“Clearly, the growth of the Latino population is no longer limited to just a few regions.”

The Hispanic population is growing in most metropolitan areas, but the rate and location of increase varies widely. Four distinct patterns of growth can be discerned. Established Latino metros such as New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Chicago posted the largest absolute increases in Latinos between 1980 and 2000. However, new Latino destinations like Atlanta and Orlando charted the fastest growth rates, despite their historically smaller Hispanic bases. Metros with relatively larger Latino bases, such as Houston, Phoenix and San Diego, meanwhile, became fast-growing Latino hubs during the past 20 years, with population growth averaging 235 percent. Small Latino places, such as Baton Rouge, posted much lower absolute and relative growth than the other locales.

Fifty-four percent of all U.S. Latinos now reside in the suburbs; the Latino suburban population grew 71 percent in the 1990s. In 1990 the central-city and suburban Hispanic populations in the 100 largest metros were nearly identical, but during the next decade suburban growth so outpaced central-city growth that by 2000 the suburban Hispanic population exceeded the central-city population by 18 percent. New Latino destinations saw the fastest growth of Latino suburbanites.

Hispanic men outnumber Hispanic women by 17 percent in new Latino destination metros where the Latino population grew fastest. By contrast, in slower-growing metros with large and well-established Latino communities, more Hispanics live in family households and gender ratios are more balanced.

Findings

An analysis of the U.S. Hispanic population across the 100 largest metropolitan areas finds that:

- The Hispanic population is growing in most metropolitan areas, but the rate and location of increase varies widely. Four distinct patterns of growth can be discerned. Established Latino metros such as New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Chicago posted the largest absolute increases in Latinos between 1980 and 2000. However, new Latino destinations like Atlanta and Orlando charted the fastest growth rates, despite their historically smaller Hispanic bases. Metros with relatively larger Latino bases, such as Houston, Phoenix and San Diego, meanwhile, became fast-growing Latino hubs during the past 20 years, with population growth averaging 235 percent. Small Latino places, such as Baton Rouge, posted much lower absolute and relative growth than the other locales.

- Fifty-four percent of all U.S. Latinos now reside in the suburbs; the Latino suburban population grew 71 percent in the 1990s. In 1990 the central-city and suburban Hispanic populations in the 100 largest metros were nearly identical, but during the next decade suburban growth so outpaced central-city growth that by 2000 the suburban Hispanic population exceeded the central-city population by 18 percent. New Latino destinations saw the fastest growth of Latino suburbanites.

- Hispanic men outnumber Hispanic women by 17 percent in new Latino destination metros where the Latino population grew fastest. By contrast, in slower-growing metros with large and well-established Latino communities, more Hispanics live in family households and gender ratios are more balanced.

I. Introduction

No shortage of analysis has described the fast and widespread growth of the Latino population in America. Numerous early commentators on Census 2000 remarked on the speed of the Latinos’ dispersal across the country, noting that the Hispanics had become the fastest growing U.S. minority group as they increased their numbers 58 percent during the 1990s—from 22.4 million
to 35.3 million during the decade. At the same time, analysts observed that Hispanic Americans had quickly become, at 12.5 percent of the population in 2000, the largest ethnic/race group in the country, barely edging out African Americans at 12.3 percent.

Recent research on metropolitan areas has sharpened the picture somewhat, adding detail to the story of the Hispanics’ rise. An earlier Brookings Institution study showed that growth in the Hispanic population in the 100 largest U.S. cities was swift and substantial in the 1990s, and that one-fifth of those cities’ populations would have declined in the decade were it not for an influx of Latinos (Berube 2001). And another study of the nation’s suburbs identified growing racial and ethnic diversity in suburban areas (Frey 2001). In particular, the suburbs of very diverse metropolitan areas saw substantial growth in their Latino population in the 1990s.

Still, important questions remain about how Latinos redistributed across and within metropolitan areas in the 1980s and 1990s. To be sure, the Hispanic population grew quickly in most of the nation’s metropolitan areas between the 1980 Census and the 2000 count. In 2000, 69 percent of the U.S. population lived in the 100 largest metropolitan areas, whereas the share of the Latino population in the same metros was 78 percent. But even so, the magnitude and distribution of Hispanic population growth in the 100 largest U.S. metropolitan areas varied widely both in absolute numbers and in key characteristics.

For example, the growth of the Hispanic population averaged 145 percent in the largest 100 metros between 1980 and 2000, but that average obscures a huge range of growth rates. The rate was 8 percent for Honolulu, HI; 105 percent for Los Angeles; and 1,180 percent for Raleigh, NC. In addition, more than a quarter of the Latinos in the top 100 metro areas—some 9 million Hispanics—continued to reside in the great magnets of Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Miami in 2000. However, the booming economy of the 1990s coupled with recent industrial restructuring in both urban and rural areas redrew the map of Latino America during the decade (see Kandel and Parrado, 2002 for an analysis of nonmetropolitan Latino growth patterns). In many instances, such developments attracted Latino workers to places where there had been little previous in-migration.

This paper explores several geographic and temporal variations of Hispanic growth. First, we propose a typology that distinguishes among several different metropolitan growth patterns based on Census data covering 1980 to 2000. Then, we supplement this categorization by isolating and identifying two key Latino-growth sub-trends in metropolitan areas during the 1990s—a period when the national Hispanic population more than doubled.

The findings that result show clearly that the Latino population is rapidly evolving and that its demographic impact on the nation is changing quickly. Significant concentrations of Hispanics are no longer confined to a few regions such as Southern California or the Southwest, or only to a few cities like New York and Miami. Instead, in the coming years Hispanic population growth will most impact communities that had relatively few Latinos a decade ago.

In fact, looking back at Hispanic demographic trends over the past twenty years reveals that Latinos have spread out faster than any previous immigrant or internal migration wave, such as that of the African-Americans who migrated out of the deep South in the middle of the century.

The Latino population has, for example, grown in heartland cities beyond the immigrant gateways in much less time than it took for the European immigrants who arrived at the beginning of the 20th century. Similarly, trends evident now could have a significant impact on cities like Atlanta or Washington, D.C. that had a sparse Hispanic presence only a couple of decades ago. What is more, change will occur even in the traditional settlement areas like Los Angeles and New York where growth will likely continue, albeit at a slower rate. There, the Latinos have already begun to become a pervasive presence on the suburban fringes of the big cities.

In short, the report that follows identifies the distinguishing characteristics of several distinct variations on the theme of Latino growth. Clearly, the growth of the Latino population is no longer limited to just a few regions.

II. Methodology

This study revolves around a categorization of Hispanic population growth rates—derived from U.S. Census data—as they were observed across a series of standard geographical locales consisting of the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas as of 2000.

Definition of Hispanic or Latino

The terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” are used interchangeably in this paper and reflect both popular use of the terms and the new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) terminology standards in effect for Census 2000. While most Latinos in the United States share a common linguistic heritage—Spanish—the Hispanic population includes a diversity of birthplace, national origin, legal status, socioeconomic class, and settlement histories. Census 2000 asked separate questions on race and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Persons were asked to identify whether they were of “Spanish/Hispanic/Latino” origin. This question was independent of the race question which asked people to identify whether they were white, black, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian or “some other race,” and persons could mark as many categories as they identified. Therefore, persons of Hispanic or...
Latino origins may be of any race. This analysis includes Latinos who were born abroad as well as those born in the United States.3

**Metropolitan Area Definitions**
This study analyzes change in the Hispanic population during the 1980s and 1990s among the largest 100 metropolitan areas. The metropolitan areas analyzed are those defined by OMB as Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs). The 2000 metropolitan area definition was applied consistently to data from each decade.

**Definitions of Central City and Suburbs**
Central cities are defined in this study, largely in accordance with OMB standards, as the largest city in the metropolitan area in combination with any other city of over 100,000 (in 2000) that is part of the official MSA name.4 The suburbs are the portion of the metropolitan area that is located outside the central city or cities.

**Four Categories of Metropolitan Areas**
Finally, for the purpose of this analysis we have classified the metropolitan areas into four categories according to whether their Hispanic base population exceeded or lagged the 8-percent national average in 1980 and whether their Latino population growth exceeded or lagged the 145-percent average growth between 1980 and 2000 for the 100 metros. Table 1 employs this typology to categorize the nation’s metropolitan areas as distinct types of Latino-growth settings.

At several points the paper also distinguishes areas that saw extraordinarily rapid growth, or “hypergrowth,” defined here as growth more than twice the national average rate for metropolitan areas, or more than 300 percent in the 20-year period.

A final note: We use 1980 to 200 data to construct our typology; however, we use 1980–2000 data to construct our typology, however, the rest of the analysis examines primarily 1990 and 2000 data only.

### III. Findings

A. The Hispanic population is growing in most metropolitan areas, but the rate and location of that growth varies widely. Four distinct patterns of Latino growth can be discerned.

The Latino population grew quickly in the nation’s metropolitan areas between 1980 and 2000, yet not all places grew in the same way. To the contrary: Wide variations in the rate and location of Latino growth are generating highly distinct local experiences in different types of metropolitan areas.

Four types of metropolitan settings for Latino growth can be discerned (see Appendix A for a full list of the 100 metros, grouped by type and rate of population increase).

**ESTABLISHED LATINO METROS (Large Base/Slow Growth): 16 metros**
Sixteen major metros constitute a kind of Hispanic heartland in America. This category of metro contains all the major contemporary immigrant gateways such as New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Chicago as well as a variety of western, southwestern and border metros with large, long-standing Latino communities (see Table 2 for the 10 metros with the largest Hispanic populations in 2000).

Half of the U.S. Latino population across the 100 largest metros lived in these 16 established Latino metropolises in 2000 (see Figure 1 for a distribution of the population across metros). In absolute numbers, these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established Latino Metros</td>
<td>35,161,592</td>
<td>7,180,206</td>
<td>39,098,721</td>
<td>10,286,158</td>
<td>43,957,950</td>
<td>14,119,006</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Latino Destinations</td>
<td>54,800,178</td>
<td>1,309,221</td>
<td>62,620,505</td>
<td>2,333,640</td>
<td>73,078,851</td>
<td>5,282,035</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Growing Latino Hubs</td>
<td>14,418,567</td>
<td>2,033,540</td>
<td>19,395,646</td>
<td>3,801,089</td>
<td>24,485,665</td>
<td>6,818,961</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Latino Places</td>
<td>30,666,478</td>
<td>666,145</td>
<td>30,719,535</td>
<td>811,802</td>
<td>31,946,791</td>
<td>1,203,339</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135,046,815</td>
<td>11,189,112</td>
<td>151,834,407</td>
<td>17,232,689</td>
<td>173,469,257</td>
<td>27,423,341</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major Latino centers started out with by far the largest stock of Hispanics in 1980 (7.2 million Latinos lived in them then), and experienced by far the greatest numerical growth in numbers, as they added 6.9 million Latinos to their populations by 2000. Moreover, just three cities—Los Angeles, New York and Chicago—dominated this growth. Those three metros accounted for more than half of the growth among established Latino metros as they added 3.9 million additional Latinos. Notably, New York’s rate of growth was virtually the same in the 1980s and 1990s, Chicago had greater growth in the 1990s than the 1980s, while Los Angeles’ share grew faster in the 1980s than in the 1990s.

The 97 percent rate of Hispanic growth in these metros over 20 years, meanwhile, lagged that in many other metros. But meanwhile, the rate of Latino population growth there was four times greater than the below-average 25-percent growth in their overall populations. As a result, the 6.9 million Latinos added in this category between 1980 and 2000 represented 79 percent of the overall population growth in these areas (Table 1). Consequently, the population growth that did occur in these metros owed largely to the Latinos.

These established centers have the highest concentrations of Latinos among all metro types. Hispanics made up 20 percent of the population in these 16 metros in 1980 but by 2000 the figure had hit 32 percent. Size and Latino concentration, meanwhile, seem to have had an inverse effect on the rate of Hispanic growth. Three of the eight cities where Latinos were 40 percent or more of the population in 2000 experienced markedly slower Hispanic growth in the 1990s than in the 1980s. In Los Angeles, for example, the Hispanic growth rate fell from 60 percent to 28 percent, and in Miami it decreased from 64 percent in the 1980s to 36 percent in the 1990s. These data suggest that Los Angeles and Miami in particular could be approaching a saturation point where shortages of housing and jobs may put a brake on Hispanic population growth.

**NEW LATINO DESTINATIONS**

*Small Base/Fast Growth:*

51 metros

Just over one-half of the largest 100 metropolitan areas in America posted explosive growth of their initially small Latino communities between 1980 and 2000. This growth of these new Latino destinations reflects an astonishing and very rapid entrance of the

---

**Table 2. Ten Metro Areas with The Largest Latino Populations, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Latinos</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
<th>Latino Growth, 1980–2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4,242,213</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,339,836</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,416,584</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1,291,737</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1,248,586</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside—San Bernadino</td>
<td>1,228,962</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>875,579</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>817,012</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>816,037</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>810,499</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,087,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1. Latino Population for Four Metropolitan Area Types, 2000**

- Fast-growing Latino Hubs: 25%
- New Latino Destinations: 19%
- Small Latino Places: 4%
- Established Latino Metros: 52%
Hispanic population into new settlement areas.

From Wilmington to West Palm Beach, from Little Rock to Las Vegas, the new Latino destinations encompass a diverse collection of metropolitan areas scattered across 35 states in every region of the country. Within these 51 metros the Hispanic population grew at rates ranging from 147 percent (Knoxville) to 1,180 percent (Raleigh-Durham) over the 20 years. In 2000, 19 percent of all Hispanics among those in the largest 100 metros lived in these 51 metros.

The Hispanic growth rates for these metros must be understood in the context of rather modest absolute numbers. Their fast growth began from very small initial populations generally, and so even extraordinary high growth rates usually did not involve large numbers of individuals. Across this category the initial 1980 Latino populations remained quite small. Sarasota, FL, for example, registered an astounding 538 percent increase in its Hispanic population between 1980 and 2000, but it began this period with a mere six thousand Latino residents. Even after 20 years of extraordinary growth Sarasota only had 38,682 Latinos, and that was in a state with a Hispanic population of 2.7 million.

Nevertheless, so much rapid growth spread out across so many metros emerges as a demographic phenomenon of consequence when it is viewed cumulatively. In 1980, 19 of these metros counted fewer than 10,000 Latinos, and only six had more than 50,000. But by 2000 only two remained below the 10,000 mark while 16 had more than 100,000. Add it up and the Latino population of all 51 of these metros in 2000 reaches 5.3 million—or 19 percent of the nation’s total Latino population (see Figure 1). And the Latinization of the new destinations is becoming more consequential, even though the total for the entire category pales beside the huge absolute populations of the big metros with longstanding Latino populations. In fact, the total for these metros is just a bit smaller than the combined Latino populations of Los Angeles and Miami. Fully three-quarters of the Hispanics in these 51 metros (4 million people) were added to the population between 1980 and 2000. That accounts for about a quarter of the total Hispanic population growth measured in all the 100 top metros during that period.

The sheer pace of this mostly very recent growth is also noteworthy. In 1980 Latinos made up 2 percent of the population of these 51 metros but by 2000 they were 7 percent of the population in this category. In all but eleven of these metros the rate of growth for the Hispanic population in the 1990s outstripped that in the 1980s, and in many cases it was substantially greater, at least doubling in 28 metros from one decade to the next. None of the new Latino destinations experienced a Hispanic growth rate of less than 42 percent in the 1990’s.

Another significant factor: This rapid Latino growth in new destinations usually accompanied rapid increases in the overall population. In these metropolitan areas, Latinos comprised only one factor in broader growth trends across metros that saw a 42-percent total growth over the 20-year period as all but seven registered growth rates in the double digits. In this fashion, the new Hispanic residents in these places accounted for just 22 percent of the increased population. By comparison, in metros with established Latino communities, Hispanics comprised by far the largest, and in some cases the only, factor in population growth, accounting for 79 percent of the overall population increase (see Table 1).

Eighteen of the new Latino destinations, finally, warrant discussion as sites of “hypergrowth.” In each of these 18 metros, the Hispanic population grew by more than 300 percent—or twice the national average—after 1980. Altogether, the combined Hispanic population of all these metros jumped 505 percent between 1980 and 2000 (see Table 3 for the 18 hypergrowth locations and their growth trends).

This collection of metros includes emerging immigrant gateways such as Washington and Atlanta and several of the nation’s fastest-growing metros such as Las Vegas and Orlando. Eleven of these metros lie in the Southeast, with three North Carolina cities—Charlotte, Greensboro and Raleigh—epitomizing the “new economy” of the 1990s with rapid development in the finance, business services, and high-tech sectors. As a group, these Latino “hypergrowth” metros grew robustly from 1980 to 2000, posting overall population growth at a combined 54-percent rate over the two decades. All but 5 of the 18 had faster overall growth in the 1990s than the 1980s, moreover. As a result, even the explosive new Latino growth in these cities remained a relatively modest portion of the overall population increase despite its incredible pace. In absolute terms, after all, the “hypergrowth” metros added a relatively modest 2.3 million Latinos between 1980 and 2000 at a time when their overall population increased by 11.2 million. Hispanics, in short, represented just 20 percent of the overall population increase.

But even so, the “hypergrowth” metros epitomized the sudden arrival of Latinos in new destinations. In 13 of these “hypergrowth” metros in 1980 Hispanics represented 3 percent or less of their metro populations or one-quarter of a million Latinos, but by 2000 they numbered nearly 1.5 million and represented 6 percent of their collective overall populations. This underscores how, from a barely measurable minority, Latinos grew into a significant segment of the population in many places. Atlanta provides a case in point. There, the 24,550 Latinos counted in 1980 represented just 1 percent of the metro population.
But after 20 years marked by a 995 percent growth rate, Atlanta’s Latino population reached 268,851—or 7 percent of the total (see Table 3).

FAST-GROWING LATINO HUBS (Large Base/Fast Growth):
11 metros
Eleven metros—the fast-growing Latino hubs—grew at extraordinary rates from very large base populations, and now supplement the established Latino metros as major population centers on the map of Hispanic America.

Latinos made up a sizable 14 percent of the population in these metros in 1980, and over the next 20 years the Hispanic population grew by 235 percent to reach fully 25 percent of the 100 metros’ overall population.

With the exception of Phoenix, the metros in this category lie in California or Texas. Two—Orange County and Riverside-San Bernardino—are suburban outliers of Los Angeles, and a third—Vallejo—is an exurb in the San Francisco Bay area. Three others—Bakersfield, Stockton and Sacramento—lie in central California and reflect that state’s growth away from the traditional coastal areas. All of the California metros grew at a faster rate in the 1980s than in the 1990s, while the opposite is true of the Texas and Arizona metros. Dallas and Houston, the two biggest metros in Texas, fit that pattern. So does Austin, one of several metros in this category that experienced exceptional economic growth in the high-tech sector. Dallas and Riverside-San Bernardino—even with their large initial Hispanic populations—met the standard for hypergrowth with increases of 358 percent and 324 percent respectively between 1980 and 2000. By 2000, some 6.8 million Hispanic people lived in one of these metros.

The fast-growing Latino hubs, meanwhile, assumed new functions in Hispanic America during the last two decades, by moving beyond the status of secondary way stations. Aside from Houston and San Diego, none of these metropolitan areas have played a longstanding role as a major gateway for Latino immigrants. Bakersfield and Stockton were initially places where agricultural workers settled when they left the fields for the stability of city life. Orange County and Riverside-San Bernardino served as secondary stops for Hispanics who had already passed through Los Angeles. However, the rapid rates of Latino population growth since the 1980s suggest these metros have emerged as immigrant ports of entry even as they retained—and perhaps enlarged—their importance as secondary destinations.

Two other aspects of the growing hubs’ emergence are these metros’ initially lower Hispanic concentrations (compared to the established Latino metros), and their high overall growth rates.

Initially, the fast-growing hubs posted an average total population of 1.3 million and a Latino population share of 14 percent. By contrast, the more established Hispanic metros that grew more slowly over the next 20 years had a larger average total population of 2.2 million and a significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Latinos</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
<th>Latino Growth, 1980–2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>72,580</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>268,851</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>62,210</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>77,092</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>271,627</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>322,038</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>40,139</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>271,652</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>38,682</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>142,444</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>26,167</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>140,675</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>432,003</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>42,994</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul</td>
<td>99,121</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>309,851</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>93,868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>38,570</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,750,564</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hypergrowth metros had Latino population growth over 300 percent between 1980 and 2000.
higher 20-percent Hispanic population share. The faster-growing new hubs may in this regard have had more room to grow before approaching a potential saturation point.

At the same time, the overall population growth rates in the newer hubs far exceeded those in the established Latino metros with Latino populations of a million or more—Los Angeles, New York, Chicago and Miami. In fact, the fast-growing Latino hubs exhibited the highest rate of overall population growth of any of the four types of metropolitan areas. Altogether, the combined total population of these 11 metros grew by 70 percent between 1980 and 2000. In absolute numbers that represented an increase of 10 million people—4.8 million of whom were Latinos. By contrast, the established Hispanic metros posted a 25 percent overall 20-year growth rate as they added just 8.8 million people and 6.9 million Latinos.

These figures suggest once again that Latino growth in the fast-growing Hispanic hubs remains just one element of a more generalized economic and population expansion. In these hubs, after all, Latino growth represented just 48 percent of the regions’ overall 20-year growth. By comparison, Hispanics accounted for 79 percent of the total growth in the more established metros. Such ratios underscore that the high overall growth rates in these big fast-growing metros stimulated and facilitated fast Latino growth much as it did in the smaller-scale new destinations such as Atlanta and Charlotte.

**SMALL LATINO PLACES (Small Base/Slow Growth): 22 metros**

About a quarter of the 100 metros in this survey, finally, remained largely on the periphery of major Hispanic growth trends. These cities were mostly located in the South and Midwest, though a number can be found in the Northeastern Rust Belt. As a group, these cities harbored relatively few Latinos in 1980, and registered only slow to moderate growth in their Hispanic populations over the 20-year period 1980 to 2000.

In terms of absolute numbers, Hispanics made up only 4 percent of the population in these regions in 2000 compared to a 16-percent overall Hispanic population share in the 100 metros. In fact, less than 1.3 million Hispanics lived in these 22 metros in 2000. All told, only 4 percent of the Hispanic population of the 100 largest metros resided in the small Latino places in 2000 (see Figure 1). Latino growth in these metro areas also lagged, reaching only 81 percent compared to the national 145 percent growth rate for the 100 metros. What is more, the relatively low Hispanic population growth in these places corresponded with the below-average total metro population growth (4 percent) between 1980 and 2000 in these metros. In this fashion, the small Latino places illustrate the extent to which Latino population growth remains a subset of growth trends for all groups. In these places, for example, it seems that the same factors discouraging population growth by other groups discouraged expansion of the Hispanic population to some degree.

**B. Fifty-four percent of all Latinos now reside in the suburbs; the number of Latinos living in suburban areas grew by 71 percent in the 1990s.**

U.S. Hispanics traditionally have been urban dwellers and many remain so now. Nevertheless, Census 2000 reveals that their distribution across the metropolitan landscape is changing dramatically. The Latinos, in short, are becoming suburbanites.

In 1990 the Latino population was almost evenly split between suburbs (8.7 million) and central cities (8.6 million) in the top 100 metropolitan areas. However, Hispanics flocked to the suburbs during the 1990s. During the decade their numbers there increased by 6.2 million to nearly 15 million as compared with a four million increase to 12.6 million in the central cities. These changes implied a 71 percent increase in the number of Latinos living in the suburbs. All told, the suburbs accounted for 61 percent of the overall growth of the Hispanic population in these metros between 1990 and 2000 (see Appendix B). By 2000, 54 percent of all Latinos resided in the suburbs.

Many Hispanics, by choosing the suburbs, are following the familiar path from city neighborhoods to the urban periphery. In addition, some suburban areas are serving as ports of entry for newly arriving immigrants. This holds both for metros with longstanding Hispanic populations and for those with newly acquired Latino communities, though suburban growth was disproportionally higher in the new Latino destinations. Moreover, some of the cities with the largest Hispanic populations—notably Los Angeles, New York and Miami—also saw very substantial increases in adjoining jurisdictions. From Long Island on the East Coast to the Southern California’s Inland Empire, Latino populations grew both at a rapid rate and in substantial numbers on the outer fringes of major metropolitan areas.

Disproportionate increases in the suburban Latino population are most evident in metros that experienced very rapid growth of their Latino populations overall and especially in those with a relatively small base population in 1990. Overall, 56 percent of the Hispanic growth in metros with established Latino communities occurred in the suburbs. For example, in Albuquerque, San Antonio and San Jose—metros with large base populations and relatively slow growth—fewer Latinos were added to the suburban population than in central cities. Meanwhile, in new-destination metros, the suburbs registered 70 percent of the growth. In Washington, D.C., Atlanta, and Fort Lauderdale—metros that started with
a small base population and experienced very rapid growth—more than 90 percent of the increase came in the suburbs. When Latino migrants ventured into new communities in the 1990’s, the suburbs apparently held a powerful draw. In the future, as these migrant pioneers draw relatives from abroad, new, larger family units are likely to form in the suburbs.

Even when large well-established Latino communities were available for settlement, much of the growth took place on the periphery of the metropolitan area. Indeed, in the metros with the largest Hispanic populations, which were also some of the nation’s most populous metros, substantial growth took place beyond the central cities. In the Chicago metropolitan area, for example, 63 percent of the growth took place in the suburbs and in Miami it was 96 percent.

Moreover, these big cities formed the core of regional clusters as the Hispanic population grew substantially in adjoining or nearby metros. The trend also prevailed in other regions. The Latino populations of Bergen-Passaic, NJ and Nassau-Suffolk, NY, which adjoin New York to the east and west, together added some 218,000 Latinos between 1990 and 2000. Along the coast north of Miami, the population of the Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach metropolitan areas together increased by 242,000 Latinos. In each case the outlying metros of the cluster grew faster than did the core metro, though not in absolute terms. In Southern California, meanwhile, the peripheral growth actually outpaced more central growth by all measures. There, the Orange County, Ventura, and Riverside-San Bernardino metropolitan areas added 950,000 Latinos, which exceeded the growth in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro both in absolute numbers and the pace of growth.

These patterns suggest that even as Hispanic growth slows in the big metros with very large Latino communities, those areas continue to serve as powerful magnets for a broader metropolitan region. Also, these patterns may reveal what other data indicate—namely, that while newly arrived immigrants still head for the more traditional ports of entry in large numbers, many better-established Latinos are moving away from those traditionally Hispanic communities to new areas within the same metropolitan cluster.

C. Hispanic men outnumber Hispanic women by 17 percent in the new Latino destination metros, where the Latino population grew fastest.

Distinctive Latino local household structures are also emerging as demographic change affects different metropolitan areas. Most notably, the newest areas of Latino settlement exhibit gender ratios that favor men and gain more non-family households. By contrast, in places where the local Hispanic community has become larger and better established, family households develop and gender ratios balance out.

Prior research has shown how these dynamics work: The gender composition of migration to a particular place changes with the “maturity” of the flow to that area (see Durand and Massey 1992). Historically, male immigrants from Latin America typically move toward opportunity first, without spouses or other nuclear family members. Subsequently, relatives and friends follow the immigrants, so that complete family units and eventually extended family and friendship networks form in the years and decades following initial settlement.

In this fashion, gender ratios suggest the newness of settlement. Gender ratios that favor men indicate growth due to new migration flows and demarcate the newest areas of settlement. By contrast, metropolitan areas with older Latino communities typically show more balanced gender ratios since over time full families, and eventually a U.S.-born third-genera-

tion join the male “trailblazers.” Nor does this dynamic apply only to the immigration of the foreign-born. It also applies to the movement of immigrants from one area within the United States to another in what is termed “secondary” migration. Even in metros where the Latino presence dates back 50 or 100 years or more, successive waves of immigrant newcomers continually refresh the Latino population, producing continuous demographic change and layering of the family structure and household composition.

Given these dynamics, Hispanic and non-Hispanic sex ratios (reflecting the number of men in a given population per 100 women) were calculated for all metropolitan areas and the subtotals for metro types are shown in Table 4. The patterns are clear. Overall, less-mobile, non-Hispanic populations included greater numbers of working-age women in 2000, while the reverse was true for Hispanic populations. The non-Latino sex ratio rises to above 100 (indicating a tilt toward more men than women) in only a handful of metros, namely those with military bases such as San Diego and El Paso, as well as San Francisco where there is a substantial gay male population. By contrast, the working-age Hispanic population leans heavily toward men across most metros, and most metropolitan areas increased their Latino male populations relative to the female population between 1990 and 2000. This reflected a steady and widely dispersed settlement of newly arrived immigrants.

In general, the faster and newer a metropolitan area’s Latino growth the higher its sex ratio climbed in the 1990s. In metros with a small Latino presence the Latino gender balance edged upwards from 100 to 108 between 1990 and 2000 (see Table 4). In metros that can be characterized as new Latino destinations, the Latino sex ratios surged from 107 in 1990 on average to 117 in 2000. Still more
dramatically, the Latino sex ratio reached an average of 124 in the “hypergrowth” metros—meaning that Latinos outnumbered Latinas in these metropolitan areas by a full 24 percent. In this category, Raleigh-Durham’s Latino population included an extraordinary 188 men for every 100 women, as large new flows of men arrived presumably without family members.

In keeping with these effects, where Latino residency is longstanding or Latino growth slower—as in many established Latino metros—sex ratios remained steady or declined as proportionally more Latino growth resulted from increases in families both from births and family reunification. For example, Chicago’s gender ratio remained at 117 both in 1990 and 2000 as a steady gathering of families offset new immigrant arrivals. Likewise, sex ratios actually declined in maturing Hispanic communities such as Fresno, Los Angeles, and Ventura as the number of women there increased during the 1990s. In fact, in 7 of the 16 well established Latino communities women outnumbered men, indicating the arrival of many more women and families indicating more “mature” immigration.

Household composition—which reflects whether unrelated individuals or families predominate in a community—also reveals the demographic change that accompanies various growth patterns. Similar to a tilt toward higher sex ratios, a proliferation of unrelated individuals can be an indicator of new migration, however in the small Latino places, it most likely also indicates an aging population with elderly living alone. Conversely, a higher share of couple-headed households usually corresponds with longer-established communities. Examining household composition reveals that 22 percent of the households in new Latino destinations were nonfamily in 2000. Fast-growing Latino hubs and established Latino metros had the highest proportions of married couple households, and posted the lowest proportions of nonfamily households across all metro types. Furthermore, half or more of the households in these two metro types contained children under 18, including both couple-headed and single-headed households. New Latino destinations, for their part, had shares of married couple households and households with children comparable to the established Latino metros, suggesting some degree of secondary migration of family members (see Table 5).

In these ways, then, distinctive demographic variations across metropolitan areas confirm that Latino growth varies considerably from one locale to another. In newer settlement areas where many workers reside without families, the share of non-family Latino households in 2000 far exceeds that in metros where Latinos have long been a major segment of the population.

### Table 4. Sex Ratios* for Non-Latino and Latino Working Age Populations for Four Metropolitan Area Types, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Latino</th>
<th></th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established Latino Metros</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Latino Destinations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Growing Latino Hubs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Latino Places</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sex ratios are defined as the number of men in a given population per 100 women.

### Table 5. Latino Households by Household Type for Four Metropolitan Area Types, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married Couple Families</th>
<th>Single Householder No Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>Without Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Latino Metros</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Latino Destinations</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Growing Latino Hubs</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Latino Places</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, some of the traditional Latino bastions are developing more stable Hispanic communities with a greater share of married couples with children. In this sense, Latino growth is an evolving process, and some cities are simply farther along in the process than others.

IV. Discussion

Taken together, these analyses of the nation’s 100 largest metro areas reveal sharp differences in the pace and characteristics of Hispanic population growth across and within metropolitan areas. What is more, this assessment suggests that these variations result not only from demographic factors within Latino populations but from differences in the economic, social, and demographic trends influencing U.S. metropolitan areas. Accordingly, the list of metros that experienced the fastest Hispanic population growth in this analysis substantially overlaps with the list of those with the fastest total population growth. Conversely, the metros with the slowest overall growth recorded unusually slow Latino growth.

But this relationship should not be interpreted as simply a mechanical one in which Latino numbers rise merely as a function of overall growth. Las Vegas, for example, the fastest-growing metro in the nation between 1990 and 2000, grew by 200 percent during that period. However, the Hispanic population grew by 750 percent during those 20 years. That contrast—nearly a fourfold difference in growth rates—and similar spreads in many other metros suggests a complex relationship in which Hispanic growth can be spurred by overall growth even as it responds to its own dynamics.

For instance, in the past, a handful of central cities were the usual destination of immigrant newcomers from Latin America. The classic process entailed “trailblazers” leaving the ports of entry to seek opportunities in these “frontier” cities, largely in California, Texas, New York, and Illinois. Family, friends, and fellow countrymen followed initial migrants and complete immigrant communities subsequently developed over time (Saenz and Cready 1998, Massey et al. 1993). However, a somewhat different process is now developing with the rapid growth of Hispanics in new Latino destinations. Those coming from abroad are now skirting traditional areas and settling directly in new places that promise economic and housing opportunities. In this fashion, the new frontier zone that has developed in the past 20 years now encompasses many metro areas of the southeast (Hernández-León and Zúñiga 2000). And much of the Latino population growth is occurring outside of central cities directly in the suburbs.

Comparing the growth of the Latino population in central cities and suburbs within a metropolitan area also reveals distinctive patterns. Across the 100 metros, 61 percent of the increase in the Latino population occurred in the suburbs. As a result, the Census 2000 located 2.4 million more Latinos living in suburbs than in central cities. But again, not all the growth had the same quality. For example, the fastest suburban growth occurred in the new Latino destinations, while more established metros with larger bases and slower growth saw slower suburbanization. Yet then again, some of the metros with the most established Latino communities saw very rapid growth in adjoining jurisdictions, as occurred in the Long Island cities outside New York City.

Variations and contrasts like these, moreover, have clear public-policy implications. Most generally, the findings presented here suggest public officials responsible for planning the allocation of services and resources need to tailor their decision-making to the particular growth variation in their service area. Housing demand, the need for classroom space, the demand for public transportation—all of these will vary greatly not only with the rate of growth in the Latino population but also with the type of growth. For example, Raleigh-Durham can probably expect to see its new Latino population mature in the next decade, gain married couples, and then produce more full families, which will produce a “spike” in its school-age population. Los Angeles, by contrast, may soon see the crest of the demographic wave that has so challenged its school system for the past two decades. Across the country, one-size-fits-all problem solving will not suffice.

A further policy implication involves the abruptness of growth in locales like Raleigh-Durham and the other new Latino destinations. Specifically, the need for policy-makers to adapt quickly to vast change presents special challenges in metros that started with miniscule Latino populations and that experienced sudden, substantial growth. By contrast, the proximity of places like Orange County, CA or Suffolk County, NY to large and long-time urban concentrations of Hispanics has allowed for more gradual change and more time to prepare for the growth of a population characterized by low-wage workers, large families, and substantial numbers of adults with little proficiency in English.

V. Conclusion

This survey reveals not only the vast and widespread growth of America’s Hispanic population but also the emergence of new forms of growth and new areas of settlement across the nation’s metropolitan landscape.

Variation is pervasive within the broad trend of Latino growth. Indeed, the variegated patterns of growth identified here underscore the dynamism of the Hispanic population as it finds its place in American society. And yet, for all the flux and change on display in Census 2000, a look back to the 1990 and 1980 counts reveals distinct trends. These trends suggest, moreover, that the growth of the Latino
population does seem to be following discernable pathways likely to carry into the future.

To begin with, the great Latino gateways—Los Angeles, New York, Miami, and Chicago—will continue to house massive concentrations of Hispanics. Yet even so, the growth rates that slowed in these vast metros in the 1990s are not likely to pick up and may slow even further. Of course, this in no way means the Latino population will necessarily stabilize in those cities. Rather, the great mainstays may be seeing a continued influx of new arrivals and a simultaneous outflow of Latinos leaving in search of better jobs, housing, and quality of life in other destinations.

Meanwhile, the move to the suburban fringes will surely continue as growth slows in already-crowded central cities. Family composition and gender data as well as other indicators suggest that suburbs, particularly those on the periphery of these great gateways, are themselves becoming ports of entry where immigrants settle without ever having first stopped in the old urban barrios. Then, too, Latino families in search of the classic American suburban dream are also moving to the outskirts where housing is cheaper. Accordingly, more and more Latinos will be flocking to the suburbs in the coming decades.

In sum, the Latino population is on the move and spreading out as it grows. Most of the Hispanic population will remain concentrated in a handful of big metropolitan areas. And yet, much of the growth will take place elsewhere. On the periphery of big cities and in the suburbs of the nation’s newest booming metros, the first wave of Latinos has already set up house and more are likely to come. In Southern California, Texas, the New York City region, and South Florida, the Hispanic share of the population will continue to increase albeit more slowly than before. But at the same time, whenever and wherever conditions lend themselves to overall population growth and robust economic development, Latinos will be a big part of the mix.
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Endnotes

1 Asians also registered a high growth rate between 1990 and 2000, and even exceeded Latino population increases by one method of enumeration. However, using consistent racial definitions for 1990 and 2000 based on the number of respondents declaring a single race (as opposed to multiple ones), Hispanic population growth outpaced Asian growth as well as that of all other racial groups.

2 The Latino population counts used in all tables in this report are derived from two sources. The 1980 and 1990 counts came from the “GeoLytics CensusCD 40 Years” (long-form variables) while the 2000 data were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau website (short-form variables).

3 The U.S. Latino population is comprised of both foreign-born and native-born persons from the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America and the Caribbean as well as Puerto Rico, a U.S. territory. The largest source countries are Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.

4 The OMB designates the city with the largest population in each metropolitan area as a central city. Additional cities qualify for this designation if specified requirements are met concerning population size, commuting patterns and employment/residence ratios.
## Appendix A. Latino Population and Share of Total Population for Four Metropolitan Area Types, 1980–2000

### 100 Largest Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established Latino Metros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM MSA</td>
<td>515,614</td>
<td>191,068</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>589,131</td>
<td>217,340</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>712,738</td>
<td>296,373</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14% 36% 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL PMSA</td>
<td>7,246,032</td>
<td>583,265</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7,410,858</td>
<td>819,676</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8,272,768</td>
<td>1,416,584</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41% 73% 143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO PMSA</td>
<td>1,428,836</td>
<td>164,158</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,622,980</td>
<td>208,264</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,109,282</td>
<td>397,236</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27% 91% 142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX MSA</td>
<td>479,899</td>
<td>297,196</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>591,610</td>
<td>411,248</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>679,622</td>
<td>531,654</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>38% 29% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA MSA</td>
<td>577,737</td>
<td>164,158</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>755,580</td>
<td>262,004</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>922,516</td>
<td>406,151</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56% 55% 143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, NJ PMSA</td>
<td>556,972</td>
<td>145,249</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>553,099</td>
<td>181,222</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>608,975</td>
<td>242,123</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25% 34% 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles—Long Beach, CA PMSA</td>
<td>35,161,592</td>
<td>7,180,206</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39,098,721</td>
<td>10,286,158</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43,957,950</td>
<td>14,119,006</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43% 37% 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Latino Destinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, NY MSA</td>
<td>824,729</td>
<td>8,351</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>861,424</td>
<td>14,440</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>875,583</td>
<td>23,798</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>73% 65% 185%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, PA MSA</td>
<td>551,052</td>
<td>14,022</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>595,081</td>
<td>26,697</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>637,958</td>
<td>50,607</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90% 90% 261%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA MSA</td>
<td>2,233,324</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,959,950</td>
<td>55,045</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4,112,198</td>
<td>268,851</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>124% 388% 995%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD PMSA</td>
<td>2,199,531</td>
<td>20,688</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,382,172</td>
<td>28,538</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,552,994</td>
<td>51,329</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38% 80% 148%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, AL MSA</td>
<td>815,286</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>840,140</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>921,106</td>
<td>16,598</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-40% 37% 183%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA-NH PMSA</td>
<td>3,148,490</td>
<td>72,698</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>322,763</td>
<td>130,896</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3,406,289</td>
<td>202,513</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>91% 47% 181%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC—SC MSA</td>
<td>971,391</td>
<td>7,469</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,162,093</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,499,293</td>
<td>77,092</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31% 68% 932%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH MSA</td>
<td>1,214,297</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,345,450</td>
<td>10,003</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,540,157</td>
<td>28,115</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14% 18% 220%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, FL PMSA</td>
<td>1,018,200</td>
<td>40,093</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,255,488</td>
<td>105,668</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,623,018</td>
<td>271,652</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>164% 157% 578%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth-Arlington, TX PMSA</td>
<td>990,852</td>
<td>72,337</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,361,034</td>
<td>147,431</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,702,625</td>
<td>309,851</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>104% 110% 328%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI MSA</td>
<td>840,824</td>
<td>18,005</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>937,891</td>
<td>27,195</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,088,514</td>
<td>68,916</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51% 153% 283%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro- Winston Salem, NC MSA</td>
<td>951,170</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,050,304</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,251,509</td>
<td>62,210</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17% 80% 962%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville, SC MSA</td>
<td>743,284</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>830,563</td>
<td>5,712</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>962,441</td>
<td>26,167</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9% 35% 397%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg, PA MSA</td>
<td>555,158</td>
<td>5,998</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>587,986</td>
<td>9,336</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>629,401</td>
<td>19,557</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56% 109% 226%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT MSA</td>
<td>1,080,581</td>
<td>46,120</td>
<td>1,157,617</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>148%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN MSA</td>
<td>1,305,911</td>
<td>9,812</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL MSA</td>
<td>722,252</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS MSA</td>
<td>1,449,374</td>
<td>33,807</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN MSA</td>
<td>546,488</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV—AZ MSA</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>37,767</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, AR MSA</td>
<td>474,484</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, KY—IN MSA</td>
<td>953,850</td>
<td>5,631</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN—AR—MS MSA</td>
<td>938,777</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex-Somerset—Hunterdon, NJ PMSA</td>
<td>886,383</td>
<td>39,380</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI PMSA</td>
<td>1,397,143</td>
<td>34,993</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA</td>
<td>2,198,190</td>
<td>22,985</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth-Ocean, NJ PMSA</td>
<td>849,211</td>
<td>21,237</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK MSA</td>
<td>860,969</td>
<td>19,174</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE-IA MSA</td>
<td>605,419</td>
<td>12,685</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL MSA</td>
<td>804,925</td>
<td>18,358</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland—Vancouver, OR—WA PMSA</td>
<td>1,333,572</td>
<td>26,544</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, RI-MA MSA</td>
<td>1,076,557</td>
<td>21,526</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Durham, NC MSA</td>
<td>665,236</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT MSA</td>
<td>761,311</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT MSA</td>
<td>910,222</td>
<td>44,720</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, FL MSA</td>
<td>350,693</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton, PA MSA</td>
<td>659,387</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle—Bellevue, WA PMSA</td>
<td>1,615,517</td>
<td>102,776</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA MSA</td>
<td>569,774</td>
<td>24,708</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma, WA PMSA</td>
<td>485,643</td>
<td>13,242</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa—St. Petersburg—Clearwater, FL MSA</td>
<td>1,613,603</td>
<td>80,433</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK MSA</td>
<td>657,173</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC—MD—VA—WV PMSA</td>
<td>3,477,873</td>
<td>96,767</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>576,863</td>
<td>28,307</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS MSA</td>
<td>441,844</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, DE—MD PMSA</td>
<td>458,545</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>1,183,110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>214%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                    | 54,800,178 | 1,309,221 | 2,333,640 | 4%                                      | 198%                                     | 214%                                     |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| **Fast-Growing Latino Hubs**  |           |            |          |           |            |          |           |            |          |                                     |        |       |       |
| Austin, TX MSA                | 585,051   | 105,455    | 18%      | 846,227   | 174,482    | 21%      | 1,249,763 | 327,760    | 26%      | 135,712 %                                       | 135%   | 101%  | 102%  |
| Bakersfield, CA MSA           | 403,089   | 87,119     | 22%      | 534,477   | 150,558    | 28%      | 661,645   | 254,036    | 38%      | 107,556 %                                       | 107%   | 93%   | 86%   |
| Dallas, TX PMSA               | 2,055,232 | 176,968    | 9%       | 2,676,248 | 364,397    | 14%      | 3,519,176 | 810,499    | 23%      | 81,558 %                                        | 101%   | 78%   | 63%   |
| Houston, TX PMSA              | 2,754,304 | 401,602    | 15%      | 3,322,025 | 498,578    | 15%      | 4,178,686 | 750,965    | 27%      | 87,381 %                                        | 106%   | 82%   | 77%   |
| Orange County, CA PMSA        | 1,932,709 | 285,722    | 15%      | 2,410,556 | 356,957    | 23%      | 2,846,289 | 875,579    | 31%      | 95,850 %                                        | 74%    | 64%   | 67%   |
| Phoenix—Mesa, AZ MSA          | 1,599,970 | 226,194    | 14%      | 2,238,480 | 374,275    | 17%      | 2,810,499 | 817,012    | 25%      | 45,458 %                                        | 65%    | 54%   | 47%   |
| **Riverside—San Bernardino,** |           |            |          |           |            |          |           |            |          | **Small Latino Places**                         |        |       |       |
| CA PMSA                       | 1,558,182 | 289,803    | 19%      | 2,588,793 | 675,918    | 26%      | 3,254,821 | 1,228,962  | 38%      | 133,720 %                                       | 133%   | 119%  | 115%  |
| Sacramento, CA PMSA           | 986,440   | 86,145     | 9%       | 1,340,010 | 140,153    | 10%      | 1,628,197 | 234,475    | 14%      | 66,185 %                                        | 63%    | 56%   | 51%   |
| San Diego, CA                 | 1,861,846 | 274,530    | 15%      | 2,498,016 | 498,578    | 20%      | 3,254,821 | 750,965    | 27%      | 82,176 %                                        | 82%    | 73%   | 66%   |
| Stockton, CA MSA              | 347,342   | 66,704     | 19%      | 480,628   | 108,987    | 23%      | 563,598   | 172,073    | 31%      | 63,657 %                                        | 73%    | 66%   | 63%   |
| Vallejo, CA PMSA              | 334,402   | 32,298     | 10%      | 451,186   | 95,576     | 21%      | 518,821   | 99,014     | 19%      | 69,190 %                                        | 79%    | 67%   | 63%   |
| **Total (All Metro Area Types)** | 14,418,567 | 2,033,540 | 14% | 19,395,646 | 3,801,089 | 20% | 24,485,665 | 6,818,961 | 28% | 87% | 79% | 235% |
| **Italics denote hypergrowth metros which had Latino population growth over 300 percent between 1980 and 2000** | | | | | | | | | | |

### 100 Largest Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established Latino Metros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM MSA</td>
<td>217,340</td>
<td>296,373</td>
<td>131,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL PMSA</td>
<td>819,676</td>
<td>1,416,584</td>
<td>535,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO PMSA</td>
<td>208,264</td>
<td>397,236</td>
<td>106,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX MSA</td>
<td>411,248</td>
<td>531,654</td>
<td>355,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA MSA</td>
<td>262,004</td>
<td>406,151</td>
<td>102,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, NJ PMSA</td>
<td>181,222</td>
<td>242,123</td>
<td>54,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL PMSA</td>
<td>949,700</td>
<td>1,291,737</td>
<td>223,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY PMSA</td>
<td>1,842,127</td>
<td>2,339,836</td>
<td>1,470,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA PMSA</td>
<td>266,283</td>
<td>416,686</td>
<td>49,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX MSA</td>
<td>624,941</td>
<td>816,037</td>
<td>517,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA PMSA</td>
<td>226,734</td>
<td>291,563</td>
<td>96,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA PMSA</td>
<td>307,113</td>
<td>403,401</td>
<td>204,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ MSA</td>
<td>161,053</td>
<td>247,578</td>
<td>117,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA PMSA</td>
<td>175,414</td>
<td>251,734</td>
<td>15,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>Metro Area</td>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC MSA</td>
<td>31,551</td>
<td>23,930</td>
<td>7,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK MSA</td>
<td>32,851</td>
<td>21,148</td>
<td>11,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE-IA MSA</td>
<td>15,419</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>5,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL MSA</td>
<td>98,812</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>84,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA PMSA</td>
<td>49,344</td>
<td>16,493</td>
<td>34,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, RI-MA MSA</td>
<td>45,893</td>
<td>23,744</td>
<td>22,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Durham, NC MSA</td>
<td>9,923</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA MSA</td>
<td>8,788</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>7,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT MSA</td>
<td>61,269</td>
<td>15,220</td>
<td>46,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, FL MSA</td>
<td>15,186</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>12,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton, PA MSA</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Bellevue, WA PMSA</td>
<td>53,479</td>
<td>19,097</td>
<td>34,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA MSA</td>
<td>48,024</td>
<td>25,642</td>
<td>22,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma, WA PMSA</td>
<td>14,445</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>5,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA</td>
<td>136,027</td>
<td>49,699</td>
<td>86,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK MSA</td>
<td>14,948</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>5,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV PMSA</td>
<td>221,458</td>
<td>31,358</td>
<td>190,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>65,028</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>55,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS MSA</td>
<td>18,417</td>
<td>14,314</td>
<td>4,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, DE-MD PMSA</td>
<td>11,701</td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>6,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,333,640</td>
<td>27,599</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>20,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Growing Latino Hubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX MSA</td>
<td>174,482</td>
<td>105,162</td>
<td>69,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, CA MSA</td>
<td>150,558</td>
<td>204,712</td>
<td>159,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX PMSA</td>
<td>364,397</td>
<td>21,947</td>
<td>159,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX PMSA</td>
<td>697,208</td>
<td>424,943</td>
<td>254,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County, CA PMSA</td>
<td>556,957</td>
<td>279,238</td>
<td>277,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA</td>
<td>374,257</td>
<td>224,667</td>
<td>149,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino, CA PMSA</td>
<td>675,918</td>
<td>114,154</td>
<td>561,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA PMSA</td>
<td>140,153</td>
<td>58,716</td>
<td>81,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA MSA</td>
<td>498,578</td>
<td>223,616</td>
<td>274,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA MSA</td>
<td>108,987</td>
<td>50,370</td>
<td>58,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo, CA PMSA</td>
<td>59,576</td>
<td>11,201</td>
<td>48,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,801,089</td>
<td>6,818,961</td>
<td>1,749,812</td>
<td>2,051,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Latino Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH PMSA</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI PMSA</td>
<td>11,624</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>8,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA MSA</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>3,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY MSA</td>
<td>23,521</td>
<td>15,287</td>
<td>8,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC MSA</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>6,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH-KV-IV PMSA</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>5,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH PMSA</td>
<td>49,617</td>
<td>22,330</td>
<td>27,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, SC MSA</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH MSA</td>
<td>6,612</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI PMSA</td>
<td>78,458</td>
<td>27,157</td>
<td>51,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary, IN PMSA</td>
<td>47,116</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>40,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI PMSA</td>
<td>54,680</td>
<td>15,450</td>
<td>39,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, AL MSA</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>2,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA MSA</td>
<td>52,563</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>36,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ PMSA</td>
<td>185,986</td>
<td>69,204</td>
<td>114,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ PMSA</td>
<td>165,844</td>
<td>84,186</td>
<td>81,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA MSA</td>
<td>11,881</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>8,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY MSA</td>
<td>29,712</td>
<td>18,936</td>
<td>10,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3,801,089 | 6,818,961 | 1,749,812 | 2,051,277 | 3,753,626 | 83%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
<td>25,383</td>
<td>39,677</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY MSA</td>
<td>8,882</td>
<td>15,112</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH MSA</td>
<td>18,675</td>
<td>27,125</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH MSA</td>
<td>7,246</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (All Metro Area Types)</strong></td>
<td>17,232,689</td>
<td>27,423,341</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Metros with no central city

*Italics denote hypergrowth metros with Latino population growth over 300 percent between 1980 and 2000.*
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