

Cities' Performance Improves Since 2000 Census

William Lucy and David Phillips

University of Virginia

April 5, 2006

Findings

Per capita income and median owner occupied housing value increased on average in 22 central cities in large metropolitan areas relative to their suburbs between 2000 and 2004, improving on their performance in the 1990s. These findings contradict claims that slower population growth in cities after 2000 indicates cities performed better in the 1990s and have fared worse since the 2000 census.

Per capita income in the 22 central cities increased on average from 86 percent to 89 percent of their metropolitan areas' income from 2000 to 2004, based on recent data released by the U.S. Bureau of the Census's American Community Survey.

This increase reversed a decline in the per capita income average from 89 percent to 86 percent of metropolitan income between 1980 and 1990. From 1990 and 2000 there was no change in the average relationship of per capita income between these central cities and their metropolitan areas. Consequently 1990 may represent the year when the competitive attractiveness of these central cities bottomed out relative to their suburbs. The substantial differences in trends in diverse metropolitan areas, however, indicate that competitive conditions between cities and suburbs vary considerably among metropolitan areas.

Similar changes occurred in median value of owner occupied housing which increased in these 22 cities from 83.7 percent in 2000 to 86.4 percent in 2004 of metropolitan housing values.

Median family income trends revealed a different story. The 22 central cities experienced a slight decline from 76 percent in 2000 to 75 percent in 2004 of median family income relative to metropolitan income. This decline was less than the change from cities' having 78 percent of metropolitan median family income in 1990 and 83 percent in 1980.

Cities were more successful attracting non-family households, reflected in per capita income data, than family households whose location preferences are captured more clearly with median family income data.

Substantial numbers of owner-occupied condominiums were built in many of these central cities between 2000 and 2004, probably contributing to increases in relative per capita income and median owner-occupied housing value.

Desires for home ownership, the largest form of investment for most households, are reflected in these condominium trends. This housing type may be increasingly attractive to “empty nest” households of the post-World War II “baby boom” generation. Between 1990 and 2000, many of these central cities gained population downtown, an area where condominiums usually are constructed in reviving cities.

Scope and Methodology

The U.S. Bureau of the Census has conducted the American Community Survey (ACS) since the 2000 census. The data items covered in the ACS are much the same as in the 2000 census. By 2004, data were available for 22 cities in 21 large metropolitan areas among the 35 metropolitan areas that we emphasized in our book *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs* (2006). This study examines post-2000 census trends in the context of previous trends.

The analytic approach used here compares characteristics in cities—per capita income, median family income, and median value of owner occupied housing—with the same characteristics for their metropolitan areas. Here we focus mainly on trends between 2000 and 2004. In some instances, these recent trends are compared with trends between 1990 and 2000 or between 1980 and 1990.

Dividing the city data by metropolitan data forms specific comparisons between cities and metropolitan areas. For example, if per capita income in the city is \$20,000 and in its metropolitan area per capita income is \$30,000, then city per capita income is 67 percent of metropolitan income. If per capita income in the city is \$33,000 and its metropolitan income is \$30,000, then city per capita income is 110 percent of metropolitan income.

By following trends for income and housing value data, we determined whether the city is competing more or less effectively with suburban areas for households that moved.

Since 1960, cities have been falling steadily behind suburbs in income measures. This trend applies to cities of all sizes, with large cities generally faring worse than smaller cities. Data for 542 cities in more than 300 metropolitan areas from the HUD Users State of the Cities Data Set track the decline of cities in median family income relative to their metropolitan areas from 1970 to 2000 (Table 1). Relative median family income for cities by population size in 2000 is described in Table 2. Every jurisdiction is vulnerable to income decline from insufficient competitive attractiveness due to residential mobility rates of nearly 50 percent in five years. Conversely, in cities and suburbs that become more attractive, incomes can rise rapidly compared with metropolitan income norms.

Per Capita Income Trends

Relative per capita income increased in 14 of 22 cities between 2000 and 2004; it decreased in seven cities and remained the same in one. Relative per capita income increases of three percent or more occurred in nine cities (Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Miami, St. Louis, St. Petersburg, and Tampa) between 2000 and 2004, compared with decreases of three percent or more in two cities (Philadelphia and Sacramento) (Table 3).

The largest increase was in Atlanta, where relative per capita income jumped from 103 percent of metropolitan income in 2000 to 128 percent in 2004. The size of this increase may be suspect, but the trajectory continues a trend evident since 1980, when Atlanta's per capita income was 84 percent of metropolitan income, and 1990, when it was 90 percent of metropolitan income. Other large increases between 2000 and 2004 were in Tampa, 101 to 111 percent, and Boston, 80 to 89 percent. We are suspicious of the St. Louis increase from 71 percent in 2000 to 81 percent in 2004, because the city's percentage was only 73 percent in 2003. St. Louis' median owner occupied housing value increased from 66 percent in 2000 to 68 percent in 2004. From the consistency in the direction of change, we infer that St. Louis probably has done better in retaining and attracting middle income households since 2000.

Between 1990 and 2000, no change occurred in the average of the 22 cities per capita income percentages, remaining at 86 percent. Only eight cities experienced increases, while 12 went down and two remained the same, a much weaker performance by cities in the 1990s than between 2000 and 2004. Cities did better in the 1990s than in the 1980s, however, when the city average per capita income fell from 89 percent to 86 percent of metropolitan income (Table 3).

Median Owner-Occupied Housing Value Trends

Housing value trends closely paralleled per capita income trends. Between 2000 and 2004, median owner-occupied housing value in cities increased from 83.7 percent to 86.4 percent of metropolitan values. It increased in 14 cities, decreased in six and remained the same in two. Median owner-occupied housing value and per capita income both increased in 11 cities and decreased in four cities. As with per capita income, median owner-occupied housing value increased by three percent or more in nine cities (Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Milwaukee, San Antonio, Seattle, and Tampa) and decreased by more than three percent in two cities (Buffalo and Dallas) relative to metropolitan value (Table 4).

The largest increase in median owner-occupied housing value was in Atlanta, an increase from 109 percent in 2000 to 128 percent of metropolitan values in 2004. Although this increase seems extraordinary, the housing value increase is consistent with the per capita income increase. By 2004, median owner-occupied housing value was higher than metropolitan values in five cities—Atlanta, Miami, San Diego, Seattle, and Tampa, and the Chicago city and metropolitan housing values were the same.

If size of units is taken into account, the value of housing in cities would be augmented slightly. Although square footage of dwellings in cities and suburbs is not available in the census, data for number of rooms are reported. For the median number of rooms in owner-occupied housing, the average size in cities was 95 percent of metropolitan areas' dwelling size. In some of the cities where housing values exceeded metropolitan values in 2004, city median rooms were lower than metropolitan medians—91 percent of the metropolitan median in Atlanta, 90 percent in Chicago, 94 percent in Miami, 98 percent in San Diego, and 94 percent in Seattle. City housing in Tampa was slightly larger than metropolitan housing, 104 percent. If adjusted upward for cities with fewer median rooms, housing values in these cities would have been still higher than metropolitan housing values.

Construction Trends in Owner-Occupied Multi-Unit Structures

According to the American Community Survey, each city in which median value of owner-occupied housing was higher than metropolitan values exceeded the 22 cities' average proportion of ownership in structures with five or more units. The 22 city average was 12 percent of units in structures with five or more units were owner-occupied (Table 5). Most of these units are condominiums. Owner occupancy in structures with five or more units was 15 percent in Atlanta in 2004, 27 percent in Chicago, 21 percent in Miami, 17 percent in San Diego, 18 percent in Seattle, and 14 percent in Tampa. Other high percentage of condominium ownership occurred in cities where per capita income and housing value were rising (Boston 17 percent, Denver 26 percent, Pittsburgh 15 percent, and St. Petersburg 25 percent). These cities also had substantial increases in condominium ownership between 2000 and 2004 (Atlanta 52 percent, Boston 12 percent, Chicago 15 percent, Denver 50 percent, Miami 13 percent, Pittsburgh 58 percent, San Diego 45 percent, Seattle 40 percent, and Tampa 33 percent). St. Louis also had a large increase, 25 percent, but it started from a low base and only had eight percent of structures with five or more units that were owner occupied in 2004. St. Louis advanced in both per capita income and median housing value relative to its metropolitan area. The Buffalo, Detroit, and St. Petersburg data seemed flawed, as they identified fewer occupied structures with five or more units in 2004 than in 2000, whether they were owner- or renter-occupied; therefore, these cities were excluded.

Several other cities experienced major increases in owner-occupied condominiums but did not increase in per capita income and housing value relative to their metropolitan areas (Dallas, Houston, Indianapolis, and San Antonio). A major increase in condominium ownership seemed a useful contributor to advances by cities in per capita income and median value of owner-occupied housing, but it was not always a sufficient condition.

Period of Housing Construction

Our analyses in *Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs* of census tract and suburban relative income increases and decreases from 1990 to 2000 revealed two trends.

First, census tracts with substantial proportions of pre-1940 housing tended to increase in relative average family income. Conversely, census tracts where substantial proportions of housing were constructed between 1940 and 1970 tended to decline in relative average family income compared with metropolitan income levels. These trends occurred in both central cities and suburbs.

At the scale of cities, similar clarity of findings is not feasible. Census tracts average 3,000 to 5,000 residents and less than half that number of dwellings. Cities in this study have hundreds of thousands, or even more than one million residents. Therefore, cities encompass diversity of housing characteristics; locations are difficult to summarize in revealing ways with an indicator of housing age.

On the other hand, housing age operationalized by period of construction does reveal some opportunities and obstacles. The challenge for central cities, as for other jurisdictions and neighborhoods, is to retain some residents and attract a satisfactory cadre of replacements for residents who move away. Pre-1940 housing presents useful opportunities for cities based on the character and location of some or much of it. Middle-aged housing built between 1940 and 1970 has the disadvantage often of small size—the median size house built in 1950 had only 1,100 square feet—and marginal locations which sometimes have convenient destinations to walk to but often do not. We explain the 1990 to 2000 trends with our interpretation that more people preferred old and convenient settings during the 1990s than before 1990. Conversely, desires for four bedroom residences encompassing 2,000 or more square feet has driven the movement of population into outer suburbs and beyond, leaving the middle-aged suburbs with fewer replacement in-movers than previously.

Some clues about these forces can be discerned in city data about periods when housing was constructed. In our sample of 22 cities, for example, the city that has struggled most, as reflected in income data, is Detroit. Detroit had a greater percentage of housing built between 1940 and 1970 (61 percent) than the other 21 cities. Other industrial cities also have struggled. In each of these industrial cities, 49 percent or more of its housing was constructed before 1940 and relative per capita income went up slightly between 2000 and 2004 (Buffalo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis). Boston went up considerably more, nine percent in relative per capita income from 2000 to 2004, aided perhaps by less industrial era left-over brownfields than in more industrial cities and by 54 percent of its housing built before 1940, slightly more than in the more industrial cities.

Housing in these cities was moderately priced, except in Boston. The pre-1940 housing was constructed during relatively affluent periods in these cities' evolution. Consequently, it may have been constructed with some attractive features and durable materials. The combination of moderate owner-occupied housing values in 2000 (median values were Buffalo \$58,800, Cleveland \$71,100, Pittsburgh \$60,700, and St. Louis \$63,500) and convenience of short distances for walking and using mass transit to numerous destinations helped these cities cope with fiscal and social liabilities

confronting home buyers and renters. Modest housing prices augment these cities' prospects for revival.

Median Family Income Trends

Cities with large amounts of old housing also fared well in median family income changes between 2000 and 2004. The attractiveness of cities traditionally is attributed to appeal to the young, single, and middle-aged to elderly empty nesters. Middle- and upper-income families with children typically have opted for suburban locations. These differences in preferences are reflected in differences in relative per capita income and relative median family income for the 22 cities in this study. Average per capita income in the 22 cities was 89 percent of metropolitan income in 2004, while it was 75 percent for median family income.

Consequently, increases in relative median family income in these old industrial cities would seem less likely than increases in relative per capita income. But between 2000 and 2004 these old industrial cities enjoyed some success, with some increases and only small decreases in relative median family income—Buffalo plus 7 percent, Cleveland plus 1, Pittsburgh minus 1, St. Louis plus 12 (Table 6). As with the increase in relative per capita income, we suspect an inaccurate estimate in the St. Louis trend, in light of an increase of only two percent between 2000 and 2003 and no prior history of increases.

Overall, the 22 cities declined by one percent in relative median family income between 2000 and 2004, consistent with the traditional difficulty cities have had in retaining and attracting middle and upper income families. This small decline, however, may indicate greater potential than in previous decades to stem decline of cities due to affluent families choosing suburban locations.

City Population Trends

Population growth often is equated with prosperity. If cities are growing, many observers assume they are prospering. If growth slows, halts, or becomes negative, some observers may assume that prosperity has been replaced by decline. Thus, when analyses of census bureau population estimates for 2004 showed slower population growth in large cities between 2000 and 2004 than in those same cities between 1990 and 2000, headlines like this one in USA Today (2005) appeared: “Big-city booms now look like blips: 1990s’ urban revivals yield to suburbs’ gains,” with this lead sentence: “The urban renaissance that reinvigorated many of the nation’s cities in the 1990s has faded since 2000, according to Census population estimates out today.”

Our analysis of income data comparing central city with metropolitan trends has revealed that cities have done better, measured both by per capita income and median family income between 2000 and 2004 than between 1990 and 2000. Next we consider how population and relative income changes were linked from 2000 to 2004.

At first glance, a connection appears between population increases and increases in relative per capita income and relative median family income. Of the 13 out of 22 cities that increased in population between 2000 and 2004, seven increased in relative per capita income and three increased in relative median family income.

But a stronger connection occurred between population decreases and relative income increases. Of the nine cities that went down in population, seven increased in relative per capita income and five increased in relative median family income (Table 7). The only cities that decreased in population and also decreased in relative per capita income were Detroit and Philadelphia. The cities that increased in population but decreased in relative per capita income were southwestern and western cities—Dallas, Houston, Sacramento, San Antonio, and San Diego. The largest relative per capita income decrease was in the city with the largest population increase—Sacramento. These findings are consistent with previous discoveries that there was no correlation between population and income changes in suburbs between 1990 and 2000 (Lucy and Phillips 2006, Chapter 6).

On the other hand, a closer connection occurred between downtown population changes and relative per capita income changes. Based on downtown population changes for 16 of the 22 cities described by Eugenie L. Birch (2005, 5), downtown population increased in 13 downtowns between 1990 and 2000; relative per capita income increased in nine of these 13 of 16 cities between 2000 and 2004. In addition, six of these 13 cities increased in relative median family income from 2000 to 2004. In the three cities whose downtowns' declined in population during the 1990s, only one increased in relative per capita income.

Condominium construction and population increases probably are linked in some downtowns. Among the 13 cities in which downtown population increased from 1990 to 2000, 11 had double digit increases in condominiums within city boundaries between 2000 and 2004. Downtown housing is more likely to be expensive, drawing a higher income population than the city income norm. Condominiums provide conveniently located opportunities for people accustomed to, or seeking, housing as an investment as well as a residence. Consequently, we expect that linkages between downtown population increases, condominium increases, and relative income increases often will occur together.

Conclusion

Population gains and losses can be deceptive. Population gains in cities may be largely due to increases in foreign immigrants whose incomes tend to be lower than metropolitan norms. Population losses may be due to reductions in household size, which may lead to higher incomes per capita.

To the extent that population increases occur in cities' downtowns and include middle-aged empty nesters, young singles, and members of the "creative class" who prefer city settings according to Richard Florida (2005), it seems likely that increasing

desires for “walking urbanity”, as interpreted by Christopher Leinberger (2005), will tend to increase cities’ relative per capita income. Our findings indicate that even old Northern industrial cities that have fallen far behind their suburbs may show signs of revival, based partly on downtown attractions and condominium construction.

The larger challenge for central cities is appealing to families with school age children. In this sample of 22 central cities, relative median family income lagged well behind relative per capita income, 75 percent for median family income and 89 percent for relative per capita income. This difference indicates a substantial gap between the appeal of cities for families with children and other households.

On the other hand, our previous findings about relative average family income gains in pre-1940 census tracts in central cities and in suburbs (Lucy and Phillips 2006, Chapter 8), provide reasons for optimism that central cities will make more gains in relative median family income in the future. We discovered that average family incomes were higher in 2000 in neighborhoods with substantial amounts of pre-1940 housing than in neighborhoods built mainly in the 1940s and 1950s in both cities and suburbs. In addition, average family incomes in these pre-1940 neighborhoods were more likely to have increased in the 1990s than in neighborhoods built mainly between 1950 and 1990. This finding indicates old neighborhoods were attracting families with higher incomes than had previously lived in these neighborhoods.

Commuting by suburbanites to well-paying city jobs indicates there is ample potential for central city family income revival by drawing on families who choose more convenience and less commuting stress. Public policies and behavior changes that deal with the size and quality of housing, feelings about and the actuality of safety in public spaces, and greater confidence in public schools will be part of the struggle for renewal by central cities.

Note on American Community Survey Methods

The analysis of data in this report and in *Tomorrow’s Cities, Tomorrow’s Suburbs* requires comparisons between cities and metropolitan areas. By late 2005, available data permitted comparison of findings for central cities and their metropolitan areas in 21 of the 35 metropolitan areas that were focused on in *Tomorrow’s Cities, Tomorrow’s Suburbs*. The American Community Survey (ACS) is replacing the traditional decennial census. In the ACS, a sample of housing units is surveyed annually. For small areas, such as census tracts, five years are needed to accumulate a sufficient sample to estimate population and housing characteristics. Consequently, small area data have not yet been reported. While data for each central city in the 35 metropolitan areas are available for 2004, in 14 instances the metropolitan areawide data are not available for 2004, preventing comparisons to the decennial census data for 1990 and 2000.

The reliability of data in the American Community Survey is uncertain. Findings reported here should be compared with results in future years.

The Census Bureau announced updated metropolitan area boundaries in 2005, but they will not be applied to the ACS data until 2006. The metropolitan data in this study use the same metropolitan boundaries as the 2000 census.

Per capita income was calculated slightly differently in 2000 and 2004. For 2004, the ACS limited data to household population and excluded persons living in group quarters. In 2000, the census calculation of per capita income included persons in group quarters. This difference in method would have a substantial effect on per capita income calculations for census tracts and small suburbs with large numbers of college students living in dormitories. We expect the effect will be modest at central city and metropolitan scale, because of their large populations and because group quarters would be excluded at both city and metropolitan scale.

References

- Eugenie L. Birch. 2005. Who Lives Downtown. Brookings Institution, November.
- Larry Copeland and Barbara Hansen. 2005. Big-city booms now look like blips: 1990s' urban revivals yield to suburbs' gains. USA Today, June 30.
- Richard Florida. 2005. Cities and the Creative Class. New York: Routledge.
- Christopher B. Leinberger. 2005. Turning Around Downtown: Twelve Steps to Revitalization. Brookings Institution, March.
- William H. Lucy and David L. Phillips. 2006. Tomorrow's Cities, Tomorrow's Suburbs. Chicago: American Planning Association Planners' Press.

Table 1. Cities Above and Below Metropolitan Median Incomes 1970 to 2000

Median Family Income: Central City Relative to Metropolitan Area Percent Distribution

542 Cities	10% or More Below	2.5% to 9.9% Below	2.49% Above to 2.49% Below	2.5% to 9.9% Above	10% or More Above
1970 ¹	18.4	24.9	21.3	21.3	14.1
1980	32.7	25.6	16.8	14.4	10.5
1990	43.7	19.2	13.7	13.5	10.0
2000	47.4	20.8	13.5	10.0	8.3

¹In 1970, there were valid data for 539 cities

Source: HUD Users State of the Cities Data Set

Table 2. Cities Above and Below Metropolitan Median Family Income by Population Size, 2000

Relative to Metropolitan Median Family Income

Population 542 Cities	10% or More Below	2.5% to 9.9% Below	2.49% Above to 2.49% Below	2.5% to 9.9% Above	10% to More Above	Number of Cities
Less than 25,000	44.1	26.5	8.8	8.8	11.8	34
25,000 to 49,999	51.7	16.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	151
50,000 to 99,999	40.2	22.3	17.3	10.1	10.1	179
100,000 to 350,000	50.8	19.2	15.4	9.2	5.4	130
More than 350,000	54.2	29.2	6.3	10.4	0.0	48

Source: HUD Users State of the Cities Data Set

Table 3. City Per Capita Income as Percent of Metropolitan Per Capita Income

	1980	1990	2000	2004
Atlanta	84	90	103	128
Boston	80	81	80	89
Buffalo	84	77	74	76
Chicago	81	78	81	86
Cleveland	72	63	64	67
Dallas	104	99	91	89
Denver	96	94	92	97
Detroit	73	60	60	58
Houston	99	95	92	91
Indianapolis	98	96	94	94
Kansas City	92	92	89	90
Miami	79	72	82	87
Milwaukee	85	75	70	71
Philadelphia	81	74	69	66
Pittsburgh	89	90	90	91
Sacramento	96	91	84	79
San Antonio	92	92	94	92
San Diego	101	101	103	102
Seattle	100	102	109	111
St. Louis	77	72	71	81
St. Petersburg	99	98	97	101
Tampa	91	92	101	111
Mean	89	86	86	89

Sources: Census of Population and Housing 1980, 1990, and 2000; American Community Survey 2004

Table 4. Median Value Owner Occupied Housing

	2000			2004		
	City	Metropolitan	City as Percent of Metropolitan	City	Metropolitan	City as Percent of Metropolitan
Atlanta	\$144,100	\$132,600	109	\$217,329	\$169,415	128
Boston	210,100	228,700	92	379,132	390,896	97
Buffalo	58,800	86,900	68	59,368	93,479	64
Chicago	144,300	161,700	89	225,247	225,916	100
Cleveland	71,100	116,600	61	83,933	138,200	61
Dallas	87,400	102,100	86	112,933	137,620	82
Denver	160,100	170,980	94	222,642	229,089	97
Detroit	62,800	127,800	49	89,759	164,787	54
Houston	77,500	86,200	90	107,148	118,365	91
Indianapolis	96,600	109,200	88	112,924	129,118	87
Kansas City	83,300	104,400	80	110,421	137,807	80
Miami	116,400	113,200	103	201,145	193,906	104
Milwaukee	79,600	130,800	61	111,573	169,963	66
Philadelphia	61,000	119,400	51	87,236	174,044	50
Pittsburgh	60,700	84,300	72	73,271	98,829	74
Sacramento	126,000	156,200	81	253,357	320,616	79
San Antonio	67,500	74,100	91	88,453	93,335	95
San Diego	220,000	212,000	104	481,829	471,132	102
Seattle	252,100	211,700	119	338,857	271,120	125
St. Louis	63,500	96,200	66	91,243	134,295	68
St. Petersburg	78,200	84,800	92	123,846	132,244	94
Tampa	80,700	84,800	95	135,670	132,224	103
Mean			83.7			86.4

Sources: Census of Population and Housing, 2000; American Community Survey 2004.

Table 5. Condominium, Downtown Population and Per Capita Income Change

	Relative Per Capita Income Change 2000-2004	Percent Increase in Number of Owner Occupied Units in Structures with 5 or more Units 2000-2004	Percent 5+ Unit Structures Owner Occupied 2004	Downtown Population Change 1990 to 2000
Atlanta	25	52	15	26
Boston	9	12	17	5
Buffalo	2	-	4	-
Chicago	5	15	27	30
Cleveland	3	-4	4	32
Dallas	-2	75	7	24
Denver	5	50	26	51
Detroit	-2	-	3	-3
Houston	-1	30	7	-
Indianapolis	0	47	4	20
Kansas City	1	-15	3	-
Miami	5	13	21	32
Milwaukee	1	7	6	13
Philadelphia	-3	17	12	5
Pittsburgh	1	58	15	26
Sacramento	-5	2	1	-
San Antonio	-2	66	5	-2
San Diego	-1	45	17	73
Seattle	2	40	18	86
St. Louis	10	25	8	-18
St. Petersburg	4	-	25	-
Tampa	10	33	14	-
Mean	3	30	12	25

Sources: Census of Population and Housing 2000; American Community Survey 2004;
Eugenie Birch 2005, *Who Lives Downtown*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings

Buffalo, Detroit, and St. Petersburg were excluded because the ACS estimated there were fewer occupied structures with 5 or more units in 2004 than in 2000, an unlikely condition.

Table 6. City Median Family Income as Percent of Metropolitan Median Family Income

	1980	1990	2000	2004
Atlanta	64	61	63	67
Boston	70	70	65	66
Buffalo	75	68	62	69
Chicago	77	74	70	71
Cleveland	70	60	58	59
Dallas	90	81	73	73
Denver	83	80	79	81
Detroit	69	55	57	52
Houston	90	82	79	78
Indianapolis	95	93	88	81
Kansas City	90	87	83	81
Miami	72	63	68	66
Milwaukee	84	73	67	64
Philadelphia	77	72	63	55
Pittsburgh	82	83	82	81
Sacramento	90	86	78	70
San Antonio	92	90	92	89
San Diego	99	99	99	102
Seattle	89	92	98	96
St. Louis	70	64	60	72
St. Petersburg	94	98	95	91
Tampa	93	89	89	88
Mean	83	78	76	75

Sources: Census of Population and Housing 1980, 1990, 2000; American Community Survey 2004.

Table 7. Population and Income Change 1990 to 2004

City	Percent Change in Population		Percent Change in Downtown Population	Percent Change in Relative Income 2000 to 2004	
	1990-2000	2000-2004		Relative Median Family Income	Relative Per Capita Income
Atlanta	5.7	0.5	26.1	4	25
Boston	3.0	-3.0	4.7	1	9
Buffalo	-10.8	-3.2		7	2
Chicago	6.3	-0.1	30.0	1	5
Cleveland	-5.4	-3.8	32.2	1	3
Dallas	19.8	5.0	24.1	0	-2
Denver	20.5	1.9	51.4	2	5
Detroit	-6.6	-4.3	-3.3	-5	-2
Houston	19.8	2.6		-1	-1
Indianapolis	6.9	0.3	20.2	-7	0
Kansas City	1.5	0.6		-2	1
Miami	1.4	5.1	31.6	-2	5
Milwaukee	-5.0	-2.1	13.1	-3	1
Philadelphia	-4.3	-2.9	4.9	-8	-3
Pittsburgh	-9.5	-3.4	26.1	-1	1
Sacramento	10.2	11.0		-8	-5
San Antonio	22.3	7.0	-1.9	-3	-2
San Diego	10.2	2.9	72.7	3	-1
Seattle	11.1	1.6	85.6	-2	2
St. Louis	-12.2	-1.0	-17.5	12	10
St. Petersburg	7.0 *	2.7 *		-4	4
Tampa	7.0 *	2.7 *		-1	10
Average:	4.5	0.9	25.0		

* Average for both cities.

Sources: Census of Population and Housing 2000; American Community Survey 2004;
Eugenie Birch 2005, Who Lives Downtown, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution