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THIS PAPER

Uses 1990 and 2000 census data to compare conditions and trends in metropolitan areas of 10 Making Connections Cities and 3 Civic Sites

Looks at selected key indicators on:

- Racial/ethnic composition
- Labor market
- Poverty and family risk factors
- Concentration of poverty
- Housing market

PURPOSE

Need to know past trends (1990-2000) to understand trends in the intervention period

For example, a 5 percent rate of improvement in the intervention period means something very different if the trend in the earlier period was –2 percent or +10 percent.

Need to know conditions and trends in metropolitan context since they will influence: (a) how you set targets and interpret performance; (b) what metropolitan policies/programs you advocate.

For example, different employment targets warranted in weak vs. strong labor markets. Different policy emphasis warranted if problem with weak labor market is sluggish job growth or inadequate workforce development system.
Exhibit 1
WIDE DIVERSITY AMONG CASEY METROS
IN RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Scatter-plot shows metros with high black populations in upper left, high concentrations of Hispanic and other non-black minorities in lower right; predominantly white in lower left.

- Atlanta, Baltimore, Washington have highest concentrations of blacks (blacks account for more than one quarter of metro populations in all 3)
- Hispanics and other non-black minorities make up by far the highest population share in San Antonio (53 percent). Oakland and Denver also above the metro average.
- Oakland is the only Casey metro with significant shares of both black and non-black minorities at the metropolitan level.
- Des Moines, Providence, Seattle and Hartford still predominantly white metropolitan populations (below metro average for both black and non-black minority shares)

Note: on all scatter plots, vertical and horizontal lines in box represent average of each variable for the 100 largest metropolitan areas.
Exhibit 2

CASEY METROS REASONABLY REPRESENTATIVE RE RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Scatter-plot format same as Exhibit 1: shows Casey metros (large dots) against 100 largest metro areas (plusses).

- With respect to racial/ethnic composition, Casey metros are reasonably representative of the diversity of the 100 largest U.S. metros
Exhibit 3

CASEY METROS ALSO DIVERSE WITH RESPECT TO STRENGTH OF METRO LABOR MARKETS

On scatter-plot, lower right is best (rapid job growth and low unemployment) and upper left is worst (slow or no job growth and higher unemployment)

- Wide range in metropolitan employment growth. Largest gains in Atlanta (+34 percent), Denver (+30 percent) and San Antonio (+21 percent). Worst performance in Hartford (-4 percent), Providence (+3 percent) and Baltimore (+3 percent).

- Narrower range in unemployment rates. Lowest unemployment in Denver (4.0 percent), Washington (4.3 percent) and Des Moines and Indianapolis (4.4 percent). Only 2 Casey metros with unemployment above metro average: Hartford and San Antonio (5.7 percent).
Exhibit 4

ALSO WITH RESPECT TO LABOR MARKET CONDITIONS
CASEY METROS REASONABLY REPRESENTATIVE

Scatter-plot format same as Exhibit 3: shows Casey metros (large dots) against 100 largest metro areas (plusses).

- Outliers include very rapid job growth in Las Vegas and Austin, and extremely high unemployment, mostly in high inmigration areas in California
- But in relation to remaining metros, Casey metros are reasonably representative with respect to both employment growth rates and unemployment levels
At metro level, rapid employment growth does not assure rapid increase in average income (a better measure of improvement in well-being).

Denver stands out as doing well on both measures; Hartford stands out as doing badly on both.

Atlanta had less income growth than would be expected given job growth

Milwaukee, Oakland and Louisville had more income growth than expected given job growth
Exhibit 6

OVERALL POVERTY RATES: LESS VARIATION BETWEEN SITES AND GENERALLY MODEST CHANGEST IN 1990S

Note: On all bar charts, sites listed in order by labor market strength from strongest at top (Atlanta) to weakest at bottom (Hartford). For this purpose, labor market strength a simple average of site’s rank among Casey metros on employment growth and unemployment rate

- Casey metro poverty rates in 2000 vary from 7-8 percent (Washington, Des Moines, Denver, Hartford, Seattle) up to 15 percent (San Antonio)

- San Antonio had biggest drop in poverty in 1990s, however (4.4 percentage points), followed by Louisville and Denver (decline of around 2 points)

- 6 Casey metros saw small net increases in poverty rate in 1990s (largest in Providence at +2.2 points, followed by Hartford at +1.2 points)

- Poverty rates not well correlated with labor market strength
Exhibit 7
MORE VARIATION IN METRO EDUCATION LEVELS - IMPROVED IN ALL SITES IN 1990S

- Share of population over 25 without a high school degree in 2000 ranged from lows in Seattle and Des Moines (10-11 percent) to highs in Providence and San Antonio (23-24 percent)

- Biggest improvements in this indicator in the 1990s in Louisville, Baltimore and Providence (drop of 6 percentage points or more); least improvement in sites where best on this indicator to begin with (Seattle, Des Moines, Washington, Denver, Oakland)

- This indicator more (though not at all perfectly) correlated with labor market strength. Share without high school degree averages 13 percent for top 6 sites in terms of labor market strength, but 19 percent for bottom 7 sites.

- In comparison, average value for this indicator for all 100 metros declined from 23 percent to 18 percent in 1990s.
Exhibit 8
FEMALE HEADED SHARE OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN GENERALLY INCREASED – LESS VARIATION ACROSS SITES

- At the metro level, the share of families with children headed by females in 2000 ranged 19 percent (Seattle) to 28 percent (Louisville and Baltimore)

- This indicator improved in only three Casey metros in the 1990s, and only modestly there (decline of 2 percentage points or less): Oakland, Denver and Baltimore. It increased most in Providence (+4 points), followed by Louisville, Hartford and San Antonio.

- For the top 100 metros, this indicator increased slightly on average (from 23 to 24 percent)

- This indicator is also somewhat correlated with labor market strength. Female headed share averages 22 percent for top 6 sites in terms of labor market strength, but 26 percent for bottom 7 sites.
Exhibit 9

**DRAMATIC DIFFERENCES IN CONCENTRATED POVERTY AMONG CASEY METROS – LARGE REDUCTIONS IN ALL BUT TWO**

Concentrated poverty = share of poor population living in high-poverty census tracts (those with poverty rates of 30 percent or more). On scatter-plot, lower-left is best (lowest levels of concentrated poverty and largest declines in concentrated poverty) and upper right is most troubling.

- Sizeable range between Milwaukee, where 44 percent of poor live in high-poverty tracts (one of highest rates in the nation) and Seattle where only 7 percent in high-poverty tracts (one of lowest).

- Level of concentrated poverty declined most in San Antonio (drop by 24 percentage points) followed by Denver (-17 points). Concentrated poverty worsened only in Providence (+12 points) and Hartford (+2 points).

- Among Casey metros, concentrated poverty is strongly correlated with labor market strength as we have defined it. For the top 6 sites on the list according to labor market strength the level of concentrated poverty averages only 12 percent. For the bottom 7, the average is 28 percent.
Exhibit 10

PATTERNS OF BLACK-WHITE SEGREGATION SIMILAR TO THOSE FOR CONCENTRATED POVERTY

Scatter plot shows values of the “dissimilarity index,” which indicates: (1) the extent of spatial segregation between blacks and whites (left is low, right is high), and (2) segregation between poor and non-poor (bottom is low, top is high). With this index, 1 = total segregation and 0 = total integration. (The value of the index can be interpreted as the fraction of the population that would have to move to achieve total integration.)

- The two measures are fairly closely correlated - values roughly form a line between Seattle (the least segregated on both dimensions) and Milwaukee (by far the most segregated on both)

- Consistently, racial segregation is more severe in these metros than economic segregation. For example, in Seattle the index value is 0.49 for black-white segregation vs. only 0.29 for poor-non-poor segregation; in Milwaukee the index value is 0.82 for black-white segregation vs. only 0.51 for poor-non-poor segregation.
Measure is ratio of average single-family home value to average family income at the metro level

- Sizeable range between Oakland, where home value 4.0 times family income, and San Antonio, where ratio is only 1.7.

- Affordability worsened in 1990s (i.e., ratio increased) in 7 metros -- most in Denver (+0.7), followed by Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Louisville, Des Moines, Seattle and Atlanta.

- Affordability improved in 6 metros -- most in Hartford (-1.0), followed by Providence (-0.7), Washington, Oakland, Baltimore, and San Antonio.

- Among large metropolitan areas generally, this measure not closely correlated with other indicators of well being; explained more by structure of local housing markets. Pacific Coast markets stand above the others (Oakland, Seattle), followed by other metros with strong economies (Denver, Washington). Weaker markets in smaller places in mid-west and south.
Exhibit 12

**VACANCY RATES MEASURE TIGHTNESS ON RENTAL SIDE OF MARKET – INCREASED TIGHTNESS IN 10 OF 13 CASEY METROS IN 1990S**

- Highest rental vacancy rates in Indianapolis (10.7 percent), followed by Louisville and San Antonio; tightest in Oakland (2.7 percent), followed by Washington, Seattle and Denver.

- Dramatic increase in tightness of rental market in 1990s in Atlanta and Denver (drop of 7.9 points in vacancy rate); also notable in San Antonio, Oakland, Washington.

- Rental market loosened only in Indianapolis (+1.5 points), Milwaukee (+1.0 points) and Des Moines (0.4 points).

- In summary:
  - Worsening of affordability both rental and homeowner markets in Denver, Atlanta, Seattle, Louisville, and Des Moines.
  - Worsening affordability, rental market only in Washington, San Antonio, Oakland, Baltimore, Providence, and Hartford
  - Worsening affordability, homeowner market only in Indianapolis and Milwaukee
IMPLICATIONS

The metropolitan contexts of Casey metros vary dramatically. Casey metros roughly representative of the range of experience for America’s 100 largest metros for most key indicators.

All sites need to work on policy and program improvements in all areas as suggested by Making Connections strategies and theory of change, but should be important differences in metro-wide priorities and expectations.

- Several are among America’s weakest labor markets. Need for stronger metropolitan efforts to reinvigorate the local economy and, in particular, strengthen workforce development system to connect people to jobs more efficiently: Hartford, Providence, Milwaukee, and Baltimore (and to a somewhat lesser extent, San Antonio and Oakland).

- The same sites have among the country’s highest levels of racial and economic segregation. Metro-wide dialogues, fair-housing enforcement and pro-integrative housing market strategies needed (recognize effects of segregation as barrier to employment given spatial mis-match)

- Improving the education system appears to warrant the highest priority in an overlapping, but somewhat different set, in order: Providence, San Antonio, Louisville, and Baltimore.

- Metropolis-wide, housing affordability pressures on renters appear most serious in Oakland, Washington, Denver, Seattle, Providence and Atlanta. Measures like inclusionary zoning may well be needed in addition to major emphasis on expanding (and preventing losses of) affordable (subsidized) housing and other strategies to expand supply.