	-
3,600,000	30,450	-	-
3,800,000	28,410	-	-
4,000,000	25,870	-	-
4,200,000	22,650	-	-
4,400,000	18,410	-	-
4,600,000	12,100	-	-
4,700,000	6,600	-	-
4,741,100	-	-	-

¹Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

²The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

³The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 8b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the New York-Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA's

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
1,000	49.0	49.0	49.0	49.0	49.0	49.0
2,500	27.7	27.7	27.7	27.7	27.7	31.0
5,000	16.1	16.1	16.1	16.1	19.0	21.9
10,000	8.8	8.8	8.8	9.3	13.4	15.5
25,000	3.7	3.7	4.3	5.9	8.5	9.8
50,000	1.9	1.9	3.0	4.2	6.0	6.9
75,000	1.3	1.3	2.5	3.4	4.9	5.7
100,000	1.0	1.0	2.1	2.9	4.2	4.9
150,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.4	3.5	4.0
200,000	0.5	0.7	1.5	2.1	3.0	3.5
250,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.7	3.1
300,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8
400,000	0.2	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.1	2.4
500,000	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.9	2.2
600,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
700,000	0.14	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.9
800,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.7
900,000	0.11	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.6
1,000,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.5
1,200,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
1,400,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3
1,600,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
1,800,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2
2,000,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.1
2,200,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0
2,400,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
2,600,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
2,800,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
3,000,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
3,500,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8
4,000,000	0.02	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.8
4,500,000	0.02	0.15	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7
4,741,100	0.02	0.14	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.7

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.0.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not apply strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units and to combined owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.0.

Table 9a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Northern New Jersey area PMSA's

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ²	Renter housing units ⁴
0	670	670	620
500	670	670	620
1,000	820	820	790
2,500	1,290	1,290	1,250
5,000	1,820	1,820	1,760
10,000	2,580	2,580	2,490
25,000	4,060	4,060	3,930
50,000	5,710	5,710	5,520
75,000	6,960	6,960	6,720
100,000	7,990	7,990	7,720
150,000	9,670	9,670	9,340
200,000	11,030	11,030	10,660
250,000	12,180	12,180	11,770
300,000	13,170	13,180	12,730
400,000	14,820	14,820	14,320
500,000	16,110	16,120	15,570
600,000	17,140	17,140	16,560
700,000	17,950	17,950	17,340
800,000	18,560	18,560	17,930
900,000	19,000	19,000	18,360
1,000,000	19,270	19,270	-
1,200,000	19,350	19,360	-
1,400,000	18,820	18,820	-
1,600,000	17,610	-	-
1,800,000	15,560	-	-
2,000,000	12,270	-	-
2,200,000	5,950	-	-
2,254,400	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 9b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Northern New Jersey area PMSA's

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
500	55.5	55.5	55.5	55.5	55.5	55.8
700	47.1	47.1	47.1	47.1	47.1	47.2
1,000	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	39.5
2,500	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	21.6	25.0
5,000	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	15.3	17.7
10,000	5.9	5.9	5.9	7.5	10.8	12.5
25,000	2.4	2.4	3.4	4.7	6.8	7.9
50,000	1.2	1.2	2.4	3.3	4.8	5.6
75,000	0.8	0.9	2.0	2.7	3.9	4.6
100,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.4	3.4	3.9
150,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.8	3.2
200,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8
250,000	0.2	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.2	2.5
300,000	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.4	2.0	2.3
400,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
500,000	0.12	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.8
600,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.6
700,000	0.09	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.5
800,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
900,000	0.07	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3
1,000,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
1,200,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
1,400,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
1,600,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
1,800,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
2,000,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9
2,200,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8
2,254,400	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

Table 10a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	340	360	320
500	410	430	400
700	490	500	470
1,000	580	600	570
2,500	920	950	890
5,000	1,290	1,340	1,260
10,000	1,830	1,900	1,780
25,000	2,860	2,980	2,790
50,000	4,000	4,150	3,900
75,000	4,830	5,020	4,710
100,000	5,500	5,720	5,370
150,000	6,550	6,800	6,390
200,000	7,330	7,620	7,150
250,000	7,930	8,240	7,740
300,000	8,390	8,720	8,190
400,000	8,960	9,310	8,740
500,000	9,140	9,490	-
600,000	8,930	9,280	-
700,000	8,320	8,650	-
800,000	7,210	-	-
900,000	5,280	-	-
991,200	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.2 for renter housing units and for combined renter and owner housing units, and 1.1 for owner housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 10b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the St. Louis, MO-IL CMSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
500	39.1	39.1	39.1	39.1	39.1	40.0
700	31.4	31.4	31.4	31.4	31.4	33.8
1,000	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.5	28.3
2,500	11.4	11.4	11.4	11.4	15.5	17.9
5,000	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.6	11.0	12.7
10,000	3.1	3.1	3.9	5.4	7.8	9.0
25,000	1.3	1.3	2.5	3.4	4.9	5.7
50,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.4	3.5	4.0
75,000	0.4	0.7	1.4	2.0	2.8	3.3
100,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.5	2.8
150,000	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.4	2.0	2.3
200,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
250,000	0.13	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.6	1.8
300,000	0.11	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.6
400,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
500,000	0.06	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3
600,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.2
700,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
800,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
900,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
991,200	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor of 1.0.

Table 11a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 San Diego, CA MSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	320	350	310
300	320	350	310
500	400	420	390
700	470	490	460
1,000	570	590	550
2,500	890	930	870
5,000	1,260	1,310	1,230
10,000	1,780	1,850	1,740
25,000	2,790	2,900	2,730
50,000	3,890	4,050	3,810
75,000	4,700	4,890	4,600
100,000	5,340	5,560	5,230
150,000	6,340	6,600	6,200
200,000	7,080	7,370	6,930
250,000	7,640	7,940	7,470
300,000	8,050	8,370	7,880
400,000	8,510	8,860	8,330
500,000	8,560	8,900	8,370
600,000	8,190	-	-
700,000	7,340	-	-
800,000	5,810	-	-
900,000	2,590	-	-
921,400	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.0 for owner housing units and for combined renter and owner housing units, and 1.1 for renter housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 11b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the San Diego, CA MSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
300	50.5	50.5	50.5	50.5	50.5	50.5
500	38.0	38.0	38.0	38.0	38.0	39.2
700	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.5	33.1
1,000	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	24.0	27.7
2,500	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	15.2	17.5
5,000	5.8	5.8	5.8	7.4	10.7	12.4
10,000	3.0	3.0	3.8	5.3	7.6	8.8
25,000	1.2	1.2	2.4	3.3	4.8	5.5
50,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.3	3.4	3.9
75,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.8	3.2
100,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8
150,000	0.2	0.4	1.0	1.4	2.0	2.3
200,000	0.15	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
250,000	0.12	0.3	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.8
300,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.6
400,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
500,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.2
600,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
700,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0
800,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0
900,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
921,400	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor 1.0.

Table 12a. Standard Errors for Estimated Number of Housing Units in the 1987 Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA

Size of estimate	Standard error ¹		
	Combined owner and renter housing units ²	Owner housing units ³	Renter housing units ⁴
0	340	380	310
300	340	380	310
500	410	440	400
700	490	520	470
1,000	580	620	560
2,500	920	980	880
5,000	1,300	1,380	1,250
10,000	1,830	1,950	1,760
25,000	2,870	3,060	2,770
50,000	4,000	4,270	3,860
75,000	4,840	5,160	4,670
100,000	5,510	5,880	5,310
150,000	6,560	6,990	6,330
200,000	7,350	7,840	7,090
250,000	7,950	8,480	7,670
300,000	8,410	8,980	8,120
400,000	8,990	9,590	8,680
500,000	9,180	9,790	-
600,000	8,990	9,590	-
700,000	8,400	8,960	-
800,000	7,330	-	-
900,000	5,480	-	-
998,600	-	-	-

¹To compute standard errors for new construction estimates, the standard errors in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1 for renter housing units and for combined renter and owner housing units, and 1.0 for owner housing units.

²Some examples that pertain to both owner and renter housing units are total housing units; all occupied housing units; all year-round housing units; mobile homes or trailers; and total vacant housing units.

³The owner housing units pertain to owner-occupied housing units and vacant housing units excluding vacant-for-rent housing units.

⁴The renter housing units pertain to renter-occupied housing units and vacant-for-rent housing units.

Table 12b. Standard Errors for Estimated Percentages of Housing Units in the 1987 Housing Inventory of the Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage ¹					
	0 or 100	1 or 99	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
300	51.1	51.1	51.1	51.1	51.1	51.1
500	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6	39.6
700	31.0	31.0	31.0	31.0	31.0	33.5
1,000	23.9	23.9	23.9	23.9	24.3	28.0
2,500	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	15.3	17.7
5,000	5.9	5.9	5.9	7.5	10.8	12.5
10,000	3.0	3.0	3.9	5.3	7.7	8.9
25,000	1.2	1.2	2.4	3.4	4.9	5.6
50,000	0.6	0.8	1.7	2.4	3.4	4.0
75,000	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.9	2.8	3.2
100,000	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8
150,000	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.4	2.0	2.3
200,000	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0
250,000	0.13	0.4	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.8
300,000	0.10	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.4	1.6
400,000	0.08	0.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.4
500,000	0.06	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.3
600,000	0.05	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.1
700,000	0.04	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
800,000	0.04	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
900,000	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
998,600	0.03	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9

¹Standard errors are presented to the nearest one-tenth of one percentage point except when the standard error is less than or equal to fifteen-hundredths of one percentage point; in those cases, the standard error is shown to the nearest one-hundredth of one percentage point. For estimates pertaining to new construction, the standard errors shown in the table should be multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

The following factors should be applied to estimates that do not pertain strictly to new construction. For estimates pertaining to both owners and renters, apply a factor of 1.0. For estimates pertaining to owner housing units, apply a factor of 1.1. For estimates pertaining to renter housing units, apply a factor of 1.0.