

William H. Frey

*Metro Magnets for Minorities and Whites:  
Melting Pots, the New Sunbelt, and the Heartland*

**PSC Research Report**

*Report No. 02-496*

February 2002

**PSC** POPULATION STUDIES CENTER  
AT THE INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH  

---

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**The Population Studies Center (PSC)** at the University of Michigan is one of the oldest population centers in the United States. Established in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Center has a rich history as the main workplace for an interdisciplinary community of scholars in the field of population studies. Today the Center is supported by a Population Research Center Core Grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) as well as by the University of Michigan, the National Institute on Aging, the Hewlett Foundation, and the Mellon Foundation.

**PSC Research Reports** are prepublication working papers that report on current demographic research conducted by PSC associates and affiliates. These papers are written for timely dissemination and are often later submitted for publication in scholarly journals. The PSC Research Report Series was begun in 1981. Copyrights for all Reports are held by the authors. Readers may quote from, copy, and distribute this work as long as the copyright holder and PSC are properly acknowledged and the original work is not altered.

**Metro Magnets for Minorities and Whites:  
Melting Pots, the New Sunbelt, and the Heartland**

by

William H. Frey, Ph.D.

Population Studies Center  
University of Michigan  
and  
Milken Institute  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

*February 2002*

---

William H. Frey is a Ph.D. Demographer and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan and Senior Fellow at the Milken Institute in Santa Monica, CA.  
This report also can be obtained from the website: [www.frey-demographer.org](http://www.frey-demographer.org)

## ABSTRACT

The recent census trends make apparent that the US is not close to becoming a single melting pot, where each minority group both spreads and blends evenly from coast to coast. Rather than forming a homogenous, national melting pot, America's racial demographic landscape is becoming more distinctly regional in its makeup. As such, commentators, marketers and political analysts will need to make distinctions between the nation's "Multiple Melting Pots", its more suburban-like "New Sunbelt," its predominantly white "Heartland".

This report examines 1990-2000 changes in racial concentration and change among the nation's metropolitan areas, and counties to support this view. It identifies only a handful of metropolitan areas with demographic profiles that qualify them as potential "melting pots" and even fewer where the population turned to a "majority minority" since the previous decennial census.

Recent regional racial shifts make plain that: as blacks return to the South, as melting pot regions become infused with more immigrants, as the New Sunbelt attracts more coastal suburbanites, and as the non-growing northern heartland remains mostly white, America's regions are evolving in decidedly different directions. It is important for commentators, political analysts, and those that monitor consumer behavior to take cognizance of these sharp regional divisions, rather than maintaining the illusion of a national melting pot.

**Datasets Used:** US Censuses, 1990 - 2000

**Note:** *Individual metropolitan area and state statistics on size and decade change for the race-ethnic groups reviewed in the report can be found on the website: [www.frey-demographer.org](http://www.frey-demographer.org)*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Immigrant Minorities “Pile-On”	5
Black and White Gainers	6
The New Sunbelt	6
Multiple Melting Pots	7
The White Heartland	7
New Minority Frontiers	8
Debunking the Diversity Myth	9
References	9
Tables and Maps	10

## LIST OF TABLES AND MAPS

- Table 1:** Top Population Gains by Metro Area: 1990-2000, Hispanics and Asians
- Table 2:** Top Population Gains by Metro Area: 1990-2000, Blacks and Whites
- Table 3:** Metro Areas with Greatest White Losses: 1990-2000
- Table 4:** Large, Growing, Mostly White & White-Black Metros in the "New Sunbelt"
- Table 5:** "Multiple Melting Pot" Metros
- Table 6:** Metro Areas That Turned From Majority White To "Majority Minority," 1990-2000
- Table 7:** Up-and-Coming Hispanic and Asian "Growth Magnets"
- Map 1:** America's Patchwork Quilt

## **Introduction**

With the release of 2000 Census results, newspaper headlines have bombarded us with messages about growing and pervasive race and ethnic diversity across the nation's regions and communities. Nationwide statistics bear out that minorities grew at twelve times the rate of whites, and that less than seven in ten Americans consider themselves to be white—"non-Hispanic white alone" in census terminology.\* And continued waves of immigrants and secondary migrants have brought an increased minority presence to all metropolitan areas and most of the nation's counties.

Still, a more hard-headed examination of the torrent of statistics flowing from the recent national headcount makes plain that: the nation's minority groups, especially Hispanics and Asians, are still heavily clustered in selected regions and markets; fast-growing communities in "the New Sunbelt" are being populated largely by whites or whites and blacks; and broad swaths of counties in the heartland and in the suburbs remain predominantly white.

Rather than forming a homogenous, national melting pot, America's racial demographic landscape is becoming more distinctly regional in its makeup. As such, commentators, marketers and political analysts will need to make distinctions between the nation's "multiple melting pots," its more suburban-like New Sunbelt, its predominantly white heartland, and "new ethnic frontiers" that are being created in-between. The sections below provide a roadmap to what the 2000 census data have in store.

## **Immigrant Minorities "Pile-On"**

The 1990s brought a continued immigration of Hispanic and Asian groups. And while there has been some dispersal, the greater tendency was a continued "piling on" in established ports of entry. As can be seen from the list of greatest Hispanic gainers (Table 1), metro Los Angeles and New York – areas with the largest Hispanic populations – also dominate in 1990s Hispanic gains. The eight metros with the largest Hispanic gains accounted for 46 percent of all Hispanic gains in the US over the decade, and house 51 percent of the Hispanic population. These gains accrue not only from immigration and domestic migration, but also from the natural increase of Hispanics, and their relatively young age-structure.

New to this list of large Hispanic gains is Phoenix, which more than doubled its Hispanic population over the 1990s- from direct immigration and from California spillover. Las Vegas and Atlanta are also relative newcomers, which more than doubled and tripled, respectively, their Hispanic populations. Still, Hispanic gains are relatively concentrated in the 1990s. Just 30 of the nation's 276 metros accounted for 70 percent of all Hispanic growth. Of course the specific Hispanic groups differ across metropolitan areas (e.g., Cubans in Miami; Mexicans in Chicago, Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Caribbean –origin Hispanics in New York City, etc).

Among Asians, the concentrated "piling on" of gains in areas with large existing Asian populations is even more apparent than with Hispanics (see Table 1). The three Asian population juggernauts—New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco—accounted for 37 percent of all 1990s Asian gains in the US. The top six areas accounted for almost half. Metros with fast-growing but smaller Asian populations include Dallas, which doubled its Asian population, and Atlanta, which tripled it. Their fast growing, high tech economies are responsible for much of this growth.

These concentrated gains for Hispanics and Asians reflect “chain migration” associated with the family reunification provisions of our immigration law, and the need for interaction with co-nationals from countries of similar backgrounds, languages and cultures that live in communities where they will receive both social and economic support.

### **Black and White Gainers**

As with Hispanics and Asians, the biggest gaining metros for blacks are those with large existing black populations. Dominating the list (Table 2) are southern metros, which are attracting African-Americans back to this fast-growing region, and northern metros that served as premier destinations for southern-born blacks in an earlier era. The gains for the latter group, including New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit, accrue primarily from natural increase of their large black populations, rather than from in-migration. It is the southern gainers that reflect the new wave of black migration, especially to the southeastern US. Atlanta leads all metro in black gains. Rising on the list are other southern newcomers like Orlando, Norfolk, and Charlotte, not to mention many other Dixie metros of all sizes that are increasingly attractive to Blacks.

The pull of the South for Blacks, as for whites, is the booming economy and warmer climate. The region has become especially attractive for Blacks because of its much-improved racial climate, familiar southern mores and, for professional blacks, the benefits of a large and growing black middle class population. In the next decade, the region is likely to attract large numbers of still another group: northern African American baby boomers, who will be heading south to retire.

White gains in the 1990s were far less concentrated than for Hispanics, Asians or Blacks. The list of largest white gainers (Table 2) points up sharply different regional attractions, as well. Whites tend to be attracted to non-coastal metros in fast-growing states of the South and West. Phoenix, Las Vegas, Atlanta and Denver lead the list, but gains are spread more evenly to a growing number of metros in these same regions.

These metro areas have a “suburban-like” quality and are, in fact, attracting whites from the congested, older suburbs of the Northeast and West Coast (See Table 3). They are attracted to the less costly, slower paced lifestyle that is available in the fast-growing economies of these regions. Unlike the racial minorities, whites are more “footloose” and less constrained economically and socially, to different parts of the country. Their migration patterns are dictated more exclusively by the pushes and pulls of employment opportunities, and quality of life amenities than by kinship ties.

### **The New Sunbelt**

The list of metros that are attracting large numbers of whites or whites and blacks encompass “the New Sunbelt.” These are expanding communities in the nation’s South and West that lie outside the heavily urbanized and congested parts of these regions. Although several of these areas are attracting new immigrant minorities, the dominant source of their growth is from the domestic migration of mostly whites and blacks, who are attracted by the lower costs, warm climates, and amenities of these areas.

Table 4 shows seven of these areas in the South including Atlanta, three North Carolina metros (Raleigh-Durham, Charlotte, Greensboro), Nashville, West Palm Beach, and Jacksonville. Four large metros in the west are Denver, Portland, Seattle and Salt Lake City. Beyond these there is a growing list of smaller New Sunbelt metros that are attracting younger families and workers as well as retirees to the interior West and South.



## **Multiple Melting Pots**

In contrast to the New Sunbelt growth centers, are a handful of metros whose racially diverse demographic profiles qualify them as true “Melting Pots”. These are areas that represent dominant primary or secondary destinations for two or more immigrant or minority groups. Though inter-marriage and the blending of cultures, each of these Melting Pot metros will develop its own politics, tastes for consumer items and demographic personalities.

Identified on Table 5 are 23 Melting Pot Metros based on their race-ethnic profiles in the 2000 Census. To qualify, a metro area’s white share of the population is less than the national white share (69.1%), and at least two of its minority groups have a greater share of the metro’s population than their national share for Hispanics (12.5%) or Blacks (12.6%), or at least 5% for Asians or American Indians.

The list includes the country’s largest immigrant gateway metros, Los Angeles, New York, Miami, Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Washington DC, as well as smaller metros located in California, Texas and New Mexico. Also on the list is Lawton, OK, which has an overrepresentation of American Indians as well as Blacks.

Two noteworthy new additions to “melting pot” status are Las Vegas, and Orlando. Both of these metros have experienced significant gains in their Hispanic populations as well as for Asians (in Las Vegas) and Blacks (in Orlando). Despite large white gains to both areas, the white shares of their populations have declined dramatically (by 14 percent and 13 percent, respectively) over the 1990s.

Some of these metros had “majority minority” populations where the white percentage is less than half of their total populations. The 2000 Census indicates that 22 of the nation’s 276 metros have majority minorities, and that 12 of these graduated to this status since 1990. (See Table 6). The largest among this group is the Houston metro areas which increased its Hispanic population by more than half a million, over the decade, and its Asian and Black populations by over 100,000 each. Smaller metro areas in California and New Mexico achieved this status as a result of their recent Hispanic gains. Three metro areas in the South, Albany GA, Sumpter, SC, and Pine Bluff, AR, became minority white due to gains in the African American populations.

## **The White Heartland**

With the backdrop of recent minority gains in the nation’s Melting Pot metros, and white-black gains in the New Sunbelt growth centers, there is a broad swath of the country where the minority presence is quite limited. This is illustrated in Map 1, which identifies counties where one or more minorities are represented at a greater percentage than they are nationally for Hispanics (12.5%) and Blacks (12.6%) or at least 5 percent for Asians and American Indians. Counties classed as “multiethnic” are over-represented for two or more of the groups.

The map makes clear that the Americas race ethnic patterns have taken on distinctly regional dimensions. Hispanics dominate large shares of county population in a span of States stretching from California to Texas. Blacks are strongly represented in counties of the South as well as selected areas of urban concentration in the Northeast and Midwest. The Asian presence is relatively small, and highly concentrated in a few scattered counties, largely in the West; and American Indians are concentrated in selected pockets in Oklahoma, the southeastern US, upper

Midwest and West. Multiethnic counties are most prominent in California and the southwestern US, with mixes of Asians and Hispanics, or Hispanics and American Indians.

The most notable aspect of this map is “the White Heartland”—a broad swath of counties stretching from the upper West and Rocky Mountains to the Midwest and Northeast that are mostly white, and where none of the minority groups comes close to approximating their national percentage of the population. Of the 3141 counties in the US, over three quarters (2419) of them have white shares greater than the nation as a whole, and well over half of all counties (1822) are at least 85% white.

In contrast, only 381 counties have a greater than national representation of Hispanics, as were 117 counties for Asians, and 697 counties for Blacks. It can certainly be argued that there has been a greater diffusion of minorities, especially Hispanics, across the counties. The vast majority of US counties (2990) have shown some increase in their Hispanic populations during the 1990s, and in about a quarter of all counties, that increase exceeded 1000 over the decade. Yet, the overall gains of Hispanics is still heavily concentrated and relegated to the core counties of large immigrant metro areas, and in the West and southwestern US. Just 100 of these counties accounted for more than 70 percent of all the nation’s Hispanic gains during the decade. The diffusion of Hispanics outward from these core areas, in term of total numbers, is far less rapid than recent post-census press accounts imply. The continual “piling on “ of Hispanics and Asians along with the resurgence of black and white migration to the South, white migration to the Rocky Mountains, and an aging non-migration of heartland whites, all serve to reinforce the distinct regional divisions.

### **New Minority Frontiers**

Still, there is some directed diffusion of Hispanics and Asians outward from the classic immigrant port of entry metros. With rising employment opportunities in parts of the New Sunbelt, and Midwest, new immigrant minorities with both high and low skill levels have made pioneering moves to these areas, establishing new minority frontiers. At the forefront of these frontiers for Hispanics and Asians, respectively, are metros that now house at least a minimum of 50,000 members of the group, and have more than doubled that group’s population over the 1990s.

Hispanics have begun to make inroads to large and medium-sized metros in the southeast and interior West—areas where growth is dominated largely by domestic migration, whites and blacks. Atlanta, along with Charlotte, Raleigh-Durham and Greensboro in North Carolina and Orlando and West Palm Beach in Florida are South metros with high rates of Hispanic gain. In the West, new Hispanic frontiers include Phoenix, Las Vegas, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle. Several Midwest areas including Minneapolis-St Paul and Kansas City are also on the list. Of course, the Hispanic shares of total populations in most of these metros are quite small (Phoenix and Las Vegas are exceptions).

New frontier metros for Asians list many of the same areas (See Table 7), including Las Vegas and Atlanta—metros with the highest rates of Asian growth. Additional areas for Asians include the high-tech, university town of Austin, along with Tampa, Miami and Detroit. Again the fast growth and an accumulation of sizeable Asian populations in these frontier metros do not translate a substantial Asian shares of the total population. They do portend a continued growth of Asians in these areas in the future.

## Debunking the Diversity Myth

The recent census trends make apparent that the US is not close to becoming a single melting pot, where each minority group both spreads and blends evenly from coast to coast. In fact, only a handful of the nation's large and small metros can be considered true melting pots, based on the recent census profiles. And it is not likely that any one of these multiple melting pot areas will resemble any one of the others, given the very different mixes of race-ethnic and national backgrounds which uniquely define each. Undoubtedly, the coming decade will see some additional "spilling-out" of the new immigrant minorities' second and third generations as their children enter the middle class and a national labor market. But the preceding review of 1990s spatial shifts makes plain that the pace of this further spilling out will be slow. In the meantime, as blacks return to the South, as melting pot regions become infused with more immigrants, as the New Sunbelt attracts more coastal suburbanites, and as the non-growing northern heartland remains mostly white, America's regions are evolving in decidedly different directions. It is important for commentators, political analysts, and those that monitor consumer behavior to take cognizance of these sharp regional divisions, rather than maintaining the illusion of a national melting pot.

## REFERENCES

- Frey, William H. and Ross C. DeVol. 1998: "America's Demography in the New Century: Aging Baby Boomers and New Immigrants as Major Players" *Policy Brief No.9*. Santa Monica, CA: Milken Institute.
- Frey, William H. 2001. "Melting Pot Suburbs: A Census 2000 Study of Suburban Diversity," *Census 2000 Series, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Studies*, Washington DC. The Brookings Institution
- Frey, William H. 2001. "Census 2000 Shows Large Black Return to the South, Reinforcing the Region's "White-Black" Demographic Profile" PSC Research Report 01-473. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Population Studies Center

\*This paper treats racial groups, Whites, Blacks, Asians (including Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders) and American Indians (including Native Alaskans) as Non-Hispanic members of those races, and treats all Hispanics as a separate single category. Further, because the 2000 Census permits respondents to select one or more races, the 2000 data presented here treats whites as those who selected the white race alone, and treats Blacks, Asians and American Indians as those who selected one or more race. As a consequence, a small number of persons in the latter three groups are included more than once in the 2000 tallies. See the website, [www.frey-demographer.org](http://www.frey-demographer.org) to obtain data for all metropolitan areas and states according to these definitions.

**Table 1: Top Population Gains by Metro Area: 1990-2000, Hispanics and Asians**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Metropolitan Area*</b>	<b>1990-2000 Gains</b>	<b>2000 Population</b>
<b>Hispanics</b>			
1	Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	1,819,370	6,598,488
2	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NY-CT-PA	992,185	3,849,990
3	Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	600,810	1,498,507
4	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	594,836	1,120,350
5	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	575,098	1,348,588
6	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	501,543	1,563,389
7	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	437,452	817,012
8	San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	413,258	1,383,661
9	San Diego, CA MSA	240,184	750,965
10	Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	232,978	322,038
11	Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	225,638	484,902
12	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	222,925	476,627
13	Atlanta, GA MSA	210,636	268,851
<b>Asians</b>			
1	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA	710,809	1,576,646
2	Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	611,201	1,886,168
3	San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	554,326	1,446,563
4	Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	212,350	454,702
5	Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	183,134	358,255
6	Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	179,537	428,819
7	Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA--NH-ME-CT CMSA	126,384	263,092
8	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	125,385	219,891
9	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	122,882	249,819
10	San Diego, CA MSA	114,786	299,930
11	Honolulu, HI MSA	110,947	610,988
12	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	109,135	224,865
13	Atlanta, GA MSA	101,822	152,702

**\*Note:** Metropolitan Areas refers to CMSAs, MSAs, and (In New England) NE CMAs, defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Table 2: Top Population Gains by Metro Area: 1990-2000, Blacks and Whites**

Rank	Metropolitan Area*	1990-2000 Gains	2000 Population
<b>Blacks</b>			
1	Atlanta, GA MSA	459,582	1,202,260
2	New York-Northern new Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA	450,725	3,575,558
3	Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	358,727	2,035,171
4	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	241,492	797,783
5	Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	181,101	1,725,069
6	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	176,293	731,791
7	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	162,932	1,225,972
8	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	142,304	794,543
9	Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	123,869	1,281,491
10	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, MI CMSA	120,320	1,175,557
11	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	91,673	180,006
12	Orlando, FL MSA	89,031	232,243
13	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC MSA	89,017	493,863
14	Memphis, TN-AR-MS MSA	85,787	494,641
15	Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA	80,794	320,153
16	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC MSA	80,082	310,821
<b>Whites</b>			
1	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	434,195	2,140,171
2	Atlanta, GA MSA	359,299	2,460,740
3	Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	326,145	986,463
4	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO MSA	278,445	1,854,428
5	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	255,208	3,096,104
6	Portland-Salem, OR-WA CMSA	230,535	1,835,959
7	Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	199,172	2,737,902
8	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	191,127	2,514,494
9	Austin-San Marcos, TX MSA	187,426	758,302
10	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC MSA	171,168	793,714
11	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC MSA	162,258	1,067,594
12	Nashville, TN MSA	146,615	960,118
13	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA	137,020	1,104,467
14	Indianapolis, IN MSA	125,841	1,299,311
15	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	115,082	798,484
16	Orlando, FL MSA	113,794	1,070,460
17	Boise City, ID MSA	103,407	374,997
18	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	102,678	1,821,955

\*Note: Metropolitan Areas refers to CMSAs, MSAs, and (In New England) NE CMAs, defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

Source: William H. Frey analysis of 1990 and 2000 US Censuses.

**Table 3: Metro Areas with Greatest White Losses: 1990-2000**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Metropolitan Area*</b>	<b>1990-2000 Losses</b>
1	Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	-843,065
2	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA	-679,790
3	San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	-269,844
4	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	-119,359
5	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	-118,506
6	Chicago-Gary--Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	-93,794
7	San Diego, CA MSA	-84,448
8	Pittsburgh, PA MSA	-81,900
9	Honolulu, HI MSA	-73,983
10	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY MSA	-60,751
11	Hartford, CT NECMA	-48,150
12	Milwaukee-Racine, WI CMSA	-40,352

**\*Note:** Metropolitan Areas refers to CMSAs, MSAs, and (In New England) NE CMAs, defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Source:** William H. Frey analysis of 1990 and 2000 US Censuses.

**Table 4: Large, Growing, Mostly White & White-Black Metros in the "New Sunbelt"**

(Metros with populations exceeding one million)

Name	% Change 1990-2000	2000 Population (millions)	Percent of 2000 Population by Race					
			Whites	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	Indian/ Eskimos	
<b>South "New Sunbelt" Metros</b>								
Atlanta, GA MSA	38.9	4.11	59.8	29.2	6.5	3.7	0.5	
38.9	38.9	1.19	66.8	23.0	6.1	3.3	0.7	
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	31.0	1.13	70.6	14.5	12.4	1.9	0.3	
Charlotte-Gastonia-RockHill, NC-SC MSA	29.0	1.5	71.2	20.7	5.1	2.2	0.7	
Nashville, TN MSA	25.0	1.23	78.0	15.9	3.3	2.0	0.6	
Jacksonville, FL MSA	21.4	1.10	70.4	21.9	3.8	2.9	0.7	
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC	19.2	1.25	72.3	20.4	5.0	1.6	0.7	
<b>West "New Sunbelt" Metros</b>								
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	30.4	2.58	71.8	5.0	18.5	3.5	1.1	
Portland-Salem, OR-WA CMSA	26.3	2.27	81.0	2.9	8.7	5.4	1.7	
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA	24.4	1.33	82.8	1.3	10.8	3.8	1.0	
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	19.7	3.55	77.0	5.5	5.2	10.1	2.1	

**Table 5: “Multiple Melting Pot” Metros**

Name	Percent of 2000 Population by Race					Metro Population (1000s)
	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	Indians/ Eskimos	
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	36.3	20.6	40.3	2.2	0.3	3,876
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA	39.0	7.8	40.3	11.5	0.8	16,374
Salinas, CA MSA	40.3	4.0	46.8	7.6	1.0	402
Fresno, CA MSA	40.6	5.3	44.0	8.0	1.6	923
Merced, CA MSA	40.6	4.0	45.3	7.9	1.2	211
Stockton-Lodi, CA MSA	47.4	7.0	30.5	13.1	1.5	564
Albuquerque, NM MSA	47.7	2.6	41.6	2.1	5.6	713
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	48.0	17.0	28.9	5.3	0.5	4,670
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	50.6	7.8	19.7	20.5	1.0	7,039
San Diego, CA MSA	55.0	6.2	26.7	10.7	1.1	2,814
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-	56.2	16.9	18.2	7.5	0.5	21,104
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA MSA	56.9	2.5	34.2	5.1	1.1	399
Modesto, CA MSA	57.3	2.8	31.7	5.6	1.7	447
Killeen-Temple, TX MSA	58.0	21.4	15.7	3.7	1.2	313
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	59.3	14.0	21.5	4.2	0.8	5,222
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	59.4	18.8	16.4	4.7	0.4	9,158
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	60.1	26.8	6.4	6.0	0.7	7,608
Lawton, OK MSA	62.0	20.0	8.4	3.5	6.4	115
Yuba City, CA MSA	62.4	2.8	20.1	11.2	3.3	139
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	63.1	8.5	20.6	6.2	1.3	1,563
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA	63.7	7.8	15.5	10.9	1.8	1,797
Waco, TX MSA	64.6	15.4	17.9	1.3	0.7	214
Orlando, FL MSA	65.1	14.1	16.5	3.3	0.6	1,645

**Note:** Metro areas where the Non-Hispanic White percentage of total population is less than the Non-Hispanic White US percentage (69.1%), and where at least two of the minority groups comprise a percentage larger than their US percentage (N-H Blacks > 12.6%, Hispanics > 12.5%) or at least 5% (for Asians, and American Indians/Eskimos).



**Table 6: Metro Areas That Turned From Majority White To “Majority Minority,” 1990-2000**

Metro Area	2000 Metro Population (1000's)	Percent White		Percent of 2000 Population			
		1990	2000	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian/ Eskimo
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	4,669,571	58.0	48.0	17.0	28.9	5.3	0.5
Fresno, CA MSA	922,516	51.8	40.6	5.3	44.0	8.0	1.6
Albuquerque, NM MSA	712,738	54.5	47.7	2.6	41.6	2.1	5.6
Bakersfield, CA MSA	661,645	62.7	49.5	6.1	38.4	3.9	1.7
Stockton-Lodi, CA MSA	563,598	58.8	47.4	7.0	30.5	13.1	1.5
Salinas, CA MSA	401,762	52.3	40.3	4.0	46.8	7.6	1.0
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA MSA	368,201	54.6	41.8	1.6	50.8	3.7	1.5
Merced, CA MSA	210,554	54.2	40.6	4.0	45.3	7.9	1.2
Yuma, AZ MSA	160,026	54.4	44.3	2.2	50.5	1.2	1.5
Albany, GA MSA	120,822	52.9	46.3	51.1	1.3	0.8	0.5
Sumter, SC MSA	104,646	54.7	49.4	46.9	1.8	1.3	0.6
Pine Bluff, AR MSA	84,278	55.8	48.0	49.7	1.0	0.8	0.5

**Source:** William H. Frey analysis of 1990 and 2000 US Census.

**Table 7: Up-and-Coming Hispanic and Asian “Growth Magnets”**

(Metros with at least 50,000 group, and 1990-2000 percent increase over 100%)

	<b>Metro Areas</b>	<b>1990-2000 % Increase</b>	<b>2000 Group Population</b>
<b>Hispanic Growth Magnets</b>			
1	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC MSA	694	62,210
2	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC MSA	622	77,092
3	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC MSA	569	72,580
4	Atlanta, GA MSA	362	268,851
5	Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	262	322,038
6	Portland-Salem, OR-WA CMSA	175	196,638
7	Orlando, FL MSA	170	271,627
8	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	162	99,121
9	Reno, NV MSA	145	56,301
10	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI MSA	136	68,916
11	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA	133	144,600
12	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	115	817,012
13	Oklahoma City, OK MSA	114	72,998
14	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	113	1,120,350
15	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	111	140,675
16	Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	108	184,297
17	Kansas City, MO-KS MSA	105	92,910
18	Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI NECMA	11	88,411
<b>Asian Growth Magnets</b>			
1	Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	286	96,942
2	Atlanta, GA MSA	200	152,702
3	Austin-San Marcos, TX MSA	175	50,221
4	Orlando, FL MSA	171	54,314
5	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	149	55,174
6	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	149	85,577
7	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	133	219,891
8	Portland-Salem, OR-WA CMSA	119	121,984
9	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	118	139,671
10	Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	115	89,750
11	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	113	86,106
12	Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, MI CMSA	111	150,098
13	Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	105	358,255
14	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA	103	50,467

**Source:** William H. Frey analysis of 1990 and 2000 US Census

# Map 1

## America's Patchwork Quilt

