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New Demographic Regions

- Melting Pot America
- The New Sunbelt
- The Heartland
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Melting Pot, New Sunbelt and Heartland States
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Language at Home</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish at Home</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Marriages</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English at Home</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demographic Components, 2000-2009 (Rates per 1000)

- Melting Pot: Immigration 45, Domestic Migration -19
- New Sunbelt: Immigration 30, Domestic Migration 66
- Heartland: Immigration 16, Domestic Migration -15
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>530,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>457,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>412,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>307,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>299,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>254,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>243,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>242,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Greatest Domestic Out-Migration, 2000-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Out-Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-1,920,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>-1,337,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>-547,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>-361,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>-343,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>-298,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>-284,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>-233,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Immigrant Magnet Metros, 2000-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,079,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>803,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>506,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>363,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>323,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>310,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>289,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>257,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CA, West Growth 2005-6 vs 2008-9

Population Change Rate, 2005-6

Population Change 2005-6
- Loss of 1.0% or greater
- Loss of less than 1.0%
- Gain of less than 1.0%
- Gain of 1.0 to 2.5%
- Gain of greater than 2.5%

Population Change Rate, 2008-9

Population Change 2008-9
- Loss of 1.0% or greater
- Loss of less than 1.0%
- Gain of less than 1.0%
- Gain of 1.0 to 2.5%
- Gain of greater than 2.5%
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Florida Growth, 2005-6 vs 2008-9

Population Change Rate, 2005-6

Population Change 2005-6
- Loss of 1.0% or greater
- Loss of less than 1.0%
- Gain of less than 1.0%
- Gain of 1.0 to 2.5%
- Gain of greater than 2.5%

Population Change Rate, 2008-9

Population Change 2008-9
- Loss of 1.0% or greater
- Loss of less than 1.0%
- Gain of less than 1.0%
- Gain of 1.0 to 2.5%
- Gain of greater than 2.5%
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Annual Population Growth, 2000-9

Nevada, Arizona, Florida, Texas
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Annual Population Growth, 2000-9

Los Angeles Metro, New York Metro
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Annual Population Growth, 2000-9

Urban, Suburban, Exurban
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Migration Slowdown
1947-8 to 2008-9
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Migration between States by Age
2000-1 versus 2008-9
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Reasons for Moving Between States
2004-5 versus 2008-9
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California versus Mountain West
Annual Net Domestic Migration 2000-9
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Nevada: Greatest Net Migration Origins: 2000-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Net Mig. Migration</th>
<th>Share of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>192,382</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>15,237</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>10,358</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,125</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California Net Migration by Education:
2004-5 versus 2007-8
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New York versus Florida
Annual Net Domestic Migration 2000-9
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## Top Metro Net Migration Gainers, 2004-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Net Mig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>98,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>72,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>51,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>51,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>51,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>39,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## New and Old Net Migration Gainers, 2008-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Net Mig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>49,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>45,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>25,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>20,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>19,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>19,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>17,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>12,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>4,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>-1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>-4,279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Florida Metro Areas
Annual Net Migration 2000-2009
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Texas Metro Areas
Annual Net Migration 2000-2009
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Metro Phoenix
Domestic and International Migration 2000-2009
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Metro Los Angeles, CA
Domestic and International Migration 2000-2009

Source: William H. Frey analysis
Race Composition of Regions  2008

Melting Pot

- White: 53%
- Black: 11%
- Asian: 3%
- Other: 3%
- Hispanic: 2%

New Sunbelt

- White: 68%
- Black: 3%
- Asian: 3%
- Other: 11%
- Hispanic: 2%

Heartland

- White: 79%
- Black: 2%
- Asian: 2%
- Other: 5%
- Hispanic: 2%
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Hispanic Concentrations


Percent of County Population

- 25% and above
- 10.0% to 24.9%
- 5.0 to 9.9%
- Under 5%
Asian Concentrations

Percent of County Population

- 10% and above
- 5.0% to 9.9%
- 2.0% to 4.9%
- Under 2%

Black Concentrations

Percent of County Population

- 25% and above
- 10.0% to 24.9%
- 5.0% to 9.9%
- Under 5%

CA and MT West: Race Change 1990-2008
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Annual Hispanic Growth Rates, 2000-8: Selected West Metros
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State Growth in Child Population*, 2000-2010
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Percent Children with Immigrant Parents
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US Growth by Age 2000-10
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boise City</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Percent 65+ population for States, 2005

- 13.4% & above
- 12% -13%
- 11% -11.9%
- under 12%
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Projected Age 65+ Growth
2000-30, US States
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Projected Age 65+ Growth, 2000-40
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Race for Age Groups: US
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Race for Age Groups: California
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Race for Age Groups: Nevada
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Race for Age Groups: Arizona
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Race for Age Groups: Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Under 15</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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United States
Projected Race Compositions, 2025

Under Age 18
- White: 52%
- Black: 15%
- Indian: 3%
- Asian: 6%
- Hispanic: 1%

Age 18 - 64
- White: 62%
- Black: 13%
- Indian: 3%
- Asian: 7%
- Hispanic: 5%

Age 65+
- White: 76%
- Black: 8%
- Indian: 3%
- Asian: 5%
- Hispanic: 2%
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Projected State Population Growth 2000-2010

- 15% and above
- 10% to 15%
- 5% to 10%
- Under 5%
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Fast-Growing Purple States, 2008

The image shows a map of the United States with states highlighted in different colors to indicate their status as fast-growing purple states. The states are color-coded as follows:

- Purple-Dem: States with a predominantly Democratic leaning.
- Purple-Rep: States with a predominantly Republican leaning.
- All Other: States with a less significant leaned status.
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2008 Blue States: Won by Whites and Minorities
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Nevada – Democratic Margins
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New Mexico – Democratic Margins
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Useful Websites

www.brookings.edu/metro

www.frey-demographer.org
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