

## **Cities' Attractive Power: Recent Trends in Cities and Suburbs Since 2000 and the Pursuit of Balanced Communities**

David L. Phillips and William H. Lucy

University of Virginia

Annual Meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

Fort Worth, Texas November 11, 2006

*[Draft: Please contact Authors for permission to cite.]*

Some trends of the 1990s and post-2000 period can be interpreted as mild, perhaps temporary, adjustments to the previous rise of suburbs to dominance in metropolitan areas in the United States. One also can interpret these trends as signaling a future major realignment of opportunities and problems in most cities and many suburbs. We will explain why we choose this realignment interpretation. We will consider how housing markets and policy problems interact. We will consider the relationship of residential location patterns to economic development challenges in middle-aged suburbs. And we will introduce some policies that can help struggling suburbs cope with the severe challenges they face.

### **Trends, Methods, and Expectations Since 2000**

Income, other socio-economic, and housing data for 2005 now are available for jurisdictions of more than 65,000 residents. For most cities, trends from the 2000 decennial census to the 2005 American Community Survey (ACS) now can be analyzed. In our method, we compare conditions in cities to conditions in their metropolitan areas, such as per capita and median family income. At this time the rich diversity of city neighborhoods and suburban places cannot be explored as the 65,000 population reporting limits us to this dichotomous city/suburban approach<sup>1</sup> By noting the trend line, for income for example, we can discern whether incomes are rising or falling in cities relative to metropolitan income.<sup>2</sup> This provides an indicator whether a city is becoming more or less attractive to metropolitan residents who have enough income to have a number of residential location options they can pay for.

In our book, *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs* (Planners Press 2006), we analyzed income trends in cities, suburbs, and census tracts relative to metropolitan income. Census tract scale analysis was most revealing. It permitted us to relate income trends to the age of housing, operationalized by the decades when much of the housing in a given census tract was constructed. Through this analysis we discovered that the trickle down process of neighborhood change, often referred to as filtering of housing and neighborhoods, from higher to lower income occupancy had been altered in the 1990s,

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to our work in *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs*, also see Lee and Leigh (2005) for a critique of the dichotomous approach, Leigh and Lee (2005) for a census tract level examination of Philadelphia's downtown, inner-city, inner and outer suburb neighborhoods and Mikelbank's (2004) typology of suburban places.

<sup>2</sup> See the Appendices for discussion of material differences between the Census and American Community Survey data items and the definitions of Metropolitan Areas.

and, to a limited extent in the 1980s. No longer in 2000 were the oldest neighborhoods the poorest. Pre-1940 neighborhoods tended to have higher average family incomes than neighborhoods specializing in housing constructed in the 1940s and 1950s in both cities and suburbs. In fact, pre-1940 neighborhoods were more likely to have increased in income relative to metropolitan income than every neighborhood development period except those developed substantially in the 1990s. In addition, we found that neighborhoods built in the 1960s were most likely to decline in relative income. Thus, the trickle down process was not dominating trends in old neighborhoods but it still was operating in middle-aged neighborhoods.

Cities are rich in pre-1940 neighborhoods—those that were rising in relative income. Many suburbs are rich in 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s neighborhoods—those tending to decline in relative income. Based on these census tract trends, and our explanation of why they occurred, it seemed likely that income increases would emerge in more cities relative to suburbs after 2000. With the 2005 ACS data we now can analyze this question.

### **Income Revival in Cities**

In this analysis, we examined 40 cities in 35 large metropolitan areas (the 34 most populous plus Buffalo), the same group as in one of the main analyses in *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs*. The un-weighted average per capita income in these 40 cities increased two percent relative to metropolitan income, from 88 percent in 2000 to 90 percent in 2005. This small upturn occurred after decades of city decline. In 1980, these cities' per capita income was 91 percent of metropolitan income, declining to 88 percent in 1990 and holding steady at 88 percent in 2000. The upward trend occurred in 22 of 40 cities between 2000 and 2005 compared with increases in 13 cities in the 1990s and increases in only seven cities during the 1980s. (Table 8)

Median value of owner-occupied housing made a similar advance. In 2000, the median value of housing in the 40 cities was 87 percent of metropolitan housing values; by 2005, the cities' housing values had risen to 90 percent of metropolitan values. (Table 9) Changes in owner-occupancy also may have played a role in rising relative incomes in cities. In the 22 cities in which relative per capita income increased from 2000 to 2005, the percentage of units owner-occupied in structures with five or more units increased in 21 cities by 10 percent or more. (Table 10) Of the 11 cities in which 10 percent or more of structures with five or more units were owner occupied in 2005, all increased in relative per capita income. Conversely, in the 20 cities in which four percent or less of structures with five or more units were owner-occupied, only five cities increased in relative per capita income. The attraction of empty nesters who are down-sizing but seeking to retain ownership in condominiums probably has contributed to rising relative per capita income in cities.

Analyzing income trends by racial groups (white, black, Asian) and area of origin (Hispanics), we discovered additional insights into influences on income trends.

We found a surprising increase in relative income in cities among non-Hispanic whites from 2000 to 2005. Blacks in cities, on the other hand, declined in relative income.

Non-Hispanic whites in cities had per capita incomes nine percent higher than their metropolitan counterparts in 2005. In addition, non-Hispanic whites in cities gained four percent relative to metropolitan per capita income of non-Hispanic whites between 2000 and 2005.

In other words, per capita incomes of non-Hispanic whites were substantially higher in cities than in suburbs. This finding reverses the standard belief that most middle and upper income whites had left cities before 2000 and that white middle and upper income newcomers usually choose suburbs over cities, leaving mainly low and moderate income whites in cities.

Based on data for the 40 principal cities in 35 of the largest metropolitan areas, per capita incomes of non-Hispanic whites in cities were higher in 24 cities and lower in only 11 than metropolitan per capita incomes. No data were available for four cities and one city, New York was virtually unchanged. For the full list, see Table 1.

Per capita incomes for non-Hispanic whites in cities compared with the suburbs were highest in the south (Atlanta 91 percent higher than its metropolitan average, with Washington, D.C. 51 percent, Tampa 33 percent, and Charlotte 30 percent higher than their metropolitan averages. High per capita incomes for non-Hispanic whites also occurred in southwestern cities (Dallas 35 percent and Houston 27 percent higher than metropolitan averages). In some western cities non-Hispanic whites had considerably higher per capita incomes than metropolitan averages, especially Seattle 20 percent, San Francisco 19 percent, and Denver 16 percent.

Even some Northern cities had non-Hispanic white per capita income averages considerably higher than metropolitan averages, led by Boston 22 percent, Chicago 20 percent, and Kansas City 10 percent higher. New York City (7 percent) and Minneapolis (4 percent) also had higher white non-Hispanic per capita incomes in cities than metropolitan averages.

In fact, of 17 Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Midwest cities, 11 experienced increases between 2000 and 2005 in per capita incomes of non-Hispanic whites compared with metropolitan and suburban averages.

Conversely, 37 of 40 cities had lower relative per capita incomes of blacks in cities than metropolitan averages. The only exceptions were Charlotte, Los Angeles, and Virginia Beach. Moreover, relative per capita incomes of blacks declined in 32 of 40 cities relative to metropolitan per capita income. See Table 2 for this list.

Thus, blacks with residential location options were more likely to gravitate to suburbs during the 2000 to 2005 period, as they tended to do also during the 1990s.

These racial income patterns and trends are contrary to typical beliefs. It has been common to think of whites with enough income to have choices to have moved to suburbs and for middle and moderate income blacks to have remained in many cities. These trends have changed dramatically in some metropolitan areas.

The impression that whites have abandoned cities comes from two income dimensions—relative per capita income in some northern cities and relative median family income in many cities nationwide. In some cities per capita incomes of non-Hispanic whites are much lower than metropolitan averages. These cities are mainly in the north. Cities with per capita incomes considerably lower than metropolitan averages included Detroit 38 percent, Cleveland 30 percent, Philadelphia 20 percent, and Milwaukee 18 percent.

Other northern cities had non-Hispanic whites below metropolitan averages, but some of them made gains from 2000 to 2005. Northern cities where non-Hispanic whites made gains in relative per capita income were Baltimore 9 percent, Buffalo 7 percent, St. Louis 6 percent, Philadelphia 1 percent, and St. Paul 1 percent.

In addition, some northern cities with per capita incomes higher than their suburbs also made substantial income gains by non-Hispanic whites, including Boston 20 percent, Chicago 11 percent, Kansas City 10 percent.

The overall average per capita incomes depended on the proportions of non-Hispanic whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the principal cities. In 2005, the un-weighted average per capita income in these 40 cities of non-Hispanic whites was \$37,479, for Asians it was \$24,187, blacks \$15,670, and Hispanics \$14,511. Consequently, cities' per capita incomes relative to metropolitan areas were influenced by changes in these groups' proportion of city populations.

Hispanics' average share of city populations increased from 16.1 percent in 2000 to 18.3 percent in 2005, compared with these changes—non-Hispanic whites decreased from 54.7 percent in 2000 to 54.3 percent in 2005, blacks increased from 29.2 percent to 29.5 percent in 2005, and Asians increased from 5.4 percent to 6.0 percent in 2005. Small sample sizes, as occurred frequently for Asians, led to uncertain data reliability. (Table 3)

Hispanics' population share increased in 36 of 40 cities from 2000 to 2005. Whites increased in 17 cities, but this category included Hispanics. Blacks increased in 18 cities, and Asians increased in 34 cities. Increases in a group's population share of three percent or more occurred for Hispanics in eight cities in the West and Southwest, for whites in seven cities of which six were in the West and Southwest, and for blacks in four cities of which two were in the North and two in the South. In Table 3, data do not add to 100 percent, because some racial groups are not included and Hispanic includes various racial categories. The trend analysis is complicated by the 2000 census including residents in group quarters, while the 2005 American Community Survey did not include group quarter residents.

Twenty one cities also had higher average per capita incomes for whites, when Hispanics were included in the white averages, with 17 cities below metropolitan averages. Overall, incomes of whites, including Hispanics, were three percent higher in cities than metropolitan averages in 2005, an increase of two percent since 2000. For this list, see Table 4. Income increases for whites were less than for non-Hispanic whites, because the whites category included Hispanics who on average had lower incomes than non-Hispanic whites.

### **Median Family Income**

Cities usually have had considerably lower median family incomes than per capita incomes relative to metropolitan incomes. This difference reflects the accurate belief that cities have had less appeal to middle income families with children than to singles, young marrieds, empty-nesters, and retired persons. Cities' performance typically has been about 10 percent lower for relative median family income than for relative per capita income. About 70 percent of the national population was included in the median family income indicator in 2000. The per capita income indicator included everyone.

Median family income in these 40 cities averaged only 77 percent of metropolitan median family income in 2005. More cities increased their median family income relative to their metropolitan area from 2000 to 2005 (17) than between 1980 and 1990 (6) and between 1990 and 2000 (10). In addition, the median income of white non-Hispanic families was 96 percent of the metropolitan median income for non-Hispanic white families (Table 5). This reflected a gain by cities of one percent since 2000 in median family income of non-Hispanic whites.

Consequently, the low median family income in cities relative to suburbs was influenced by the proportions of whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the family population. Given the large gap in incomes between non-Hispanic whites and Asians compared with blacks and Hispanics, decisions by these family groups about location preferences will shape city and suburban income differences in coming years.

Of the 40 principal cities, only 14 had higher median family incomes of non-Hispanic whites than their suburbs. But between 2000 and 2005, these median family incomes increased relative to suburbs in 23 cities, with seven having no change and only 10 cities declining. In addition, frequency of progress by northern cities was striking as nine of 17 increased, while three did not change. Thus, many of the cities that had much lower median family incomes than their suburbs experienced median family income increases among non-Hispanic whites during the 2000 to 2005 period.

### **Suburban Trends and Problems**

The American Community Survey does not yet provide income data for suburban jurisdictions with less than 65,000 residents. But the rise of 21 cities in aggregate income data and the five percent increase in relative per capita incomes among non-Hispanic

whites in cities are consistent with a continuing the relative income decline that was evident in many suburbs between 1990 and 2000.

In *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs*, we track changes in per capita income and median family income in 2,586 suburbs in 35 large metropolitan areas from 1980 to 2000. We discovered that:

Half of the suburbs that increased in population decreased in income relative to the level of metropolitan income.

Some suburbs 20 to 40 miles from the central city declined in relative income, not only suburbs adjacent to the central city.

Overall, 52 percent of suburbs were declining faster or increasing more slowly than their central cities in relative per capita income, as were 33 percent in relative median family income.

Concentrated poverty in suburban neighborhoods nearly doubled.

In addition, the number of suburbs below 80 percent of metropolitan median family income was four times higher in 1990 than in 1960.

Moreover, we found that some suburbs had declined to very low levels of income. In fact, 155 suburbs had per capita income less than 60 percent of metropolitan per capita income. We chose 60 percent for comparisons, because that was the relative per capita income of Detroit, the lowest income central city relative to its metropolitan area in 2000. The number of suburbs in this low income category had increased from 121 in 1990. But not every suburb below this level in 1990 remained below it in 2000. Some improved. That is the good news. Something happened so that some suburbs moved up in relative income, providing hope that either market forces or public policy interventions sometimes can make a difference.

The population components of suburbs also have changed. The elderly have become more numerous. Low income residents increased. Minorities increased. Immigrants increased. In fact, a majority of the large national increase in immigrants during the 1990s moved first to suburbs rather than cities as their first destination. (Singer 2005)

Consequently, many suburbs have had a more diverse public school clientele, with more students eligible for free and reduced lunches and more students needing language assistance. At the same time, suburbs with more elderly face increased transportation and health challenges. Some elderly households find themselves house rich and income poor. They live mortgage free in a house large enough for children, worth considerable money on the market, carrying a substantial assessed value with property taxes to match, but with modest or low incomes. Taxes may be a burden and repairs may be impossible.

## Probable Cause

Two plausible theories, the aging theory of housing deterioration and the cancer theory of neighborhood decay, are not sufficient explanations of suburban income decline, although they may be contributing causes. Some suburbs with large amounts of old housing, Alexandria, Virginia, for example, grow in population and thrive in income and economic activity despite, and perhaps because of, their old housing. Some suburbs in the midst of enveloping decline manage to hold on and remain stable despite the cancer of decline all around them, for example, Oak Park adjacent to Chicago. And our analysis has demonstrated that old neighborhoods rose in relative income in the 1990s more often than all decades of specialized neighborhoods except those built mainly in the 1990s.

Our analysis did not explain income trends in every case. Individual suburbs' histories also should be interpreted. But we were able to discern general effects of the age of housing in both cities and suburbs by analyzing relative income trends in relation to when housing was built.

To analyze effects of housing age, we examined 8,471 census tracts in the cities and suburbs of six metropolitan areas—Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Richmond, and Washington, D.C. We discovered that the standard trend of housing and neighborhood decline—as housing ages it is passed down (filters or trickles down) from middle income and upper income households to moderate and low income households—was altered significantly during the 1990s. By 2000, pre-1940 census tracts no longer were the lowest income tracts in metropolitan areas. Tracts dominated by housing built in both the 1940s and 1950s were occupied by families with lower incomes than neighborhoods specializing in pre-1940s housing. Middle-aged census tracts, those developed from 1945 to 1970 were most likely to have fallen or to be falling to lower income levels relative to metropolitan averages.

The puzzle then became to explain this trend—why were middle-aged tracts falling while old census tracts were rising? Here we lack direct evidence—a task awaiting further research. But our hypothesis is that these phenomena are related to typical house sizes and typical neighborhood settings.

### Small House Problem

In 1950 the median size new house was 1,100 square feet. Median size increased to 1,375 square feet in 1970. By 2005 it was more than 2,200 square feet, doubling the median size since 1950 and increasing it by 60 percent since 1970.

The period from 1945 to 1970 was dominated by a land development goal of separating land uses, having residential areas protected spatially from retail, office, industry, and busy streets. Cul de sacs often were featured, further reducing accessibility.

We suspect that the combination of small size, outmoded facilities—one bath, no central air conditioning, two or three small bedrooms, and somewhat inconvenient settings that interfered with walking to any activity except neighbors, have combined to reduce these neighborhoods' attractions. Conversely, pre-1940 neighborhoods were widely varied in their housing types and quality, nearly always were more accessible, sometimes were in prime areas including close to downtown and therefore frequently were attractive areas for remodeling or for demolition and rebuilding—although certainly not in every instance.

Many suburbs were developed almost entirely during the 25 years following World War II. Such suburbs are most likely to be dominated by small houses with limited accessibility. While success stories can be found—Levittown on Long Island, NY is an example—decline is a more frequent outcome.

Bedroom suburbs from the post-WWII era usually lacked strong, if they had any, downtowns. And the shopping centers, which may have succeeded for many years, often have faded to low value uses or become vacant. In some instances, they have been demolished.

The small house suburbs and the faded or failed shopping centers are not prime generators of land values or property tax revenues. And their prospects, in general, are not good, although in certain instances they may be in locations that have become attractive.

## **Residential Property and Economic Development**

As more suburbs move deeper into their rehabilitation and redevelopment periods, they will face more economic development needs. The obstacles to economic development also will increase. The obstacles include conceptual problems.

One conceptual problem is that places which developed mainly as bedroom suburbs cannot suddenly convert to settings rich in non-residential land uses. Land patterns are fixed, perhaps even immutable, and public policy habits are ingrained. Still, almost every suburb has a struggling downtown or challenged shopping centers or both, and they should be addressed in economic development policy.

A second conceptual problem is that housing must be included in economic development policy, despite economic development usually being conceived as a task mainly to develop retail, office, and perhaps industrial properties. In past decades, when the U.S. Census of Governments included a variation on Value of Taxable Property, residential property constituted about 60 percent of assessed real property value while commercial and industrial property were less than half that much from the 1950s through the 1980s (Netzer 1966, Raimondo 1989). In most suburbs, residential property would be more than 60 percent of assessed real property value. In a small metropolitan city like Charlottesville, VA, 65 to 68 percent of assessed property value was residential from 1991 to 2006. If most property value is residential, and the residences have lost some of

their appeal, then efforts to enhance the tax base must include the main source of tax revenue, residential property.

## **Reinvestment Challenges**

Many cities have been making comebacks, especially in their downtowns, because cities retained major assets, like offices, finance, government, courts, hotels, restaurants, convention centers, museums, performance venues. (Leinberger, 2006) They also received federal and state aid, and they retained the loyalty of many members of the region's economic elites, who had financial resources to contribute and invest. Through these means, central cities retained inducements to investments and the advantages of proximity to diverse activities. Some of these activities appealed to young households and empty nesters. (Birch 2006) These assets have been driving reinvestment in many cities.

Most small suburbs lack diverse assets. Their main assets, solid residential neighborhoods, often have deteriorated. In the process, many neighborhoods have lost one of their main attractions—dependability and predictability.

When neighborhoods are dominated by small houses, with little variation in age, size, and quality, neighborhood characteristics complicate obstacles to reinvestment in each house. From the perspective of an owner or buyer who wants to expand, the following considerations will be important and some will be difficult:

- Exploring design options is puzzling, time consuming, and potentially expensive.
- Finding a reliable, affordable builder is challenging.
- Mastering zoning regulations takes time.
- Borrowing reinvestment funds, if home equity is insufficient, may be difficult.
- Financing two residences in some instances during construction is expensive.
- Coping with financial risks if neighbors do not reinvest is adventurous.

Similar risks confront developers. Developers nearly always find easier, less risky, and more profitable development alternatives.

Consequently, jurisdictions with too much small middle aged housing have poor prospects of retaining and attracting key population components—young well-educated professionals with children who are seeking larger, better equipped houses and empty nesters who may be attracted to downsizing but who want services and activities nearby and usually do not want the stresses of remodeling and expanding.

## **Policy Options**

Unless a suburb's location is exceptional, the regional market is strong, and sprawl continues at a rapid pace, these obstacles to reinvestment in small middle-aged houses will be daunting. Any local government, or a coalition of local governments, can assist with each of these challenges. Local government coalitions in Cuyahoga County

surrounding Cleveland and in several counties surrounding Kansas City, Missouri have begun this effort. Cuyahoga County has emphasized low cost loans for expansions. Kansas City's suburbs have emphasized design manuals explaining realistic options for expanding the four main post-World War II house types. Reports about progress in these suburbs should be instructive. (Puentes 2006)

The most likely local policy to aid in this effort, however, is the one which is easiest administratively. That easy to implement policy is tax abatements for expansions that add more than a specified value to the property. This policy has two problems. One problem is that it does not add to the property tax base for a number of years—and enhanced property tax value is one motivation for the policy. The second problem is that it may not add to the number of house expansions that would have occurred without the tax abatement. Potential house expanders need assistance with front-end decisions, with construction implementation, and with up-front financing. Avoiding higher property taxes, after solving these problems, is desirable for homeowners, but it does not directly address the more difficult decisions that precede construction.

### **Suburban Downtowns, Shopping Centers, and Housing**

Focusing economic development effort on downtowns and by-passed shopping centers probably is the most typical suburban policy. These efforts are most likely to achieve political support. Success, if it can be achieved, will lead to the largest increase in property tax revenues. But success usually will be elusive. And success in these traditional economic development efforts will not be sufficient.

Residential rehabilitation and expansion are essential because residences comprise large proportions of suburban property tax capacity. Consequently, suburbs that are out of what Christopher Leinberger (1995) calls “the favored quarter” where most owners of major businesses live, which lack major conveniences like heavy rail and light rail stations, and which lack major assets like colleges and universities will have great difficulty in attracting sufficient housing reinvestment. Public policy inventions and interventions are needed, such as those currently being attempted in Cuyahoga County and in suburbs near Kansas City.

### **Federal, State, Regional, and County Policies**

When local assets are scarce, assistance from federal, state, regional, or county governments become more important. Federal policies often address city problems and rural problems and may be less focused on reinvestment in middle-aged suburbs.<sup>3</sup> State policies follow federal tendencies, in some respects. State policies also tend to support outward sprawl, especially by subsidizing highway construction. Suburban schools usually benefit adequately from state aid, but state programs are unlikely to address expansion of small houses. Regional governance usually is provided by limited purpose special districts or by voluntary government associations with few resources and enforcement powers. County governments could be helpful with housing rehabilitation

---

<sup>3</sup> See Lee and Leigh (2005) for a discussion of a discussion of policies for inner suburbs p 341-343.

and expansion, but they are more likely to be focused on infrastructure investments in unincorporated areas and outlying exurban areas.

Government assistance of broader units of government is not likely to be offered in the absence of requests from suburban governments. Consequently, the challenge comes back to small local governments which need to embrace an unusual concept: Economic development for middle-aged bedroom suburbs should include and sometimes emphasize housing rehabilitation and small house expansion.

### **Mild Adjustment or Incipient Realignment of Fortunes?**

The 2000 to 2005 trends described here have been mild in aggregate. Some aspects of the trends have been considerably stronger, however, and they can be interpreted as supporting a realignment of fortunes between principal cities and their suburbs. The substantial increase in per capita incomes for non-Hispanic whites in cities relative to suburbs indicates potential for realignment of fortunes if the non-Hispanic proportion of city populations increases. Non-Hispanic whites had much higher incomes than other groups. If whites constitute a higher proportion of city populations, in addition to higher income whites choosing city locations, then the potential for a realignment of fortunes between cities and suburbs is apparent.

Potential for a realignment of fortunes trend also can be discerned in the 1990 to 2000 tendency for pre-1940 neighborhoods to revive in relative family income, while 1945 to 1970 neighborhoods tended to decline. If this trend continues—and it accelerated in the 1990s compared with the 1980s—principal cities rich in pre-1940 housing will experience rising income fortunes.

The argument made above about obstacles to reinvestment in small middle-aged housing, of which many suburbs have an abundance, indicates that housing markets may work strongly against suburban revival. In addition, the trends of the 1990s occurred with low gasoline prices. The 2000 to 2005 period also was characterized by relatively low gasoline prices, remembering that in 2000 incomes for 1999 were reported and in 2005 incomes for 2004 were reported. Consequently, effects of higher gasoline prices in 2005 and 2006 are not reflected in location trends embedded in income trends described here. Sustained periods of high gasoline prices may be necessary to influence residential location patterns, a longer period at least than the relatively volatile motor vehicle purchase shifts away from SUVs that occurred during the spike in gasoline prices during 2006.

## List of References:

Birch, Eugenie L., 2006. Who Lives Downtown. Alan Berube, Bruce Katz and Robert E. Lang, *Redefining Urban And Suburban America: Evidence From The 2000 Census*, Volume 3, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 29-59.

Frey, William H., Jill H. Wilson, Alan Berube, and Audrey Singer. 2006. Tracking American Trends into the Twenty-First Century: A Field Guide to the New Metropolitan and Micropolitan Definitions. Alan Berube, Bruce Katz and Robert E. Lang, *Redefining Urban And Suburban America: Evidence From The 2000 Census*, Volume 3, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 191-234.

Lee, Sugie and Nancey Green Leigh 2005a. The Role of Inner Ring Suburbs in Metropolitan Smart Growth Strategies. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 19 (3): 330-346.

Leigh, Nancey Green and Sugie Lee. 2005 Philadelphia's Space In Between: Inner-Ring Suburb Evolution. *Opolis: An International Journal of Suburban and Metropolitan Studies* 1(1):Article 4. 13-32.

Leinberger, Christopher B. 1995. The changing location of development and investment opportunities. *Urban Land* 45 (5): 31-36.

Leinberger, Christopher B. 2006 Turning Around Downtown: Twelve Steps to Revitalization. A Brookings Institution Research Brief, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, March 2006.

Lucy, William H. and David L. Phillips, 2006 *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs*, Chicago, Ill., APA Planners Press.

Singer, Audrey. 2005. The Rise of the New Immigrant Gateways: Historical Flows, Recent Settlement Trends. Alan Berube, Bruce Katz and Robert E. Lang, *Redefining Urban And Suburban America: Evidence From The 2000 Census*, Volume 2, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Mikelbank, Brian A. 2004. A Typology of U. S. Suburban Places. *Housing Policy Debate* 15(4):935-964.

Netzer, Dick. 1966. *Economics of the Property Tax*. Washington D.C. Brookings Institution.

Raimondo, Henry J. 1989 Leviathan and Federalism in the United States. *Public Finance Review*. 17 (2): 204-215.

Puentes, Robert (2006) The State of Organizing in Midwestern First Suburbs Commentary", *Opolis: An International Journal of Suburban and Metropolitan Studies*.: 2: (1) Article 4.

**Table 1. Relative Per Capita Income of Non Hispanic Whites in Principal Cities Compared to Their Metropolitan Areas in 2005**

Principal City	Principal City as Percent of Metropolitan Area		Percent Change
	2005	2000	
Atlanta	191	173	10
Baltimore	97	89	9
Boston	122	102	20
Buffalo	89	83	7
Charlotte	130	134	-3
Chicago	120	108	11
Cincinnati	--	105	--
Cleveland	70	75	-7
Columbus	92	93	-1
Dallas	135	127	6
Denver	116	110	5
Detroit	62	66	-6
Houston	127	118	8
Indianapolis	96	99	-3
Kansas City	110	100	10
Las Vegas	103	109	-6
Los Angeles	107	110	-3
Miami	122	114	7
Milwaukee	82	83	-1
Minneapolis	104	103	1
New York	107	107	0
Newport News	--	91	--
Norfolk	94	96	-2
Oakland	103	97	6
Orlando	123	116	6
Philadelphia	80	79	1
Phoenix	104	100	4
Pittsburgh	--	101	--
Portland	104	101	3
Sacramento	105	100	5
San Antonio	104	102	2
San Diego	108	110	-2
San Francisco	119	120	-1
Seattle	120	118	2
St. Louis	93	88	6
St. Paul	91	90	1
St. Petersburg	--	101	--
Tampa	133	124	7
Virginia Beach	108	106	2
Washington, DC	151	147	3
Average	109	105	4

100 percent means that per capita income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that per capita income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that per capita income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 2. Relative Per Capita Income of Blacks in Principal Cities Compared to Their Metropolitan Areas in 2005**

Principal City	Principal City as Percent of Metropolitan Area		Percent Change
	2005	2000	
Atlanta	82	77	6
Baltimore	79	82	-4
Boston	88	90	-2
Buffalo	89	95	-6
Charlotte	102	104	-2
Chicago	90	90	0
Cincinnati	83	89	-7
Cleveland	79	81	-2
Columbus	91	96	-5
Dallas	84	87	-3
Denver	84	91	-8
Detroit	85	90	-6
Houston	87	92	-5
Indianapolis	91	99	-8
Kansas City	91	94	-3
Las Vegas	90	97	-7
Los Angeles	101	95	6
Miami	74	79	-6
Milwaukee	95	96	-1
Minneapolis	92	87	6
New York	92	93	-1
Newport News	87	94	-7
Norfolk	81	85	-5
Oakland	89	88	1
Orlando	80	91	-12
Philadelphia	84	88	-5
Phoenix	91	91	0
Pittsburgh	91	94	-3
Portland	96	91	5
Sacramento	87	90	-3
San Antonio	92	98	-6
San Diego	94	100	-6
San Francisco	87	97	-10
Seattle	93	97	-4
St. Louis	82	83	-1
St. Paul	80	89	-10
St. Petersburg	94	96	-2
Tampa	82	94	-13
Virginia Beach	115	108	6
Washington, DC	79	83	-5
Average	88	92	-4

100 percent means that per capita income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that per capita income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that per capita income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 3. Percent of 40 Principal Cities Populations by Race or Origin in 2000 and 2005**

Principal City	Percent Population in Principal Cities							
	2005				2000			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Atlanta	36.2	58.6	4.7	2.0	33.2	61.4	4.5	1.9
Baltimore	30.2	65.2	2.3	1.6	31.6	64.3	1.7	1.5
Boston	55.3	24.6	14.7	8.7	54.5	25.3	14.4	7.5
Buffalo	50.3	41.0	7.6	2.7	54.4	37.2	7.5	1.4
Charlotte	57.0	34.3	9.7	3.9	58.3	32.7	7.4	3.4
Chicago	38.6	34.9	28.8	4.8	42.0	36.8	26.0	4.3
Cincinnati	48.8	46.0	1.3	2.4	53.0	42.9	1.3	1.5
Cleveland	38.7	53.8	7.7	1.5	41.5	51.0	7.3	1.3
Columbus	65.5	26.2	3.5	3.9	67.9	24.5	2.5	3.4
Dallas	56.9	23.7	42.1	2.8	50.8	25.9	35.6	2.7
Denver	71.9	10.0	35.1	2.9	65.3	11.1	31.7	2.8
Detroit	11.1	82.1	5.6	1.1	12.3	81.6	5.0	1.0
Houston	56.7	23.5	42.3	5.8	49.3	25.3	37.4	5.3
Indianapolis	66.3	25.5	6.2	1.6	69.1	25.5	3.9	1.4
Kansas City	61.5	30.0	8.2	2.5	60.7	31.2	6.9	1.9
Las Vegas	74.3	11.3	28.6	4.8	69.9	10.4	23.6	4.8
Los Angeles	49.1	9.9	48.9	11.1	46.9	11.2	46.5	10.0
Miami	68.5	21.9	67.4	0.7	66.6	22.3	65.8	0.7
Milwaukee	44.7	40.2	14.5	3.6	50.0	37.3	12.0	2.9
Minneapolis	65.2	16.6	10.6	5.8	65.1	18.0	7.6	6.1
New York	44.0	25.3	27.9	11.6	44.7	26.6	27.0	9.8
Newport News	51.1	41.3	4.7	2.8	53.5	39.1	4.2	2.3
Norfolk	47.0	44.8	3.7	2.8	48.4	44.1	3.8	2.8
Oakland	32.4	31.0	25.0	16.4	31.3	35.7	21.9	15.2
Orlando	53.3	34.1	19.9	2.6	61.1	26.9	17.5	2.7
Philadelphia	42.1	44.7	10.4	5.2	45.0	43.2	8.5	4.5
Phoenix	73.7	5.1	41.8	2.0	71.1	5.1	34.1	2.0
Pittsburgh	64.4	28.8	1.8	3.8	67.6	27.1	1.3	2.7
Portland	79.5	6.2	8.4	7.1	77.9	6.6	6.8	6.3
Sacramento	45.7	16.3	25.1	18.4	48.3	15.5	21.6	16.6
San Antonio	64.0	6.1	61.2	1.8	67.7	6.8	58.7	1.6
San Diego	63.2	6.8	25.9	15.8	60.2	7.9	25.4	13.6
San Francisco	53.2	6.5	13.8	33.1	49.7	7.8	14.1	30.8
Seattle	68.9	8.2	6.3	14.4	70.1	8.4	5.3	13.1
St. Louis	44.3	50.6		2.2	43.8	51.2	2.0	2.0
St. Paul	66.1	13.7	8.6	13.5	67.0	11.7	7.9	12.4
St. Petersburg	68.8	25.5	4.3	3.0	71.4	22.4	4.2	2.7
Tampa	62.7	28.6	21.3	2.5	64.2	26.1	19.3	2.2
Virginia Beach	70.2	19.0	4.8	5.3	71.4	19.0	4.2	4.9
Washington	32.4	56.8	8.9	3.0	30.8	60.0	7.9	2.7
Average of Cities	54.3	29.5	18.3	6.0	54.7	29.2	16.1	5.4

Figures for each city should not add to 100% since not all racial groups are included and there is overlap between the race groups and the Hispanic origin classes.

**Table 4. Relative Per Capita Income of Whites in Principal Cities Compared to Their Metropolitan Areas in 2005**

Principal City	Principal City as Percent of Metropolitan Area		Percent Change
	2005	2000	
Atlanta	187	170	10
Baltimore	97	89	9
Boston	115	98	17
Buffalo	87	83	5
Charlotte	125	131	-5
Chicago	111	98	13
Cincinnati	104	105	-1
Cleveland	69	74	-7
Columbus	92	93	-1
Dallas	105	108	-3
Denver	102	102	0
Detroit	59	63	-6
Houston	99	103	-4
Indianapolis	95	99	-4
Kansas City	108	99	9
Las Vegas	101	107	-6
Los Angeles	100	102	-2
Miami	87	84	4
Milwaukee	79	80	-1
Minneapolis	102	102	0
New York	101	99	2
Newport News	88	91	-3
Norfolk	94	96	-2
Oakland	92	87	6
Orlando	119	112	6
Philadelphia	78	78	0
Phoenix	93	94	-1
Pittsburgh	105	100	5
Portland	104	101	3
Sacramento	100	96	4
San Antonio	95	95	0
San Diego	108	108	0
San Francisco	117	121	-3
Seattle	121	118	3
St. Louis	92	87	6
St. Paul	89	89	0
St. Petersburg	117	104	13
Tampa	122	116	5
Virginia Beach	107	105	2
Washington, DC	153	144	6
Average	103	101	2

100 percent means that per capita income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that per capita income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that per capita income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 5. Relative Median Family Income of Non-Hispanic Whites in Principal Cities Compared to Their Metropolitan Areas in 2005**

Principal City	Principal City as Percent of Metropolitan Area		Percent Change
	2005	2000	
Atlanta	152	155	-2
Baltimore	78	74	5
Boston	91	84	8
Buffalo	80	74	8
Charlotte	124	122	2
Chicago	96	86	12
Cincinnati	90	90	0
Cleveland	66	69	-4
Columbus	87	91	-4
Dallas	105	103	2
Denver	98	92	7
Detroit	53	57	-7
Houston	105	102	3
Indianapolis	92	93	-1
Kansas City	98	92	7
Las Vegas	103	108	-5
Los Angeles	96	97	-1
Miami	103	98	5
Milwaukee	74	79	-6
Minneapolis	94	88	7
New York	85	84	1
Newport News	91	91	0
Norfolk	80	84	-5
Oakland	98	97	1
Orlando	98	97	1
Philadelphia	73	73	0
Phoenix	99	99	0
Pittsburgh	93	93	0
Portland	99	92	8
Sacramento	91	87	5
San Antonio	101	100	1
San Diego	106	106	0
San Francisco	108	103	5
Seattle	105	105	0
St. Louis	77	75	3
St. Paul	89	84	6
St. Petersburg	104	100	4
Tampa	123	113	9
Virginia Beach	104	103	1
Washington, DC	136	144	-6
Average	96	95	1

100 percent means that per capita income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that per capita income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that per capita income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 6. Per Capita Income in Principal Cities Relative to Each Metropolitan Area's Income in 2005**

Principal City	Percentage of Principal City to Metropolitan Area Income					
	All	White	Black	Hispanic	White Non-Hispanic	Asian
Atlanta	121	187	82	95	191	160
Baltimore	70	97	79	75	97	80
Boston	90	115	88	88	122	65
Buffalo	74	87	89	87	89	52
Charlotte	110	125	102	109	130	107
Chicago	84	111	90	88	120	88
Cincinnati	82	104	83	--	--	85
Cleveland	60	69	79	81	70	47
Columbus	85	92	91	86	92	77
Dallas	92	105	84	89	135	98
Denver	95	102	84	89	116	113
Detroit	57	59	85	67	62	53
Houston	92	99	87	88	127	101
Indianapolis	88	95	91	82	96	88
Kansas City	94	108	91	100	110	70
Las Vegas	100	101	90	105	103	102
Los Angeles	94	100	101	87	107	93
Miami	84	87	74	83	122	108
Milwaukee	67	79	95	81	82	66
Minneapolis	89	102	92	74	104	117
New York	87	101	92	90	107	84
Newport News	85	88	87	--	--	98
Norfolk	83	94	81	84	94	78
Oakland	72	92	89	70	103	68
Orlando	98	119	80	105	123	112
Philadelphia	67	78	84	79	80	68
Phoenix	90	93	91	88	104	109
Pittsburgh	91	105	91	--	--	81
Portland	101	104	96	101	104	88
Sacramento	86	100	87	97	105	81
San Antonio	93	95	92	97	104	103
San Diego	104	108	94	99	108	99
San Francisco	110	117	87	110	119	88
Seattle	113	121	93	111	120	100
St. Louis	73	92	82	100	93	76
St. Paul	78	89	80	107	91	50
St. Petersburg	106	117	94	--	--	73
Tampa	105	122	82	113	133	173
Virginia Beach	112	107	115	100	108	97
Washington	100	153	79	123	151	123
Average	90	103	88	92	109	90

100 percent means that per capita income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that per capita income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that per capita income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 7. Median Family Income in Principal City Relative to Each Metropolitan Area's Income in 2005**

**Percentage of Principal City to Metropolitan Area Income**

Principal City	All	White	Black	Hispanic	White Non-Hispanic	Asian
Atlanta	66	149	54	71	152	145
Baltimore	58	78	77	70	78	75
Boston	64	85	81	76	91	33
Buffalo	59	79	92	69	80	50
Charlotte	101	121	102	116	124	107
Chicago	71	92	85	89	96	79
Cincinnati	64	89	84	72	90	42
Cleveland	50	65	80	78	66	42
Columbus	78	86	89	95	87	80
Dallas	65	73	74	83	105	56
Denver	77	85	81	91	98	81
Detroit	53	52	85	71	53	38
Houston	74	75	84	85	105	83
Indianapolis	84	91	91	89	92	95
Kansas City	81	95	90	93	98	80
Las Vegas	101	102	72	101	103	104
Los Angeles	81	85	89	81	96	86
Miami	68	66	64	72	103	96
Milwaukee	58	70	96	91	74	54
Minneapolis	78	93	80	82	94	67
New York	73	80	89	84	85	73
Newport News	89	91	87	85	91	145
Norfolk	69	80	81	79	80	82
Oakland	59	92	86	62	98	50
Orlando	77	98	77	93	98	101
Philadelphia	60	71	82	63	73	61
Phoenix	85	87	94	88	99	81
Pittsburgh	76	93	96	--	93	59
Portland	92	97	86	89	99	79
Sacramento	79	82	83	92	91	80
San Antonio	92	92	83	98	101	95
San Diego	103	104	71	94	106	102
San Francisco	92	103	97	91	108	74
Seattle	98	105	103	93	105	93
St. Louis	61	77	80	141	77	70
St. Paul	76	88	92	90	89	60
St. Petersburg	98	108	99	91	104	47
Tampa	93	114	94	86	123	122
Virginia Beach	109	103	129	93	104	101
Washington	57	134	56	80	136	85
Average	77	91	85	86	96	79

100 percent means that Median Family income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city in 2005. Any percentage less than 100 means that median family income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that median family income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 8. City Income Relative To Metropolitan Areas 1980 to 2005**

City	<u>Relative Median Family Income</u>				<u>Relative Per Capita Income</u>			
	1980	1990	2000	2005*	1980	1990	2000	2005*
Atlanta	64	60	63	66	84	90	103	121
Baltimore	72	67	60	58	77	72	70	70
Boston	70	70	65	64	80	81	80	90
Buffalo	75	68	62	59	84	77	74	74
Charlotte	102	106	105	101	107	115	115	110
Chicago	77	74	70	71	81	78	81	84
Cincinnati	78	72	68	64	92	87	87	82
Cleveland	70	60	58	50	72	63	64	60
Columbus	89	89	86	78	91	91	89	85
Dallas	90	81	73	65	104	99	91	92
Denver	83	80	79	77	96	94	92	95
Detroit	69	55	57	53	73	60	60	57
Houston	90	82	79	74	99	95	92	92
Indianapolis	95	93	88	84	98	96	93	88
Kansas City	90	87	82	81	92	92	89	94
Las Vegas	100	100	104	101	98	98	104	100
Los Angeles	90	81	78	81	101	96	95	94
Miami	72	63	68	68	79	72	82	84
Milwaukee	84	73	67	58	85	75	70	67
Minneapolis	80	76	74	78	92	88	87	89
New York	77	75	70	73	88	86	84	87
Newport News	100	90	86	89	103	94	88	85
Norfolk	80	77	75	69	91	86	85	83
Oakland	72	66	62	59	80	73	69	72
Orlando	88	85	85	77	95	93	100	98
Philadelphia	77	72	63	60	81	74	69	67
Phoenix	99	95	91	85	98	94	91	90
Pittsburgh	82	83	82	76	89	90	90	91
Portland	88	88	90	92	97	96	97	101
Sacramento	90	86	78	79	96	91	84	86
San Antonio	92	90	92	92	92	92	94	93
San Diego	99	99	99	103	101	101	103	104
San Francisco	85	84	89	92	97	97	109	110
Seattle	89	92	98	98	100	102	109	113
St. Louis	70	64	60	61	77	72	71	73
St. Paul	84	78	75	76	89	82	77	78
St. Petersburg	94	98	95	98	99	98	97	106
Tampa	93	89	89	93	91	92	101	105
Virginia Beach	118	112	108	109	115	113	110	112
Washington D.C	69	67	64	57	87	88	94	100
Average	85	81	78	77	91	88	88	90

100 percent means that income in the principal city was the same as in its entire metropolitan area including the principal city.. Any percentage less than 100 means that income in the principal city was less than in its entire metropolitan area. Any percentage greater than 100 means that income was higher in the principal city than in its metropolitan area.

**Table 9. Changes in Owner Occupancy of Structures with 5 or More Units, 2000 to 2005**

City	Occupied 5+ Unit Structures Owner Occupied 2000 (%)	Occupied 5+ Unit Structures Owner Occupied 2005 (%)	Change in Owner Occupied Units in Occupied Structures with 5 or more Units 2000-2005
Atlanta city, Georgia	9.8	18.8	91.6%
Baltimore city, Maryland	2.9	3.4	17.3%
Boston city, Massachusetts	19.6	21.8	11.4%
Buffalo city, New York	1.0	1.3	28.3%
Charlotte city, North Carolina	3.8	4.0	3.8%
Chicago city, Illinois	17.4	21.4	23.1%
Cincinnati city, Ohio	3.3	3.6	6.6%
Cleveland city, Ohio	1.1	1.3	20.9%
Columbus city, Ohio	2.8	2.6	-6.5%
Dallas city, Texas	3.9	5.2	33.3%
Denver city, Colorado	11.1	12.7	14.2%
Detroit city, Michigan	1.2	1.3	13.4%
Houston city, Texas	4.4	5.3	21.3%
Indianapolis city (balance), Indiana	0.9	1.0	7.9%
Kansas City city, Missouri	1.4	1.6	12.7%
Las Vegas city, Nevada	2.5	2.6	1.4%
Los Angeles city, California	8.4	8.7	3.7%
Miami city, Florida	18.9	21.9	15.4%
Milwaukee city, Wisconsin	3.0	3.2	6.2%
Minneapolis city, Minnesota	5.9	7.2	21.1%
New York city, New York	29.0	30.0	3.5%
Newport News city, Virginia	2.6	2.7	2.2%
Norfolk city, Virginia	3.7	2.9	-21.0%
Oakland city, California	5.7	8.2	42.4%
Orlando city, Florida	8.6	7.5	-13.1%
Philadelphia city, Pennsylvania	2.9	3.5	20.7%
Phoenix city, Arizona	2.0	2.3	15.8%
Pittsburgh city, Pennsylvania	3.4	4.1	19.6%
Portland city, Oregon	2.5	3.2	29.1%
Sacramento city, California	0.7	1.0	42.1%
San Antonio city, Texas	1.2	1.1	-12.1%
San Diego city, California	8.1	10.0	22.6%
San Francisco city, California	11.0	12.9	16.8%
Seattle city, Washington	11.2	14.1	25.2%
St. Louis city, Missouri	2.4	3.0	23.8%
St. Paul city, Minnesota	3.8	4.7	24.0%
St. Petersburg city, Florida	9.7	12.5	28.7%
Tampa city, Florida	4.3	5.1	17.1%
Virginia Beach city, Virginia	3.1	3.9	23.9%
Washington city, District of Columbia	17.9	21.0	17.1%

Table 10. Median Value Owner Occupied Housing in Principal Cities Relative to Metropolitan Areas, 2000 to 2005

Principal Cities	2005			2000			
	City (\$)	Metro Area (\$)	City as Percent of Metro Area	City (\$)	MSA (\$)	City as Percent of Metro Area	Percent Change in City to Metro Area 2000 to 2005
Atlanta	218,500	177,200	123	144,100	132,600	109	13
Baltimore	103,400	243,500	42	69,900	132,400	53	-21
Boston	420,400	394,800	106	210,100	228,700	92	15
Buffalo	60,800	99,700	61	58,800	86,900	68	-10
Charlotte	159,900	150,900	106	131,500	116,200	113	-6
Chicago	245,000	233,500	105	144,300	161,700	89	18
Cincinnati	121,000	143,400	84	93,200	111,600	84	0
Cleveland	86,900	146,700	59	71,100	116,600	61	-3
Columbus	132,100	155,600	85	99,100	118,700	83	2
Dallas	120,900	133,900	90	87,400	102,100	86	5
Denver	231,900	239,100	97	160,100	170,900	94	3
Detroit	88,300	170,600	52	62,800	127,800	49	6
Houston	112,800	123,400	91	77,500	86,200	90	1
Indianapolis	117,900	136,500	86	96,600	109,200	88	-2
Kansas City	124,900	145,500	86	83,300	104,400	80	8
Las Vegas	285,200	289,300	99	133,100	125,700	106	-7
Los Angeles	513,800	520,000	99	215,600	201,400	107	-8
Miami	248,500	250,000	99	116,400	113,200	103	-4
Milwaukee	119,000	183,800	65	79,600	130,800	61	7
Minneapolis	226,900	235,900	96	113,700	139,200	82	17
New York	449,000	419,200	107	221,200	230,400	96	11
Newport News	152,000	190,600	80	94,200	107,100	88	-9
Norfolk	152,200	190,600	80	88,300	107,100	82	-2
Oakland	487,300	655,300	74	227,300	340,800	67	10
Orlando	194,300	193,200	101	97,400	99,500	98	3
Philadelphia	100,200	208,400	48	61,000	119,400	51	-6
Phoenix	184,300	207,300	89	107,000	119,600	89	0
Pittsburgh	74,000	104,600	71	60,700	84,300	72	-1
Portland	225,900	228,400	99	154,700	167,100	93	6
Sacramento	341,400	396,900	86	126,000	155,600	81	6
San Antonio	89,800	97,200	92	67,500	74,100	91	1
San Diego	566,700	552,000	103	220,000	212,000	104	-1
San Francisco	726,700	655,300	111	422,700	340,800	124	-10
Seattle city,	384,900	290,200	133	252,100	211,700	129	11
St. Louis	103,300	141,800	73	63,500	96,200	66	11
St. Paul	200,100	235,900	85	105,000	139,200	75	13
St. Petersburg	166,500	163,300	102	78,200	84,800	92	11
Tampa	168,300	163,300	103	80,700	84,800	95	8
Virginia Beach	231,400	190,600	121	121,500	107,100	113	7
Washington DC	384,400	404,900	95	153,500	172,900	89	7
Mean			90			87	3

## **Appendix A: Comparing the ACS for 2004 and 2005 and 2000 Census Data**

The metropolitan area territory varied in some instances between the 2000 census and the 2005 ACS. The 2000 census and the 2004 ACS used 1999 metropolitan area boundaries, while the 2005 ACS used metropolitan boundaries that in several instances were different than the 1999 boundaries. Similar adjustments have occurred routinely from one decennial census to another. The goal of the adjustments is consistency—maintaining realistic commuting to work territories that have expanded from time to time. Consequently, the metropolitan boundary adjustments should maintain more realistic metropolitan territories than would occur if the metropolitan boundaries were not adjusted as needed.

The release of the 2005 American Community Survey gives detailed data sets for jurisdictions with 65,000 or more population. It also reports data based on the new metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas. William H. Frey and associates have provided a useful overview of the new sets of reporting areas and some of the implications for longitudinal studies. (Frey, 2006) This current study begins to engage those implications. Primarily among them is to select comparable geographic regions. The decisions made in this study are detailed in Appendix B. We aimed to achieve three goals. First, we wanted to be able to make comparisons with the three decades of comparisons made in our book *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs*. Second, when an identical metropolitan area regions were not available, a slightly larger more inclusive region was selected (e.g. Boston Metro NECTA area is larger than the 2000 Boston PMSA based on New England cities and towns.) Third, in anticipation of future studies, simplicity rather than combining different metro divisions was selected. (e.g. Philadelphia Metro Area was selected even though the Philadelphia and Camden Metro Divisions could have been combined to replicate the 2000 Philadelphia PMSA.

The second major difference between the American Community Survey to date and the 2000 Census is the exclusion of persons in Group Quarters, whether institutions or not, from the ACS. This potentially impacts the figures reported here in several ways. First, when considering the percent racial composition of the population of the cities, the disproportional racial representation in prisons and colleges and universities has an indeterminate effect. Second, the group quarter population, and their income, are excluded from the computations of per capita income. In some cities such as Atlanta and Pittsburgh with a high college population and prison population and in Norfolk with a high military population, these may lead to higher estimate of city per capita income relative to metropolitan income, however these metropolitan populations also have similar group quarter populations. This mitigating effect in bias is less likely to be operating however in the case of individual racial or Hispanic designated subgroups. The group quarter population exclusion does not affect the median family income comparisons.

The boundary and the group quarter differences could well interact in some metropolitan cases. We have not yet explored these in detail. However, of the 40 cities and 35 metropolitan areas in this report, only 22 cities and 21 metropolitan areas had data permitting a similar analysis for 2004. The 2004 data were reported using the same geography as the 2000 Census. The overall trends for per capita income and median family income for whites, non-Hispanic whites, blacks, and Hispanics for 2004 were similar to the 2005 findings. Several large differences occurred for specific cities, however, between the 2004 and 2005 findings. With larger data samples available for 2005, one expects the 2005 data are more accurate. But caution is warranted concerning the reliability of the data trends in specific metropolitan areas reported here because of the changes in metropolitan boundaries.

A third methodological issue is the differences in the way the Census 2000 and the American Community Survey collects income data. The Census asked on April 1, 2000 for income in the previous tax year (1999). The American Community Survey asks for income in the previous 12 months as the survey is administered each month of the year. While for county level analysis this difference may be important where there are transient populations that may be present in some months and not others such as seasonal residents or college students at home during the summer but in group quarters during the academic year. However, at the large city and metropolitan area scale these populations are not likely to be large and by using the relative comparison between the city and the metropolitan incomes, any systematic bias would exist in the same direction and would be minimized by the comparative ratio.

A fourth methodological issue is the difference in the sample sizes of the Census (one out of six households) and the much smaller rolling sample of the American Community Survey. While the ACS is careful to report the standard errors for each estimate they make, we have not yet explored these in detail for this recently released data. Consequently small percentage changes or differences in the comparative income ratios reported here should be viewed as “little if any difference or change”. However, many of the shifts identified here are not small and while deserving of a more thorough test of significance, the trends are well deserving our attention.

**Appendix B: Comparing 2005 ACS Metropolitan Areas with Census 2000 Metropolitan Areas:**

1. For Census 2000 used the MSA or PMSA for the principal city with the following exceptions:
  - a. New York we used the CMSA
  - b. Los Angeles we combined the Los Angeles and Orange County PMSAs
  - c. San Francisco and Oakland were compared with the San Francisco and Oakland PMSAs combined.
  - d. Cincinnati-Hamilton CMSA
  - e. Sacramento-Yolo CMSA
2. For the 2005 American Community Survey we used 2003 Metro Areas in most cases with the following exceptions:
  - a. **Dallas** where we will use the Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX Metro Division. One county, Henderson, is lost and one county Delta is added to the 2000 Dallas PMSA.
  - b. **Miami** where we use the Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL Metro Division which contains Miami-Dade County alone.
  - c. **New York** where we use the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA **Metro Area** but compare it with the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA in 2000 (which we used in the book).
  - d. **Boston:** Use the **Metro NECTA** boundary.
  - e. **Seattle Metro Division** Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA, **Metro Division** in the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA Metro Area;
  - f.
3. Other metro areas lead to some shifts in the number of counties in the metro area when compared with the MSA or PMSA in 2000.

Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA Metro Area	Added 8 counties
Baltimore-Towson MD Metro Area	No Change
Buffalo-Cheektawaga-Tonawanda, NY Metro Area ( <i>name Buffalo-Niagara</i> )	No Change
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC Metro Area	Dropped Lincoln and Rowan; Added Anson
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI Metro Area	Adds the Gary Indiana and Kenosha PMSA counties.
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN Metro Area	Added 2 counties Franklin IN, Bracken KY
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH Metro Area	Dropped Ashtabula Co.
Columbus, OH Metro Area	Added 2 counties: Morrow and Union
Denver-Aurora, CO Metro Area	Dropped Weld; Added 5 one of which was 1. Broomfield, CO was formed from parts of Adams, Boulder, Jefferson, and Weld Counties, CO on November 15, 2001 and was coextensive with Broomfield city.
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI Metro Area	Dropped one county: Monroe and adds one county Livingston.. Which had been in Ann Arbor in 1999
Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX Metro Area	Added two Counties PLUS Brazoria and Galveston Counties (2000 separate PMSAs)
Indianapolis, IN Metro Area	Dropped Madison County; Added two Brown and Putman
Kansas City, MO-KS Metro Area	Added four Counties
Las Vegas, NM Metro Area ( <i>May be listed as Las Vegas-Paradise Metro Area</i> )	Dropped Nye County

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA Metro Area	We combined these two in our earlier study.
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI Metro Area	No Change
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI Metro Area	No Change
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC Metro Area	Added One Surry Co.
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA Metro Area;	We combined SF and Oakland PMSAs in book. Had to do the addition. Now a metro area.
Orlando, FL. Metro Area	
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD <b>Metro Area;</b>	Adds 2 counties Cecil, MD. New Castle, DE. Including city of Wilmington Del.
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	No Change
Pittsburgh, PA Metro area	Added One County: Armstrong
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA Metro Area	Added One county: Skamania
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA <b>Metro Area</b>	Same as Sacramento-Yolo CMSA in 2000
San Antonio, TX Metro Area	No Change
San Diego, CA Metro Area	No Change
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA; Metro Area;	Same but did we not combine SF and Oakland
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA, <i><b>Metro Division</b></i> in the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA Metro Area;	2,414,616 in PMSA in 2000 Dropped one county: Island Co.
St. Louis, MO-IL Metro Area	Added four Counties Bond IL, Calhoun, IL, Macoupin IL, Washington MO.
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL Metro Area	No Change
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metro Area	Dropped Three Counties: Culpeper VA, King George Va, Berkeley WV.