# THE CONTINUING DECENTRALIZATION OF PEOPLE AND JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

### Donghwan An, Peter Gordon and Harry W. Richardson School of Policy, Planning and Development University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA 90089-0626

February, 2002

### Presented at the 41<sup>st</sup> annual meeting, Western Regional Science Association Monterey, California, February 17-20, 2002\*

\*The Bureau of Economic Analysis made data through 2000 available after the conference version of this paper was presented. These latest data update the time series and include several MSA reclassifications. Yet, they do not change the findings or conclusions of the paper in any way. For the sake of completeness, we have updated all of our REIS-based tables and charts and included them in an appendix that is attached to this paper.

### ABSTRACT

Although the full picture is necessarily complex and many commentators are pointing to signs of re-centralization, population and employment in the 3132 counties of the U.S. continues to decentralize. This is based on an analysis of annual data from the Regional Economic Information System (REIS) by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA, of the U.S. Department of Commerce) that describes population and employment and income for seven major economic sectors for all counties over the years 1969-1999. The more specific conclusions of this analysis are as follows. First, Frostbelt-Sunbelt migration remains a powerful trend. Climate counts. Second, the facts do not support the idea of a "return to the cities", "regeneration", or any resurgence of compact development despite a strong policy interest in achieving such outcomes. Third, the dominant trends show an ebb and flow over time between growth in exurban and in suburban locations. Suburban growth was concentrated in the middle-sized metro areas. Exurban areas and rural counties usually performed better than core counties. Consistently, the core counties of the largest metro areas have fared worst, even in the most recent period (1995-99) when they did a little better. Fourth, most firms no longer have to seek locations in traditional high-density centers to achieve agglomeration economies; they can either do without them or find them in low-density regions. Finally, most planners in pursuit of "smart growth" are attempting to counter potent market trends in favor of more dispersal, potentially a costly strategy.

"It is one of the ironies of the age. Just as the wonders of communications technology make it possible to conduct all sorts of computer-based activities from any corner of the earth, so humanity clusters more into cities than ever before. Location, which should surely be irrelevant, seems to matter more, not less. Physical proximity appears to have virtues in commercial life that no amount of technological gimmickry can replace" ("Location, location, location: Why place still matters" *The Economist* June 16, 2001, p. 81).

"We were born and raised as a suburban county and now all of a sudden the frontier is going to be closing. That will force us not only to grow differently; it is going to refocus the way we view our county. It will change from suburban psychology to more urban psychology" (Prof. Scott Bollens, UC Irvine, interviewed in the *LA Times*, June 17, 2001, p. B1, B8).

"Cities Are Back! Mayors have known this for some time, but now the census figures spell out the incredible resurgence our cities have seen in the past few years" (U.S. Conference of Mayors, <u>www.usmayors,org</u>, Sep 11, 2001).

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The 2000 census reported ten-year population growth for the nation of slightly more than 13 percent. Most of the large cities did not keep up although most of their suburbs grew as fast or faster. Of the top 50 cities, only 13 significantly beat national growth (only four in the top 20); predictably all of these were in the Sunbelt states (Table 1). None of this is surprising because city-to-suburb and frostbelt-to-sunbelt migrations have been going on for some time. Both are explained by the lifestyle choices made by large numbers of people, facilitated by new technologies, especially falling communications and transportation costs. Indeed, recent electronic wonders have caused communications costs to plummet to such an extent that some commentators have wondered why clustering of any sort is not on the way out.

As always, however, the details are complex and hard to reduce to just one story. Table 1 compares recent metro area employment trends with population trends. At this writing, these are unfortunately not available for all the same geographic units. We see that suburban counties usually added jobs at a faster rate than their core counties. We also note that areas outside the central cities of metro areas usually also grew fastest in terms of population. The same pattern is apparent for all of the size and geographic groupings of MSAs (bottom of the table).

There were also exceptions: population growth in eight CBDs of the top-20 metros outpaced the surrounding central cities as well as the surrounding suburbs. Yet for seven of these eight, suburban job growth still beat core county job growth (San Diego not counted because the MSA does not have a suburban county).

CBD job growth using the County Business Patterns zip code files limit us to a three-year look. Also, these CBD definitions necessarily vary from the ones used to measure ten-year population growth. Metro area job growth (County Business Patterns definitions) for the 19 areas covered for the three-year period was 8.7 percent. Only seven CBDs surpassed this rate.

To try to make sense of the pattern, the rest of this paper focuses on trends. We examine the 31-year series made available by the Regional Economic Information System (REIS) by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA, of the U.S. Department of Commerce) for the 3132 counties of the U.S. that describes population and employment and income for seven major economic sectors for all counties for the years 1969-1999. We find that there is much less clustering than the first quotation suggests. This paper extends in more detail the descriptive analysis of U.S.

settlement trends that we earlier explored in 1998 (Gordon, Richardson and Yu, 1998).

The employment data cover both full-time and part-time jobs (Table 2). The major economic trends over the 31-year period are well known: the wage and salary employment share fell (from 86.5 percent to 83.4 percent), while the nonfarm proprietors' share rose (from 10.5 percent to 15.2 percent); the services sector's share of jobs grew significantly (from 18.4 percent to 31.6 percent); the share of jobs in finance, insurance and real estate also expanded (from 6.5 percent to 7.9 percent); on the other hand, the shares of farming and manufacturing jobs continued to fall (from 4.4 percent to 1.9 percent and from 22.6 percent to 11.8 percent respectively). Smaller or less widely recognized adjustments include an increase in agricultural services, forestry and fishing, a rise in the share of construction jobs, a drop in transportation and public utilities employment, an increase in retail trade jobs, and a fall in the share of government work (mainly reflecting a decline in the armed forces); wholesale trade jobs maintained a near constant share.

Although a file of this size can be sliced and diced in many different ways, we tried to identify geographic divisions that would help us to study the issue of agglomeration economies and its evolution. People may choose to live and work in clusters for a number of reasons. They may enjoy social interaction with others and/or they may profit from economic interactions, e.g. in markets as buyers and as sellers. Economists and others have made much of agglomeration economies as a source of economic growth because ideas are spawned and developed as a result of interactions facilitated by proximity (geographic features that contribute to connectivity also favor the subsequent spread of ideas; Diamond, 1999). Economic development and urbanization have reinforced each other over the years. Yet the operational definition of proximity, as the first quotation suggests, continues to change. Social coordination via markets (transactions) has been facilitated when distances are small; social coordination via the exchange of ideas is likewise augmented. The latter has both economic and community consequences. But these may be costly because clustering, if too dense, can result in congestion. The benefits of dispersal are expanded by increased connectivity, i.e, cheaper modes of moving people, goods and (especially) ideas. The marginal costs of moving the latter are now close to zero. This is confirmed by our analysis that reveals substantial decentralization, much of it away from metropolitan areas in general and especially from their cores.

We divided the 831 metropolitan counties five ways: i. the core counties of the

largest (i.e. > 3 million) metro areas (MSAs or CMSAs); ii. their suburbs (noncore counties); iii. the core counties of middle-sized (1-3 million) metro areas; iv. their suburbs; and v. those counties constituting the small (less than 1-million) metro areas. All data aggregations based on political boundaries are problematic. With this in mind, we often refer to noncore areas as "suburbs," although it is clear that there are also many areas in core counties that exhibit suburban characteristics.

The nonmetro counties were divided seven ways, using the USDA's 1993 Urban Influence Codes. If counties are adjacent to metro areas, there is a four-way partition: adjacent to larger metropolitan areas (defined for the nonmetro analysis as larger than 1 million) or to small metro areas, and with or without a city of 10,000-plus people. If counties are *not* adjacent to a metro county, there are three types: with a city of 10,000 or more, with a city of 2,500 to 9,999, or without an urban place greater than 2,500. The first four of these nonmetro counties may be considered as exurban while the last three may be defined as rural.

An obvious drawback of the classification system is that counties can be very large spatial units that have considerable heterogeneity; unfortunately, data on central cities (or "inner cities") are not available in the REIS file. Another geographical shortcoming is the fact that counties vary significantly in size, typically as one moves west; they are likely to underbound a metropolitan region in the east and overbound it in the west. Also, the BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis) now designates counties throughout the 31-year period in terms of their 1999 OMB (Office of Management and Budget) metro-nonmetro status; similarly, we used 1998 population estimates to categorize metro areas into size groups, while the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) codes reflect 1990 commuting patterns. We have no data source that treats each year's observations in terms of that year's particular designations. The inference is that the BEA convention results in a slight classification bias in favor of metropolitan growth: the counties reclassified from nonmetro to metro were typically the fast-growing nonmetro counties.

Spatial economic analysis is always constrained by data problems. The analysis in this paper is based on County-level data. The discussion would obviously benefit from data for smaller spatial units. But these are only available sporadically, for example, from the decennial Census and or from the quinquennial Economic Censuses. County Business Pattern data at the zip code level are available on an annual basis but only since 1994 (see Glaeser and Kahn, 2001, for a use of zip code data with similar results to those found in this research). They have no sectoral detail and less coverage than the REIS data used in this paper (for

example, nonfarm proprietors are absent from the CBP totals). Moreover, they suffer from numerous zip code redefinitions, making them much harder to use. Finally, the recent change in industrial classifications from SICs to the NAICS (North American Industrial Classification Scheme), and the difficulty of constructing correspondence tables, will slow down any investigations (especially time series analysis) of sectoral detail.

The broad overall trends in U.S. settlement patterns are well known, and include the following:

- i. The westward movement of population and employment, in more recent decades to the Sunbelt.
- ii. Persistent rural-urban migration of jobs and people to the cities.
- iii. Suburbanization (and, more recently, exurbanization) out of cities.

However, the more detailed analysis made possible by the huge REIS data set (over one million observations on employment alone) suggests a much more complex picture. Although only the highlights are discussed in this paper, they are revealing. In the tables that follow, the highest growth rates in each period are marked in bold, while those that exceed the national rate for the period are shaded (see Tables 3-15b).

### 2. POPULATION

U.S. population growth through the period studied averaged a little over 1 percent per year. Was there an unequivocal redistribution of people towards cities? Table 3 suggests that the answer is more complex than a simple urbanization trend or even a post-1970 "counterurbanization" phenomenon (Frey, 1988). The fastest growth occurred in the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas (1.63 percent; average annual growth rates are used throughout). The second-fastest growth occurred in the exurbs of the large metro areas without a city of 10,000 or more (1.22 percent). Close behind were the suburbs of the largest metro areas (1.18 percent). Three other categories of places grew faster than the national average: core counties of the middle-sized metros (1.1 percent), small metro areas (1.1 percent), exurbs of the large metros with a city of 10,000 or more (1.04 percent).

On the other hand, the major population losers were the core counties of the largest metro areas (0.52 percent), exurbs of the small metro areas, and rural counties. There was an overall redistribution of population towards the urban areas but not to the core counties of the largest metropolitan areas. Growth was strong in the suburbs but also in the exurbs of the large metropolitan areas.

A complication is that the thirty-one year pattern was not a steady trend but was subject to clear swings. Our approach to taming a large data set was to divide the period into four intervals. These correspond roughly to urban and rural dominance in terms of private employment growth (see the discussion of Figure 1 below). Whereas considerable literature comments on the "rural renaissance" of the 1970s (which many took be to be a reversal of longstanding urbanization trends) and the "urban revival" of the 1980s, we find that there were swings in population and employment growth that do not match the Census years. The years 1969-76 denote a period of predominantly rural growth, 1976-88 designates a change favoring metropolitan (if more suburban) growth, 1988-95 a period reminiscent of the first (a "rural rebound"), while 1995-99 again signals growth (at least in terms of employment) that is distinctly more urban (a possible explanation is that the boom years benefited the cities by mopping up unemployment in the core counties).

Table 3 reveals that while the highest population growth in the first period was in the non-core counties of the middle-sized metros, all of the exurban and two of the three rural groups as well as the smallest metro areas significantly surpassed the national rate of 1.12 percent. The suburbs of the largest metros lagged and the core areas of the largest metro areas lagged even more. Some of these trends have been widely noted but are often misnamed as a "rural revival." While not completely

false, this description ignores the existence of both lagging rural areas and some strongly growing metro areas and their suburbs.

Data for the second period (1976-88) signal a clear change. National population growth had fallen to 0.98 percent with only four areas exceeding this rate: the noncore counties of the middle-sized metros were still the growth leaders (1.49 percent), followed by the core counties of the same areas (1.20 percent), the noncore counties of the largest metros (1.21 percent) and the small metro areas (1.01 percent). The label "urban revival" is inaccurate; although the exurban and rural counties fell behind, population growth in the core counties of the largest metro areas continued to lag behind.

The 1988-95 years were also distinct. Noncore counties of the middle-sized metro areas were still the growth leaders (1.67 percent), while all the other metro area groups except for the core counties of the largest urban areas grew faster than the national average. However, the exurban areas of the large metro areas also did well (the "rural rebound"), while population growth in other nonmetropolitan area groups faded.

The final period (1995-1999) followed the same pattern, except for the fact that the national population growth rate again slipped below 1 percent, as did population growth in the smallest metros (0.73 percent). However, as we shall see, what distinguishes these two recent periods is the differential pattern of their job growth performance.

## 3. EMPLOYMENT

Table 4 summarizes the private job growth story and provides the rationale for the time periods used in this research. For employment, much more than in the case of population, there are alternating periods of clear metro or nonmetro job growth dominance.

National job growth over the 31 years averaged 2.25 percent, substantially higher than population growth because of the well documented increase in female labor force participation. The county groups that led are similar to those observed with respect to population: the noncore counties of the middle-sized metro areas grew fastest (3.09 percent), followed by the suburbs of the largest metro areas (2.58 percent), the core counties of the middle-sized metro areas (2.57 percent), the exurbs of the large metros (without a city of 10,000 or more; 2.43 percent), and the

smallest metro areas (2.37 percent).

The laggards were the rest of the exurban and rural areas and the core counties of the largest metro areas (the latter grew the least, 1.25 percent). Central cities vs. the suburbs is apparently no longer the key issue in the spatial competition for jobs: the more interesting comparisons are among suburbs, exurban areas and rural counties.

The 31-year span is again broken into the four periods, roughly denoting shifts between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan private employment growth dominance (Figure 1). Growth comparisons over the four time periods corroborate this view. In the years 1969-76, nonmetro job growth dominated; rural counties with a city in the 2,500-9,999 range grew fastest (2.73 percent) and there was faster than national job growth in all of the non-metro counties, especially in the two other exurban groups. These were followed by the suburbs of the middle-sized metros (2.65 percent), the small metro areas (2.34 percent) and the exurban counties. Next came the suburbs of the largest metros and the core counties of the middle-sized metro areas, both of which barely exceeded national job growth. The only lagging areas were the core counties of the largest metro areas.

This pattern changed sharply in the next period, 1976-88. Only three countygroups grew faster than the U.S.: the suburbs of the largest metro areas (3.66 percent), the noncore counties of the middle-sized metros (3.35 percent), and the core counties of the middle-sized metros (3.22 percent). The core areas of the largest metros continued to lag behind national trends, however, a key fact that belies the nomenclature of an "urban revival."

Interestingly, the third period (1988-95) is similar to the first. While the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas were again the growth leaders (2.91 percent), *all* of the exurban and rural county groups grew faster than the U.S. (1.69 percent). The core counties of the middle-sized metros grew somewhat faster (1.93 percent) while the suburbs of the largest metros lagged (1.31 percent). Once again, the core areas of the largest metros grew most slowly, indeed almost not at all (0.13 percent).

Bu this pattern did not persist into the final period (1995-99) which is reminiscent of the second period: most of the nonmetro counties (except for the large-metro exurbs without a city of 10,000) lagged U.S. growth; the middle-sized metro suburbs continued to grow the fastest (3.41 percent), closely followed by their core counties (3.25 percent). The suburbs of the largest metros performed quite well

(3.03 percent). But the major change occurred in the core areas of the largest metros. Although they still lagged the national growth rate, they grew faster than in any other period (2.41 percent). In the late years of the economic boom, even the hitherto slow-growing core counties of the large metro area finally developed buoyant labor markets.

There are economic growth opportunities in all types of spatial settings. Clustering remains important, as evidenced by the success of the suburbs of middle-sized metro areas. However, significant job growth is also possible in the lower density exurban areas and even in some remote rural areas. But aggregates do not tell the full story. Ways of digging deeper include examining the growth of proprietor employment, sectoral employment, and regional differentials. We perform this in the following sections.

### 4. **PROPRIETORSHIPS**

Proprietorships are one of the three major forms of legal business entity. They tend to be smaller than the other two groups (partnerships and incorporated businesses). In 1997, the IRS reported that there were 17.2 million businesses of this type; more than 72 percent of all enterprises that filed returns were nonfarm proprietorships. Yet they accounted for less than 5 percent of all business receipts in that year. We suggest that the growth of proprietorships can serve as a proxy for the vitality of small, start-up firms. In what spatial settings have they performed best?

In 1999, total U.S. full-time and part-time employment was 163.8 million. The split between wage and salary employees and proprietors was 136.6 million vs 27.1 million. Of the latter, 2.2 million were farm proprietors. Table 5 details the growth of nonfarm proprietors' employment. This occurred primarily in metro areas, and at rates that varied little between metro county types. For the years 1969-99, proprietor employment grew fastest in the suburbs of the middle-sized metros (3.6 percent), but almost as fast in the core and noncore counties of the large and middle-sized metros. Elsewhere, only the small metros exhibited proprietorship growth faster than the national overall rate (2.79 percent).

The story was similar in the first period (1969-76), except that the core counties of the largest metros grew a little more slowly than the national rate (2.34 percent rather than 2.47 percent). This changed in the 1976-88 period, when the core counties of the largest metros performed better than any of the other county groups

(4.26 percent), a rare occurrence. In the third period (1989-95), these core counties lagged while the suburbs of the middle-sized metros again had the fastest growth (2.73 percent). Also, the core counties of both the largest and the middle-sized metros also grew more slowly than the national average (2.18 percent). During this period, the exurban areas of the large metros (without a city of 10,000) grew faster than the national average (2.63 percent). In the most recent period (1995-99), the suburbs of the middle-sized metros led once again (3.28 percent). The other counties of the middle-sized and largest metro areas plus the exurban areas of the large metros also exceeded the national growth rate (2.59 percent). The spatial pattern of entrepreneurial incubation shows a moderate tendency over the years to remain metropolitan rather than nonmetropolitan, but with the suburbs usually predominating.

Using this measure as a proxy for innovation and risk-taking, it is possible to conclude that the suburbs consistently performed well. The core areas did well in some periods, while the exurban areas have featured prominently in recent years. On the other hand, the growth in non-farm proprietorships has not been a rural phenomenon. These findings neither vindicate nor undercut conventional hypotheses about the presence of agglomeration economies as a prerequisite for the incubation of new and small firms.

### 5. FROSTBELT AND SUNBELT DIFFERENTIALS

The REIS data are available for eight major Census regions. We aggregated these into sets that roughly approximate a Frostbelt (New England, Mideast, Great Lakes, Plains) and a Sunbelt (Southeast, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, Far West<sup>1</sup>). Long-term shifts of people and capital from the former are familiar and well-documented. Not surprisingly, the major trends found in the previous sections are repeated in the regional tables. Higher Sunbelt growth rates persist throughout, even strengthening some of the contrasts among periods.

Tables 6a and 6b exhibit the population growth rates for both regions. In the Sunbelt, population grew at 1.69 percent per year for the 31-year period while the rate for the Frostbelt was merely 0.33 percent. In the Sunbelt, all area groups except for two of the rural categories grew faster than the national average; in the Frostbelt, none did.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Following convention, the Pacific Northwest is classified as part of the Sunbelt, but it is a misnomer of colossal proportions.

An analysis of the four sub-periods confirms that the suburban counties were the leaders in both regions. The suburban counties of the largest metros grew faster in the newer Sunbelt metro areas in every period. In the Frostbelt, only the suburban counties of the middle-sized metro areas ever grew faster than the national average, and then only in the two most recent periods.

In the 1969-76 period, the leading Frostbelt counties were the exurban areas of the large metro areas. In the other periods, the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas led. The core counties of the largest metro areas declined throughout. In the Sunbelt, the main distinction among the time periods was the relatively strong exurban and rural growth in the first period.

Private sector employment trends (Tables 7a and 7b) reiterate a similar story and highlight the importance of exurban and rural growth in the first and third periods in both regions. Sunbelt suburbs were almost consistently the job growth leaders. Core counties performed best in the most recent (1995-99) phase.

Fast-paced proprietor employment has already been shown to be somewhat more observable in the metropolitan counties. In the Sunbelt (Table 8a) most occurs in the suburbs of the largest metro areas, but occasionally features in the exurban areas. In the Frostbelt (Table 8b), the suburbs usually perform best in terms of proprietor employment growth. However, the core counties of the largest metros had the highest growth rate in the 1995-1999 period.

### 6. MAJOR SECTORS

There are employment data for seven major (excluding mining and agricultural services, forestry and fishing) private industrial sectors in the REIS series. For the nation as a whole, over the 31 years, employment in four industries grew faster than national private employment (2.25 percent): services (3.85 percent), finance, insurance and real estate (2.65 percent), construction (2.49 percent), and retail trade (2.35 percent). The other three sectors lagged behind national job growth: wholesale trade (2.03 percent), transportation and public utilities (1.70 percent) and manufacturing which declined absolutely (-0.19 percent). Because our metric is jobs, we must qualify these descriptors of growth in the sense that industries can hire less labor either because they are declining or because they are becoming more efficient.

We will discuss the sectors' performance in terms of the two regions, the Sunbelt and the Frostbelt. Sunbelt services (Table 9a) grew fastest in the suburbs of the largest (>3 million) metro areas for the first two periods and in the exurban areas of the large (>1 million) metro areas in the second and third periods. Growth in the core counties of the largest metro areas lagged in the two recent periods. Frostbelt service sector growth (Table 9b) also grew fastest in noncore counties (most often, the suburbs of the middle-sized metros) or in the exurban areas surrounding the large metro areas.

The most visible vigorous exurban and rural growth is for employment in the Finance, Insurance and Real Estate sector (Tables 10a and 10b). For the Sunbelt, this was true in three of the four periods studied, including the most recent periods, where exurban growth surpassed suburban and core county growth. High growth rates also occurred in the most rural areas. In 1995-99, the 7.68 percent growth rate in the nonadjacent counties (with cities no larger than 2,500) was surpassed only by the growth rate (8.03 percent) in the exurban areas of the large metro areas (those without a city of 10,000 or more) and growth in the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas (7.75 percent). Similar patterns occurred in the Frostbelt areas, where over the 1995-99 period, the same rural areas (with a 4.92 percent growth rate) were only surpassed by the same group of exurban areas (with a 5.32 percent growth rate).

Both of these major sectors are perceived be the most dependent on agglomeration economies. If so, they appear able to find these in locations far away from the traditional core metro areas. This finding corroborates some of Beyers' (1998) results, based on an examination of the County Business Patterns (CBP) data for 1985-95. At the same time, the de-coupling of back-office from headquarters operations made possible by low-cost communications makes it possible for some firms to co-locate in core areas and in the periphery.

Construction job growth in the Sunbelt (Table 11a) has been complex. In the first period, the fastest growth (7.3 percent per annum) was experienced in the exurban areas of the largest metro areas (without a city >10,000). Growth rates >4 percent occurred in the other exurban areas, in most suburbs, and in rural counties. This changed dramatically in the years 1976-88 when growth was fastest in the suburbs of the largest metros (7.45 percent per annum). Only three other groups were above the national pace (core counties of middle-sized metro areas at 5.5 percent; noncore counties of middle-sized metros areas at 4.55 percent; and the exurban areas of the largest metros [without a city of >10,000] at 3.86 percent). In the third period, an era of slow growth for construction everywhere, growth was again

fastest in the exurban areas and the rural areas. In the fourth period, when construction activity picked up rapidly, the experience of the second period was replicated. As for the Frostbelt (Table 11b), growth in the rural and exurban counties was also faster in the first and third periods. However, in the final period, only the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas experienced faster construction sector growth than the U.S. as a whole.

Retail trade is the only other of the seven sectors analyzed where jobs grew faster than private jobs overall in the 31-year span (2.35 percent vs. 2.25 percent). The Frostbelt story (Table 12b) is a simple one; growth was fastest in the suburbs of the middle-sized metro areas in every period. Only in the years 1988-95 was there any retail job growth higher than the national growth rate (1.88 percent) in other areas, in six of the seven exurban and rural county groups. Performance in the Sunbelt (Table 12a) was more varied: growth was fastest during the first and last periods in the suburbs of the middle-sized metros (5.21 percent and 2.75 percent respectively); in the second period, the growth leader was the suburbs of the largest metros (5.13 percent); while in the third period, the fastest growth (3.67 percent) was experienced in the exurban areas of the large metro areas (without a city of > 10,000). Growth above the national average was observed in several exurban and rural groups in each of the four periods, most noticeably in the third period.

Wholesale activities increasingly serve large-scale regional or national markets. It is no surprise, therefore, that wholesale jobs occasionally grew fastest in the rural areas of both regions (Tables 13a and 13b). This was particularly true in the first period in rural areas (with no city >2,500): 11.07 percent in the Sunbelt and 14.75 percent in the Frostbelt. In the subsequent periods, most wholesale job growth in both regions occurred in the suburbs, especially in the noncore counties of the middle-sized metro areas. In the third period, characterized by very slow national wholesale job growth (0.98 percent per annum), there was growth in the exurban areas and rural counties faster than the national average in both regions, but not in the highly rural group that experienced the fastest growth in the first period.

Another slower growing sector with substantial exurban and rural growth is Transportation and Public Utilities (TPU; Tables 14a and 14b). Sunbelt growth in TPU in the first period was fastest in the noncore counties of the middle-sized urban areas (2.86 percent), but growth was almost as fast in the suburbs of the largest metros (2.58 percent) and also in many of the exurban and rural counties. The second and third periods exhibited a similar experience. In the fourth period, Sunbelt TPU jobs grew fastest (5.02 percent per annum) in the exurban areas of the largest metros (those without a city of >10,000). The Frostbelt TPU story is not very different: relatively fast exurban and rural growth in the first period; no county groups with above average national growth in the second period; third period performance showing the fastest growth in the rural areas (with no towns >2,500 population); while no county group outperformed national growth in the last period.

Changes in the status of the manufacturing sector during the 20th century are well known; manufacturing is highly decentralized compared with services and other sectors (Glaeser and Kahn, 2001). Carlino (1985) used the CBP data for the 1970s to illustrate the degree of nonmetropolitan manufacturing employment growth. He also demonstrated that this shift was explained by weakening agglomeration opportunities in cities. Furthermore, he referred to manufacturing as the "leading" sector", responsible for substantial rural growth in other employment sectors. However, he notes that this is nothing new. Manufacturing has been leaving population centers ever since the rise of the auto-highway system elevated truck transport over rail or waterways (in dollar value of freight shipped) as the dominant freight mode. More recently, increasing air transport has also played a significant role. For decades, manufacturing has been overwhelmingly on assembly lines that are best suited to horizontal rather than to the vertical mills so common in the nineteenth century, occupying large parcels of cheap land much less likely to be tied to rail spurs or ports. Easterlin (1998) has commented that this increasing "footlooseness" means that businesses are much more likely to follow the locational preferences of their workers than to determine them. The strength of household preferences for suburban and exurban settings is well known, and is a governing determinant of industrial location (this theme is also echoed in Glaeser and Kahn, 2001).

In addition, manufacturing was the only one of the seven major economic sectors that *declined* absolutely through the 31-year span. But most of the decline was in the Frostbelt (Table 15b), occurring in each of the four periods. Elsewhere, there were signs of positive growth in the first three periods, in two cases at substantial rates (3.10 percent in 1969-76 and 3.21 percent in 1988-95, each in the most rural counties). This changed in the final period when these counties declined (-2.81 percent), although manufacturing jobs did expand in most of the other exurban and other rural counties.

Sunbelt manufacturing (Table 15a) employment growth was more likely to be positive than in the Frostbelt. In the first period, growth was fastest in rural counties with a city of 2,500-9,999 (2.27 percent); the exurban areas of the large metros (with no city above 10,000) ranked second (1.97 percent); and all other

rural, exurban and suburban counties grew faster than 1 percent. In the second period, while national growth turned barely positive (0.27 percent), rapid Sunbelt growth occurred mainly in the suburbs of the largest metros (3.51 percent). However, the core counties of the middle-sized metro areas surpassed the national rate (2.44 percent), as did the core counties of the largest metros (1.14 percent). The third period was another era of national manufacturing decline (-0.50 percent), with only three county groups growing faster than 1 percent (the rural counties with a city of 10,000 or more and two of the exurban county groups). In the final period, there was no national growth (the growth rate was -0.07 percent) but there was, once more, relatively strong positive job growth in the suburbs of the largest metros (2.17 percent).

In the Frostbelt (Table 15b), the very rural counties (i.e. with no city above 2,500) grew fastest in the first three periods but declined sharply in the last period (-2.81 percent). The only positive metropolitan county growth was found in the suburbs of the middle-sized metros, and only in the last two periods (0.90 percent and 0.60 percent). In both regions, manufacturing firms continued to retreat from traditional urban centers.

### 7. CONCLUSIONS

What preliminary conclusions might be drawn? First, Frostbelt-Sunbelt migration remains a powerful trend. Climate counts. Greenwood and Hunt's demonstration that "incremental employment opportunities are differentially attractive to migrants if the opportunities occur in southern and western states" remains true (Greenwood and Hunt, 1984, p. 957; see also Carlino and Mills, 1987). Second, the facts do not support the idea of a "return to the cities", "regeneration", or any resurgence of compact development, so often mentioned in recent years in the media and by planners and politicians (the second and third quotations that begin this paper are representative). While there are pockets of spontaneous development activity in various core areas, these are still few and are overwhelmed by the widespread decentralization trends documented in this paper. Third, the dominant trends show an ebb and flow over time between growth in exurban and in suburban locations. Suburban growth tended to be concentrated in the middle-sized metro areas. Exurban areas and rural counties usually performed better than core counties. Consistently, the core counties of the largest metro areas have fared worst, even in the most recent period (1995-99) when they did a little better. Fourth, most firms no longer have to seek locations in traditional high-density centers to achieve agglomeration economies; they can either do without them or find them in lowdensity regions, Silicon Valley being perhaps the first and most famous example. Finally, most planners that seek the holy grail of "smart growth" are, somewhat desperately, attempting to counter potent market trends that favor of more dispersal. Given their extent, as monitored here, planned reversals would be very costly.

Looking at population growth in U.S. cities in the 1990s, Glaeser and Shapiro (2001) have concluded that the trend to sprawl persists. This is hardly surprising. People overwhelmingly choose personal mobility, and the restructuring of metropolitan areas continues to favor a reliance upon automobiles.

However, this paper does not address the policy vs. preferences question. We have argued elsewhere that decentralization and suburbanization are widespread phenomena, occurring in places (including Canada and Europe) with policies more pro-compact and more pro-transit than the urban policies that continue to prevail in the United States (Gordon and Richardson, 2000). Recent research that looks at the timing of decentralization and policy implementation reaches similar conclusions (Beauregard, 2001). Other researchers report similar trends, but see them as "(t)he problem of decentralization" (Brennan and Hill, 1999, p. 1).

However, the documentation of serious market failures associated with these development patterns remain elusive (Gordon and Richardson, 2000).

### REFERENCES

Beauregard, Robert A. (2001) "Federal Policy and Postwar Urban Decline: A Case of Government Complicity?" *Housing Policy Debate* 12, 129-151.

Beyers, William B. (1998) "Trends in Producer Service Employment in the U.S.: The 1985-1995 Experience" presented at the 1998 North American Regional Science Association Meetings, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Brennan, John and Edward W. Hill (1999) "Where Are The Jobs? Cities, Suburbs, and the Competition for Employment" Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Survey Series.

Carlino, Gerald A. (1985) "Declining City Productivity and the Growth of Rural Regions: A Test of Alternative Explanations" *Journal of Urban Economics* 18, 11-27.

Carlino, Gerald A. and Edwin S. Mills (1987) "The Determinants of County Growth" *Journal of Regional Science*. 27, 39-54.

Diamond, Jared (1999) Guns, Germs and Steel. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Easterlin, Richard A. (2000) "Twentieth Century American Population Growth" in S. Engerman and R.E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the U.S., Vol III, The Twentieth Century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frey, William H. (1988) "Migration and Metropolitan Decline in Developed Countries: A Comparative Study" *Population and Development Review*, 14, 595-628.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Matthew E. Kahn (2001), *Decentralized Employment and the Transformation of the American City*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, WP 8117.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Jesse Shapiro (2001) "Is There a New Urbanism? The Growth of U.S.. Cities in the 1990s" Cambridge: NBER Working Paper 8357.

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson (2000) *Critiquing Sprawl's Critics* Washington DC: Cato Policy Analysis No. 365

Gordon, Peter and Harry W. Richardson and Gang Yu (1998) "Metropolitan and Non-metropolitan Employment Trends in the U.S.: Recent Evidence and Implications" *Urban Studies* 35, 1037-1057.

Greenwood, Michael J. and Gary L. Hunt (1984) "Migration and Interregional Employment Distribution in the U.S." *American Economic Review* 75, 957-969.

Mieszkowski, Peter and Edwin S. Mills (1993) "The Causes of Metropolitan Suburbanization" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7, 135-147.



\* 1998 MSA definitions were used.
\* Source : Calculated from "Regional Economic Information System 1969-1999", Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2001.



Figure 1: U.S. Private Employment Growth Rates, Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties, 1969-1999

			1990-2000 P	op Growth			1990-1999	Job Growth	1994-1997 Job Growth
METRO AREA(S)	Metro	Core Central City	All Other CC's > 100k Pop	Rest of Metro	Core CBD	CBD Share of Metro Growth	Private Jobs Metro	Private Jobs Noncore Counties	Core CBD***
New YorkNorthern New JerseyLong Island, NYNJCTPA CMSA	8.4%	9.4%	0.8%	7.2%	10.9%	1.02%	8.0%	9.1%	7.4%
Los AngelesRiversideOrange County, CA CMSA	12.7%	6.0%	13.9%	14.9%	5.7%	0.11%	7.4%	21.3%	-0.8%
ChicagoGaryKenosha, ILINWI CMSA	11.1%	4.0%	20.0%	14.4%	30.0%	1.83%	15.1%	32.7%	2.2%
WashingtonBaltimore, DCMDVAWV CMSA	13.1%	-5.7%	-11.5%	18.6%	4.0%*	0.12%	15.7%	18.0%	6.0%
San FranciscoOaklandSan Jose, CA CMSA	12.6%	7.3%	12.1%	13.8%	32.3%	1.35%	18.8%	21.1%	13.8%
PhiladelphiaWilmingtonAtlantic City, PANJDEMD CMSA	5.0%	-4.3%	na	8.4%	4.9%	1.24%	9.2%	13.9%	-6.2%
BostonWorcesterLawrence, MANHMECT CMSA	6.7%	2.6%	3.8%	7.5%	4.7%	1.00%	13.3%	14.1%	10.1%
DetroitAnn ArborFlint, MI CMSA	5.2%	-7.5%	-4.5%	9.1%	2.1%	0.28%	14.8%	24.2%	-9.7%
DallasFort Worth, TX CMSA	29.3%	18.0%	22.5%	37.3%	28.2%	0.28%	33.6%	40.9%	-7.7%
HoustonGalvestonBrazoria, TX CMSA	25.2%	19.8%	na	29.3%	7.6%	0.06%	27.4%	43.3%	1.6%
Atlanta, GA MSA	38.9%	5.7%	na	44.0%	25.1%	0.37%	42.3%	51.0%	37.6%
MiamiFort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	21.4%	1.1%	2.0%	25.2%	31.6%	0.70%	21.5%	30.6%	-24.1%
SeattleTacomaBremerton, WA CMSA	19.7%	9.1%	15.0%	22.7%	54.4%	1.14%	23.7%	27.8%	3.6%
PhoenixMesa, AZ MSA	45.3%	34.3%	35.3%	68.8%	-9.1%	-0.06%	52.2%	28.8%	12.2%
MinneapolisSt. Paul, MNWI MSA	16.9%	3.9%	-12.2%	26.2%	-16.6%	-1.40%	24.1%	31.1%	9.4%
ClevelandAkron, OH CMSA	3.0%	-5.4%	-2.7%	5.6%	32.2%	2.71%	13.9%	22.4%	9.2%
San Diego, CA MSA	12.6%	10.1%	22.9%	13.9%	16.1%	0.78%	22.4%	na	3.0%
St. Louis, MOIL MSA	4.5%	-12.2%	na	7.6%	-17.5%	-1.44%	12.5%	11.3%	2.9%
DenverBoulderGreeley, CO CMSA	30.4%	18.6%	na	34.0%	51.4%	0.24%	40.7%	51.7%	10.1%
TampaSt. PetersburgClearwater, FL MSA	15.9%	8.4%	5.8%	19.6%	11.6%	na	32.7%	26.1%	na
TOP 10	11.5%	6.7%	9.0%	13.7%	11.3%	0.65%	13.5%	17.8%	5.6%
TOP 20	13.7%	7.6%	9.5%	16.5%	11.6%**	0.52%	17.1%	20.6%	8.7%
TOP 50	14.7%	9.0%	9.9%	17.5%	na	na	18.4%	22.8%	na
SUNBELT (30)	22.0%	15.6%	15.8%	25.6%	na	na	22.0%	31.7%	na
FROSTBELT (20)	8.4%	3.4%	-2.0%	11.0%	na	na	8.3%	17.3%	na
FROSTBELT less NY	8.4%	-0.6%	-3.1%	11.8%	na	na	14.7%	21.3%	na
*Daltimary (DD arouth - 5 10/ ** no (DD data for Tampa St Data	**	** Dofinod	her zin and	2					

# Table 1: US METRO GROWTH PERFORMANCE IN THE 1990s

\*Baltimore CBD growth = 5.1% \*\* no CBD data for Tampa-St. Petersburg \*\*\* Defined by zip codes Sources: 1) MSA and cities population data from www.census.gov; 2) CBD population data from E.L. Birch (forthcoming) "Having a Longer View of Downtown" Journal of the American Planning Association; 3) REIS employment data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic

Analysis; 4) CBD employment data from Zipcode County Business Patterns.

Employment Types and Sectors	1969		1999		Change in Proportion
Total full-time and part-time employment	91057,200	100.0%	163,757,900	100.0%	
Wage and salary employment	78726,000	86.5%	136,617,000	83.4%	-3.5%
Proprietors' employment	12331,200	13.5%	27,140,900	16.6%	22.4%
Farm proprietors' employment	2751,000	3.0%	2,249,000	1.4%	-54.5%
Nonfarm proprietors' employment	9580,200	10.5%	24,891,900	15.2%	44.5%
Farm employment	3978,000	4.4%	3,172,000	1.9%	-55.7%
Nonfarm employment	87079,200	95.6%	160,585,900	98.1%	2.5%
Private employment	71238,200	78.2%	138,329,900	84.5%	8.0%
Ag. services, forestry, fishing, & other	506,200	0.6%	2,048,400	1.3%	125.0%
Mining	734,500	0.8%	782,100	0.5%	-40.8%
Construction	4470,800	4.9%	9,254,000	5.7%	15.1%
Manufacturing	20546,000	22.6%	19,252,700	11.8%	-47.9%
Transportation and public utilities	4795,900	5.3%	7,970,300	4.9%	-7.6%
Wholesale trade	4097,900	4.5%	7,464,700	4.6%	1.3%
Retail trade	13448,900	14.8%	26,910,000	16.4%	11.3%
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5914,900	6.5%	12,978,700	7.9%	22.0%
Services	16723,100	18.4%	51,669,000	31.6%	71.8%
Government and Government Enterprises	15841,000	17.4%	22,256,000	13.6%	-21.9%

Table 2: Employment Proportions, Total Full-time and Part-time Jobs by Employment Types and Major Industrial Sectors, 1969 and 1999

 \* The proportion represents each category's employment share in U.S. total full-time and part-time employment.
\*\* Source : Calculated from "Regional Economic Information System 1969-1999", Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2001.

	Area Group	Ν	69/99	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	13	0.52%	0.18%	0.70%	0.52%	0.59%
3 million Population	Non-Core	154	1.18%	1.07%	1.21%	1.19%	1.25%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	34	1.10%	0.89%	1.20%	1.19%	1.02%
million Population	Non-Core	175	1.63%	1.84%	1.49%	1.67%	1.63%
Small Metro Areas with f	fewer than 1 million Population	455	1.10%	1.47%	1.01%	1.10%	0.73%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	1.04%	1.17%	0.92%	1.18%	0.97%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	1.22%	1.47%	0.95%	1.26%	1.50%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	0.75%	1.25%	0.58%	0.69%	0.51%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	0.89%	1.27%	0.66%	0.89%	0.91%
Not A discont	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	0.73%	1.30%	0.56%	0.69%	0.31%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	0.58%	1.23%	0.30%	0.54%	0.38%
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	0.27%	0.74%	-0.06%	0.29%	0.36%
U.S. Total		3132	1.02%	1.12%	0.98%	1.04%	0.93%
* N : number of counties							

Table 3: U.S. Population Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ν	69/99	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	13	1.25%	0.07%	2.21%	0.13%	2.41%
3 million Population	Non-Core	154	2.58%	1.75%	3.66%	1.31%	3.03%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	34	2.57%	1.73%	3.22%	1.93%	3.25%
million Population	Non-Core	175	3.09%	2.65%	3.35%	2.91%	3.41%
Small Metro Areas with	fewer than 1 million Population	455	2.37%	2.34%	2.52%	2.17%	2.33%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.16%	1.84%	2.16%	2.48%	2.14%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	2.43%	2.20%	2.27%	2.75%	2.75%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	1.87%	1.81%	1.90%	1.85%	1.88%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.08%	2.10%	2.01%	2.31%	1.88%
Not A discent	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.21%	2.66%	1.92%	2.47%	1.86%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	2.03%	2.73%	1.58%	2.31%	1.70%
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	1.92%	2.52%	1.41%	2.39%	1.59%
U.S. Total		3132	2.25%	1.72%	2.76%	1.69%	2.65%
* N : number of counties		2				-	

Table 4: U.S. Private Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

Metro Are than 3 million Metro Are million Po	eas with more Population eas with 1-3 opulation	Area Group Core Non-Core Core Non-Core	N 13 154 34 175	69/99 3.07% 3.44% 3.43% <b>3.60%</b>	69/76 2.34% 3.37% 3.62% <b>4.16%</b>	76/88 <b>4.26%</b> 4.23% 4.15% 3.88%	8 2. 2. 2. 2.
ıall Me	tro Areas with f	ewer than 1 million Population	455	2.79%	3.20%		3.02%
	Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.15%	1.80%	2	21%
	Large Meno Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	1.80%	0.85%	1.	58%
	Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	1.70%	1.39%	1.	74%
Metro	Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	1.28%	0.43%	1.	12%
AICAS	Not Adjacent	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	1.82%	1.67%	1.	95%
	to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	1.24%	0.80%	1.	03%
	Alica	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	0.65%	-0.23%	0.	40%
U.S. Tota	1		3132	2.67%	2.47%	3	10%
N: numb	er of counties		1			•	

Table 5: U.S. Proprietor Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

		Area Group	Ν	69/99	69/76	76/88	88/95	95
Metro Areas with	n more	Core	7	1.26%	1.02%	1.65%	0.97%	
3 million Populat	tion	Non-Core	70	2.55%	2.64%	2.80%	2.23%	
Metro Areas with	n 1-3	Core	21	2.13%	2.16%	2.33%	1.93%	
million Populatio	n	Non-Core	96	2.38%	3.03%	2.29%	2.07%	
Small Metro Area	as with fe	wer than 1 million Population	276	1.60%	2.12%	1.56%	1.46%	
Adjacer	nt to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	1.59%	1.64%	1.62%	1.61%	
Areas	VICHO	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	1.67%	1.84%	1.49%	1.61%	
Adjacer	nt to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	1.11%	1.69%	0.94%	1.02%	
Metro Areas	VICH O	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	1.09%	1.45%	0.92%	1.01%	
Not Adi	iscent	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	1.05%	1.67%	0.89%	0.97%	1
to a Me	tro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	0.82%	1.56%	0.55%	0.70%	1
11104		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	0.48%	1.00%	0.19%	0.41%	I
<b>Region</b> Total			1831	1.69%	1.96%	1.74%	1.52%	
U.S. Total			3132	1.02%	1.12%	0.98%	1.04%	
* N : number of cou	inties							Ī

Table 6a: Sunbelt Population Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							: number of counties	* Z
0.93%	1.04%	0.98%	1.12%	1.02%	3132		S. Total	U.S
0.37%	0.48%	0.21%	0.36%	0.33%	1301		gion Total	Reg
0.13%	0.14%	-0.35%	0.44%	0.01%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500		
0.10%	0.26%	-0.10%	0.74%	0.21%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
-0.04%	0.31%	0.15%	0.86%	0.33%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not A discont	
0.59%	0.71%	0.32%	1.03%	0.61%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	tro Areas	Me
0.19%	0.34%	0.23%	0.85%	0.39%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
0.83%	0.85%	0.40%	1.11%	0.73%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
0.48%	0.68%	0.19%	0.74%	0.47%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
0.23%	0.54%	0.25%	0.67%	0.41%	179	fewer than 1 million Population	all Metro Areas with t	Sm
1.13%	1.22%	0.69%	0.84%	0.91%	79	Non-Core	llion Population	mil
-0.26%	0.11%	-0.14%	-0.30%	-0.13%	13	Core	tro Areas with 1-3	Me
0.66%	0.59%	0.46%	0.47%	0.52%	84	Non-Core	nillion Population	3  m
-0.16%	-0.14%	-0.48%	-0.68%	-0.41%	9	Core	tro Areas with more	Me
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		

Table 6b: Frostbelt Population Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ζ	66/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	7	2.26%	1.88%	3.23%	0.62%	2.87%
3 million Population	Non-Core	70	4.22%	4.13%	5.44%	2.41%	3.90%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	21	3.77%	3.27%	4.50%	2.72%	4.29%
million Population	Non-Core	96	4.10%	4.34%	4.50%	3.22%	4.04%
Small Metro Areas with f	fewer than 1 million Population	276	2.93%	3.32%	3.02%	2.55%	2.64%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	2.68%	2.54%	2.81%	2.69%	2.50%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	2.82%	2.78%	2.67%	2.98%	3.05%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	2.22%	2.49%	2.15%	2.22%	1.99%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.12%	2.26%	2.04%	2.35%	1.75%
Not A discont	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.44%	3.11%	2.06%	2.71%	1.95%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	2.16%	3.15%	1.67%	2.32%	1.64%
71104	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	2.06%	2.70%	1.77%	2.23%	1.51%
Region Total		1831	3.07%	3.07%	3.54%	2.24%	3.14%
U.S. Total		3132	2.25%	1.72%	2.76%	1.69%	2.65%
* N: number of counties							

Table 7a: Sunbelt Private Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ν	66/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	9	0.16%	-1.54%	1.04%	-0.54%	1.73%
3 million Population	Non-Core	84	1.83%	0.90%	2.83%	0.68%	2.48%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	13	1.31%	0.49%	1.89%	0.92%	1.74%
million Population	Non-Core	79	2.18%	1.39%	2.26%	2.56%	2.67%
Small Metro Areas with f	fewer than 1 million Population	179	1.69%	1.27%	1.90%	1.64%	1.88%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	1.64%	1.21%	1.51%	2.24%	1.74%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	2.01%	1.62%	1.84%	2.49%	2.38%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	1.55%	1.23%	1.68%	1.50%	1.77%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	2.04%	1.91%	1.99%	2.26%	2.03%
Not Adiopant	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.94%	2.14%	1.75%	2.17%	1.75%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.85%	2.15%	1.44%	2.29%	1.79%
/ 11 CH	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	1.76%	2.32%	0.98%	2.58%	1.69%
Region Total		1301	1.59%	1.07%	2.02%	1.09%	2.08%
U.S. Total		3132	2.25%	1.72%	2.76%	1.69%	2.65%
* N: number of counties							

Table 7b: Frostbelt Private Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ν	66/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	7	3.71%	3.84%	4.83%	2.35%	2.46%
3 million Population	Non-Core	70	4.75%	6.15%	5.42%	3.29%	2.82%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	21	4.36%	4.85%	5.29%	2.48%	3.99%
million Population	Non-Core	96	4.18%	4.99%	4.62%	2.80%	3.84%
Small Metro Areas with f	ewer than 1 million Population	276	3.27%	4.02%	3.47%	2.45%	2.77%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	2.84%	2.47%	3.23%	2.46%	2.94%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	2.59%	1.31%	2.59%	3.51%	3.20%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	1.93%	1.59%	2.00%	1.90%	2.36%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	1.48%	0.55%	1.38%	2.09%	2.39%
Not A discont	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.27%	2.07%	2.48%	2.11%	2.26%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	1.65%	1.27%	1.49%	1.94%	2.31%
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	1.10%	0.18%	0.87%	1.79%	2.20%
Region Total		1831	3.29%	3.46%	3.77%	2.52%	2.89%
U.S. Total		3132	2.67%	2.47%	3.10%	2.18%	2.59%
* N: number of counties							

Table 8a: Sunbelt Proprietor Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							* N: number of counties
2.59%	2.18%	3.10%	2.47%	2.67%	3132		U.S. Total
2.19%	1.77%	2.33%	1.38%	1.96%	1301		Region Total
1.17%	1.05%	0.01%	-0.54%	0.28%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	-11C4
1.42%	1.23%	0.46%	0.26%	0.72%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro
1.36%	1.24%	1.34%	1.25%	1.30%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adiopont
1.70%	1.78%	0.83%	0.30%	1.04%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas
1.85%	1.52%	1.50%	1.20%	1.48%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
2.05%	1.68%	0.66%	0.49%	1.04%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas
2.15%	1.78%	1.09%	1.18%	1.41%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
1.75%	1.86%	2.37%	2.16%	2.12%	179	fewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with
2.57%	2.66%	3.04%	3.34%	2.96%	79	Non-Core	million Population
1.73%	1.53%	2.49%	2.23%	2.11%	13	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3
2.82%	1.98%	3.46%	1.99%	2.69%	84	Non-Core	3 million Population
3.05%	1.31%	3.22%	0.09%	2.02%	9	Core	Metro Areas with more
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group	

Table 8b: Frostbelt Proprietor Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ν	66/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	7	3.88%	3.56%	5.03%	2.36%	3.64%
3 million Population	Non-Core	70	5.69%	5.80%	6.99%	4.07%	4.44%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	21	5.23%	4.62%	6.07%	4.49%	5.09%
million Population	Non-Core	96	5.59%	5.59%	6.36%	4.64%	4.98%
Small Metro Areas with f	ewer than 1 million Population	276	4.13%	3.57%	4.66%	4.05%	3.64%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	3.86%	2.25%	4.47%	4.10%	4.42%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	4.12%	2.16%	3.59%	6.21%	5.48%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	3.13%	2.18%	3.21%	3.34%	4.21%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.93%	1.20%	3.04%	3.38%	4.84%
Not A discont	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	3.48%	3.22%	3.58%	3.73%	3.18%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	3.13%	2.77%	3.05%	3.24%	3.79%
7 11 64	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	3.03%	1.80%	3.40%	3.53%	3.21%
Region Total		1831	4.44%	3.90%	5.22%	3.78%	4.19%
U.S. Total		3132	3.85%	3.29%	4.58%	3.18%	3.77%
* N: number of counties		-					

Table 9a: Sunbelt Services Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

	Area Group	Ν	69/99	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/99
Metro Areas with more	Core	6	2.04%	0.38%	3.02%	1.42%	3.11%
3 million Population	Non-Core	84	3.79%	3.44%	4.78%	2.52%	3.69%
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	13	3.34%	3.14%	4.10%	2.47%	2.95%
million Population	Non-Core	79	3.93%	3.81%	4.27%	3.78%	3.39%
Small Metro Areas with f	ewer than 1 million Population	179	3.56%	3.66%	3.96%	2.95%	3.24%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	2.99%	2.83%	3.35%	2.88%	2.39%
Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	3.67%	2.93%	4.22%	3.24%	4.04%
Adjacent to	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	3.13%	3.05%	3.41%	2.80%	3.00%
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	3.18%	3.12%	3.30%	2.99%	3.28%
Not A discont	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	3.18%	3.23%	3.44%	2.88%	2.82%
to a Metro	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	2.89%	3.03%	2.97%	2.55%	3.04%
, 11 C 4	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	2.66%	2.92%	2.41%	3.32%	1.80%
Region Total		1301	3.19%	2.44%	3.98%	2.54%	3.29%
U.S. Total		3132	3.85%	3.29%	4.58%	3.18%	3.77%
* N : number of counties							

Table 9b: Frostbelt Services Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

* N: number of	U.S. Total	Region Total		to a ]	Not	Metro Area	Non Adja	Adja Larg Area		Small Metro 4	Metro Areas w million Popula		3 million Popu	Metro Areas w	
counties				Metro	Adiacont	IS INCLIO	icent to	IS INTERIO	cent to	Areas with fe	ation	vith 1-3	lation	vith more	
			with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	ewer than 1 million Population	Non-Core	Core	Non-Core	Core	Area Group
	3132	1831	279	350	125	398	104	71	34	276	96	21	70	7	Ν
	2.65%	3.33%	2.92%	2.86%	2.63%	2.79%	2.78%	3.95%	2.90%	3.11%	4.73%	4.02%	4.16%	2.31%	69/99
	3.63%	5.14%	3.80%	4.49%	4.50%	4.12%	4.96%	5.23%	4.77%	5.50%	7.56%	5.39%	6.92%	3.26%	69/76
	2.90%	3.22%	1.44%	1.94%	1.92%	1.84%	1.84%	2.01%	2.39%	2.49%	3.60%	4.12%	3.94%	3.43%	76/88
	0.49%	0.63%	1.85%	1.92%	1.61%	1.45%	1.33%	3.68%	1.13%	0.99%	2.12%	1.02%	0.79%	-1.24%	88/95
	3.99%	5.23%	7.68%	4.41%	3.24%	5.65%	4.29%	8.03%	4.26%	4.48%	7.75%	6.57%	5.92%	3.54%	95/99

Table 10a: Sunbelt Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999
Table 10b: Frostbelt Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							* N: number of counties
4.35%	1.13%	3.53%	1.03%	2.49%	3132		U.S. Total
4.93%	1.89%	3.70%	2.99%	3.28%	1831		Region Total
3.76%	4.06%	1.07%	4.83%	3.00%	279	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	- 11 C 4
1.98%	4.31%	0.10%	4.94%	2.46%	350	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro
2.89%	3.82%	0.85%	4.80%	2.74%	125	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adiocont
3.33%	2.77%	2.12%	4.69%	3.03%	398	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas
3.64%	2.91%	1.85%	3.78%	2.78%	104	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
5.39%	1.07%	3.86%	7.03%	4.15%	71	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas
4.28%	1.94%	3.51%	4.60%	3.50%	34	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
4.08%	2.52%	2.68%	3.49%	3.02%	276	fewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with :
6.24%	3.19%	4.55%	4.63%	4.47%	96	Non-Core	million Population
6.39%	1.52%	5.50%	1.93%	3.86%	21	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3
6.63%	0.23%	7.45%	2.23%	4.44%	70	Non-Core	3 million Population
4.34%	0.65%	2.96%	0.85%	2.11%	7	Core	Metro Areas with more
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group	

Table 11a: Sunbelt Construction Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							* N: number of counties	*
4.35%	1.13%	3.53%	1.03%	2.49%	3132		U.S. Total	J
3.52%	0.13%	3.35%	0.17%	1.88%	1301		Region Total	H
0.08%	3.08%	-0.19%	3.27%	1.42%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	21104	
2.59%	3.40%	0.39%	2.50%	1.88%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
2.66%	2.07%	0.70%	2.45%	1.69%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adiacont	5
2.96%	2.20%	1.91%	3.75%	2.55%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas	
3.70%	0.34%	2.96%	0.35%	1.84%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	7
4.13%	1.73%	2.35%	-0.19%	1.85%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
2.23%	3.64%	1.91%	0.95%	2.13%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
3.61%	1.24%	2.67%	0.11%	1.87%	179	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with f	
4.96%	2.70%	4.04%	0.43%	3.01%	79	Non-Core	million Population	п
1.70%	0.16%	2.99%	-2.73%	0.82%	13	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3	7
3.96%	-1.64%	5.28%	-1.52%	1.90%	84	Non-Core	and 3 million Population	ພະ
4.13%	-2.40%	2.31%	-4.76%	-0.20%	9	Core	Metro Areas with more	• 7
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		

Table 11b: Frostbelt Construction Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							* N : number of counties	*
1.67%	1.88%	2.86%	2.33%	2.35%	3132		U.S. Total	
2.06%	2.48%	3.65%	3.58%	3.15%	1831		Region Total	
1.36%	3.01%	1.62%	1.41%	1.86%	279	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	× 11C4	
1.38%	3.11%	2.06%	2.65%	2.35%	350	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
1.47%	3.14%	2.85%	3.50%	2.89%	125	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adjacent	
1.75%	2.75%	2.46%	1.89%	2.30%	398	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas	
2.02%	2.79%	2.82%	2.81%	2.70%	104	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
2.28%	3.67%	3.20%	2.07%	2.92%	71	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
1.87%	3.21%	3.46%	2.58%	2.98%	34	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
1.78%	2.78%	3.53%	4.08%	3.25%	276	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with fo	
2.75%	3.24%	4.80%	5.21%	4.26%	96	Non-Core	million Population	
2.66%	2.55%	4.11%	4.10%	3.55%	21	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3	
2.23%	2.46%	5.13%	4.53%	3.98%	70	Non-Core	3 million Population	
1.89%	0.79%	2.80%	2.23%	2.08%	7	Core	Metro Areas with more	
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		

Table 12a: Sunbelt Retail Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

-	_					* N : number of counties
.88%	2.86% 1	2.33%	2.35%	3132		U.S. Total
.20%	2.07% 1	1.56%	1.63%	1301		Region Total
.31%	-0.18% 2	0.44%	0.65%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	21104
.31%	1.31% 2	1.20%	1.52%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro
.39%	1.86% 2	2.29%	2.00%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not A discont
.52%	1.79% 2	1.16%	1.79%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas
.79%	2.22% 1	1.68%	1.89%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
.70%	1.88% 2	1.06%	1.83%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas
.59%	2.04% 2	1.36%	1.96%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
.91%	2.33% 1	2.12%	2.01%	179	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with f
.72%	2.88% 2.	2.31%	2.59%	79	Non-Core	million Population
.89%	1.92% 0	1.46%	1.38%	13	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3
.41%	2.53% 0	1.57%	1.65%	84	Non-Core	3 million Population
1.74%	0.71% -0	-1.24%	-0.03%	9	Core	Metro Areas with more
8/95	76/88 8	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group	

Table 12b: Frostbelt Retail Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

* N : numt	U.S. Tota	Region T			Alcas	Metro	Non			Small Me	million P	Metro Ar	3 million	Metro Ar	
per of counties	[]	otal	7 1104	to a Metro	Not A discont	Areas	Adjacent to	Areas	Adjacent to	etro Areas with fe	opulation	eas with 1-3	Population	eas with more	
			with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	wer than 1 million Population	Non-Core	Core	Non-Core	Core	Area Group
	3132	1831	279	350	125	398	104	71	34	276	96	21	70	7	Ν
	2.03%	2.78%	2.64%	2.63%	2.50%	2.70%	2.54%	3.78%	3.10%	2.42%	4.91%	2.58%	4.97%	1.76%	69/99
	2.91%	4.09%	11.07%	7.77%	6.07%	7.41%	5.61%	8.95%	4.28%	4.24%	5.83%	2.60%	6.23%	2.84%	69/76
	2.19%	2.80%	0.40%	0.60%	0.94%	1.17%	1.19%	1.58%	3.61%	1.85%	5.10%	3.08%	6.04%	2.23%	76/88
	0.98%	1.70%	0.71%	2.19%	2.41%	1.77%	2.66%	3.69%	2.17%	1.98%	4.11%	1.61%	2.77%	-0.23%	88/95
	1.83%	2.31%	-2.06%	0.47%	1.08%	0.72%	0.99%	1.52%	1.11%	1.73%	4.13%	2.73%	3.38%	1.91%	95/99

Table 13a: Sunbelt Wholesale Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							" N : number of counties
1.83%	0.98%	2.19%	2.91%	2.03%	3132		U.S. Total
1.30%	0.23%	1.63%	1.39%	1.20%	1301		Region Total
-0.73%	0.17%	0.36%	14.75%	3.53%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	
0.26%	1.56%	0.37%	9.34%	2.73%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro
0.30%	1.07%	0.67%	7.07%	2.21%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adiacont
-0.13%	1.29%	0.43%	9.05%	2.57%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas
1.42%	1.72%	1.22%	5.44%	2.35%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
1.20%	0.16%	0.83%	10.36%	2.95%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas
0.97%	2.36%	1.45%	6.26%	2.72%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
1.24%	1.08%	1.67%	2.98%	1.78%	179	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with fe
2.54%	2.81%	2.50%	3.79%	2.88%	79	Non-Core	million Population
1.23%	0.33%	1.55%	1.03%	1.10%	13	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3
1.97%	0.39%	2.92%	3.28%	2.29%	84	Non-Core	man 3 million Population
-0.15%	-3.13%	0.02%	-2.18%	-1.25%	9	Core	Metro Areas with more
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group	

Table 13b: Frostbelt Wholesale Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							number of counties	* N
دى	1.84%	1.84%	0.58%	1.70%	3132		Total	U.S.
	2.44%	2.71%	1.74%	2.55%	1831		ion Total	Regi
N	2.94%	2.22%	2.47%	2.50%	279	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500		
2	1.16%	2.08%	1.99%	1.90%	350	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
1	2.09%	0.76%	2.43%	1.55%	125	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adiscont	
2	1.89%	2.64%	1.63%	2.25%	398	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	ro Areas	Meti
2	1.60%	1.76%	2.05%	1.93%	104	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	Non
স	1.42%	2.85%	2.38%	2.69%	71	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
4	3.00%	1.43%	1.77%	2.26%	34	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
J	2.20%	2.09%	2.00%	2.26%	276	ewer than 1 million Population	II Metro Areas with fo	Sma
4	3.61%	3.99%	2.86%	3.65%	96	Non-Core	ion Population	milli
4	2.91%	3.45%	1.88%	3.06%	21	Core	ro Areas with 1-3	Meti
3	3.63%	4.26%	2.58%	3.65%	70	Non-Core	llion Population	3 mi
4	1.61%	2.35%	0.45%	1.97%	7	Core	ro Areas with more	Meti
	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		
I								

Table 14a: Sunbelt Transportation and Public Utilities Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

						number of counties	* N
0	1.84%	0.58%	1.70%	3132		Total	U.S.
~	0.99%	0.22%	1.02%	1301		on Total	Regio
0`	1.52%	1.02%	1.30%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	AILCA	
0`	1.05%	0.74%	0.86%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
°`	0.75%	1.31%	1.01%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adjacent	Alla
<u> </u>	1.28%	1.18%	1.36%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	Metro
•	0.37%	0.00%	0.55%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	Non
•	1.62%	1.47%	1.57%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
0`	1.30%	-0.07%	1.03%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
0`	1.11%	0.68%	1.25%	179	fewer than 1 million Population	l Metro Areas with 1	Smal
	1.29%	0.11%	1.32%	79	Non-Core	on Population	millio
-	1.13%	-0.91%	0.99%	13	Core	o Areas with 1-3	Metro
	1.72%	-0.02%	1.38%	84	Non-Core	lion Population	uiaii 3 mil
	-0.52%	-2.33%	-0.68%	6	Core	o Areas with more	Metro
	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		

Table 14b: Frostbelt Transportation and Public Utilities Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							* N : number of counties
-0.07%	-0.50%	0.27%	-0.72%	-0.19%	3132		U.S. Total
0.18%	-0.05%	1.52%	0.92%	0.84%	1831		Region Total
-4.58%	0.64%	1.48%	1.93%	0.58%	279	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	
-2.37%	0.79%	0.91%	2.27%	0.76%	350	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro
-0.01%	1.12%	0.49%	1.39%	0.78%	125	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not A discont
-2.66%	1.08%	0.93%	1.85%	0.70%	398	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas
-0.94%	0.54%	1.04%	1.59%	0.79%	104	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
-1.17%	0.42%	1.10%	1.97%	0.84%	71	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas
0.19%	1.04%	0.70%	1.49%	0.90%	34	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to
-0.30%	0.41%	0.83%	1.50%	0.74%	276	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with for
0.61%	0.95%	2.38%	1.57%	1.62%	96	Non-Core	million Population
1.57%	0.25%	2.44%	0.08%	1.26%	21	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3
2.17%	-0.41%	3.51%	1.06%	1.85%	70	Non-Core	man 3 million Population
0.82%	-2.60%	1.14%	-0.85%	-0.24%	7	Core	Metro Areas with more
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group	

Table 15a: Sunbelt Manufacturing Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999

							N: number of counties	*
-0.07%	-0.50%	0.27%	-0.72%	-0.19%	3132		U.S. Total	U.
-0.31%	-0.91%	-0.71%	-0.38%	-0.63%	1301		Region Total	Re
-2.81%	3.21%	1.65%	3.10%	1.76%	250	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	7104	
0.22%	2.48%	0.64%	1.53%	1.22%	210	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	to a Metro	
0.60%	1.65%	0.55%	0.18%	0.73%	100	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Not Adjacent	2
-0.59%	1.59%	1.41%	0.18%	0.90%	223	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Metro Areas	
0.02%	0.35%	-0.11%	-0.43%	-0.06%	78	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	Ž
0.75%	1.84%	0.78%	0.21%	0.89%	51	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	Areas	
0.20%	1.17%	0.01%	-0.34%	0.22%	28	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	Adjacent to	
-0.02%	-0.53%	-0.52%	-1.29%	-0.63%	179	ewer than 1 million Population	Small Metro Areas with f	Sn
0.60%	0.90%	-0.34%	-1.19%	-0.12%	79	Non-Core	million Population	m
-0.90%	-1.71%	-1.19%	-2.04%	-1.47%	13	Core	Metro Areas with 1-3	Ā
-0.45%	-2.25%	-0.65%	-2.13%	-1.34%	84	Non-Core	3 million Population	3 1
-1.40%	-3.05%	-2.34%	-3.45%	-2.64%	6	Core	Metro Areas with more	W M
95/99	88/95	76/88	69/76	69/99	Ν	Area Group		

Table 15b: Frostbelt Manufacturing Employment Growth Rates, 1969-1999



**APPENDIX: Updates of all REIS tables and charts to 2000** 

Source : Calculated from "Regional Economic Information System 1969-2000", Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2002.

	Are	ea Group	Ζ	69/00	69/76	76/88	26/88	95/00
Metro A	Areas with more than	Core	14	0.80	0.34	0.87	0.92	1.07
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	1.27	1.07	1.21	1.38	1.52
Metro <i>I</i>	Areas with 1-3	Core	34	1.01	0.71	0.98	1.29	1.15
million	Population	Non-Core	180	1.68	1.84	1.48	1.78	1.76
Small N	1etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	1.18	1.48	1.03	1.29	0.94
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	1.11	1.17	0.92	1.33	1.18
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	1.25	1.47	0.95	1.32	1.54
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	0.81	1.25	0.58	0.85	0.71
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	0.96	1.27	0.66	1.06	1.09
<b>FILCAS</b>		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	0.79	1.30	0.56	0.87	0.52
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	0.63	1.23	0.30	0.67	0.53
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	0.33	0.74	-0.06	0.44	0.53
U.S. To	tal		3132	1.09	1.12	0.98	1.23	1.16
* N : nui ** 1993 U	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	oup the va	rious non-met	tro counties be	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Population Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Ar	ea Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro <i>F</i>	Areas with more than	Core	14	1.48	0.20	2.40	0.31	2.71
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	2.59	1.76	3.66	1.31	2.99
Metro A	Areas with 1-3	Core	34	2.39	1.59	2.96	1.84	2.93
million	Population	Non-Core	180	3.07	2.59	3.35	2.92	3.25
Small N	Aetro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	2.37	2.38	2.54	2.16	2.24
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.14	1.84	2.16	2.48	2.08
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	2.45	2.20	2.27	2.75	2.81
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	1.83	1.81	1.90	1.85	1.66
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.09	2.10	2.01	2.31	1.96
ALCAS		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.18	2.66	1.92	2.47	1.74
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	2.01	2.73	1.58	2.31	1.63
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	1.92	2.52	1.41	2.39	1.68
U.S. To	tal		3132	2.26	1.72	2.76	1.69	2.59
* N : nui ** 1993 U	mber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gr	oup the va	rious non-me	tro counties b	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Private Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Arc	2a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	Areas with more than	Core	14	1.68	-1.35	3.12	-0.01	4.81
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	2.90	-0.38	6.04	-0.88	5.28
Metro Ar	eas with 1-3 million	Core	34	2.29	-0.58	4.05	0.80	4.21
Populatic	'n	Non-Core	180	3.75	2.52	4.29	3.02	5.22
Small N	1etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	2.57	2.17	2.67	2.04	3.64
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.87	2.82	2.79	2.64	3.44
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	3.10	3.12	3.14	1.31	5.49
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	2.27	2.04	2.37	1.66	3.17
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.87	4.25	2.00	2.52	3.52
ni cas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.28	3.73	0.77	3.11	2.73
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	2.35	3.90	0.20	3.94	3.12
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	2.44	3.97	0.43	3.60	3.49
U.S. Tota	1		3132	2.55	1.03	3.53	1.13	4.31
* N: nu ** 1993 U	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	oup the va	rious non-me	tro counties be	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Construction Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Are	a Group	Z	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	reas with more than	Core	14	1.74	1.48	3.11	-1.35	3.14
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	3.37	4.56	3.97	0.61	4.13
Metro A	reas with 1-3 million	Core	34	2.89	3.74	3.09	0.83	4.12
Populati	on	Non-Core	180	3.85	5.81	2.84	2.10	6.00
Small N	letro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	2.76	4.67	2.26	1.11	3.62
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.41	3.99	1.30	1.42	4.25
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	3.15	3.81	1.15	3.23	6.91
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	2.25	4.02	1.40	0.80	3.86
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.47	3.26	1.36	1.52	5.33
AlCas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.26	3.72	1.44	1.36	3.46
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	2.37	3.43	1.38	1.53	4.42
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	2.14	2.52	0.31	1.86	6.40
U.S. To	tal		3132	2.70	3.63	2.90	0.49	3.99
* N : nur * N : nur	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	oup the va	rious non-met	tro counties be	elong to: 2000	population d	ata and

Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

Ar	ea Group	Z	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more than	Core	14	-1.29	-2.27	-0.38	-2.61	-0.27
3 million Population	Non-Core	155	-0.42	-1.45	0.51	-1.61	0.48
Metro Areas with 1-3	Core	34	-0.62	-1.40	-0.17	-0.94	-0.17
million Population	Non-Core	180	0.54	-0.33	0.83	0.96	0.45
Small Metro Areas with fewer	r than 1 million Population	448	-0.01	-0.05	0.15	-0.07	-0.28
Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	0.47	0.44	0.32	1.11	-0.05
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	0.78	1.22	0.96	0.99	-0.56
Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	0.26	0.45	0.43	0.44	-0.66
Metro Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	0.72	1.18	1.11	1.28	-1.67
	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	0.71	0.82	0.52	1.37	0.11
Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	0.85	1.97	0.80	1.45	-1.42
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	0.80	2.27	1.53	1.49	-3.99
U.S. Total		3132	-0.20	-0.72	0.27	-0.50	-0.21
<ul> <li>N : number of counties</li> <li>** 1993 USDA Urban Influence Code</li> </ul>	es were used to determine which non-MSA groups of the second	oup the va	rious non-met	ro counties be	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Manufacturing Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

C F F

	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro <i>F</i>	Areas with more than	Core	14	1.39	0.71	2.11	0.43	1.99
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	2.42	2.39	3.39	1.20	1.82
Metro A	Areas with 1-3 million	Core	34	2.35	2.52	2.90	1.73	1.66
Populat	ion	Non-Core	180	3.36	3.60	3.84	3.01	2.34
Small N	Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	2.66	3.20	3.01	2.43	1.38
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.43	1.94	2.76	2.93	1.65
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	2.35	1.52	2.53	3.20	1.86
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	2.20	2.19	2.50	2.28	1.36
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.03	1.52	2.13	2.64	1.62
ALCAS		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.39	2.92	2.40	2.81	1.06
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	1.90	1.99	1.74	2.78	0.94
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	1.18	0.86	0.68	2.67	0.77
U.S. To	tal		3132	2.32	2.33	2.86	1.88	1.66
* N: nui ** 1993 U	mber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	oup the va	rious non-met	ro counties be	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Retail Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Are	ea Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Ar	eas with more than	Core	14	3.14	1.97	4.23	2.09	3.62
3 million	Population	Non-Core	155	4.36	4.10	5.49	3.08	3.81
Metro Ar	eas with 1-3 million	Core	34	4.19	3.73	4.93	3.56	3.95
Populatic	n	Non-Core	180	4.70	4.65	5.30	4.24	3.99
Small Me	etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	3.81	3.62	4.37	3.60	3.01
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	3.43	2.54	3.91	3.51	3.43
Γ	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	3.90	2.53	3.89	4.75	4.66
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	3.08	2.64	3.32	3.05	3.19
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	3.07	2.11	3.16	3.18	4.06
ALC43		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	3.30	3.22	3.51	3.34	2.80
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	3.00	2.88	3.02	2.95	3.21
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	2.85	2.37	2.89	3.42	2.62
U.S. Tota	tl		3132	3.81	3.29	4.58	3.18	3.57
ISIJ 503 N : numl	ber of counties DA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	nun the va	rious non-me	tro counties be	elong to: 2000	) population d	ata and

Services Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Arc	29 Grnin	z	00/69	69/76	76/88	26/88	95/00
Metro A	Areas with more than	Core	14	1.05	-0.89	1.21	0.96	3.48
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	155	2.14	0.66	2.51	2.21	3.21
Metro A	Areas with 1-3 million	Core	34	2.03	0.34	2.22	2.31	3.59
Populat	ion	Non-Core	180	2.41	1.14	2.48	2.71	3.61
Small N	1etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	1.84	1.43	1.67	1.83	2.82
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	1.58	0.70	1.35	1.90	2.89
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	1.96	1.83	2.14	1.63	2.15
	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	1.21	0.88	1.00	1.16	2.26
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	1.92	1.39	1.96	1.90	2.56
Allas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	1.33	1.92	0.75	1.55	1.60
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	1.49	1.44	1.65	1.15	1.66
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	1.95	1.74	1.86	2.61	1.53
U.S. To	tal		3132	1.76	0.58	1.84	1.84	3.10
* N: nui ** 1993 U	mber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gr	oup the va	rious non-me	tro counties be	elong to; 2000	population d	ata and

Transportation and Public Utilities Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

	Are	a Group	Z	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	reas with more than	Core	14	0.58	0.32	1.39	-1.10	1.31
3 millior	n Population	Non-Core	155	3.06	4.00	3.83	1.23	2.42
Metro A	reas with 1-3 million	Core	34	1.68	1.67	2.11	0.89	1.77
Populati	on	Non-Core	180	3.76	4.62	3.65	3.46	3.24
Small M	etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	448	2.13	3.69	1.80	1.58	1.49
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	62	2.87	5.26	2.54	2.25	1.21
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	122	3.35	9.67	1.12	1.90	1.86
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	182	2.42	5.51	1.20	2.17	1.39
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	621	2.61	8.25	0.77	1.52	0.63
Alleas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	225	2.18	6.52	0.81	1.81	-0.07
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	560	2.59	8.48	0.49	1.89	0.35
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	529	3.12	13.31	0.36	0.36	-0.68
U.S. Tot	al		3132	2.01	2.91	2.19	0.98	1.76
* N : nun ** 1993 US	iber of counties 3DA Urban Influence Code	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro	oup the va	rious non-me	tro counties b	elong to; 2000	) population d	ata and

Wholesale Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

C 5

que	Z	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
C	14	3.28	2.51	4.45	2.00	3.31
-Core	155	3.41	3.37	4.23	2.52	2.73
C	34	3.27	3.49	3.82	2.15	3.19
-Core	180	3.55	4.17	3.85	2.74	3.12
1 million Population	448	2.78	3.19	3.05	2.22	2.37
a City of 10,000 or more ulation	62	2.17	1.80	2.21	2.16	2.61
out a City of at least 10,000 ulation	122	1.87	0.85	1.58	2.63	2.92
a City of 10,000 or more ulation	182	1.65	1.39	1.74	1.70	1.73
out a City of at least 10,000 ulation	621	1.36	0.43	1.12	1.95	2.40
a City of 10,000 or more ulation	225	1.79	1.67	1.95	1.73	1.66
a City of 2,500 to 9,999 ulation	560	1.27	0.80	1.03	1.64	1.96
no City or a City with a ulation less than 2,500	529	0.73	-0.23	0.40	1.40	1.92
	3132	2.68	2.47	3.10	2.18	2.64
used to determine which non-MSA grou	up the va	rious non-met	ro counties be	long to; 2000	population d	ata and
	-Core -Core -Core -Core -Core 1 million Population 1 a City of 10,000 or more ulation out a City of 10,000 or more ulation a City of 10,000 or more ulation a City of 10,000 or more ulation a City of 2,500 to 9,999 ulation no City or a City with a ulation less than 2,500 ulation less than 2,500	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	up       IN       07/00         c       14       3.28         -Core       155       3.41         c       34       3.27         -Core       180       3.57         -Core       180       3.55         -Core       62       2.17         -Intition       448       2.78         -a City of 10,000 or more       182       1.65         -a City of 2,500 to 9,999       560       1.27         -a City of 2,500 to 9,999       560       1.27         -a City of 2,500 to 9,999       560       1.27         -a City of 3132       2.68       2.68	mpiv $07/00$ $07/70$ c143.282.51-Core153.413.37core343.273.49-Core180 <b>3.554.17</b> 1 million Population4482.783.19a City of 10,000 or more622.171.80ulation1221.870.85ulation1221.651.39a City of 10,000 or more1821.651.39a City of 10,000 or more1821.651.39ulationa City of 10,000 or more2251.791.67a City of 10,000 or more2251.791.67a City of 2,500 to 9,9995601.270.80ulation less than 2,50031322.682.47used to determine which non-MSA group the various non-metro counties be $3132$ $2.68$ $2.47$	inp         inp         opyoor         opyoor	upIV $07/0$ $07/0$ $07/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $000/0$ $1000/0$ $1221.802.212.160.431.121.951.731000010,000000/01000/06211.360.431.121.951.731000010,000000/0100/06211.360.431.121.951.7310000000/0000/0000/01.270.801.031.641.4010000/0000/0000/0000/0000/0000/0000/0<$

Proprietors' Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000

Frostbelt	Population Growth Kai	tes, 1969- <u>2000</u>						
	Are	a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro /	Areas with more than	Core	6	-0.31	-0.68	-0.48	0.06	0.09
3 millic	n Population	Non-Core	84	0.63	0.47	0.46	0.82	0.98
Metro /	Areas with 1-3 million	Core	13	-0.04	-0.30	-0.14	0.34	0.04
Populat	ion	Non-Core	83	0.94	0.86	0.69	1.25	1.19
Small N	Atro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	0.46	0.66	0.25	0.67	0.41
	Adiacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	0.49	0.74	0.19	0.74	0.54
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	0.72	1.11	0.40	0.83	0.79
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	0.44	0.85	0.23	0.47	0.37
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	0.65	1.03	0.32	0.80	0.70
AICas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	0.38	0.86	0.15	0.44	0.16
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	0.25	0.74	-0.10	0.37	0.24
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	0.05	0.44	-0.35	0.22	0.21
Region	Total		1301	0.41	0.38	0.21	0.65	0.60
U.S. To	tal		3132	1.09	1.12	0.98	1.23	1.16
* N : nu ** 1993 U 1999 N *** Source	mber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code: ISA definitions were used to : Calculated from "Regiona	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau c	rious non-met category each of Economic /	ro counties b belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, ]	lata and May 2002.
000000			, Duroun (		maryon, ee			ining 2002.

Ţ ÷ , + J t. C ÷ ٦ ) + 1060 7000

Sunbelt I	opulation Growth Kate	(S, 1969-2000)						
	Are	a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro /	Areas with more than	Core	8	1.59	1.26	1.86	1.43	1.61
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	71	2.60	2.64	2.80	2.37	2.37
Metro <i>I</i>	Areas with 1-3 million	Core	21	1.94	1.83	1.99	2.01	1.90
Populat	ion	Non-Core	97	2.45	3.04	2.29	2.27	2.26
Small N	1etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	1.69	2.16	1.60	1.69	1.27
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	1.68	1.64	1.62	1.84	1.68
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	1.73	1.84	1.49	1.74	2.16
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	1.18	1.69	0.94	1.22	1.01
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	1.18	1.45	0.92	1.24	1.36
AI Cas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	1.11	1.67	0.89	1.17	0.76
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	0.87	1.56	0.55	0.86	0.70
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	0.56	1.00	0.19	0.61	0.79
Region	Total		1831	1.77	1.96	1.74	1.73	1.63
U.S. To	tal		3132	1.09	1.12	0.98	1.23	1.16
* N : nui ** 1993 U 1999 N *** Source	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code: ISA definitions were used to : Calculated from "Region:	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau (	rious non-me category eacl of Economic	tro counties b 1 belongs to. Analysis, US J	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.
DOMIC		a Economic intormation system 1909-2000	, Durcau o		miatysis, Oo i			wiay 2002.

2 2 ÷. J 1060\_2000

Frostbelt	Private Employment G	rowth Kates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	reas with more than	Core	9	0.25	-1.54	1.04	-0.54	1.95
3 millio	1 Population	Non-Core	84	1.84	0.90	2.83	0.68	2.37
Metro A	reas with 1-3 million	Core	13	1.31	0.49	1.89	0.92	1.63
Populati	on	Non-Core	83	2.17	1.33	2.27	2.58	2.55
Small M	letro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	1.67	1.29	1.89	1.62	1.73
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	1.64	1.21	1.51	2.24	1.72
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	2.02	1.62	1.84	2.49	2.35
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	1.52	1.23	1.68	1.50	1.57
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	2.06	1.91	1.99	2.26	2.16
Alleas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.90	2.14	1.75	2.17	1.58
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.84	2.15	1.44	2.29	1.74
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	1.78	2.32	0.98	2.58	1.82
Region	Fotal		1301	1.50	0.64	2.02	1.09	2.01
U.S. Tot	al		3132	2.26	1.72	2.76	1.69	2.59
* N : nun ** 1993 Ug *** Source	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Codes SA definitions were used to : Calculated from "Regiona	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000".	oup the va ich metro , Bureau (	rious non-me category eacl of Economic ,	tro counties b 1 belongs to. Analysis, US J	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, 1	ata and May 2002.
*** Source	: Calculated from Regiona	a Economic Information System 1969-2000,	, Bureau (	of Economic	Anaiysis, ∪S i	Department of	r Commerce, 1	viay 2002.

Sunbelt E	mployment Growth Ka	ites, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	reas with more than	Core	8	2.53	2.04	3.51	0.87	3.17
3 millio	1 Population	Non-Core	71	4.22	4.14	5.43	2.41	3.95
Metro A	reas with 1-3 million	Core	21	3.46	2.97	4.05	2.61	3.90
Populati	on	Non-Core	97	4.08	4.33	4.53	3.23	3.86
Small M	etro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	2.95	3.40	3.07	2.56	2.60
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	2.66	2.54	2.81	2.69	2.40
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	2.85	2.78	2.67	2.98	3.19
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	2.18	2.49	2.15	2.22	1.75
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.12	2.26	2.04	2.35	1.80
111043		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.41	3.11	2.06	2.71	1.86
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	2.13	3.15	1.67	2.32	1.56
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	2.05	2.70	1.77	2.23	1.56
Region	Fotal		1831	3.07	3.07	3.54	2.24	3.10
U.S. Tot	al		3132	2.26	1.72	2.76	1.69	2.59
* N : nun ** 1993 US 1999 M *** Source	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Codes SA definitions were used to : Calculated from "Regions	; were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau (	rious non-me category each of Economic /	tro counties b belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.
	c	t			,	F		ţ

Ņ + d + 1969-2000

Frostbelt Construction Emplo	yment Growth Rates, 1969-2000						
	Area Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more than	1 Core	9	-0.01	-4.76	2.31	-2.40	4.45
3 million Population	Non-Core	84	2.02	-1.52	5.28	-1.64	4.29
Metro Areas with 1-3 millio	n Core	13	0.88	-2.73	2.99	0.16	1.85
Population	Non-Core	83	3.04	0.45	4.04	2.77	4.63
Small Metro Areas with few	ver than 1 million Population	175	1.86	0.10	2.66	1.20	3.29
Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	2.17	0.95	1.91	3.64	2.42
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	2.02	-0.19	2.35	1.73	4.73
Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	1.79	0.35	2.96	0.34	3.04
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	2.58	3.75	1.91	2.20	3.08
/11.cus	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.75	2.45	0.70	2.07	2.87
Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.92	2.50	0.39	3.40	2.73
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	1.60	3.27	-0.19	3.08	1.46
Region Total		1301	1.69	-0.95	3.35	0.13	3.58
U.S. Total		3132	2.55	1.03	3.53	1.13	4.31
<ul> <li>* N : number of counties</li> <li>** 1993 USDA Urban Influence Council 1999 MSA definitions were use</li> <li>*** Source : Calculated from "Reg</li> </ul>	odes were used to determine which non-MSA gro d to determine which counties are MSAs and whi ional Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau (	rious non-me category eac of Economic	tro counties b h belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department o	) population d f Commerce,	lata and May 2002.
C				,	-		J

Sundelt Construction Employ	ment Growth Kates, 1969-2000						
А	rea Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more than	Core	8	2.64	1.03	3.57	1.02	4.95
3 million Population	Non-Core	71	4.50	2.22	7.45	0.23	6.58
Metro Areas with 1-3 million	1 Core	21	3.39	1.52	4.84	1.21	5.58
Population	Non-Core	97	4.45	4.67	4.54	3.22	5.67
Small Metro Areas with few	er than 1 million Population	273	3.06	3.63	2.70	2.54	3.83
Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	3.52	4.60	3.51	1.94	4.21
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	4.31	7.03	3.86	1.07	6.08
Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	2.76	3.78	1.85	2.91	3.29
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	3.13	4.69	2.12	2.77	3.86
	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.70	4.80	0.85	3.82	2.65
Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	2.67	4.94	0.10	4.31	3.38
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	3.24	4.83	1.07	4.06	5.09
Region Total		1831	3.31	2.99	3.70	1.89	4.82
U.S. Total		3132	2.55	1.03	3.53	1.13	4.31
* N : number of counties ** 1993 USDA Urban Influence Co 1999 MSA definitions were used *** Source : Calculated from "Regi	des were used to determine which non-MSA gro to determine which counties are MSAs and whi onal Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va iich metro ', Bureau (	rious non-me category eac of Economic	tro counties b h belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department o	) population d f Commerce,	lata and May 2002.
	onai Economic intormation system 1909-2000	, Durcau o		niiaiyəiə, Uə			IVIAY 2002.

Ņ 2 ÷ t. ŗ ; ₽ ÷. J ) + 1060\_2000

Frostbelt	Finance, Insurance, and	d Real Estate Employment Growth Ra	ates, 190	59-2000				
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	reas with more than	Core	6	0.74	-0.25	2.47	-1.73	1.44
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	84	2.96	3.50	4.01	0.54	3.09
Metro A	reas with 1-3 million	Core	13	2.03	2.53	2.54	0.58	2.14
Populat	ion	Non-Core	83	2.98	4.27	2.05	2.06	4.70
Small N	fetro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	2.23	3.56	1.90	1.28	2.49
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	1.88	3.27	0.11	1.82	4.30
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	2.19	2.63	0.26	2.69	5.47
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	1.74	3.30	1.05	0.36	3.16
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	2.04	2.52	0.90	1.59	4.72
		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.76	2.87	0.86	1.05	3.37
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.64	2.29	0.70	1.02	3.87
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	1.40	1.67	-0.62	1.87	5.22
Region	Total		1301	2.07	2.38	2.60	0.35	2.74
U.S. To	tal		3132	2.70	3.63	2.90	0.49	3.99
* N : nur ** 1993 U *** Source	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Code: SA definitions were used to · Calculated from "Regions	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro	rious non-me category each	iro counties bé belongs to. Analysis TJS I	elong to; 2000 Denartment of	) population d f Commerce	ata and May 2002
*** Source	: Calculated from "Regiona	al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	, Bureau (	of Economic /	Analysis, US I	Department of	f Commerce, I	May 2002.

	Fro
	stbe
	lt F
,	inance
	Insurance,
	and
	Real
	Estate
	Emi
	olov
	/ment
	Growt
	h Rates
	1969-2
	000

	Z	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
	8	2.73	3.52	3.74	-1.02	4.48
ore	71	4.24	6.92	3.95	0.78	6.03
	21	3.68	5.03	3.61	1.03	5.67
ore	97	4.73	7.58	3.59	2.15	7.06
llion Population	273	3.18	5.59	2.54	1.00	4.41
City of 10,000 or more	34	2.94	4.77	2.39	1.13	4.25
t a City of at least 10,000 tion	71	4.09	5.23	2.01	3.68	8.05
City of 10,000 or more tion	104	2.88	4.96	1.84	1.33	4.61
t a City of at least 10,000 tion	398	2.93	4.12	1.84	1.45	5.92
City of 10,000 or more	125	2.70	4.50	1.92	1.61	3.55
City of 2,500 to 9,999	350	2.98	4.49	1.94	1.92	4.81
• City or a City with a tion less than 2,500	279	3.06	3.80	1.44	1.85	7.62
	1831	3.39	5.14	3.22	0.63	5.19
	3132	2.70	3.63	2.90	0.49	3.99
d to determine which non-MSA grou which counties are MSAs and which ic Information System 1969-2000",	up the va ch metro Bureau	rious non-met category each of Economic /	tro counties be belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d `Commerce, l	ata and May 2002.
	ore ore City of 10,000 or more fion City of 10,000 or more city of 10,000 or more city of 10,000 or more city of 10,000 or more city of 2,500 to 9,999 city of 2,500 to 9,999 city or a City with a nion less than 2,500 which counties are MSAs and which counties are MSAs and which conformation System 1969-2000",	NNore71ore21ore21ore21city of 10,000 or more273City of 10,000 or more34city of 10,000 or more104city of 10,000 or more104city of 10,000 or more104city of 10,000 or more104city of 2,500 to 9,999350city of 2,500 to 9,999350city of 2,500 to 9,999350city or a City with a279ion1831which counties are MSAs and which metroinformation System 1969-2000", Bureau	N         69/00           ore         8         2.73 $3 re$ 71         4.24 $2 re$ 21         3.68           yre         97         4.73 $2 re$ 97         4.73 $2 re$ 3.18         2.73 $2 re$ 97         4.73 $2 re$ $3 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $3 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $1 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $2 re$ $3 re$	N69/0069/76ore714.246.92ore714.246.92jon213.685.03ore974.733.18jon2733.185.59City of 10,000 or more342.944.77ta City of at least 10,000714.095.23tion10,000 or more1042.884.96ta City of 10,000 or more1042.884.96tion1000 or more1252.704.12on500 to 9,9993502.984.49on18313.1322.704.50on18313.1322.703.63ion less than 2,50018313.1322.703.634 to determine which non-MSA group the various non-metro counties bwhich counties are MSAs and which metro category each belongs to.ic Information System 1969-2000", Bureau of Economic Analysis, USI	N69/0069/7676/88ore714.246.92 $3.74$ ore714.246.92 $3.95$ ore974.73 $3.18$ $5.03$ $3.61$ ore974.73 $3.18$ $5.03$ $3.61$ ore974.73 $3.18$ $5.59$ $2.54$ Oty of 10,000 or more34 $2.94$ $4.77$ $2.39$ ion10,000 or more104 $2.88$ $4.96$ $1.84$ ion10,000 or more104 $2.88$ $4.96$ $1.84$ ion10,000 or more125 $2.70$ $4.50$ $1.92$ ion125 $2.70$ $4.50$ $1.92$ ion3132 $2.70$ $3.63$ $2.90$ Vidy or a City with a $2.79$ $3.06$ $3.80$ $1.44$ ion $3132$ $2.70$ $3.63$ $2.90$ 10 determine which non-MSA group the various non-metro counties belong to; 2000 $2.90$ $3132$ $2.70$ $3.63$ $2.90$ $3132$ $2.70$ $3.63$ $2.90$ $3.63$ $2.90$ $2.90$	N69/0069/7676/8888/95are71 $4.24$ $6.92$ $3.52$ $3.74$ $-1.02$ are97 $4.73$ $3.68$ $5.03$ $3.61$ $1.03$ are97 $4.73$ $7.58$ $3.59$ $2.15$ lion Population273 $3.18$ $5.59$ $2.54$ $1.00$ City of 10,000 or more $34$ $2.94$ $4.77$ $2.39$ $1.13$ ion71 $4.09$ $5.23$ $2.01$ $3.68$ Dity of 10,000 or more $104$ $2.88$ $4.96$ $1.84$ $1.33$ ion100 $398$ $2.93$ $4.12$ $1.84$ $1.45$ ion100 $398$ $2.93$ $4.12$ $1.84$ $1.45$ ion125 $2.70$ $4.50$ $1.92$ $1.61$ ion125 $2.70$ $4.50$ $1.44$ $1.85$ ion1831 $3.39$ $5.14$ $3.22$ $0.63$ ion less than 2,500 $3132$ $2.70$ $3.63$ $2.90$ $0.49$ 1 to determine which non-MSA group the various non-metro counties belong to, 2000 population dwhich metric category each belongs to.ic Information System 1969-2000", Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, 1

Frostbelt Man	utacturing Employ	ment Growth Rates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas	with more than	Core	6	-2.60	-3.45	-2.34	-3.05	-1.43
3 million Pop	oulation	Non-Core	84	-1.31	-2.13	-0.65	-2.25	-0.44
Metro Areas	with 1-3 million	Core	13	-1.48	-2.04	-1.19	-1.71	-1.08
Population		Non-Core	83	-0.14	-1.40	-0.32	0.94	0.50
Small Metro	Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	-0.65	-1.21	-0.53	-0.56	-0.28
Adj	acent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	0.17	-0.34	0.01	1.17	-0.15
Me	tro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	0.92	0.21	0.78	1.84	0.96
Non Adj	acent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	-0.07	-0.43	-0.11	0.35	-0.08
Metro Me	tro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	0.89	0.18	1.41	1.59	-0.34
		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	0.70	0.18	0.55	1.65	0.47
Not Me	t Adjacent to a tro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.17	1.53	0.64	2.48	0.08
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	1.58	3.10	1.65	3.21	-2.99
<b>Region</b> Total			1301	-0.94	-1.75	-0.71	-0.91	-0.41
U.S. Total			3132	-0.20	-0.72	0.27	-0.50	-0.21
* N : number o ** 1993 USDA U 1999 MSA de **** Source : Calc	f counties Jrban Influence Codes finitions were used to ulated from "Regiona	; were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau	rious non-me category each of Economic /	tro counties be 1 belongs to. Analysis, US I	blong to; 2000 Department of	) population d Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.

ŗ 

Sunbelt Ma	anufacturing Employr	nent Growth Rates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Are	eas with more than	Core	8	-0.07	-0.79	1.41	-2.30	0.48
3 million	Population	Non-Core	71	1.84	1.08	3.51	-0.40	2.01
Metro Ar	eas with 1-3 million	Core	21	0.80	0.03	1.60	0.12	0.93
Populatio	n	Non-Core	97	1.56	1.55	2.38	0.98	0.40
Small Me	tro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	0.77	1.57	0.94	0.42	-0.28
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	0.85	1.49	0.70	1.04	0.07
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	0.69	1.97	1.10	0.42	-1.72
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	0.68	1.59	1.04	0.54	-1.26
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	0.60	1.85	0.93	1.08	-2.61
ALC do		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	0.73	1.39	0.49	1.12	-0.22
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	0.64	2.27	0.91	0.79	-2.51
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	0.42	1.93	1.48	0.64	-4.55
Region To	otal		1831	0.79	0.92	1.52	-0.05	-0.01
U.S. Tota	1		3132	-0.20	-0.72	0.27	-0.50	-0.21
* N : numb ** 1993 USI 1999 MS, *** Source :	eer of counties DA Urban Influence Codes A definitions were used to Calculated from "Region	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau o	rious non-met category each of Economic /	iro counties b belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.

Frostbelt Ketail Employment	nt Growth <u>Rates</u> , 1969-2000						
	Area Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more the	an Core	6	0.06	-1.24	0.71	-0.74	1.41
3 million Population	Non-Core	84	1.65	1.57	2.53	0.41	1.41
Metro Areas with 1-3 mill	ion Core	13	1.36	1.46	1.92	0.89	0.52
Population	Non-Core	83	2.55	2.30	2.88	2.74	1.84
Small Metro Areas with fe	wer than 1 million Population	175	1.97	2.12	2.33	1.90	0.97
Adjacent to Larg	with a City of 10,000 or more	28	1.92	1.36	2.04	2.59	1.49
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	1.81	1.06	1.88	2.70	1.44
Adjacent to Sma	with a City of 10,000 or more Il Population	78	1.85	1.68	2.22	1.79	1.26
Metro Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	1.82	1.16	1.79	2.52	1.85
	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.91	2.29	1.86	2.39	0.82
Not Adjacent to Metro Area	a with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	1.47	1.20	1.31	2.31	1.06
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	0.62	0.44	-0.18	2.31	0.44
Region Total		1301	1.56	1.29	2.07	1.20	1.21
U.S. Total		3132	2.32	2.33	2.86	1.88	1.66
* N : number of counties ** 1993 USDA Urban Influence 1999 MSA definitions were u: *** Source : Calculated from "R	Codes were used to determine which non-MSA gro sed to determine which counties are MSAs and whi egional Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau o	rious non-me category each of Economic	tro counties b n belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department o	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.
	U J			, - , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-		J

Ţ ÷ 0 + D + ÷ Ð + ۵ + 1060\_2000

Sunbelt Ke	tail Employment Gro	Wth Kates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Are	eas with more than	Core	8	2.36	2.47	3.08	1.08	2.28
3 million	Population	Non-Core	71	3.95	4.52	5.13	2.47	2.42
Metro Are	eas with 1-3 million	Core	21	3.28	3.75	3.84	2.40	2.49
Populatio	n	Non-Core	97	4.22	5.23	4.81	3.25	2.76
Small Me	tro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	3.22	4.17	3.55	2.80	1.66
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	2.93	2.58	3.46	3.21	1.78
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	2.89	2.07	3.20	3.67	2.23
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	2.59	2.81	2.82	2.79	1.46
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.23	1.89	2.46	2.75	1.41
Al Cas		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.80	3.50	2.85	3.14	1.24
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	2.23	2.65	2.06	3.11	0.86
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	1.80	1.41	1.62	3.01	1.08
Region To	otal		1831	3.11	3.58	3.65	2.48	2.03
U.S. Tota	1		3132	2.32	2.33	2.86	1.88	1.66
* N : numb ** 1993 USI 1999 MS/ *** Source : (	er of counties )A Urban Influence Codes A definitions were used to Calculated from "Regions	were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi Economic Information System 1969-2000".	oup the va ich metro . Bureau	rious non-met category each of Economic /	rro counties by belongs to. Analysis, US 1	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.
BOULCE.		a Economic information system 1909-2000,	, Dureau o		uaiysis, ∪o i		r Commerce, i	IVIAY 2002.

Ņ 2 + + G ÷ d + 1969-2000

Frostbelt Se	rvices Employment	Jrowth Kates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Are	as with more than	Core	6	2.11	0.38	3.02	1.42	3.32
3 million I	opulation	Non-Core	84	3.74	3.44	4.78	2.52	3.38
Metro Are	as with 1-3 million	Core	13	3.30	3.14	4.10	2.47	2.79
Population		Non-Core	83	3.87	3.84	4.27	3.78	3.10
Small Met	ro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	3.50	3.65	3.96	2.94	2.95
ł	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	3.00	2.83	3.35	2.88	2.57
7	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	3.58	2.93	4.22	3.24	3.40
Non I	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	3.06	3.05	3.41	2.80	2.59
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	3.18	3.12	3.30	2.99	3.24
111043	Γ	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	3.12	3.23	3.44	2.88	2.54
77	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	2.89	3.03	2.97	2.55	2.96
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	2.67	2.92	2.41	3.32	2.05
Region To	tal		1301	3.24	2.77	3.98	2.54	3.11
U.S. Total			3132	3.81	3.29	4.58	3.18	3.57
* N : numbe ** 1993 USD 1999 MSA *** Source : C	r of counties A Urban Influence Codes definitions were used to alculated from "Regiona	were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi I Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau c	rious non-me category each f Economic /	tro counties be t belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, I	ata and May 2002.
	0		, — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —					·····

ŗ 

Sunbelt Se	rvices Employment G	rowth Kates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Ar	eas with more than	Core	8	4.08	3.73	5.27	2.57	3.83
3 million	Population	Non-Core	71	5.66	5.79	6.98	4.08	4.51
Metro Ar	eas with 1-3 million	Core	21	4.95	4.35	5.70	4.41	4.77
Populatic	'n	Non-Core	97	5.54	5.62	6.36	4.64	4.72
Small Me	tro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	4.04	3.59	4.70	4.07	3.06
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	3.83	2.25	4.47	4.10	4.16
[	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	4.20	2.16	3.59	6.21	5.68
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	3.12	2.18	3.21	3.34	3.88
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.99	1.20	3.04	3.38	4.83
		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	3.44	3.22	3.58	3.73	3.02
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	3.08	2.77	3.05	3.24	3.39
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	3.03	1.80	3.40	3.53	3.16
Region T	otal		1831	4.40	3.90	5.22	3.78	3.98
U.S. Tota	1		3132	3.81	3.29	4.58	3.18	3.57
* N : numl ** 1993 USI 1999 MS *** Source :	oer of counties DA Urban Influence Codes A definitions were used to Calculated from "Regiona	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau o	rious non-met category each of Economic /	ro counties b belongs to. Analysis, US ]	elong to; 200( Department o	) population d f Commerce, ]	ata and May 2002.
	q		2		J	F		J

2 2 ŗ + Ċ Ł J + 1060\_2000
	$D_{\text{result}}$ Tetral [ 1201] 0.03 [ -0.3	with no City or a City with a2501.361.0Population less than 2,5002501.361.0	Not Adjacent to awith a City of 2,500 to 9,9992100.920.7Metro AreaPopulation	with a City of 10,000 or more1001.061.00Population1001.061.00	Metro Areas Without a City of at least 10,000 223 1.43 1.1 Areas	Non-Adjacent to Smallwith a City of 10,000 or more780.620.0	Metro Areaswithout a City of at least 10,000511.461.46Population	Adjacent to Largewith a City of 10,000 or more281.02-0.0	Small Metro Areas with fewer than 1 million Population1751.270.t	Population Non-Core 83 1.45 0.1	Metro Areas with 1-3 million Core 13 1.06 -0.5	3 million Population Non-Core 84 1.41 -0.0	Metro Areas with more than Core 6 -0.59 -2.3	Area Group N 69/00 69/	Frostbelt Transportation and Public Utilities Employment Growth Rates, 1969-2000
		o City or a City with ation less than 2,500	City of 2,500 to 9,9 ation	City of 10,000 or m ation	ation	City of 10,000 or mation	ation	City of 10,000 or m ation	million Population	ore		ore		q	lities Employment C
		h a	999	nore	10,000	nore	10,000	nore							Growth Rates
3132	1301	250	210	100	223	78	51	28	175	83	13	84	6	Z	, 1969
1.76	0.93	1.36	0.92	1.06	1.43	0.62	1.46	1.02	1.27	1.45	1.06	1.41	-0.59	69/00	9-2000
0.58	-0.36	1.02	0.74	1.31	1.18	0.00	1.47	-0.07	0.68	0.14	-0.91	-0.02	-2.33	69/76	_
1.84	0.99	1.52	1.05	0.75	1.28	0.37	1.62	1.30	1.08	1.36	1.13	1.72	-0.52	76/88	
1.84	1.16	2.27	1.14	0.85	1.93	0.73	1.82	1.05	1.39	1.85	1.58	1.43	-0.46	88/95	
3.10	2.29	0.15	0.51	1.71	1.48	1.91	0.51	1.81	2.37	2.95	2.91	2.63	1.47	95/00	

Sunbelt 1	ransportation and Publ	ic Utilities Employment Growth Rate	es, 1969	-2000				
	Are	a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro A	vreas with more than	Core	8	2.27	0.61	2.56	1.81	4.52
3 millio	n Population	Non-Core	71	3.72	2.58	4.26	3.62	4.13
Metro A	vreas with 1-3 million	Core	21	2.86	1.61	3.13	2.82	4.03
Populat	ion	Non-Core	97	3.70	2.86	3.99	3.64	4.26
Small N	fetro Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	273	2.27	2.07	2.11	2.14	3.13
	Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	2.29	1.77	1.43	3.00	4.06
	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	2.62	2.38	2.85	1.42	4.11
Non	Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	1.93	2.05	1.76	1.60	2.62
Metro	Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.38	1.63	2.64	1.89	3.51
		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	1.56	2.43	0.76	2.09	1.52
	Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	1.91	1.99	2.08	1.16	2.41
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	2.51	2.47	2.22	2.94	2.67
Region	Total		1831	2.60	1.74	2.71	2.44	3.75
U.S. To	tal		3132	1.76	0.58	1.84	1.84	3.10
* N : nur ** 1993 U *** Source	nber of counties SDA Urban Influence Codes ISA definitions were used to : Calculated from "Regions	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro Bureau	rious non-me category each	tro counties but to counties but to counties but to belongs to.	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d	ata and May 2002
*** Source	: Calculated from "Regiona	al Economic Information System 1969-2000",	, Bureau	of Economic /	Analysis, US I	Department of	Commerce, l	May 2002.

5	
E	
nt	
Зe	
h	
. 1	
$\Gamma$	
a	
ñ	
õ	
õ	
Ħ	
a	
ΠĊ	
Ц	
ar	
Б.	
ק	
H I	
Ĕ	
<u>.</u>	
Ţ	
H	
it	
<u>1</u>	
ò	
H	
'n	
1	
2	
Уľ	
Ľ	
<b>6</b>	
lt	
14	
°.	
$\mathbf{x}$	
4	
b	
R	
a	
б	
S	
_ ا	
5	
6	
9	
5	
lÕ	
- <b>-</b>	
$\circ$	

Frostbelt Wholesale Em	ploymer	nt Growth Rates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more	e than	Core	6	-1.21	-2.18	0.02	-3.13	-0.08
3 million Population		Non-Core	84	2.27	3.28	2.92	0.39	1.92
Metro Areas with 1-3 1	million	Core	13	1.08	1.03	1.55	0.33	1.05
Population		Non-Core	83	2.87	3.85	2.49	2.82	2.46
Small Metro Areas wit	h fewer	than 1 million Population	175	1.76	2.96	1.67	1.07	1.29
Adjacent to I	arge	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	2.73	6.26	1.45	2.36	1.35
Metro Areas		without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	2.94	10.36	0.83	0.16	1.50
Adjacent to S	Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	2.32	5.44	1.22	1.72	1.41
Metro Areas		without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	2.55	9.05	0.43	1.29	0.32
	Γ	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	2.13	7.07	0.67	1.07	0.19
Not Adjacent Metro Area	t to a	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	2.73	9.34	0.37	1.56	0.77
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	3.46	14.75	0.36	0.17	-0.27
Region Total			1301	1.33	1.96	1.63	0.23	1.30
U.S. Total			3132	2.01	2.91	2.19	0.98	1.76
* N : number of counties ** 1993 USDA Urban Influe 1999 MSA definitions we *** Source : Calculated from	ence Codes are used to "Regiona	s were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi al Economic Information System 1969-2000'	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau	irious non-me category each of Economic /	tro counties b 1 belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d Commerce, l	ata and May 2002.
	,					,		

ŗ 

Sunbelt Wholesale Employme	nt Growth Kates, 1969-2000						
A	rea Group	Ν	69/00	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more than	Core	8	1.96	2.97	2.44	0.10	2.01
3 million Population	Non-Core	71	4.90	6.24	6.03	2.78	3.24
Metro Areas with 1-3 millior	1 Core	21	2.25	2.36	2.66	1.37	2.36
Population	Non-Core	97	4.86	5.83	5.11	4.11	3.96
Small Metro Areas with few	er than 1 million Population	273	2.42	4.31	1.91	1.96	1.63
Adjacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	34	3.03	4.28	3.61	2.17	1.10
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	71	3.82	8.95	1.58	3.69	2.21
Adjacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	104	2.55	5.61	1.19	2.66	1.39
Metro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	398	2.68	7.41	1.17	1.77	0.95
<u>лиса</u> ,	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	125	2.24	6.07	0.94	2.41	-0.25
Not Adjacent to a Metro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	350	2.48	7.77	0.60	2.19	0.00
	with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	279	2.60	11.07	0.40	0.71	-1.37
Region Total		1831	2.74	4.09	2.80	1.70	2.17
U.S. Total		3132	2.01	2.91	2.19	0.98	1.76
<ul> <li>* N : number of counties</li> <li>** 1993 USDA Urban Influence Co</li> <li>1999 MSA definitions were used</li> <li>*** Source : Calculated from "Regi</li> </ul>	des were used to determine which non-MSA gro to determine which counties are MSAs and whi onal Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro ', Bureau	urious non-me category eacl of Economic .	tro counties b n belongs to. Analysis, US	elong to; 2000 Department o	) population d f Commerce,	lata and May 2002.
					,		

Frostbelt Pro	oprietors' <u>Employme</u>	nt Growth Rates, 1969-2000						
	Are	a Group	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Area	as with more than	Core	6	2.10	0.09	3.22	1.31	3.34
3 million P	opulation	Non-Core	84	2.62	1.99	3.46	1.98	2.38
Metro Area	as with 1-3 million	Core	13	2.08	2.23	2.49	1.53	1.67
Population		Non-Core	83	2.91	3.37	3.01	2.64	2.39
Small Meti	o Areas with fewer	than 1 million Population	175	2.07	2.14	2.38	1.86	1.49
A	djacent to Large	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	28	1.49	1.18	1.09	1.78	2.46
7	1etro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	51	1.07	0.49	0.66	1.68	2.03
A	djacent to Small	with a City of 10,000 or more Population	78	1.42	1.20	1.50	1.52	1.41
Metro N	1etro Areas	without a City of at least 10,000 Population	223	1.11	0.30	0.83	1.78	2.00
		with a City of 10,000 or more Population	100	1.28	1.25	1.34	1.24	1.20
~ ~ ~	lot Adjacent to a 1etro Area	with a City of 2,500 to 9,999 Population	210	0.75	0.26	0.46	1.23	1.41
		with no City or a City with a Population less than 2,500	250	0.36	-0.54	0.01	1.05	1.46
Region Tot	al		1301	1.97	1.50	2.33	1.77	2.03
U.S. Total			3132	2.68	2.47	3.10	2.18	2.64
* N : numbe ** 1993 USD/ 1999 MSA *** Source : C	r of counties A Urban Influence Codes definitions were used to alculated from "Regiona	were used to determine which non-MSA gro determine which counties are MSAs and whi d Economic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau c	rious non-me category each of Economic /	tro counties be belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	<sup>1</sup> population da Commerce, I	ata and May 2002.
			,			- a bur arrient of		

Ļ 2 3

Sundelt Proprietors Emp	Loyment G	rowth Kates, 1969-2000						
	Area C	broup	Ν	00/69	69/76	76/88	88/95	95/00
Metro Areas with more	than C	ore	8	3.92	4.01	5.07	2.31	3.30
3 million Population	Z	on-Core	71	4.74	6.14	5.42	3.29	3.16
Metro Areas with 1-3 n	nillion C	ore	21	4.14	4.65	4.81	2.54	4.07
Population	Ν	on-Core	97	4.15	5.00	4.61	2.81	3.70
Small Metro Areas with	ı fewer tha	n 1 million Population	273	3.29	4.02	3.52	2.45	2.91
Adjacent to L	arge Po	ith a City of 10,000 or more opulation	34	2.81	2.47	3.23	2.46	2.73
Metro Areas	w Po	ithout a City of at least 10,000 ppulation	71	2.68	1.31	2.59	3.51	3.66
Adjacent to Si	mall Po	ith a City of 10,000 or more opulation	104	1.89	1.59	2.00	1.90	2.04
Metro Areas	w Po	ithout a City of at least 10,000 ppulation	398	1.57	0.55	1.38	2.09	2.74
/11 cao	Pc Pc	ith a City of 10,000 or more opulation	125	2.23	2.07	2.48	2.11	1.99
Not Adjacent Metro Area	to a w	ith a City of 2,500 to 9,999 opulation	350	1.68	1.27	1.49	1.94	2.35
	w Pa	ith no City or a City with a pulation less than 2,500	279	1.17	0.18	0.87	1.79	2.40
Region Total			1831	3.31	3.46	3.77	2.52	3.10
U.S. Total			3132	2.68	2.47	3.10	2.18	2.64
* N : number of counties ** 1993 USDA Urban Influer 1999 MSA definitions wer *** Source : Calculated from	nce Codes we e used to det "Regional E	re used to determine which non-MSA gro ermine which counties are MSAs and whi conomic Information System 1969-2000"	oup the va ich metro , Bureau o	rious non-me category each of Economic /	tro counties b belongs to. Analysis, US I	elong to; 2000 Department of	) population d f Commerce, 1	ata and May 2002.
	c				J.,	-		J

0 1+ D ÷ ľ + Ċ. ÷ ۵ + 1060\_2000

MSA	Area Group Change	County	Population 2000	Core County
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ (MSA)	Medium-Sized MCA -> I arge MCA	Maricopa, AZ [04013]	3,094,906	Core county
Population 2000 : 3,276,392	Mcaluli-Bizca Mon / Laige Mon	Pinal, AZ [04021]	181,486	
		Jefferson, KY [21111]	693,591	Core county
		Bullitt, KY [21029]	61,656	
I amiguilla VV IN (MCA)		Oldham, KY [21185]	46,596	
Population 2000 : 1 027 058	Small MSA $\rightarrow$ Medium-Sized MSA	Clark, IN [18019]	96,775	
		Floyd, IN [18043]	70,894	
		Harrison, IN [18061]	34,495	
		Scott, IN [18143]	23,051	
*** Source : "Regional Economic Information	n System 1969-2000", Bureau of Economic Aní	alysis, US Department of Commer	rce, May 2002.	

Area Group Changes