

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE  
DEMOGRAPHICS AND SOCIAL CHANGE  
ISSUE PAPER**

Prepared for:

Maricopa Association of Governments

Prepared by:

BRW, Inc.  
7720 N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Phoenix, AZ 85020

June 2001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>
Key Findings and Issues.....	1
Population .....	3
Employment .....	5
Immigration .....	6
Race and Ethnicity .....	8
Seniors and Youth.....	10
Women .....	11
Poverty and Income.....	12
Abbreviations.....	15
References .....	16

## KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES

- Maricopa County is forecast to continue to experience major population increases and is expected to grow from approximately 3.1 million in 2000 to 6.3 million in 2040, driven by migration from other states and immigration from Latin America. How will the transportation system keep up with the amount and rate of new population growth? Will this require double the existing transportation infrastructure and investment levels?
- Transportation systems, particularly the transit system, should be made more responsive to the characteristics of the users. For example, the parenting responsibilities placed on women severely limits their ability to use transit — what alternatives exist? Transit ridership by immigrants is relatively high, but transit usage tends to decline as immigrants assimilate and incomes rise — can we combat this trend through better service? What can be done to alleviate the challenges of an aging population, growing mobility rates for women, continued immigration and suburbanization?
- While the central cities of Maricopa County have avoided the decline in population experienced by many cities during recent decades, continuing rapid growth in the region's edge cities may signal an impending crisis for the core cities and a growing spatial mismatch between semi-skilled population groups in the core and entry-level employment opportunities at the urban edge. How can mobility best be provided from the core to the edge? What effects will suburb-to-suburb trips have on the transportation system in the core? How can negative effects be avoided or reduced?
- Both the senior and youth population cohorts are forecast to increase rapidly in numeric terms in the future, as is the proportion of seniors. How will the extended driving life of seniors be accommodated safely? What alternative transportation systems exist for seniors? Similarly, how can the transportation needs of youths best be accommodated?
- The forecast doubling of point-to-point travel times in Maricopa County is symptomatic of increasing suburbanization and congestion, which appear to be only marginally reduced via transit, flextime, telecommuting and the like. What alternatives exist in terms of transportation systems and land use patterns? Are there sufficient political will and financial incentives to increase land use densities, and would this substantially reduce congestion?

- The number of vehicle miles traveled in Maricopa County is forecast to increase at a rate faster than population. This is due in part to the increasing number of women in the work force, the related increase in household incomes and the growing prevalence of trip linking. What methods can be used to reduce the rate of increase in vehicle miles traveled, particularly during peak periods? What effect is the increase in vehicle miles traveled likely to have on maintenance requirements for the road and freeway network?

## POPULATION

- **National Findings:** The United States is forecast to experience continued strong population growth. Based on historical trends, this growth is likely to be higher in suburbs than in central cities.
  - U.S. population was 76.2 million in 1900 and grew to 281.4 million in 2000, an increase of 205.2 million or 269%. During the last decade, 1990 to 2000, the population of the United States grew from 248.7 million to 281.4 million, an increase of 32.7 million persons or 13.2%. Over three-quarters of this increase was in the South (14.8 million) and West (10.4 million). California had the largest numeric increase (4.1 million), and Nevada had the highest percentage growth (66%).<sup>1</sup>
  - In U.S. metropolitan areas, suburban population grew by 11.9% during the period 1990 to 1998, compared with 4.7% for central cities. Central cities now house only 38% of U.S. metropolitan population, versus 45% in 1970.<sup>2</sup>
  - According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the nation's population will continue to grow during the coming century. The Census Bureau's middle (most commonly used) forecast indicates that U.S. population will increase to 337.8 million in 2025, 403.7 million in 2050, 480.5 million in 2075, and 570.9 million in 2100.<sup>3</sup>
- **Regional Findings:** Strong population growth in Maricopa County is expected to continue in the future, particularly given the projected growth of the United States as a whole and Maricopa County's recent explosive growth. While the recent strong population growth in the core cities of Maricopa County suggests that the region's center is not declining in population, this continued fast growth poses challenges for both the core cities and the edge cities, and increases in population density may or may not continue in the future.
  - Arizona's population grew from 123,000 in 1900 to 5,131,000 in 2000, an increase of over 5.0 million persons or 4,000%. The state now ranks 20<sup>th</sup> in the nation in population. Arizona has doubled its population approximately every 18 years since 1900.<sup>1,4</sup>
  - During the period 1990-2000, Arizona's population increased from 3,665,000 in 1990 to 5,131,000 in 2000, an increase of 1,466,000 million persons or 40%. Arizona was the second fastest growing state based on percent change and the fifth fastest growing in absolute terms.<sup>1</sup>

- Maricopa County grew from 971,000 in 1970 to an estimated 2,784,000 in 1998, an increase of over 1.8 million persons or 287%. This was faster growth than that of any other large metropolitan area in the United States. From 1990 to 1998, population increased 31% due to the net arrival of 51,000 new residents a year.<sup>5</sup>
- Approximately one-third of the population growth in Maricopa County during the period 1990 to 1998 took place in the City of Phoenix and one-fifth went to major cities close to the urban core — Tempe, Scottsdale and Glendale. In addition, 8 of the 24 municipalities in Maricopa County experienced growth rates of over 50% during the period 1990 to 1998. However, strong growth is challenging the region's ability to provide infrastructure, particularly at the urban fringe where most of these fast-growing cities are located. Meanwhile, pockets of slow growth are emerging in and near the urban cores in south and central Phoenix.<sup>5</sup>
- Maricopa County is one of a handful of large U.S. metropolitan areas whose density increased from 1960 to 1990. This trend is thought to have continued during the 1990's, and is believed to be due primarily to increased construction of multi-family housing, decreases in average lot sizes and infill development. While population growth is expected to continue in any case, population density may be susceptible to some influence by public policy and land use planning.<sup>5</sup>
- The total population of Maricopa County is projected to be 6.3 million in 2040, an increase of approximately 3.3 million or 110% over the estimated 2000 population of 3.0 million.<sup>6</sup> Nine cities in Maricopa County are forecast to have populations of 250,000 or more persons in 2040, compared with two cities today.<sup>7</sup>
- At buildout, Maricopa County will have a population of 13 million, which is equivalent to the third largest metropolitan area in the United States today. In addition, Pinal County will add 500,000 persons.<sup>7</sup>
- A look at the past reveals that previous forecasts have tended to underestimate growth in population, the number of vehicles and the number of vehicle miles traveled, although forecasts have become more accurate over time. Underestimation was due largely to the following: more women entering the labor force, declining household size, growing real income and wealth, baby boomers coming of age, increase in average life span, increased children's safety concerns, neighborhood design/configuration and identification with the automobile as an extension of self.<sup>7</sup>

## EMPLOYMENT

- **National Findings:** Employment growth in the United States will continue to be driven by service-producing industries. Historical trends indicate that employment growth is likely to be strongest in the suburbs.
  - Non-farm employment in the United States increased from 107.8 million in 1990 to 128.8 million in 1997, an increase of 21 million employees or 19%. Due to the continued shift of manufacturing to other countries and reductions in defense spending, employment in the goods-producing and defense industries declined from 19.4 million in 1990 to 18.5 million in 1997. However, the service-producing sector, driven by technology and demand for services, grew from 82.6 million to 103.3 million employees, accounting for almost all new job growth.<sup>8</sup>
  - Civilian employment is projected to increase by approximately 16 million during the period 1998 to 2008, which is slightly less than the 16.5 million civilian employees added during the 1988 to 1998 period.<sup>9</sup>
  - The service-producing sector will continue to drive future job growth in the United States. All of the ten industries with the highest projected job growth are in this sector. Service-producing sector jobs tend to be lower paying than construction and manufacturing employment.<sup>10</sup>
  - High-tech growth is driving the New Economy (information-based industries), with high-tech employment growing faster in the suburbs of U.S. metropolitan areas than in cities, although cities have a larger proportion of high-tech jobs than suburbs.<sup>2</sup>
  - The percentage of metropolitan-area jobs located in the suburbs increased from 55% in 1992 to 57% in 1997.<sup>2</sup>
- **Regional Findings:** The primary and secondary employment cores are expected to maintain their positions as the focus of employment in Maricopa County. However, a spatial mismatch may exist between less-skilled workers living in the center, where skilled professional positions are concentrated, and entry-level and skilled positions in the growing high-tech manufacturing industry outside the employment cores.
  - The number of employed persons in the Maricopa County grew from 1.2 million in 1990 to 1.7 million in 1997, an increase of over 500,000 jobs or 42%.<sup>5</sup>

- In 1997, one-third of the region's employment was concentrated in two central areas covering only 4% of the land in the region. The primary employment core is downtown Phoenix and the Central Corridor, with the secondary employment core including southeast Phoenix, Tempe, and downtown Scottsdale.<sup>5</sup>
- While many professional positions (banking, government, law) remain concentrated in the primary core, high-technology industries are growing in the secondary core and beyond. Software and information industries have a strong presence in Tempe and Scottsdale, while high-tech manufacturing companies are generally located outside both the primary and secondary cores in the northwest and southeast.<sup>5</sup>
- The number of private sector jobs in the Phoenix-Mesa Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which includes portions of Maricopa and Pinal Counties, grew from 804,000 in 1992 to 1,100,000 in 1997, an increase of 296,000 jobs or 37%. The suburbs grew by 52% while central cities grew by 28%.<sup>11</sup>
- The number of high-tech jobs in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA grew by 42,000 or 62% from 1992 to 1997. The suburbs grew by 71% while central cities grew 55%.<sup>12</sup>

## IMMIGRATION

- **National Findings:** Historic settlement patterns suggest that most immigrants will continue to settle in central cities, although movement to the suburbs will occur.
  - The nation's foreign-born population, most of whom are legal or illegal immigrants, increased from 19.8 million to 28.4 million from 1990 to 2000. The percentage of foreign-born increased from 7.9% in 1990 to 10.4% in 2000. The foreign-born population in 2000 was proportionally highest in the West at 39.9%. Fifty-one percent (51%) of the foreign-born population was from Latin America, and 45% lived in the central cities of metropolitan areas (versus 28% of the native-born population).<sup>13,14</sup>
  - During the 1980's, over 50% of all immigrants were concentrated in five cities: Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, New York and Washington, DC. In 1995, over 50% of all immigrants settled in California, New York and Florida. Since family reunification and immediate relatives account for approximately 60% of U.S. immigrants admitted annually, this concentration is expected to continue.<sup>15,16</sup>
  - The outlook is for a maturing immigrant population in terms of age and duration of U.S. residence. This maturation has important effects, including:

increasing naturalization to U.S. citizenship, growing English proficiency, advancing occupational status, self-employment, rising incomes, falling poverty, less overcrowding of housing, rising homeownership, rising car use and falling transit use.<sup>17</sup>

- A systematic, multi-year research project on immigration and housing in the United States noted that the U.S. foreign-born population is not only growing rapidly, but it is also changing in ways that have important implications for American society. One of the most important changes will be the large increase in the number of immigrants who have resided in the United States for more than 10 years, which is projected to rise from 11.1 million in 1990 to 21.8 million in 2010, an increase of 10.7 million or 96%. By contrast, the number of more recent immigrants is projected to increase by only 0.5 million, from 8.8 million in 1990 to 9.3 million in 2010.
  - Another major change is the aging of the foreign-born population, whose median age is projected to increase from 37.4 years in 1990 to 43.1 years in 2010. These changes are expected to have positive effects on the foreign-born population's earnings, poverty rates, tax payments, entrepreneurship and welfare dependency.<sup>18</sup>
  - Financial status and English speaking ability are the primary determinants of residential location choices by immigrants.<sup>19,20</sup>
- **Regional Findings:** The high rate of increase in Arizona's foreign-born population, particularly from Latin America, is expected to continue in the future. Since recent immigrants have historically settled in central city locations and have initially had higher than average rates of poverty, the central cities may face growing pressure in terms of housing, social services, and education for these new residents.
- According to the 1990 Census, Arizona had an estimated 278,000 foreign-born residents. This group is estimated to have increased by 352,000 in 10 years to reach 630,000 in 2000. Arizona has the eighth highest foreign-born population in the nation, and ranked fourth among states in percentage increase over the last decade.<sup>21</sup>
  - At least 500,000 more immigrants are projected to settle in Arizona by 2025, primarily from Latin American countries.<sup>22</sup>

## RACE AND ETHNICITY

- **National Findings:** Continued growth in the number and proportion of Hispanic and non-white persons, fueled primarily by immigration, may result in a growing concentration of these population group in central cities.
  - The number of non-white and Hispanic persons, as well as their proportion of the U.S. population, increased substantially during the 1990's. The Hispanic population increased from 22.4 million in 1990 to 30.3 million in 1998, a gain of 7.9 million people or 35.2%. The Asian and Pacific Islander population increased by 3.0 million people or 40.8% from 1990 to 1998. The African-American population increased from 30.5 million to 34.4 million (12.8%) during the period 1990 to 1998. The American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut population increased by 295,000 or 14.3% from 1990 to 1998.<sup>23</sup>
  - Immigration is fueling increases in the proportion of minorities, especially Hispanics and Asians, in both central cities and suburbs. During the period 1980 to 1998, minorities grew from 13.4% to 21.7% of the suburban population. However, minorities grew even more rapidly as a proportion of the central city population, from 34.8% to 47.0%.<sup>2</sup>
  - Transit use by immigrants for work trips declines with the number of years in the United States. However, immigrants' use of transit is always above the U.S. average.<sup>24</sup>
  - Minorities will account for 80% of population growth in the United States to 2040. Over the period 1995 to 2050, total population will increase by 54%, Hispanic population will increase 258%, African-American population will increase 70%, and White non-Hispanic population will increase 7%. Hispanics will outnumber African-Americans by 2003.<sup>25</sup>
  - Minorities rely more heavily on transit and have a higher level of trust in transit.<sup>25</sup>
  - Assimilation of Latin American immigrants occurs more slowly than did past assimilation of European immigrants, because of technological advances and the proximity of the border (e.g., Spanish-language television, international telephone calls).<sup>25</sup>
  - During the period 1990-99, 1,278,000 immigrants from Europe entered the United States, constituting 11.4% of all immigrants to the United States during this period and approximately double the number from Europe during the previous decade (660,000). The number of immigrants from the Middle East

during the period 1990-99 was 330,000, constituting 2.9% of all immigrants to the United States during this period .<sup>26</sup>

- **Regional Findings:** Historical trends suggest that the projected growth of minority racial and ethnic groups, both in absolute and proportional terms, is likely to occur mainly within the City of Phoenix.
- Arizona's Hispanic population increased by 345,000 persons (the fifth largest increase in the United States) from 1990 to 98. Arizona's American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut population increased by 42,000, the largest increase in the United States.<sup>23</sup>
  - In Arizona during the period 1990 to 2000, the Asian population grew 77%, the Hispanic population grew 58%, and the African-American population grew 53%. By 2040, minority groups are projected to comprise 4.1 million persons, while non-minorities will comprise 3.9 million.<sup>25</sup>
  - Arizona's growth is partially a function of its role as a gateway state for population from Latin America. This situation will continue due to the strength of the U.S. economy and the relative weakness of Latin American economies.<sup>25</sup>
  - The proportion of non-Hispanic Whites in the Maricopa County population declined from 81.3% in 1980 to 71.9% in 1995. This was primarily due to the increase in the region's Hispanic population, which grew from 13.2% to 20.5% during the same period.<sup>5</sup>
  - While racial and ethnic diversity is growing in Maricopa County, an increasing proportion of the region's Hispanic and African-American residents live in the City of Phoenix, and there may be a growing north-south racial divide within the City. This concentration of minorities corresponds to concentrations of high poverty and low housing values.<sup>5</sup>
  - Minority school-age children are concentrated in Central Phoenix and the region's southwestern corner. For example, the percentage of non-Hispanic Whites was 20% in Central Phoenix and 41% in the southwestern districts, versus 87% in the five northeastern school districts. The region's lowest-achieving school districts (as measured by standardized test scores) were within Central Phoenix and the region's southwestern corner.<sup>5</sup>
  - Over the period 2000 to 2040, the share of minority population in Maricopa County is forecast to increase from 28% (0.7 million persons) to 40% (2.2 million persons). However, the Census Bureau consistently under-projects minority population, so this percentage could turn out to be higher.<sup>25</sup>

- The Hispanic population of Maricopa County is expected to increase from 20.5% of the total in 2000 to 31.1% in 2040.<sup>6</sup>

## SENIORS AND YOUTH

- **National Findings:** Seniors will become an increasingly high proportion of the population in the future and will more often choose to remain active and mobile as they age. While youths will decline as a proportion of the U.S. population, they too will increase significantly in numbers.
  - In 2000, an estimated 34.8 million Americans, or 12.7% of the total population (1 in 8 persons), were aged 65+. This number is projected to increase rapidly during the next 100 years in both absolute and percentage terms: 62.6 million or 18.5% in 2025; 82.0 million or 20.3% in 2050; 102.3 million or 21.3% in 2075; and 131.2 million or 23.0% in 2100.<sup>3</sup>
  - Seniors will live healthier, longer lives with greater financial resources, and the combination of prosperity and technology will permit them to select from a much wider choice of housing than ever before. A whole new industry of home services will develop to serve the overwhelming majority of seniors who will choose to remain in their homes as they age. Technology may significantly improve home mobility for seniors, although questions regarding external mobility remain. Many alternatives to nursing homes are becoming available to seniors, including residing in shared housing with a non-elderly person, living in supported housing and residing in an age-restricted community with partial or full assistance.<sup>27</sup>
  - Older Americans in the future will have greater mobility than now, leading to higher automobile ownership rates, more trips and more miles traveled. As suburbanites age and become more concerned about their ability to drive, the high congestion of cities may become more objectionable. Effective transportation planning would enhance the independence of older Americans by reducing their need to drive (for example, via improvements to existing transit and non-motorized options).<sup>28</sup>
  - In addition to its impact on the transportation system, the rapid growth in the number of persons aged 65+ has significant implications for the nation's health care and social security systems.
  - The percentage of workers aged 65-plus who reported starting a new job during the last 12 months increased from 10% in 1987 to 16% in 1998. The percentage of older Americans who reported having a sedentary lifestyle declined from 34% in 1985 to 28% in 1995 among men, and from 44% to 39% among women.<sup>29</sup>

- In 1990, there were an estimated 51.5 million children aged 0 to 17 in the United States, constituting 19% of the total population. This age group is projected to increase to 57.9 million in 2025, representing 17% of the population. By 2100, the number of 0 to 17 year olds is forecast to increase to 93.8 million, or 16% of the population.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the youthful population will grow numerically but decline as a proportion of the total.
- **Regional Findings:** As at the national level, the absolute number of both seniors and youths is expected to rise substantially, fueling a need for facilities to serve both groups (e.g., health care facilities and schools), as well as increasing demands for transportation services.
- Persons aged 55 or older represent nearly one-third of new residents at the urban fringe in Maricopa County. These residents are most likely to move directly to the urban fringe from places outside the region and to congregate in age-segregated retirement communities.<sup>5</sup>
  - The percentage of persons aged 60+ in the Phoenix Metropolitan Area is forecast to increase from 16.5% in 2000 to 26.2% in 2040. This group will increasingly choose to remain in the workforce and remain active in other ways.<sup>6</sup>
  - Although the cohort aged 0 to 19 will decline from 28.8% of the population in 2000 to 25.7% in 2040, it will still increase in absolute numbers by approximately 750,000. This will generate demand for an additional 825 new schools in growth areas, while older schools may be closed in more central locations with declining youthful populations.<sup>6</sup>
  - In Arizona during the period 1990 to 1998, there was a net gain of 142,000 (18%) in the number of K-12 students. Minorities accounted for 87% of this growth, with Hispanics alone accounting for 67%. These trends are expected to accelerate in the future; minorities will become the majority of high school graduates in 2008. However, education dropout rates are currently highest among Native Americans and second highest among Hispanics.<sup>25</sup>

## WOMEN

- **National Findings:** Women will continue to become a mainstream component of the U.S. workforce in the future. Their growing financial and mobility independence, coupled with their propensity to live longer than men, will result in continued demands for transportation.
- A 1999 profile of U.S. women shows increasing labor force participation, education and income: 6 in 10 women were in the labor force; 23% had a

bachelor's degree or higher (versus 27% for men); the median income for women age 25+ who worked full-time, year round in 1998 was \$26,711 (73% of their male counterparts' earnings); the number of women living alone doubled from 7.3 million in 1970 to 15.3 million in 1998; and women outnumbered men 139 million to 133 million, with the ratio of men to women declining with age.<sup>30</sup>

- Women's median income increased by 63% between 1970 and 1998, while median income declined by 6% for men. With regard to household finances, women have at least an equal say with their male partners in 75% of all U.S. households, and women manage the finances in 4 in 10 U.S. households. The average age of a bride in 1998 was 25, nearly five years older than in 1970.<sup>31</sup>
- Analysis of data from the 1995 National Personal Transportation Survey (NPTS) suggests that when they reach age 75, female baby boomers will be more likely to own cars, will make more trips and will drive more miles than older women do now.<sup>28</sup>
- Regardless of age group, women today travel less than men. Younger women travel more than older women. In the future, older women (today's young women) will make as many vehicle trips as men of the same age.<sup>24</sup>
- The number of trips women make varies by the age of their children, while men's trip numbers do not vary by age of children. Women also have higher numbers of linked trips, resulting in more complicated travel patterns. Lower income women with cars are less likely to use transit due to their distance from work and trip requirements.<sup>24</sup>
- Research into the travel behavior of younger women reveals the following: younger women are making more trips and are making more linked trips (multiple stops per trip) than their mothers; younger women are making more trips than men the same age; they make more trips in suburban areas with no auto alternatives; and they make more trips for their aging parents. In addition, more women than men work in service industries, which tend to require variable or non-traditional hours.<sup>24</sup>

## POVERTY AND INCOME

- **National Findings:** The concentration of poverty in central cities is likely to continue, particularly due to the growing spatial mismatch between the suburbanization of jobs and the concentration of poor people in the central city. While the deconcentration of low-income families to the suburbs would be the most effective solution, improved opportunities to commute may be more politically palatable.

- The U.S. poverty rate dropped from 12.7% in 1998 (32.3 million persons) to 11.8% in 1999 (34.5 million), the lowest rate since 1979. The percentage of people 65 or older who are poor reached a low of 9.7%, and the proportion of children in poverty declined to 16.9%.<sup>11</sup>
- Poverty rates for all major ethnic groups equaled or set all-time lows in 1999: non-Hispanic Whites at 7.7%; African-Americans at 23.6%; Hispanics at 22.8%; Asians and Pacific Islanders at 10.7%; and American Indians and Alaskan Natives at 25.9%.<sup>11</sup>
- Eighty percent (80%) of the net decline in poverty occurred in central cities of metropolitan areas, where 3 out of 10 of the U.S. population live and 4 out of 10 poor people live.<sup>11</sup>
- The 1999 real median household income reached \$40,816, the highest level recorded by the Census Bureau since data were first recorded in 1967. Three ethnic groups had the highest real median household income ever recorded for those groups: non-Hispanic Whites at \$44,366; African-Americans at \$27,910; and Hispanics at \$30,735. Asians and Pacific Islanders remained the same at \$51,205. The median income for American Indians and Alaskan Natives was reported for the first time, with a median of \$30,784.<sup>11</sup>
- The percentage of the foreign-born population in poverty was 16.8% in 2000 (versus 11.2% for the entire U.S. population). The poverty rate was 21.9% for foreign-born residents from Latin America.<sup>13</sup>
- A comprehensive review of literature concerning eight hypotheses of the causes of inner city poverty suggests that industrial transformation (the shift from an industrial economy to an information economy) and inadequate human capital (an educated, skilled workforce with access to capital) are the two most important factors. In addition, segregation, spatial mismatch (between jobs and housing), and employment discrimination are very significant.<sup>32</sup>
- The spatial mismatch hypothesis contends that the suburbanization of jobs and involuntary housing market segregation (due to lower income levels and racism) together act to create a deficit of jobs in central cities where poor people and minorities are concentrated. A comprehensive review of studies supports this hypothesis. The deconcentration of minorities to the suburbs through affordable housing appears to be more effective than improved commuting opportunities, although the former is more likely to be strongly resisted by suburban communities.<sup>33,34</sup>

- The movement of middle-class families from cities to suburbs appears to leave cities with: a higher proportion of households in poverty; a higher proportion of single-parent families; declines in property values; and underfunded, deteriorating infrastructure and schools. Suburbs gaining upper-income families often enjoy: low poverty rates; rising property values; and well-funded infrastructure and schools. Decentralization also appears to widen disparities between suburbs with lucrative commercial and industrial tax bases, and aging municipalities with static or declining tax bases.<sup>35,36</sup>
- **Regional Findings:** Based on local trends, poverty is likely to be increasingly concentrated in central and south Phoenix, while wages rise in the surrounding communities.
- Arizona ranks has the second highest disparity in the nation in median income between the highest one-fifth and the lowest one-fifth of households.<sup>37</sup>
  - In 1990, 12.3% of Maricopa County’s population lived in poverty. High poverty rates tended to be clustered in central and south Phoenix, and the geographic extent of this area grew significantly since 1970.<sup>5</sup>
  - The average annual pay for private sector jobs increased 7.7% in the suburban communities of the Phoenix-Mesa Metropolitan Area from 1992 to 1997. In contrast, the average annual pay in the central cities of Phoenix and Mesa increased 1.8% over the same period.<sup>11</sup>

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

MSA            Metropolitan Statistical Area

NPTS          National Personal Transportation Survey

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. January 3, 2001a. "First Census 2000 Results – Resident Population and Apportionment Counts." Press release referenced at <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>.
- <sup>2</sup>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2000. *State of the Cities 2000*. Referenced at [http://www.huduser.org/publications/polleg/soc2000\\_rpt.html](http://www.huduser.org/publications/polleg/soc2000_rpt.html).
- <sup>3</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. January 13, 2000. "Annual Projections of the Total Resident Population as of July 1: Middle, Lowest, Highest, and Zero International Migration Series, 1999 to 2100 (NP-T1)." Referenced at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/natsum.html>.
- <sup>4</sup>Arizona Republic, The. December 29, 2000. "Surprise! Population Beats Expectations."
- <sup>5</sup>Morrison Institute for Public Policy. September 2000. *Hits and Misses: Fast Growth in Metropolitan Phoenix*. Tempe, AZ: Morrison Institute for Public Policy.
- <sup>6</sup>Maricopa Association of Governments. December 15, 2000. *Management Committee Retreat 2000*.
- <sup>7</sup>Anderson, Eric. February 23, 2001. *Mobility for the New Millennium Expert Forum: Demographics and Social Change*.
- <sup>8</sup>Hatch, Julie and Angela Clinton. December 2000. "Job Growth in the 1990's: A Retrospect," *Monthly Labor Review*. Referenced at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2000/12/art1exc.htm>.
- <sup>9</sup>Saunders, Norman C. and Betty W. Su. November 1999. "Employment Outlook: 1998-2008," *Monthly Labor Review*. Referenced at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1999/11/art2exc.htm>.
- <sup>10</sup>Bureau of Labor Statistics. February 9, 2000. "Employment Projections: Table 3c. The 10 occupations with the largest job growth, 1998-2008." Referenced at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/news.release/ecopro.t07.htm>.
- <sup>11</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. September 26, 2000. "Poverty Rate Lowest in 20 Years, Household Income Record High, Census Bureau Reports," press release referenced at <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2000/cb00-158.html>.

<sup>12</sup>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. July 11, 2000. *State of the Cities Data System*. Referenced at [http://webstage1.aspensys.com/SOCDS/SOCDS\\_Home.htm](http://webstage1.aspensys.com/SOCDS/SOCDS_Home.htm).

<sup>13</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. January 2001. Foreign-Born Population in the United States. Referenced at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2000pubs/p20-534.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. January 3, 2001b. "Foreign-Born Population Nears 30 Million, Census Bureau Estimates," press release referenced at <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2001/cb01-04.html>.

<sup>15</sup>Frey, William. 1995. "Immigration and Internal Migration 'Flight' from U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Toward a New Demographic Balkanization," *Urban Studies* 32:733-757. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

<sup>16</sup>Frey, William H., and Kao-Lee Liaw. 1996. *The Impact of Recent Immigration on Population Redistribution Within the United States*. PSC Research Report No. 96-376. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Population Studies Center. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

<sup>17</sup>Myers, Dowell. October 7, 1996. "Immigration: Past and Future." Referenced at <http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~dowell/pubs/sc2/sc2immig.htm>.

<sup>18</sup>Fannie Mae Foundation. 1997. "Immigration and Housing in the United States: Trends and Prospects." Referenced at <http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/HousingResearch/immigration/immig.html>.

<sup>19</sup>Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, Brian J. Stults, Gilbert Marzan, and Wenquan Zhang. 1999. "Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 64, Issue 3.

<sup>20</sup>Glaster, George C., Kurt Metzger, and Ruth Waite. 1999. "Neighborhood Opportunity Structures of Immigrant Population, 1980 and 1990," *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 10, Issue 2.

<sup>21</sup>Center for Immigration Studies. January 2001. *Immigrants in the United States – 2000*. Referenced at <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back101.html>.

<sup>22</sup>Arizona Republic, The. January 8, 2001. "World's Cultures Converge in State."

<sup>23</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. September 15, 1999. "Census Bureau Releases State and County Population Changes for the Nation's Racial and Ethnic Groups – Substantial Increases Estimated from 1990," press release referenced at <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/1999/cb99-170.htm>.

- <sup>24</sup>Rosenbloom, Sandra. February 23, 2001. *Mobility for the New Millennium Expert Forum: Demographics and Social Change*.
- <sup>25</sup>Olivas, Louis. February 23, 2001. *Mobility for the New Millennium Expert Forum: Demographics and Social Change*.
- <sup>26</sup>Camarota, Steven A. January 2001. "Immigrants in the United States – 2000: A Snapshot View of America's Foreign-Born Population." Center for Immigration Studies.
- <sup>27</sup>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. May/June, 2000. "Trends in Elderly Housing," in *Urban Research Monitor*, referenced at [http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/urm/urm\\_07\\_2000/urm1.html](http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/urm/urm_07_2000/urm1.html).
- <sup>28</sup>Spain, Daphne. December 1997. *Societal Trends: The Aging Baby Boom and Women's Increased Independence*. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Order No. DTFH61-97-P-00314.
- <sup>29</sup>Gardyn, Rebecca. November 2000. "Retirement Redefined," *American Demographics*. Referenced at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00\\_ad/0011\\_ad/ad001101.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00_ad/0011_ad/ad001101.htm).
- <sup>30</sup>U.S. Census Bureau. March 16, 2000. "Profile of the Nation's Women Released by Census Bureau," press release referenced at <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2000/cb00-47.html>.
- <sup>31</sup>Raymond, Joan with Robbie Woliver. July 2000. "For Richer and For Poorer: Among married households, women's financial prowess is on the rise. Are marketers ready?" in *American Demographics*, referenced at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00\\_ad/000702.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00_ad/000702.htm).
- <sup>32</sup>Teitz, Michael B., and Karen Chapple. 1998. "The Causes of Inner-City Poverty: Eight Hypotheses in Search of Reality," *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development Research*, 3(3): 33-70.
- <sup>33</sup>Ihlanfeldt, Keith R. and David L. Sjoquist. 1998. "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: A Review of Recent Studies and Their Implications for Welfare Reform," *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 9, Issue 4.
- <sup>34</sup>Downs, Anthony. 1999. "Some Realities About Sprawl and Urban Decline," *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 10, Issue 4.
- <sup>35</sup>Downs, Anthony. 1997. "The Challenge of Our Declining Big Cities," *Housing Policy Debate* 8:359-408. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

<sup>36</sup>Orfield, Myron. 1997. *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*. Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institution. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

<sup>37</sup>Maricopa Association of Governments. January 11, 2001. *Regional Path We're On*.

Borjas, George. 1993. "The Intergenerational Mobility of Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics* 11:113-35. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

Center for Urban Transportation Research. September 1998. *Public Transit in America: Findings from the 1995 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey*.

Downs, Anthony. February 23, 2001. *Mobility for the New Millennium Expert Forum: Demographics and Social Change*.

Downs, Anthony. January 1, 2000. "Might as Well Enjoy It," *The Washington Post*. Referenced at <http://www.brook.edu/view/op-ed/downs/20010101.htm>.

Downs, Anthony. July/August 1999. "Congestion Is Here To Stay...You Might As Well Learn To Enjoy It," *Metropolitan Development/Growth Management*, Vol. 10. No. 4. Referenced at <http://innobriefs.com>.

Edmondson, Brad. June 1994. "Alone in the Car," *American Demographics*. Referenced at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/94\\_ad/9406\\_ad/ad597.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/94_ad/9406_ad/ad597.htm).

Fetto, John. January 2000. "Time for the Traffic," in *American Demographics*. Referenced at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00\\_ad/0001\\_ad/ad000106a.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00_ad/0001_ad/ad000106a.htm).

Gardyn, Rebecca. March 2000. "And Baby Makes Two," *American Demographics*. Referenced at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00\\_ad/0003\\_ad/ad00036a.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/ad/00_ad/0003_ad/ad00036a.htm).

Mokhtarian, Patricia L. October 1997. "Now That Travel Can Be Virtual, Will Congestion Virtually Disappear?" Referenced at <http://www.sciam.com/1097issue/1097mokhtarian.html>.

Staheli, Lynn A., Janet E. Kodras, and Colin Flint, eds. 1997. *State of Devolution in America: Implications for a Diverse Society*. *Urban Affairs Annual Reviews* 48. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Referenced in Wyly, Glickman and Lahr, 1998.

Urban Data Systems. 1996. Referenced by *American Demographics*, December 1996, at [http://www.demographics.com/publications/fc/96\\_fc/9612\\_fc/9612fo6.htm](http://www.demographics.com/publications/fc/96_fc/9612_fc/9612fo6.htm).

U.S. Census Bureau. July 7, 1997. "Nevada Leads All States in Housing Unit Growth from 1990-1996, According to State Census Bureau Report." Referenced at <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/cb97-112.html>.

Wyly, Elvin K., Norman J. Glickman and Michael L. Lahr. 1998. "A Top 10 List of Things to Know About American Cities," *Cityscape: A Journal of Development and Research*, Vol. 3, No. 3:7-32. Referenced at <http://huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol2num3>.