The Shifting Geography of Poverty and Opportunity in Metropolitan America
Overview

I. WHERE do the metropolitan poor live today?

II. WHO are the metropolitan poor?

III. WHY does this shifting geography matter for public policy?

IV. HOW has the Great Recession affected these trends?

V. WHAT strategies effectively engage this new geography of poverty?
Much of our research, and the data presented today, come from analysis of the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas.

100 largest U.S. metropolitan areas, 2009

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Metropolitan areas are statistical representations of “commuter sheds” and, by extension, labor markets.

Commuting patterns in the Chicago metropolitan area, 2000

Source: Brookings analysis of Census 2000 data
Nationally, 83% of the country lives in a metro area, and two-thirds lives in the top 100 metros alone.

In Michigan:

- 84% of the population lives in a metro area.
- 52% of the population lives in the metro areas of Grand Rapids or Detroit.

Source: 2009 ACS
The poverty rate in metropolitan areas is lower than elsewhere, but the gap has narrowed over time.

In 2009, the official poverty threshold was:

- $14,787 for one parent with one child
- $17,285 for one parent with two children
- $21,834 for two parents with two children

Sources:
- U.S. Census Bureau
- U.S. Census Bureau

Values for 1984 and 2004 are estimated due to changes in metropolitan definitions during those years.
Meanwhile, the ranks of metropolitan poor have more than doubled, while non-metropolitan poor have declined.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Values for 1984 and 2004 are estimated due to changes in metropolitan definitions during those years.
Within large metro areas, the number of poor people in suburbs has now surpassed the number in cities.

Poor residents, primary cities versus suburbs, 100 largest metro areas*: 1990, 2000, and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and ACS data

*Represent 95 of the largest 100 metropolitan areas for which data are available. Primary cities include first city in metro area title plus other named cities with populations of at least 100,000. Suburbs include residual metropolitan territory.
Michigan’s large metros also saw double the rate of growth among the suburban poor population compared to cities.

Growth rate in poor residents, primary cities versus suburbs, select large metro areas: 2000 and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and ACS data
Suburbanization of the poor has occurred in every region

Share of poor in suburbs, 100 largest metro areas*, by region: 1990, 2000, and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and ACS data

*Represent 95 of the largest 100 metropolitan areas for which data are available.
And within Michigan’s large metro areas as well

Share of poor in suburbs, selected metro areas: 1990, 2000, and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and ACS data
And the poor are growing fastest not in older, “inner suburbs,” but in maturing and rapidly developing suburban communities.

Poor residents by suburb type, 100 largest metro areas, 2000 to 2005-07

Source: Brookings analysis of decennial census and ACS data
In the Detroit-Warren region, regardless of community type, every county outside of Wayne saw its poor population increase by more than 50 percent over the decade.
West Michigan also saw growth rates in the poor population well above average

% change in poor population by county, West Michigan, 2000 to 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of Census 2000 and ACS data
Though urban poverty rates remain higher overall than in the suburbs, the gap has narrowed slightly over this decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Cities</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represent 95 of the largest 100 metropolitan areas for which data are available. All change estimates are significant at the 90 percent level.
However, this has not been the case in Michigan’s largest metro areas

Poverty rate, primary cities versus suburbs, selected Michigan metro areas, 2000 and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of Census 2000 and 2009 ACS data

*All estimate of change are significant at the 90 percent confidence level.*
Poverty rates still vary widely across West Michigan counties

Poverty rate by county, West Michigan, 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of ACS data
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Demographically, the suburban poor are more likely to be white, and from married couple families.

### Characteristics of city versus suburban poor, 100 largest metro areas, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of poor</th>
<th>Primary cities</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall*</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born*</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white*</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple families*</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed families*</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 18</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference significant at 90% confidence interval

Source: Brookings analysis of 2008 ACS data
Nearly equal shares of city and suburban poor live in extreme poverty, have low education levels, work full-time, or have a disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of city versus suburban poor, 100 largest metro areas, 2008</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of poor</td>
<td>Primary cities</td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall*</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income below 50% poverty*</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With H.S. diploma or less*</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have FT, year-round worker</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have PT/part-year worker*</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working-age disabled</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference significant at 95% confidence interval

Source: Brookings analysis 2008 ACS data
Significant disparities persist in the prevalence and profile of city v. suburban poverty within some metro areas, like Detroit…

Characteristics of city versus suburban poor, Detroit-Warren metro area, 2008

Source: Brookings analysis of 2008 ACS data
Characteristics of city versus suburban poor, Grand Rapids metro area, 2008

Source: Brookings analysis of 2008 ACS data

Though less so in Grand Rapids
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Poverty—and strategies to alleviate it—are bound up more than ever with the labor market, and the labor market is metro location relative to residence, workers in 100 largest metro areas, 2008

Source: Brookings analysis of ACS data
Like most major metro areas, Detroit and Grand Rapids have seen jobs decentralize, but under very different circumstances.

### Detroit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ring</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 3 miles of downtown</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 10 miles from downtown</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 35 miles from downtown</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Rapids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ring</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 3 miles of downtown</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 10 miles from downtown</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 35 miles from downtown</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Brookings analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data.
In general the suburban poor are less likely to live in a jobs rich neighborhood compared to higher-income suburbanites, and transit options in the suburbs tend to be limited.

Source: Brookings analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data
The social services infrastructure in diversifying suburbs is generally weaker than that in central cities.

Mean number of social service providers within 1.5 miles in neighborhoods with rising poverty rates, selected cities and suburbs, 2003

Source: Allard (2004)
Among poor households, suburban residents access food stamps at significantly lower rates than city residents.

Share of below-poverty households receiving food stamps, by location, 2008

Source: Brookings analysis of ACS data
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California and Florida dominated the lists of metro areas experiencing the largest increases between 2007 and 2009 due to the effects of the housing crisis.
Unemployment data suggest that cities and suburbs are feeling the effects of this recession in roughly equal measure.

Unemployment rate, cities and suburbs, 100 largest metro areas, 12 and 24 months following the start of the 1990, 2001, and 2007 recessions.

Source: Brookings analysis of BLS data

*Data for Indianapolis are not available prior to 1995. Hawaii is excluded from each year because BLS does not report city data separate from the county.
Growth rates among the city and suburban poor populations during the Great Recession show a similar story

Change in poor population, cities and suburbs, 2007, 2008, and 2009

Source: Brookings analysis of ACS data
During the recession, Ottawa was the only West Michigan county to see its poverty rate increase significantly, but all WM counties continue to struggle with high unemployment.

Annual average unemployment rate by select county, July 2010

Source: Brookings analysis of LAUS data
Suburban social services providers are being stretched, demand-wise and revenue-wise, in current environment

Suburban safety nets are stretched thin
- Nearly two-thirds run programs in more than one municipality, and one-third in more than one county

Demand is up considerably during the recession
- On average providers saw demand increase 30%, with one-fifth seeing increases of 50% or more
- Three-quarters of nonprofits are seeing more clients with no previous connection to the safety net, and the types of demands are changing too

Revenues are down
- 47% report decrease in key revenue source

Tougher times ahead
- 66% expect cuts in government funding
- 47% expect philanthropic dollars to fall

Findings from Scott Allard’s interviews with suburban service providers in Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.
What are some coping strategies service providers have reported using to face these challenges? Allard found a range of responses…

Cutting back
- 28% cut staff, 22% reduced services, 13% cut caseloads

Making resources stretch
- Collaboration has helped some providers improve quality and efficiency. Others have turned to call centers, tried co-locating services, or fostered partnerships with local (e.g. community colleges) and non-local (e.g., Americorps) institutions.

Recruiting more volunteers
- Some are turning to volunteers to handle previously paid positions. Others are recruiting recently unemployed individuals to volunteer their expertise

Seeking new funding
- Some started a new social enterprise or fee-based program. Others have put more time into private fundraising. Many are working to tap into federal stimulus dollars, government contracts, and foundation grants
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We are just beginning to wrestle with what these trends imply for policy, practice, and systems

1. Overcoming geographic/informational barriers to delivering work supports

Can more “bricks and mortar” organizations scale operations metro-wide? Would it enhance sustainability?

Do states like Wisconsin that have streamlined access do a better job reaching the suburban poor?

How can agencies use funding, regulatory authority to ease access to programs for harder-to-reach families?
We are just beginning to wrestle with what these trends imply for policy, practice, and systems.

2. Enhancing human capital at the regional scale of the labor market

Can institutions work together on a metro-wide basis to serve city and suburban clients effectively?

Do explicitly regional strategies like industry partnerships effectively overcome jurisdictional fragmentation?

Where can federal workforce and higher ed programs usefully encourage enhanced regional collaboration?
We are just beginning to wrestle with what these trends imply for policy, practice, and systems

3. Investing strategically in low-income people and communities at the metro scale

What are the opportunities/challenges in making regional philanthropy more “regional?”
We are just beginning to wrestle with what these trends imply for policy, practice, and systems

4. Meeting housing and transportation needs on a metropolitan basis

Can federal policy “join up” housing and transportation in ways that benefit lower-income households?
Questions?

www.brookings.edu/metro ekneebone@brookings.edu