UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233-0001

February 23, 2011

ACSO Research and Evaluation Memorandum Series

No. ACS-R&E -11-02

MEMORANDUM FOR Distribution List

From: James Treat **/signed/**
Chief, American Community Survey Office

Subject: Comparison of ACS Detailed Tables with Tables in Census 2000 Summary File 3

Contact Person: Deborah Griffin
Special Assistant, American Community Survey Office

Attached is the final report summarizing a comparison of the detailed tables that were released in Census 2000's Summary File 3 (SF3) with the detailed tables that were released in December 2010 with the first ACS 5-year estimates.

The highlights of the findings are:

- Although the tables are organized and labeled very differently in the ACS versus SF3, there is virtually complete coverage of all major Census 2000 SF3 subject areas in the ACS tables. The only subject area not represented in the 2005-2009 ACS tables but in the SF3 tables is Disability. This is due to the redesign of this question in the ACS. Future ACS 5-year products will include this subject area.

- SF3 tables contain much more iteration of characteristics by the major race and Hispanic origin groups than are found in the ACS.

- There are two concepts ("language density" and "specified housing units") in SF3 which are not continued in the ACS and several concepts underlying ACS tables that are not found in SF3 (e.g., fertility, income inequality, median age at first marriage, characteristics by geographic place of work).

- About a third of the 813 SF3 detailed tables have an identical or more detailed ACS 5-year detailed table.

- Users will be able to make comparisons of the ACS and Census 2000 estimates for about half of the SF3 detailed tables.

Attachment: Comparison of ACS Detailed Tables with Tables in Census 2000 Summary File 3.

Distribution List:

Frank A. Vitrano (DMD)
Daniel H. Weinberg (DIR)
ACS Division Chiefs Forum List
Jerry Imel (DSSD)
Earl Letourneau (DSSD)
Robin Pennington (DSSD)
Mary Bucci (DMD)
Kevin Deardorff (DMD)
Adrienne Oneto (DMD)

American Community Survey Research and Evaluation Program
February 23, 2011

Comparison of ACS Detailed Tables with Tables in Census 2000 Summary File 3

FINAL REPORT

Douglas Hillmer (Contractor)
Deborah Griffin
American Community Survey Office

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U
Helping You Make Informed Decisions

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

As we define and describe the final set of data products and tables released in 2010 as ACS 5-year estimates it is important to understand the coverage of ACS estimates relative to Census 2000. With this in mind, this documentation provides summaries that can assist users who wish to understand the scope of this ACS release relative to Census 2000 by comparing the tables included in the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year estimates with those based on Census 2000 sample data. The following three research questions are answered in this report:

1. How do the detailed tables that were released as part of Summary File 3 (SF3) from Census 2000 compare with the detailed tables proposed for the ACS 5-year estimates?
2. Which ACS detailed tables that are scheduled for release as 5-year estimates were not included in the Census 2000 SF3?
3. Why were decisions made to drop certain SF3 tables or add new ACS tables?

This analysis focuses on the detailed tables included in the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year estimates compared with the Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF3) detailed tables. Two matches were conducted. An attempt was made to identify the detailed table from the SF3 most similar (defined later in this document) to each ACS detailed table. The same examination was conducted in reverse, holding the Census 2000 SF3 detailed table fixed and searching for the most similar ACS detailed table. A by-product of this work is a list of those topics that were in SF3 but not continued in ACS as well as topics that are new in the ACS.

The approach taken to meet this objective was one requiring a great deal of collaboration with the subject matter analysts and their managers, the actual authors of the current ACS tables. For each major subject area (or group of subject areas) a report was drafted on the degree to which ACS and SF3 tables are comparable, and that report was reviewed by the analysts.

The highlights of the findings are:

- Although the tables are organized and labeled very differently in the ACS versus SF3, there is virtually complete coverage of all major Census 2000 SF3 subject areas in the ACS tables. The only subject area not represented in the 2005-2009 ACS tables but in the SF3 tables is Disability. This is due to the redesign of this question in the ACS. Future ACS 5-year products will include this subject area.

- SF3 tables contain much more iteration of characteristics by the major race and Hispanic origin groups than are found in the ACS.

- There are two concepts (“language density” and “specified housing units”) in SF3 which are not continued in the ACS.

- There are several concepts underlying ACS tables that are not found in SF3 (e.g., fertility, income inequality, median age at first marriage, characteristics by geographic place of work).

- There are several instances in which an ACS table has no similar table in SF3 but one or more similar tables can be found in the Census 2000 Summary File 1 or Summary File 4.

Motivation

Since data users will have data products from the ACS replacing those from the former long-form sample, it is natural to ask how closely the ACS products approximate those from Census 2000. In particular, how similar are the ACS 5-year detailed tables to the detailed tables from Summary File 3 (SF3)? Through calendar year 2004, the ACS detailed tables were consciously designed to resemble the Census 2000 SF3 tables to the greatest extent possible. Since then, the ACS detailed tables have undergone a major redesign, including changing the entire table ID structure. As the overall list of topics covered by these ACS tables has grown, the appearance and content of these tables has, in some cases, changed quite a bit from the SF3 tables upon which the ACS tables were originally based.

Now that ACS 5-year estimates have been released, data users have two sets of detailed tables that may contain many comparable estimates: the Census 2000 SF3 detailed tables and the 2005-2009 ACS detailed tables. In anticipation of the release of ACS data, users have raised several questions, including:

- Can I find ACS tables that are identical with or close to the SF3 tables I have used from Census 2000? Can I create something from ACS tables that can be compared with SF3?
- Will the ACS tables include the same level of characteristic detail found in SF3?
- Are all the topics covered in Census 2000 SF3 also covered in the ACS?
- What has been dropped?
- What are the new topics covered by the ACS?
- If I want to use ACS estimates to look at change over time from the estimates in a Census 2000 SF3 table, how do I go about doing that?

To be in a position to advise and guide data users on these questions, we determined that we needed to compare both the content and structure and the table universes of the ACS and the SF3 tables. Identifying tables with similar content and structure would allow us to answer questions about the coverage of SF3 characteristics in the ACS. Ensuring that these tables involved identical universes would be critical to making comparisons. The detailed steps taken to compare the two sets of tables are described in the methodology section.

Background

Detailed Tables

The ACS detailed tables, like the SF3 detailed tables, present survey estimates in many forms:

- Weighted count estimates (for example, the number of males in the labor force),
- Aggregates (for example, the aggregate number of vehicles used in commuting by workers 16 years and over),
- Medians (for example, median age by sex),

- Quartiles (for example, lower value quartile (dollars) for owner-occupied housing units),
- Ratios (for example, average household size of occupied housing units), and
- Rates (for example, the proportion of the population that is foreign born).

Some detailed tables are defined as race-iterated tables because a single table shell is iterated across a set of nine race and Hispanic origin groups (White alone, Black or African American alone, American Indian and Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, Some other race alone, Two or more races alone, White alone - not Hispanic or Latino, Hispanic or Latino). Tables without these iterations are either tables of "non-iterated survey estimates," quality measures tables, or imputation tables.

In this analysis summaries are provided for the combination of all detailed tables and by type of table.

Subject Areas

All detailed tables were classified into 1 of 25 subject areas that cover subjects in the ACS and/or in Census 2000. This organization of subject areas is consistent with the organizational units responsible for the definition of these detailed tables. The subject areas are listed alphabetically in Table 1. Summaries are also provided in this report by subject area.

Table 1. Subject Areas (alphabetical order)

Age and Sex	Industry, Occupation, and Class of Worker
Ancestry	Journey to Work
Disability	Language
Earnings	Marital Status and Marital History
Employment and Work Status	Migration and Place of Birth – Domestic
Fertility	Place of Birth – Foreign: Citizenship and Year of Entry
Food Stamps/Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	Poverty
Grandparents	Quality Measures
Group Quarters	Race
Hispanic Origin	Relationship
Household and Family Type	School Enrollment and Educational Attainment
Housing Characteristics	Veteran Status
Income	

Methodology

Overview

In November, 2009 the Data Products Planning Workgroup in collaboration with the Census Bureau Disclosure Review Board reached a preliminary decision on the final set of detailed tables to be included in the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year data release, that was scheduled for late 2010. Additional changes were made to this list of tables with a final version identified by staff in the

Population Division and the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division in early 2010. This final set of 930 approved tables is the set of ACS tables that were examined relative to the set of 813 Census 2000 SF3 tables. It is important to note that the ACS tables analyzed include the full set of detailed tables scheduled to be released in the 2005-2009 ACS summary file. The current plans for the release of tables on American FactFinder include only a subset of these tables. See Table 11 for a more detailed discussion of this point.

The first decision to be made was what to choose as the unit of analysis for examining the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year estimates relative to the estimates in Census 2000 SF3. The detailed tables were chosen for several reasons:

- Most experienced ACS data users are familiar with the detailed tables from both the ACS and SF3.
- They are the most detailed set of estimates that are released.
- The detailed tables are easily mapped to subject areas.
- The estimates in other data products can be derived from estimates in the detailed tables

Another possible unit of analysis would have been the actual characteristics being estimated in the cells of the detailed tables. That approach was determined to be much more cumbersome and did not appear to yield results that would be more valuable to data users.

The primary goal of this analysis was to determine if a table exists in the ACS that provides the same information that was provided in Census 2000. Such tables are classified as similar. This analysis also distinguishes between similar tables that include ACS estimates that can be compared with Census 2000 (referred to as comparable tables) and similar tables that include ACS estimates that should not be compared with Census 2000 (referred to as not comparable tables). This study does not consider all methodological, procedural, or questionnaire differences in the two programs that may limit comparisons. Guidance is provided on the ACS website for users wishing to make comparisons between the two data sources. The guidance for the 2005-2009 ACS data release can be found at <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/guidance_for_data_users/comparing_data/>. When there are differences that prevent a meaningful or correct comparison, a "Do not compare" statement appears by the subject area or topic within subject area.

The approach taken to assess similarity and comparability was very collaborative; the contractor (Doug Hillmer) worked closely with analysts and managers in the American Community Survey Office, the Population Division and the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division. The ACS Data Products Planning Workgroup and the Disclosure Review Board decided which detailed tables would be included in the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year products. An initial determination was made by the contractor of the SF3 tables that were similar and comparable to the ACS tables by manually reviewing all tables. See the “Determining Similarity and Comparability” section below. This initial determination was compared with the results of a computer match of SF3 and ACS tables and all discrepancies were resolved. Concurrent with this review, staff in the Population Division and the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division developed a list of ACS tables that appeared to have a matching SF3 table which was also reviewed with discrepancies resolved.

A report summarizing the findings for each subject area (in some cases, subject areas were combined since they were under the purview of the same organizational unit within the Population Division or the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division) was sent to the appropriate contact person for review. Comments from the contact person (and others) on his initial report led to the revisions reflected in this report. The process continued until the analysts and the author came to an agreed-up version of the document. The results of this work for each major subject area form the basis for the results summarized in this paper. These detailed subject area reports are available upon request. In addition, detailed spreadsheets with information for each ACS and SF3 table ID are also available upon request. Those spreadsheets were used to update the ACS website's guidance on comparing Census 2000 and ACS estimates.

Determining Similarity and Comparability

Each detailed table can be defined by its content, structure, and table universe, therefore, these parameters were used to assign a status to every ACS table (relative to tables in SF3) and to every SF3 table (relative to tables in the ACS). It was important that this comparison be done in both directions, because that was the only way to identify the tables from the ACS that are not included in SF3 and the tables from SF3 that are not included in the ACS. For this analysis the following definitions were used.

Content is the topic, theme or title of the table which usually defines the specific dimensions of the table. For example, the title of ACS Table C23002 is Sex by age by employment status for the population 16 years and over which defines the content as including sex, age, and employment status.

Structure is defined as the specific cells or estimates included in the table. For example, the structure of ACS Table B08105 involves estimates of workers 16 years and over with the following means of transportation:

Car, truck, or van – drove alone,
Car, truck, or van – carpooled,
Public transportation (excluding taxicab),
Walked,
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means, and
Worked at home.

These are the cells or estimates in this table and therefore define the table's structure.

Table universe is the population in scope for the tabulation. For example, the title of ACS Table B14005 is Sex by school enrollment by educational attainment by employment status for the population 16 to 19 years. The universe for this table is the population 16 to 19 years.

The following example demonstrates how content, structure, and table universe are used to make this classification. Because Table B25033 from the ACS and Table H33 from SF3 both have the title "Total Population in Occupied Housing Units by Tenure by Units in Structure" they are classified as having the same content. Both tables have the same three dimensions – population

in occupied housing units, tenure, and units in structure. The two tables also have the same table universe, "Population in occupied housing units". However, the table structure differs because the "Units in structure" dimension of the SF3 table is broken out into 10 categories versus the breakout of this dimension into only 5 categories in the ACS table.

A SF3 table is considered **similar** to an ACS table when the content of the two tables is the same. A SF3 table is classified as **not similar** when the topic of that table cannot be found in any ACS table.

Similar tables can be **comparable** or **not comparable** based on their table universes. If, for example, the table universe for a SF3 table is different from the table universe used in the ACS, the table would be similar but **not comparable**. In SF3 it was common to restrict certain housing tables to what are called “specified units” (either rented or owned housing units). The ACS does not use this concept. Therefore, both the ACS and SF3 have tables that are identical in content and structure, but cannot be considered comparable because the universe of the SF3 table is more restrictive than the ACS table and there is no way to isolate that subset of the ACS table corresponding to “specified units”. In such cases, the SF3 table is **similar** to an ACS table, but it is **not comparable** to any ACS table.

Similar tables can also be **comparable** or **not comparable** based on their respective table structures. Table structures that are identical (the same categories are presented in the same detail) are **comparable** as are table structures that require some collapsing of detail in one table or another to create the same set of estimates. When no collapsing of categories permits the creation of the same estimate, the similar table is classified as **not comparable**. Gradations of comparable tables were defined to distinguish between tables that retain the full level of detail and those with some, but not all, of the detailed estimates.

Going back to our original example, since both tables deal with the same content, both have the same table universe, and since the ACS categories for the "units in structure" dimension can be derived from the SF3 table by combining cells, we consider these two tables to be both **similar** and **comparable**.

Each SF3 table was assigned a status of 0 to 5, based on the content, table universe, and structure of an available ACS table. Table 2 summarizes these definitions and Appendix A contains examples of each of these similarity/comparability levels.

The same levels were used when examining the similarity and comparability of ACS tables relative to SF3 tables; the only difference is that "ACS" replaces every reference to "SF3" and "SF3" replaces every reference to "ACS" in the above definitions.

Table 2. Summary of Similarity/Comparability Levels

Level	Description	Definition
0	Not similar	No ACS detailed table exists that provides estimates of characteristics like those in the SF3 detailed table.
1	Similar, not comparable	An ACS detailed table exists with estimates of characteristics that are similar to those in the SF3 detailed table but the estimates in the two tables cannot be compared due to universe differences, major differences in table structure, or fundamental differences in the questions used to collect the data.
2	Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS	An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of both the ACS and SF3 detailed tables
3	Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3	An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of the SF3 detailed table
4	Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS	An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of the ACS detailed table
5	Similar and comparable - identical	An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table without any collapsing

Detailed Methodology

There are several nuances that the above definitions do not mention.

In theory, combining and eliminating cells would allow one to reduce a table to something that is no longer of any use for the subject area which that table represents. For example, we might be able to make an Age by Sex table from a table that crosses Educational Attainment by Age by Sex, but that would not help us achieve the actual goals of the comparison between the ACS and SF3 for "Educational Attainment". To avoid such misleading results we made sure that the table formed by combining cells still related to the title of the original table. In the case of the ACS, this meant that the table would still be considered in the subject area indicated by the table ID, since the ACS table ID has a code for the subject area embedded in it.

Occasionally, a single table from one dataset is most similar to two or more tables from the other dataset. For example, Table H11 in SF3, “Tenure by Race of Householder”, is the most comparable table for each of the race-iterated tables on Tenure, Tables B25003A-H. Therefore, there are multiple ACS tables that have a comparable table, but only one SF3 table that has a comparable table. In fact, the comparability to the SF3 table is only achieved by combining all 8 Tables B25003A-H.

The individual subject area reports contain notes about tables from Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) that are comparable to a given ACS table when no comparable table exists in the Census 2000 SF3. However, there are several differences between the Census 2000 SF1 detailed tables and the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year detailed tables. SF1 covers only characteristics from the Census 2000 short form, those questions asked of the entire U.S. population. Thus, when an SF1 table is found to be comparable to an ACS table (as defined above), the numbers published in that table for a given geographic area are actual counts as opposed to estimates subject to sampling

variance as is the case in the ACS.

The individual subject area reports contain notes about tables from Census 2000 Summary File 4 (SF4) that are comparable to a given ACS table when no comparable table exists in the Census 2000 SF3. However, each SF4 detailed table is published for a very large number of race, Hispanic origin, and ancestry groups. In order to protect the confidentiality of individual respondents to the Census 2000 long form, the Census Bureau has placed additional constraints on the publication of the tables for a specific group and in a specific geographic area. Therefore, when the notes in a subject area report make reference to a specific SF4 detailed table as comparable to an ACS table, it should be assumed that the only SF4 population group for which the SF4 table may be considered comparable is the "total population" group. However, even with that assumption, it is possible that an SF4 table for the total population may not exist for a specific geographic area although the comparable ACS table would be published for that area. This is due to the confidentiality restrictions imposed on SF4.

Over 43 percent of the ACS detailed tables (and an even greater percent of the SF3 detailed tables) are race-iterated or iterated by Hispanic/non-Hispanic. Each of these tables is given the same weight in this analysis as any non-iterated table. However, that is basically a result of the table design. Had race been a dimension of the table (as opposed to creating a separate table for each race group), there would be one table instead of the seven tables we have now - one for each of the seven major race groups. This alternative approach to the design of the tables would have greatly reduced the total number of tables and also altered the relative distribution of the tables across the similarity/comparability levels. For example, if we assume that the ACS has 36 tables for a subject area and 27 of those tables are race/Hispanic iterations, the alternative design would produce only 15 tables (9 non-iterated plus the three with race as a dimension and three with Hispanic origin as a dimension). Therefore the impact of the iterated tables on the overall distribution of the results by similarity level is greatly reduced in the alternative design - based on the assumption that the similarity level of the ACS tables for the race iterations would not change regardless which table design approach is taken. The approach taken in this analysis attempts to examine the tables as they are designed in the ACS and in SF3. But, it is worth noting that certain result summaries could look very different with this alternative table design.

Results

This section is framed around the three research questions and describes the methodology in greater detail**.**

How do the detailed tables that were released as part of SF3 from Census 2000 compare with the detailed tables proposed for the ACS 5-year estimates?

There were a total of 813 detailed tables in Census 2000 SF3. Although the ACS tables are organized and labeled very differently from the SF3 tables, there is virtually complete coverage of all major SF3 subject areas in the ACS tables. The only subject area not represented in the 2005-2009 ACS tables but in the SF3 tables (36 tables) is Disability. This is due to the redesign

of the ACS disability question in 2008. Future 5-year products will include this subject area. There are two concepts ("language density" and "specified housing units") in SF3 which are not continued in the ACS.

Table 3 summarizes the comparison of these 813 SF3 tables with the 930 detailed tables that were released as ACS 5-year estimates. In some cases, the comparable ACS table is identical or contains more detail than the SF3 table and in other cases it contains less detail than the SF3 table.

Table 3. Comparison of Census 2000 SF3 and 2005-2009 ACS 5-year Detailed Tables

Of the 813 SF3 detailed tables released in Census 2000…	**Number**	**Percent**
Not Similar - No ACS detailed table exists that provides estimates of characteristics like those in the SF3 detailed table.	292	36.0
Similar, not comparable - An ACS detailed table exists with estimates of characteristics that are similar to those in the SF3 detailed table but the estimates in the two tables cannot be compared due to universe differences, major differences in table structure, or fundamental differences in the questions used to collect the data.	101	12.4
Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS - An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of both the ACS and SF3 detailed tables	34	4.2
Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3 - An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of the SF3 detailed table	98	12.0
Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS - An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 detailed table if you collapse the detail of the ACS detailed table	37	4.5
Similar and comparable - identical – An ACS detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the SF3 table without any collapsing	251	30.9
Total	**813**	**100.0**

Major findings include:

- Over a third of the SF3 tables do not have a similar ACS detailed table. As summarized in Table 4, this is largely due to the number of race-iterated tables (207 of the 292) that were not carried over into the ACS. In addition, some tables (such as 36 disability tables) cannot be supported in this initial 5-year release due to major changes in the question wording in 2008 but will be supported in future 5-year releases.
- About a third of the SF3 detailed tables have an identical or more detailed ACS 5-year detailed table.[1]
- Users will be able to make comparisons of the ACS and Census 2000 estimates for about half of the SF3 tables. As was true when comparing 1990 and 2000 data, specific changes in how the data were collected need to be considered for meaningful comparisons.

[1]In the new release of American FactFinder increased functionality will allow data users to create identical tables from these more detailed ACS tables.

Table 4. Reasons for SF3 Tables with no similar ACS Table

No similar ACS table due to…	Number	Percent
Delay in the release of disability estimates (not in the 5-year ACS data products until 2008-2012)	36	12.3
Race iterated topics not in the ACS (excluding Disability)	207	70.9
Questionnaire differences (domestic migration and veterans period of service)	2	0.7
Other topics not continued in the ACS	47	16.1
Total SF3 tables – Not Similar	**292**	**100.0**

Tables 5 and 6 provide additional detail by subject area, type of table, and type of estimate.

Table 5 displays distributions for each subject area (row). For example, of the 328 housing tables in SF3, 59.8 percent have no similar table in the ACS, 11.6 percent have a similar table in the ACS but the estimates cannot be compared. The remaining 28.6 percent have a comparable ACS table although some collapsing may be required. Major differences are seen across subject areas. Tables related to income and poverty, for example, have very high rates of comparability with most of the SF3 tables having an identical table in the ACS. But the housing tables show a very different story.

Table 6 breaks the SF3 detailed tables into four groupings (shaded rows) based on whether the information in the table is a survey estimate or a measure of the quality of the estimate. Most tables are survey estimate tables and in this summary they are further subdivided into two types – tables that are iterated by race and Hispanic origin and those that are not. In Table 6 these are called “Iterated Survey Estimates” tables and “Noniterated Survey Estimates” tables. Some SF3 and ACS detailed tables summarize the levels of imputation that were required which is a measure of how often data for an item were missing and had to be supplied by a source other than the respondent. These are categorized as “Imputation” tables. Other “Quality Measures” tables include such information as sample sizes.

In Table 6 the Survey Estimates tables are further classified by the types of estimates they include. As noted earlier, there were six types of survey estimates included in SF3: Weighted Counts, Aggregates, Medians, Quartiles, Ratios, and Rates. Most ACS and SF3 tables contain estimates that are simply tallied from the data and reflect the survey weights. These tables are referred to as "Weighted Count Tables” although it’s important to recall that they are not counts, they are estimates. This would include, for example, estimates of the total number of housing units with complete kitchen facilities. Tables that estimate the sum of a given numeric data item, such as the total income for a geographic area, use a slightly different measure and are referred to as "Aggregate Tables.” ACS and SF3 contain many tables that provide medians, such as median household income and other percentiles of distributions such as B25057 Lower Contract Rent Quartile (in dollars). In this report we classify them as "Median or Quartile Tables.” There are also tables that contain ratios of two estimates, such as "per capita income." These tables are referred to as "Ratio or Rate Tables.”

In Table 6 you can see the prevalence of the various types of tables and the types of tables that changed from SF3 to the ACS. Of the 813 SF3 tables, 459 were iterated survey estimates tables, 276 were noniterated survey estimates, and 78 were either imputation or quality measures tables.

Nearly all SF3 imputation tables have an identical ACS imputation table but none of the SF3 quality measures tables are found in the ACS. All of the SF3 ratio or rate tables for both iterated and noniterated survey estimates have an identical ACS table. The greatest differences are seen in the iterated survey estimates weighted count tables.

Table 5. Comparison of Census 2000 SF3 and ACS Detailed Tables by Subject Area

	Similarity Level												Total
	0 Not Similar		1 Similar, not comparable		2 Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS		3 Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3		4 Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS		5 Similar and comparable - identical		
Subject Area	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**
Age and Sex	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	71.4	0	0.0	3	21.4	**14**
Ancestry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	**4**
Disability	36	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**36**
Earnings	0	0.0	11	44.0	9	36.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	**25**
Employment and Work Status	27	57.4	2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.1	12	25.5	5	10.6	**47**
Fertility	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**
Food Stamps/SNAP	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**
Grandparents	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	**5**
Group Quarters	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**
Hispanic Origin	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	**2**
Household and Family Type	3	14.3	0	0.0	1	4.8	10	47.6	0	0.0	7	33.3	**21**
Housing Characteristics	196	59.8	38	11.6	4	1.2	13	4.0	6	1.8	71	21.6	**328**
Income	0	0.0	34	26.8	0	0.0	4	3.1	0	0.0	89	70.1	**127**
Industry, Occupation, and Class of Worker	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	4	66.7	**6**
Journey to Work	0	0.0	1	4.2	1	4.2	9	37.5	7	33.3	5	20.8	**24**
Language	1	5.3	0	0.0	9	47.4	2	10.5	0	0.0	7	36.8	**19**
Marital Status and Marital History	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	**3**
Migration and Place of Birth - Domestic	2	11.1	13	72.2	2	11.1	0	0.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	**18**
Place of Birth - Foreign: Citizenship and Year of Entry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	78.6	2	14.3	1	7.1	**14**
Poverty	12	20.7	0	0.0	4	6.9	1	1.7	1	1.7	40	69.0	**58**
Quality Measures	3	50.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	**6**
Race	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	**2**
Relationship	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	**4**
School Enrollment and Educational Attainment	9	25.0	1	2.8	1	2.8	19	52.8	2	5.6	4	11.1	**36**
Veteran Status	1	7.1	1	7.1	1	7.1	9	64.3	0	0.0	2	14.3	**14**
ALL SUBJECTS	**292**	**36.0**	**101**	**12.4**	**34**	**4.2**	**98**	**12.0**	**37**	**4.5**	**251**	**30.9**	**813**

Table 6: Comparison of Census 2000 SF3 and ACS Detailed Tables by Type of Table

Similarity Level													
Type of Table	0 Not Similar		1 Similar, not comparable		2 Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS		3 Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3		4 Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS		5 Similar and comparable - identical		Total
	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#
Noniterated Survey Estimates	**52**	**19.0**	**49**	**17.9**	**14**	**5.1**	**33**	**12.0**	**26**	**9.5**	**100**	**36.5**	**274**
Weighted Count Tables	41	20.9	31	15.8	13	6.6	28	14.3	22	11.2	61	31.1	**196**
Aggregate Tables	7	15.2	8	17.4	1	2.2	4	8.7	4	8.7	22	47.8	**46**
Median or Quartile Tables	4	12.9	10	32.3	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0	16	51.6	**31**
Ratio or Rate Tables	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	**1**
Iterated Survey Estimates	**225**	**49.0**	**45**	**9.8**	**18**	**3.9**	**63**	**13.7**	**9**	**2.0**	**99**	**21.6**	**459**
Weighted Count Tables	153	47.2	45	13.9	9	2.8	63	19.4	9	2.8	45	13.9	**324**
Aggregate Tables	27	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	40.0	**45**
Median or Quartile Tables	45	55.6	0	0.0	9	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	27	33.3	**81**
Ratio or Rate Tables	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	**9**
Quality Measures	**4**	**66.7**	**0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0.0**	**2**	**33.3**	**6**
Imputation	**11**	**14.9**	**7**	**9.5**	**2**	**2.7**	**2**	**2.7**	**2**	**2.7**	**50**	**67.6**	**74**
All Tables	**292**	**36.0**	**101**	**12.4**	**34**	**4.2**	**98**	**12.0**	**37**	**4.5**	**251**	**30.9**	**813**

Which ACS detailed tables that are scheduled for release as 5-year estimates were not included in the Census 2000 SF3?

Table 7 summarizes the results of comparing each of the 930 ACS detailed tables to the universe of SF3 tables. For 361 of the 930 ACS tables no SF3 counterparts exist. Identical (or more detailed) SF3 tables exist for about 31 percent of the ACS detailed tables. There are two different instances in which two ACS tables can be collapsed to produce a table that is identical to the same SF3 table. Users interested in comparing ACS data with Census 2000 data can compare estimates from about 444 ACS detailed tables back to a detailed SF3 table. As was noted earlier, specific changes in how the data were collected need to be considered for meaningful comparisons.

Table 7. Comparison of 2005-2009 ACS 5-year and Census 2000 SF3 Detailed Tables

Of the 930 ACS 2005-2009 detailed tables released as 5-year estimates…	Number	Percent
Not Similar - No SF3 detailed table exists that provides estimates of the characteristics included in the ACS detailed table	361	38.8
Similar, not comparable – A SF3 detailed table exists with estimates of characteristics that are similar to those in the ACS detailed table but the estimates in the two tables cannot be compared due to universe differences, major differences in table structure, or fundamental differences in the questions used to collect the data.	125	13.4
Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS – A SF3 detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the ACS detailed table if you collapse the detail of both the ACS and SF3 detailed tables	37	4.0
Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3 – A SF3 detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the ACS detailed table if you collapse the detail of the SF3 detailed table	120	12.9
Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS – A SF3 detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the ACS detailed table if you collapse the detail of the ACS detailed table	36	3.9
Similar and comparable - identical - A SF3 detailed table exists that is identical in both structure and table universe to the ACS table without any collapsing	251	27.0
Total	**930**	**100.0**

It is important to take a closer look at the ACS tables with no similar SF3 table. There are several concepts underlying ACS tables that are not found in SF3 (fertility, income inequality, age at first marriage, characteristics by geographic place of work.) In most instances this is because the questions were not on the 2000 Census form. If these ACS tables are removed from consideration, the total number of ACS detailed tables is much closer to the total number of SF3 tables and, the number of similar tables is much larger. As Table 8 shows, 139, or about 38 percent, of these 361 tables could not have any SF3 counterpart due to major questionnaire differences or to new concepts and measures that were not part of the Census 2000 SF3. In two subject areas, domestic migration and journey to work, the ACS has added a set of tables that are not based on the current residence. Residence 1 year ago is used for domestic migration; the place of work is used for journey to work. No similar tables were produced in SF3.

Table 8. Reasons for ACS Detailed Tables with no similar SF3 Detailed Table

No similar SF3 table due to…	Number	Percent
Questionnaire differences between ACS and SF3 or new concepts in ACS but not in SF3	139	38.5
Census 2000 included this as either an SF1 or an SF4 table	65	18.0
Post Census 2000 redesign by subject matter analysts	157	43.5
Total ACS Tables – Not Similar	**361**	**100.0**

There are several instances in which an ACS table has no similar table in SF3 but one or more similar tables can be found in the Census 2000 Summary File 1 or Summary File 4 data products. This is especially true of the Age and Sex and Race subject areas. In addition, subject matter analysts in the following seven subject areas: Age and Sex; Industry, Occupation, and Class of Worker; Journey to Work; Marital Status and Marital History; Migration and Place of Birth -

Domestic; Place of Birth – Foreign: Citizenship and Year of Entry; and Race designed a large number of new tables. Unlike the 139 tables described earlier, these newly designed tables include concepts and cross tabulations that would have been possible in SF3. Some of these tables were added based on feedback from data users after Census 2000. In Table 8 you can see that there are a total of 157 such tables, explaining most of the reasons for the no similar SF3 tables.

Table 9 provides detail by subject area. As expected, new subject areas such as fertility, marital status and marital history, and food stamps have very high rates of ACS tables with no similar SF3 table. But many subject areas that were included in Census 2000 such as citizenship, grandparents, Hispanic origin, industry, occupation, and class of worker, journey to work, migration and place of birth, quality measures, and race have "not similar" rates of 50 percent or more. This indicates that new tables were developed for these subject areas to replace tables that existed in 2000 with changes that are significant.

With the exception of the new subject areas and disability, every subject area has at least one SF3 table that can be compared to an ACS table[2]. Subject areas with the greatest stability (codes 4 and 5) include employment and work status, income, and poverty.

Table 10 summarizes the comparability of ACS detailed tables with Census 2000 SF3 detailed tables by type of table. Like Table 6, this summary provides results for ACS noniterated and iterated survey estimate tables, quality measures tables and imputation tables. The table categories are the same with one exception. In the ACS there are a small number of tables that employ other types of measures that do not fall into any of the above categories. For example, Table B19083, "GINI index of income inequality" employs a measure of income inequality referred to as the GINI measure. This measure is entirely different from any of the other measures. These tables are collectively referred to as "GINI or other related measure tables."

From the last column of Table 10 we can see that most of the ACS detailed tables are noniterated survey estimate tables, usually in the form of weighted count tables. This contrasts with the highest proportion of tables in SF3 being iterated survey estimate tables. Table 10 indicates that 80 percent of the quality measures tables and nearly half of the noniterated survey estimate tables have no similar table in SF3. A majority of the median and quartile tables for noniterated survey estimates are either not similar or similar but not comparable. Only the iterated aggregate, ratio and rate tables have high proportions of tables that are identical to SF3 tables.

One interesting result shown in Table 10 is that a high proportion of the aggregate tables (those that are often used as numerators in averages) have a similarity level of 4 or 5. Among the table types, the aggregates have the highest percentage of tables that are comparable to SF3 tables followed by medians. This indicates that the derived measures in these tables may be the easiest estimates to compare with SF3.

[2] While the subject area of "migration and place of birth-domestic" was included in Census 2000, the concepts differ significantly making comparisons inappropriate.

Table 9: Comparison of ACS and Census 2000 SF3 Detailed Tables by Subject Area

Similarity Levels													
Subject Area	**0 Not Similar**		**1 Similar, not comparable**		**2 Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS**		**3 Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3**		**4 Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS**		**5 Similar and comparable - identical**		**Total**
	#	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**	**Percent**	**#**
Age and Sex	10	43.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	43.5	0	0.0	3	13.0	**23**
Ancestry	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	42.9	0	0.0	1	14.3	**7**
Disability	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**
Earnings	1	4.0	11	44.0	9	36.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	**25**
Employment and Work Status	6	24.0	2	8.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	11	44.0	5	20.0	**25**
Fertility	18	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**18**
Food Stamps/SNAP	15	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**15**
Grandparents	22	84.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	3	11.5	**26**
Group Quarters	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**1**
Hispanic Origin	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	**4**
Household and Family Type	14	42.4	1	3.0	0	0.0	11	33.3	0	0.0	7	21.2	**33**
Housing Characteristics	26	15.9	38	23.2	4	2.4	19	11.6	6	3.7	71	43.3	**164**
Income	5	3.7	37	27.4	0	0.0	4	3.0	0	0.0	89	65.9	**135**
Industry, Occupation & Class of Worker	32	76.2	3	7.1	1	2.4	2	4.8	0	0.0	4	9.5	**42**
Journey to Work	57	67.1	3	3.5	2	2.4	11	12.9	7	8.2	5	5.9	**85**
Language	4	18.2	0	0.0	9	40.9	2	9.1	0	0.0	7	31.8	**22**
Marital Status and Marital History	21	87.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	2	8.3	**24**
Migration & Place of Birth—Domestic	59	67.8	28	32.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**87**
Place of Birth—Foreign: Citizenship & Year of Entry	30	48.4	0	0.0	4	6.4	22	35.5	5	8.1	1	1.6	**62**
Poverty	9	16.7	0	0.0	3	5.6	2	3.7	0	0.0	40	74.1	**54**
Quality measures	8	66.7	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	**12**
Race	10	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	8.3	**12**
Relationship	5	55.6	0	0.0	1	11.1	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	11.1	**9**
School Enrollment and Educational Attainment	1	3.4	1	3.4	1	3.4	19	65.5	3	10.3	4	13.8	**29**
Veteran Status	3	18.8	1	6.3	1	6.3	9	56.3	0	0.0	2	12.5	**16**
ALL SUBJECTS	**361**	**38.8**	**125**	**13.4**	**37**	**4.0**	**120**	**12.9**	**36**	**3.9**	**251**	**27.0**	**930**

Table10. Comparison of ACS and Census 2000 SF3 Detailed Tables by Type of Table

Similarity Level													
Type of Table	0 Not Similar		1 Similar, not comparable		2 Similar and comparable - must collapse both SF3 and ACS		3 Similar and comparable - must collapse SF3		4 Similar and comparable - must collapse ACS		5 Similar and comparable - identical		Total
	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	#
Noniterated Survey Estimates	**233**	**49.1**	**64**	**13.5**	**17**	**3.6**	**39**	**8.2**	**24**	**5.1**	**98**	**20.6**	**475**
Weighted Count Tables	171	49.9	43	12.5	16	4.7	33	9.6	21	6.1	59	17.2	**343**
Aggregate Tables	10	20.8	8	16.7	1	2.1	5	10.4	3	6.3	21	43.8	**48**
Median or Quartile Tables	50	64.9	10	13.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	16	20.8	**77**
Ratio or Rate Tables	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	**3**
GINI or other related measure	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**4**
Iterated Survey Estimates	**108**	**29.3**	**54**	**14.6**	**18**	**4.9**	**79**	**21.4**	**9**	**2.4**	**101**	**27.4**	**369**
Weighted Count Tables	90	31.3	54	18.8	9	3.1	79	27.4	9	3.1	47	16.3	**288**
Aggregate Tables	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	100.0	**18**
Median or Quartile Tables	18	33.3	0	0.0	9	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	27	50.0	**54**
Ratio or Rate Tables	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	**9**
Quality Measures	**8**	**66.7**	**0**	**0.0**	**2**	**16.7**	**0**	**0.0**	**0**	**0.0**	**2**	**16.7**	**12**
Imputation	**12**	**16.2**	**7**	**9.5**	**0**	**0.0**	**2**	**2.7**	**3**	**4.1**	**50**	**67.6**	**74**
All Tables	**361**	**38.8**	**125**	**13.4**	**37**	**4.0**	**120**	**12.9**	**36**	**3.9**	**251**	**27.0**	**930**

While a total of 930 ACS detailed tables are being produced, only a subset of these tables were released on American FactFinder for the first ACS 5-year release.[3] Some of the most detailed tables were only released in summary file format. This means that it was harder for data users to access these tables. Table 11 summarizes the tables that were only released in summary file format- the tables that did not reside on American FactFinder. Results are provided by subject area. Large proportions of the ACS tables on fertility, food stamps, grandparents, industry, occupation, and class of worker, language, marital status and marital history, migration and place of birth-domestic will only be accessible as summary files.

Also included is a breakout by similarity level using the two extremes, similarity level 0 and similarity levels 4 and 5. Recall that levels 4 and 5 mean that an identical or more detailed SF3 table exists that could be compared to an ACS table. About 75 percent of the ACS tables with no similar SF3 table will only be released in summary file format while virtually all of those tables with the highest similarity level result will be released on American FactFinder.

[3] Future data releases may include the full set of detailed tables on American FactFinder.

Table 11. Summary of ACS Detailed Tables Released only in Summary File Format

Subject Area	Across all Similarity Levels			Similarity Level = 0			Similarity Level = 4 or 5		
	Total ACS Detailed Tables	Released only in Summary File Format		Total ACS Detailed Tables	Released only in Summary File Format		Total ACS Detailed Tables	Released only in Summary File Format	
		#	Percent		#	Percent		#	Percent
Age and Sex	23	0	0.0	10	0	0.0	3	0	0.0
Ancestry	7	2	28.6	3	2	66.7	1	0	0.0
Earnings	25	1	4.0	1	1	100.0	3	0	0.0
Employment and Work Status	25	6	24.0	6	6	100.0	16	0	0.0
Fertility	18	14	77.8	18	14	77.8	0	0	0.0
Food Stamps/SNAP	15	13	86.7	15	13	86.7	0	0	0.0
Grandparents	26	20	76.9	22	20	90.9	3	0	0.0
Group Quarters	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
Hispanic Origin	4	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0
Household and Family Type	33	1	3.0	14	1	7.1	7	0	0.0
Housing Characteristics	164	24	14.6	26	23	88.5	77	0	0.0
Income	135	6	4.4	5	3	60.0	89	0	0.0
Industry, Occupation and Class of Worker	42	33	78.6	32	29	90.6	4	0	0.0
Journey to Work	85	41	48.2	57	39	68.4	12	1	8.3
Language	22	13	59.1	4	4	100.0	7	0	0.0
Marital Status and Marital History	24	21	87.5	21	21	100.0	3	0	0.0
Migration & Place of Birth - Domestic	87	57	65.5	59	57	96.6	0	0	0.0
Place of Birth – Foreign: Citizenship and Year of Entry	62	27	43.5	30	26	86.7	6	0	0.0
Poverty	54	10	18.5	9	9	100.0	40	0	0.0
Quality measures	12	0	0.0	8	0	0.0	2	0	0.0
Race	12	0	0.0	10	0	0.0	2	0	0.0
Relationship	9	2	22.2	5	2	40.0	1	0	0.0
School Enrollment and Educational Attainment	29	1	3.4	1	1	100.0	7	0	0.0
Veteran Status	16	3	18.8	3	3	100.0	2	0	0.0
ALL SUBJECTS	**930**	**295**	**31.7**	**361**	**274**	**75.9**	**287**	**1**	**0.3**

Why were decisions made to drop certain SF3 tables or add new ACS tables?

There were a variety of reasons for the decisions made by the subject matter analysts to change the ACS detailed tables. This included adding new tables, deleting tables from the SF3 set of detailed tables, or altering the structure of existing SF3 tables (shrinking or expanding the detail of the table.) This research question could not be fully answered by subject matter experts for a variety of reasons including staff turnover and lack of full documentation. The subject area with the greatest reduction in tables was "Housing Characteristics". The analyst responsible for the tables for housing characteristics provided the following reasons for some of these changes.

Why was the emphasis on "specified" units in SF3 not carried over into the ACS?

In Census 2000 SF3 data products, the financial housing data were provided for specified owner-occupied units in order to maintain comparability with data from earlier censuses. Prior

to 1990, much of the owner-occupied housing inventory was comprised of single-family homes, either detached or attached. The specified owner-occupied universe used to present financial housing characteristics such as property values and housing costs captured the predominant housing structure type occupied by U.S. homeowners after the end of World War II through the 1980's. The housing market began to change during the 1990's as single family homes became more expensive. Increasing numbers of units in multiunit structures were constructed and sold as condominiums in the 1990's since these types of structures were more affordable and often times located in areas closer to employment centers in large cities and metropolitan areas. Mobile homes also provided more opportunity for lower-income owners to purchase homes in rural areas and the outer suburbs. Consequently, the data from Census 2000 provided financial information for all owner-occupied homes as well as the more restricted universe of single-family homes on less than 10 acres without a business or medical office on the property.

We abandoned the concept of the specified owner-occupied universe in the ACS in order to provide housing data for all owned units. In many areas of the country, including New York City, Chicago, and San Francisco, a large proportion of the owner-occupied inventory consisted of multi-units purchased through condominium or cooperative basis.

Why were so many of the race iterated housing tables dropped?

Many of the race iterated tables were deleted because the data were readily available elsewhere. For the decennial data, all tables in SF3 are available in SF4, which is itself iterated by every race group. In ACS, race data are available in the race iterated selected population profile. While not as much data are available in the profile as would be in iterated tables, we decided not to include it due to the restriction of data availability by small sample numbers.

Appendix A

Example 1

Similarity Level 5 - ACS table B10050 is identical in both structure and universe to SF3 table PCT8

ACS Table

B10050. GRANDPARENTS LIVING WITH OWN GRANDCHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS BY RESPONSIBILITY FOR OWN GRANDCHILDREN BY LENGTH OF TIME RESPONSIBLE FOR OWN GRANDCHILDREN FOR THE POPULATION 30 YEARS AND OVER - Universe: POPULATION 30 YEARS AND OVER

SF3 Table

PCT8. GRANDPARENTS LIVING WITH OWN GRANDCHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS BY RESPONSIBILITY FOR OWN GRANDCHILDREN BY LENGTH OF TIME RESPONSIBLE FOR GRANDCHILDREN FOR THE POPULATION 30 YEARS AND OVER IN HOUSEHOLDS [10] - Universe: Population 30 years and over in households

Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

	United States	
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)
Total:	177,110,502	21,737
Living with own grandchildren under 18 years:	6,221,444	30,930
Grandparent responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years:	2,526,195	19,963
Grandparent responsible less than 6 months	307,166	6,601
Grandparent responsible 6 to 11 months	271,011	5,919
Grandparent responsible 1 or 2 years	597,648	8,541
Grandparent responsible 3 or 4 years	410,919	7,983
Grandparent responsible 5 years or more	939,451	11,360
Grandparent not responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years	3,695,249	20,822
Not living with own grandchildren under 18 years	170,889,058	43,634

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data

	United States
Total:	158,881,037
Living with own grandchildren under 18 years:	5,771,671
Grandparent responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years:	2,426,730
Less than 6 months	293,045
6 to 11 months	262,623
1 or 2 years	563,403
3 or 4 years	374,251
5 years or more	933,408
Grandparent not responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years	3,344,941
Not living with own grandchildren under 18 years	153,109,366

Example 2

Similarity Level 4 - Combine cells across the age dimension from C23002A to produce a table identical to SF3 table P150A

ACS Table

C23002A. SEX BY AGE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR THE POPULATION 16 YEARS AND OVER (WHITE ALONE) - Universe: WHITE ALONE POPULATION 16 YEARS AND OVER

Geographic Area: United States
Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)
Total:	179,606,360	45,683
Male:	87,768,590	28,069
16 to 64 years:	74,027,176	27,896
In labor force:	60,535,053	38,267
In Armed Forces	703,052	9,408
Civilian:	59,832,001	39,289
Employed	56,528,569	43,512
Unemployed	3,303,432	17,421
Not in labor force	13,492,123	35,222
65 years and over:	13,741,414	4,563
In labor force:	2,799,241	8,669
Employed	2,700,889	9,274
Unemployed	98,352	2,935
Not in labor force	10,942,173	9,692
Female:	91,837,770	24,908
16 to 64 years:	73,237,475	23,808
In labor force:	51,660,072	43,240
In Armed Forces	97,819	4,180
Civilian:	51,562,253	43,300
Employed	48,809,493	42,678
Unemployed	2,752,760	15,168
Not in labor force	21,577,403	43,738
65 years and over:	18,600,295	5,583
In labor force:	2,102,261	10,675
Employed	2,033,814	11,027
Unemployed	68,447	2,258
Not in labor force	16,498,034	11,375

SF3 Table

P150A. SEX BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR THE POPULATION 16 YEARS AND OVER (WHITE ALONE) [15] - Universe: White alone population 16 years and over

Geographic Area: United States
Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3

Total:	167,359,106
Male:	81,072,654
In labor force:	58,495,465
In Armed Forces	714,774
Civilian:	57,780,691
Employed	55,099,441
Unemployed	2,681,250
Not in labor force	22,577,189
Female:	86,286,452
In labor force:	49,583,861
In Armed Forces	96,248
Civilian:	49,487,613
Employed	47,225,521
Unemployed	2,262,092
Not in labor force	36,702,591

Example 3

Similarity Level 3 - Combine cells in SF3 table PCT65B to produce table identical in structure and universe to ACS table B08105B

ACS Table				**SF3 Table**	
B08105B. MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK (BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN ALONE) - Universe: BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN ALONE WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER				PCT65B. MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK FOR WORKERS 16 YEARS AND OVER (BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN ALONE) [16] - Universe: Black or African American alone workers 16 years and over	
Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates				Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data	
	United States				
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)			**United States**
Total:	14,981,193	29,637		Total:	12,820,103
Car, truck, or van - drove alone	10,601,779	30,961		Car, truck, or van:	10,489,848
Car, truck, or van - carpooled	1,591,515	13,574		Drove alone	8,442,110
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	1,752,181	14,507		Carpooled	2,047,738
Walked	430,826	7,041		Public transportation:	1,567,025
Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other means	269,623	6,824		Bus or trolley bus	981,531
Worked at home	335,269	6,642		Streetcar or trolley car (publico in Puerto Rico)	11,773
				Subway or elevated	439,178
				Railroad	76,206
				Ferryboat	4,035
				Taxicab	54,302
				Motorcycle	5,597
				Bicycle	33,856
				Walked	413,495
				Other means	119,960
				Worked at home	190,322

Example 4

Similarity Level 2 - Combine cells across the sex dimension in ACS table B14005; combine armed forces and civilian cells in SF3 table P38 - note that armed forces are considered to be employed and in the labor force.

B14005. SEX BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR THE POPULATION 16 TO 19 YEARS - Universe: POPULATION 16 TO 19 YEARS

Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

	United States	
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)
Total:	17,364,134	21,382
Male:	8,917,279	16,198
Enrolled in school:	7,318,351	18,701
Employed	2,153,244	12,684
Unemployed	616,161	5,749
Not in labor force	4,548,946	15,409
Not enrolled in school:	1,598,928	13,963
High school graduate:	939,472	8,933
Employed	604,983	7,435
Unemployed	145,360	3,493
Not in labor force	189,129	4,311
Not high school graduate:	659,456	9,454
Employed	266,201	5,399
Unemployed	119,515	3,160
Not in labor force	273,740	5,442
Female:	8,446,855	13,669
Enrolled in school:	7,222,379	17,528
Employed	2,457,691	14,417
Unemployed	544,251	7,174
Not in labor force	4,220,437	14,502
Not enrolled in school:	1,224,476	12,534
High school graduate:	761,045	9,579
Employed	443,941	8,038
Unemployed	108,416	2,938
Not in labor force	208,688	4,686
Not high school graduate:	463,431	8,139
Employed	140,268	3,520
Unemployed	76,297	2,721
Not in labor force	246,866	5,425

P38. ARMED FORCES STATUS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR THE POPULATION 16 TO 19 YEARS [22] - Universe: Population 16 to 19 years
Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data

	United States
Total:	15,930,458
In Armed Forces:	102,613
Enrolled in school:	13,744
High school graduate	11,295
Not high school graduate	2,449
Not enrolled in school:	88,869
High school graduate	85,014
Not high school graduate	3,855
Civilian:	15,827,845
Enrolled in school:	12,695,865
Employed	4,746,742
Unemployed	1,026,572
Not in labor force	6,922,551
Not enrolled in school:	3,131,980
High school graduate:	1,569,796
Employed	1,024,491
Unemployed	194,273
Not in labor force	351,032
Not high school graduate:	1,562,184
Employed	684,206
Unemployed	254,037
Not in labor force	623,941

Example 5

Similarity Level 1 - ACS table B25054 is identical to SF3 table H52 in content and structure. However, the SF3 table restricted the universe to "specified" renter-occupied units. There is no way to isolate this part of the universe of the ACS table. Thus, the two tables cannot be compared, although they are similar.

ACS Table

B25054. KITCHEN FACILITIES BY MEALS INCLUDED IN RENT - Universe: RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS PAYING CASH RENT
Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

SF3 Table

H52. KITCHEN FACILITIES BY MEALS INCLUDED IN RENT [7] - Universe: Specified renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent

Data set: Census 2000 Summary File 3

	United States			
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)		**United States**
Total:	34,852,880	78,647	Total:	33,386,326
Complete kitchen facilities:	34,398,825	77,732	Complete kitchen facilities:	32,959,311
Meals included in rent	460,711	5,929	Meals included in rent	414,356
No meals included in rent	33,938,114	77,403	No meals included in rent	32,544,955
Lacking complete kitchen facilities:	454,055	6,811	Lacking complete kitchen facilities:	427,015
Meals included in rent	143,108	3,608	Meals included in rent	103,374
No meals included in rent	310,947	5,788	No meals included in rent	323,641

Example 6

Similarity Level 0 - There is no SF3 table similar to this ACS table. However, SF1 table P13 is identical to this ACS table.

B01002. MEDIAN AGE BY SEX - Universe: TOTAL POPULATION

Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

	United States	
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)
Median age --		
Total:	36.7	0.1
Male	35.4	0.1
Female	38	0.1

Example 7

Similarity Level 0 - There is no SF3 table that breaks out median earnings by educational attainment levels.

B20004. MEDIAN EARNINGS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2008 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS) BY SEX BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR THE POPULATION 25 YEARS AND OVER - Universe: POPULATION 25 YEARS AND OVER WITH EARNINGS
Data Set: 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates

	United States	
	Estimate	Margin of Error (+/-)
Total:	34,483	44
Less than high school graduate	19,989	53
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	27,448	28
Some college or associate's degree	33,838	51
Bachelor's degree	47,853	81
Graduate or professional degree	63,174	115
Male:	41,298	49
Less than high school graduate	23,638	97
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	33,506	74
Some college or associate's degree	41,861	58
Bachelor's degree	59,079	163
Graduate or professional degree	79,276	210
Female:	28,104	43
Less than high school graduate	14,682	54
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	21,711	35
Some college or associate's degree	27,663	62
Bachelor's degree	39,571	79
Graduate or professional degree	52,301	100

Example 8

Similarity Level 0 - Although ACS does have a table, B17018, that deals crosses poverty status with educational attainment of householder in family households, there is no ACS table like this SF3 table for unrelated individuals.

PCT56. POVERTY STATUS IN 1999 OF UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS BY HOUSEHOLDER STATUS (INCLUDING LIVING ALONE) BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT [23] - Universe: Unrelated individuals for whom poverty status is determined

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data

	United States
Total:	47,140,624
Income in 1999 below poverty level:	10,721,935
Nonfamily householder:	5,783,292
Living alone:	4,616,293
High school graduate	2,705,897
Not high school graduate	1,910,396
Not living alone:	1,166,999
High school graduate	909,963
Not high school graduate	257,036
Other unrelated individuals:	4,938,643
High school graduate	2,974,031
Not high school graduate	1,964,612
Income in 1999 at or above poverty level:	36,418,689
Nonfamily householder:	27,494,050
Living alone:	22,587,431
High school graduate	18,883,686
Not high school graduate	3,703,745
Not living alone:	4,906,619
High school graduate	4,384,734
Not high school graduate	521,885
Other unrelated individuals:	8,924,639
High school graduate	7,198,726
Not high school graduate	1,725,913