The median value of a home in the United States in 2000 was \$119,600, according to findings in Census 2000.' This value represented an increase of 18 percent over the 1990 value of $\$ 101,100$, after adjusting for inflation. ${ }^{2}$ Median value means that one-half of all homes were worth more and one-half were worth less. These values refer to specified owner-occupied housing units; that is, owner-occupied single-family homes on less than 10 acres without a business or medical office on the property. In 2000, 55.2 million of the country's 115.9 million housing units were this type. The value of a home is the owner's estimate of what the house and lot would sell for if it were on the market.

[^0]Figure 1.
Reproduction of the Question on Housing
Value From Census 2000

51 What is the value of this property; that is, how much do you think this house and lot, apartment, or mobile home and lot would sell for if it were for sale?

| $\square$ Less than $\$ 10,000$ | $\square \$ 90,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square \$ 10,000$ to $\$ 14,999$ | $\square \$ 100,000$ to $\$ 124,999$ |
| $\square \$ 15,000$ to $\$ 19,999$ | $\square \$ 125,000$ to $\$ 149,999$ |
| $\square \$ 20,000$ to $\$ 24,999$ | $\square \$ 150,000$ to $\$ 174,999$ |
| $\square \$ 25,000$ to $\$ 29,999$ | $\square \$ 175,000$ to $\$ 199,999$ |
| $\square \$ 30,000$ to $\$ 34,999$ | $\square \$ 200,000$ to $\$ 249,999$ |
| $\square \$ 35,000$ to $\$ 39,999$ | $\square \$ 250,000$ to $\$ 299,999$ |
| $\square \$ 40,000$ to $\$ 49,999$ | $\square \$ 300,000$ to $\$ 399,999$ |
| $\square \$ 50,000$ to $\$ 59,999$ | $\square \$ 400,000$ to $\$ 499,999$ |
| $\square \$ 0,000$ to $\$ 69,999$ | $\square \$ 500,000$ to $\$ 749,999$ |
| $\square \$ 70,000$ to $\$ 79,999$ | $\square \$ 750,000$ to $\$ 999,999$ |
| $\square$ | $\square 80,000$ to $\$ 89,999$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 questionnaire.

## By
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The specific question, reproduced in Figure 1, was asked at owner-occupied housing units and units that were being bought or were vacant and for sale at the time of enumeration.

This report, part of a series that presents population and housing data collected by Census 2000, presents data on median home values in the United States, including regions, states, counties, and places with populations of 100,000 or more. It also includes home values for householders by age, race, and Hispanic origin, as well as other findings.
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## Data collection methods changed between 1990 and 2000.

In Census 2000, only a sample of households were asked the home value question, whereas all households were asked that question in 1990. The 2000 question was slightly different from the one used in 1990. The wording was changed to replace "condominium unit" with "apartment" and to include "mobile home." Some of the value categories were collapsed while others were added, allowing respondents to indicate homes valued for $\$ 1$ million or more. The highest value category in 1990 was $\$ 500,000$ or more.

## Median home values more than doubled between 1950 and 2000.

The median value of single-family homes in the United States rose from \$44,600 in 1950 to $\$ 119,600$ in 2000, after adjusting for inflation. ${ }^{3}$ Median home value increased in each decade of this 50-year period, rising fastest (43 percent) in the 1970s and slowest ( 8.2 percent) in the 1980s. The 18 -percent increase in the 1990s was higher than the rate of increase in the 1960s (11 percent) and the 1980s ( 8.2 percent) but below the rate of increase in the 1950s (31 percent) and the 1970s (43 percent). Figure 2 presents median home values for each census since 1950.

Homeowners aged 45 to 54 lived in the highest-priced homes.

The median value for single-family homes was lowest $(\$ 84,700)$ for homeowners under age 25, as shown in Figure 3. Median values

[^1]rose with age of homeowner, peaking for homeowners 45 to 54 at $\$ 131,100$. After that, median
home values fell to $\$ 124,000$ at 55 to $64, \$ 108,300$ at 65 to 74 , and $\$ 95,500$ at 75 and over.

## Figure 2.

## Median Home Values: 1950 to 2000

(For specified owner-occupied single-family housing units.
Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/docsf3.pdf)


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census of Population and Housing, decennial publications.

Figure 3.

## Median Home Value by Age of Householder: 2000

(For specified owner-occupied single-family housing units.
Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/docsf3.pdf)


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 special tabulation.

Figure 4.

## Median Home Value by Race and Hispanic Origin of Householder: 2000

(For specified owner-occupied single-family housing units. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/docsf3.pdf)


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3.

The median value of homes owned by Asian householders was more than 50 percent higher than the national median.

Census 2000 allowed respondents to choose more than one race. With the exception of the Two or more races group, all race groups discussed in this report refer to people who indicated only one racial identity among the six major categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Some other race. ${ }^{4}$ The use of the single-race

[^2]population in this report does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches. ${ }^{5}$

The median value of single-family homes for householders who identified their race as Asian was \$199,300—more than 50 percent higher than the national median home value (see Figure 4). A

[^3]large proportion of these households (45 percent) were located in Hawaii or California, states that recorded the highest median home values. Householders who were Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander had a median home value of $\$ 160,500$, also considerably higher than the national estimate. In contrast, homeowners who were Black or African American or who were American Indian and Alaska Native had a median value of about $\$ 81,000$-one-third below the national median. Among homeowners who were nonHispanic White the median value for a single-family home was $\$ 123,400$-higher than the national estimate-while among Hispanic or Latino homeowners it was \$105,600—below the national
estimate. ${ }^{6}$ The median home value for people who reported two or more races was \$124,400.

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF HOME VALUES

## Home values were highest in the West.

Median values for a single-family home were higher in the West $(\$ 171,000)$ than in the Northeast (\$139,400), the Midwest $(\$ 105,500)$, or the South $(\$ 96,300)$ (see Table 1). In the Northeast, the median value dropped between 1990 and 2000 by 12 percent, but home values increased in the other regions. The increase was greatest in the Midwest (up 33 percent), followed by the South (up 15 percent) and the West (up 6 percent).

## Hawaii continued to have the highest median home value among states.

In Census 2000, as in 1990, Hawaii recorded the highest median value for single-family homes among states ( $\$ 272,700$ )—more than twice the national median. California followed Hawaii with a

[^4]median value of $\$ 211,500$ for sin-gle-family homes. Six additional states had median home values above \$150,000: Massachusetts (\$185,700), New Jersey (\$170,800), Washington (\$168,300), Connecticut $(\$ 166,900)$, Colorado $(\$ 166,600)$, and Oregon (\$152,100). The District of Columbia had a similar median value at $\$ 157,200$. Colorado was the only noncoastal state with a median home value above $\$ 150,000$. With the exception of Maine and South Carolina, all of the states with median home values below $\$ 100,000$ were adjacent and located near the middle or interior of the country (see Figure 5). The lowest median home value among the states was $\$ 70,700$, recorded in Oklahomamore than one-third below the national estimate. Four additional states in the South and Midwest had median home values below $\$ 75,000$ : Mississippi $(\$ 71,400)$, Arkansas and West Virginia (both at $\$ 72,800$ ), and North Dakota $(\$ 74,400) .{ }^{8}$

Between 1990 and 2000, median home values decreased in 11 states and the District of Columbia, with Connecticut showing the sharpest drop, of 27 percent. ${ }^{9}$ In addition to Connecticut, median values fell by more than 10 percent in eight states: Rhode Island (down 22 percent), New Hampshire (down 19 percent), New Jersey (down 18 percent), California (down 15 percent), Hawaii (down 13 percent), Maine and New York (both down 12 percent), and Massachusetts (down 11 percent). In contrast, Oregon had the

[^5]sharpest rise in median home value, up 78 percent. Other states in the West with more than a 50-percent increase in median home value were Utah (up 66 percent) and Colorado (up 58 percent). Oregon and Utah went from far under the national median in 1990 to well above it in 2000. Minnesota was the only other state to follow this path, although its gain was more modest. Maine and Vermont went in the opposite direction, from above the national median in 1990 to under by 2000. See Table 1 for values for the United States, regions, states, and Puerto Rico.

## Counties with more expensive homes were primarily located in major metropolitan areas.

A band of counties with median single-family home values in excess of $\$ 150,000$ extended almost continuously from the District of Columbia and its suburbs up the east coast to Boston, Massachusetts, and its suburbs (see Figure 5). Another band of homes in this price range extended along the California coast. Other counties where median single-family home values exceeded \$150,000 clustered around Denver and in other Rocky Mountain areas of Colorado and in large metropolitan areas throughout the country. Counties with exceptionally high single-family median home values or those with values above $\$ 500,000$ were New York County, New York (the borough of Manhattan), with a median value in excess of $\$ 1$ million; Pitkin County, Colorado (\$750,000); Nantucket, Massachusetts $(\$ 577,500)$; and Marin County, California
(\$514,600). ${ }^{10}$ Counties where

[^6]Table 1.
Median Home Values for the United States, Regions, and States, and for Puerto Rico: 1990 and 2000
(For specified owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

| Area | 1990 |  |  | 2000 |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Median } \\ \text { percent } \\ \text { change, } \\ 1990 \text { to } 2000 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Specified owner-occupied housing units | Median (dollars) | Median* (dollars) | Specified owner-occupied housing units | Median (dollars) |  |
| United States | 44,918,000 | 79,100 | 101,100 | 55,212,108 | 119,600 | 18.3 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast. | 8,762,882 | 124,400 | 158,900 | 10,009,448 | 139,400 | -12.3 |
| Midwest . | 11,794,663 | 62,300 | 79,600 | 14,037,418 | 105,500 | 32.5 |
| South | 15,595,606 | 65,800 | 84,100 | 19,964,932 | 96,300 | 14.5 |
| West. | 8,764,849 | 126,200 | 161,200 | 11,200,310 | 171,000 | 6.1 |
| State |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 753,827 | 53,700 | 68,600 | 918,570 | 85,100 | 24.1 |
| Alaska | 77,527 | 94,400 | 120,600 | 105,620 | 144,200 | 19.6 |
| Arizona | 668,718 | 80,100 | 102,300 | 1,032,103 | 121,300 | 18.6 |
| Arkansas | 427,676 | 46,300 | 59,200 | 513,483 | 72,800 | 23.0 |
| California | 4,690,264 | 195,500 | 249,800 | 5,527,618 | 211,500 | -15.3 |
| Colorado | 637,629 | 82,700 | 105,700 | 903,259 | 166,600 | 57.6 |
| Connecticut | 643,500 | 177,800 | 227,200 | 728,244 | 166,900 | -26.5 |
| Delaware | 137,526 | 100,100 | 127,900 | 177,323 | 130,400 | 2.0 |
| District of Columbia | 71,532 | 123,900 | 158,300 | 76,289 | 157,200 | (NS) |
| Florida | 2,378,207 | 77,100 | 98,500 | 3,242,202 | 105,500 | 7.1 |
| Georgia | 1,138,775 | 71,300 | 91,100 | 1,596,408 | 111,200 | 22.1 |
| Hawaii | 144,431 | 245,300 | 313,400 | 173,861 | 272,700 | -13.0 |
| Idaho | 177,333 | 58,200 | 74,400 | 255,077 | 106,300 | 42.9 |
| Illinois. | 2,084,708 | 80,900 | 103,400 | 2,470,338 | 130,800 | 26.5 |
| Indiana. | 1,137,766 | 53,900 | 68,900 | 1,378,878 | 94,300 | 36.9 |
| Iowa. | 566,559 | 45,900 | 58,600 | 665,442 | 82,500 | 40.8 |
| Kansas. | 500,628 | 52,200 | 66,700 | 581,960 | 83,500 | 25.2 |
| Kentucky | 662,174 | 50,500 | 64,500 | 806,461 | 86,700 | 34.4 |
| Louisiana | 733,914 | 58,500 | 74,700 | 864,810 | 85,000 | 13.8 |
| Maine . | 214,663 | 87,400 | 111,700 | 254,866 | 98,700 | -11.6 |
| Maryland | 970,864 | 116,500 | 148,800 | 1,178,779 | 146,000 | -1.9 |
| Massachusetts | 1,004,573 | 162,800 | 208,000 | 1,187,871 | 185,700 | -10.7 |
| Michigan | 1,916,143 | 60,600 | 77,400 | 2,269,175 | 115,600 | 49.4 |
| Minnesota | 894,345 | 74,000 | 94,500 | 1,117,489 | 122,400 | 29.5 |
| Mississippi. | 441,821 | 45,600 | 58,300 | 532,291 | 71,400 | 22.5 |
| Missouri. | 1,005,407 | 59,800 | 76,400 | 1,188,442 | 89,900 | 17.7 |
| Montana | 132,419 | 56,600 | 72,300 | 165,397 | 99,500 | 37.6 |
| Nebraska. | 314,363 | 50,400 | 64,400 | 370,495 | 88,000 | 36.6 |
| Nevada | 183,816 | 95,700 | 122,300 | 363,321 | 142,000 | 16.1 |
| New Hampshire | 199,358 | 129,400 | 165,300 | 249,345 | 133,300 | -19.4 |
| New Jersey. | 1,466,270 | 162,300 | 207,400 | 1,701,732 | 170,800 | -17.6 |
| New Mexico | 262,309 | 70,100 | 89,600 | 339,888 | 108,100 | 20.6 |
| New York. | 2,387,606 | 131,600 | 168,100 | 2,689,728 | 148,700 | -11.5 |
| North Carolina | 1,217,975 | 65,800 | 84,100 | 1,615,713 | 108,300 | 28.8 |
| North Dakota | 103,702 | 50,800 | 64,900 | 122,078 | 74,400 | 14.6 |
| Ohio | 2,241,277 | 63,500 | 81,100 | 2,613,123 | 103,700 | 27.9 |
| Oklahoma | 616,290 | 48,100 | 61,500 | 699,452 | 70,700 | 15.0 |
| Oregon. | 511,829 | 67,100 | 85,700 | 653,869 | 152,100 | 77.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,581,261 | 69,700 | 89,100 | 2,889,484 | 97,000 | 8.9 |
| Rhode Island | 176,494 | 133,500 | 170,600 | 202,216 | 133,000 | -22.0 |
| South Carolina | 615,434 | 61,100 | 78,100 | 783,909 | 94,900 | 21.5 |
| South Dakota | 113,057 | 45,200 | 57,700 | 137,531 | 79,600 | 38.0 |
| Tennessee. | 938,366 | 58,400 | 74,600 | 1,205,931 | 93,000 | 24.7 |
| Texas | 2,949,089 | 59,600 | 76,100 | 3,849,585 | 82,500 | 8.4 |
| Utah | 303,724 | 68,900 | 88,000 | 427,244 | 146,100 | 66.0 |
| Vermont. | 89,157 | 95,500 | 122,000 | 105,962 | 111,500 | -8.6 |
| Virginia. | 1,192,077 | 91,000 | 116,300 | 1,510,798 | 125,400 | 7.8 |
| Washington. | 896,436 | 93,400 | 119,300 | 1,157,462 | 168,300 | 41.1 |
| West Virginia | 350,059 | 47,900 | 61,200 | 392,928 | 72,800 | 19.0 |
| Wisconsin. | 916,708 | 62,500 | 79,900 | 1,122,467 | 112,200 | 40.4 |
| Wyoming . | 78,414 | 61,600 | 78,700 | 95,591 | 96,600 | 22.7 |
| Puerto Rico. | 669,302 | 36,200 | 46,300 | 817,927 | 75,100 | 62.2 |

[^7]
median home values exceeded $\$ 150,000$ represented 6.2 percent of all counties. In nearly one-half of counties ( 49 percent) median single-family home values fell below $\$ 75,000$. Most of these
counties were located in the Great Plains extending from North Dakota to Texas and in the nonmetropolitan South. For example, five counties with very low median single-family home values were

Table 2.
Ten Places of $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ People or More With the Highest Median Home Values: 2000
(For specified owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

| Area | Specified owner-occupied single-family housing units | Median value (dollars) | 90-percent confidence interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 55,212,108 | 119,600 | 119,500-119,700 |
| Place |  |  |  |
| Sunnyvale, CA | 19,314 | 495,200 | 487,700-502,700 |
| Cambridge, MA | 4,453 | 398,500 | 377,200-419,800 |
| Santa Clara, CA. | 15,831 | 396,500 | 391,300-401,700 |
| San Francisco, CA | 79,545 | 396,400 | 393,300-399,500 |
| San Jose, CA. | 146,892 | 394,000 | 392,000-396,000 |
| Honolulu, HI (CDP)* | 40,162 | 386,700 | 383,000-390,400 |
| Berkeley, CA. | 15,869 | 380,200 | 372,100-388,300 |
| Fremont, CA. | 40,429 | 363,400 | 359,900-366,900 |
| Stamford, CT | 18,034 | 362,300 | 355,000-369,600 |
| Daly City, CA | 15,803 | 335,000 | 331,100-338,900 |

[^8]Table 3.

## Ten Places of $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ People or More With the Lowest Median Home Values: 2000

(For specified owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

| Area | Specified owner-occupied single-family housing units | Median value (dollars) | 90-percent confidence interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 55,212,108 | 119,600 | 119,500-119,700 |
| Place |  |  |  |
| Flint, MI | 26,410 | 49,700 | 48,900-50,500 |
| Kansas City, KS. | 31,461 | 52,500 | 51,600-53,400 |
| Brownsville, TX | 20,258 | 53,000 | 51,500-54,500 |
| Waco, TX | 18,226 | 53,300 | 51,500-55,100 |
| Gary, IN. | 18,997 | 53,400 | 52,200-54,600 |
| Buffalo, NY | 33,030 | 59,300 | 58,600-60,000 |
| Philadelphia, PA. | 315,437 | 59,700 | 59,400-60,000 |
| Pittsburgh, PA | 66,568 | 59,700 | 59,300-60,100 |
| Abilene, TX. | 22,578 | 61,100 | 59,700-62,500 |
| Rochester, NY | 30,910 | 61,300 | 60,700-61,900 |

[^9]Flint, Michigan recorded the lowest median home value among places of $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ or more.

The lowest median single-family home value among large cities (places with 100,000 people or more) was recorded in Flint, Michigan (\$49,700)-more than 50 percent below the national median (see Table 3). These ten lowest median single-family home values ranged from about \$50,000 to $\$ 60,000$. The other nine places were Kansas City, Kansas (\$52,500); Brownsville, Texas $(\$ 53,000)$; Waco, Texas $(\$ 53,300)$; Gary, Indiana ( $\$ 53,400$ ); Buffalo, New York (\$59,300); Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (both at $\$ 59,700$ ); Abilene, Texas (\$61,100); and Rochester, New York $(\$ 61,300) .{ }^{13}$

## Cambridge, Massachusetts had

 the highest percentage of homes valued at $\$ 1$ million or more.The city with the highest percentage of single-family homes valued at $\$ 1$ million or more was Cambridge, Massachusetts with 12 percent (see Table 4). San Francisco, California followed Cambridge with 7.0 percent and Pasadena, California was next with 4.7 percent. Los Angeles, California had 3.8 percent, while the remaining six cities-Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Berkeley, California, Stamford, Connecticut, Honolulu, Hawaii, Atlanta, Georgia, and Fremont, California-all had about 3 percent. Five of the ten places were in California and two were in the New England area. None of the ten places was in the Midwest. ${ }^{14}$

[^10]Table 4.
Ten Places of $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ People or More With the Highest Percentage of Home Values of \$1 Million or More: 2000
(For specified owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

| Area | Specified owner-occupied single-family housing units | Homes valued at $\$ 1$ million or more |  | 90-percent confidence interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |  |
| United States . | 55,212,108 | 313,759 | 0.6 | 0.6-0.6 |
| Place |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge, MA | 4,453 | 516 | 11.6 | 9.5-13.7 |
| San Francisco, CA . | 79,545 | 5,547 | 7.0 | 6.6-7.4 |
| Pasadena, CA | 19,318 | 912 | 4.7 | 4.1-5.4 |
| Los Angeles, CA | 412,804 | 15,501 | 3.8 | 3.6-3.9 |
| Fort Lauderdale, FL | 22,871 | 765 | 3.3 | 2.8-3.9 |
| Berkeley, CA. | 15,869 | 510 | 3.2 | 2.6-3.8 |
| Stamford, CT | 18,034 | 485 | 2.7 | 2.2-3.2 |
| Honolulu, HI (CDP)* | 40,162 | 1,048 | 2.6 | 2.3-3.0 |
| Atlanta, GA . | 61,208 | 1,597 | 2.6 | 2.3-2.9 |
| Fremont, CA. | 40,429 | 1,052 | 2.6 | 2.3-3.0 |

[^11]Figure 6.

## Median Home Value by Type of Structure: 2000

(For all owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample.
For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error,
nonsampling error, and definitions, see
www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/docsf3.pdf)


[^12]Figure 7.
Median Home Value by Year Structure Built: 2000
(For all owner-occupied housing units. Data based on sample.
For information on confidentiality protection,
sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see
www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/docsf3.pdf)


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 special tabulation.

## ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

What was the median value of mortgaged homes versus nonmortgaged homes?

Of all 55.2 million specified owneroccupied homes in the United States, 70 percent were mortgaged and 30 percent were nonmortgaged. The median value of single-family homes with a mortgage ( $\$ 128,800$ ) was much higher than the median value of those without a mortgage $(\$ 96,900)$.

## What were the median values

 for homes within different structures?Among all owner-occupied housing ( 69.8 million), not just specified, the median home value was $\$ 111,800$. For single-family detached homes ( 56.3 million) the median value was $\$ 121,100$ (see Figure 6). This estimate was significantly higher than the $\$ 112,500$ for single-family
attached units, which numbered 3.8 million and included townhouses, row houses, or duplexes. The median value for owner-occupied homes in buildings of two or more units ( 3.8 million) was $\$ 116,600$. Finally, for mobile homes ( 5.9 million) it was $\$ 31,200$.

## What were the median values for new homes and old homes?

Of all owner-occupied homes, the 7.7 million new homes or those built between 1995 and March 2000 (median value $\$ 146,300$ ) were much more expensive than the 24 million old homes or those built before 1960 (median value $\$ 95,600$ ). As shown in Figure 7, the newer the home the higher the median value, except for the 12.3 million built in the 1970s $(\$ 106,800)$, which was lower than the 9.1 million homes built during the 1960s $(\$ 108,500)$.

## WHY CENSUS 2000 ASKED ABOUT HOME VALUE

The value of home and property is an important measure of neighborhood quality, housing affordability, and wealth. These data provide socioeconomic information not captured by household income and comparative information on the state of local housing markets. The federal government uses this information for the development of transportation plans, policies, and programs. It uses this information in preparing the value of housing services for the National Income and Product Accounts. Value data are incorporated in annual reports that the President sends to the Congress about housing production, occupancy, and tenure, and in analyses of housing needs.

## Accuracy of the Estimates

The data contained in this report are based on the sample of households who responded to the Census 2000 long form. Nationally, approximately one out of every six housing units was included in this sample. As a result, the sample estimates may differ somewhat from the 100 -percent figures that would have been obtained if all housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters had been enumerated using the same questionnaires, instructions, enumerators, and so forth. The sample estimates also differ from the values that would have been obtained from different samples of housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters. The deviation of a sample estimate from the average of all possible samples is called the sampling error.

In addition to the variability that arises from the sampling
procedures, both sample data and 100-percent data are subject to nonsampling error. Nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the various complex operations used to collect and process data. Such errors may include: not enumerating every household or every person in the population, failing to obtain all required information from the respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent information, and recording information incorrectly. In addition, errors can occur during the field review of the enumerators' work, during clerical handling of the census questionnaires, or during the electronic processing of the questionnaires.

Nonsampling error may affect the data in two ways: (1) errors that are introduced randomly will increase the variability of the data and, therefore, should be reflected in the standard errors; and (2) errors that tend to be consistent in one direction will bias both sample and $100-$ percent data in that direction. For example, if respondents consistently tend to underreport their incomes, then the resulting estimates of households or families by income category will tend to be understated for the higher income categories and overstated for the lower income categories. Such biases are not reflected in the standard errors.

While it is impossible to completely eliminate error from an operation as large and complex as the decennial census, the Census Bureau attempts to control the sources of such error during the data collection and processing operations. The primary sources of error and the programs instituted to control error in Census 2000 are described in detail in Summary File 3 Technical Documentation under Chapter 8, "Accuracy of the Data," located at www.census.gov/ prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf.

All statements in this Census 2000 Brief have undergone statistical testing and all comparisons are significant at the 90-percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted. The estimates in tables, maps, and other figures may vary from actual values due to sampling and nonsampling errors. As a result, estimates in one category may not be significantly different from estimates assigned to a different category. Further information on the accuracy of the data is located at www.census.gov/ prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf. For further information on the computation and use of standard errors, contact the Decennial Statistical Studies Division at 301-763-4242.

## For More Information

The Census 2000 Summary File 3 data are available from the

American Factfinder on the Internet (factfinder.census.gov). They were released on a state-by-state basis during 2002. For information on confidentiality protection, nonsampling error, sampling error, and definitions, also see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/ $d o c / s f 3 . p d f$ or contact the Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636).

Information on population and housing topics is presented in the Census 2000 Brief series, located on the Census Bureau's Web site at www.census.gov/population/www/ cen2000/briefs.html. This series, which will be completed in 2003, presents information on race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, household type, housing tenure, and social, economic, and housing characteristics, such as ancestry, income, and housing costs.

For additional information on housing, including reports and survey data, visit the Census Bureau's Internet site at www.census.gov/ hhes/www/housing.html. To find information about the availability of data products, including reports, CD-ROMs, and DVDs, call the Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636), or e-mail webmaster@census.gov.


[^0]:    The text of this report discusses data for the United States, including the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Data for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown in Table 1 and Figure 5.
    ${ }^{2}$ The estimates in this report are based on responses from a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All statements made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Median value estimates for 1950 to 1990 were adjusted to 2000 dollars using the appropriate CPI-U-RS factors.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ For further information on each of the six major race groups and the Two races population, see reports from the Census 2000 Brief series (C2KBR/01), available on the Census 2000 Web site at www.census.gov/ population/www/cen2000/briefs.html.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ This report draws heavily on Summary File 3, a Census 2000 product that can be accessed through American FactFinder, available from the Census Bureau's Web site, www.census.gov. Information on people who reported more than one race, such as "White and American Indian and Alaska Native" or "Asian and Black or African American," is forthcoming in Summary File 4, which will also be available through American FactFinder in 2003. About 2.6 percent of people reported more than one race.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ Because Hispanics may be of any race, data in this report for Hispanics overlap with data for racial groups. Based on Census 2000 sample data, the proportion Hispanic was 8.0 percent for Whites, 1.9 percent for Blacks, 14.6 percent for American Indians and Alaska Natives, 1.0 percent for Asians, 9.5 percent for Pacific Islanders, 97.1 percent for those reporting Some other race, and 31.1 percent for those reporting Two or more races.
    ${ }^{7}$ The Northeast region includes the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The Midwest region includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The South region includes the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a state equivalent. The West region includes the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Because of sampling error, the estimates for geographic areas in this report may not be significantly different from one another or from estimates for other geographic areas not in this report.
    ${ }^{9}$ The decrease for the District of Columbia was not statistically significant.

[^6]:    ${ }^{10}$ The single-family homes in Manhattan represented a very small proportion ( 1.8 percent) of all owner-occupied housing in Manhattan.

[^7]:    *Adjusted to 2000 dollars, using CPI-U-RS factor 1.277636.
    NS: Not significantly different from zero at the 90 -percent confidence level.
    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3 and 1990 census Summary File 1.

[^8]:    *Honolulu is a Census Designated Place (CDP). By agreement with the state of Hawaii, the Census Bureau does not show data separately for the city of Honolulu, which is coextensive with Honolulu county.

    Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from estimates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3.

[^9]:    Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from estimates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3.

[^10]:    ${ }^{13}$ See footnote 8.
    ${ }^{14}$ See footnote 8.

[^11]:    *Honolulu is a Census Designated Place (CDP). By agreement with the state of Hawaii, the Census Bureau does not show data separately for the city of Honolulu, which is coextensive with Honolulu county.

    Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from estimates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3.

[^12]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 special tabulation.

