# **BEST CITIES** for **MINORITIES**: Gauging the Economics of Opportunity

center for opportunity urbanism

Innine



# **BEST CITIES** for **MINORITIES**: Gauging the Economics of Opportunity

by

Joel Kotkin & Wendell Cox

Special thank you to: Luke Phillips, Research Associate Mandy Shamis, Editor





To us, cities emerge because they provide opportunity to people, and are sustainable only so long as they continue to do so.

For a city to sustain itself, it must provide a wide range of opportunities - not just for the affluent. And the city, better seen as a metropolitan area, needs to address the diverse interests and preferences of its residents. And given that those interests and preferences are constantly evolving, the "over planning" mindset is untenable, even dangerous, to the future of cities that embrace it.

Another paradigm is needed; one that concentrates more on human capital than physical capital. Such a paradigm would stress issues of upward mobility, human capital development, small business expansion, governance, and middle-wage job growth. It would not ignore the physical environment, but acknowledge that physical assets should adapt to serve human beings, not the other way around. It would also change the way we think about physical assets, giving higher priority to those that actually boost opportunity, particularly for working and middle-class residents.

It will be the primary task of the Center to spell out how cities can drive opportunity for the bulk of their citizens. Initially, at least, this will be primarily a virtual, media-centered effort. This is necessary given the very weak profile of key opportunity cities, including Houston, particularly in comparison with the key media centers located either in the Northeast or coastal California. A major reason why the current planning mindset so dominates policy discussion, in part, reflects that there is no coherent alternative vision. Our intention is through conferences, articles and studies to provide an alternative "pole" in the now very stilted and predictable trajectory of urban studies. It will help rediscover the essence of great cities, what Descartes called "an inventory of the possible."

# PRINCIPLES OF OPPORTUNITY URBANISM

- The primary organizing principle of cities should be the creation of opportunity and social mobility.
- People should have a range of neighborhood choices (including suburban), rather than being socially engineered into high-density, transit-oriented developments beloved by overly prescriptive planners.
- Restricting housing supply unreasonably through regulation drives up costs and harms the middle class.
- Education impacts housing choices, forcing parents to overpay in the few good school districts or move further out of the core city. Making educational alternatives available for working and middle class families is essential to upward mobility and long-term urban growth.
- Supporting the needs of middle-class families should be just as important, if not more, than the needs of the childless creative class. Children, afterall, represent the future of society.
- Successful economies need a broad spectrum of industries. Solid middleclass and blue-collar jobs are just as important as the much celebrated hightech industries aimed at white-collar professionals. Educational choices should be made to address these varied needs.
- Concentrations of power whether through political or economic structures - undermine social mobility and the creation and pursuit of new opportunities. Decision-making power, therefore, should be as widely dispersed as practical.
- Transit investments should be based in large part on serving cost-effectively those who most need it, to provide a reasonable alternative for those (the disabled, elderly, students) for whom auto transit is difficult. It should not be primarily a vehicle for real estate speculation or indirect land use control. The use of bus transport, including rapid bus lanes, as well as new technologies, including firms like Uber and driverless cars, need to be considered as potential answers to the issue of urban mobility.
- In general, cities are better off with more market-oriented land-use policies than prescriptive central planning.

# AUTHORS:

**Joel Kotkin** is the RC Hobbs Fellow in Urban Studies and director of the Center for Demographics and Policy at Chapman University, and directs the Center for Demographics and Policy there. He is also executive director of the Center for Opportunity Urbanism in Houston, Texas. He writes regular columns for Forbes, the Orange County Register and the Daily Beast. His most recent book is The New Class Conflict (Telos Press 2014)

**Wendell Cox** is principal of Demographia, an international public policy and demographics firm. He is co-author of the "Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey and author of "Demographia World Urban Areas . He served on the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, and was a visiting professor at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Metiers in Paris, he also serves a member of the Board of Advisors of the Center for Demographics and Policy and as a senior fellow with Center for Opportunity Urbanism. Wendell Cox is Chair, Housing Affordability and Municipal Policy for the Frontier Centre in Canada.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Authors	 

Overview .....

Minorities Head To Opportunity Cities
African-Americans: Reversing the Great Migration
Hispanic Population Growth Changing Landscape of Asian America
Housing the Critical Difference
African-American Homeownership
Hispanic Homeownership
Asian Homeownership
Minority Incomes
Self-Employment
Conclusion
Best City Appendices
Footnotes and Sources



	4
	7
	14
	17
	19
••••••	
	27
	30
	33
	4-39
	40



#### OVERVIEW

This study provides an initial analysis of African-American, Latino and Asian economic and social conditions in 52 metropolitan regions currently and over the period that extends from 2000 to 2013. Our analysis includes housing affordability, median household incomes, self-employment rates, and population growth. Overall, the analysis shows that ethnic minorities in metropolitan regions with significant economic growth and affordable housing tend to do better than in other locations irrespective of the dominant political culture.

Understanding the dynamics of minority economic mobility is critical to the future of all Americans. If ethnic minorities may once have been viewed as a cultural afterthought in a primarily anglo society, they are now unquestionably America's future. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, minority children will outnumber white children by as early as 2020, and by 2050, non-white ethnic groups will equal the total number of White-non Hispanics in the population.' These estimates likely understate the rate of ethnic transformation in the U.S. because of the country's growing number of mixed race households.

For years America has been an anglo-dominated nation and ethnic groups largely peripheral societies all too frequently marginalized by discrimination, segregation and racial strife. If W.E.B. Dubois famously noted that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line" at the beginning of the 20th century,"

### US Population by Race & Ethnicity to 2050



Census Projection

the great historian John Hope Franklin asserted that racial issues will continue to shape our society in the 21st."

Demographic trends suggest this is inevitable. Today, America's ethnic population has surged to an unprecedented extent Latinos, together with African Americans and Asians, now constitute 43 percent of the population in the country's 52 largest metropolitan areas with a population of at least one million residents, which also comprise \_55 percent of the total U.S. population. This is up from 35 percent in 2000.

African Americans, including new immigrants from the Caribbean and Africa, constitute 15 percent of the population, Hispanics are now 21 percent and Asians 7 percent. These areas. Today Latinos are the nation's largest ethnic minority and Asians the fastest growing in percentage terms.

Despite the massive new and growing influence of ethnic minorities, there are surprisingly few studies comparing the economic performance of American's burgeoning communities in different metropolitan areas. Fewer still have attempted to identify specific factors that correlate with the most and least favorable results in different regions. As the ethnic composition of America decisively shifts, it is vitally important to understand what regional factors work best to create and sustain economic and social opportunities for the nation's emerging majority groups.

Overall we found that metropolitan areas with less burdensome regulations, especially those affecting land use and housing costs, tended to do better, in the survey, but not in every instance. Some areas with more restrictive regulations were also highly ranked if other factors, such as a proximity to a relatively robust government employment base (Washington D.C. and Baltimore

regions), or rapid private sector growth (Asians in the San Jose area) were sufficiently strong to overcome adverse regulatory and tax burdens.

The data also show a strong contrast between America's luxury cities, such as New York, San Francisco or Boston, where high costs have significantly reduced opportunities for middle and working class households, and "opportunity cities," often located in less costly portions of the country like Texas or the South but that have also sustained more rapid and broadly based economic growth.

Although most, if not all, luxury cities sustain strongly progressive politics African-Americans, Asians and Latino households have done relatively worse in these locations; cities in the states with the more generous welfare provisions aimed to help the minority poor - notably California, New York and Illinois tended to perform worse than those that were less forthcoming, notably in the sunbelt.<sup>III</sup> Ironically, in many of these places, such as metropolitan New York, Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles, the media and public officials may be the most adamant in attacking racial and class inequality, but their outcomes have been generally less than optimal.

Instead, America's ethnic population growth, has shifted away from these slower growth, higher cost regions, irrespective of the level of public assistance or political ideology, towards opportunity cities where economic, housing and other policies provide greater chances of social advancement for middle and working class Americans of all races.

The implication of these findings is that America's emerging majorities, like the Anglo communities before them, primarily desire and will populate regions where they can afford decent homes, earn

### Employment Growth: 2000–2013 Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas





higher incomes relative to the cost of living, and have greater independence and opportunity, as reflected in selfemployment rates. These broad strategies do much more to enhance the lives of African-Americans, Asians and Latino households than the redistributive war on poverty-era programs employed in regions with high housing and living costs. These programs are usually not sufficient to improve the prospects of minorities if the business environment is burdened by high costs and regulatory burdens.

#### Minorities Head To **Opportunity Cities**

The data overwhelmingly show that minority populations are growing much faster in opportunity cities than in the more expensive, highly regulated luxury cities in the Northeastern corridor or on the west coast.<sup>iv</sup> In some cases, this has to do with the changing post-industrial nature of these economies. The increasing dependence on industries, such as software and social media, that employ few Latinos or African Americans. In Silicon Valley, African Americans and Hispanics make up roughly one-third of the valley population but barely five percent of employees in the top Silicon Valley firms.<sup>v</sup>

Over the past forty years States such as Texas, Arizona, the Carolinas and Florida have seen their employment base grow far more rapidly and broadly in terms of manufacturing and other blue collar sectors than either California or the Northeast corridor.<sup>vi</sup> Generally, the leading metropolitan areas in the sunbelt also have overall enjoyed higher growth in population, income and selfemployment and considerably higher rates for minority homeownership. "Luxury cities" such as described by

former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg are generally not so good for minorities.

#### **African-Americans: Reversing the Great Migration**

Much of the perception about the best places for African American economic and social performance is derived from the Great Migration, when African Americans migrated to northern cities in several waves. Between 1910 and 1970, six million African Americans moved from the south to the north, notably to Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Detroit; after World War Two, the migration also extended to California, notably Los Angeles and the Bay Area.

In this period, blacks faced almost insurmountable barriers to upward mobility in the South, where segregation was legally permissible. In this period African American poverty rates varied considerably, falling during period of high growth in the 1960s, increasing when the economy stalled in the 1970s, and falling again during the latter 1980s and mid 1990s, even when welfare spending was being restrained by both Republican (Reagan) and Democratic (Clinton) governments.<sup>ix</sup>

African American poverty dropped to near 25 percent by 2000. Poverty, tragically, began to expand slowly again during the tepid recovery of the Bush era, but rising more steeply during the Great Recession, and through the slow, and also tepid, except for stock prices, recovery of the Obama years.<sup>x</sup> The periods of black gains are notable for being associated with better overall economic performance.

Black economic indicators have not improved in recent years - in 2013, African American unemployment





remained twice that of whites, and according to the Urban League. Equally disturbing, in the last decade the black middle class has conceded many of the gains made over the past 30 years. <sup>xi</sup> Concentrated poverty, particularly in metropolitan areas, on the decline in the booming 1990s, now appears once again growing.<sup>xii</sup> As one recent study reveals, entrenched urban poverty - places where 30 percent or more of the population live below the poverty line - actually grew in the first 10 years of the new millennium, from 1,100 to 3,100 neighborhoods; the population of these areas increased from two to four million.<sup>xiii</sup> "We are spending massive amounts of money and conditions are getting worse," concludes author Walter Russell Mead, in his assessment of black fortunes since the

Given these conditions, African Americans appear to be moving once again, but this time primarily to cities, many in the south, the very region they exited in huge numbers during the last century. Increasingly, they, as well as Latino and Asian households seeking a better future, are moving to opportunity cities. Between 2000 and 2013, the African American population of Atlanta, Charlotte, Orlando, Houston, Dallas-Fort Worth, Raleigh, Tampa-St. Petersburg and San Antonio all experienced growth of close to 40 percent or higher, well above the average of 27 percent for the 52 metropolitan areas.

Great Society.xiv

The opportunity thesis fits this pattern, when we add other economic factors which will be discussed below. In fact, for African Americans, 13 of the top 15 cities, including number one, Atlanta, were located in Dixie. The other two, the Washington, D.C. area and greater Baltimore, famously straddle the line between North and South. Even though inner city poverty is severe in both core

cities, these areas are also home to four of the nations ten most affluent African-American suburbs.<sup>xvi</sup> All four of Texas' large metros - #12 Houston, #13 Dallas-Ft. Worth and #8 San Antonio - made the top 15. The only two other states with more than one top ranked metropolitan area include northern Virginia, nestled in #3 greater Washington, along with #8 Richmond, itself the former capital of the South. The other state with more than two is North Carolina, led by #2 Raleigh and #4 Charlotte.

In contrast to this pattern of growth, African Americans are more likely to leave places like New York and Detroit for places south.<sup>xv</sup> Indeed many of the cities that once attracted African Americans now sit at the bottom of our rankings, such as Milwaukee, Cleveland and Cincinnati. In all these cities black growth rates are now well below the national average.<sup>xvii</sup> Blacks who have relocated tend to be either retirees or well-educated, well-off middle agers with children," John Giggie, associate professor of history and director of graduate studies at the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, told BET.com. xviii

More remarkable still, the African-American population actually dropped in five critically important large metros that once were beacons for black progress: San Francisco-Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles, Chicago and Detroit. In many cases, most notably in San Francisco, blacks have become the unintended victims of soaring house prices and rampant gentrification, with little option to move to the also high-priced suburbs. <sup>xix</sup> Today, suggests economist Thomas Sowell, the black population of the city itself is half that of 1970; the situation has changed so much that former Mayor Gavin Newsom even initiated a task force to address black out-migration.xx



**BEST CITIES FOR MINORITIES:** GAUGING THE ECONOMICS OF OPPORTUNITY 13

#### **Hispanic Population Growth**

Like African-Americans, Latinos are also generally moving to opportunity cities. This resonates with our overall findings about the best cities overall for Hispanics, where our rankings generally parallel those for African Americans. For Latinos, now the nation's largest ethnic minority, nine of the top 13 places are held by cities wholly or partially in the old Confederacy, led by #1 Jacksonville, Florida. Current state projections in Texas indicate that Latinos will outnumber Anglos by 2025.xxi The majority of newcomers to the South, notes a recent Pew study, are classic first-wave immigrants: young, 57 percent foreign born and not well educated; but they see the South as their land of opportunity. xxii

Other areas where Latinos are doing best in our rankings, as for African-Americans, also include #5 Washington - much of which is in Virginia - as well as nearby Baltimore, which ranks third on our list. Some older Midwestern cities also do well, including #9 St. Louis as well as #14 Pittsburgh. In the case of Latinos, many parts of the Heartland remain new territory for growth, opportunity cities, not for blacks, but for Latinos.

Elsewhere in the South, in Florida, no stranger to Latino populations, Tampa-St. Petersburg, Orlando and Jacksonville all experienced Hispanic growth rates since 2000 between 100 and 150 percent, well above the average of 96 percent among the 52 metropolitan regions with more than one million residents. Lower housing costs and better prospects for advancement drive this change. "You go where the opportunities are," explains Mark Hugo Lopez, associate director of the Pew Hispanic Center in Washington, D.C.<sup>xxiii</sup>

Overall, the migration patterns closely parallel our overall rankings. Despite their historically large populations in Texas, Latino populations still grew at a rapid rate in Houston, at 68 percent, Dallas-Ft. Worth at 70 percent and Austin, 83 percent.<sup>xxiv</sup> Although gentrification may have pushed some Latinos as well as African Americans out of the cores of some cities, notably Austin, the overall Latino growth in the area since 2000 has remained strong. Overall Texas saw its Latino population grow by 40 percent, a product not only of growing Texas-native Latinos, but also significant immigration from Mexico and other parts of Latin America.

Luxury cities with high costs and generally slower long-term job creation rates had far slower growth. This is particular notable in New York, ranked 42nd on our list, which expanded its Latino population by 29 percent, well below the national average, and Los Angeles, ranked 32nd on our list, which saw a meager 15 percent expansion.

In the case of Los Angeles, however, it is critical to see the shift in Latino growth not out of Southern California per se, but towards #2 Riverside-San Bernardino area (Inland Empire). Riverside-San Bernardino grew its Latino population by 74 percent since 2000. This largely suburban area,<sup>xxv</sup> where house prices are around 40 percent less than in Los Angeles, also ranked #18 for African Americans and, as we will see, did even better - second best - among Asians.

### Hispanic Population Growth: 2000-2013 Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



Bureau of Labor Statistics Data



### Asian Population Growth: 2000–2013 Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



Bureau of Labor Statistics Data

### The Changing Landscape of Asian America

Asians - primarily Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Vietnamese and Filipinos -- are not only the fastest growing ethnic group of the three but constitute the nation's largest source of legal immigrants, constituting 40 percent of new arrivals in 2013. And as a portion of the American population, the Asian population (both native born and immigrant), increased from 4.2 to 5.6 percent between 2000 and 2010. This is a rate of increase slightly higher than Latinos. By 2050, the Asian population that is expected to reach 8.6 percent, according to Census Bureau projections.

Asians, according to a 2013 Pew study xxvi constitute the country's highestincome, best-educated and fastestgrowing ethnic group. Overall, Asians - notably Indians, Chinese and Koreans - do better or at least as well as Anglos. It is true that some groups struggle, notably Hmong, Laotians and Bangladeshis, but among the 52 major metropolitan areas, Asian median household income is \$70,600,<sup>xxvii</sup> compared to \$66,200 for White-non-Hispanics. xxviii

Principally because of its geographic proximity and its long history of Asian settlement, California remains the natural place for Asians to go and with 4.8 million, almost the population of Singapore, it still towers over all other states. Second place New York, with 1.4 million Asians, ranks a distant second, while Texas, with 964,000, ranks third. But neither New York nor California, with 32 percent and 35 percent growth, respectively, in the last decade, grew at the national average of 43 percent. The shift, as with most things demographic, heads towards the Sunbelt, notably Texas, which grew 72 percent, nearly twice as fast as the national rate. Other

states, mostly in the Southeast, grew Many of the areas where Asians Dixie, a region of the country

even faster - Florida, North Carolina and especially Georgia, now home to over 310,000 Asians. Among the major cities, the fastest growth was found in unlikely urban centers like Phoenix and Las Vegas, as well as Austin, Texas. are doing best economically tend to be those where their populations have historically been relatively meager. These include, for example, the #1 Riverside-San Bernardino, which between 2000 and 2013 saw a 109 percent growth among Asians, a rate twice that of #28 New York and approximately three times that of Los Angeles and San Francisco. These two large cities still predominate in their total Asian population, but the trend lines suggest other areas are beginning to attract many newcomers and migrants whose ancestry is South and East Asia. As with all the groups, the #2 Washington area, where the Asian population is up 77 percent since 2000, and the #5 Baltimore also performed strongly, growing an impressive 101 percent.

that historically was home to very few Asians, is strongly represented with six of the top 10 cities for Asians (including Washington). Since 2000, Houston, Dallas-Ft. Worth and Austin all doubled their Asian population, a growth rate more than double that of the rest of the nation. Three of the top metropolitan areas are located in Texas, which is also home to the only municipality among the top 20 with an Asian population exceeding 50,000 outside California or Hawaii, the Houston suburb of Sugarland. Plano, a suburb north of Dallas, showed the fastest Asian growth of any city of this size in the nation.



The other hot spots for Asian growth and success include the sunbelt cities of #4 Raleigh, Las Vegas, ranked #9th in our survey, Phoenix, which notched #12, as well as #13 Atlanta and #15 Jacksonville. In all these cities the Asian population has grown since 2000 by from 100 to 180 percent. None of these areas have emerged - unlike the Texas cities - as major Asian hubs, but their trajectory seems to place them in that direction.

#### Housing: The Critical Difference

The data shows that the greatest divergence in cities best for minorities lies in housing costs. Homeownership has come under some criticism in the aftermath of the 2007-8 housing bust, with some suggesting that it has become, in Richard Florida's words, "overrated" and with others, including from Wall Street, hailing the rise of a "rentership society."<sup>xxix</sup> In general, the "end of housing" thesis is most strongly held in luxury cities where, in fact, homeownership has become unaffordable for all but the most wealthy.

Surveys show that African-Americans, Asians and Latinos, like Americans generally, strongly desire to own a home of their own. These views are common among Americans as a whole. A 2012 study by the Woodrow Wilson Center found that the vast majority placed "very high importance" on homeownership, including 69 percent of African Americans. A survey by the New York Times found that nine of ten Americans value homeownership as a critical part of the "American dream." This means, that even after the damaging housing crisis, Americans still continue to sanctify homeownership. <sup>xxx</sup>

Everywhere we see the combination of broad-based economic growth and moderated housing prices, homeownership rates for minorities rise, often by more than double digits. According to one 2013 survey, 76 percent of Hispanics believe that being able to own your own home is necessary to be considered middle class. For both Hispanics and Asians, the preference has been for single family detached homes. Approximately 67 percent of Hispanic household growth since 2000 has been in detached housing. Among Asians, the increase has been 60 percent, more than 20 percent above the 2000 share. Today nearly half of all Hispanics and Asians live in single family homes.<sup>xxxi</sup> This is even true

of newcomers i York City. <sup>xxxii</sup>

In some senses, affordability can also serve as a proxy for regulatory burdens; costs rise where land is more difficult to develop and subjected to extraordinary requirements. These higher prices run against the basic desires of upwardly mobile minorities, including many immigrants. Latinos, for example, put greater emphasis on homeownership than the rest of the population, according to a Fannie Mae study. <sup>xxxiii</sup>

As we head into an increasingly multiracial future, homeownership seems to be perhaps the primary driver of population growth. <sup>xxxiv</sup> Further, more than 40 percent of non-citizen immigrants, who have historically tended to move to core cities of the metropolitan areas, now move directly to suburbs. <sup>xxxv</sup>

Although some paint this movement as a sign of suburban decline, it also can be seen as a way to address the continuing deficit in minority home ownership. As a recent report by the liberal think tank Demos indicates, much of the "ethnic wealth gap" - white households with wealth more than 10 times their Latino or African American counterparts - comes from differing home ownership rates. On average, some 71 percent of Anglo households in the major metropolitan areas own their own homes, compared to only 43 percent for Latinos and 38 percent for African Americans. At 59 percent, the Asian home ownership rate is much higher than the other two minorities. Since most minorities tend not to

Since most minorities tend not to own other assets, such as stocks, and also often lack a significant inheritance, houses make up a larger portion of assets for most minorities. This made them more vulnerable to the collapse of the housing bubble, particularly in metropolitan areas

of newcomers in such urban places as New

where regulations have tended to limit supply, driving house prices up beyond an affordable rate and, in too many cases, leaving minority households with mortgages beyond their capacity to pay. xxxvi

#### African American Homeownership

African American incomes were particularly Diminished by the Great Recession, which wiped out much of their net wealth and also damaged the credit of many households.<sup>xxxvii</sup> African Americans were particularly hard hit by foreclosures. There was a 9.1 percent foreclosure rate among the loans originated from 2004 to 2008 among African-Americans, nearly double the rate of White non-Hispanics (5.1 percent). xxxviii

*"The lowest household incomes generally were* not in the South, but in the old industrial heartland; in Chicago and Detroit, historic centers of black America"

> But the decline of homeownership for blacks is not universal. In some areas - usually those with lower house prices relative to incomes - the rates of homeownership are far higher. Leading the cities here, as in our overall survey, is Birmingham, where ownership rates were fifty percent in 2013. The

Alabama metropolis is followed by the Washington area, where 49 percent of black households own their own home, the Virginia metropolis of Richmond and, surprisingly, Philadelphia. These areas are followed by Atlanta, where 47 percent of African American households own their residences.

With the exception of Philadelphia, Detroit, Riverside-San Bernardino and Chicago, the balance of the 21 areas with African American homeownership over 40 percent are located in the South (including Washington and Baltimore), <sup>xxxix</sup> where housing prices, adjusted for income (measured by the median multiple, which is the median house price divided by the median household income), tend to be lower. xl

In contrast, areas with the worst housing affordability (measured again by the median multiple) tend to have lower homeownership rates for African Americans. The lowest homeownership rates are in metropolitan areas with either a comparatively low percentage of black population or strong land use regulations, which drives up prices by reducing new housing construction. This was especially the case during the housing bubble, when prices escalated to unprecedented levels. The lowest black rate of homeownership was in Salt Lake City, which also has the lowest black population percentage, at less than 2%. But many others were in high priced areas such as San Francisco -Oakland, San Diego, and Seattle.

### African-American: Homeownership Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas: 2013



#### **Hispanic Homeownership**

Hispanics were even more hit by foreclosures than African Americans. Among the loans originated in 2004 to 2008, the foreclosure rate for Latinos was 11.9 percent. This is nearly double the rate of White non-Hispanics (5.1%). <sup>xli</sup> Yet this has not turned them away from the goal of homeownership, but appears to have impacted their locational decisions. Among Latinos, most of the top 10 metropolitan areas are in the Midwest and the South. Detroit, San Antonio and St. Louis have the highest rates. Others included in the top 10 were Riverside-San Bernardino, which ranks fourth. Jacksonville, where the Latino population doubled since 2000, <sup>xlii</sup> ranks fifth.

*"The growth of the Riverside- San Bernardino"* area has been fueled by migration from Los Angeles, much of it from minorities with many households seeking less costly housing."

> Perhaps the most relevant comparison can be seen by comparing homeownership in traditional centers of Hispanic America. San Antonio, Houston, Dallas- Ft. Worth, Jacksonville and Miami all enjoy rates of homeownership of about 50 percent. This contrasts, however, with the two cities with the largest Latino populations: New York

and Los Angeles. In New York, Hispanic homeownership is 24 percent; along with Boston and Providence, the New York area has the lowest percentage of Latinos who own their own home.

Los Angeles — the area that sprawls from Ventura County to the southern edge of Orange County — and home by far the largest Latino population, does better, with 38 percent ownership rate. But this lags the Riverside-San Bernardino area, where that rate reaches 55 percent. The growth of the Riverside-San Bernardino area has been fueled by migration from Los Angeles, much of it from minorities with many households seeking less costly housing.<sup>xliii</sup> This high home ownership rate is likely the result of the largely outer suburban and exurban form of the metropolitan area.

Overall, home ownership percentages tend to be higher in outer suburban and exurban areas.<sup>xliv</sup> This "overspill" of middle income migration has also occurred in the exorbitantly costly San Francisco Bay area to metropolitan areas in the San Joaquin Valley, such as Stockton and Modesto. These metropolitan areas, however, are too small to be included in this analysis. However, many of the same patterns seen with other groups can be seen as well

# Hispanic: Homeownership

Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas: 2013





"Asians, like other immigrants, move to the suburbs to achieve the American Dream built largely around the ideal of homeownership"

#### **Asian Homeownership**

As with most indices, the results for Asians are somewhat different, in part due to their generally higher incomes. However, many of the same patterns seen other groups can be seen as well. The highest percentages of homeownership are found in Jacksonville, where the rate is an astonishing 80 percent, as well as two other cities, Orlando and Grand Rapids. But these cities have very low Asian populations, at or below the national average.

The homeownership rates of areas with higher Asian populations may be more revealing. Among the 10 metropolitan areas with the highest Asian percentages, Houston has the highest Asian home ownership rate, at 67.8 percent, followed by Washington at 66.4 percent. In contrast, the seven metropolitan areas with the largest percentages of Asian populations have average or below average home ownership (59 percent). Each of these areas, San Jose, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, Seattle and New York, have had substantially more costly housing relative to incomes over the last decade. Among these, New York had the lowest Asian rate of homeownership at 51%.

Generally, Asians are also headed to suburbs for homeownership; as places like Sugarland, Plano, and the Inland Empire grow, while the core cities, with their dense urban Chinatowns, have slower Asian growth. Asians, like other immigrants, move to the suburbs to achieve the American Dream built largely around the ideal of homeownership, just as earlier generations of European Americans.xlv

## **Asian:** Homeownership

Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas: 2013



## African-American Median Income: 2013 Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



#### Census Bureau Data

#### **Minority Incomes**

Between 1980 and 2000, household incomes generally rose for all three ethnic minorities and non-Hispanic whites. Income growth generally declined after 2000, the result of the post-9/11 recession and the Great Recession, the worst period of economic growth and job creation since the 1930s. The income trend data has been mixed for the three ethnic minorities.

African-Americans did very well between 1980 and 2000, as their median household incomes rose at nearly double the national rate (constant dollars, not adjusted for the cost of living). In 1980, black incomes were 43% lower than White non-Hispanic median incomes. By 2000 the gap had narrowed to 35%. The most recent data show a re-widening of the gap to 41%, having retreated to the 1980 level.

Hispanics did not experience the huge increases that blacks achieved between 1980 and 2000. The income gap relative to White non-Hispanics dropped from 28% to 27%. Since 2000, the gap has widened to 30%. However, the expansion of the gap between 2000 and 2013 may be overly influenced the high rate of new immigration that occurred over the period (newer immigrants tend to have lower incomes).

Between 2007 and 2013, Hispanics experienced a six percent inflationadjusted loss in median incomes, approximately the same loss experienced by White non-Hispanics.

Both African-Americans and Asians<sup>xlvi</sup> experienced a larger nine percent loss. Yet, Asian incomes continue generally to be above those of White non-Hispanics.

To some extent this growth can be seen in the relative income for minorities as well. For African Americans,

the highest income by far is in the Washington, D.C. area, over \$64,000, well above the national average of \$52,300. Most opportunity cities, including those in Texas, show black household incomes of over \$40,000. The lowest household incomes generally were not in the South, but in the old industrial heartland; in Chicago and Detroit, historic centers of black America, household incomes are below \$35,000. It's even worse in other old industrial cities; in Buffalo, for example, African American household incomes stood at a paltry \$26,000, the worst of any major metropolitan area.

Perhaps most troubling, African It is no surprise then that many There are somewhat similar patterns

American incomes are, relatively, low even in such famously expensive areas as San Francisco, Los Angeles or New York, one possible explanation for the black exodus from those regions. Surprisingly, despite much high costs, African-American households in the two great California metro areas earn barely \$40,000, below most opportunity cities, and even below that of Riverside-San Bernardino, where cost of living, notably housing, is considerably lower. Black households in New York have incomes of roughly \$43,000, about the same as much as much less costly Atlanta, Raleigh and the Texas cities, where house prices are at least 40 percent lower relative to incomes. ambitious African Americans move south. "For upwardly mobile blacks, the job-creating South represents a new land of opportunity," notes Daniel DiSalvo, an assistant professor of political science at the City College of New York and a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute's Center for State and Local Leadership.xlvii for Latinos, with the Washington, D.C. area once again showing the highest

# Hispanic Median Income: 2013

Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



## Asian Median Income: 2013 Top Ten and Bottom Ten Major Metropolitan Areas





household incomes, almost \$66,000, with greater Baltimore second at \$60,000 In contrast to African-Americans, Latinos do show higher incomes than the national median (\$52,300) in San Jose and San Francisco-Oakland but markedly lower incomes in Los Angeles, \$45,000, which is home to the nation's largest Latino population. Parallel to our findings for African-Americans, household incomes in the Riverside-San Bernardino area nearly as high, at \$42,000, despite that area's considerably lower costs. Indeed when costs are factored in, the highest incomes for Latinos are largely in the opportunity cities.

As with African-Americans, Latino incomes are lowest in old industrial cities, with Rochester, New York Latinos earning the least, slightly more than \$26,000. In Birmingham, Buffalo, Hartford, Providence, Indianapolis, Memphis and Milwaukee, Hispanic incomes are lower than \$32,500. This may explain why the Hispanic population although growing, remains fairly small throughout the industrial heartland. Nonetheless, the lower costs of living in these areas allow these small incomes to stretch farther.

Asian incomes diverge somewhat from the picture above. The highest Asian incomes are in San Jose, over \$100,000, reflecting in part the fact that Asians constitute a majority of workers in the generally high-paid tech sector.xlviii But they also share many characteristics seen with other ethnic minorities. For example, the lowest Asian incomes tend also to be in the Great Lakes region and, in greater Los Angeles; surprisingly, incomes are actually \$5,000 higher in the Riverside-San Bernardino area.

#### Self-Employment

Among our four critical factors we have included self-employment. Throughout the evolution of America into a multi-ethnic country, going into business for oneself has been one clear way for minorities - including African Americans, particularly before the Civil Rights Movement. Today, the small business environment has become increasingly reflective of the country's changing demography, with all three large ethnic groups expanding their entrepreneurial presence faster than the Anglo population. The latest Small Business Owners Survey of the Economic Census (2007), found that minorityowned firms increased their number by 45 percent, more than twice the 17.9 percent rise for all U.S. businesses.xlix

Self-employment represents one of the clearest paths for minorities to improve their status, notes sociologists Ivan Light and Steven J. Gold. This is true both for immigrants and among African-Americans, according to an Urban Institute study. Entrepreneurship also tends to run in families; people who start business tend to have relatives that do so; among African-Americans and Latinos, people who start businesses are 10 times more likely to have a relative who did the same. This is part of what Light and Gold call "the cultural capital" of entrepreneurs.<sup>1</sup>

The number of minority entrepreneurs has increased rapidly in the United States in last two decades, notes the Kaufmann Foundation, although, besides Asians, their share of firms and revenues still greatly trails that of Anglos.<sup>li</sup> Immigrants, according to a 2014 study, are particularly prodigious in business creation, starting new firms at roughly twice the rate of the native born population.<sup>lii</sup> The immigrant share of the

**Hispanic:** Self-Employment Percentage Top Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



African-American: Self-Employment Percentage Top Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



**Asian:** Self-Employment Percentage Top Ten Major Metropolitan Areas



self-employed has more than doubled since 1980, and now constitutes one in four small business owners, higher than their one-fifth of the workforce.<sup>liii</sup>

These patterns, of course, differ by area but the influence of minority business is quite profound nationwide. According to the most recent data from Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc., the three minorities now account for over thirty percent of all businesses in 18 of our 52 largest metropolitan areas. The highest share of minority owned business, 39.6 percent, is in the Riverside-San Bernardino area, which is virtually all suburban and which helps account, in part, for its high ranking in our survey.

There is, at the same time, a wide divergence between ethnic groups. As would be expected, minority businesses account for the largest share in areas

"Self-employment represents one of the clearest paths for minorities to improve their status..."

> where their own ethnic group is best represented. Today, the small business environment for blacks has become strongest in the south, led by New Orleans, Birmingham and Atlanta. Austin rank from second to fourth, while Sacramento, San Diego and Los Angeles occupy the next three positions. Twelve cities had a black self-employment percentage greater than their population percentage. San Antonio was the highest rank said city at 22nd, while Salt Lake

City, which was ranked 52nd in Black self-employment had the highest ratio of self-employment to population, at 3.5.

For Latinos the strongest entrepreneurial presence is in San Bernardino-Riverside, followed by San Antonio, Houston and Dallas Ft. Worth. All of the top ten metropolitan areas are located in the strong Latino areas of California, Texas and Arizona. San Antonio, Houston and Austin rank from second to fourth, while Sacramento, San Diego and Los Angeles occupy the next three positions. San Jose and Phoenix round out the top 10 Figure. Sacramento has the highest percentage of Hispanic entrepreneurs relative to population at slightly over 100 percent. Dallas-Fort Worth and San Jose also ranked highly, at between 70% and 80% relative to population. Overall Eighteen cities had an Hispanic self-employment percentage greater than their population percentage.

As we have seen in other measurements, Asians show a somewhat different pattern, in part due to their extraordinary concentration in California and their higher incomes. For Asians, San Jose leads the pack here, with Asians accounting for 10 percent of all the self-employed, followed by San Francisco-Oakland, Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento and Riverside-San Bernardino Figure. Yet at the same time the strongest Asian presence relative to Asian population can be found in Buffalo at 220 percent and Riverside San Bernardino at 130 percent. Seventeen cities had an Asian self-employment percentage greater than their population percentage.



#### Conclusion: this study has led us to three key points

FIRST, the critical importance of strong, broad based economic growth for the upward mobility of minorities. Many of the cities that scored best for all three groups - the Washington, D.C. area, Houston, Dallas-Fort Worth, San Antonio and Austin - have enjoyed stronger than normal economic growth over the past decade. In the areas around the nation's capital, government employment has been a critical factor; in the other areas more generalized business growth has taken the lead. In contrast, cities with meager job growth, largely in the still recovering industrial cities, such as Cleveland, Rochester, Providence and Milwaukee, have tended to lag behind.

SECOND, political rhetoric aside, areas with the strongest ethnic agendas or most generous welfare policies - with the exception of Washington and Baltimore generally did not fare as well. As we have seen over the past 50 years, the expansion of transfer payments, while critical to alleviating the worst impacts of poverty, have not generally been best at promoting upward mobility for African Americans and, increasingly, Latinos. If political pronouncements about intention were currency, New York, Los Angeles, Boston and San Francisco would not be, for the

most part, stuck in the second half of our rankings.

THIRD, we learned about the powerful influence of home ownership rates in determining minority success. Virtually all the cities towards the top of our list have higher than average homeownership rates for minorities. In contrast, those toward the bottom, including some in very affordable areas like Columbus and Indianapolis, have done far worse. Homeownership remains a critical determinant of upward mobility, and those cities that have done better here tend to also have higher incomes as well as elevated levels of self-employment The data here is meant to provide a first step towards understanding what actually works in a variety of locations to advance the economic and social condition of American's emerging nonwhite majority. There seems to be some basic commonalities about the efficacy of widespread economic opportunity fostered by reasonable costs and broadbased growth. It is such cities - the opportunity cities --- that now offer the better template for minority upward mobility and social progress. ¬¬The more the country fosters conditions that offer what opportunity cities now provide to Asian, African-American and Latino households, the better they - and all Americans - will be.

#### **52 BEST CITIES FOR AFRICAN-AMERICANS**

METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	HOME OWNERSHIP RATE	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF EMPLOYMENT	CHANGE IN POPULATION: 2000–2013
Atlanta, GA	1 / 87.0	46.9%	\$41,803	17.1%	49.9%
Raleigh, NC	2 / 84.6	46.7%	\$42,285	12.8%	55.9%
Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV	3 / 83.2	49.2%	\$64,896	15.1%	19.7%
Baltimore, MD	4 / 74.5	46.2%	\$47,898	15.0%	15.6%
Charlotte, NC-SC	4 / 74.5	43.9%	\$36,522	13.6%	47.8%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk, VA-NC	6 / 72.6	43.8%	\$40,677	13.2%	34.6%
Orlando, FL	7 / 71.6	44.7%	\$33,982	11.0%	58.9%
Miami, FL	8 / 68.3	44.9%	\$36,749	11.2%	32.4%
Richmond, VA	8 / 68.3	47.7%	\$38,899	12.7%	17.9%
San Antonio, TX	8 / 68.3	40.8%	\$41,681	9.3%	43.3%
Austin, TX	11 / 67.8	43.6%	\$42,514	9.0%	39.2%
Houston, TX	12 / 66.3	41.6%	\$40,572	9.9%	37.5%
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	13 / 64.4	38.7%	\$40,239	9.5%	45.2%
Nashville, TN	13 / 64.4	41.8%	\$37,716	10.9%	31.9%
Birmingham, AL	15 / 63.0	50.0%	\$33,092	15.0%	12.0%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	16 / 61.1	47.2%	\$31,981	13.5%	18.5%
Jacksonville, FL	17 / 58.7	46.3%	\$32,469	10.8%	24.2%
Boston, MA-NH	18 / 58.2	31.7%	\$46,556	9.1%	38.9%
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	18 / 58.2	40.9%	\$42,673	7.6%	32.6%
Philadelphia, PA-NJ-DE-MD	20 / 57.2	47.3%	\$36,595	9.1%	13.3%
Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL	21 / 52.9	36.6%	\$31,665	10.8%	40.9%
Columbus, OH	22 / 51.4	35.9%	\$33,451	9.3%	40.0%
Hartford, CT	22 / 51.4	33.3%	\$46,097	8.3%	24.4%
New York, NY-NJ-PA	24 /49.5	32.0%	\$43,381	10.9%	2.4%
New Orleans. LA	25 / 46.6	45.5%	\$27,812	17.4%	-13.4%
Denver, CO	26 / 46.2	38.9%	\$41,215	6.3%	29.6%

METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	HOME OWNERSHIP RATE	MEDIAN Household Income	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF EMPLOYMENT	CHANGE IN POPULATION: 2000–2013
Las Vegas, NV	26 / 46.2	29.0%	\$34,281	8.3%	77.7%
Phoenix, AZ	28 / 45.7	31.5%	\$36,779	6.8%	93.4%
Portland, OR-WA	29 / 44.2	39.7%	\$33,699	5.8%	42.5%
Kansas City, MO-KS	30 / 43.8	39.4%	\$35,277	8.3%	15.8%
Chicago, IL-IN-WI	31 / 42.3	39.4%	\$34,287	9.4%	-4.3%
Oklahoma City, OK	32 / 41.8	39.2%	\$34,745	7.8%	18.4%
San Jose, CA	33 / 40.9	32.9%	\$53,645	7.2%	11.4%
Detroit, MI	34 / 39.9	43.8%	\$30,162	9.5%	-4.9%
St. Louis, MO-IL	35 / 39.4	42.4%	\$31,215	9.1%	6.9%
Seattle, WA	36 / 37.5	28.3%	\$41,081	6.7%	36.4%
Providence, RI-MA	37 / 36.5	29.3%	\$32,907	7.3%	52.5%
Indianapolis, IN	38 / 35.6	35.4%	\$31,452	7.8%	29.1%
San Diego, CA	39 / 33.7	30.1%	\$46,650	7.1%	2.6%
Los Angeles, CA	40 / 32.2	32.9%	\$40,980	7.7%	-8.0%
Rochester, NY	41 / 31.7	34.2%	\$28,104	8.9%	16.2%
Sacramento, CA	41 / 31.7	31.6%	\$33,530	7.2%	26.4%
Salt Lake City, UT	41 / 31.7	18.7%	\$32,102	5.5%	94.2%
Louisville, KY-IN	44 / 30.8	35.7%	\$28,826	7.4%	21.0%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	44 / 30.8	26.3%	\$31,564	6.4%	69.2%
Buffalo, NY	46 / 26.9	33.7%	\$26,210	9.4%	1.6%
Cleveland, OH	47 / 26.0	37.8%	\$26,646	8.8%	0.0%
Pittsburgh, PA	48 / 25.5	37.3%	\$28,088	8.0%	2.5%
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	48 / 25.5	30.8%	\$40,152	7.3%	-9.1%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	50 / 23.6	31.4%	\$28,684	8.7%	10.7%
Grand Rapids, MI	51 / 21.6	29.9%	\$25,495	8.0%	19.3%
Milwaukee,WI	52 / 14.4	29.9%	\$27,438	7.2%	10.8%

CALCULATED FROM 2013 AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY & EMSI DATA

#### **52 BEST CITIES FOR HISPANICS/LATINOS**

		HOME OWNERSHIP	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF	CHANGE IN POPULATION
METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	RATE	INCOME	EMPLOYMENT	2000-2013
Jacksonville, FL	1 / 80.3	54.9%	\$50,171	17.1%	148.2%
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	2 / 78.8	55.3%	\$47,196	23.5%	74.3%
Baltimore, MD	3 / 74.0	47.5%	\$59,939	9.8%	175.3%
Houston, TX	4 / 71.6	52.3%	\$43,020	22.9%	68.4%
Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV	5 / 70.7	45.4%	\$65,736	11.0%	105.0%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk, VA-NC	6 / 70.2	47.2%	\$50,197	9.8%	156.6%
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	7 / 66.8	50.0%	\$41,622	22.1%	70.3%
San Antonio, TX	8 / 66.3	56.9%	\$42,377	23.3%	43.8%
Austin, TX	9 / 65.4	44.6%	\$43,712	20.9%	83.4%
St. Louis, MO-IL	9 / 65.4	56.5%	\$50,570	7.8%	92.2%
Sacramento, CA	11 / 63.9	43.9%	\$45,667	21.8%	66.1%
Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL	12 / 63.5	49.4%	\$39,757	17.1%	100.4%
Orlando, FL	13 / 61.5	46.7%	\$38,721	17.1%	128.1%
Pittsburgh, PA	14 / 9.1	48.4%	\$55,108	7.3%	102.4%
Salt Lake City, UT	14 / 59.1	49.5%	\$42,232	10.8%	78.3%
Miami, FL	16 / 58.2	52.6%	\$41,547	17.7%	46.2%
Las Vegas, NV	17 / 57.7	40.8%	\$42,789	16.8%	101.5%
Chicago, IL-IN-WI	18 / 55.8	51.4%	\$45,349	11.1%	36.7%
Oklahoma City, OK	19 / 55.3	48.5%	\$38,054	10.0%	121.4%
Seattle, WA	20 / 53.4	35.6%	\$48,903	9.9%	112.4%
Richmond, VA	21 / 52.4	41.8%	\$38,186	9.8%	196.1%
San Jose, CA	2 / 51.9	38.8%	\$59,150	19.9%	23.7%
San Diego, CA	23 / 51.4	38.6%	\$46,875	21.3%	40.8%
Charlotte, NC-SC	24 / 51.0	42.9%	\$38,843	8.6%	174.6%
Denver, CO	25 / 50.5	44.7%	\$42,071	13.5%	53.7%
Phoenix, AZ	25 / 50.5	44.9%	\$38,704	19.9%	61.1%

METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	HOME OWNERSHIP RATE	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF EMPLOYMENT	CHANGE IN POPULATION: 2000–2013
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	25 / 0.5	38.5%	\$56,269	19.8%	34.9%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	28 / 48.1	41.3%	\$42,271	6.8%	190.6%
Atlanta, GA	29 / 47.6	42.8%	\$38,919	8.8%	116.9%
Kansas City, MO-KS	29 / 47.6	47.1%	\$40,432	7.8%	90.7%
New Orleans. LA	29 / 47.6	41.7%	\$46,146	8.2%	74.2%
Los Angeles, CA	32 / 44.2	37.7%	\$45,202	21.3%	15.3%
Raleigh, NC	33 / 43.8	39.6%	\$37,572	8.4%	177.7%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	34 / 42.3	40.9%	\$42,764	7.6%	90.0%
Detroit, MI	35 / 41.8	61.5%	\$41,276	7.5%	39.8%
Louisville, KY-IN	36 / 39.4	41.3%	\$35,571	6.5%	206.8%
Philadelphia, PA-NJ-DE-MD	37 / 38.9	43.3%	\$36,365	8.9%	81.4%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	38 / 37.0	40.5%	\$32,041	8.1%	156.2%
Portland, OR-WA	39 / 36.5	33.3%	\$40,486	9.6%	83.8%
Nashville, TN	40 / 35.6	38.2%	\$36,458	7.3%	176.5%
Grand Rapids, MI	41 / 35.1	47.7%	\$35,114	8.3%	54.4%
New York, NY-NJ-PA	42 / 34.6	26.5%	\$42,981	13.3%	29.4%
Birmingham, AL	43 / 32.7	40.3%	\$32,165	6.9%	174.1%
Indianapolis. IN	43 / 32.7	35.5%	\$27,293	7.7%	195.5%
Boston, MA-NH	45 / 31.7	24.5%	\$39,080	10.7%	65.6%
Cleveland, OH	46 / 30.3	43.9%	\$38,762	7.6%	45.7%
Columbus, OH	47 / 29.3	28.1%	\$38,520	6.9%	155.6%
Rochester, NY	48 / 27.9	37.7%	\$26,315	12.2%	55.1%
Buffalo, NY	49 / 25.0	33.8%	\$30,489	12.0%	50.8%
Hartford, CT	50 / 24.5	29.9%	\$30,453	11.4%	54.7%
Providence, RI-MA	51 / 21.2	23.8%	\$28,622	10.0%	64.5%
Milwaukee,WI	52 / 19.2	34.7%	\$32,308	7.6%	68.3%

CALCULATED FROM 2013 AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY & EMSI DATA

### **52 BEST CITIES FOR ASIANS**

		HOME OWNERSHIP	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF	CHANGE IN POPULATION
METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	RATE	INCOME	EMPLOYMENT	2000-2013
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	1 / 76.9	68.4%	\$72,367	0.085	109.3%
Richmond, VA	2 / 74.5	63.4%	\$86,211	0.040	115.6%
Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV	2 / 74.5	66.4%	\$102,025	0.052	76.7%
Raleigh, NC	4 / 71.6	62.2%	\$85,031	0.034	180.2%
Baltimore, MD	5 / 70.2	62.2%	\$82,690	0.047	101.3%
Houston, TX	5 / 70.2	67.8%	\$81,991	0.041	96.7%
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	7 / 63.9	59.0%	\$78,190	0.041	102.2%
Austin, TX	8 / 62.5	55.8%	\$83,246	0.041	114.3%
Las Vegas, NV	9 / 61.5	60.9%	\$61,407	0.057	162.8%
Hartford, CT	10 / 61.1	57.5%	\$88,434	0.037	103.1%
San Jose, CA	11 / 60.1	58.2%	\$113,450	0.100	44.7%
Phoenix, AZ	12 / 59.1	58.8%	\$70,323	0.038	128.4%
Atlanta, GA	13 / 58.2	63.3%	\$67,611	0.034	117.3%
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	13 / 58.2	58.8%	\$89,840	0.096	37.9%
Jacksonville, FL	15 / 56.3	80.0%	\$66,581	0.031	100.3%
Charlotte, NC-SC	16 / 55.3	58.1%	\$76,094	0.029	155.4%
Portland, OR-WA	17 / 54.3	62.9%	\$71,279	0.047	56.4%
Seattle, WA	17 / 54.3	58.1%	\$73,323	0.066	69.0%
Orlando, FL	19 / 53.4	70.8%	\$54,311	0.034	124.4%
Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL	20 / 52.4	67.5%	\$62,288	0.034	103.3%
Chicago, IL-IN-WI	21 / 51.4	61.4%	\$77,151	0.042	48.0%
Philadelphia, PA-NJ-DE-MD	21 / 51.4	60.8%	\$70,593	0.038	76.1%
Denver, CO	23 / 51.0	63.6%	\$74,137	0.034	66.8%
Detroit, MI	23 / 51.0	63.4%	\$82,212	0.031	57.8%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk, VA-NC	23 / 51.0	69.3%	\$64,742	0.041	65.8%
Nashville, TN	26 / 50.0	62.8%	\$69,273	0.022	129.6%

METROPOLITAN AREA	RANK/SCORE	HOME OWNERSHIP RATE	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	SHARE OF TOTAL SELF EMPLOYMENT	CHANGE IN POPULATION: 2000–2013
San Diego, CA	27 / 48.6	56.2%	\$76,321	0.091	45.1%
Miami, FL	28 / 47.1	69.2%	\$64,502	0.035	66.6%
New York, NY-NJ-PA	28 / 47.1	51.4%	\$79,193	0.062	51.7%
Boston, MA-NH	30 / 43.8	49.9%	\$79,059	0.045	62.0%
Buffalo, NY	30 / 43.8	40.6%	\$62,734	0.057	109.3%
Salt Lake City, UT	32 / 42.8	67.0%	\$60,581	0.036	66.8%
Sacramento, CA	33 / 40.9	56.9%	\$59,777	0.088	70.8%
San Antonio, TX	33 / 40.9	49.4%	\$68,217	0.035	105.7%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	35 / 39.4	57.2%	\$75,104	0.023	92.3%
Columbus, OH	36 / 38.5	58.4%	\$74,689	0.025	75.1%
Los Angeles, CA	36 / 38.5	54.8%	\$67,902	0.093	31.2%
Milwaukee,WI	38 / 34.6	56.8%	\$69,363	0.028	75.5%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	39 / 30.8	55.1%	\$65,594	0.032	73.5%
Indianapolis. IN	40 / 29.8	50.1%	\$62,225	0.023	159.7%
Grand Rapids, MI	41 / 28.8	72.2%	\$51,914	0.026	49.3%
Pittsburgh, PA	41 / 28.8	42.7%	\$67,076	0.030	89.6%
St. Louis,, MO-IL	43 / 27.4	51.3%	\$66,044	0.027	76.1%
Birmingham, AL	44 / 26.0	52.2%	\$62,988	0.023	99.0%
Oklahoma City, OK	44 / 26.0	62.5%	\$58,850	0.027	52.3%
Kansas City, MO-KS	46 / 24.5	53.4%	\$62,456	0.025	82.4%
Rochester, NY	47 / 24.0	50.9%	\$49,086	0.051	50.9%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	48 / 21.2	58.0%	\$60,750	0.026	61.8%
Louisville, KY-IN	49 / 20.2	51.6%	\$60,026	0.022	97.3%
New Orleans. LA	50 / 16.8	59.9%	\$43,992	0.028	27.4%
Providence, RI-MA	51 / 13.9	48.6%	\$52,268	0.036	41.8%
Cleveland, OH	52 / 12.0	48.4%	\$65,813	0.026	38.0%

CALCULATED FROM 2013 AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY & EMSI DATA

i. Calculated from Census Bureau projections.

- ii, W.E.B. Dubois, The Souls of Black Folks, Dover Thrift Edition (Mineola, NY:1994), p.9 ; http://www.amazon.com/ The-Color-Line-Twenty-First-Century/dp/08262096453. World Resources Institute CAIT 2.0 database for 1990-2011, total reported emissions excluding potential forestry and land use-related reductions, (http://cait2.wri.org accessed September 2014).
- iii. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2009/01/25/us/20090126-welfare-table.html?ref=us& r=0...As calculated by researcher Luke Phillips, states like New York, Massachussetts, California and Illinois spend as much as twice as much on welfare payments than states like North Carolina. Texas or Florida both in terms of percentage GDP and percentage of state spending
- iv. http://www.newgeography.com/files/Kotkin-Opportunity-Urbanism\_2014.pdf
- v. http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06085.html; http://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/2014/10/12/silicon-valley-diversity-tech-hiring-computer-science-graduates-african-american-hispanic/14684211/
- vi. http://www.newgeography.com/content/004868-california-social-priorities-a-new-report8. The Council of Economic Advisers, The War On Poverty 50 Years Later: A Progress Report, (January 2014), http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/50th\_anniversary\_cea\_report\_-\_final\_post\_embargo.pdf (accessed February 2015).
- vii. http://nvmag.com/dailv/intelligencer/2013/09/michael-bloomberg-billionaires-are-a-godsend.html
- viii. https://www.census.gov/dataviz/visualizations/020/
- ix. Alphonso Pinkney, The Myth of Black Progress, Cambridge
- x. University Press, (Cambridge, UK: 1984), p.83x. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/07/11/poverty-in-the-50-years-since-the-other-america-in-five-charts/ 13. Tesla, an electric car pioneer largely supported by state policies, recently located a pioneering \$5 billion battery factory in Nevada rather than California, largely due to regulatory risks and costs. Nevada has a higher per capita emissions rate than California, and the 6,500 employees that will work in the new factory will produce 18,000 metric tons of additional greenhouse gas per year than if the business was located in the state. Marc Lifsher, California Legislature fails to reach a deal on Tesla battery factory, Los Angeles Times, August 31, 2014, and *California may waive environmental rules for Tesla battery factory* Los Angeles Times, August 12, 2014.
- xi, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-10-07/news/ct-met-black-middle-class-austerity-20121007 1 black-middleclass-black-households-national-rate15. The 3.8 million person out-migration during 1990-2010 moved former residents to states that, on average, generate twice the per capita amount of greenhouse gas than in California (11.4 metric tons per capita in California versus 22.3 metric tons per capita in the rest of the U.S.). The net emission increase associated with this population shift-about 41,714,614 metric tons of additional greenhouse gas per year-almost completely offsets the state's 2020 emission reduction objective. See CARB, *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (December 2008), p. 12.
- xii. http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2003/05/demographics-jargowsky
- xiii. http://cityobservatory.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/LostinPlace\_12.4.pdf/
- xiv. http://www.the-american-interest.com/2011/07/04/the-shame-of-the-cities-and-the-shade-of-lbj/; http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/12/12/racial-wealth-gaps-great-recession/

- xv. http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/0p-Ed/2012/09/30/The-Great-Reverse-Migration-African-Americans-are-abandoning-the-Northern-cities-that-have-failed-them/stories/201209300228
- xvi. http://www.blacdetroit.com/BLAC-Detroit/June-2013/Black-Detroiters-Moving-to-Atlanta-for-New-Opportunities/
- xvii. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/22/nyregion/many-black-new-yorkers-are-moving-to-the-south.html?pagewanted=all& r=0
- xviii. https://news.vice.com/article/tech-money-is-helping-sweep-away-san-franciscos-black-community
- xix. http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2009/0615/p02s04-usgn.html; http://www.creators.com/conservative/thomas-sowell/ race-and-rhetoric.htmlhttp://www.blackpast.org/perspectives/gentrification-integration-or-displacement-seattle-storyandAfrican Americans are also being pish out of Portlandhttp://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index. ssf/2011/04/in portlands heart diversity dwindles.html as are those in Seattle.
- xx. http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/TPEPP/Projections/Index.aspx
- xxi. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2005/07/26/the-new-latino-south/; Steven Murdock, "Populaton Change in Texas: Implications for Human and Socioeconomic Resources in the 21st Century". Institute for Demographic and Sociological Research. College of Business, University of Texas at San Antonio
- xxii. http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Hispanic-population-growing-fast-in-South-Midwest-2369770.php
- xxiii. http://projects.statesman.com/news/economic-mobility/divide.html
- xxiv. http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf
- xxv. Riverside San Bernardino, like some other newer metropolitan areas, does not have a traditional dense urban core. Nearly all of Riverside San Bernardino is suburban in form (a high rate of detached housing and transit use near zero).
- xxvi. http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-Asians/
- xxvii. Calculated from one-race data for 2013, from American Community Survey.
- xxviii. http://borgenproject.org/Asians-facing-high-poverty-rates/; http://www.asian-nation.org/14-statistics.shtml
- xxix. http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748703559004575256703021984396; http://guardianlv. com/2014/05/views-differ-on-transition-in-u-s-from-ownership-to-rentership-society/
- xxx. Suzy Khimm. MSNBC. July 10, 2014. http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/homeownership-credit-access-minority-low-income-mortgages; http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/30/business/30poll.html?\_r=Ohttp://www.wilsoncenter.org/ sites/default/files/keyfindingsfromsurvey 1.pdf
- xxxi. Calculated from American Community Survey data 2007-2011
- xxxii. Dominicans in Northern Queens, New York City, Author(s): Stephen J. Johnston, MorsinaKatimin and William J. Milczarski, Reviewed work(s): Source: Cityscape, Vol. 3, No. 1, Ethnicity and Homeownership (March 1997), pp. 63-90, Published by: US Department of Housing and Urban Development:
- xxxiii. http://www.wsj.com/articles/renters-are-majority-in-big-u-s-cities-1423432009?ref=/home-page&cb=loaged0.8001066217238658&cb=loaged0.9292434098366615

- xxxiv. Census Bureau Current Population Survey for 2013 tp 2014. The number is actually higher, because this report uses the "principal cities" to identify non-suburban immigration. Principal cities include the core cities as well as municipalities that are suburban employment centers and which are overwhelmingly suburban in their built form (http://www.newgeog-raphy.com/content/004453-urban-cores-core-cities-and-principal-cities).
- xxxvi. http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/RacialWealthGap\_1.pdf
- xxxvii. http://www.the-american-interest.com/2014/10/18/for-aspiring-black-homeowners-the-recession-is-still-very-real/
- xxxviii. http://www.responsiblelending.org/mortgage-lending/research-analysis/Lost-Ground-2011.pdf

xxxix. According to Census Bureau geography

- xl. This is indicated in the annual editions of the Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey, http://www.demographia.com/dhi.pdf.
- xli. http://www.responsiblelending.org/mortgage-lending/research-analysis/Lost-Ground-2011.pdf
- xlii. http://jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/080708/met\_314939787.shtml#.VQtAh0EYG48
- xliii. http://la.curbed.com/archives/2014/02/why\_are\_people\_fleeing\_los\_angeles\_for\_san\_bernardino.php

xliv. http://www.demographia.com/csm-ho.pdf

- xlv. http://www.demographia.com/csm-ho.pdf
- xlvi. Because of changes in definitions, comparable data for 2000 and before is not available for Asians.
- xlvii. http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2012/09/30/The-Great-Reverse-Migration-African-Americans-are-abandoning-the-Northern-cities-that-have-failed-them/stories/201209300228
- xlviii. http://www.mercurynews.com/ci\_22094415/asian-workers-now-dominate-silicon-valley-tech-jobs
- xlix. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/business\_ownership/cb11-103.html
- I. http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1001164\_selfemployment.pdf; Ivan Light and Steven J. Gold, Ethnic Economies, Academic Press, (San Diego: 2000), p.57, p.93, p.96
- li. http://sotf.kauffman.org/Entrepreneurship/Background-of-Entrepreneurs/Demographics/Race
- lii. http://www.kauffman.org/~/media/kauffman\_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2014/04/kiea\_2014\_report.pdf
- liii. http://www.forbes.com/sites/kauffman/2015/01/22/the-remedy-to-americas-stalled-startup-activity-immigration-reform/

### **Design Notes**

Best Cities for Minorities and the graphics utilize the following:

To achieve visual harmony a modified version of the grid Jan Tschichold conceived for his book Typographie was employed.

MINION PRO Chapman's serif family, is a digital typeface designed by Robert Slimbach in 1990 for Adobe Systems. The name comes from the traditional naming system for type sizes, in which minion is between nonpareil and brevier. It is inspired by late Renaissance-era type.

BERTHOLD AKIZEDENZ GROTESK is Chapman's san serif family. It is a grotesque typeface originally released by the Berthold Type Foundry in 1896 under the name Accidenz-Grotesk. It was the first sans serif typeface to be widely used and influenced many later neo-grotesque typefaces after 1950.

Page 6: Asian Couple Copyright: www.123rf.com/18344648

Page 13: African-American Family Copyright: www.123rf.com/30926770

Page 18, Family at dining table Copyright: www.123rf.com/10240475

Page 24: Asian Family Copyright: www.123rf.com/37802811

Page 33: Hispanic/Latino Family Copyright: www.123rf.com/25961846

Front/Back Cover and Inside Front/Inside Back Cover: Skyline of Austin Texas Copyright: www.123rf.com/150200048 and www.123rf.com/150200021

Book exterior and interior design by Chapman University professor Eric Chimenti. His work has won a Gold Advertising Award, been selected for inclusion into *LogoLounge: Master Library, Volume 2 and LogoLounge Book 9*, and been featured on *visual.ly*, the world's largest community of infographics and data visualization. He has 17 years of experience in the communication design industry. To view a client list and see additional samples please visit www.behance.net/ericchimenti.



Professor Chimenti is also the founder and head of Chapman's **Ideation Lab** that supports undergraduate and faculty research by providing creative visualization and presentation support from appropriately qualified Chapman University undergraduate students. Services include creative writing, video, photography, data visualization, and all aspects of design. The students specialize in the design and presentation of complex communication problems.

In addition the following graphic design majors and ideation lab students also helped on the book layout: Annie Woodward, Justin Pineda, Cheyenne Gorbitz, and Kirsten Worrels.



The data here is meant to provide a first step towards understanding what actually works in a variety of locations to advance the economic and social condition of American's emerging non-white majority.

