

## **Attachment 8**

# **CHIS Geographic Strata and Selection Probabilities**

## RDD Sample: Geographic Strata and Selection Probabilities

Stratum ID	Stratum	DOF 2009 HHs Est*	Prop Dist of HHs	Adult	Adolescent
1	Los Angeles	3,442,863	0.262	10,221	633
2	San Diego	1,028,998	0.078	3,055	185
3	Orange	1,142,357	0.087	3,391	216
4	Santa Clara	665,839	0.051	1,977	127
5	San Bernardino	712,889	0.054	2,116	179
6	Riverside	610,185	0.046	1,812	137
7	Alameda	557,586	0.042	1,655	120
8	Sacramento	533,758	0.041	1,585	111
9	Contra Costa	386,935	0.029	1,149	79
10	Fresno	305,817	0.023	908	67
11	San Francisco	271,657	0.021	807	25
12	Ventura	348,030	0.027	1,033	86
13	San Mateo	277,265	0.021	823	60
14	Kern	259,554	0.020	771	64
15	San Joaquin	234,928	0.018	697	43
16	Sonoma	176,891	0.013	600	33
17	Stanislaus	185,601	0.014	600	58
18	Santa Barbara	130,879	0.010	600	39
19	Solano	143,951	0.011	600	45
20	Tulare	151,116	0.012	600	44
21	Santa Cruz	134,250	0.010	600	43
22	Marin	122,926	0.009	600	36
23	San Luis Obispo	91,412	0.007	600	39
24	Placer	106,331	0.008	600	45
25	Merced	107,339	0.008	600	52
26	Butte	79,816	0.006	600	37
27	Shasta	89,374	0.007	600	49
28	Yolo	71,357	0.005	600	51
29	El Dorado	74,526	0.006	600	54
30	Imperial	67,798	0.005	500	46
31	Napa	52,951	0.004	500	34
32	Kings	45,238	0.003	500	37
33	Madera	46,544	0.004	500	41
34	Monterey	51,954	0.004	600	40
35	Humboldt	54,229	0.004	500	36
36	Nevada	40,836	0.003	500	28
37	Mendocino	35,693	0.003	500	31
38	Sutter	34,133	0.003	500	44
39	Yuba	26,655	0.002	500	30
40	Lake	27,426	0.002	500	33
41	San Benito	18,720	0.001	500	50
42	Tehama-Glenn-Colusa	42,216	0.003	500	33
43	Del Norte-Lassen-Modoc- Plumas-Sierra-Siskiyou-Trinity	62,100	0.005	500	32
44	Tuolumne-Calaveras-Amador- Inyo-Mariposa-Mono-Alpine	78,777	0.006	500	19
<b>Total</b>		<b>13,129,700</b>		<b>48,000</b>	<b>3,291</b>

## CHIS 2009 Preliminary RDD Sample Design

### Approximate Design Effects for the CHIS 2009 Sample

The following table shows the approximate design effects for the CHIS 2009. The data source for adjusted household and population counts is the California Department of Finance (DOF) 2009 population estimates. These approximations do not reflect the oversampling of high density areas, and they use population counts rather than adult counts. Further, they can only be produced for the groups found in the DOF files. In spite of these limitations, we consider these estimates to be sufficiently valid for purposes of estimating design effect.

**Table 1. Approximate design effect for the CHIS 2009 sample**

Population	Nominal Sample	Design Effect	Effective Sample
Total Adults	48,000	1.15	41,891
OMB White alone non-Hispanic	26,813	1.16	23,097
OMB African American alone non- Hispanic	2,576	1.04	2,472
OMB American Indian alone non- Hispanic	347	1.25	278
OMB Asian alone non- Hispanic	4,564	1.05	4,362
OMB Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander non-Hispanic	114	1.10	104
OMB Multiple race non- Hispanic	951	1.16	819
Adult Hispanic	12,635	1.11	11,342