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The New Urban Demographics

I. What are the general demographic trends affecting the United States?

II. How do these trends affect central cities?

III. How do city trends compare with suburban trends?

IV. What do these trends mean for urban and housing policy?
What are the general demographic trends affecting the United States?
Major demographic forces are changing the United States

- Population Growth
- Immigration
- Internal Migration
- Aging
The 1990s presented the strongest growth in four decades

US population growth (millions), 1960-2000
More than 1/3 of population growth was driven by immigration
Despite a decade of rapid migration, the share of the U.S. population that is foreign-born is lower now than in the 1900s.
The US population is aging
Minorities have younger age structures than whites.

Age distribution, 2020
America’s New Demographic Regions

The New Sunbelt → Migration growth states
Melting Pot America → Diversity states
The Heartland → Slow growth states
America’s New Regions

Source: William H. Frey
New Sunbelt: Examples

- **Colorado**: Immigration: 1.9, Domestic Migration: 12.2, Natural Increase: 8.6
- **Georgia**: Immigration: 1.6, Domestic Migration: 10.0, Natural Increase: 8.1

Melting Pot: Examples

California

New York

Heartland: Example

Pennsylvania

Source: William Frey
Hispanics are concentrated in Washington, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Florida and isolated urban pockets.

Hispanic share of population by county, 2000

Source: William Frey
Asians are concentrated in California and isolated urban pockets

Asian share of population by county, 2000

Source: William Frey
Blacks are concentrated in the South and industrial cities of the North

African-American share of population by county, 2000

Source: William Frey
Whites are principally concentrated in the heartland.

White share of population by county, 2000

Source: William Frey
Melting pot states include a large share of America’s diversity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Born</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian Language at Home</strong></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish at Home</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Marriages</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Born</strong></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English at Home</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: William H. Frey
II

How do these trends affect cities?
As a group, the largest cities grew faster in the 1990s than in the 1980s.
Cities in growing areas grew; cities in slow growth areas generally declined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Category</th>
<th>Number of Cities</th>
<th>City Population Change</th>
<th>MSA Population Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Growth (over 20%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Growth (10 to 20%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Growth (2 to 10%)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Growth (-2 to 2%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss (below -2%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the fastest growing cities were concentrated in the West and Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Population Change</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, TX</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, CO</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central City Growth in the 1990s was fueled by Asians and Hispanics

- Hispanic: 42.6%
- Black: 6.4%
- Asian: 38.3%
- White: -8.5%
If not for Hispanic and Asian growth, city growth would have been dramatically lower.
In 2000, the top hundred cities became majority minority

- White: 44
- Black: 24
- Hispanic: 23
- Asian: 2
- Multi-racial: 4

2000
As with states, the experience of immigration and diversity varies across the country.
Former Gateways

Share of foreign born, 1900 - 2000

Source: Audrey Singer
Continuous Gateways

Share of foreign born, 1900 - 2000

Source: Audrey Singer
Post World War II Gateways

Share of foreign born, 1900 - 2000

Source: Audrey Singer

Cities
Emerging Gateways

Share of foreign born, 1900 - 2000

Source: Audrey Singer
Share of foreign born, 1900 - 2000

Source: Audrey Singer
The significant growth in cities was in non-married households with children and “non-families”
This also varies across the country.
How city trends compare with suburban trends
Suburbs grew faster than cities in the 1990s

Percent population growth, 1990-2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; cities and suburbs in the 100 largest metro areas
Although, there is significant regional variation in percent population growth, 1990-2000.
The percent of each racial/ethnic group living in the suburbs increased substantially.
In addition, every minority group grew at faster rates in the suburbs than in central cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Cities</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now more than 1 in 4 households are minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The suburbanization of foreign born is particularly pronounced in emerging gateways.
Every household type grew at faster rates in the suburbs than in cities

Percent population growth, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married - no children</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married - with children</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family - no children</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family - with</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth among older individuals is more prevalent in suburbs.
IV What are the policy implications?
Demographics shape market demand for housing

Aging - changes lifestyle choices
Immigration - changes size and type of housing demanded
Suburbanization - changes the location of demand
Regional Economy - affects price of housing

This will differ across and within regions
Affordable housing policy has been devolved principally to localities over the past 20 years.

- Low Income Housing Tax Credit
- HOME
- Community Development Block Grant
- Homeless Assistance Programs
- Public Housing Reform
Federal housing policy is under attack

- Broader fiscal policy
- Low income housing tax credit
- HOPE VI
- Vouchers
- Public Housing Rules
- Federal Regulatory Policy
www.brookings.edu/urban