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#### Abstract

The Decennial Census is traditionally an enumeration of persons and housing units together with characteristics of interest. Previously used methods for adjusting for net coverage only reflect coverage error for persons. For consistent handling of traditional tabulations we need coordinated adjustment of persons and housing units. This report describes the construction of a data file for Decennial short form data based on such a coordinated adjustment given the presence of external data constraints. The example presented is for the state of New Jersey and uses estimates of persons from the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (March 2001 estimates) as the external constraints.
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## I. Introduction

Traditionally, the Decennial Census is an enumeration of persons and housing units together with characteristics of interest. The data collected are, after further processing, placed on a data file which is the source of subsequent tabulations.

Previously used methods for adjusting for net coverage only reflect coverage error for persons. Added or deleted persons are placed on the data file under a special classification, but are not associated with housing units. For consistent handling of traditional tabulations we need coordinated adjustment of persons and housing units. In this report, we describe the construction of a data file for Decennial short form data given the presence of external data constraints. The specific example presented is for the state of New Jersey and uses estimates of persons in housing units from the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (A.C.E.) survey (March 2001 estimates).
[Note: The estimates from the March 2001 A.C.E. were determined to be unacceptable because A.C.E. failed to measure significant numbers of erroneous census enumerations and did not adequately measure residency status. As such, it is estimated that the March 2001 A.C.E. overstated the net undercount by at least three million persons and Census 2000 data products were not adjusted. Thus, the example presented here should be viewed in this context and would not be indicative of Census 2000 coverage errors. For further research efforts, it is recommended that the estimates from A.C.E. Revision II be used.]

Section II gives some brief background and overview about the transparent file. Section III gives an overview of the methodology for construction of the New Jersey transparent file. Section IV gives an overview of the results. Section V provides a general summary and outlines possibilities for future work. Section VI contains a brief list of references.

The appendices contain additional methodological details and results. Appendix 1 contains a summary of results for each of the 210 poststrata in New Jersey. Appendix 2 contains documentation of software and data files and the schema for the A.C.E. poststratification. Appendix 3 contains details on the housing unit categories. Appendix 4 contains the file layout for the transparent (research) file. Appendix 5 contains details of the donor selection procedure.

Documentation of previous work on transparent file construction, along with additional background information and related references, can be found in Isaki, Ikeda, Tsay, and Fuller (2000) and Isaki, Tsay, and Fuller (2001). The basic methodology for the current work is very similar to the methodology for the previous work.

## II. Background

The 2000 Decennial Census produces a Short Form file which is the source of further tabulations. Persons in households can be associated with housing unit characteristics, and their relationship to the householder is recorded.

There are also persons who are not in households. These people have similar information on person characteristics but are associated with group quarters characteristics, rather than housing unit characteristics. Relationship information is not collected for these persons and they are excluded from A.C.E.

## Diagram 1. 2000 Census Short Form File

## 2000 Census Short Form File

For each geographic block:

| Households / Persons | Non-household Category |
| :--- | :--- |
| Persons listed by household with relationships, <br> characteristics and housing unit data. | Persons listed with characteristics. <br> Group Quarters data. |

Previously used methods for adjusting for undercount modify the Short Form file by adding two special categories of "Adjustment persons". One category of "Adjustment persons" is reserved for undercounted persons, the other category is reserved for overcounted persons. These persons have short form person characteristics but are not associated with housing units and lack relationship information. They thus resemble the "Non-Household" persons, in terms of the data available for them.

However, the "Adjustment Persons" are really persons in households, since the estimates used to calculate the "Adjustment Persons" are estimates of persons in households. It would therefore be
desirable to adjust both persons and households, in order that we can analyze household results allowing for undercoverage and overcoverage.

One solution to this problem is the creation of a "Transparent File" that incorporates the estimates of coverage.

Definition: Given a census operation that includes sampling and estimation, we define a transparent file to be a census data file that is devoid of any evidence of sampling and estimation.

A transparent Decennial Census data file would -
i) have the appearance of an enumeration with effective weights of one to avoid non-integer estimates
ii) be constructed by duplicating or eliminating households at the block level
iii) contain a listing of housing units and persons with their short form data and block identification

A transparent Decennial Census data file maintains the A.C.E. (or other) estimates, has the structure of a traditional Census data file, and assigns all data from households to the household category.

While early planning for the 2000 Census included the possibility of a transparent file as part of production, it was decided that operational considerations ruled this out. One of the main problems was a requirement that the transparent file maintain (as much as possible) A.C.E. synthetic estimate totals at low levels of geography. This requirement considerably complicates the process of constructing a transparent file.

Instead, a transparent file would be constructed as a research file, starting with a single state. We wanted a state that would provide a good test of the methodology. We thought that the state should be moderately large, although not one of the very largest. Some degree of ethnic diversity was also desirable. Consultation with Louisa Miller of Population Division provided three suggestions: New Jersey, Arizona, and Virginia. We decided on New Jersey, because it had slightly above average proportions of both Blacks and Hispanics, as well as an above average proportion of Asians.

## III. Methodology

## A. Introduction

The basic idea in constructing a Transparent File is to classify households enumerated in the

Census by relevant characteristics and estimate the true number of households. Then delete or duplicate households on the Census file to attain the number of households required. The final product is the Transparent File. Not all Census variables were included on the research Transparent File, although the missing variables can be added.

Many steps are involved in the construction of a Transparent File. In the following, we describe the general nature of each step and in later sections, refer to appendices for details. The methodology outlined here is very similar to that outlined in Isaki, Ikeda, Tsay, and Fuller (2000) and Isaki, Tsay, and Fuller (2001). The methodology uses Quadratic Programming combined with raking to obtain estimates of the true number of households. These household estimates must maintain the person control totals. The estimates are then integerized and households on the Census file are deleted or duplicated. The addition or deletion of households takes place in three stages: $4+$ person households, 2-3 person households, 1 person households. Control totals are adjusted after each stage. The final Transparent File does not necessarily maintain the person control totals, although the donor selection process does attempt to minimize differences from the person control totals. One difference from previous work is that the state-level person poststratum totals that are used as person controls are synthetic estimates instead of direct A.C.E. estimates. The housing unit categories and person poststrata are also somewhat more detailed in the current work.

## B. Regression Estimation

In the estimation step, we seek housing unit weights, $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}}$, for the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ housing unit (HU) category in the $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{kh}}$ geographic block. The weights are obtained subject to state-level A.C.E. synthetic poststratum totals and A.C.E. synthetic block person totals. The HU categories i are defined by size of household (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6+) ; race/ethnic origin of householder (Non-hispanic White/Other, Non-hispanic Black, Hispanic, Non-hispanic Asian and Remainder); age of householder ( $0-29,30-49,50-64,65+$ ), sex of householder ("female, spouse present" is placed in the same household category as male for Black and Hispanic households); tenure; mail return category (low/high); MSA status (large MSA/other) and several categories of an "undercount variable".

The "undercount variable" breaks down households into several categories if the householder is a female with no spouse present and a renter and either Black or Hispanic. The categories are based on the composition of the household and depend on the age of the householder, presence of children, and presence of adult non-elderly Black or Hispanic males.

The main change to the housing unit categories from previous transparent file work is the addition of the mail return and MSA status categories.

The households were grouped into categories to reduce computation time and to facilitate imputation. By grouping HUs, we are able to use standard software packages for our estimation problem. Full details on the housing unit categories are found in Appendix 3. Selecting the
housing unit categories for New Jersey involved a substantial amount of trial and error. We plan to explore methods for automating the process of defining housing unit categories.

The basic estimation procedure used is regression, with a raking component. Additional details are given just below in Section III-C.

## C. Quadratic Programming (QP) Iteration

The basic estimation method used is a combination of quadratic programming and raking. The quadratic programming method differs from the usual regression estimator in that weights are restricted to be nonnegative. The raking is used because of the number of block restrictions. The procedure consists of several steps. Do the QP step and get a solution. Then use the solution in the raking operation to maintain block controls. Then use the block control results in a new QP step, and so forth. Note that the last step in the iteration is a QP step.

Let

$$
a_{\mathrm{rk}}=\hat{X}_{\mathrm{Tk}}\left(\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{r}-1, \mathrm{i}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ijk}}\right)^{-1}
$$

where $\mathrm{c}_{0 \mathrm{i}}=1$,
$r$ is an iteration index, $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ijk}}$ is the number of Census persons in housing unit category i , poststratum j , and block k , and $\hat{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{Tk}}$ is the A.C.E. synthetic total for block k .

Given the vector $\mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{r}-1}$, a new vector of weights $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{r}, 1}, \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{r}, 2}, \ldots, \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{r}, \mathrm{n}}\right)$ is chosen to minimize

$$
\mathrm{f}(\mathbf{c})=\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{n}}\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ri}}-1\right)^{2} \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{i}}
$$

with respect to $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ri}}$, subject to

$$
\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ri}}\left(\sum_{\mathrm{k}=1}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{rk}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ijk}}\right)=\hat{X}_{\mathrm{j}} ; j=1,2, . ., \mathrm{m}
$$

where $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ri}}>0$
$h_{i}$ is the number of Census housing units in housing unit category $i$, $B$ is the number of blocks in the state, and $\hat{X}_{\mathrm{j}}$ is the A.C.E. state-level synthetic person total for poststratum j .

After four iterations, the weight for housing unit type i and block k is $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}}=\mathrm{a}_{4 \mathrm{k}} \mathrm{c}_{4 \mathrm{i}}$. The weight construction combines elements of raking and of least squares regression estimation.

If a software program could accommodate a QP program with all of the observations and several
thousand constraints in a reasonable amount of computer time, then there would be no need to form HU categories and use a raking procedure. A single application of QP would suffice and the estimator provided by the solution would be 'close' to a regression estimator. Additional details on the Quadratic Programming procedure can be found in Isaki, Ikeda, Tsay, and Fuller (2000) and Isaki, Tsay, and Fuller (2001).

## D. Integer Estimates

If $h_{i k}$ represents the number of HUs in category $i$ in block $k$ in the Census, then $w_{i k} h_{i k}$ is an estimator of the number of housing units for the Transparent File, where $w_{i k}$ is the weight from the QP. Since $w_{i k} h_{i k}$ is not an integer, we implement an integer rounding procedure that converts $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ to its "nearest" integer in such a manner that the sums

$$
\sum_{i} w_{i k} h_{i k} \text { and } \sum_{k} w_{i k} h_{i k}
$$

are maintained.
Let $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ denote the integerized $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{ik}}$, obtained by using a controlled rounding procedure from Cox and Ernst (1982). Define,

$$
\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}=\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ik}}-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{ik}} .
$$

Then $U_{i k}$ is the number of households required to supplement (add to) the Census file if $U_{i k}$ is positive, and the number to delete (subtract from) the Census file if $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ is negative. The determination of HUs to add to (or delete from) the Census file is accomplished by a donor selection routine which is described below.

## E. Donor Selection

In selecting HUs in the Census file for addition or deletion, we first work with housing units of four or more persons. Then after completing that group, we work with housing units of two and three persons and, finally, work with one-person housing units. The development of the Transparent File in such stages affords the possibility of adjusting state person controls and block total person controls at successive stages. To summarize, the Transparent File is constructed by adding HUs to and deleting HUs from the Census file. The donor selection process is the most time-consuming part of the entire procedure. A single donor selection phase (e.g. $4+$ person units) could take more than a week for the state of New Jersey. We are exploring methods for speeding up the donor selection phase. Further details on the donor selection process can be found in Appendix 5.

The $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ for four or more person HUs is strictly determined by the QP method and integer rounding. The ratio of the synthetic block estimates and the unrounded Transparent File block estimates are quite close to one and the synthetic state person controls are maintained. Hence,
using integer rounding derived $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ values and random donor selection of HUs should result in a Transparent File of four or more person HUs that is close to the A.C.E. block total person estimates and the state person controls. The differences would be due to the integer rounding to obtain the $U_{i \mathrm{ik}}$ and the variation of types of persons in the $i^{\text {th }} \mathrm{HU}$ category. Given these expectations, the four or more person HUs are selected (for addition or deletion) strictly based on the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$.

A condition check using total population of each block is then performed on housing units with four or more persons in the transparent file. First, the synthetic block estimate is compared with the transparent file total. All blocks with transparent file total exceeding the synthetic total are considered completed if the block contains no 1-, 2- or 3- person households. Otherwise they are subject to a condition check. The condition is that the total person count in households with four or more persons on the Transparent File in the block plus the Census person count in households with $1-, 2-$, and 3 - persons be less than or equal to the total person synthetic estimate. To meet the condition, $4+$ person households are randomly eliminated from the transparent file.

Once the four or more person HUs in the Transparent File are identified, the QP method is applied to the one, two and three person HUs to obtain weights, $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{i} k}$, that are constructed to maintain A.C.E. synthetic block person totals and synthetic state person controls minus those persons in four or more person households on the Transparent File. The $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ are then used to obtain the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$. The same condition check that is used for the $4+$ person housing units is used for elimination of 2- and 3- person housing units. A complication is that the quadratic programming step may run fine for all households, but fail for the 1-3 person HUs.

Once the Transparent File is complete with two-person and three-person HUs, the single person HUs on the Transparent File are determined by raking the estimated HUs by category and block that were obtained from the preceding QP application on 1-, 2- and 3- person HUs. The raking is done by tract and controlled rounding is performed to integerize the raked estimates. For each major race, the difference between the A.C.E. synthetic tract estimate and the persons in the Transparent File (persons in $2^{+} \mathrm{HUs}$ ) is allocated to their respective single person HU categories.

Two complications can arise with the single unit procedure. One complication is that the tract total race difference may be negative. The second is that there may not exist any single-person HUs of a certain race in the tract. In the first situation, housing units of the problem race are eliminated from the transparent file in a prescribed manner (see Appendix 5). In the second situation, the recommended procedure is to combine the 'problem' race with another race which has a positive difference larger than the absolute value of the negative difference and containing some single-person unit HUs. If the concern is lack of single units, the remedy is to collapse the 'problem race' with another race according to the Long Form race collapsing criteria until singleperson HUs appear in the combined race group. Then, raking can be implemented and the usual $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ determined. The procedure maintains race or combined race at the tract level and also at the state level. Donor selection is on the basis of the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$.

## IV. Results

There are 112,746 blocks in the state of New Jersey; 111,951 blocks contained 1 to 1573 housing units; 34 percent of the blocks contained fewer than 11 HUs .

Some Census summary statistics (excludes Group Quarters) for New Jersey are as follows:
Characteristics

| 1. Persons | $8,219,529$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2. Housing units | $3,310,275$ |
| 3. Occupied Housing units | $3,064,645$ |
| 4. Vacant Housing units | 245,630 |
| 5. Blocks (non-empty) | 111,951 |
| 6. Tracts | 1,938 |
| 7. Counties | 21 |

The race/ethnicity groups are White (Non-hispanic White and other), Black (Non-hispanic Black), Hispanic, and Asian ( Non-hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, American Indian).

The race/ethnicity groups are based on the poststratum groups for the Census 2000 A.C.E. Some descriptive statistics for New Jersey are as follows:

| Characteristics | Census Population | Census Housing Units | A.C.E. Estimate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. White Owner | $4,454,965$ | $1,670,215$ | $4,472,603$ |
| 2. White Renter | $1,092,542$ | 548,633 | $1,108,658$ |
| 3. Black Owner | 496,953 | 156,864 | 499,907 |
| 4. Black Renter | 590,063 | 229,524 | 612,097 |
| 5. Asian Owner | 301,158 | 81,194 | 302,795 |
| 6. Asian Renter | 186,512 | 67,065 | 189,815 |
| 7. Hispanic Owner | 405,177 | 103,200 | 409,159 |
| 8. Hispanic Renter | 692,159 | 207,950 | 720,521 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 9. Total | $8,219,529$ | $3,064,645$ | $8,315,555$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| 10. Owner | $5,658,253$ | $2,011,473$ | $5,684,464$ |
| 11. Renter | $2,561,276$ | $1,053,172$ | $2,631,091$ |

New Jersey estimates from the Census, A.C.E., and the Transparent File for the 210 A.C.E. poststrata in New Jersey can be found in Appendix 1. More details on the A.C.E. postratum groups can be found at the end of Appendix 2 or in DSSD memorandum Q-37 (see references).

Quantiles of relative differences between A.C.E. and Transparent File poststratum estimates are given below. The differences are mostly fairly small in magnitude. Positive relative differences indicate an A.C.E. estimate larger than the Transparent File estimate. Note that relative differences of large absolute magnitude are generally associated with very small poststrata.

| Quantile | Relative Difference (\%) |
| :--- | ---: |
| 100\% Maximum | 11.5385 |
| $95 \%$ | 2.3256 |
| $90 \%$ | 1.4728 |
| $75 \%$ | 0.3425 |
| $50 \%$ Median | 0.0000 |
| $25 \%$ | -0.5882 |
| $5 \%$ | -5.7143 |
| $0 \%$ Minimum | -16.6667 |

Some statistics on relative differences (in percent) between the A.C.E. and the Transparent File poststratum estimates grouped by various characteristics are given below:

| Characteristic | Number of poststrata | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Median |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| White | 56 | -2.0997 | 1.3980 | 3.4977 | -0.00161 |
| Black | 56 | -8.3916 | 11.5385 | 19.9301 | -0.09690 |
| Hispanic | 56 | -16.6667 | 3.6082 | 20.2749 | -0.10441 |
| Asian | 42 | -6.6148 | 6.5217 | 13.1365 | -0.37849 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age under 18 | 30 | -0.0176 | 2.9371 | 2.9574 | 0.30096 |
| Male 18 to 29 | 30 | -5.7143 | 3.4765 | 9.1908 | 0.06278 |
| Female 18 to 29 | 30 | -2.1739 | 1.8868 | 4.0607 | 0.06107 |
| Male 30 to 49 | 30 | -9.0909 | 2.3810 | 11.4719 | -0.17118 |
| Female 30 to 49 | 30 | -4.5574 | 3.6082 | 8.1657 | 0.06942 |
| Male 50+ | 30 | -16.6667 | 8.2192 | 24.8428 | -0.19516 |
| Female 50+ | 30 | -16.3043 | 11.5385 | 27.8428 | -0.56581 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner | 105 | -16.3043 | 8.2192 | 24.5235 | 0.14826 |
| Non-Owner | 105 | -16.6667 | 11.5385 | 28.2051 | -0.12065 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Return Rate | 84 | -8.3916 | 3.4765 | 11.8681 | 0.02882 |
| Low Return Rate | 84 | -16.6667 | 11.5385 | 28.2051 | 0.05368 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large MSA | 84 | -1.1490 | 1.3980 | 2.5469 | 0.04951 |
| All Other TEAs | 84 | -16.6667 | 11.5385 | 28.2051 | 0.00000 |

Additional results are shown in Table 1-3. Note that no statistical testing was done on any of the differences. Any statements about relative magnitudes are descriptive only and do not imply statistical significance.

Table 1 provides selected (mostly race by tenure) summary totals of the 210 poststrata. Most of the Transparent File totals in the table are fairly close to the A.C.E. totals although the differences in the totals for Asians are relatively larger (the difference for Asian owners is the largest in the table at slightly more than one A.C.E. standard error).

Table 2 provides a comparison between the census and the Transparent File for housing units by race and tenure, as well as a comparison between person differences and housing unit differences. Based on Table 2, it appears that adjusted persons have a tendency to be in smaller sized households for Asian renters and for all groups of owners. Note that the percent increase for Asian renter units is the largest in the table, but the percent increase for Asian renter persons is similar to the overall percent increase for renters.

Table 3 provides summary statistics for blocks and tracts for differences by race or tenure. Let $T F_{\mathrm{k}}, S Y N_{\mathrm{k}}$ and $C E N_{\mathrm{k}}$ denote the transparent file estimate, synthetic estimate, and Census count for a characteristic in the k-th area, respectively, where an area can be a block or a tract, and let N denote the number of areas with a non-zero population for the given characteristic. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mean Squared Difference }=\mathrm{MSD}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{N}^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(T F_{k}-S Y N\right)^{2} \\
& \text { Mean Absolute Difference }=\mathrm{MAD}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{N}^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left|T F_{k}-S Y N k\right| \\
& \text { Relative Difference } \quad=\mathrm{RD}_{\mathrm{k}}=\left(T F_{K}-S Y N_{K}\right)\left[C E N_{\mathrm{k}}\right]^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

The differences at the block level in total persons are due to rounding. The differences in other categories are larger than those for total persons, because no direct restrictions were imposed on those categories at the block level. Smaller groups tend to have larger relative differences at both the block and tract levels. The absolute and mean squared tract-level differences by tenure are larger than the corresponding tract-level differences by race because there is an attempt to control by race at the tract level in the donor selection process. The mean absolute differences appear to be reasonably small at the block and tract levels, although the relative differences can be fairly variable for smaller groups.

Table 1. Person Summary Estimates for the State of New Jersey

| Category | Census | A.C.E. | $\begin{gathered} \text { s.e of } \\ \text { A.C.E. } \end{gathered}$ | Transparent File | Difference A.C.E. -T.File |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black Persons | 1,087,016 | 1,112,003 | 5104.57 | 1,112,111 | -107 |
| Black Owner | 496,953 | 499,907 | 2768.01 | 499,606 | 301 |
| Black Owner age 0-17 | 142,215 | 144,520 | 823.61 | 144,063 | 457 |
| Black Renter | 590,063 | 612,096 | 4093.05 | 612,505 | -408 |
| Hispanic Persons | 1,097,336 | 1,129,680 | 5172.42 | 1,130,049 | -369 |
| Hispanic Owner | 405,177 | 409,159 | 2197.53 | 408,831 | 328 |
| Hispanic Renter | 692,159 | 720,521 | 4420.95 | 721,218 | -697 |
| Asian Persons | 487,670 | 492,610 | 3101.07 | 491,094 | 1,516 |
| Asian Owner | 301,158 | 302,795 | 2584.20 | 300,056 | 2,739 |
| Asian Renter | 186,512 | 189,815 | 1843.09 | 191,038 | -1,223 |
| White Persons | 5,547,507 | 5,581,261 | 18083.97 | 5,582,301 | -1,039 |
| White Owner | 4,454,965 | 4,472,603 | 17084.55 | 4,472,999 | -396 |
| White Renter | 1,092,542 | 1,108,659 | 5860.28 | 1,109,302 | -643 |
| Total Persons | 8,219,529 | 8,315,554 | 20369.56 | 8,315,555 | -1 |

Table 2. Housing Unit Estimates for the State of New Jersey 2000 Census

| Category | Census | Transparent <br> File | Difference <br> T. File-Census <br> (Persons)** | Difference <br> T. File-Census <br> (HU) | \% Difference <br> (Persons)** | \% Difference <br> (HU) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black | 386,388 | 396,228 | 25,095 | 9,840 | 2.31 | 2.55 |
| Black Owner | 156,864 | 159,462 | 2,653 | 2,598 | 0.53 | 1.66 |
| Black Renter | 229,524 | 236,766 | 22,442 | 7,242 | 3.80 | 3.16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic | 311,150 | 323,157 | 32,713 | 12,007 | 2.98 | 3.86 |
| Hispanic Owner | 103,200 | 105,346 | 3,654 | 2,146 | 0.90 | 2.08 |
| Hispanic Renter | 207,950 | 217,811 | 29,059 | 9,861 | 4.19 | 4.74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian | 148,259 | 152,095 | 3,424 | 3,836 | 0.70 | 2.59 |
| Asian Owner | 81,194 | 81,135 | $-1,102$ | -59 | -0.36 | -0.07 |
| Asian Renter | 67,065 | 70,960 | 4,526 | 3,895 | 2.43 | 5.81 |
| White |  |  |  |  |  | 2.25 |
| White Owner | $1,218,848$ | $2,268,814$ | 34,794 | 49,966 | 0.63 | 2.66 |
| White Renter | 548,633 | $1,714,601$ | 18,034 | 44,386 | 0.40 | 1.02 |
|  |  |  | 16,760 | 5,580 |  |  |
| Owned HUs | $2,011,473$ | $2,060,544$ | 23,239 | 49,071 | 0.41 | 2.44 |
| Rented HUs | $1,053,172$ | $1,079,750$ | 72,787 | 26,578 | 2.84 | 2.52 |
| Occupied HUs | $3,064,645$ | $3,140,294$ | 96,026 | 75,649 | 1.17 | 2.47 |

** Refer to Table 1. Person estimates are based on person characteristics.

Table 3. Summary Statistics of Transparent File and Synthetic Person Estimates at the Block and Tract Levels for the State of New Jersey

| BLOCKS | Number of Non-Zero B locks | Mean Squared Difference | Mean Absolute Difference | Quantiles of Relative Difference |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristic | N | MSD | MAD | $5 \%$ of $\mathrm{RD}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | $95 \%$ of $\mathrm{RD}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Mean of $\mathrm{TF}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Mean of $\mathrm{CEN}_{\mathrm{k}}$ |
| Total Persons | 111951 | 0.20 | 0.31 | -0.018 | 0.014 | 74.28 | 73.42 |
| Owners | 108759 | 4.41 | 0.91 | -0.059 | 0.054 | 52.24 | 52.03 |
| Renters | 71719 | 6.54 | 1.14 | -0.074 | 0.169 | 36.70 | 35.68 |
| Blacks | 44986 | 6.03 | 1.29 | -0.350 | 0.486 | 24.72 | 24.16 |
| Hispanics | 59576 | 5.39 | 1.21 | -0.453 | 0.601 | 18.97 | 18.42 |
| Whites | 108344 | 5.82 | 1.23 | -0.079 | 0.085 | 51.53 | 51.21 |
| Asians | 42257 | 10.65 | 1.68 | -0.992 | 0.885 | 11.62 | 11.54 |


| TRACTS | Number of Non-Zero Tracts | Mean Squared Difference | Mean Absolute Dfference | Quantiles of Relative Difference |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristic | N | MSD | MAD | 5\% of $\mathrm{RD}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | 95\% of $\mathrm{RD}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Mean of $\mathrm{TF}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Mean of $\mathrm{CEN}_{\mathrm{k}}$ |
| Total Persons | 1938 | 1.46 | 0.85 | -0.0005 | 0.0005 | 4290.79 | 4241.24 |
| Owners | 1935 | 317.18 | 11.99 | -0.020 | 0.021 | 2936.17 | 2924.16 |
| Renters | 1935 | 315.98 | 11.94 | -0.025 | 0.034 | 1361.27 | 1323.66 |
| Blacks | 1928 | 35.93 | 3.54 | -0.111 | 0.121 | 576.82 | 563.80 |
| Hispanics | 1927 | 22.01 | 2.78 | -0.061 | 0.073 | 586.43 | 569.45 |
| Whites | 1938 | 25.20 | 2.43 | -0.004 | 0.006 | 2880.44 | 2862.49 |
| Asians | 1913 | 55.23 | 4.09 | -0.178 | 0.168 | 256.71 | 254.92 |

## V. Summary and Future Work

The implementation of the transparent file methodology on the state of New Jersey generally seems to have been successful. The resulting person estimates are similar to the A.C.E. estimates and the housing unit estimates seem reasonable based on our initial examination.

There are some operational issues that need to be addressed. We need to substantially speed up the donor selection phase. Currently it can take more than a week to complete one donor selection phase for the state of New Jersey. The entire process has three donor selection phases (4+ person hh, 2-3 person hh, 1 person hh), although the single-person phase takes less time.

In addition, we need to automate the process. The current procedure required a substantial amount of trial and error. One problem is that it is possible for the quadratic programming step to work fine for all households but fail when we do the quadratic programming on just the 1-3 person households.

The obvious extension is to continue the process on additional states. We would prefer to have some resolution of the operational issues before we try this. We might also want to consider incorporation of results from the A.C.E. Revision II. Other sets of person controls could also be used, such as the demographic analysis results. One problem is that the demographic analysis results are only available at the national level. We would need some way of extending the demographic analysis person estimates down to lower levels of geography. Another possible extension is to incorporate housing unit controls into the procedure, such as those from the A.C.E. housing unit dual system estimates.
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## APPENDIX 1

## New Jersey 210 Poststrata Summary

Details on the poststratification scheme can be found at the end of Appendix 2.

|  | Poststratum | Census | A.C.E. | Transparent <br> File | Difference <br> (A.C.E-T.F) | (Difference/A.C.E.)*100 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1 | 011 | 910554 | 918480 | 917837 | 643 | 0.0700 |
| 2 | 012 | 176192 | 179475 | 179369 | 106 | 0.0591 |
| 3 | 013 | 171966 | 169617 | 169291 | 326 | 0.1922 |
| 4 | 014 | 581114 | 591433 | 591719 | -286 | -0.0484 |
| 5 | 015 | 615689 | 622415 | 621906 | 509 | 0.0818 |
| 6 | 016 | 595972 | 599128 | 599450 | -322 | -0.0537 |
| 7 | 017 | 707583 | 708755 | 710595 | -1840 | -0.2596 |
| 8 | 051 | 93009 | 88187 | 87885 | 302 | 0.3425 |
| 9 | 052 | 28316 | 27903 | 27791 | 112 | 0.4014 |
| 10 | 053 | 26495 | 25028 | 24912 | 116 | 0.4635 |
| 11 | 054 | 72737 | 68630 | 68411 | 219 | 0.3191 |
| 12 | 055 | 70811 | 66955 | 66019 | 936 | 1.3980 |
| 13 | 056 | 83101 | 82705 | 82736 | -31 | -0.0375 |
| 14 | 057 | 102979 | 101591 | 102737 | -1146 | -1.1281 |
| 15 | 251 | 51276 | 53300 | 53241 | 59 | 0.1107 |
| 16 | 252 | 7571 | 7664 | 7676 | -12 | -0.1566 |
| 17 | 253 | 7332 | 7302 | 7318 | -16 | -0.2191 |
| 18 | 254 | 30537 | 31111 | 31112 | -1 | -0.0032 |
| 19 | 255 | 32409 | 33053 | 32993 | 60 | 0.1815 |
| 20 | 256 | 23769 | 24173 | 24213 | -40 | -0.1655 |
| 21 | 257 | 24545 | 24482 | 24542 | -60 | -0.2451 |
| 22 | 291 | 9731 | 10045 | 10020 | 25 | 0.2489 |
| 23 | 292 | 2069 | 2124 | 2109 | 15 | 0.7062 |
| 24 | 293 | 2002 | 2055 | 2047 | 8 | 0.3893 |
| 25 | 294 | 6933 | 6745 | 6735 | 10 | 0.1483 |
| 26 | 295 | 7100 | 7028 | 7059 | -31 | -0.4411 |
| 27 | 296 | 6340 | 6545 | 6564 | -19 | -0.2903 |
| 28 | 297 | 6833 | 6674 | 6712 | -38 | -0.5694 |
| 29 | 331 | 149923 | 154395 | 154270 | 125 | 0.0810 |
| 30 | 332 | 74202 | 77428 | 77343 | 85 | 0.1098 |
| 31 | 333 | 78878 | 80396 | 80362 | 34 | 0.0423 |
| 32 | 334 | 134008 | 137339 | 137409 | -70 | -0.0510 |
| 33 | 335 | 129835 | 132959 | 132885 | 74 | 0.0557 |
| 34 | 336 | 80915 | 80944 | 81126 | -182 | -0.2249 |
| 35 | 337 | 128243 | 125527 | 126042 | -515 | -0.4103 |
| 36 | 341 | 52211 | 52707 | 52679 | 28 | 0.0531 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 37 | 342 | 35424 | 36873 | 36853 | 20 | 0.0542 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 38 | 343 | 34109 | 34452 | 34456 | -4 | -0.0116 |
| 39 | 344 | 51454 | 53383 | 53383 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 40 | 345 | 43592 | 43809 | 43784 | 25 | 0.0571 |
| 41 | 346 | 31174 | 30610 | 30693 | -83 | -0.2712 |
| 42 | 347 | 41596 | 40296 | 40445 | -149 | -0.3698 |
| 43 | 391 | 5668 | 5679 | 5680 | -1 | -0.0176 |
| 44 | 392 | 1727 | 1815 | 1795 | 20 | 1.1019 |
| 45 | 393 | 1885 | 1974 | 1972 | 2 | 0.1013 |
| 46 | 394 | 3819 | 3944 | 3951 | -7 | -0.1775 |
| 47 | 395 | 3963 | 4119 | 4112 | 7 | 0.1699 |
| 48 | 396 | 2113 | 2088 | 2088 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 49 | 397 | 2602 | 2498 | 2499 | -1 | -0.0400 |
| 50 | 401 | 1206 | 1246 | 1242 | 4 | 0.3210 |
| 51 | 402 | 608 | 681 | 688 | -7 | -1.0279 |
| 52 | 403 | 641 | 713 | 718 | -5 | -0.7013 |
| 53 | 404 | 976 | 994 | 1007 | -13 | -1.3079 |
| 54 | 405 | 950 | 957 | 976 | -19 | -1.9854 |
| 55 | 406 | 365 | 381 | 389 | -8 | -2.0997 |
| 56 | 407 | 455 | 451 | 455 | -4 | -0.8869 |
| 57 | 411 | 93786 | 95646 | 95269 | 377 | 0.3942 |
| 58 | 412 | 18841 | 19064 | 19009 | 55 | 0.2885 |
| 59 | 413 | 19090 | 19567 | 19524 | 43 | 0.2198 |
| 60 | 414 | 46497 | 47684 | 47654 | 30 | 0.0629 |
| 61 | 415 | 55349 | 56386 | 56540 | -154 | -0.2731 |
| 62 | 416 | 36297 | 36580 | 36595 | -15 | -0.0410 |
| 63 | 417 | 46126 | 46280 | 46684 | -404 | -0.8729 |
| 64 | 421 | 45782 | 46212 | 46138 | 74 | 0.1601 |
| 65 | 422 | 12523 | 12164 | 12144 | 20 | 0.1644 |
| 66 | 423 | 12563 | 12222 | 12202 | 20 | 0.1636 |
| 67 | 424 | 22644 | 23006 | 22987 | 19 | 0.0826 |
| 68 | 425 | 26172 | 25986 | 25907 | 79 | 0.3040 |
| 69 | 426 | 21833 | 21136 | 21090 | 46 | 0.2176 |
| 70 | 427 | 30479 | 28999 | 28934 | 65 | 0.2241 |
| 71 | 431 | 2500 | 2515 | 2512 | 3 | 0.1193 |
| 72 | 432 | 481 | 489 | 472 | 17 | 3.4765 |
| 73 | 433 | 497 | 514 | 506 | 8 | 1.5564 |
| 74 | 434 | 1268 | 1272 | 1265 | 7 | 0.5503 |
| 75 | 435 | 1459 | 1444 | 1437 | 7 | 0.4848 |
| 76 | 436 | 1034 | 1024 | 1024 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 77 | 437 | 1261 | 1245 | 1252 | -7 | -0.5622 |
| 78 | 441 | 147 | 147 | 144 | 3 | 2.0408 |
| 79 | 442 | 32 | 35 | 37 | -2 | -5.7143 |
| 80 | 443 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0.0000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 81 | 444 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 82 | 445 | 62 | 61 | 60 | 1 | 1.6393 |
| 83 | 446 | 75 | 73 | 67 | 6 | 8.2192 |
| 84 | 447 | 80 | 78 | 75 | 3 | 3.8462 |
| 85 | 451 | 89923 | 94202 | 94091 | 111 | 0.1178 |
| 86 | 452 | 21546 | 23458 | 23507 | -49 | -0.2089 |
| 87 | 453 | 27717 | 29381 | 29410 | -29 | -0.0987 |
| 88 | 454 | 36114 | 37611 | 37813 | -202 | -0.5371 |
| 89 | 455 | 48592 | 50117 | 50303 | -186 | -0.3711 |
| 90 | 456 | 16818 | 16755 | 16910 | -155 | -0.9251 |
| 91 | 457 | 27121 | 27385 | 27665 | -280 | -1.0225 |
| 92 | 461 | 109494 | 114817 | 114780 | 37 | 0.0322 |
| 93 | 462 | 25681 | 27068 | 27050 | 18 | 0.0665 |
| 94 | 463 | 35985 | 38664 | 38621 | 43 | 0.1112 |
| 95 | 464 | 38359 | 39582 | 39599 | -17 | -0.0429 |
| 96 | 465 | 53526 | 54071 | 54046 | 25 | 0.0462 |
| 97 | 466 | 21931 | 21317 | 21239 | 78 | 0.3659 |
| 98 | 467 | 34648 | 35004 | 34800 | 204 | 0.5828 |
| 99 | 471 | 728 | 756 | 754 | 2 | 0.2646 |
| 100 | 472 | 202 | 212 | 205 | 7 | 3.3019 |
| 101 | 473 | 198 | 203 | 204 | -1 | -0.4926 |
| 102 | 474 | 323 | 340 | 342 | -2 | -0.5882 |
| 103 | 475 | 434 | 436 | 430 | 6 | 1.3761 |
| 104 | 476 | 142 | 143 | 155 | -12 | -8.3916 |
| 105 | 477 | 166 | 159 | 169 | -10 | -6.2893 |
| 106 | 481 | 202 | 205 | 205 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 107 | 482 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 108 | 483 | 47 | 46 | 47 | -1 | -2.1739 |
| 109 | 484 | 41 | 42 | 41 | 1 | 2.3810 |
| 110 | 485 | 52 | 51 | 50 | 1 | 1.9608 |
| 111 | 486 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 112 | 487 | 27 | 26 | 23 | 3 | 11.5385 |
| 113 | 491 | 84815 | 85614 | 85020 | 594 | 0.6938 |
| 114 | 492 | 20169 | 20838 | 20827 | 11 | 0.0528 |
| 115 | 493 | 20556 | 20974 | 20952 | 22 | 0.1049 |
| 116 | 494 | 43949 | 44877 | 44974 | -97 | -0.2161 |
| 117 | 495 | 49212 | 49865 | 49890 | -25 | -0.0501 |
| 118 | 496 | 23313 | 23329 | 23354 | -25 | -0.1072 |
| 119 | 497 | 28644 | 29118 | 29400 | -282 | -0.9685 |
| 120 | 501 | 37331 | 37308 | 37239 | 69 | 0.1849 |
| 121 | 502 | 12522 | 12831 | 12774 | 57 | 0.4442 |
| 122 | 503 | 11472 | 11356 | 11331 | 25 | 0.2201 |
| 123 | 504 | 19808 | 20299 | 20320 | -21 | -0.1035 |
| 124 | 505 | 19434 | 19318 | 19272 | 46 | 0.2381 |


| 125 | 506 | 13072 | 12577 | 12584 | -7 | -0.0557 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 126 | 507 | 14495 | 14358 | 14385 | -27 | -0.1880 |
| 127 | 511 | 1988 | 2041 | 2012 | 29 | 1.4209 |
| 128 | 512 | 301 | 305 | 301 | 4 | 1.3115 |
| 129 | 513 | 328 | 337 | 339 | -2 | -0.5935 |
| 130 | 514 | 809 | 820 | 861 | -41 | -5.0000 |
| 131 | 515 | 1075 | 1116 | 1106 | 10 | 0.8961 |
| 132 | 516 | 407 | 397 | 403 | -6 | -1.5113 |
| 133 | 517 | 422 | 414 | 413 | 1 | 0.2415 |
| 134 | 521 | 345 | 346 | 342 | 4 | 1.1561 |
| 135 | 522 | 79 | 86 | 84 | 2 | 2.3256 |
| 136 | 523 | 96 | 106 | 104 | 2 | 1.8868 |
| 137 | 524 | 158 | 157 | 164 | -7 | -4.4586 |
| 138 | 525 | 193 | 194 | 187 | 7 | 3.6082 |
| 139 | 526 | 89 | 86 | 86 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 140 | 527 | 95 | 92 | 107 | -15 | -16.3043 |
| 141 | 531 | 126137 | 128949 | 128655 | 294 | 0.2280 |
| 142 | 532 | 56095 | 61022 | 61005 | 17 | 0.0279 |
| 143 | 533 | 47930 | 50300 | 50353 | -53 | -0.1054 |
| 144 | 534 | 67226 | 70973 | 71302 | -329 | -0.4636 |
| 145 | 535 | 66351 | 66584 | 66743 | -159 | -0.2388 |
| 146 | 536 | 25323 | 26178 | 26347 | -169 | -0.6456 |
| 147 | 537 | 33335 | 33247 | 33629 | -382 | -1.1490 |
| 148 | 541 | 86061 | 87770 | 87472 | 298 | 0.3395 |
| 149 | 542 | 37580 | 43423 | 43223 | 200 | 0.4606 |
| 150 | 543 | 31906 | 33817 | 33790 | 27 | 0.0798 |
| 151 | 544 | 41087 | 43671 | 43743 | -72 | -0.1649 |
| 152 | 545 | 38249 | 38955 | 39002 | -47 | -0.1207 |
| 153 | 546 | 14864 | 15411 | 15492 | -81 | -0.5256 |
| 154 | 547 | 17600 | 17658 | 17847 | -189 | -1.0703 |
| 155 | 551 | 698 | 722 | 718 | 4 | 0.5540 |
| 156 | 552 | 244 | 280 | 280 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 157 | 553 | 213 | 219 | 220 | -1 | -0.4566 |
| 158 | 554 | 336 | 354 | 380 | -26 | -7.3446 |
| 159 | 555 | 270 | 283 | 282 | 1 | 0.3534 |
| 160 | 556 | 100 | 101 | 108 | -7 | -6.9307 |
| 161 | 557 | 92 | 89 | 95 | -6 | -6.7416 |
| 162 | 561 | 192 | 201 | 199 | 2 | 0.9950 |
| 163 | 562 | 41 | 49 | 50 | -1 | -2.0408 |
| 164 | 563 | 54 | 62 | 63 | -1 | -1.6129 |
| 165 | 564 | 56 | 66 | 72 | -6 | -9.0909 |
| 166 | 565 | 67 | 76 | 77 | -1 | -1.3158 |
| 167 | 566 | 30 | 36 | 42 | -6 | -16.6667 |
| 168 | 567 | 25 | 29 | -4 | -16.0000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 169 | 571 | 466 | 488 | 474 | 14 | 2.8688 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 170 | 572 | 141 | 154 | 153 | 1 | 0.6493 |
| 171 | 573 | 159 | 150 | 149 | 1 | 0.6666 |
| 172 | 574 | 333 | 365 | 373 | -8 | -2.1917 |
| 173 | 575 | 347 | 328 | 328 | 0 | 0.0000 |
| 174 | 576 | 207 | 227 | 232 | -5 | -2.2026 |
| 175 | 577 | 231 | 218 | 213 | 5 | 2.2935 |
| 176 | 581 | 327 | 356 | 355 | 1 | 0.2809 |
| 177 | 582 | 199 | 204 | 214 | -10 | -4.9019 |
| 178 | 583 | 199 | 218 | 222 | -4 | -1.8348 |
| 179 | 584 | 239 | 244 | 248 | -4 | -1.6393 |
| 180 | 585 | 210 | 230 | 228 | 2 | 0.8695 |
| 181 | 586 | 84 | 86 | 84 | 2 | 2.3255 |
| 182 | 587 | 84 | 92 | 86 | 6 | 6.5217 |
| 183 | 591 | 82111 | 81511 | 79832 | 1679 | 2.0598 |
| 184 | 592 | 18285 | 17970 | 17696 | 274 | 1.5247 |
| 185 | 593 | 18917 | 19405 | 19093 | 312 | 1.6078 |
| 186 | 594 | 48062 | 48982 | 48394 | 588 | 1.2004 |
| 187 | 595 | 56798 | 57038 | 57357 | -319 | -0.5592 |
| 188 | 596 | 32263 | 32530 | 32275 | 255 | 0.7839 |
| 189 | 597 | 36153 | 36652 | 36582 | 70 | 0.1909 |
| 190 | 601 | 41608 | 41489 | 41038 | 451 | 1.0870 |
| 191 | 602 | 22972 | 24184 | 24654 | -470 | -1.9434 |
| 192 | 603 | 23614 | 23766 | 23979 | -213 | -0.8962 |
| 193 | 604 | 37698 | 38906 | 39425 | -519 | -1.3339 |
| 194 | 605 | 32410 | 32876 | 32941 | -65 | -0.1977 |
| 195 | 606 | 10960 | 11092 | 11159 | -67 | -0.6040 |
| 196 | 607 | 11514 | 11465 | 11756 | -291 | -2.5381 |
| 197 | 631 | 1795 | 1876 | 1853 | 23 | 1.2260 |
| 198 | 632 | 426 | 401 | 419 | -18 | -4.4887 |
| 199 | 633 | 389 | 405 | 401 | 4 | 0.9876 |
| 200 | 634 | 1079 | 1071 | 1096 | -25 | -2.3342 |
| 201 | 635 | 1095 | 1141 | 1193 | -52 | -4.5574 |
| 202 | 636 | 864 | 867 | 875 | -8 | -0.9227 |
| 203 | 637 | 1037 | 1016 | 1068 | -52 | -5.1181 |
| 204 | 641 | 1357 | 1430 | 1388 | 42 | 2.9370 |
| 205 | 642 | 417 | 470 | 476 | -6 | -1.2766 |
| 206 | 643 | 356 | 403 | 406 | -3 | -0.7444 |
| 207 | 644 | 686 | 707 | 737 | -30 | -4.2433 |
| 208 | 645 | 699 | 732 | 725 | 7 | 0.9563 |
| 209 | 646 | 361 | 351 | 369 | -18 | -5.1282 |
| 210 | 647 | 518 | 514 | 548 | -34 | -6.6147 |

## APPENDIX 2

## DOCUMENTATION OF SOFTWARE, DATA FILES, AND POST-STRATIFICATION USED IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY TRANSPARENT FILE CONSTRUCTION

This document gives an overview of the programs along with input and output files for constructing the transparent file for the State of New Jersey. The basic steps include classifying occupied housing units (HU) by relevant characteristics, determining the HU weight, estimating the number of households and converting the estimates to integers, and deleting or duplicating households on the census file to obtain the desired transparent file. The schema for A.C.E. poststratification in Census 2000 can be found at the end of this Appendix.

## I Classification of the Occupied Housing Unit Category

The cor-hucat.sas program, a SAS program that reads the Hundred Percent Edited Detail File (HEDF) , classifies households by relevant characteristics and creates the output file hucat_nj.dat. with housing unit category attached to the housing unit record. The housing unit category record layout is in Appendix 3.

## II Housing Unit Weight Determination ( $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ )

1. Initialization
crtqpdat.sas is a program that creates the initial phase counts of persons in housing unit category i , ACE poststratum j and block $\mathrm{k}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ijk}}\right)$; The initial phase housing unit counts in housing unit category i in block $\mathrm{k}\left(\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ and the A.C.E. total persons control ( $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{j}}$ ). The program includes two input files and three output files for the running of the quadratic programming.

## Input Files

1) File with total persons of each poststratum from A.C.E.
2) hucat_nj.dat

## Output Files

1) File of Person Controls (syntot-nj.dat)

This file contains 4 variables:
a) Poststratum code
b) Total persons in each poststratum from Census
c) Total persons in each poststratum from A.C.E.
d) The adjustment factor for each poststratum
2) Housing Unit File (cnhucat-nj.dat)

This file contains 2 variables.
a) Housing unit category code for each HU .
b) Number of initial phase housing units in each housing unit category.
3) Person File (cnpercat-nj.dat)

This file contains 2 variables as well.
a) Poststratum code within each HU category (PCAT)
b) Number of initial phase persons in each PCAT.
2. Running Quadratic Programming

Using the quadratic programming (QP) method to obtain housing weights for occupied housing units, the weight construction procedure consists of iteration steps of QP and a raking operation to maintain block controls to A.C.E. synthetic estimates of total persons for the block.

There are 3 input files associated with the version of hufullr2.f for calculating weights controlling to ACE totals.

## Input Files

1) File of Person Controls from ACE
2) Housing Unit File from Census
3) Person File

## Output Files

1) File of HU Weights

There is one record for each HU on the Census housing unit file that has five variables.
a) HU identifier
b) HU category 1
c) HU category 2
d) Initial Weight
e) Final Weight
2) File of HU Level Diagnostics
3) File of Person Level Diagnostics

The two diagnostic files are used by diagnostic SAS programs to check the lower constraint element and upper constraint element.

## 3. Iterating Weight Construction Procedure

Program calab**.sas is a SAS program that applies the weight from QP and raking to maintain the block controls. Then the weight construction procedure is repeated in an iterative manner by using the block control results in a new QP input. The ${ }^{* *}$ is an iteration index. This program has 4 input files and 2 output files.

## Input Files

1) File of housing unit weight from $Q P$.
2) File of total persons control in each poststratum from A.C.E.
3) File with number of persons in each HU category from Census.
4) File with number of persons in each PCAT in each block.

## Output Files

1) Adjusted Person Block Control File

This file contains 2 variables.
a) Block identifier
b) Adjusted persons in each block..
2) The Person File From Adjustment .

This file contains 2 variables.
a) PCAT code.
b) Number of adjusted persons in each PCAT.
III. Integer Estimates ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ )

The prernd.sas SAS program applies the final weight of the fourth QP solution to estimate the required households. Then it reads in the Census files and creates the arrays needed for the controlled rounding program. There are 2 files associated with the version of the FORTRAN program rndnj.f for the controlled rounding of the estimates of households $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{ik}} * \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{ik}}\right)$ to
integers.

## Input File: hubkwt.dat

## Output File: rndhu.output

The program for calculating the undercount or overcount housing units for each category in every block k is in crt-donor.sas, that reads in the output from controlled rounding and writes out the output file with the name undhu-c**-t\#.dat. Where "**" is the index of the county and " $\#$ " is the index of the tract. This file contains 2 variables.
a) Block identifier
b) Number of required housing units for each HU category in each block. $\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}\right)$
IV. Donor selection.

For convenience, when the required housing units are selected at random from the housing units in every block, we run 4 to 5 tracts at each time to generate a group file. During this process, the nock-c**-\#.sas is used in selecting the HUs from the Census file. This program includes 2 input files and 1 output file.

## Input Files

1) Census file.
2) File with number of undercount or overcount HUs in each block .

## Output File

Transparent File of Group of Tracts (nockc**-\#.dat )
Where "** " is the index of the county and " \#" is the index of the group file of tracts , the generated output files nockc**-\#.dat are then combined into one file called tpf-nock-4+.dat. At that time a condition check is performed on each block to identify if the blocks with the total persons count of households with 4 or more persons on the transparent file plus Census count of households of 1,2 and 3 persons exceeds the total person in A.C.E (dfp1). This procedure is carried out by a program called chkper4+.sas, which produces an output with a listing of the dfp1 for each HU category i in block k .

To find the candidate HUs for elimination, a program called findelm-nock.sas is used to select the duplicated HUs with nonmixed households in dfp1. Then generates the elimination of HUs in the output file. There are 4 files ( 3 input and 1 output) included in the findelm-nock.sas program.

## Input Files

1) Transparent File
2) Census File
3) Person File from A.C.E.

## Output File

## Eliminate HU File

Program elm-tpf.sas eliminates the HU from the transparent file and creates the tpf-elm4+.dat , which is the Transparent File for four or more households. The four or more person HUs portion of the Transparent File is constructed first. The software for constructing the transparent file for 4 or more households resides in directory /home/jtsay/cen2000.

## V. Transparent File Construction

Using the same QP procedure, control rounding and donor selection as was done for the $4+$ HUs we constructed the transparent file for 2 and 3 person HUs, but all the software for constructing the transparent file for 2 and 3 person HUs----tpf-elm-nock.dat resides in subdirectory /home/jtsay/cen2000/tpf3p.

Software crt-bk-tmi-nock.sas is a program for creating control totals for 1 person households. There are 4 input files and 2 output files.

## Input Files

1) Transparent File for 2+ Persons
2) HEDF File
3) A.C.E. Poststratum Person File
4) File of Housing Units Weight

## Output Files

1) File of the Block Total Population Control $\left(b_{k}\right)$

This file contains 2 variables.
a) Block identifier.
b) Total persons of each block.
2) File of Controls for HU Category i Types that are within Race $m\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ in Each Tract.

This file contains 4 variables.
a) Tract code
b) Race code
c) HU category
d) Number of control persons in each $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{mi}}$ in each Tract

Programs rak-\#-**.sas are for raking which is done by tract where \# indicate the county's code and ${ }^{* *}$ indicate the tract's code then controlled rounding of the estimator to integer and the computation of the undercount or overcount housing units in category i in block $\mathrm{k}\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}\right)$. Donor selection for the single HU is the same as before, and the transparent file for single housing units is tpf-1p-nock.dat, all software are resides in subdirectory /home/jtsay/cen2000/tpf1p.

Finally, we combined the transparent file for $4+$ person HUs along with transparent file for 2 and 3 person HUs and the transparent file for the single HU into one file called tpf-nock-all.dat. The record layout for the transparent file is in Appendix 4.
VI. 2000 Transparent File - Determining A.C.E. Controls for QP

The 2000 A.C.E. is designed to produce adjustment factors by region for Non-Hispanic White and Other Owners and for the entire U.S. for other races (Non-Hispanic Black, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic Asian, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native on Reservation and Off-Reservation American Indian or Alaska Native) and tenure types. Within race groups tenure by sub-geography, detail is provided for Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic while only tenure is provided for the remaining race groups. Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic detail is also crossed by mail return rate categories (two of them).

All categories above are crossed by seven age-sex categories. A schematic of the detail follows this section. The crossed categories are termed poststrata. Depending on the final A.C.E. distribution of sample persons, some poststrata may be combined with others. When combined, less detail, e.g. geographic, is available.

Each state will be done separately with the largest state done last in each region. For the largest states, adjust person controls for region race totals by accounting for persons already on the T . File. Note that person race controls are determined for each state. This means that for one state, Indians on reservation may stand alone while in another state, it is collapsed with another race group.

Since all sub poststratum group controls are based on synthetic estimation, we know all of the controls before T. File construction. The manner of collapsing of geographic entities is dictated by the poststratum groups. For example, if the 'All other TEA's' group is too small and exhaustive, we look to combine them with the tracts in the 'Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB' group.

Schematic for Post-stratification Variables

| High Return Rate* |  |  |  |  | Low Return Rate* |  |  |  | West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nor | heast | Midwest | South | West | Northeast |  | Midwest | South |  |
| Non-Hispanic White and Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large MSA MO/MB | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Medium MSA MO/MB | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| All Other TEAS | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |  | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |
| Non-Owner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large MSA MO/MB |  | 33 |  |  |  |  | 34 |  |  |
| Medium MSA MO/MB |  | 35 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB |  | 37 |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |  |
| All other TEAs |  | 39 |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |  |

## Non-Hispanic Black

Owner

| Large MSA MO/MB <br> Medium MSA MO/MB | 41 | 42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB All other TEAs | 43 | 44 |
| Non-Owner |  |  |
| Large MSA MO/MB <br> Medium MSA MO/MB | 45 | 46 |
| Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB <br> All other TEAs | 47 | 48 |

## Hispanic

Owner

| Large MSA MO/MB | 49 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Small MSA and Non-MSA MO/MB |  |  |
| All other TEAs | 51 | 52 |



* Separate median cut-off values will be formed from census data for each Race/Hispanic Origin by Tenure group.


## Age/Sex Groups:

|  | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Under 18 | 1 |  |
| 18 to 29 | 2 | 3 |
| 30 to 49 | 4 | 5 |
| $50^{+}$ | 6 | 7 |

Full details on the A.C.E. poststrata can be found in memorandum Q-37 (see references). The poststratum number is the poststratum group number followed by the age/sex group number.

## APPENDIX 3

## Record Layout for The State of New Jersey Housing Unit Categories

| Variable |  |  | Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Character | Name | Description | code | Description |
| 1 | H1 | Household size | 1 | one person |
|  |  |  | 2 | two people |
|  |  |  | 3 | three people |
|  |  |  | 4 | four people |
|  |  |  | 5 | five people |
|  |  |  | 6 | six or more people |
| 2 | H2 | Race of Householder | 1 | Non-Hispanic White |
|  |  |  | 2 | Non-Hispanic Blacks |
|  |  |  | 3 | Non-Hispanic Asians and rest |
|  |  |  | 4 | Hispanic |
| 3 | H3 | Tenure | 1 | Owned |
|  |  |  | 2 | Rented |
| 4 | H4 | Age of Householder | 1 | Age 0-29 |
|  |  |  | 2 | Age 30-49 |
|  |  |  | 3 | Age 50-64 |
|  |  |  | 4 | Age 65+ |
| 5 | H5 | Sex of Householder |  | For (Black or Hispanic) hh |
|  |  |  |  | Male hh or Female hh with spouse |
|  |  |  | $2$ | Female hh with no spouse present |
|  |  |  |  | For all other hh |
|  |  |  | $1$ | Male hh |
|  |  |  | 2 | Female hh |
| 6 | H6 | Undercount Variable | 0 | Household size=1 OR |
|  |  |  |  | hh not Black or Hispanic OR |
|  |  |  |  | Owner hh OR |
|  |  |  |  | Male hh OR |
|  |  |  |  | Female hh with spouse present |



## APPENDIX 4

## RECORD LAYOUT FOR TRANSPARENT FILE (RESEARCH FILE)

## BLOCK RECORD

Variable Description ..... Length
RT Record Type 1 ..... 1
ST Tabulation State ..... 2
COUNTY Tabulation County ..... 3
TRACT Census Tract ..... 6
BLOCK Census Block ..... 4
BLOCKSFX Block Group ..... 1
BLANK1 Blank ..... 1
DIVISION Division ..... 17
PLACE Place ..... 9
BLANK2 Blank ..... 1
POP100 Population Count(100\%) ..... 5
HU100 Housing Count(100\%) ..... 5
BLANK3 Blank ..... 1
BTYP Block type ..... 1
HOUSING UNIT RECORD

| Variable | Description | Length |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| RT | Record Type 4 | 1 |
| COUNTY | Tabulation County | 3 |
| TRACT | Census Tract | 6 |
| BLOCK | Tabulation Block Number | 4 |
| BLOCKSFX | Tabulation Block suffix | 1 |
| ID | MAF and DMAF ID | 12 |
| NRU | Nonresponse Follow-up Universe | 1 |
| NP | Number of Persons at this Housing Unit | 3 |
| FINST Final | Status of Unit | 1 |
| SFINST | Source of FINST and NP | 1 |
| UBSA | Units at Basic Street Address(BSA) | 4 |
| HSUB | Housing unit Substituted | 1 |
| RFT | Record TYPE and Form Type of the CUF Primary Return Record |  |
|  | for the ID | 17 |
| STENURE | Tenure | 2 |

HHT Household/Family Type ..... 2
P65 Number of people 64+ years in Household ..... 2
P18 Number of People Under 18 years in household ..... 2
NPF Number of people in Family ..... 2
NRC Number of Related Children under 18 in household ..... 2
TEN Tenure ..... 1
HUCAT Housing Unit Category ..... 8
DPCODE Duplicate Code ..... 3
PERSON RECORD
Variable Description Length
RT Record Type 5 ..... 1
COUNTY Tabulation County ..... 3
TRACT Census Tract ..... 6
BLOCK Tabulation Block Number ..... 4
BLOCKSFX Tabulation Block Suffix ..... 1
PUID Current Unit ID Number ..... 12
REL Relationship ..... 3
SEX Sex ..... 1
QAGE Age ..... 3
QDB Date of birth ..... 8
QSPAN Hispanic Origin Code ..... 3
QRACE Race Code ..... 2
QDDP Data Defined Person ..... 1
QGQTYP Person's Group Quarters Type code ..... 3
POSTR1 Poststratum: First 2 Digits ..... 2
POSTR2 Poststratum: Third digit ..... 1
OC Own Child indicator ..... 1
RC Related Child indicator ..... 1
AGELONG Age Recode (90+ recoded to 90) ..... 2
DPCODE Duplicate Code ..... 3

## APPENDIX 5.

## DONOR SELECTION PROCESS FOR NEW JERSEY (top down)

The donor selection process for Transparent File construction for New Jersey used the 'top down' methodology (previously documented in Isaki, Tsay, and Fuller (2001)). The donor selection procedure is a 'top down' approach in which the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ households are added to the Transparent File (in stages, e.g. $4^{+}$HUs, then 2 to 3 person HUs, etc.) in their entirety. Then the condition check is applied to determine the number of HUs to eliminate from the file to exactly achieve the synthetic estimate (done in stages as well). So, if the synthetic estimate for a block is 67.34 , the $4^{+}$T. File is 75 and the Census count is 5 for persons in 1,2 and 3 person HUs, 13 are deleted from the $4^{+} \mathrm{T}$. File and 13 are added to the control totals used for 1-3 person households.

The 'top down' approach is desirable because it achieves the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ count better than the alternative 'bottom up' procedure (procedure also documented in Isaki, Tsay, and Fuller (2001)). The 'top down' approach deletes from persons in the $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ik}}$ rather than supplements the $1,2,3$ person Census counts while attempting to attain the synthetic block total. Furthermore, the 'top down' adjusts to achieve the synthetic block total. It does it with the following procedure -
(i) Identify all blocks k with Transparent File $4^{+}$block person totals exceeding the synthetic estimate of total person for block k .
a. If there are no persons in the block in 1,2 , or 3 person households in the Census, then accept the $4^{+}$person T. File households in the block. Set the iteration $\mathrm{a}_{5 \mathrm{k}}=\varnothing$.
b. Otherwise, suppose the number of Census persons in 1, 2, or 3 person HUs is 5 as in the above example. Here, we impose a condition check after the donor selection of $4^{+}$HUs. That is, we require that the final $4^{+}$HUs in the Transparent File for block k plus the Census 1, 2, 3 person HUs equal the Total person synthetic estimate.

So, we want

$$
\text { Syn Total }=\text { T. File } 4^{+}+\text {Census } 1,2,3 .
$$

So, since Syn Total $=67.34$, T. File $4^{+}=75$ we need to eliminate 13 persons from HUs in the T. File 4 .
(ii) In addition, for QP application on 1, 2, and 3 person HUs we use

$$
a_{5 k}=\left[\text { Total Person Synthetic - Final T. File } 4^{+} \text {persons }\right] /{ }_{k} \sum_{i(1,2,3)} C_{4 j} X_{i j k}
$$

(iii) The manner of $4^{+} \mathrm{HU}$ person elimination follows -

1. If less than 4 persons for removal, use the closest 4 person substituted HU
2. If between 4 and 8 , choose among $4^{+} \mathrm{HU}$ combinations that are closest to that desired.
3. If exceeding 8, randomly select HUs by first forming combinations of substituted HUs; select a combination and continue until the total persons were achieved as closely as possible. If the number required was large, we randomly selected $4^{+}$HUs until we achieved or attained closeness to the target.

After the initial QP application and donor selection there were 64 blocks requiring the elimination step for a total of 489 persons eliminated in 72 households. After the QP for 1, 2, \& 3 person HUs we identified 5566 blocks with negative differences (total synthetic minus T. File $2^{+}$) and of these 1580 contained single units. Unfortunately, 3986 blocks had negative 1 to 6 and no single units. We accepted as completed, all $2^{+}$HUs with zero single unit counts. We then performed an elimination step on 2 and 3 person HUs.

In the $2 / 3 \mathrm{HU}$ elimination step from blocks with negative differences between total person synthetic and Transparent File $2^{+}$, we eliminated 2 and 3 person substituted HUs first to convert to a positive dfp1. When there were not sufficient substitutions, we eliminated all substitutions and eliminated some non-substitutions to attain the positive dfp1 target. Note that all substituted $2 / 3$ person HUs were subject to elimination. Blocks with negative differences and containing no census single units were considered completed and added to the T. File.

There were 1580 blocks where Synthetic total-T.F. $2^{+}$total was negative and containing census single unit persons. For each of these blocks, the absolute difference was added to the census single person count and the sum represented the target elimination (dfp1). We eliminated substitutions (duplications) first. Among substitutions, if the required elimination was two or less, we randomly chose one among the two person HUs. Same for three persons. Larger figures required selecting random combinations of 2 and 3 person HUs. The largest figure was twenty-eight.

No attention was paid to race or other HU category characteristics in selection for elimination. Nearly all figures were under four and most were under three. Upon selection, the HUs were eliminated from the $2^{+} T$. File. After completion, we checked the tract / race differences $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ between the synthetic total and the $2^{+} \mathrm{T}$. file for negativeness.

## Elimination - Tract / Race

We obtained 1285 negative tract / race $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}$ in the state of New Jersey. For these tract / race, we need to eliminate race persons until $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}$ is positive. Three tracts contained no single units.

We used the following algorithm to identify HUs for elimination. Assume that the absolute value of the negative difference for a given tract / race, rounded up to an integer, is R. We then listed all blocks in the tract in order of increasing dfp1 where dfp1 = Synthetic - T. File $2^{+}$- Census 1 person total for the race in question. This places the block with the largest negative value of dfp1 first in the list.

We then considered elimination from the T. File $2^{+}$, non-mixed HUs of the race in question in the first block in the list.

Given R we formed an inventory of sizes of HUs in the tract whose combinations exactly totaled R. Then, we scanned the HUs in the first block for the largest HU eligible for a combination. When an HU was found, it was marked for elimination and the magnitude of the block's dfp1 and the tract R were each reduced by the number of persons in the HU. After this adjustment was made, the new block with the largest negative dfp1 was searched for the largest HU eligible for the new set of combinations. This continued until the recomputed R was zero. We then proceeded to the next tract.

If there were no non-mixed substitution HUs within one of R in the tract but a non-mixed nonsubstitution HU within one of R existed, then the non-mixed non-substituted HU was eliminated.

If in the above, several HUs of the same size existed in a block and not all were needed, a random selection of HUs to be eliminated was undertaken in the block. In summary, the combinations of HUs, the ordering of blocks and the distribution of non-mixed substituted HUs in the block dictated the elimination process.

Upon completion of the tract / race elimination, the block differences (synthetic total - Transparent File $2^{+}$total) from blocks without any Census single units but with positive differences were summed and spread over the remaining block constraints in a ratio adjustment prior to raking the $\mathrm{t}_{\text {mik }}$.

