

Introduction: In spring of 2010, the Center for Whole Communities hired consultant Danyelle O’Hara to research some questions about demographic changes in America. We wanted more statistical documentation, and a fuller understanding, to support our curriculum around the 2042 transition date to a dominant non-white American population. The following report gives a summary of that research.

What is the racial diversity expected to be in America in 2042? What will the racial diversity look like in 2042 by regions of the country? What are the factors that most contribute to this demographic trend? For example, how much is this due to in-migration versus population growth? How does this demographic information match up with what journalists are calling the "balkanization" of America into segregated communities? See <http://www.miller-mccune.com/culture-society/re-crafting-the-united-states-as-disunited-duchies-3441/> In this article, the stat is given that all high growth communities are either dominate white or dominant brown. The author also asserts that today 40% of all Americans under 24 are people of color. We need some understanding of how these ideas about balkanization fit into the 2042 date. There's some very powerful and, no doubt, controversial implications for land conservation.

1. What is the racial diversity expected to be in the United States in 2042?

See excel spreadsheet.

2. What will race look like in 2042 by regions of the country?

States currently majority people of color (POC)

State	Percentage
HI	.75
NM	.58
CA	.58
TX	.53
DC*	.67

*The white population in DC has increased by 1% per year for several years. If this rate remains constant, by 2025 DC will have a white majority.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2009

Projections* for states that will become majority POC by 2038

State	Year
NV	2016
AZ	2020
GA	2021
MD	2022
FL	2024
MS	2026
NJ	2030
NY	2038

* The source for this is a blog site using U.S. census data – probably very thoughtful, but not necessarily scientific.

Source: <http://mucow.blogspot.com/2010/03/majority-minority.html> March 2010

3. What are regional growth trends?

Fastest changing states (percentage points annually):

State	% annually
NV	0.9
WY	0.7
AZ	0.7
UT	0.6
ID	0.6

Slowest changing states (percentage points annually):

State	% annually
SC	0.2
RI	0.2
MI	0.2
OH	0.3
MN	0.3

Fastest growing cities in 2009

City	Pop. 2008	Gain (%)
New Orleans La.	311,853	8.2%
Round Rock Tex.	104,446	8.2%
Cary N.C.	129,545	6.9%
Gilbert Ariz.	216,449	5.0%
McKinney Tex.	121,211	4.8%
Roseville Calif.	112,660	3.8%
Irvine Calif.	207,500	3.8%
Raleigh N.C.	392,552	3.8%
Killeen Tex.	116,934	3.8%
Fort Worth Tex.	703,073	3.6%

Cities losing population: Detroit, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Memphis lost, on the average, 0.5% of their populations in 2009.

Source: U.S. Census Data 2009

http://money.cnn.com/2009/07/01/news/economy/fastest_growing_cities/index.htm

4. What are current trends in growth and racial distribution?

Source: Excerpt/summary from William H. Frey “America's Regional Demographics in '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Baby Boomers and New Minorities.” Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution (November 27, 2006).

http://www.frey-demographer.org/reports/R-2006-3_AmRegionalDem00.pdf

Also see document entitled Q1 Maps for maps that illustrate population distribution for each race described below.

Hispanics

Traditional ‘immigrant gateways’ such as Los Angeles, New York, Miami, Chicago and Houston still rank highest in Hispanic populations. Established neighborhoods and institutions make these areas familiar and attractive to long term residents and migrants.

In the ’00 decade, the large gateways had less hold on the Hispanic population. In 1990, the top 10 metropolitan areas housed 55 percent of all US Hispanics, and the top 2, Los Angeles and New York, housed nearly 3 in 10 Hispanics nationwide. In 2005, however, less than half of all Hispanics live in the top 10 areas and Los Angeles and New York are home to only 22 percent.

There remain large shares of the Hispanic population in traditional ‘magnet areas’ and in Texas border towns and in farming towns like those in central California.

Areas with the fastest rates of change: Southeast and interior West, as well as selected areas in the Midwest and Northeast. Fast rates of growth are shown in North Carolina areas like Charlotte and Raleigh, as well as Nashville, TN, Atlanta, GA and a number of Florida metropolitan areas including Sarasota, Orlando, Jacksonville and Tampa. People are both attracted to jobs in construction, service, and retail, and being driven from the coasts by high housing costs.

Nearly one third of all counties in the United States have at least 5% Hispanic populations, compared with one out of 6 in 1990. The Hispanic population is both concentrated and dispersing.

Asians

While Asians are not spreading out nearly to the same extent as Hispanics, there is some noticeable tendency towards dispersal. In 2005 372 counties were at least 2 percent Asian population, and 96 counties represented 5 percent. In 1990, only 44 counties were more than 5 percent Asian.

When examining the fastest rates of Asian growth it is clear that Asians are moving to areas that are attracting a broad spectrum of the nation’s population — Las Vegas, NV, Orlando, FL, Atlanta, GA and Phoenix, AZ, to name a few. Though Asians do not represent a large share of these populations, they represent an increasing share of the growth of these areas, many of which (such as Atlanta, GA, Phoenix, AZ, Austin, TX and Washington, DC) are related to ‘high tech’ knowledge economy development. Cities like Detroit, MI and Philadelphia, PA are also experiencing a rapid rise in Asian growth.

The Asian populations in Los Angeles and New York, by far, are larger than in any other metropolitan areas, together they represent 27 percent of the total US Asian population, and the top 10 magnets represent 56 percent. As with Hispanics, the metropolitan areas

showing the greatest Asian gains are dominated by those which house the largest overall populations.

African American

The legacy of the black migration out of the South that occurred many decades ago remains in the fact that 4 of the 10 metropolitan areas with the largest black populations are located in the North, led by New York, NY and Chicago, IL, but also including Philadelphia, PA and Detroit, MI.

For the past three decades (since the 1980's) black populations have risen in many fast growing Southern metropolitan areas – Atlanta, GA, Washington, DC, Miami, FL, Houston and Dallas, TX. In fact, Atlanta, GA is poised to take over Chicago, IL, as the second most populous black city in the United States. Southern metropolitan areas such as Orlando, FL, Charlotte, NC and Tampa, FL represent a new wave of black destinations. The draw back to the south is linked to both jobs, lower housing costs, and family and cultural ties.

Philadelphia, PA and Baltimore, MD, continue to show positive gains in black population, but those gains are driven by natural increase rather than by migration into these areas.

The fastest growing areas in terms of rates of growth for blacks include both southern and non-southern parts of the country. While they comprise relatively small shares of the populations in non-southern metropolitan areas like Las Vegas, NV, Phoenix, AZ, Minneapolis, MN and Sacramento, CA, the growth of African American populations is especially strong in these areas. At the same time, southern metropolitan areas with already large and established black populations — Orlando, FL, Atlanta, GA, Raleigh, NC, Charlotte, NC and Tampa, FL — continue to show high rates of growth further increasing these large populations.

Whites

Overall, 31 of the nation's 88 large metropolitan areas lost whites over the 2000–05 period, led by coastal metropolitan areas, New York, NY, Los Angeles, CA, San Francisco, CA, Boston, MA, San Jose, CA and Miami, FL. Some of the drivers away include high cost of living and the 'bursting bubble' of high tech jobs in the 1990's.

The growth of immigrant communities of color is generated by natural increase and immigration African Americans population growth is through natural increase and migration. Among whites, domestic migration is the major component of growth and is probably the component most affected by economic 'pushes and pulls' across markets.

Aside from the expensive coastal areas, several other areas losing white population are Midwest cities such as Pittsburgh, PA, Detroit, MI and Cleveland, OH. Here the lack of employment opportunities, rather than the high cost of living have affected the white losses.

Big metropolitan areas like Las Vegas, NV and Phoenix, AZ are attracting many whites, and other areas with high white growth rates are located in Florida, interior California, North Carolina and broad stretches of the Southwest.

There are still large swaths of the country that are mostly white. 855 of the 3,141 counties in the United States are at least 95 percent white, another 1762 are over 85 percent white. Those counties which are less than 70 percent white in the US are in the decided minority, but are also mostly located in the fast growing southeastern and western areas that are not only attracting whites, but also immigrant people of color and blacks.

The slow rate of population growth among whites contrasts with the large immigration surges that are propelling Hispanic and Asian gains, and the somewhat higher levels of natural increase for blacks. In contrast to these groups, the distribution of whites across the United States is really a 'zero sum' game: when some areas gain large numbers of whites, other areas must show white population losses.

Frey proposes the following categorizations to understand trends in racial distribution:

New Minority States

New states where Hispanics, Asians, and other Non-black minorities comprise a large part of the population (at least 20 percent) and non-Hispanic whites make up less than 70 percent of the population. They are states where Hispanics and Asians have a strong presence and whose numbers are replenished by ongoing immigration waves. The 11 states represented here are the big immigration states of California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois and New Jersey; the established minority states of Hawaii, Alaska and New Mexico; and states where new minorities are becoming a dominant presence, Nevada and Arizona.

Faster Growing States

These states that do not qualify as new minority states, but are growing faster than the US population. Their growth is coming from whites, or from both whites and blacks, although immigrant minorities are contributing. They include the western states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and Colorado; the southern states of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Delaware; and the faster growing northeastern state of New Hampshire.

Largely White - Slow Growing

States growing slower than the nation as a whole where the black population comprises at least 12 percent of the population include the northern states of Michigan and Ohio, and the southern states of Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi and Alabama, as well as the District of Columbia.

The remaining 20 states are also growing more slowly than the nation as a whole; they are at least 70 percent white and do not have a large presence of blacks or new immigrant minorities. They are located primarily in the Northeast and Midwest but also include the western states of Montana and Wyoming, and the southern states of West Virginia, Kentucky and Oklahoma.

The growth of “new communities of color” (immigrants) is especially important because, as relatively recent immigrants, they have younger age structures than the native white population. In fact, the median age of Hispanics in the United States is 13 years younger (27.3) than that for whites (40.3). As a consequence, now, one out of five households under age 25 is either Hispanic or Asian, suggesting their future impact on the overall population as they age.

Updated snapshots of racial distribution in the U.S.
(Consistent with Frey’s analysis above.)

Source: Census Bureau, May 2009
<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/013734.html>

	Lgst pop.	Lgst numeric increase	Highest %	Lgst county population	Lgst county numeric increase	Highest county %	# of counties majority
Hispanic	CA: 13.5M	CA: 313,000	NM: 45%	LA Co, CA.: 4.7M	LA Co: 67,000	Starr Co, TX: 97%	48, top 10 in TX
African American	NY: 3.5M	GA: 67,000	DC: 56% MS: 38%	Cook Co, IL: 1.4M	Orleans Co (NewOrleans): 16,000	Claiborne Co, MS: 84%	77, all in south
Asian	CA: 5.1M	CA: 105,000	HI: 54%	LA Co, CA: 1.4M	Santa Clara Co, CA: 19,000	Honolulu Co, HI: 58%	1, Honolulu Co.
American Indians Alaska Natives	CA: 739,000	TX: 13,000	AK: 18%	LA Co, CA: 155,000	Maricopa Co, AZ (Phoenix): 2,300	Shannon Co, SD: 88%	10
Native Hawaiians Pacific Islanders	CA: 282,000	CA: 6,000	HI: 22%	Honolulu Co, HI: 179,000	Clark Co, NV (Las Vegas): 857	Hawaii Co, HI: 30%	
White	CA: 15.5M	TX: 85,000	ME/VT: 95%	LA Co, CA: 2.8M	Maricopa Co, AZ (Phoenix): 22,000	Magoffin Co, KY: 99%	

All figures are as of July 2008. Numeric increases are between July 2007 and July 2008.

5. What factors contribute to demographic trends?

Source: Excerpt/summary from Population Reference Bureau, Mark Mather, March 2008 <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2008/populationlosses.aspx>

As noted in Frey’s analysis above, domestic migration (going to jobs and away from high cost of living) and natural increase (the excess of births over deaths) are the primary source of population growth in fast-growing areas. Mark Mather (Population Reference Bureau) argues that international migration plays a role in population growth but is dwarfed by migration from other parts of the country. In counties with moderate growth/loss, international migration—and the children of immigrants—help to keep the population afloat. This is especially true for the core counties of big cities such as Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, and New York. Domestic migrants continue to leave these areas while new immigrants come in to take their place. In areas that have lost significant numbers of people, the minimal population gains through

natural increase and international migration cannot offset the large outflow of domestic migrants seeking opportunities elsewhere.

The Economic Research Service at the U.S. Department of Agriculture attributes population loss in rural areas to declines in farming and other rural industries, high poverty rates, lack of services, and—in some areas—a lack of natural amenities such as warm winters, forests, or lakes. The fact that most out-migrants are of reproductive age compounds the problem, because it means that fewer babies are being born to replace the aging population. Of the 1,346 counties that shrank in population between 2000 and 2007, 85 percent are located outside of metropolitan areas, and 59 percent rely heavily on farming, manufacturing, or mining.

Source: Excerpt/summary from “Latinos Account for Half of U.S. Population Growth Since 2000,” William Fry, Pew Hispanic Center, October 23, 2008
<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1002/latino-population-growth>

In a reversal of past trends, Latino population growth in the new century has been more a product of the natural increase (births minus deaths) of the existing population than it has been of new international migration. Of the 10.2 million increase in the Hispanic population since 2000, about 60% of the increase (or 6 million) is due to natural increase and 40% is due to net international migration, according to U.S. Census Bureau figures. Pew Hispanic Center identified 676 fast-growing Hispanic counties among the nation's total of 3,141 counties. These counties all share two characteristics: a 2007 Latino population of at least 1,000; and an above-average Hispanic growth of at least 41% from 2000 to 2007.

The 676 fast-growing Hispanic counties have also experienced significant growth in their non-Hispanic populations. In the aggregate, the non-Hispanic population of these 676 counties has increased by 9.9 million since 2000, accounting for virtually all of the nation's 10 million increase in non-Hispanics during this decade. In short, growth begets growth, irrespective of ethnicity. The counties to which Latinos are dispersing in the new century are also attracting non-Latinos.

Some counties in Maine, Vermont and Massachusetts in the Northeast and in Montana, New Mexico and California in the West that have experienced fast Hispanic population growth in the new century were not fast-growers in the 1990s. In the South, too, Hispanics have dispersed to some new settlement areas in this decade -- perhaps most notably to several counties in Louisiana, whose Hispanic populations have sharply increased in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Also, while the strong Hispanic growth that some parts of the Midwest experienced in the 1990s has continued into the new century, the formerly fast rates of Hispanic growth in other areas of that region -- especially in economically hard-hit counties in western Michigan and western Minnesota -- have fallen below average in the new century.

6. How does this demographic information match up the “balkanization” of the United States into segregated communities?

Both Rich Benjamin, in Searching for Whitopia (<http://www.richbenjamin.com/>), and Bill Bishop, in The Big Sort (<http://www.thebigsort.com/home.php>), seek to provide context to the demographic trends we've seen in the U.S. over the past 30 years. While the demographic research summarized in sections 4 and 5 explain the "who" and the "where" part of the movement we've seen, the "why" part of the demographic analyses is limited to jobs, housing, and to a lesser extent family and cultural ties. Bishop seeks to understand the political (and much deeper social) divisions that underlie movement in the U.S., while Benjamin filters these dynamics through a lens of class and race.

In Searching for Whitopia, Benjamin makes the argument that as immigrants and other brown people move into the middle class and into suburbs, white people that used to populate those suburbs are moving to towns and exurban locations that are at least 75% (and often 90% and more) white, what he calls "whitopia." The analysis Benjamin draws is complex – motivated by race, but not exclusively (although for some of the whites Benjamin interviewed, race was the explicit and defining motivation). Migration is a push-pull phenomenon. The pushes are stagnant job opportunities, overpriced housing markets (as noted in Frey, et al), as well as congestion and traffic, crumbling public facilities, violence, and neighborhoods that seem hostile to raising children – much of which gets framed as "race" (or, more specifically, people of color). Whites, Benjamin argues, are pulled to whitopia, because of economic opportunities, more house for the dollar, a perceived sense of safety, outdoor amenities (shimmery lakes, breathtaking mountains), and social comfort (homogenous neighbors). These elements are seen as being synonymous with whiteness.

The table below shows the top ten states with the most number of its counties that qualify as whitopias. Whitopia is defined as U.S. counties that are at least 75% non-Hispanic white; with total population growth of at least 10% after 2000; and with at least 75% of that growth coming from non-Hispanic whites. Extreme whitopias are 90%. The whitopia website provides a list of over 100 U.S. counties that are extreme whitopias.

States	# of Whitopian Counties
Tennessee	23
Minnesota	20
Georgia	21
Missouri	18
Kentucky	17
Utah	11
Virginia	11
Arkansas	10
Colorado	10
Idaho	10
Indiana	10
Ohio	10
Wisconsin	10

Bill Bishop, in The Big Sort (<http://www.thebigsort.com/home.php>), focuses on political divisions in the United States to understand balkanizing demographic trends. Beyond the political differences, Bishop argues, is a deeper social and economic transformation which started in the mid-70's. Not only have demographic groups sorted themselves into particular places, Americans have also constructed their social lives so that they spend more time around like-minded others. Bishop argues that the U.S. has become a country where we base most choices on their compatibility with our lifestyle and beliefs. The result is that "we've become so polarized, so ideologically inbred, that people don't know and can't understand those who live just a few miles away."

Data from The Big Sort wasn't available on the website, but there are maps of the U.S. political landscape in 1976 and in 2004 (see <http://www.thebigsort.com/maps.php>) which illustrate the radical shifts both Bishop and Benjamin seek to explain.