SMART GROWTH, IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

U.S. Decadal Growth Rates for Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1980-2010

- API: 50.3% (1980-1990), 42.7% (1990-2000), 53.1% (2000-2010)
- Latino: 57.9% (1980-1990), 43.0% (1990-2000)
U.S. Share of Decadal Population Growth by Race/Ethnicity

U.S. Change in Youth (<18) Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2000-2010
U.S. Changing American Demographics, 1970-2050

LEADING THE NATIONAL TREND

California's Changing Demographics, 1980-2000

Note: Data from the U.S. Census Bureau. Projections for 2020 through 2050, which were generated before the 2010 Census, were adjusted based on the results of the 2010 Census.

Source: California Department of Finance.
IMMIGRATION AS A FACTOR

Immigrants as a Share of the Population, California and the Rest of the U.S., 1960-2007

A Leveling Off: Immigrant Share of Total Population California, Los Angeles, and the U.S.
CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES

U.S.-Born and Immigrant Populations in Los Angeles

Immigrants

U.S.-Born

Population (thousands)

AND LEADING FORWARD

California’s Changing Demographics
Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity

- Other or Mixed Race
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Latino
- African American
- Non-Hispanic White

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2000 and 2010); California Department of Finance (2020-2050).
CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES

California: Among the Most Long-Term of Immigrant Populations
% of immigrants who arrived > 10 years ago, 2009

Percent Immigrant by Share Long-Term
U.S. States, 2009
ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL: Ancestry & Migration

Ancestry of Long-Term Immigrants (30+ Years)
Los Angeles County, 2007-2009

- Mexican: 40%
- Other Latino: 10%
- Western European: 9%
- Chinese: 5%
- Filipino: 5%
- Salvadoran: 4%
- Korean: 4%
- Eastern European: 3%
- Armenian: 3%
- Other: 17%

* Other includes any group accounting for <2% of immigrants

ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL: Ancestry & Migration

Ancestry of Recent Immigrants (<10 Years)
Los Angeles County, 2007-2009

- Mexican: 32%
- Other Latino: 9%
- Filipino: 8%
- Chinese: 7%
- Guatemalan: 6%
- Salvadoran: 6%
- Korean: 5%
- Armenian: 4%
- Western European: 3%
- Asian Indian: 2%
- Other Asian: 2%
- Other: 16%

* Other includes any group accounting for <2% of immigrants
ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL: Becoming More Suburban
Composition of Latino Population by State, 1990

- California: 34%
- Texas: 20%
- New York: 10%
- Florida: 7%
- Illinois: 4%
- New Jersey: 3%
- New Mexico: 3%
- Arizona: 3%
- Colorado: 2%
- Remainder of U.S.: 14%

Composition of Latino Population by State, 2010

- California: 28%
- Texas: 19%
- New York: 10%
- Florida: 8%
- Illinois: 4%
- New Mexico: 4%
- Arizona: 2%
- Colorado: 2%
- New Jersey: 3%
- Remainder of U.S.: 23%
Percent Latino by State, 2010

Los Angeles County Share U.S. Latino Population, 1980-2010
Portraits of America: The Changing Suburbs

2040 Percent People of Color by County

- Less than 40% People of Color
- "Tipping Point" Counties: 40% to 50% People of Color
- Greater than 50% People of Color

Sources: Wealth & Income Economics projections data (updated using the 2010 Census) Census TIGER Line, SAE, and ESRI

Copyright © 2011 PolicyLink and PERC
South Los Angeles with 2000 U.S. Census Tract Boundaries

Total Population:
1990: 802,371
2000: 825,408
2005-09: 858,773
7% increase from 1990 to 2005-09

South Central Los Angeles High School Demography, 1981-82 School Year

- Crenshaw: 99% Other, 1% Latino
- Dorsey: 91% Other, 9% Latino
- Fremont: 93% Other, 7% Latino
- Jefferson: 57% Other, 42% Latino
- Jordan: 90% Other, 10% Latino
- Locke: 98% Other, 2% Latino
- Manual Arts: 68% Other, 31% Latino, 1% African American
- Washington Prep: 91% Other, 9% Latino

Other: Other race; Latino: Latino ethnicity; African American: African American ethnicity
South Central Los Angeles High School Demography, 2008-09 School Year

- Crenshaw: 30% Other, 68% Latino, 2% African American, 1% Other
- Dorsey: 42% Other, 57% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Fremont: 9% Other, 90% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Jefferson: 90% Other, 9% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Jordan: 77% Other, 22% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Locke: 67% Other, 31% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Manual Arts: 81% Other, 18% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other
- Washington Prep: 52% Other, 47% Latino, 1% African American, 1% Other

U.S. Change in Racial Identification of Latinos, 1980-2010

- 1980: 3% API, 58% Black, 3% Other, 2% White
- 1990: 3% API, 52% Black, 4% Other, 4% White
- 2000: 2% API, 48% Black, 5% Other, 5% White
- 2010: 2% API, 53% Black, 4% Other, 4% White
Median Age by Race/Ethnicity
U.S., 2010

Age by Race/Ethnicity/Nativity
1980
Age by Race/Ethnicity/Nativity
2005-2009

Growing Generation Gap in the U.S.
1975-2010
THE GAP MATTERS

Demographics and State Capital Spending Adjusted for Income

Per capita state spending capital outlays adjusted for per capita income (100 = average of U.S. states)

THE GAP MATTERS

Income Adjusted Per Pupil Spending on Public Schools & the Generation Gap by State 2007-2008

THE CHALLENGE OF INEQUALITY

![Graph showing income distribution in the U.S., 1917-2007](image)

Source: Emmanuel Saez, "Staking a Claim: The Evolution of Top Incomes in the United States (Update: August 5, 2009)."
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

America’s Tomorrow:
Equity is the Superior Growth Model

WHAT’S THE EVIDENCE?

- Utilizing weighted regression approach to 341 metro areas in the U.S. 1990-2000

  Per capita income as a function of:
  (+) regional education
  (-) manufacturing concentration
  (+) central city presence
  (-) previous income
  (?) region of U.S.

  (-) measure of inequity, including ratio of city to suburb poverty, concentration of poverty, income distribution, black-white segregation
FROM THE FEDERAL RESERVE

- Federal Reserve of Cleveland studies almost 120 mid-size regions, looking for factors that predict regional prosperity
  - Usual suspects: skilled workforce, quality of life, industrial decline
  - Unusual suspects: income inequality, racial exclusion, concentration of poverty – and they’re highly significant

IT'S A BROADER STORY

- Underinvestment in each other makes us less competitive as a nation
  - Social tensions over who will gain and who will lose make us less likely to cohere on what we need to do to thrive
WHERE TO BEGIN

- Metros offer new scale for doing well and doing good, fusing competitiveness and inclusion

- Configuration of metropolitan space and opportunity has become center – from racial justice to spatial justice

- Metros offer new opportunities to bridge difference face-to-face, race-to-race, space-to-space

WHERE TO BEGIN
LOOKING FORWARD: Challenge and Opportunity

Immigrant integration is
• improved economic mobility for,
• enhanced civic participation by,
and
• receiving society openness to
immigrants.

Integration requires an intentional
process that incorporates the assets of
immigrant populations into policies
governing our cities, regions, and states.

INTEGRATION OCCURRING ALREADY

Immigrants advance economically and socially
with more experience in the US already

• Longer time in the US = higher
socio-economic status and
greater English language ability
PROGRESS OVER TIME: Income

Income by Recency of Migration
Los Angeles County, 2007-2009

- Migrated last 10 years
- Migrated 10 to 20 years ago
- Migrated 20 to 30 years ago
- Long-term immigrant
- US born

PROGRESS OVER TIME: Language

Adult English Language Abilities
Los Angeles County, 2007-2009

- Yes, speaks only English
- Yes, speaks very well
- Yes, speaks well
- Yes, but not well
- Does not speak English
**HOMEOWNERSHIP**

### Percent homeownership by group, 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrated last 10 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 10 to 20 years ago</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 20 to 30 years ago</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term immigrant</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US born</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent homeownership by immigration and race, 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Migrated last 10 years</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 10 to 20 years ago</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 20 to 30 years ago</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term immigrant</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US born</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Migrated last 10 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 10 to 20 years ago</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated 20 to 30 years ago</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term immigrant</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PERE analysis of 2007-2009 ACS data

---

**NEW SUPPORT? IMMIGRANTS & SMART GROWTH**

### Use of Public Transit, Carpooling, Biking, or Walking

- Migrated last ten years
- Migrated ten to twenty years ago
- Migrated twenty to thirty years ago
- Long-term immigrant
- Non-immigrant

Source: PERE analysis of 2006 ACS data
NEW SUPPORT? THE GEOGRAPHY OF HOUSING

The Geography of Young Professionals

- Scarred by the Recession: Gen-Xers bore the brunt of the foreclosure crisis and don’t see homes as a safe investment
- See value in living closer to work: Permits for single-family homes are on the decline (20% of peak), permits for multi-family are on the rise (40% of peak)

Source: Houston Tomorrow

NEW SUPPORT? THE GEOGRAPHY OF HOUSING

Re-concentration of living in the recovery

- In California, Coastal (read urban) markets have hit bottom, inland (read exurban) markets have not yet turned.
- “We haven’t overbuilt, we’ve just built in the wrong place . . . The incremental demand for housing is moving more into multifamily housing”
  – J. Nickelsburg, UCLA Annenberg Forecast
LEADING THROUGH THE DIVIDE

- Understanding that equity and inclusion are no longer luxuries but imperatives for economic and social sustainability

- Understanding the need for policy packages, unexpected alliances, and new collaborations

- Reimagining “Smart Growth” and determining new models of participation, capacity building and coalitions