

w o r k i n g  
p a p e r

15 03

**Are America's Inner Cities Competitive?  
Evidence from the 2000s**

Daniel A. Hartley, Nikhil Kaza, and  
T. William Lester



FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF CLEVELAND

**Working papers** of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment on research in progress. They may not have been subject to the formal editorial review accorded official Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland publications. The views stated herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Working papers are available on the Cleveland Fed's website at:

**[www.clevelandfed.org](http://www.clevelandfed.org)**

**Are America's Inner Cities Competitive? Evidence from the 2000s**

Daniel A. Hartley, Nikhil Kaza, and T. William Lester

In the years since Michael Porter's paper about the potential competitiveness of inner cities there has been growing evidence of a residential resurgence in urban neighborhoods. Yet, there is less evidence on the competitiveness of inner cities for employment. We document the trends in net employment growth and find that inner cities gained over 1.8 million jobs between 2002 and 2011 at a rate comparable to suburban areas. We also find a significant number of inner cities are competitive over this period—increasing their share of metropolitan employment in 120 out of 281 MSAs. We also describe the pattern of job growth within the inner city, finding that tracts that grew faster tended to be closer to downtown, with access to transit, and adjacent to areas with higher population growth. However, tracts with higher poverty rates experienced less job growth, indicating that barriers still exist in the inner city.

JEL Classification: R12 , O18

Keywords: Urban Labor Markets, City and Suburban Employment

Suggested citation: Hartley, Daniel A., Nikhil Kaza, and T. William Lester, 2015. "Are America's Inner Cities Competitive? Evidence from the 2000s," Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, working paper no 15-03.

Daniel A. Hartley is at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland ([daniel.hartley@clev.frb.org](mailto:daniel.hartley@clev.frb.org)); Nikhil Kaza is at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill ([kaza@unc.edu](mailto:kaza@unc.edu)); and T. William Lester is at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill ([twlester@unc.edu](mailto:twlester@unc.edu)). The authors extend special thanks for excellent research assistance to Daniel Kolliner.

## 1. Introduction

In the years since Michael Porter's seminal paper about the potential competitiveness of inner cities, two narratives have emerged about the overall pattern of urban economic development. The first, which we call the "comeback cities" narrative, states that the decades of the 1990s and 2000s were a renaissance for cities as flows of population, jobs and investment shifted back from suburbs and exurbs to urban areas, particularly downtowns (Grogan & Proscio, 2000; Sohmer & Lang, 2001). The literature on gentrification, as well as the oft-cited creative class theories of Richard Florida underscore this narrative by highlighting the pro-urban preferences and consumption patterns of a new middle class (R. Florida, 2003; Neil Smith, 2002; Zukin, 1982). The second narrative that has taken shape is that of an uneven geography of growth in the last few decades. Moretti's *The New Geography of Jobs* (2012) and the literature on high-technology regions argues that contemporary US economic development has taken on a distinctly uneven pattern that leads to a polarization between so-called "innovative" regions and "backward" regions, which in turn drives inequality and a divergence in outcomes across metropolitan areas (Moretti, 2012; Pastor, Lester, & Scoggins, 2009; Saxenian, 1994).<sup>i</sup> The implication of this second narrative is that the type of inner-city renaissance described in the first narrative will only occur in growing, innovative regional economies.

Is this necessarily the case? Can inner-city economic growth occur in declining regions? Recent research has demonstrated an empirical link between gentrification and neighborhood job growth (Lester & Hartley, 2014). Is the type of consumption-based growth that is fueled by gentrification in growing regions like New York or the San Francisco Bay Area, the only mechanism to bring jobs back to urban neighborhoods? In addition to private market-driven development, policy makers have employed a host of economic development tools and distributed millions of dollars in funding targeted towards business development and job growth in inner-city neighborhoods. Have tools such as

targeted tax credits (e.g. Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community designation, Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)) influenced the pattern of inner city employment growth? In this paper, we explore these intertwined narratives by describing the pattern of neighborhood based employment changes at a national scale. We then test the validity of a number of competing claims about the competitiveness of inner-city neighborhoods in terms of economic development during the 2000s.

First, using data at the census tract level from the Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) program at the US Census Bureau, we begin by providing an overview of the extent and broad characteristics of employment growth of inner-cities, Central Business Districts (CBDs), and suburban areas of all metropolitan areas in the U.S. Surprisingly, we find that the rate of job growth between 2002 and 2011<sup>1</sup> in inner-cities—defined as non-CBD tracts in large principal cities within a metropolitan area—was on par with that of suburban areas (6.1% versus 6.9%) and even surpassed suburbs in the post-Great recession recovery (2009-11). This trend is consistent across broad census regions and industrial sectors.

Next, we explicitly test the question of inner-city competitiveness by considering 120 metropolitan areas, which had net positive employment growth and an increase in the share of jobs located in the inner city (these two criteria form our working definition of competitive inner cities). We find that the regions with competitive inner-cities are diverse geographically, but, compared to other metropolitan areas, tend to have above average growth in high-wage jobs, less racial segregation, and less job sprawl.

Finally, we provide a descriptive analysis of the spatial determinants of inner-city growth at the tract-level within inner-city areas. Specifically, we find that inner-city employment growth is positively

---

<sup>1</sup> 2002 and 2011 are the earliest and latest years available in our primary dataset. While the choice of study period may impact the results slightly, we test for the robustness of the period choice by examining the post-recession period (2009-2011) separately.

associated with neighborhoods closer to downtown, with nearby population increases, recent residential construction, and other indicators of gentrification. We also find that employment grew faster in areas with mixed uses and greater employment diversity. There is some evidence that empowerment zone designation is associated with more employment growth. However, tracts with high poverty levels have lower job growth.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section two reviews the research on the competitiveness of inner cities, and puts our empirical analysis in the context of the literature inspired by Porter's work. Section three describes the main datasets and analytical methods used in our analysis. Section four presents the descriptive analysis of the patterns of inner city job growth in aggregate and describes our analysis of the characteristics of regions with competitive inner cities. Section five, presents our model of tract-level correlates of inner-city employment growth. The final section concludes the paper and summarizes our rich descriptive analysis of the nature of inner-city job growth in the 2000s.

## **2. Literature Review**

Michael Porter made a strong and influential argument that inner-city areas had important and "unrecognized" competitive advantages as a business location. Specifically, he called for a private-sector-led economic development strategy which leveraged the strategic location of inner city neighborhoods (near the CBD and key infrastructure), along with existing regional economic strengths, as well as the local purchasing power and human resources of inner-city residents (Porter, 1997). While he recognized a significant role for government (and non-profits), he also helped to highlight regulatory barriers of high-taxes and red tape that prevented further private sector investment. Looking back at his strategic recommendations and comparing them to current practice, it is easy to see how influential they have been, as few contemporary urban economic developers or planners would

find much to disagree with. However, it is important to recall the context in which he was writing. While the mid-1990s was a period of significant economic growth for the U.S., it followed nearly two decades of economic restructuring which significantly altered the economic role of central cities and changed the geography of employment opportunities throughout most metropolitan areas in the country.

The decades of the 1970s and 1980s were characterized by a pattern of economic restructuring that featured the dual trends of massive manufacturing job losses coupled with the continued suburbanization of population and employment. These trends significantly reduced the base of job opportunities for residents of inner city neighborhoods, which once housed many of the goods producing jobs and a predominantly working-class workforce. The problem of declining employment in older, inner-city neighborhoods and growth in emerging suburban areas was first recognized in the late 1960s by scholars like Kain (1968) who argued that housing discrimination coupled with lack of opportunity in urban areas led to a persistently high unemployment of minority workers in inner cities. While the “spatial mismatch” hypothesis has been a widely debated topic in the social sciences (see Chapple, 2006; Ihlanfeldt & Sjoquist, 1989; Teitz & Chapple, 1998), the declining employment within inner-city neighborhoods was widely viewed as a critical problem. To get a sense of how profoundly scholars viewed the problem of the inner-city in the mid-1990s, we recall here the opening lines of Galster and Killen’s (1995) article on the geography of metropolitan opportunity as follows:

“Horatio Alger lies dead in the streets of the inner city. For millions of Americans, the rags-to-riches fable has been reduced to ashes just as surely as have many blocks in South Central Los Angeles and other desperate inner-city communities. What once was a spring board of socioeconomic mobility for generations...has for too many been transformed into a pit in which perpetual deprivation and social dysfunction reign” (Galster and Killen, 1995, 7)

Scholars from a wide variety of disciplines attempted to diagnose the problems associated with lack of inner-city employment opportunities, linking it broader issues of neighborhood decline including high crime, persistent poverty, segregation and changing attitudes toward work (Kasarda, 1993; Katz, 1993; Wilson, 1987, 1996).

The issue of declining inner-city employment and population losses coupled with continued suburbanization and sprawl also spawned concerns that declining central cities could pose a drag to an entire region's economic growth. This, in turn, ignited a series of studies specifically focused on the question of whether or not suburbs could prosper without their central cities (Hill, Wolman, & Ford, 1995; Ledebur & Barnes, 1993; Voith, 1992, 1998). The question seems appropriate in light of Pack's (2002) comprehensive analysis of long-term trends in metropolitan economic performance which finds that between 1960 and 1990 the share of income earned by central city residents declined from 45% to 30% and rose in suburban areas from 55% to 70% (Pack, 2002, 3). Although a great deal of empirical work focused on the issue of inner city competitiveness and the inter-dependency of suburbs and cities, eventually a consensus emerged supporting the idea that the economic health of both areas was closely linked by regional factors. Voith (1992) concluded, "decline in central cities is likely to be associated with slow-growing suburbs. Even if the most acute problems associated with urban decline do not arise in the suburbs, central city decline is likely to be a long-run, slow drain on the economic and social vitality of the region." (Voith, 1992, 31)

Just as the attention of federal policy makers shifted away from defining economic challenges in stark urban versus suburban terms, the academic literature shifted in the following decade to questions of the determinants of overall metropolitan economic competitiveness. The key question here was what factors explained the relative economic health and resilience of some metropolitan regions, particularly those with a growing, high-technology industrial base. The work of Saxenian (1994), Storper (1997) and others argued that metropolitan areas that featured regionally-based networks of



firms and supporting institutions that foster accelerated innovation were ultimately more resilient to economic restructuring and, as a result, are more competitive in terms of employment and income growth. This emphasis on innovation and regional competitiveness in the economic development literature had a profound impact on practice (Clark, 2013) and shifted the focus away from intra-metropolitan disparities and instead highlighted the overall uneven pattern of metropolitan growth in the 1990s and 2000s. Recently, Moretti (2012) makes a strong argument in *The New Geography of Jobs* that there is a growing disparity between what he calls “innovative regions”—which will garner a disproportionate share of employment and income growth in the coming decades—and “non-innovative regions” which will continue to be plagued by stagnant economic growth. The divergent trend was identified empirically by (Pastor, et al., 2009).

Starting in the early 2000s, a new narrative began to emerge on “comeback cities” as many scholars used newly available census data to identify a growing trend of residential growth particularly focused in the downtown and nearby areas of older central cities (Sohmer & Lang, 2001). Much of this research highlighted shifting demographics such as the aging of the population (i.e. empty nesters without children) and changing preferences for high-amenity locations like downtown as the causes of residential resurgence of downtown areas. This research is largely congruent with a pre-existing literature on the causes and consequences of gentrification. What began as a niche field that focused on select neighborhoods in places like the Lower East Side in New York (Smith, 1996) or the South End in Boston and was initially considered a relatively small trend (Wyly & Hammel, 1999), has now grown to be an active literature drawing scholarship from a wide variety of disciplines. While much of the empirical debate in the gentrification literature focused on measuring the extent of displacement (Freeman, 2005; Marcuse, 1985; Vigdor, 2002) within individual cities, there is growing consensus that gentrification is part of a broader demographic shift that results in the influx of better educated and high income households to formerly low and moderate income inner-city neighborhoods. The drivers of this

trend are seen to involve changes in the consumption and locational preferences of what some sociologists called a “new middle class” (Ley, 1996) and what Florida (2002) later termed the “creative class.” Regardless of their moniker, members of this demographic sub-group favor urban living and the greater accessibility it affords over the suburban dream of previous generations. According to these scholars, such preference shifts also drive gentrification by increasing demand for urban entertainment and consumption spaces for the new high-income residents (Lloyd & Clark, 2001; Zukin, 1982).

While scholars continue to debate how widespread and significant gentrification is as a demographic trend and what it will ultimately mean for inner cities, there is a growing literature that has examined the impact of gentrification on employment within inner-city neighborhoods. Curran (2004; 2007) focused on a single neighborhood—Williamsburg in Brooklyn—and found that new residential growth led to displacement of nearby industrial jobs. More recently Lester and Hartley (2014) examined the impact of gentrification at the census tract-level using detailed employment data for 29 large cities in the US and found that gentrifying neighborhoods had faster employment growth and a more rapid shift between traditionally blue collar work and locally oriented services such as restaurants and entertainment. Beyond these studies, there have been relatively few papers that specifically look at the nature of employment growth in inner-cities. There have been individual case studies such as Hutton’s (2004) description of the emergence of new high-tech industry clusters in Vancouver, BC. In addition, there are two new reports that focus on the long-term residential shifts of poor neighborhoods in U.S. metropolitan areas, which suggest that the gentrification or “back to the city” trend may be limited, or is bypassing high-poverty neighborhoods. Specifically, Cortright and Mahmoudi (2014) find that 69 percent of census tracts with high poverty levels (30%) in 1970 still had high poverty levels in 2010. Aliprantis, Fee, and Oliver (2014) examine patterns of tract-level income change between 1980 and 2010 and find considerable stability in tract-level income quartiles over time. However, they also find that tract-level income growth varied widely by metropolitan characteristics, as tracts that

transitioned from poor to non-poor were more likely to be located in growing metropolitan areas that were relatively large and densely populated and which experienced greater immigration.

Given the potentially conflicting evidence about demographic trends affecting the inner city and the relative paucity of research on recent inner city employment trends, we argue that there is a need for a comprehensive analysis of job growth in America's inner cities over the past decade. Porter (1997) recognized this need early on, but lamented that there was no single source of localized, workplace-based employment statistics to track the changing economic role of inner city neighborhoods and to assess how much private investment "already recognized" the competitive potential of the inner city. Now we have such a data source; namely the Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) (see below). Ultimately, this paper will use a descriptive approach that revisits some of the key questions in the preceding literature. First, we assess the actual extent of job growth that has occurred in America's inner cities relative to suburban areas and CBDs between 2002 and 2011, highlighting key differences by broad geographic regions, industrial sector, and tract poverty status. Next, we return to the question of inner city competitiveness by defining a new method for identifying which regions have competitive inner cities and what distinguishes them from the rest of the metropolitan pack. Finally, we test some of the predictions of the gentrification literature and build a simple descriptive model of inner city job growth at the tract level.

### **3. Data Sources and Methods**

We primarily use data from the US Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employment and Household Dynamics (LEHD) dataset. Specifically we use special tabulations of the LEHD data created for local transportation and workforce development analysis called the Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) program. The dataset is available at a 2010 block-group-level geography. Total

employment and employment by broad industry sector from 2002 through 2011 is summarized to a tract level for the purposes of this analysis. While the dataset is available for the most of the United States, some states are missing from the analysis because of data non-availability for the full period of analysis. These include Arizona, Arkansas, the District of Columbia, Mississippi, New Hampshire and Massachusetts which began participation in the LEHD at various years throughout the period and therefore do not figure in the current analysis.

While the LODES data is also available on a worker residence basis, we use workplace-based counts of employment, as we are primarily interested in the changing geography of employment between inner-city tracts and other components of metropolitan areas. The LODES dataset is a synthetic dataset derived from confidential data sources such as unemployment insurance records, TIGER line files and additional administrative data from the US Census and the Social Security Administration. Noise is then infused into the workplace totals to protect employer and employee confidentiality. These data production methods and caveats should be considered while evaluating the evidence presented in this analysis. For a more complete description of the LODES dataset and its differences with the standard Census products such as the American Community Survey (ACS) refer to Graham et.al (2014).

### 3.1 Identifying the Inner City

As discussed above, while there is significant research on the competitiveness of inner cities, it is very hard to find a commonly accepted definition in the literature as to what constitutes an inner-city area. Generally speaking, inner cities are understood as relatively poor areas with high concentration of minorities within large central cities. While nearly all scholars distinguish the inner city from suburban areas and traditional downtowns, there is little agreement on the essential characteristics of inner-city neighborhoods. Porter implies that these areas are “distressed neighborhoods, in which, in most cases,

African Americans and other people of color represent the majority of the population (Porter, 1997. p. 11)". Yet, more recent studies, such as Hutton (2004), simply look at all non-downtown portions of the central city. Ultimately, the literature lacks a systematic delineation of the geographic or jurisdictional extent of inner cities.

As a first approximation, we define inner cities as areas of the largest central city or main cities in a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) that are not part of the Central Business District. To identify the main central cities in each MSA, we consider the official set of Principal Cities<sup>ii</sup> within an MSA (as defined by the US Census) and select the largest of those principal cities that collectively make up more than half of the principal city population within the MSA. Such identification of main cities in an MSA eliminates classifying older suburban satellite cities (e.g. Schaumburg, IL) as inner cities but still retains the flexibility of having multiple inner city clusters within an MSA. For example, in Minnesota both Minneapolis and St. Paul are considered the main cities and the tracts that are not within the CBDs of these cities are considered inner city areas. In general, a vast majority of the 281 MSAs considered in this analysis have only one main central city from which we draw our definition of inner-city tracts.

### 3.1 Identifying the CBD

In order to classify census tracts as inner-city or not, we needed to clearly define the central business district (CBD) or downtown of each principal city. In addition to lack of definition of inner city, there is also no accepted current definition and delineation of a CBD. The last known delineation of the CBD was done in 1982 in the Census of Retail Trade. To update this identification we first identify all employment centers in an MSA. We then identify the cluster of employment centers that overlap the point definitions of CBD provided by Fee & Hartley (2011) and call them the central business districts (CBDs) within the MSA.

The employment centers are identified using methods detailed by McMillen (2001, 2003). Briefly, a locally weighted regression is constructed using the employment densities at a tract level. The weighting is a smoothing function that accounts for the spatially nearest 50 percent of the density values. A tract is identified as an employment center if the residuals are significantly greater than 0, accounting for the standard error of the estimate. This non-parametric method has been used to identify employment centers in a number of studies (Garcia-López, 2010; Suárez & Delgado, 2009). Once the tracts that have a higher than expected residuals are identified within an MSA, a contiguity matrix is constructed using 'spdep' (Bivand, 2015). The contiguity matrices are converted to a graph, where nodes are the identified census tracts and a pair of nodes have an edge if the corresponding contiguity matrix element is non-zero using 'igraph' (Csardi & Nepusz, 2006). Once the graph is constructed, standard graph theoretic methods are used to decompose the graph into maximally connected components. If any of the census tracts within a maximally connected cluster overlaps with the CBD point, then we designate the entire cluster a central business district.

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

### 3.2 Other Data Sources

To conduct our descriptive analysis comparing metropolitan regions with competitive inner cities to other regions, and for our tract-level determinants of inner city job growth we also draw upon several other data sources. The two main sources of additional data beyond the LODES dataset are the Smart Location Database (SLD) produced by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)<sup>iii</sup> and the Building Resilient Regions (BRR) database. The BRR database is a comprehensive dataset on demographic, economic, and policy variables for all metropolitan areas in the U.S. (mainly derived from Census data) and was produced by the MacArthur Foundation's Building Resilient Regions research network (see Pastor et. al, 2009 for more information).

## 4. Employment Trends and the Competitiveness of Inner Cities

### 4.1 *The Nature of Inner City Employment Change in the U.S. in the 2000s.*

Compared to the preceding two decades, the 2000s was a period of relatively stable job growth for America’s inner cities. During the nine year period from 2002—just after a mild recession—to 2011 two years after the end of the Great Recession—inner city census tracts added 1.8 million net new jobs. Surprisingly, this rate of growth (6.1 percent) was roughly comparable to the rate of growth observed in suburban areas (6.9 percent). However, suburbs still added nearly twice as many total positions and maintain the preponderance of all metropolitan jobs. Over the study period, inner cities grew faster than non-metropolitan areas (2.3 percent) and CBDs, which declined by 1.6 percent. As indicated in Table 1 below, the post-Great Recession period (2009-2011) was particularly favorable to inner cities as their growth rate actually surpassed the suburban rate (3.6 versus 3.0) and nearly 1 in 3 jobs created during this period was located in the inner city.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Given some concern in the literature that the “comeback cities” narrative is limited primarily to only a select set of coastal cities such as New York, Washington, and San Francisco, we examined the same employment trends in each of the nine census divisions across the country (see Figure 2). Looking at the full period, this observation holds somewhat. Although inner city growth was positive in all divisions except the East North Central (which declined as a whole), it outpaced suburban areas in only the Mid Atlantic (which includes New York) and the Pacific census divisions.

[FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In the post-recession period however, inner cities were considerably more competitive vis-à-vis the suburbs throughout the country, growing faster in five out of nine divisions and rebounding strongly even in the rust-belt East North Central area. The outlier region seems to be West South Central where suburban job growth consistently swamped both CBD and inner city areas. Although this is a relatively small period, the post-recession evidence is indicative of a relatively urban-based recovery.

While total employment increased within inner-city tracts in aggregate, there have been significant industrial shifts occurring within inner cities as they continue to transition away from goods producing sectors and towards relatively place-bound service sector industries. In Figure 3 we analyze net employment change for the full period (2002-11) and the post-recession period for all of the inner city tracts for the U.S. as a whole. Not surprisingly, the greatest losses occurred in manufacturing (-782,000 jobs), followed by construction (-224,000), which was particularly hard hit by the housing crisis and recession. The strongest gaining industries were the so-called “eds and meds” sectors of Health Care and Social Assistance and Educational Services, which added 1.1 million and 633,000 jobs respectively. This finding makes sense since many institutions such as universities and hospitals were founded in the past century in inner-city neighborhoods, have remained in those neighborhoods, and have proved resilient to the wider economic changes that affected the inner city during the 1970s and 1980s. The economic role of universities and their expanding hospitals is critical in areas like West Philadelphia (home to the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel University) and Hyde Park (home to the University of Chicago). Inner city areas also saw strong growth in the Accommodation and Food Services sector (323,000 jobs), which includes restaurants and is consistent with the findings in the gentrification literatures on the changing economic role of inner cities from spaces of production to spaces of consumption.

[FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE]



Since our definition of inner city is quite broad, including all non-CBD portions of the largest principal city in each MSA, we also sought to understand if the net positive employment growth was limited to areas that were initially higher income enclaves within the city. To test this, we categorized each census tract by its poverty status in 2000. Since much of the literature in the 1990s focused on high poverty neighborhoods and declining employment therein, we also included the tract poverty status in 1990.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

As Table 2 indicates, the large majority of inner city job creation occurred in areas where less than 20 percent of residents earned incomes below the poverty line (79% for 1990 and 73% for 2000). In addition, lower poverty areas maintained a much larger share of total jobs (by a factor of two) compared to high poverty tracts. What is interesting about this tabulation is that the figures for high-poverty tracts are positive at all, given all the preceding discussion of job flight and neighborhood decline. Most interesting is the fact that, while they only have a small share of total jobs, the growth rate of tracts with extreme poverty (over 40 percent) was the faster than low-poverty tracts.

#### *4.2 Inner city competitiveness at the metropolitan scale*

The decade of the 2000s was significant in the long-term economic trajectory of inner cities over the past 40 years because it marked a reversal of the trend of large-scale job losses and decline. But does this necessarily mean that inner cities are now more competitive locations for business expansion and job growth compared to suburban areas? We revisit the question of inner city competitiveness by exploring the nature of inner city job growth in nearly all metropolitan areas in the U.S. and attempting to determine the extent of inner city competitiveness and the regional factors that influence the growing competitiveness of inner cities in certain MSAs.

However, the uneven pattern of metropolitan growth itself clearly plays a role for the prospects of inner city change. In general, larger MSAs experienced larger total employment growth over the study period. Places like San Antonio, TX and Los Angeles, CA experienced substantial growth in metropolitan employment and also experienced significant growth in inner city employment. However, metropolitan area growth does not always coincide with employment growth in the inner city. For example, in places like Houston and Dallas, TX while the inner city employment growth is positive, suburban growth overshadows the inner city. Therefore, we wanted to develop a method of defining inner city competitiveness that accounted for overall metropolitan growth and identified MSAs where job growth was disproportionately focused on the inner city during the 2000s.

[FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE]

To identify which inner cities are competitive over our study period, we examined the relative change in the proportion of inner city employment within its metropolitan area (see Figure 4). Within each quadrant we plot the 2002 inner city share and 2011 inner city share of total metropolitan area employment. We then divide the whole data set into four groups based on whether or not total employment in the metropolitan area grew or declined (horizontal axis) and whether there was net positive inner city job growth or not (vertical axis). While there are a few inner cities that have grown despite the overall metropolitan area decline (SW quadrant), the vast majority of observations with positive inner city employment growth also had positive regional growth. However, since we are interested in “competitive” inner cities, we focus on those metropolitan areas with both positive employment growth and where inner cities increased their share of jobs. These metros are above the 45° line in the SE quadrant of Figure 4. Specifically, we find that 120 out of a total set of 281 metropolitan areas (43 percent) have “competitive inner cities.” We label these metros as metros with competitive inner cities and compare their characteristics with the other metropolitan areas in the

sample. A complete list of these metropolitan areas is provided in Appendix A. The metropolitan areas that are on this list are quite diverse ranging from large metros to more moderate size ones. In general, the change in the share of employment in the inner city is modest between 2002 and 2011, except in a few metropolitan areas.

Next, we compared these metropolitan areas with competitive inner cities to the rest of the metros in the sample (see Figure 5). There is no difference between proportions of jobs in the concentrated employment sub-centers between the two groups (as defined using McMillen 2003's method). However, high wage job growth both at the metro level and within the inner city stand out. Competitive inner cities, in general, have experienced significant high wage job growth. Further research is needed to address the question of whether this high wage job growth is a cause or an effect of "competitiveness".

[FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Metropolitan areas that have a lower black-white dissimilarity index—an indicator of segregation at the metro-level—are more likely to have a competitive inner city. This is consistent with the work of Pastor (Pastor, Drier, & al., 2000) and others who argue that regions where segregation is less pronounced are more likely to produced balanced economic growth. We find that metros with competitive inner cities have lower average black-white dissimilarity indices in 2000s compared to their peers. However, the two groups have the similar distribution of dissimilarity indices with the foreign born and native born, suggesting smaller influence of cross-national migration on competitive inner cities.

Competitive inner city metropolitan areas had higher poverty rates in 2000, suggesting higher poverty rates are not a constraint for economic development. There are only small differences in the means of the median household income between the two groups. However, the means tell only part of

the story. The distributions are quite different. The median income distribution of the competitive metropolitan areas is skewed to the left compared to the rest of the metros. Furthermore, higher poverty rates, especially in inner cities might suggest redevelopment opportunities.

Metropolitan areas with competitive inner cities, on average, have higher average job accessibility. Accessibility is measured at the block group level as the percentage of the jobs in the metro that can be accessed within a 45 minute commute; the figure is then averaged for all block groups in the metropolitan area. This difference disappears when we compare the average block group accessibility based on transit service. While we should expect to see higher competitiveness of metros with high quality transit, this result is likely due to persistent low levels of transit provision and usage in the United States.

Neither the population distribution, nor the proportion of creative jobs is significantly different in the competitive metropolitan areas from the rest of the metros. The Theil Index of population density represents skewness in the population density distribution. Higher Theil index metropolitan areas are metros with some tracts with large population densities and the rest very low population density, while a lower Theil index means the metropolitan area has relatively uniform population density. The results suggest that concentrations of density are not different between the two groups of the metropolitan areas.

## **5. Tract-Level Drivers of Inner City Employment Growth**

What are the characteristics of inner city neighborhoods that experience employment growth? In this section, we present census tract-level regressions to examine the correlates of employment growth during the 2000s; focusing on variation in tract-level measures within these inner cities. Our

sample consists of the non-CBD census tracts of 106 large principal cities (within each metropolitan area) which had at least 30 census tracts once the CBD tracts were excluded. We use 2010 census tract boundaries and consider the degree to which changes in log employment from 2002 to 2011 are associated with a number of explanatory variables.

$$[1] \quad \Delta emp_{i,c} = \alpha_c + \beta_d distCBD_{i,c} + \beta_e emp_{i,c} + \beta_r res_{i,c} + \beta_l loc_{i,c} + \beta_p pol_{i,c} + \epsilon_i,$$

where the dependent variable,  $\Delta emp_{i,c}$  represents the change in the log of census tract employment from 2002 to 2011 in tract,  $i$ , in city,  $c$ . The explanatory variables are,  $\alpha_c$ , a city fixed effect,  $distCBD_{i,c}$ , the log of the distance (in miles) from the centroid of the tract to the centroid of the CBD,  $emp_{i,c}$ , the log of tract-level employment in 2002,  $res_{i,c}$ , a vector of variables describing the residential characteristics of the tract,  $loc_{i,c}$ , a vector of location factors which measure the accessibility of the tract vis-à-vis the transportation network,  $pol_{i,c}$ , a vector describing whether certain place-based policies were in effect in the tract, and an error term,  $\epsilon_i$ .

The vector of residential characteristics,  $res_{i,c}$ , includes the log of the tract population in 2000, the change in the log of the sum of the population in all contiguous tracts, the poverty rate in 2000, the change in the share of the population with a college or higher degree, the share of occupied housing units in which the residents moved in between 2000 and 2010, and the share of the housing units that were built between 2000 and 2010. These variables are included to capture both the overall socio-economic characteristics of the tract itself as well as provide some indicators of gentrification by accounting for recent building activity and recent changes in population around the tract in question. It is important to note that we are simply describing associations between tract-level employment growth and measures related to gentrification. It is likely that there is some degree of endogeneity between local employment growth and gentrification.

The vector of location factors,  $loc_{i,c}$ , includes the gross residential density of the tract measured in housing units per acre, an entropy index of the industrial diversity of the tract, a measure of automobile accessibility (the number of automobile-oriented road links per square mile), a measure of pedestrian accessibility (the number of pedestrian-oriented road links per square mile), and an indicator of whether the tract contains any public transit stops. The public transit indicator variable is only available for 55 of the 106 cities in our sample. We set this variable equal to negative one for all observations in the cities for which it is missing. Inclusion of city fixed effects ensure that the estimation of the coefficient on this variable will be due to within-city variation in public transit stop presence in cities for which we do have public transit data.

The vector of place-based policies,  $pol_{i,c}$ , includes an indicator of whether the tract contains any Low Income Housing Tax Credit developments and an indicator of whether the tract has been designated an Empowerment Zone or Renewal Community.<sup>iv</sup> Appendix B contains a table of descriptive statistics for all independent variables in our regression sample.

Table 3 presents our tract-level regression results aimed at revealing some of the correlates of within-city variation in non-CBD inner city employment growth. The table shows four specifications, with an increasing number of explanatory variables. The specification in column (1) includes on the log of the distance from the centroid of the tract to the CBD. The coefficient of 0.066 means that tracts that are twice as far from the CBD have on average 4.6 more log points of employment growth ( $0.69 * 0.066 = 0.046$ ). The specification in column (2) adds the log of initial year (2002) employment. This variable is added to help mitigate potential measurement error problems in the tract-level employment data. Adding this control reduces the magnitude of the coefficient on the distance to CBD measure. Column (3) adds local demand variables in the form the log of the tracts own initial year population and the change in the log of the population of all of the tracts that share a border with the tract. In this

specification changes in the local area (neighboring tract) population are correlated with tract-level employment growth. The coefficient of 0.535 implies that, on average, a 10 log point increase in neighboring tract population is associated with a 5 log point increase in own-tract employment.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

The specification in column (4) contains our full set of tract-level explanatory variables. The first thing that stands out is that the sign of the coefficient on the log of distance to CBD is now negative and is statistically different from zero. Conditional on all the other explanatory variables, employment growth is negatively correlated with distance to the CBD. In other words, controlling for other factors, neighborhoods closer to downtown added jobs at a faster rate than those further away, indicating the importance of proximity to the largest concentration of employment in region. The log of initial year (2000) tract population is now positively related to employment growth. The change in the log population of neighboring tracts is still positively related to employment growth but conditional on all the other explanatory variables the coefficient has dropped to about half of its value in column (3). Higher poverty rate tracts are associated with less employment growth. All else equal, 10 percentage points higher poverty rate is associated with 2.4 fewer log points of employment growth. Thus neighborhood poverty still seems to be a deterrent to local employment growth.

The coefficient on the change in the share with a college degree is positive but not statistically different from zero. While we would expect that this would be an important variable, given the literature on gentrification and then urban preferences of the creative class, it is likely that the effect of this variable is usurped by the next two variables, which are also indicators of residential changes. Specifically, the share of occupied housing units with residents that moved in during the 2000s (an indicator of recent migration to the area) is positively correlated with employment growth. This higher residential turnover is consistent with urban re-development. Further evidence that employment

growth and re-development are correlated comes from the positive coefficient on the share of housing units built during the 2000s. It appears that tracts with 10 percentage points higher share of units built during the 2000s have, on average, 6.6 log-points higher employment growth.

The coefficient on residential density is negative, though not statistically significant. This is not surprising as tracts which have mostly residential uses (and thus higher density) have little room left for commercial land-uses and the jobs located therein. Industrial diversity—measured as the 5 category employment entropy index—is positively correlated with employment growth over the period.

Automobile accessibility shows a positive association with employment growth while pedestrian accessibility is negatively associated with employment growth. This finding indicates the importance of auto accessibility for local employment growth in sectors such as retail. While the negative association for pedestrian oriented streets is indicative low growth in tracts that are primarily residential. Even in inner city neighborhoods in older cities, such as Chicago, employment growth is still concentrated in commercial corridors along arterial roads. Finally, there is a statistically significant association between the presence of a public transit stop and employment growth. The coefficient implies that tracts containing public transit stops saw roughly 6.7 log-points higher employment growth than those without a public transit stop.

There is no clear association between the presence of Low Income Housing Tax Credit developments and employment growth. There is a marginally statistically significant positive relationship between Empowerment Zone / Renewal Community status and employment growth. While we do not consider this strong causal evidence of the effectiveness of EZ/RC policies, it is consistent with the findings of recent research (Busso, Gregory, & Kline, 2010) . On average, tracts in these programs saw about 5.3 log-points higher employment growth than other inner city tracts.



The specification in column (4) has an R-squared of 0.23, meaning that our full set of explanatory variables can explain about a quarter of the variation in tract-level employment growth. In specifications without the city fixed effect (not shown) the R-squared drops to 0.19 and without the log of initial year employment it drops to 0.12.

## 6. Conclusion

For America's inner cities as a whole, the decade of the 2000s stands in stark relief compared to the 1980s and 1990s in terms of job growth. Using a dataset that was unavailable in the past (LODES), we show that inner city tracts (those in the non-CBD portions of the large central cities) added 1.8 million jobs between 2002 and 2011. This trend is not just limited to a few cities and regions, as inner city growth was positive in nearly all census divisions and even outpaced suburban growth rates in some areas. The post-recession period has been even stronger for inner cities. While the overall national trend is encouraging given the scale of job losses in previous decades, this growth is probably not enough to declare a "renaissance" in urban America.

Clearly, regional growth differentials are important, as the literature on city-suburban dependence indicates. It is not surprising that New York City and San Francisco have much higher inner city employment growth as they are located within strong, growing metropolitan areas. However, in places like Dallas and Houston which also grew, suburban employment continues to outpace inner city employment, suggesting important differences in characteristics and policies of the metropolitan areas that result in competitive inner cities. Yet, places known for their suburban dominance such as Los Angeles and San Antonio showed strong inner city resurgence in the last decade. Thus, competitive inner cities emerged in some unlikely places. We find that while competitive inner cities are no longer the exception, they are also not universal. Two fifths (120 out of 281) of the metros studied in this

analysis have seen both increases in overall employment as well as share of inner city employment. Much of the growth in these metropolitan areas is driven by growth in the high wage sectors.

There are also important differences in the nature of job growth by sector. The inner city resurgence has been led by Health Care and Educational Services; at the same time losses in manufacturing and construction jobs continue in the inner city reflecting the twin trends of globalization and suburbanization of manufacturing. Within inner cities, access to physical infrastructure (e.g. proximity to CBD, transit), as well as social infrastructure (e.g. population increases nearby) are associated with significant advantage for job growth. However, if access to infrastructure is one of the competitive strengths of the inner cities, it is not reflected in the job growth in the sectors that largely depend on infrastructure (such as manufacturing). Instead, the job growth is driven by residential sectors such as food services supporting some claims from the gentrification literature that inner city job growth is fueled at least in part by recent residential growth.

However, our findings also indicate that inner city job growth tends to be greater in areas that are relatively less poor. Thus, even though metros with competitive inner cities have higher poverty rates, on average, high poverty neighborhoods within inner cities still seem to have major barriers that limit more robust employment gains. It is here that there may be a continued role for government intervention. Our finding that tracts designated as either an Empowerment Zone or Renewal Community grew faster, on average, than other tracts suggests that economic development strategies that are targeted to high-poverty areas can play a role. Our results suggest that, overall, inner city areas do have real advantages as locations for employment and are increasingly viewed as an attractive residential location.

## References

- Aliprantis, D., Fee, K., & Oliver, N. (2014). *Which Poor Neighborhoods Experienced Income Growth in Recent Decades?* Cleveland: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
- Bivand, R. (2015). Spatial Dependence: Weighting Schemes, Statistics and Models. R package (spdep) (Version version 0.5-81).
- Busso, M., Gregory, J., & Kline, P. M. (2010). *Assessing the incidence and efficiency of a prominent place based policy*: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Chapple, K. (2006). Connection missed: Revisiting the spatial mismatch hypothesis in the new metropolitan reality. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, forthcoming.
- Clark, J. (2013). *Working Regions: Reconnecting Innovation and Production in the Knowledge Economy*: Routledge.
- Cortright, J., & Mahmoudi, D. (2014). *Neighborhood Change, 1970 to 2010: Transition and Growth in Urban High Poverty Neighborhoods*. Portland, OR: Impresa Economics.
- Csardi, G., & Nepusz, T. (2006). The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal, Complex Systems*, 1695.
- Curran, W. (2004). Gentrification and the nature of work: exploring the links in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. *Environment and planning.A*, 36(Journal Article), 1243.
- Curran, W. (2007). 'From the Frying Pan to the Oven': Gentrification and the Experience of Industrial Displacement in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1427-1440.
- Fee, K., & Hartley, D. (2011). Urban Growth and Decline: The Role of Population Density at the City Core. Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the Creative Class. *City & Community*, 2(1), 3-19.
- Florida, R. L. (2002). *The rise of the creative class : and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Freeman, L. (2005). Displacement or Succession? *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(4), 463-491.
- Galster, G. C., & Killen, S. P. (1995). The geography of metropolitan opportunity: a reconnaissance and conceptual framework. *Housing Policy Debate*, 6(1), 7-43.
- Garcia-López, M.-À. (2010). Population suburbanization in Barcelona, 1991–2005: Is its spatial structure changing? *Journal of Housing Economics*, 19(2), 119-132.
- Graham, M. R., Kutzbach, M. J., & McKenzie, B. (2014). *Design Comparison Of Lodes And Acs Commuting Data Products*.
- Grogan, P. S., & Proscio, T. (2000). *Comeback cities: A blueprint for urban neighborhood revival*: Basic Books.
- Hill, E. W., Wolman, H. L., & Ford, C. C. (1995). Can suburbs survive without their central cities? Examining the suburban dependence hypothesis. *Urban Affairs Review*, 31(2), 147-174.
- Ihlanfeldt, K., & Sjoquist, D. (1989). The impact of job decentralization on the economic welfare of central-city blacks. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 26, 110-130 .
- Kain, J. (1968). Housing segregation, Negro employment, and metropolitan decentralization. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 82(2), 175–197
- Kasarda, J. D. (1993). Inner-city concentrated poverty and neighborhood distress: 1970 to 1990. *Housing Policy Debate*, 4(3), 253-302.
- Katz, M. B. (1993). *The "underclass" debate: Views from history*: Princeton University Press.
- Ledebur, L. C., & Barnes, W. R. (1993). *"All in it Together": Cities, Suburbs, and Local Economic Regions. Research Report on America's Cities*. Washington D.C.: National League of Cities.
- Lester, T. W., & Hartley, D. A. (2014). The long term employment impacts of gentrification in the 1990s. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 45(0), 80-89.

- Ley, D. (1996). *The new middle class and the remaking of the central city* Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Lloyd, R., & Clark, T. N. (2001). The city as an entertainment machine. In K. Fox Gotham (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment* (pp. 357-378): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Marcuse, P. (1985). Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Washington University journal of urban and contemporary law*, 28(Journal Article), 195.
- McMillen, D. P. (2001). Nonparametric employment subcenter identification. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 50(3), 448-473.
- McMillen, D. P. (2003). Identifying sub-centres using contiguity matrices. *Urban Studies*, 40(1), 57-69.
- Moretti, E. (2012). *The New Geography of Jobs*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Pack, J. R. (2002). *Growth and convergence in metropolitan America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Pastor, M., Drier, P., & al., e. (2000). *Regions that Work: How Cities and Suburbs Can Grow Together*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Pastor, M., Lester, T. W., & Scoggins, J. (2009). WHY REGIONS? WHY NOW? WHO CARES? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 31(3), 269-296.
- Saxenian, A. (1994). *Regional advantage : culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, N. (2002). New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 427-450.
- Sohmer, R. R., & Lang, R. E. (2001). Downtown rebound. *Redefining Urban and Suburban America: Evidence From Census 2000*, 1, 63-74.
- Storper, M. (1997). *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*. New York: Guilford.
- Suárez, M., & Delgado, J. (2009). Is Mexico City Polycentric? A trip attraction capacity approach. *Urban Studies*, 46(10), 2187-2211.
- Teitz, M., & Chapple, K. (1998). The causes of inner-city poverty: Eight hypotheses in search of reality. *Citiscap: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 3(3), 33-70.
- Vigdor, J. L. (2002). Does Gentrification Harm the Poor? [with Comments]. *Brookings-Wharton papers on urban affairs*(ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: 2002 / Copyright © 2002 Brookings Institution Press), 133-182.
- Voith, R. (1992 ). City and Suburban Growth: Substitutes or Compliments. *Business Review- Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia*, September-October, 21-33.
- Voith, R. (1998). Do suburbs need cities? *Journal of Regional Science*, 38(3), 445-464.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged : the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears : the world of the new urban poor* (1st ed.). New York: Knopf : Distributed by Random House, Inc.
- Wyly, E. K., & Hammel, D. J. (1999). Islands of decay in seas of renewal: Housing policy and the resurgence of gentrification. *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(4), 711-771.
- Zukin, S. (1982). *Loft living : culture and capital in urban change*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.



## Tables and Figures

**Table 1. Employment Change in CBD, Inner City, Suburban and Non-metro tracts, 2002-11.**

Year	CBD	Inner City	Suburban	Non-Metro	Total
<b>Total Employment</b>					
<b>2002</b>	9,806,579	29,699,043	59,207,009	15,401,902	114,114,533
<b>2003</b>	9,466,413	29,406,696	59,122,731	15,351,324	113,347,164
<b>2004</b>	9,368,606	29,688,362	60,114,666	15,481,987	114,653,621
<b>2005</b>	9,391,107	30,143,171	61,722,807	15,711,700	116,968,785
<b>2006</b>	9,502,148	30,512,600	62,976,328	15,969,935	118,961,011
<b>2007</b>	9,462,838	31,030,945	64,129,684	16,113,194	120,736,661
<b>2008</b>	9,422,301	31,082,578	64,323,119	16,120,592	120,948,590
<b>2009</b>	9,405,450	30,425,117	61,460,391	15,426,231	116,717,189
<b>2010</b>	9,599,146	30,796,523	61,733,541	15,466,790	117,596,000
<b>2011</b>	9,654,338	31,521,499	63,296,946	15,758,332	120,231,115
<b>Net Employment Change (2002-11)</b>					
	(152,241)	1,822,456	4,089,937	356,430	6,116,582
<b>% Change</b>	-1.6%	6.1%	6.9%	2.3%	5.4%
<b>Post-Recession Net Change (2009-11)</b>					
	248,888	1,096,382	1,836,555	332,101	3,513,926
<b>% Change</b>	2.6%	3.6%	3.0%	2.2%	3.0%
<b>Share of US Emp., 2002</b>	9.9%	30.1%	60.0%	15.6%	
<b>Share of US Emp., 2011</b>	9.2%	30.0%	60.3%	15.7%	

Note: Authors analysis of LODS data by tract-type for states with full sample (2002-11).

**Table 2. Inner city Employment Change by Tract Poverty Status**

Employment Measure	Tract Poverty Status, 1990				Tract Poverty Status, 2000		
	Low Poverty (<20%)	High Poverty (>20%)	Extreme Poverty (>40%)		Low Poverty (<20%)	High Poverty >20%	Extreme Poverty (>40%)
Total Employment, 2002	19,843,121	9,855,922	2,879,470		19,779,094	9,919,949	2,177,597
% of Inner City Jobs, 2011	66.8%	33.2%	9.7%		66.6%	33.4%	7.3%
Total Employment, 2009	20,581,454	9,843,663	2,936,604		20,440,333	9,984,784	2,206,598
% of Inner City Jobs, 2011	67.6%	32.4%	9.7%		67.2%	32.8%	7.3%
Total Employment, 2011	21,296,609	10,224,890	3,183,065		21,116,880	10,404,619	2,352,930
% of Inner City Jobs, 2011	67.6%	32.4%	10.1%		67.0%	33.0%	7.5%
Net Employment Change (2002-11)	1,453,488	368,968	303,595		1,337,786	484,670	175,333
% Change	7.3%	3.7%	10.5%		6.8%	4.9%	8.1%
Net Employment Change (2009-11)	715,155	381,227	246,461		676,547	419,835	146,332
% Change	3.5%	3.9%	8.4%		3.3%	4.2%	6.6%

Source: Authors analysis of Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) data, 2002-2011.

**Table 3: OLS Regression Results: Predictors of Tract-level Employment Growth, 2002-2011.**


Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
log Distance to CBD	0.066***	0.037***	0.006	-0.029**
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.012)
log Employment 2002		-0.152***	-0.15***	-0.202***
		(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.007)
log Population 2000			-0.007	0.076***
			(0.014)	(0.014)
Change in log pop in neighboring tracts, 2000-2010			0.535***	0.256***
			(0.045)	(0.042)
Poverty Rate, 2000				-0.24***
				(0.072)
Change in Share with College Degree, 2000-2010				0.107
				(0.098)
Share of occupied housing with new residents, 2000-2010				0.246***
				(0.065)
Share of housing units built between 2000 and 2010				0.662***
				(0.066)
Residential density (Units/Acre)				-0.001
				(0.001)
Industrial diversity index (5 category entropy index)				0.464***
				(0.035)
Automobile Accessibility (links per square mile)				0.01***
				(0.003)
Pedestrian Accessibility (links per square mile)				-0.008***
				(0.002)
Public transit stop in tract?				0.067*
				(0.041)
Low Income Housing Tax Credit Development in Tract?				0.008
				(0.014)
Empowerment Zone/Renewal Community?				0.053*
				(0.031)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.0753	0.1648	0.1864	0.2309
N	11,837	11,837	11,837	11,837

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses below estimate. \*Significant at 10%. \*\*Significant at 5%.



\*\*\*Significant at 1%.




Figure 1. Examples of Delineation of Inner City in the Cleveland, MSA



**Figure 2. Employment Change by Tract-Type and Census Division, Full Period and Post-Recession**




**Figure 3. Inner-City Employment change by Major Industry Sector (NAICS)- Full Period (2002-11) and Post Recession (2009-11).**




Source: Authors analysis of Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) data, 2002-2011.

Figure 4. Relationship between Inner city proportion of employment in 2002 and 2011.



Source: Authors analysis of Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) data, 2002-2011.

**Figure 5. Characteristics of Metropolitan Regions with Competitive Inner Cities Versus All other Metros**



Notes: Figure presents the difference in distribution of various indicators for metropolitan areas with competitive inner cities and to the distribution for all other metropolitan areas. Sources: LODS (panel 1-3); Building Resilient Regions (BRR) Database (panels 4-8); EPA Smart Location Database (Panels 9-11). All variables calculated at the metropolitan (CBSA) level. N=281.

## A. Appendix: List of Regions with Competitive Inner Cities

CBSA	Share of employment in the inner city		Difference in shares
	2002	2011	
Palm Coast, FL	0.392	0.628	0.236
Ames, IA	0.109	0.305	0.196
Athens-Clarke County, GA	0.569	0.726	0.156
Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA	0.063	0.213	0.150
Morgantown, WV	0.145	0.273	0.128
Lawrence, KS	0.468	0.593	0.125
Kokomo, IN	0.265	0.386	0.121
Columbia, MO	0.492	0.602	0.111
Jackson, TN	0.573	0.681	0.108
Appleton, WI	0.250	0.340	0.090
Bismarck, ND	0.300	0.373	0.074
Logan, UT-ID	0.249	0.319	0.070
Bowling Green, KY	0.629	0.698	0.069
Johnson City, TN	0.338	0.405	0.066
Jackson, MI	0.210	0.274	0.064
Clarksville, TN-KY	0.359	0.419	0.061
Ann Arbor, MI	0.483	0.542	0.059
Glens Falls, NY	0.046	0.105	0.058
Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.523	0.580	0.057
Springfield, IL	0.473	0.529	0.056
Springfield, OH	0.392	0.448	0.056
Atlantic City, NJ	0.077	0.133	0.056
Sumter, SC	0.220	0.275	0.055
Anchorage, AK	0.807	0.860	0.053
New Haven-Milford, CT	0.104	0.156	0.052
Port St. Lucie, FL	0.159	0.210	0.050
College Station-Bryan, TX	0.183	0.226	0.043
Laredo, TX	0.674	0.716	0.042
Salinas, CA	0.101	0.142	0.041
San Antonio, TX	0.650	0.690	0.040
Joplin, MO	0.122	0.162	0.040
Lexington-Fayette, KY	0.614	0.652	0.038
Lake Charles, LA	0.277	0.315	0.038
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	0.368	0.403	0.035
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville, CA	0.195	0.229	0.035
Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	0.291	0.325	0.034
Goldsboro, NC	0.407	0.441	0.034

Ocean City, NJ	0.028	0.061	0.033
Longview, WA	0.048	0.082	0.033
Lafayette, IN	0.416	0.449	0.033
Bakersfield, CA	0.316	0.348	0.033
St. Cloud, MN	0.361	0.394	0.032
Gadsden, AL	0.380	0.411	0.031
Redding, CA	0.562	0.593	0.031
Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI	0.199	0.230	0.031
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	0.340	0.371	0.031
Florence, SC	0.095	0.125	0.030
Warner Robins, GA	0.240	0.269	0.030
Bend, OR	0.287	0.316	0.029
Salem, OR	0.364	0.393	0.029
Corvallis, OR	0.373	0.401	0.028
Merced, CA	0.177	0.203	0.026
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	0.413	0.439	0.026
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	0.146	0.171	0.025
Corpus Christi, TX	0.580	0.605	0.025
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC	0.320	0.344	0.024
Chico, CA	0.165	0.188	0.023
Rome, GA	0.253	0.276	0.023
Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL	0.323	0.345	0.022
Dubuque, IA	0.445	0.466	0.021
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	0.371	0.392	0.020
Auburn-Opelika, AL	0.294	0.314	0.020
Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	0.167	0.187	0.020
Reno-Sparks, NV	0.449	0.468	0.019
Punta Gorda, FL	0.069	0.088	0.019
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	0.179	0.198	0.019
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	0.304	0.323	0.019
Durham, NC	0.396	0.414	0.019
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	0.231	0.250	0.018
Utica-Rome, NY	0.213	0.231	0.018
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	0.314	0.332	0.018
Bellingham, WA	0.321	0.338	0.017
Spartanburg, SC	0.095	0.111	0.016
Rochester, MN	0.498	0.513	0.015
Bloomington-Normal, IL	0.512	0.527	0.015
Duluth, MN-WI	0.275	0.290	0.015
Longview, TX	0.294	0.308	0.014
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	0.304	0.318	0.014
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	0.231	0.244	0.013
Tuscaloosa, AL	0.446	0.459	0.013
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	0.339	0.352	0.012
Winston-Salem, NC	0.600	0.612	0.012

Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	0.260	0.272	0.012
Abilene, TX	0.583	0.594	0.011
Yuba City, CA	0.229	0.239	0.010
Valdosta, GA	0.343	0.353	0.010
Columbus, GA-AL	0.642	0.652	0.010
Jacksonville, FL	0.628	0.637	0.009
Lakeland, FL	0.197	0.206	0.009
Oklahoma City, OK	0.567	0.576	0.009
Columbia, SC	0.182	0.190	0.008
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	0.128	0.136	0.008
Pittsburgh, PA	0.107	0.115	0.008
Louisville, KY-IN	0.413	0.421	0.008
Fayetteville, NC	0.624	0.632	0.008
Pocatello, ID	0.530	0.537	0.007
State College, PA	0.098	0.104	0.007
Yakima, WA	0.237	0.243	0.006
Fairbanks, AK	0.224	0.230	0.006
Las Cruces, NM	0.368	0.374	0.006
Asheville, NC	0.289	0.295	0.006
Niles-Benton Harbor, MI	0.014	0.020	0.006
Wenatchee, WA	0.159	0.165	0.005
Spokane, WA	0.235	0.240	0.005
Springfield, MO	0.637	0.641	0.005
Wilmington, NC	0.443	0.448	0.004
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	0.086	0.090	0.004
Monroe, LA	0.155	0.159	0.004
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA	0.090	0.094	0.004
Modesto, CA	0.289	0.293	0.003
Tyler, TX	0.449	0.452	0.003
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.165	0.168	0.002
Salt Lake City, UT	0.302	0.304	0.002
Orlando, FL	0.161	0.163	0.002
Albuquerque, NM	0.732	0.734	0.002
Morristown, TN	0.077	0.078	0.002
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	0.142	0.143	0.001
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	0.148	0.150	0.001
Colorado Springs, CO	0.697	0.698	0.001
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	0.500	0.501	0.000



## Appendix B. Summary Statistics of Tract-level Data

Variable	Observations	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Change in log Employment 2002-2011	11,837	0.062	0.697	-6.672	5.182
log Distance to CBD	11,837	1.526	0.760	-4.560	4.029
log Employment 2002	11,837	6.468	1.430	0	11.537
log Population 2000	11,837	8.092	0.546	1.609	9.865
Change in log Population of Neighboring Tracts 2000-2010	11,837	0.033	0.221	-1.497	5.093
Poverty Rate 2000	11,837	0.183	0.136	0	0.932
Change in Share with College Degree 2000-2010	11,837	0.032	0.079	-1	0.872
Share of Occupied Housing Units with new Residents 2000-2010	11,837	0.706	0.124	0	1
Share of Housing Units Built 2000-2010	11,837	0.083	0.138	0	1
Residential Density (Units/Acre)	11,837	6.669	9.807	0.000	561.963
Industrial Diversity Index	11,837	0.466	0.242	0	1.000
Automobile Accessibility (links per square mile)	11,837	1.479	2.413	0	36.770
Pedestrian Accessibility (links per square mile)	11,837	16.114	5.946	0.245	46.595
Public Transit Stop in Tract?	8,806	0.914	0.280	0	1
Low Income Housing Tax Credit Development in Tract?	11,837	0.292	0.455	0	1
Empowerment Zone/Renewal Community?	11,837	0.075	0.263	0	1

Note: Summary statistics are presented for inner city census tract sample. These are non-CBD tracts in the largest principal cities for states with a full sample of data (2002-2011)

<sup>i</sup> Throughout this paper we use the terms region and metropolitan area interchangeably.

<sup>ii</sup> Principal Cities are defined for each MSA by the Census Bureau as the largest city in the MSA. Additional cities may qualify to be a principal city, if it is a census designated place or incorporated place with more than 250,000 residents and 100,000 workers or a place whose employment exceeds the population and both are at least 10,000.

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/smartlocationdatabase.htm>

<sup>iv</sup> For the list of tracts that were included in EZ/RCs see [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/comm\\_planning/economicdevelopment/programs/](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/economicdevelopment/programs/).