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Approximately 3.3 million people had gross assets of $\$ 500,000$ or more in 1986 according to estimates of personal wealth derived from estate tax returns using the "estate multiplier technique." These individuals, the Nation's "top wealthholders," represented only 1.6 percent of the Nation's adult population [1]. Their net worth was nearly $\$ 3.8$ trillion and accounted for approximately 28.5 percent of the personal wealth in the United States in 1986 [2]. In contrast, 2.2 million people had gross assets of $\$ 500,000$ or more in 1982 [3]. The net worth of these top wealthholders was approximately $\$ 2.1$ trillion.

Just as the total number of top wealthholders increased between 1982 and 1986, so too did the number of millionaires among them. Approximately 941,000 individuals had a net worth of $\$ 1$ million or more in 1986, nearly twice the 475,000 in 1982. This followed a sharp increase from the 180,000 millionaires estimated for 1976.

## ESTIMATING PERSONAL WEALTH FROM ESTATE TAX RETURNS

The measurement of personal wealth in the United States has attracted considerable attention in recent years. This interest has been stimulated by a number of factors. The effects of changes in the tax law, and other public policies, on the economy and on the concentration of wealth has focused attention on this subject. Accurate and comprehensive estimates of wealth, however, are difficult to obtain because individuals are not required to regularly report wealth information on any tax return or other public document. Several alternative approaches, each with its own merits, have been developed [4]. The estimates presented here are based on the "estate multiplier technique." This approach utilizes administrative records, in particular, estate tax returns filed for the deceased, to estimate the wealth of the living population.

The estate multiplier technique can be used to estimate wealth for all individuals whose assets exceed the estate filing requirement in effect for a particular year. While the increase in the filing requirement from $\$ 60 ; 000$ for decedents who died in 1976 to $\$ 500,000$ for those who died in 1986 has served to limit the scope of the estimates, the estate tax return still serves as a valuable source of information on the wealthy. From these returns, estimates of wealth can be provided for the top 1 to 2 percent of the Nation's wealthholders; that is, those individuals or "top wealthholders" who control the largest portion of the personal wealth in the United States. (The estimation technique is discussed in greater detail later.)

The estimates of personal wealth in 1986 are the result of continuing efforts by the Internal Revenue Service to improve the accuracy of the data [5]. In the past, wealth estimates, such as the preliminary estimates for 1982, were derived from the Statistics of Income sample of estate tax returns filed in a particular year [6]. Because a decedent's estate has up to 9 months to file an estate tax return and an extension of 6 months is not uncommon, returns filed in a given year can include deaths that occurred over several years. Thus, wealth estimates generated from a sample selected on a filing year basis actually reflected the value of wealth held during several years, and are therefore subject to different economic conditions based on the year of death.

The personal wealth estimates for 1986 presented here are based on estate tax returns filed from 1986 through 1988 for individuals who died in 1986 [7]. By sampling returns filed over this 3 -year period, the returns filed for nearly all individuals who died in 1986 can be captured. By looking at the wealth of a single year, rather than a series of years, the estimates more accurately reflect wealth at a particular time.

[^0]As the level of gross estate (or gross assets) required for filing an estate tax return has increased, the definition of top wealthholders also has changed. The level of wealth to which these estimates apply is $\$ 500,000$ or more of gross assets. The gross estate criterion is a Federal estate tax concept of wealth that does not conform to the usual definitions of wealth, primarily because it includes the face value of life insurance in the wealth of the decedent. Therefore, three measures of wealth are used in this article: gross assets (or gross estate), total assets, and net worth.

Gross assets refiect the gross value of all assets, including the full face value of life insurance reduced by policy loans but excluding any reduction for other indebtedness [8]. This measure defines the individuals included in the top wealthholder group. The amount of total assets, a lower wealth value; is still essentially a gross measure. Total assets differs from gross assets in that the cash value of life insurance, i.e., the value of insurance immediately before the policyholder's death, replaces the "at death" value of life insurance included in gross assets [9]. Net worth, the level of wealth after all debts have been removed, also includes the cash value of life insurance.

## PERSONAL WEEALTH IN 1986

Female wealthholders accounted for 41.2 per$\checkmark$ cent of the 3.3 million top wealthholders in 1986 (see Figure A) compared with 36.9 percent at a corresponding level in 1982. While this increase continued a recent trend, it was also due, in part, to a change in the estate tax law in 1982. This change permitted bequests to the surviving spouse of a decedent to go untaxed.

Figure A.-Top Wealthholders With Gross Assets of

[Number of wealthholders in thousands; amounts in billions]

| Hem | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of top wealthnolders | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | 3,329 | 1,957 | 1,372 |
| Total assets | \$4,321 | \$2,557 | \$1,764 |
| Debts and mortgages | 554 | 395 | 160 |
| Net worth....................................... | 3,767 | 2,163 | 1.604 |
| Average net worth | 1.131 | 1.105 | 1,169 |

Note: Detail does not add to totals because of rounding

Women, holding 42.6 percent of the net worth of top wealthholders, were on average wealthier and had fewer debts than their male counterparts. Their
average net worth was 6 percent higher than that of male top wealthholders. The debt burden, i.e., amounts owed as debts and mortgages, of women was only 9 percent of their total assets compared to 15.4 percent for men. In part because they had fewer debts, just 15 percent of the female top wealthholders had net worth below $\$ 500,000$, while nearly one third of the male top wealthholders had net worth below that level.

## Composition of Assets

In 1986, corporate stock constituted the largest share of the assets held by top wealthholders (see Figure B). This is a departure from the portfolio mix observed in 1981 and 1982 when real estate was the predominant asset. Previous to that, corporate stock comprised the largest share of the portfolio of the wealthy. Considering the relative performance of the real estate and stock markets between 1982 and 1986, this reversal was not unexpected. The Dow Jones Industrial Average more than doubled during this period, rising 103 percent; while the Price Index of-New-One-Family-Houses Sold rose a comparatively modest 14 percent $[10,11]$.

Once again, cash at 9.3 percent of the assets was the third most commonly held asset. Bonds and noncorporate business assets; however, switched positions of importance [12]: The share of assets held as bonds increased from 7 percent in 1982 to 9 percent in 1986, while noncorporate business assets remained constant at 7.5 percent. With 70 percent of the bonds held by top wealthholders consisting of State and local Government bonds, the 56 percent increase in the Standard and Poor's Municipal Bond Price index during this period provides some insight into the increase [10].

A look at the composition of assets by sex shows that the share of wealth held in the form of corporate stock was similar for men and women. Real estate, the other major asset in the portfolio of the wealthy, represented a slightly larger share of the wealth of females, 30 percent compared to 28 percent for males. Noteworthy differences in the proportion of assets held by men and women were observed for several other types of assets. Bonds made up 11.2 percent of women's assets in 1986, compared with 7.5 percent for men. Conversely, wealth held by men was characterized by a greater concentration in noncorporate business assets, nearly 9 percent, compared with only 5.7 percent for women. An examination of all other asset types shows that notes

Figure B
Top Wealthholders, by Type of Asset and Sex, 1986


Type of Asset
and mortgages and life insurance constituted a more significant portion of the assets of men, while cash represented a greater share of the assets of women. Another noteworthy difference in the portfolios of men and women was in the share of assets held as "other assets." ("Other assets" includes intangible and depletable assets, annuities, pensions, and personal property.) Nearly 12 percent of the assets of men were classified as "other assets" compared with just 8.3 percent for women.

Although corporate stock constituted the greatest share of assets in the portfolio of top wealthholders, the proportions of wealth held as corporate stock and real estate were quite different for millionaires and "sub-millionaires," that is, those top wealthholders whose net worth was less than $\$ 1$ million (see Figure C). Corporate stock made up more than 36 percent of the assets of millionaires while just 23.6 percent of their assets were held as real estate. In contrast, real estate accounted for over 37 percent of the assets of sub-millionaires while 19.5 percent
of their assets were in corporate stock. In 1982, nearly 42 percent of the assets of sub-millionaires were held as real estate.

Cash and bonds were held in quite different proportions by the two groups. Whereas cash represented more than 12 percent of the assets of the less wealthy group, they were, at 7.5 percent, a less significant asset in the portfolio of millionaires. Proportionately, millionaires held more corporate stock, bonds, and noncorporate business assets, and less real estate, cash, notes and mortgages, life insurance and "other assets," than the sub-millionaires.

## Geographic Distribution of Wealth

Estimates of personal wealth using the estate multiplier technique for a limited population, for instance, by state, are subject to high variance making it difficult to reliably estimate wealth for the extremely wealthy. Thus, the estimates by state presented

Figure C
Top Wealthholders With Net Worth
Under $\$ 1,000,000,1986$


Percentage

Top Wealthholders With Net Worth \$1,000,000 or Rhore, 1986


NOTE: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.
here are limited to those individuals whose net worth is not in excess of $\$ 10$ million. (Only 25,000 top wealthholders were excluded from these estimates.)

In 1986, nearly 560,000 of these 3.3 million top wealthholders in the United States lived in California. New York, with 340,000 , had the second highest number of top wealthholders, displacing Texas, which dropped to third. Florida with its rapid growth and attractive tax policy (no State income tax) was a close fourth behind Texas whose economy showed the effects of the decline in oil prices.

Looking at wealth on a per capita basis presents a somewhat different picture of wealth in this country by eliminating the distortions caused by the large populations of some states. For instance, Connecticut; the 25th most populous state (adults), had the highest concentration of top wealthholders, 327 per 10,000 adults [13]. This compared with the 198 top wealthholders per 10,000 adults for the Nation. California with 17 percent of the Nation's top wealthholders and 11 percent of the adult population, still had the third highest concentration of top wealthholders with 299 per 10,000. On the other hand, Pennsylvania, ranked seventh in the number of top wealthholders, had a relatively low concentration of wealthy individuals, just 134 per 10,000 adults. As shown in Figure D, wealth appears to be more heavily concentrated in the Southwest--with the exception of New Mexico-and in the Northeast.

## ESTATE RHULTIPLIER TECHNIQUE

Researchers have been using the estate multiplier technique since the beginning of the 20th century to draw conclusions about the wealth of the living population through knowledge of the wealth of the deceased [14]. (Financial records were used as early as 1864 to estimate total personal wealth by a related technique) The technique assumes that estate tax returns taken as a whole represent a random sample, designated by death, of the living population. Death, however, is not a truly random event and therefore is not a simple representative sample of the living population under consideration. It does, however, provide a means of producing reasonable estimates of personal wealth utilizing existing data.

The probability that a person will die in a given year depends on the particulars of one's life. Age and sex are usually taken as indicators of these conditions.

Figure D
Concentration of Top Wealthholders With Net Worth Less Than $\$ 10,000,000$, by State, 1986


NOTE: The median concentration of top wealthholders by State was 143 to 183 per 10,000 adults.

If one knows the mortality rate and the number of deaths for each age and sex group, one can approximate the population of living wealthholders [15].

Vital to the estimation of personal wealth is the use of a mortality rate appropriate to the top wealthholder population. This is essential to the estimates because there is much evidence that the wealthy have mortality rates that are lower than those of the population as a whole. In other words, social class also is a determinant in the "selection of the sample" [16]. Therefore, an adjustment to the general mortality rates is necessary.

The mortality rates assumed to approximate those of the wealthy are based on the mortality experience of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's preferred-risk policyholders [17]. As part of the effort to improve the accuracy of these estimates, the Internal Revenue Service developed new mortality differentials based on Metropolitan Life data for a series of years. Thus, the effect of the sampling variance of death has been reduced. Multipliers are then derived using the inverse of the adjusted mortality rates for each decedent according to age and sex. These multipliers, applied to sampled estate tax return data, produce wealth estimates for the living population.

The estimates of personal wealth for 1986 are based on a stratified sample of estate tax returns filed between 1986 and 1988 for individuals dying in 1986. This approach, first used for the updated 1982 estimates, is a departure from the filing year approach used for the preliminary 1982 estimates and for the estimates for earlier studies [3,5].

The strength of the estate multiplier technique is due, in part, to the large sample size. The 13,694 returns sampled during the 3 -year period for 1986 decedents was considerably larger than the samples selected for other studies for comparable levels of wealth. Yet, despite the large overall sample size, the limited number of returns filed each year for decedents who were young (under 40 years of age) or very wealthy (gross assets of $\$ 5$ million or more) can make results for these categories subject to considerable variance.

Death's achieved sample of these relatively young and very wealthy decedents in a given year can
distort estimates of the wealth of the living. Death samples at varying rates which tend to average out over a period of years. This can result in large short-term fluctuations for a given year. When death "selects" a smaller sample, i.e., fewer deaths for a segment of the population during a sample year, wealth estimates of that segment will be lower than the true population values. Similarly, too large a sample produces estimates that overstate the wealth of the population:

In order to reduce the variability of the estimates, the sample of estate tax returns is designed so that it is stratified by age as well as by size of gross estate. All returns filed for both the very wealthy (those with gross estates of $\$ 5$ million or more) and the young (those under 40 years of age) were selected for the study. Thus, the sampling variance introduced by the IRS sample for returns of relatively young or wealthy decedents was eliminated.

The variability of the final estimates for very wealthy and relatively young individuals was further reduced by including in the sample all returns filed for non-1986 decedents during the 3 -year period. These segments of the sample were then poststratified and reweighted to represent the true 1986 decedent population. This technique reduces the affect of outliers on the estimates of the type and amount of wealth for the young and very wealthy.

Further adjustments to the estimation technique have been incorporated in a continuing effort to improve the accuracy of the estimates. The use of returns for a particular year of death filed during a 3 -year period is dependent upon all or nearly all the returns being filed timely for that year, or, alternatively, an awareness of the number of missing or yet-tobe filed returns. Data for prior years have enabled us to estimate the number of unfiled returns for 1986 decedents. This adjustment proved to be age dependent since the likeiiinood of the reiurn being iiied timely increases with the decedent's age.

Basing the estimates on returns for a single year of death eliminated much of the distortion of inflation on the estimates. However, the problem was not entirely eliminated due to the use of all returns for the young and wealthy decedents regardless of the year of death. Money amounts for these individuals were converted to 1986 dollars to further reduce the effects of inflation on the estimates.

## SUMMARY

For 1986, approximately 3.3 million people--1.6 percent of the adult population of the United States--held gross assets of $\$ 500,000$ or more. The net worth of these individuals was nearly $\$ 3.8$ trillion and accounted for almost 28.5 percent of the personal wealth in this country.

Wealthy women, although still the minority of top wealthholders, nevertheless increased their representation from just under 37 percent in 1982 to 41.2 percent in 1986. Their average net worth, $\$ 1,169,000$ was 6 percent higher than that of male top wealthholders.

Corporate stock constituted the largest share of the assets held by top wealthholders. Real estate, the predominant asset in the portfolio of the wealthy in 1982, comprised the next largest share of the assets. Together they represented nearly 59 percent of the assets of top wealthholders.

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

## Sample Selection Criteria

The 1986 estimates of personal wealth are based on data from a sample of estate tax returns, Form 706, processed by the Internal Revenue Service between 1986 and 1988. The sample was stratified according to the year of death and age of the decedent, along with the size of the gross estate. The returns were selected during the 3 -year period at annual rates that ranged from 7 percent to 100 percent with weights appropriate to each year maintained.

Of the returns filed during the 1986-1988 period, only those filed for individuals dying in 1986 were selected, with two exceptions. All returns for the very wealthy (those with gross estates of $\$ 5$ million or more) and individuals under 40 years of age were selected, regardless of the year of death. The estate sample weights for those returns were adjusted accordingly. Other returns filed during this period for individuals who died in years other than 1986 were not used for these estimates.

## Limitations

Because the data in this article are estimated on the basis of a sample of estate tax returns filed with the Internal Revenue Service, they are subject to
sampling as well as nonsampling error. For proper use of the statistical data, the magnitude of the potential sampling error should be considered. Estimates of the coefficients of variation (CV's) for frequency estimates can be obtained by writing the authors at the Internal Revenue Service, Statistics of Income Division R:S:F, P.O. Box 2608, Washington, DC 20013-2608.

Estimates of personal wealth using the estate multiplier technique are subject to further limitations. Since the data are obtained prior to audit, the possibility exists of some understatement of the value of certain assets. This and other issues concerning the accuracy of these estimates are discussed by Scheuren and McCubbin in an earlier publication [5].
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Table 1.-All Top Wealthholders with Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More, by Size of Net Worth
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-numbers are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


[^1]*Estimate should be used with caution because of the small number of sampled estate tax returns on which it is based
Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding

Table 2.—All Male: Top Wealthholders with Gross Assets of $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ or More, by Size of Net Worth
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


[^2]Table 3.—All Female: Top Wealthholders with Gross Assets of $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ or More, by Size of Net Worth
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]

| Size of net worth | rotal assets |  | Debts and mortgages |  | Net worth |  | Total assets by type |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Real estate |  |  |
|  | Number | Amount |  |  | Number | Amount | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Total .............................. | 1,372.0 | 1,763,838 | 1,200.5 | 159,824 | 1,372.0 | 1,604,014 | 1,238.4 | 527,132 |
| Under \$250,000 ${ }^{1}$ | 42.7 | 15.159 | 40.0 | 9.476 | 42.7 | 5,683 | 38.3 | 8,900 |
| \$250,000 under \$500,000 ................ | 159.8 | 95,499 | 148.7 | 28,875 | 159.8 | 66,623 | 151.8 | 51,317 |
| \$500,000 under \$1,000,000 ............... | 759.3 | 564,703 | 641.6 | 42,138 | 759.3 | 522,565 | 675.6 | 201.414 |
| \$1,000,000 under \$2,500,000 ............. | 320.9 | 505,853 | 287.6 | 34,700 | 320.9 | 471.153 | 290.3 | 152,366 |
| \$2,500,000 under \$5,000,000 ............. | 57.3 | 217.748 | 53.3 | 22,872 | 57.3 | 194.876 | 51.9 | 56,228 |
| \$5,000,000 under \$10,000,000 ........... | 23.3 | 169.900 | 21.1 | 12.979 | 23.3 | 156,921 | 22.0 | 37,682 |
| \$10,000,000 or more.......................... | 8.7 | 194,976 | 8.2 | 8,784 | 8.7 | 186, 192 | 8.5 | 19.224 |
| Total assets by type (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size of net worth | Corporate stock |  | Cash |  | Noncorporate business assets |  | Bonds |  |
|  |  |  | Total bonds |  |  |
|  | Number | Amount |  |  | Number | Amount | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
|  | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) |
| Total ...................................... | 1,113.0 | 539,981 | 1,343.8 | 189,860 | 429.8 | 99,923 | 779.8 | 197,273 |
| Under \$250,000 ${ }^{1}$............................. | 21.3 | 857 | 40.3 | 1.172 | 10.5 | 678 | *2.6 | *73 |
| \$250,000 under \$500,000 ................. | 116.4 | 12,578 | 153.3 | 9.421 | 58.6 | 3,285 | 43.4 | 1,941 |
| \$500,000 under \$1,000,000. | 611.2 | 118,347 | 747.3 | 90,751 | 187.3 | 19.998 | 456.3 | 57,372 |
| \$1,000,000 under \$2,500,000 ............ | 280.9 | 136,689 | 315.3 | 55.055 | 128.9 | 38,345 | 218.1 | 63.163 |
| \$2.500,000 under \$5,000,000 :............. | 52.7 | 85,577 | 55.7 | 14,693 | 27.0 | 11,266 | 36.9 | 28,479 |
| \$5.000.000 under \$10,000,000 ............ | 22.1 | 73,998 | 23.2 | 9,068 | 12.3 | 10,660 | 15.7 | 24,251 |
| \$10,000,000 or more.......................... | 8.4 | 111,936 | 8.6 | 9,700 | 5.3 | 15,691 | 6.8 | 21,995 |
| Total assets by type (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size of net worth | Bonds (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | State and local bonds |  | Corporate and foreign bonds |  | Federal savings bonds |  | Other Federal bonds |  |
|  | Number | Amount | Number | Amount | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
| Total ...................................... | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) | (21) | (22) | (23) | (24) |
|  | 568.5 | 135,915 | 274.7 | 14,777 | 145.8 | 4,816 | 276.4 | 41,766 |
| Under \$250,000 ${ }^{1}$ | ** | - 37 | *** | ** | *** | ** | ** | ** |
| \$250,000 under \$500,000 .................. | **28.6 | *1,374 | **11.4 | * 176 | * 14.5 | * 168 | * 10.3 | **296 |
| \$500,000 under \$1,000,000 ............... | 310.3 | 32,667 | 167.1 | 6,592 | 94.8 | 3,234 | 171.7 | 14,879 |
| \$1,000,000 under \$2,500,000 $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . .$. | 174.5 | 44.258 | 78.2 | 4,370 | 33.3 | 999 | 75.0 | 13,536 |
| \$2,500,000 under \$5.000,000 ............ | 35.1 | 23,064 | 10.5 | 1,298 | 2.0 | 351 | 11.7 | 3,765 |
| \$5,000,000 under \$10,000,000 ........... | 13.6 | 19,194 | 4.4 | 838 | 1.0 | 45 | 5.6 | 4,174 |
| \$10,000,000 or more.......................... | 6.5 | 15,358 | 3.1 | 1,503 | 0.3 | 17 | 2.1 | 5,117 |
| Size of net worth |  | Total assots by type (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mortgages and notes |  | Life insurance equity |  |  | Other assets |  |
|  |  | Number | Amount |  | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
|  |  | (25) | (26) |  | (27) | (28) | (29) | (30) |
| Total |  | 460.2 |  |  | 690.9 | 7,273 | 1,322.6 | 145,674 |
| Under \$250,000 ${ }^{1}$ |  | 7.5 | 56,721589 |  | 39.3 | 877 | 42.7 | 2,013 |
| \$250.000 under \$500,000 | . | 47.1 | 5.653 |  | 121.9 | 1,254 | 156.5 | 10,049 |
| \$500,000 under \$1,000,000. |  | 243.2 | 20,30116,809 |  | 360.5 | 2,886 | 723.7 | 53,634 |
| \$1,000,000 under \$2,500,000 | ......... | 123.5 |  |  | 131.2 | 1,421 | 312.5 | 42,005 |
| \$2,500,000 under \$5.000,000 |  | 24.4 | 4,471 |  | 24.5 | 483 | 55.7 | 16,552 |
| \$5,000,000 under \$10,000,000 |  | 8.9 | 2,9625,936 |  | 10.3 | 260 | 23.1 | 11.019 |
| \$10,000,000 or more .................. | -1.a.a...... | 5.6 |  |  | 3.2 | 94 | 8.6 | 10,402 |

[^3]Table 4.-Top Wealthholders Under 50 Years of Age With Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More, by Size of Net Worth [All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


[^4]Table 5.-Top Wealthholders 50 under 65 Years of Age With Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More, by Size of Net Worth [All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


[^5]Table 6.-Top Wealthholders 65 Years of Age or Older With Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More, by Size of Net Worth
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


[^6]Table 7.-Top Wealthholders With Net Worth Under $\$ 10,000,000$ and Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More: Total and Selected Assets, Debts and Mortgages, and Net Worth, by State of Residence
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]

| State of residence | Total assets |  | Debts and mongages |  | Net worth |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Amount | Number | Amount | Number | Amount |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Total.................................................. | 3,304.3 | 3,743,641 | 2,919.8 | 513,691 | 3,304.3 | 3,229,951 |
| Alabama. | 39.0 | 40,469 | 34.5 | 3,585 | 39.0 | 36,884 |
| Alaska | 8.8 | 10,409 | 8.4 | 2.300 | 8.8 | 8.110 |
| Arizona......................................................... | 52.9 | 60.649 | 47.6 | 9.662 | 52.9 | 50,988 |
| Arkansas ........................................................ | 16.7 | 18,753 | 15.5 | 3.596 | 16.7 | 15,157 |
| California | 558.3 | 701,235 | 506.4 | 107.717 | 558.3 | 593,518 |
| Colorado | 52.6 | 48,355 | 46.6 | 7,166 | 52.6 | 41,189 |
| Connecticut. | 74.7 | 90,336 | 70.5 | 9,775 | 74.7 | 80,562 |
| Delaware | 7.1 | 6,332 | 6.9 | 369 | 7.1 | 5.964 |
| District of Columbia | 14.0 | 17,990 | 13.2 | 1,350 | 14.0 | 16,641 |
| Florida. | 238.8 | 294,922 | 202.7 | 39,408 | 238.8 | 255,514 |
| Georgia | 62.6 | 72,469 | 58.9 | 9,540 | 62.6 | 62,929 |
| Hawaii. | 11.0 | 11,330 | 10.1 | 1,475 | 11.0 | 9,855 |
| Idaho. | 11.3 | 10.088 | 9.3 | 1,846 | 11.3 | 8.242 |
| Illinois... | 148.5 | 175,151 | 129.8 | 27,114 | 148.5 | 148.037 |
| Indiana | 39.7 | 39,746 | 31.2 | 5,717 | 39.7 | 34.030 |
| lowa | 34.5 | 28,936 | 30.8 | 4,072 | 34.5 | 24.863 |
| Kansas | 25.9 | 29,258 | 20.6 | 3,453 | 25.9 | 25,805 |
| Kentucky | 34.9 | 38,942 | 30.2 | 6.019 | 34.9 | 32,924 |
| Louisiana....................................................... | 38.3 | 42,047 | 35.2 | 8,472 | 38.3 | 33.576 |
| Maine ...................................................... | 14.9 | 11,792 | 13.9 | 1,477 | 14.9 | 10,314 |
| Maryland | 49.7 | 53,351 | 40.1 | 5,429 | 49.7 | 47,923 |
| Massachusetts | 113.2 | 117,160 | 106.9 | 12,922 | 113.2 | 104,238 |
| Michigan. | 72.4 | 71.707 | 62.5 | 5.465 | 72.4 | 66,242 |
| Minnesota.................................................... | 35.2 | 36.411 | 30.6 | 5.405 | 35.2 | 31,006 |
| Mississippi..................................................... | 23.5 | 23,388 | 22.6 | 6,167 | 23.5 | 17,221 |
| Missouri. | 53.9 | 61,335 | 48.5 | 6,990 | 53.9 | 54,345 |
| Montana. | 7.2 | 6,384 | 5.9 | 1,051 | 7.2 | 5,333 |
| Nebraska....................................................... | 19.8 | 18,352 | 14.9 | 3,699 | 19.8 | 14.654 |
| Nevada......................................................... | 13.3 | 17.953 | 12.0 | 1.249 | 13.3 | 16.704 |
| New Hampshire .............................................. | 20.2 | 24,892 | 16.9 | 4.681 | 20.2 | 20,211 |
| New Jersey | 139.2 | 150,128 | 115.2 | 16,549 | 139.2 | 133,579 |
| New Mexico | 12.3 | 15,797 | 9.9 | 1,646 | 12.3 | 14,151 |
| New York....................................................... | 339.6 | 381,476 | 288.9 | 35,843 | 339.6 | 345,633 |
| North Carolina ............................................... | 66.3 | 80.352 | 61.1 | 8,936 | 66.3 | 71.416 |
| North Dakota. | 9.4 | 7.548 | 7.9 | 3.096 | 9.4 | 4.451 |
| Ohio | 106.4 | 103,880 | 95.7 | 13,218 | 106.4 | 90.662 |
| Oklahoma | 37.6 | 48,605 | 34.9 | 7,331 | 37.6 | 41.273 |
| Oregon......................................................... | 25.4 | 37,008 | 22.9 | 5,221 | 25.4 | 31.788 |
| Pennsylvania .................................................. | 113.8 | 120.914 | 100.8 | 13,171 | 113.8 | 107.743 |
| Rhode Island................................................. | 12.1 | 15,902 | 10.5 | 1,886 | 12.1 | 14.015 |
| South Carolina............................................... | 29.4 | 31,084 | 27.8 | 3,529 | 29.4 | 27.555 |
| South Dakota.................................................. | 7.0 | 4,784 | 5.9 | 1,220 | 7.0 | 3,564 |
| Tennessee .................................................. | 51.4 | 55,303 | 42.2 | 5,736 | 51.4 | 49,567 |
| Texas ............................................................ | 250.6 | 295,471 | 229.9 | 60.646 | 250.6 | 234.825 |
| Utah ............................................................. | 7.3 | 8.787 | 6.2 | 1.276 | 7.3 | 7.510 |
| Vermont. | 4.8 | 5,483 | 4.8 | 445 | 4.8 | 5,038 |
| Virginia .......................................................... | 76.5 | 75,017 | 69.7 | 9,140 | 76.5 | 65,878 |
| Washington .................................................... | 55.6 | 56,618 | 45.0 | 9.034 | 55.6 | 47,584 |
| West Virginia.................................................. | 11.2 | 9,996 | 9.2 | 620 | 11.2 | 9.375 |
| Wisconsin ..................................................... | 44.8 | 48,107 | 39.9 | 5.393 | 44.8 | 42.715 |
| Wyoming ........................................................ | 6.4 | 6,670 | 5.1 | 2,255 | 6.4 | 4,415 |
| Other areas ${ }^{1}$................................................ | 4.5 | 4,566 | 3.3 | 329 | 4.5 | 4,238 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 7.-Top Wealthholders With Net Worth Under $\$ 10,000,000$ and Gross Assets of $\$ 500,000$ or More: Total and Selected Assets, Debts and Mortgages, and Net Worth, by State of Residence-(continued)
[All figures are estimates based on estate tax return samples-number are in thousands; money amounts are in millions of dollars]


T U. . citizens domiciled abroăd. Persons who acquired U.S. citizenshipsolely by viftue of being a citizen of Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands are not included. Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding


[^0]:    *Foreign Special Projects Section. Prepared under the direction of Michael Alexander, Chief.

[^1]:    1 Includes top wealthholders with negative net worth

[^2]:    Includes top wealthholders with negative net worth

    * Data combined with those for next size class to avoid disclosure of information for specific estate tax returns

    Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes top wealthholders with negative net worth.
    Estimate should be used with caution because of the small number of sampled estate tax returns on which it is based

    * Data combined with those for next size class to avoid disclosure of information for specific estate tax returns.

    Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes top wealthholders with negative net worth
    *Estimate should be used with caution because of the small number of sampled estate tax returns on which it is based.

    * *Data combined with those for next size class to avoid disclosure of information for specific estate tax returns.

    Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

[^5]:    includes top wealthholders with negative net worth

    * Data combined with those for next size class to avoid disclosure of information for specific estate tax returns.

    Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Includes top wealthholders with negative net worth.
    *Estimate should be used with caution because of the small number of sampled estate tax returns on which it is based.

    * Data combined with those for next size class to avoid disclosure of information for specific estate tax returns

    Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

