A resolution test chart featuring several groups of horizontal and vertical lines of varying thicknesses. Each group is accompanied by a numerical value indicating the resolution level. The values include 1.0, 1.1, 1.25, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2.0, 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 3.2, 3.6, 4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.6, 6.3, 7.1, 8.0, and 9.0. The chart is used to measure the resolving power of imaging systems.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No 2)

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**A CROSS-NATIONAL COMPARISON OF LEVELS OF URBAN DECLINE
AND DISTRESS IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES**

by Peter F. Kitchen B.A.

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

**Department of Geography
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada**

March 1994

Copyright

1994, Peter Kitchen

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-92957-X

Canada

Name Peter F. Kitchen

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Geography

SUBJECT TERM

0 3 6 6

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0329
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Palaeontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis**

**"A Cross-National Comparison of Levels of Urban Decline and
and Distress in Canada and the United States"**

**submitted by Peter F Kitchen, B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts**

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Geography

Carleton University

March 1994

ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been growing concern over the health of urban areas in North America. Since the early 1980s, several important events, including two major recessions, economic restructuring, and cutbacks in government programmes, have had a significant impact on cities in Canada and the United States. The majority of research on urban decline and distress has been conducted from the American perspective and very few cross-national comparative studies have been undertaken. This study attempts to fill this void in the research by comparing levels of urban decline and distress in Canada and the United States during the 1980s. Using a sample of five paired cities, the study found that in 1980-81, urban decline and distress occurred to a similar extent in both countries. However, by 1990-91, it was more prevalent in the Canadian cities in the sample. It appears that restructuring combined with cutbacks in social programmes and the recession of the early 1990s had a relatively greater impact on Canadian central cities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was supported by a grant from the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at Carleton University, Dr. J.W. ApSimon. I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr. Gennady Ozornoy for his attention and patience throughout my stay at Carleton. I am grateful to Professor Mike Fox for his very helpful comments on the statistical portion of the thesis. I would also like to thank all the graduate students from the Department of Geography for their support and in particular John Buffone, Roxanne Lalonde and Josee Levesque for their assistance throughout various stages of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF MAPS	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 URBAN DECLINE AND DISTRESS: A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW	5
Defining Urban Decline and Distress	5
Perspectives on Urban Decline and Distress	9
Measuring Urban Decline and Distress	20
Urban Decline and Distress: The American Experience	25
Urban Decline and Distress: The Canadian Experience	36
Conclusion	48
3 URBAN DIFFERENCES AND URBAN POLICY IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES	49
An Overview of Urban Differences	50
The Role of Public Policy in Urban Development	64
Recent Urban Policy Developments in the United States	66
Public Policy Issues and Canadian Cities	70
Conclusion	74
4 STUDY METHODOLOGY	76
Description of City Pairs	77
Geographic Scope	79
Data Sources and Selection of Variables	80
Method of Analysis	85

5 URBAN DECLINE AND DISTRESS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS	94
Descriptive Statistics	94
Standard Score Analysis	104
Principal Components Analysis	110
Cluster Analysis	121
Interpreting the Results	132
6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	147
APPENDICES	
I Definition of Variables	151
II Definition of Terms	154
III Census Data Matrix	156
IV Maps	217
BIBLIOGRAPHY	227

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 HUD's Community Need Index	22
3.1 Moody's Bond Rating System	61
4.1 Comparative Population Data for Sample Cities	93
4.2 Total Number of Census Tracts Examined in Sample Cities	93
5.1A Descriptive Statistics: Halifax - Savannah	98
5.1B Descriptive Statistics: Montreal - Baltimore	99
5.1C Descriptive Statistics: Hamilton - Toledo	100
5.1D Descriptive Statistics: Regina - Lincoln	101
5.1E Descriptive Statistics: Vancouver - Portland	102
5.1F Descriptive Statistics: Canada - United States	103
5.2A Standard Score Analysis: Results	108
5.2B Standard Score Analysis: High and Low Scores	109
5.3A Combined Canada - United States Data Set - Component Loadings	117
5.3B Mean Component Scores	118
5.3C Component 1 "Social Hardship/Impoverishment"	119
5.3D Component 1: High and Low Scores	120
5.4A Cluster Analysis: 1980-81 Results	126
5.4B Cluster Analysis: 1990-91 Results	129

LIST OF MAPS

Halifax Census Tracts	217
Regina Census Tracts	218
Hamilton Census Tracts	219
Vancouver Census Tracts	220
Montreal Census Tracts	221
Savannah Census Tracts	222
Lincoln Census Tracts	223
Toledo Census Tracts	224
Portland Census Tracts	225
Baltimore Census Tracts	226

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many municipalities in Canada and the United States have recently been confronted with a growing number of fiscal and social problems. In North America, the 1980s and early 1990s were marked by several significant events including two major recessions, economic restructuring, constraints on government spending and cutbacks in social programmes. With more than 76 percent of the population of Canada and the United States living in cities, these events, among others, have shed new light on urban issues and concerns.

Since the early 1970s, within the fields of urban geography and urban studies, a vast amount of research has been conducted on the issues and problems of urban areas. The majority of this research, however, has focused on U.S. cities and metropolitan areas. In comparison, very little has been written from the Canadian perspective. As a result, a U.S.- based theoretical structure is often imposed on the Canadian urban system. It has become evident, however, that much of this theory is not applicable.

More study is needed on the Canadian urban system in order to develop a set of independent theories and models. One way to achieve this is through comparative urban research. John Mercer and Michael Goldberg are responsible for most of the recent work comparing American and Canadian cities. However, very few cross-national studies examining

urban problems have been conducted. One of the few studies was recently undertaken by Broadway (1989) who compared patterns of urban deprivation in a sample of Canadian and American inner cities. The purpose of this project, therefore, is to continue to fill this void in the research by comparing levels of urban decline and distress in the two countries during the 1980s.

Canadians generally have a perception of their cities as being healthier and free from the severe problems of poverty, crime and decay evident in American cities. This image is fostered primarily through the media which tends to focus on the largest and most distressed U.S. metropolitan areas such as New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Detroit and Los Angeles. It must be emphasized, however, that there is a great deal of variability within the U.S. urban system and it is misleading to generalize. The problems evident in the largest urban centres cannot be imposed on the entire system. Furthermore, since there are no cities of equivalent size and age in Canada, comparing the conditions of these American cities to any in Canada is inappropriate.

Therefore, the objective of this project is to compare indicators of urban decline and distress using a sample of five paired Canadian and American cities. The cities are selected according to a set of criteria, creating a more appropriate scale for making comparisons between the two countries. The indicators, drawn from the 1980 and 1990 U.S.

censuses and the 1981 and 1991 Canadian censuses, include economic measures such as unemployment and poverty and social measures such as population change and educational attainment.

Many studies on urban decline, particularly in the United States, examine indicators at the municipal or metropolitan scale. However, there is considerable variability in cities and it cannot be assumed that urban problems are uniformly distributed within their boundaries. This project addresses this issue by examining measures of decline and distress at the neighbourhood scale. This approach takes into account the spatial differences within urban areas and allows all the neighbourhoods in the sample of ten cities to be compared directly with each other.

The study will determine which cities in the sample had the highest concentration of urban problems for the two points in time, 1980-81 and 1990-91. It will also determine which cities experienced declining conditions during the 1980s. From this analysis, conclusions about the extent, nature and geographical character of urban decline and distress in Canada and the United States are made. The empirical analysis is set within a conceptual framework.

The thesis is divided into six chapters. The second chapter defines urban decline and distress and provides a theoretical and methodological overview. It then reviews the literature on the Canadian and American experiences with

respect to urban problems, focusing primarily on the 1970s and early 1980s. The third chapter discusses important urban differences between Canada and the United States and briefly outlines the impact of public policy on cities in the two countries during the 1970s and 1980s.

The fourth chapter describes the project's methodology. It outlines the criteria for choosing the five pairs of cities and discusses the selection of variables as well as the method of analysis. The fifth chapter presents the empirical analysis. Four main techniques are used to examine the data: descriptive statistics, standard score analysis, principal components analysis and cluster analysis. The results are interpreted according to the trends visible in each city. The sixth chapter consists of the summary and conclusions.

CHAPTER 2

URBAN DECLINE AND DISTRESS: A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the phenomenon of urban decline and its impact on cities in North America. It will rely on literature written from both American and Canadian perspectives, although the former is clearly dominant. The first part of the chapter will provide a definitional framework of urban decline and distress, followed by an overview of theories and causes. The third section will outline several methodologies used by governments and other organizations to measure urban decline and distress. The final two parts will describe the American and Canadian experiences.

Defining Urban Decline and Distress

The terms "decline" and "distress" suggest that cities are experiencing economic and social problems. The most common measure of urban decline is population loss in a municipality or metropolitan area. As Bradbury et al (1982, p.18) explain, population loss affects a city's desirability as a place to live. Positive net-outmigration from a city indicates that its economic and/or social health is in question.

According to Bourne (1980, p.40), measures of urban decline are diverse. Decline can mean an absolute decrease in either population, income, output, or the number of jobs in a city. Decline can also refer to a drop in the rate of

expansion of any of the above indicators. It may also be defined as a relative decrease in the growth of one sector, region, or urban area in comparison with some external benchmark such as the performance of a competing sector, region, or city.

Bourne (1980, p.39) also proposes that urban decline is characterized by a reversal of traditional migration flows into metropolitan areas and the resurgence of growth in some peripheral regions and smaller urban areas. Related to these trends is a significant spatial reorganization of population and economic activity.

Clark (1989, p.2) states that urban decline, as measured by large and accelerating losses in population and employment, is occurring in cities in many countries throughout the world. It is partly associated with demographic changes that are determined by the level of economic development. The greatest losses, however, have occurred in the large industrial cities of the West (Clark 1989, p.6).

Bradbury et al (1982, p.18) state that there are two ways of explaining urban decline. The first is descriptive decline, involving the loss of population or employment in an urban area. The second is functional decline, which refers to socially undesirable changes that decrease the ability of a city to perform its social function adequately. The authors define a social function of an urban area as an activity that produces important benefits to local residents

and to society. Such activities include employment, the provision of social services, local government and the maintenance of the urban infrastructure.

Functional decline, as a result, can be measured by such indicators as unemployment and crime rates, labour force participation, poverty incidence, fiscal health and the extent of old housing in total stock. Bradbury et al acknowledge that there are important links between descriptive and functional decline. For example, a decline in population and employment can lead to fiscal problems in a city by shrinking its tax base for financing local services (Bradbury et al 1982, p.24).

Burchell and Listokin (1981, p.xi) suggest that distressed cities are those "declining and in some cases, rapidly growing, political subdivisions which cannot adequately meet current public service demands." With reference to American urban areas, they state that fiscally distressed cities are characterized by their inability to: A) generate sufficient funding to provide basic service levels such as police, fire, public works, tax assessment/collection and recreation/culture; B) regularly and fully fund capital facilities or pension and benefit systems; C) maintain an adequate and sound financial position in the public bond markets; D) critically evaluate necessary services/expenditures and shape a public service system that reflects these needs; and E) maximize the mix of and emphasis on local

revenues and inter-governmental transfers (Burchell and Listoken 1981, p.xi).

Closely related to the concepts of decline and distress is urban deprivation. Studies on urban deprivation, particularly in inner city areas, have been conducted in the United States, Britain and to a lesser extent in Canada. Deprivation refers to a "standard of living or quality of life below that of the majority in a particular society" (Broadway 1989). It is usually measured by such components as unemployment, overcrowding, housing lacking basic amenities and income below the poverty level (Broadway 1989, p.532).

Along with the concept of deprivation is multiple deprivation. People who are "multiply deprived" are positioned at the lower end of several dimensions of unequally distributed resources (Norris 1979, p.17). Sim (1984), in his study of British cities, found that incidence of deprivation and multiple deprivation are not only confined to inner city areas, but are evident in many outer areas as well.

Cadwallader (1985) offers several explanations for urban deprivation. One is centered on the concept of culture of poverty, which contends that problems are derived from the "internal pathology of deviant groups who suffer from a lack of opportunity and aspiration" (Cadwallader 1985 p.282).

Perspectives on Urban Decline and Distress

A considerable literature exists on theories and causes of urban growth and decline in North America. Many of these issues and approaches have been widely documented. Due to the magnitude and complexity of the subject, this section can only provide, at best, a general overview of some of the more relevant perspectives.

Causes of Decline and Distress

Several important factors have contributed to the decline of urban areas in North America over the past several decades. These include changing demographic trends, shifting residential and industrial location preferences, government policies, national economic trends and economic restructuring.

In terms of demographic trends, metropolitan and central city population growth rates have been significantly affected by changes in the birth rate, immigration levels, and migration patterns. Since the turn of the century, the birth rate in the United States and Canada has fallen substantially from over 25 per 1000 persons in 1925 to about 15 by the mid 1980s. With a slight decrease in the death rate and a steep decline in the birth rate, the rate of natural increase is only about one-third of what it was in the 1950s (Alonso 1982, p.42). Alonso proposes that the decline in the rate of natural increase is the principal reason for the slowdown in metropolitan population growth.

Urban growth rates are also affected by fluctuations in immigration levels. Between 1840 and 1930, over 2 million immigrants per decade arrived in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1975, pp.8-12). Immigration in Canada was most predominant between 1900 and 1930 when well over a million persons arrived in each decade (The Canadian World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1990. p.94). Urban population growth increased significantly as a large proportion of these immigrants settled in cities. Since the early 1900s, however, immigration levels in both countries have fluctuated widely. For example, in Canada during the 1970s and 1980s, levels ranged from a high of 218,465 in 1974 to a low of 84,302 in 1985 (The Canadian World Almanac and Book of Facts. p,94).

Another factor affecting urban growth rates is migration from farms. In Canada and the United States, the acceleration of urban growth after 1880 was a result, in part, of large flows of people from rural to urban areas. This migration was due to high birth rates on farms, improvements in technologies and the accumulation of capital in agriculture (Bradbury et al 1982, p.71). As a result, the proportion of the population living in urban areas in Canada and the United States increased from between 30 and 35 percent in 1890 to between 70 and 75 percent by 1980 (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.75). In recent decades, however, migration from farms has slowed considerably.

The growing use of automobiles and trucks throughout the 20th century had a marked impact on urban growth and decline. This development had a decentralizing effect on urban areas. Increased mobility reduced the attractiveness of larger cities. As Butler (1977, p.39) states, accelerating rates of suburbanization, brought on by increased automobile use, particularly during the 1950s and 1960s, contributed, for the first time, to a shrinking revenue base in cities.

Katzman (1980) proposes that high crime rates in metropolitan areas have contributed significantly to suburbanization and decentralization. His empirical study of U.S. cities demonstrated that crime has a strong influence on the likelihood of new families moving into central city neighbourhoods. It also increases the incidence of residents moving out and decreases property values.

An Overview of Major Theories

Bradbury, Downs and Small (1982, pp.79-81), provide a convenient synthesis of the major theories of decline and distress. They group these theories into six principal categories, while focusing primarily on descriptive decline and more specifically on the location decisions of households and businesses.

The six main categories are as follows:

1. Disamenity Avoidance Theories: suggest that people and businesses are moving from the central city to the suburbs

or from certain metropolitan areas to others in order to avoid negative factors such as crime and high energy costs.

2. Tax Avoidance Theories: postulate that households and firms migrate to suburban areas to reduce tax burdens associated with central city location.

3. Positive Attraction Theories: hold that households and businesses are migrating to the suburbs or from one metropolitan area to another in search of desired amenities, such as lower population density and improved employment opportunities.

4. Economic Evolution Theories: suggest that large urban areas and specific activities within them undergo stages of development. This evolution changes the optimal combination and location of activities, making large cities less desirable places to carry them on.

5. Biased Policy Theories: claim that certain government policies favour locating public and private investments, households and economic activities in the suburbs rather than in the central city.

6. Demographic Trend Theories: propose that some cities and metropolitan areas are severely affected by certain population trends. For example, net-outmigration may decrease the average skill and income level of a metropolitan area.

Bourne (1980) provides a similar theoretical structure in his examination of the phenomenon of urban decline and the decentralization of metropolitan population. He presents

five "schools of thought" to account for these trends. The first school he refers to as "Structural Change, Economic Efficiency, and the Recession." Bourne explains that metropolitan decline is often linked to changes in the national and international economies. Economic specialization in a country can lead to a functional differentiation in the urban system.

Growth in one sector will obviously benefit those locations specializing in that sector, while decline in another sector will impact most severely on locations dependent on that sector (Bourne 1980, p.42).

With respect to the decline of large cities, important sectoral changes have occurred in manufacturing. The existing industrial base and the attractiveness of large metropolitan areas in developed countries as locations for new industries has been impacted by a number of factors, including rapid technological change, international trade competition, increasing local production costs, plant obsolescence and changing consumption patterns. Manufacturing growth has occurred in smaller urban centres and nonmetropolitan areas (Bourne 1980, p.42).

Bourne refers to the second school of thought as "Cultural Predispositions: Amenities and Disamenities Hypotheses." This perspective proposes that metropolitan decline is a result of the desire for certain amenities such as space, privacy, low density and new surroundings. It has been suggested that people are becoming increasingly attracted to newer regions and smaller urban centres where the

cost of living is lower and there are more environmental amenities.

At the same time, there are also metropolitan disamenity factors at work, which have led to the substantial out-migration of population and jobs from older central cities and metropolitan areas. These factors, alluded to above by Bradbury et al, include higher taxes, pollution, congestion and racial conflict (Bourne 1980, p.44).

Clark (1989, p.40) is critical of the amenities approach. He states that the extent of freedom of choice among the urban population is exaggerated. He argues that the majority of people living in advanced industrial societies do not possess the freedom to decide where to live. Most are constrained by job location and "specifically the location of jobs which require their particular skills and experience."

The range of individual choice is in fact dictated by wealth, income, earning capacity, qualifications and social status. These in turn are products of the economic relationships that are determined by the prevailing capitalist mode of production (Clark 1989, p.40).

The third school is "Unintended Policy Hypotheses." Bourne discusses the role of national and sectoral policies on urbanization and spatial development. Examples of these include policies on investment and taxation, trade, transportation, defense, social security, welfare expenditures and housing. He proposes that almost all sectoral policies result in unintended spatial impacts, which in turn influ-

ence urban development.

Bourne lists several possible outcomes of a national urban policy. For example, U.S. federal government policies tend to favour:

1. new construction over the rehabilitation and reuse of existing buildings;
2. highway transportation over public transit;
3. the conversion of undeveloped land for urban uses over the reuse of developed urban land;
4. the construction of single-family, owner-occupied housing over multiple-family and rental housing;
5. growing areas over depressed areas;
6. new locations (recently developed) over old locations (Bourne 1980, p.45).

Bourne refers to the fourth perspective as "Systematic Exploitation, Power and Conflict." This approach views urbanization as a result of a process of exploitation of "specific sectors or social groups by the larger economic and political system." Bourne places these various perspectives under the structuralist label.

One argument contends that the urban system is arranged spatially for the benefit of certain groups such as large institutions, social classes, political blocs and industrial sectors. It has been suggested that these groups have developed an interest in leaving older metropolitan cores for nonmetropolitan areas "in search of greater social control,

political power, lower costs, or higher profits." (Bourne 1980, p.46).

Clark (1989, p.38) is also critical of the structuralist approach. He contends that it does not pay sufficient attention to the urban effects of cyclical economic recession, which has had an impact on Western economies since the 1970s. The relocation of manufacturing firms and others to peripheral regions, he argues, may only be a temporary solution for firms seeking to survive an economic downturn.

The final school described by Bourne is "The Random Spatial Economy." He proposes that urban systems which are open to external influence are characterized by elements of uncertainty and randomness.

The origins of this uncertainty and its spatial imprint will vary within the region and the country under study. Thus, for any given country, an additional component in any explanation of population deconcentration and decline must consider the unique ingredients of that country's economy and society as well as the inherited structure of urbanism (Bourne 1980, p.47).

This approach ties together some of the components of "staple" theory with those of random spatial economy. Trends in growth or decline are imposed on the urban system from external forces. Bourne gives the example of externally influenced changes in the agriculture and energy sectors.

Friedrichs (1993) argues that urban decline occurs primarily in old-industrialised regions and is linked to the decline of manufacturing activity. He proposes that the pro-

duct-cycle theory offers a partial explanation of the causes of urban decline. According to this theory, the life-cycle of a product has four stages: 1. the innovative stage; 2. the growth or expansion stage; 3. the maturity stage; and 4. the stagnation/decline stage. During the third and fourth stages, the product can be manufactured in almost any location. As a result, production investment abroad is a strong possibility (Friedrichs 1993, p.908). Friedrichs provides the examples of the automobile industry in Detroit and the steel industry in Pittsburgh, where the product-cycle theory can be applied.

In cities with a dominant industry, such as Detroit, the theory assumes that the products are in the late phase of the product cycle. With standardization, production can be taken over in other cities or countries where costs are lower, and profits will be higher. "The stagnation or decline of the initial industry will affect all other industries related to it, resulting in an overall decline of jobs in the city" (Friedricks 1993, p.909).

Several other perspectives on urban decline and distress can be considered. These include functionalist urban ecology, Marxist analysis, social disorganization theory and social conflict theory. Amos Hawley is closely associated with the functionalist urban ecology approach. His theory revolves around Parsonian concepts of the urban social system, "involving both spatial and social interdependence

in interlocking and symbiotic patterns that together create an ecosystem" (Driedger 1991, p.235). As Driedger explains, with this perspective in mind, urban problems occur when there is a decline of spatial areas, an aging infrastructure, an inadequate transportation system and an imbalance and deterioration in the ecosystem.

The Marxist approach views urban distress as a reflection of wider societal problems brought on through conflict by groups with competing interests. Urban conflicts are seen primarily as the result of class relations. Castells argues that industrialization creates differential urban cultures.

Excessive individualism and fragmentation of roles and values are a result of an industrial system based on individual enterprise, competition, the profit motive, and inheritance - all part of laissez faire capitalism (Driedger 1991, p.236).

Herbert and Johnston (1978, p.19) propose that differential and monopoly rents can be demanded by "gatekeepers" (bank managers, building society managers, housing officers and estate agents) because of the fixed supply of land. The constraints created by this situation are viewed as an important factor contributing to residential differentiation and the intraurban segregation of households.

Through their ability to purchase land, a class of monopoly land owners is created in the city (Clark 1982, p.176). The urban land market is effectively controlled by high income groups who have significant purchasing power. As a result, large areas of the city are owned by a small

number of landowners. Exploitation of certain groups in the housing market, including low-income, minority and elderly tenants, occurs when landlords increase rents far above the competitive market level (Solomon and Vandell 1982, p.87).

The Marxist approach suggests that landowners in a capitalist system want to maximize their return or profits so they can set rents as high as possible while spending a minimum on repairs and maintenance. For example, in the view of profit making, homebuilders will often buy land in suburban areas where it is cheaper instead of in more central areas where values are higher. "The desired end is not to provide offices and homes for people who need them, but to circulate capital for profit" (Driedger 1991, p.236).

Driedger presents two additional perspectives on urban social problems: social disorganization and social conflict. Social disorganizational theorists propose that problems arise due to the disorganization of social structures. Driedger provides the example of older housing in inner city areas that decay and can no longer provide adequate shelter for residents. The residents of poorer areas lack the education and job training required to gain employment and improve their social and economic position. This perspective assumes a failure of social structures (Driedger 1991, 237).

Similarly, Cadwallader (1985, p.282) argues that institutional malfunctioning has played a major role in the creation of socioeconomically deprived groups in the city. Poor

planning and inadequate administrative bureaucracies, he proposes, have resulted in the establishment of an incoherent public policy.

Social conflict theorists do not believe that problems are rooted in spatial and social structures. They view social conflict as functional rather than dysfunctional. Driedger describes the power struggle that exists between groups in the city. Marxists see this struggle occurring between powerful political elites and the proletariat.

There are several forms through which this conflict becomes evident. An imbalance in the distribution of employment, income and resources leads to poverty. Inequalities between middle class and affluent whites and disadvantaged minorities is associated with racial tension. Efforts by the disadvantaged to acquire property and power are related to crime. "Conflict is seen as inevitable as long as societies contain stratified groups, and inequalities between groups is a result of the western capitalist political economy" (Driedger 1991, p.238).

Measuring Urban Decline and Distress

Several methods have been employed to measure and analyze urban decline and distress. Burchell et al (1981) report that by 1980, about 15 urban distress measures had been developed in the United States. The authors state:

Measurement is a key concern because it draws explicit attention to the components of distress and also serves as an operational device for directing relief to those cities with the greatest hardship (p.163).

Urban distress indices have been developed in the U.S. by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Urban Development Action Grant Program (UDAG), the Economic Development Administration (EDA) and the Brookings Institution.

The Community Need Index developed by HUD in 1979 measures urban decline and distress in American cities. It utilizes twenty quantifiable variables including population change, old housing, elderly population, crime, density, minority population, poverty, overcrowding, and single parent families. These variables are reduced to a smaller number of dimensions by way of factor analysis. This method produces three components of community need: Age and Decline, Density, and Poverty (Table 1).

The Brookings Institution has developed two indices: The Intrametropolitan Hardship Index and the Intercity Hardship Index. The objective of these two indices is to generate a single index which provides relative ratings for levels of city distress. The Intrametropolitan Hardship Index compares central areas with suburban areas, while the Intercity Hardship Index compares the level of distress in one city to all cities.

Both utilize the same quantifiable variables: unemployment, dependency, education, income level, crowded housing and poverty. Each of the variables is transformed into a standard score. The scores are then summed across each

Table 2.1

HUD's Community Need Index

PROGRAM/INDEX/ALLOCATION: HUD analysis (1979) Community Need Index			
CONCEPTUAL INDICATOR:	<i>Age and Decline</i>	<i>Density</i>	<i>Poverty</i>
QUANTIFIABLE VARIABLES/ VARIABLE DEFINITIONS:	<p>CPOP6075, PRE1939H, POPAGE65, CRES6372, CRS6372, CPOP7075, CEMP6772, POPAGE65, NEW H, FEMALEH</p> <p>CPOP6075—percent change in population, 1960-75 (inverse indicator of need) PRE1939H—pre-1939 Housing POPAGE65—percent of the population over 65 CRES6372—percent change in retail sales establishments, 1963-72 (inverse indicator of need) CRS6372—percent change in retail sales, 1963-72 (inverse indicator of need) CPOP7075—percent change in population, 1970-75 (inverse indicator of need) POPAGE65—percent of the population over 65</p> <p>NEWH—new private housing units authorized by building permits in 1975 and 1976 as a percentage of total housing (inverse indicator of need) FEMALEH—percent of families with a female head CEMP6772—percent change in retail, wholesale and service employment, 1967-72 (inverse indicator of need)</p>	<p>CRIME, DENSITY, RENTER, CHPNEGRO, NONWHITE, UNEMPL, FEMALEH</p> <p>CRIME—number of violent crimes per 10,000 of the population, 1976 DENSITY—population per square mile RENTER—percent of housing units occupied by a renter CHPNEGRO—change in the percentage Negro, 1960-70 NONWHITE—percent of population nonwhite (Negro and Spanish) UNEMPL—unemployment rate, defined by giving equal weights to the 1976, 1977 and December 1977 unemployment rates</p>	<p>YOUTHPOV, POVERTY, NONWHITE, OVERCRWD, WOPLUM, FEMALEH, WOHSED</p> <p>YOUTHPOV—percent of occupied poor and under 18 POVERTY—percent of population with incomes below the poverty level NONWHITE—percent of population nonwhite (Negro and Spanish) OVERCRWD—percent of occupied houses with 1.01 or more persons per room WOPLUMB—percent of occupied houses without adequate plumbing FEMALEH—percent of families with a female head WOHSED—percent of population over 25 with less than a high school education</p>
VARIABLE LINKAGE:	<p>The 20 quantifiable (need) variables were grouped via factor analysis into three sets or dimensions: AGE AND DECLINE, DENSITY, and POVERTY. For each of these three dimensions, factor analysis provided a city index score measuring relative per capita need among cities. A city generally received a high score on the three dimensions if it had a high percentage of most of the variables that defined that factor (positive scores indicate above average per capita need; negative scores below average per capita need). A single or composite index of community need was derived by combining and weighting the three dimensions as follows:</p> $\text{NEED} = .40 (\text{POVERTY}) + .35 (\text{AGE AND DECLINE}) + .35 (\text{DENSITY})$		

Source: Burchell, R.W. and D. Listoken (1981): Cities Under Stress: The Fiscal Crisis of Urban America. pp. 190-191.

variable and an overall average standard score for each jurisdiction is determined. A composite index is produced which provides a rank ordering of jurisdictions according to level of hardship (Burchell et al 1981, p.181).

Bradbury (1984), in her study of American cities, developed the "Distress Index". The index is comprised of five components: unemployment rate, percentage of population in poverty, violent crime rate, percent of housing units thirty years old or more, and city tax effort. City tax effort is defined as a city government's own source revenues as a fraction of aggregate money income of city residents (Bradbury 1984, p.55).

Cities are ranked on each component and the distribution is divided into thirds. Cities in the most advantaged third are given a score of +1, the middle third, a score of 0, and the most disadvantaged receive a score of -1. Each city's component scores are then summed to produce the index score. The index has a range of +5 to -5, meaning that cities with a score of +5 are the least distressed, while cities with a score of -5 are the most distressed.

The index compares each city with other cities on the five components to identify those places where relatively poor conditions are concentrated. For example, in Bradbury's study, Cleveland, Dayton, Detroit, St.Louis and Trenton all received scores of -5, while Amarillo, Garden Grove, Honolulu, Huntington Beach, Independence, Parma, Torrance and

Virginia Beach received scores of +5.

Bradbury et al (1982) used a set of simultaneous regressions to measure urban decline in 121 U.S. cities and their metropolitan areas between 1970 and 1975. Three dependent variables were used to examine both descriptive and functional decline: changes in population, employment and per capita income. The sample of cities included those that were losing population, employment and income as well as those that were gaining. The regression analysis allowed the authors to examine the significant causative differences between growing and declining areas.

Decline is not a single uniform process even among declining cities, but rather the outcome of a variety of factors locally present. The regressions sort out the effects of these separate factors, and estimate the independent contribution of each, controlling for all the others (Bradbury et al 1982, p.87).

The authors estimated five general equations for each of the three measures of decline for standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs) for the period 1970-1975:

1. Percent change in SMSA population;
2. Percent change in SMSA employment;
3. Percent change in SMSA real per capita income;
4. City minus SMSA percent change in population;
5. City minus SMSA percent change in real per capita income.

Cadwallader (1991) used discriminant analysis and a simultaneous equations framework to examine patterns of growth and decline in U.S. cities. Discriminant analysis statistically distinguishes two or more groups of cases. A

set of discriminating variables were selected to measure expected differences between the groups, in this case, between growing and declining cities. The first discriminant analysis was based on the net migration rates for 1965-1970 for the two groups of cities. The standardized coefficients were computed for ten variables: income, unemployment, manufacturing, housing costs, property tax, general tax, general spending, education spending, crime and climate. The standardized coefficients demonstrated that manufacturing activity, property taxes and general taxes (which were all higher for the declining group) were the most important discriminators between growing and declining cities (Cadwallader 1991, p.10). A second two group discriminant analysis for 1975-1980 and a three group discriminant analysis for 1965-1970 and 1975-1980 produced similar results.

Urban Decline and Distress: The American Experience

Since the early 1970s, a great deal has been written on the decline of central cities and metropolitan areas in the United States. This section will provide an overview of important trends and processes that have affected U.S. cities and will focus primarily on the 1970s and early 1980s. During the 1970s, American central cities were in a state of decline. They suffered from significant losses in population and employment, particularly in the manufacturing sector, and an increase in the concentration of poor and minority populations. Central cities have also experienced consider-

able fiscal stress, brought on by a declining economic base.

Population Trends

During the 1970s, significant population decline occurred in U.S. metropolitan areas and central cities. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (1988, pp.59, 32-34), between 1970 and 1980, 22 out of 210 SMSAs and 72 out of 176 central cities with populations of 100,000 or more experienced declining populations. During this period, net outmigration from all U.S. central cities totalled more than 13 million persons (Sternlieb and Hughes 1983, p.459). Population losses were most pronounced in the central cities and metropolitan areas of the Northeast and Midwest regions of the United States, while significant population growth occurred primarily in southern regions.

Frey and Speare (1988) examined population trends in a sample of 39 metropolitan areas. They found that 18 of these areas experienced declining populations during the 1970s. Of the 18 declining areas, 13 were older cities located in the north. Several of these cities with large manufacturing bases lost between 20 and 30 percent of their populations. The 26 non-declining metropolitan areas in the sample were distributed among older and newer cities in the North, South and West regions.

During the 1970s, nonmetropolitan areas grew more rapidly than metropolitan areas, reflecting growing residen-

tial preferences for small cities and rural areas (Frey and Speare 1988, p.42). By 1980, the population of nonmetropolitan areas exceeded that of central cities by more than 11 million (Sternlieb and Hughes 1983, p.457).

Thomas (1991, p.220) reports that during the 1970s, the 50 largest central cities in the U.S. experienced a loss of population and an increase in poverty. For example, the combined population of the central cities of Chicago, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia and Los Angeles declined by 9 percent, while there was a 22 percent increase in the population living in poverty.

The decline of central cities in America is largely the result of selective out-migration. Since the early 1970s, an increasing number of people with higher socioeconomic status have been leaving central cities for suburban areas. The factors contributing to this migration were outlined above by Bradbury et al (1982) and Bourne (1980). Population decentralization or suburbanization has been particularly evident in the most distressed U.S. cities and is attributed mainly to job deconcentration and the construction of new homes on the outskirts of SMSAs (Nelson 1988, p.31). Between 1960 and 1978, the white population of U.S. central cities declined by 9 percent, while the black population increased by 40 percent (Jacobs 1992, p.62).

While there is general agreement that population growth is beneficial to cities, it is also becoming increasingly

evident that substantial population decline has many negative impacts. Frey and Speare (1988, p.109), for example, state that decline tends to result in abandonment and neighbourhood decay. It can also lead to the concentration of underprivileged persons in areas where a drop in tax revenues makes it difficult to provide social assistance. Other possible consequences include the closing of businesses and lay-offs.

Economic Restructuring

A recurring theme in the literature on the decline of urban centres in the U.S. is the economic transformation of cities. The 1970s and 1980s were characterized by a substantial reduction and decentralization in manufacturing activity and employment, particularly in central cities, and a growth in service related industries. This transformation has had a marked impact on the economic performance and social condition of U.S. cities.

Throughout much of the 20th century, manufacturing activity has been tied to the central city. Industries clustered in these locations and took advantage of low wages paid to successive waves of immigrant workers. Manufacturing facilities were typically multistory structures. In recent decades, however, the once strong link between manufacturing and urban location has weakened considerably.

Changes in production technology and transportation requirements have lead to an increase in the decentraliz-

ation of manufacturing industries to suburban locations.

Central city locations have become less attractive. According to Sternlieb and Hughes (1983, p.456):

A worldwide revolution has occurred in the technologies of goods production, information processing, and communications. Automation and technological change have rationalized labor-intensive industries, undermining the traditional economic foundations of America's cities.

Between 1977 and 1982, the number of service jobs in the central cities of the 68 largest metropolitan areas in the U.S. grew by 1,319,400, while manufacturing employment fell by 266,300. In the suburban areas of these metropolitan centres, meanwhile, service employment grew by 1,571,700 and manufacturing by 139,500 (Landis 198 , p.226). More specifically, between 1972 and 1983, the central cities of New York, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Detroit each lost more than 100,000 manufacturing jobs (Thomas 1991, p.219). Losses in manufacturing employment have been most apparent in the metropolitan areas and central cities of the Northeast and Midwest.

These trends have resulted in major geographical shifts in the metropolitan economy. Black (1980, p.97) proposes that

a transition has occurred from a city-dominant and suburban-dependent structure to a far more complex and sprawling structure with multiple activity centres and far less dependence on the central city for employment, shopping, cultural activities, and a place to live.

These shifts have resulted in a changing set of job opportunities for the whole metropolitan area. In central

cities, some new service-related jobs pay considerably less than the old manufacturing jobs they replaced. Furthermore, many of these new jobs may require a skill level that most central city residents do not have. It is likely that the majority of these residents do not possess the level of education needed to compete for many of the information-based jobs that are becoming more common (Ladd and Yinger 1989, p.19).

As a result, there has been a "widening gap between urban job opportunity structures and skill level of disadvantaged residents" (Kasarda 1985, p.34). Less fortunate groups of residents in the central city have become increasingly isolated. The consequences of this isolation include high rates of structural unemployment, racial segregation, as well as increasing levels of poverty and welfare dependency.

In U.S. metropolitan areas between 1970 and 1980, unemployment increased from 4.3% to 6.3% (Frey and Speare 1988, p.124). Central city unemployment also increased for both blacks and whites. Between 1969 and 1982, unemployment rates among white-male central city residents grew from 2.6% to 9.5%, while for black males it increased from 5.4% to 23.4% (Kasarda 1985, p.57).

The economic performance of a city can be measured by the rate of change in per capita income. Cities with higher per capita income are considered to be in better condition.

Changes in per capita income are dependent primarily on job availability, employment levels as well as the salary and wage structure of available jobs (Garn and Ledebur 1980, p.205).

Garn and Ledebur (1980) assessed the economic performance of the 147 largest cities in the U.S. in terms of changes in the number of jobs, unemployment rates and per capita income levels and their rates of change. They found that high unemployment rates and slow employment growth restrained per capita income growth. An economic performance index was created. The most distressed cities in the index were Newark, Paterson, Hartford, Jersey City, Buffalo, Bridgeport, New Haven, New York, Detroit, and Boston (Garn and Ledebur 1980, p.205).

Black (1980) and James (1981) discuss the impact of recessions on U.S. cities in the 1970s. James argues that substantial declines in employment were experienced by older cities during the 1970s due to economic recession. There has been a lengthy debate over the impact of recessions on the economies of central cities. The debate has focused on whether recessions have a greater effect on central cities than in suburban or nonmetropolitan areas.

In a study of employment trends in eight U.S. cities between 1962 and 1976, James (1981 p.29), found that declining central cities recovered much slower than newer, growing cities. Of the eight, four were declining cities in the

Northeast and Midwest: Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and St. Louis. The recession of the early 1970s caused rapid employment losses in each of the four cities. For example, between 1970 and 1971, Philadelphia lost 43,000 jobs and between 1974 and 1975 another 49,000.

It appears that in distressed cities, employment declines during recessions have long-run impacts. Existing, marginal businesses cut back or shut-down, and the investment opportunities foregone cannot be counted on to reappear when business conditions improve (James 1981, p.29)

The manufacturing to service activities transformation may also compromise the ability of a city to provide public services. One reason is the decline in the local property tax base. Manufacturing tends to occupy more property than service activities (Ladd and Yinger 1989, p.19).

Social Problems

The social condition of many U.S. cities has worsened in recent decades. Poverty is a growing problem. Within metropolitan areas, poverty is overwhelmingly concentrated in central cities. Between 1959 and 1983, the total number of central city residents in all metropolitan areas in the United States living below the poverty line increased from 10,437,000 to 12,872,000 (from 18.3% to 19.8% of the total central city population) (O'Hare 1985, p.15). Poverty is twice as high in central cities than in suburban areas.

Between 1978 and 1983 there was an increase in poverty in 17 of the 20 largest SMSAs. Boston and Houston were the only SMSAs to experience a drop. In the northern industrial

metropolitan areas of Detroit, Pittsburgh and Cleveland, the poverty rate more than doubled. Central city poverty is highest in the largest U.S. metropolitan areas. For example, between 1978 and 1983, the poverty rate in central city Detroit increased by 300 percent. (O'Hare 1985, p.16).

One particularly disadvantaged group in U.S. central cities is the black population. Since 1960, the black population in the largest U.S. cities in the Northeast and Midwest (Snow Belt), including Baltimore and Toledo, has grown steadily. In 1980, 58% of the entire black population in America lived in the central cities of metropolitan areas, compared to 25% of all whites. In the Snow Belt metropolitan areas, 77% of blacks live in central cities (Peterson 1985, p.14). They have significantly lower median family incomes and much higher levels of poverty.

Over one-third of the black population in the U.S. is poor. In 1983, there were 9.9 million blacks living below the poverty line, comprising 28% of all poor people. The poverty rate for blacks is three times higher than for whites (O'Hare 1985, p.19).

The concentration of the black population in the central city has resulted in isolation from new employment opportunities both in the central city and in outer areas. Inadequate and expensive transportation as well as the unavailability of affordable housing in peripheral areas have effectively limited their access to suburban jobs.

In fact, in many U.S. cities there are laws prohibiting the construction of low-income housing in suburban communities. As a result, less-fortunate residents are forced to settle into older housing units in the central city.

Peterson (1985, p.15) states that older homes are often allowed to deteriorate slowly until their condition makes them attractive only to low-income people.

Another seriously disadvantaged group in the central city is female-headed family households. Since the early 1970s, there has been a marked decline in the proportion of full families with children and an increase in childless-couple families, family households headed by only one adult, and nonfamily households (households comprised of one or more unrelated individuals) (Frey and Speare 1988, p.322). There has been a particularly large increase in female-headed households, especially among the black population in the U.S. Frey and Speare (1988, p.323) suggest that this trend

holds potential negative consequences for the central city's economy, and may serve to reinforce the "vicious cycle" of race - and status selective city-suburb redistribution that operated in the 1950s and 1960s.

There appears to be a strong relationship between female-headed families and poverty, particularly in central cities where these families tend to be concentrated. In the U.S., single-mother families increased from 4.3 million in 1959 (9.8% of all families) to 10.4 million in 1983 (14.3% of all families) (O'Hare 1985, p.31). By 1983, 35% of the

poor population in America was residing in female-headed families. O'Hare also reports that these families are over four times more likely to be living in poverty than male-headed families.

During the 1970s, the number of female-headed family households among the black population increased by 85%. By 1980, these families comprised 29% of all black households (Frey and Speare 1988, p.324). Of all racial groups, black female-headed family households are the most poverty-prone. Between 1959 and 1983, the total number of poor blacks living in female-headed families increased from 2.9 million (29.3% of the total) to 5.8 million (53.8% of the total). In 1983, 75% of poor black children lived in these families (O'Hare 1985, p.32).

The growth of female-headed households is partly associated with an increasing proportion of children born out of wedlock and increases in divorce. Black women have more children out of wedlock than white women and have higher rates of divorce (O'Hare 1985, p.32).

According to Frey and Speare (1988, p.369) poor families and unrelated individuals, both black and non-black, continue to be concentrated in the city. They barely participated in the suburbanization process during the 1970s. In 1980, the lowest percentage of suburban residence was associated with poor black families and unrelated individuals.

This concentration of poverty as well as racial segregation has had a highly negative impact on U.S. central cities. Thomas (1991, p.225) comments:

The most intractable crises include a faltering educational system, inner-city crime fuelled by illicit drugs and crumbling city services and infrastructures due to tax flight and the increasing burdens of indigent citizens.

These problems make the central city an unattractive place for middle-class residents. The AIDS epidemic, which has had a particularly devastating impact on the black and Hispanic population in some U.S. inner cities, has only added to the problems confronting the central city.

Urban Decline and Distress: The Canadian Experience

As stated, considerably less has been written directly on the decline of Canadian cities. Moreover, a large part of the existing literature focuses on inner city problems. Nevertheless, it is apparent that some of the problems confronting U.S. cities are also visible, to varying degrees, in Canadian cities. Population loss in several Canadian cities was evident in the 1970s and early 1980s as was decline in employment, particularly in the manufacturing sector. Similarly, there is a concentration of poor and disadvantaged groups in central areas. Since the 1970s, the overall fiscal health of Canadian cities has also come into question.

Recently, the social geography of Canadian cities has also been marked by important social upgrading and redevelop-

opment efforts, particularly in core areas. This section will provide an overview of these issues, while Chapter 3 will consider differences in the extent and form of urban decline and distress in the central cities of the two countries.

Population Trends

Between 1971 and 1981, Sudbury was the only metropolitan area in Canada to lose population. Its population declined from 158,000 to about 156,000 (Ley and Bourne 1993, p.8). Over the same period, however, the central cities of eleven metropolitan areas experienced declines. The greatest losses were in Montreal and Toronto. The population of the city of Montreal fell from 1,214,000 in 1971 to 980,000 in 1981, while in Toronto it declined from 713,000 to 599,000. Between 1971 and 1981, the total number of people living in metropolitan areas grew from 11,877,000 to 13,393,000 while in central cities it also increased from 5,942,000 to 6,321,000 (Evenden and Walker 1993, p.236-237).

During the late 1960s and the 1970s, the overall urban growth rate in Canada slowed as a result of a drop in fertility rates and immigration. Towards the end the 1970s, the decline in manufacturing and an increase in oil prices caused a shift in urban growth and migration flows away from the industrial heartland of southern Ontario and Quebec towards resource cities in the west. As a result, small and medium sized centres in the west, such as Edmonton and Cal-

gary, grew at a faster rate than the large centres of the industrial heartland (Bourne 1991, p.29). During the 1970s, about 56 percent of all population growth in Canada occurred in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. Additionally, only six of the 24 metropolitan areas recorded a net inflow of migrants, of which five were located west of Winnipeg (Bourne 1984, p.8)

When the recession of the early 1980s ended, growth returned to the industrial heartland and, in particular, to urban centres in south-central Ontario and to the greater Toronto area. According to Bourne, cities such as Montreal experienced a boom period. However, "resource-based communities and the national periphery suffered badly as most resource prices remained depressed" (Bourne 1991, p.31).

Between 1981 and 1986, Sudbury, again, was the only metropolitan area to lose population. Its population fell from 150,000 to 149,000. Over the same period, very slight declines occurred in the central cities of six metropolitan areas. Both Montreal and Toronto experienced growth (Evenden and Walker 1993, pp.236-237). Following four decades of continuous decline, population growth returned to the central city.

Mercer (1991, p.48) states that during the 1960s and 1970s, Canada's census metropolitan areas (CMAs) grew at a quicker rate than American standard metropolitan areas (SMSAs). In both countries, central cities in the largest

metropolitan areas experienced population decline. Central city decline in Canada, on the whole, however, was not as extensive as in the U.S. Many central cities, particularly in smaller metropolitan areas in Canada, gained population during the 1970s. "The Canadian experience was typified by less extreme growth and decline and by 'healthier' central cities in terms of population gain or stability" (Mercer 1991, p.48).

Manufacturing Decline

An economic transformation from manufacturing to service activities also occurred in Canada and has had a significant impact on central cities. It should be noted, however, that compared to other developed Western economies, this sector assumes a relatively small role in the Canadian economy. Between 1951 and 1986, employment in the manufacturing sector declined from 24.5 percent to 16.8 percent of total employment (Filion and Mock 1991, p.408).

There are several possible explanations for this decline, some of which have been outlined above. These include factors such as technological change, a growth in service industries, and the globalization of the economy. More recently, the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement has also had an significant impact on manufacturing in Canada.

Like the United States throughout much of the 20th century, manufacturing in Canada was closely associated with central city location. However, during the late 1950s and

1960s, manufacturing became increasingly decentralized. Suburban locations became more attractive to firms seeking to increase productivity. Large, inexpensive and accessible sites were readily available. This relocation coincided with a growing suburbanization of the labour force.

Over the past several decades, there has been a substantial loss of central city manufacturing activity. For example, between 1975 and 1985, total employment in this sector in the cities of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver declined 22.2 percent from 254,569 to 198,007. Montreal experienced the greatest loss (-25.8 percent). Meanwhile, in the outer areas of these three cities total manufacturing employment grew 15.4 percent from 424,287 to 489,547 (Filion and Mock 1991, p.413).

Filion and Mock discuss some possible negative consequences of manufacturing decline in the central city. It can lead to a decline in municipal tax revenues which in turn jeopardizes the quality of public services. Additionally, working class neighbourhoods located in close proximity to former industrial sites can be significantly disrupted through population changes. Finally, as was the case in American cities, manufacturing decline can lead to the isolation of lower-income, unskilled workers who cannot gain access to suburban jobs (Filion and Mock 1991, p.417).

In the core areas of Canadian cities, employment has become increasingly polarized between quaternary and terti-

ary sector jobs. The higher paying quaternary sector jobs are generally taken by well educated newcomers. Those residents that remain and who have lost their old jobs are likely either to find low-paying jobs in the service sector or to be unemployed (Broadway 1992, p.189). According to Ley and Bourne (1993, p.22) between 1971 and 1986, there was a net increase of 116,000 residents in the inner cities of six large metropolitan areas working in the advanced services sector. Over the same period, there was a loss of 215,000 workers in manufacturing and other sectors. These factors have contributed to the presence of important social problems in many Canadian cities.

Social Problems

Poor and disadvantaged groups tend to be concentrated in central cities in Canada. The most visible are street people, transient youth and the homeless. Other groups include recent immigrants, persons with low-income, elderly women, and female headed families. Bourne (1991) argues that new groups of disadvantaged people have appeared in Canadian cities. He attributes this trend to economic restructuring, changes in technology and occupational deskilling. With reference to the less-fortunate, Bourne (1991, p.42) comments

These are individuals and groups who have obviously not been beneficiaries of economic change and urban growth. Indeed, their problems may have worsened precisely because of the rapidity, selectivity, and concentration of urban growth.

According to the Canadian Council on Social Development, incidence of family poverty in Canada increased from 23.3 percent in 1973 to 25.9 percent in 1986 (Globe and Mail 1992, p.18). Poverty is an important feature of many Canadian cities. Ley (1991a, p.313) states that while distinct areas of poverty are present in inner cities, they are not as concentrated and visible as in U.S. cities. In Canadian cities, "elements of decline most commonly occur in scattered pockets coinciding with the location of particular poverty groups" (Ley 1991a, p.326). One such poverty area is skid row, visible in the downtown areas of most cities.

Other visible inner city areas of poverty and decline are found in zones of housing conversions, which are characterized by a more dispersed rooming and lodging-house population. Poverty districts are also associated with marginalized populations in places such as Vancouver's Chinatown or the North ends of Winnipeg and Halifax. Urban poverty is also evident in Atlantic Canada and parts of Quebec. Montreal has particularly high levels of poverty (Ley 1991a, p.327). According to a 1991 Statistics Canada study, incidence of poverty (where the median income is less than \$15,000 a year) is primarily concentrated within central city Montreal (The Gazette. 1993).

Bourne (1989), Broadway (1989 and 1992) and Driedger (1991) have documented the concentration of social problems in Canadian inner cities. Bourne (1989) conducted a dis-

criminant analysis on 14 variables for over 3,000 census tracts to determine the spatial structure of metropolitan areas in Canada. He found that urban neighbourhoods are likely to differ depending on their relative location within an urban area. There are marked differences between neighbourhoods located in the inner city and the suburbs.

Census tracts in the inner city are characterized by much higher residential densities, smaller households, more elderly and foreign born populations, lower median household incomes and dwelling values, lower levels of home-ownership and lower rates of labour force participation by females. Bourne (1989, p.15) states that these differences are consistent in all Canadian cities.

Broadway (1992) studied levels of urban deprivation in seven Canadian cities. He found that the Canadian inner city holds larger concentrations of less educated, low-income, and unemployed persons. Broadway argues that the in-migration of middle class residents did little to change the condition of core areas. The inner cities were classified into two groups: 1) regional or national service centres with social upgrading (Toronto, Vancouver, Halifax and Edmonton); 2) cities with low levels of social upgrading (Regina, Winnipeg and Saint John). Location quotients were used to examine changes in inner city deprivation between 1971 and 1986. Several variables were measured including population change, employment levels, unemployment, labour

force participation and poverty. The study found that all the inner cities had disproportionate concentrations of deprived groups.

However, Broadway also found that the four cities with the highest levels of social upgrading had the lowest levels of deprivation. Conversely, the three cities with lower levels of social upgrading experienced declining inner city conditions. The inner cities of Regina, Winnipeg and Saint John all experienced declines in employment and labour force participation and increases in unemployment and poverty (Broadway 1992, p.191).

Broadway's findings provided additional support for his earlier work. In 1989, he compared levels of inner city deprivation in Canada and the United States. Using a sample of five paired cities, he examined seven variables of deprivation and multiple deprivation in inner city census tracts. He concluded that while overall levels of deprivation are higher in the U.S., Canada has an inner city problem.

Driedger (1991) reports that inner cities in Canada contain a concentration of young, single persons taking advantage of cheaper housing. Between 1951 and 1986, the proportion of people living alone in the inner cities of the 12 largest metropolitan areas in Canada grew from 15 percent to 56 percent. These areas also contain higher shares of single-parent families (22 percent compared to 14 percent in outer areas). As might be expected, inner cities also con-

tain much older housing stocks. In 1986, 57 percent of owner-occupied dwellings were built before 1946, compared to 15 percent in outer areas (Ram, Norris and Skof 1989, p.35).

Like Bourne (1989), Driedger found that average incomes were lower in the inner city, and that only 14 percent of residents owned their own homes compared to 57 percent in the suburbs. He also found, however, that in 1986, levels of education were higher in inner cities than in outer areas. About 36 percent of inner city residents had some university education compared to 23 percent in outer areas. Driedger proposes that during the 1980s, there was an infusion of better educated people into core areas in search of cheaper accomodation (Driedger 1991, p.246).

Elderly women and lone female-parent families are two disadvantaged groups that are highly visible in Canadian central cities. (These groups are also visible in outer municipalities in Canadian metropolitan areas, particularly in Toronto). Milroy (1991) and Lemon (1993) discuss the problem of poverty among elderly women who are often highly dependent on government pensions as they tend not to have their own retirement plans. While many elderly women own their own homes, they experience considerable difficulty in maintaining them (Milroy 1991, p.528).

Poverty in Canada is particularly pronounced among single-parent families. There are over 700,000 of these families in Canada of which 85 percent are female headed

(Milroy 1991, pp.528-529). Between 1976 and 1991, the number of lone-female parent families increased 66 percent from 267,000 to 444,000. It is estimated that 60 percent of these families are living in poverty (Globe and Mail, 1992).

Additionally, 40 percent of poor families are headed by single women, while only 10 percent are headed by single men. According to Milroy, in 1985, female-headed families had an average income less than half that of two parent families. Increasing unemployment is also evident, particularly among young single mothers. Klodawsky and Spector (1988, p.147) report that the primary source of income for more than 70 percent of young single mothers are government transfer payments, such as welfare and unemployment insurance.

These families have experienced considerable difficulty in the Canadian central city. For example, Klodawsky and Spector (1988), Milroy (1991) and Bourne and Bunting (1993) propose that the poor economic situation of female-headed families makes them susceptible to discrimination in the private housing market.

They are the most in need of residential locations that offer a range of educational, health, recreational, and retail services as well as employment within short distances - in areas that are physically safe for women and children (Milroy 1991, p.529).

Many central city (and suburban) neighbourhoods in Canada do not appear to be well suited to providing all these needs, particularly employment opportunities.

More recently, however, the attention of Canadian urban geographers has shifted somewhat from issues of decline and distress to the social upgrading and revitalization of inner cities. Ley (1988, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1993) Filion (1987), Bunting and Filion (1988) and Bourne (1992) have studied this trend. It involves the settlement of middle and higher-income residents in inner city neighbourhoods and the subsequent rise in property and rent values (Bunting and Filion 1988, p.1). Between 1981 and 1986, for example, the overall inner city population in Canada grew by five percent. Montreal and Saint John were the only cities to lose population (Ram, Norris and Skof 1989, pp.7,18).

Gentrification began in the 1970s and has affected the core areas of most large Canadian cities. It coincided with large gains in service sector employment and substantial declines in manufacturing activity in these areas. Gentrification has occurred most rapidly in the inner cities of Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary, Victoria, Ottawa and Halifax. It has occurred at a much slower rate in Montreal, Hamilton, London, Regina and Windsor (Ley 1991b, p.182). Filion (1987 p.223) argues that this process has led to the "relative socioeconomic stability of core neighbourhoods in major Canadian cities."

Whether the dominant process is renovation or redevelopment, revitalizing districts are characterized by often spectacular short-term increases in land and housing costs, modest gains in home-ownership rates, and a well educated and dominantly childless population of young professional households (Ley 1991a, p.330).

On the down side, for less-fortunate groups, social upgrading has led to the displacement of thousands of households and has significantly limited the availability of affordable housing. Ley concludes that the contemporary Canadian inner city is characterized by "a confusing mix of wealth and poverty" (1991a, p.342).

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a conceptual overview of the phenomenon of urban decline and distress in North America. It is a process which has affected cities in both countries. At first glance, there appear to be broad similarities in the American and Canadian experiences. During the 1970s and early 1980s, many central cities in both countries experienced declines in population, while economic restructuring led to substantial losses in central city manufacturing employment. Additionally, the core areas of Canadian and American cities contain disproportionate shares of socially and economically marginalized persons.

It would be misleading, however, to talk generally about a North American "experience" with regard to urban decline. It is widely acknowledged that there are significant differences in the urban landscapes of the two countries. Chapter 3 will provide an overview of these major differences while focusing on the processes that cause decline and distress.

CHAPTER 3

URBAN DIFFERENCES AND URBAN POLICY IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

This chapter presents an overview of the major differences in the urban geographies of Canada and the United States, while paying particular attention to urban problems. It also briefly considers the role of public policy in urban affairs in the two countries. It is becoming increasingly evident that the Canadian urban system is distinct in many ways from the U.S. system. For years, textbooks on urban geography, written primarily from a U.S. perspective, were relied on to provide a theoretical framework for the Canadian urban condition. While there are some obvious similarities between cities in the two countries, it is also apparent that portions of this theory are not transferable.

There is a scarcity of literature devoted to examining urban differences between Canada and the United States. Most of the work challenging the concept of the North American city has been conducted by Michael Goldberg and John Mercer (Mercer 1979, 1991; Goldberg and Mercer 1980; Edmonston, Goldberg and Mercer 1985; Mercer and Goldberg 1986; and Goldberg and Mercer 1986). They are concerned about the American-dominated conception of North America and the impact of homogenizing Canada and the United States on urban studies. The first section of this chapter draws largely from the work of these two urban analysts.

Goldberg and Mercer (1986) state that North America is

viewed as essentially a homogeneous unit, primarily reflecting American values. They argue, however, that this is not the case, and that while there are some important similarities between the two countries, there are also many significant differences. Canada and the United States are different nations with distinct economic, political, social and value systems. Goldberg and Mercer (1986, p.3) propose that since there are marked differences, then one should not "expect the cities which evolve within these societies to be undifferentiable."

An Overview of Urban Differences

The Urban System and Urban Form

Perhaps the most obvious difference is the size of the urban systems in Canada and the United States. In Canada, there are 25 Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) with a population over 100,000 while in the U.S. there are 227 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) with a population of over 150,000. In Canada, there are nine metropolitan areas with a population of over half a million while in the U.S. there are 90. Furthermore, there are only three metropolitan areas in Canada with a population of more than one million and 42 in the United States. The rate of urbanization in both countries is over 75 percent, meaning that in the U.S., approximately 186 million people live in cities, while in Canada about 20 million reside in cities. These figures clearly demonstrate the enormity of the American urban

system compared to the Canadian.

Metropolitan areas in the U.S. are more dispersed geographically throughout the entire country. By contrast, in Canada, nearly half of the CMAs are located in Ontario. With the exception of Sudbury and Thunder Bay, all of these are located in the southern portion of the province.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Canada's CMAs grew at a quicker rate than U.S. SMSAs. Between 1971 and 1981, the population of CMAs in Canada increased by 12.9 percent while American SMSAs grew by 10.3 percent (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.154). During the 1970s, 22 SMSAs and three CMAs experienced population losses. Canadian central cities have not witnessed the extensive population declines evident in U.S. cities. During the 1970s, approximately 40 percent of American central cities lost population and 10 percent experienced a net loss of households. Over the same period, only 8 percent of central cities in Canada lost population while none experienced a net decline of households (Broadway 1989, p.535). The massive population declines in cities such as Detroit, Philadelphia and Washington during the 1970s were not evident in Canada.

Population growth returned in the early 1980s and was greater in U.S. metropolitan areas and central cities. Between 1980 and 1984, the population of U.S. metropolitan areas and central cities grew, on average, by 5.3 and 3.1 percent respectively. Between 1981 and 1986, the population

of Canadian metropolitan areas and central cities increased, on average, by 4.8 and 2.4 percent respectively (Mercer 1991, p.49).

Mercer proposes that there is a positive relationship between economic growth and metropolitan population change. He attributes the larger population growth rates in U.S. metropolitan areas to that country's quicker economic recovery from the serious recession of the early 1980s. Canada's economy was slower to recover (Mercer 1991, p.51).

Edmonston, Goldberg and Mercer (1985) found that in terms of urban form, Canadian cities are significantly more dense and compact than U.S. cities. Using population density gradients, the authors discovered that Canadian cities were, on average, twice as dense as U.S. cities. U.S. cities are more automobile oriented, as evidenced by a much more dispersed urban form. On the other hand, due to substantial investments by municipal and regional governments, there is a greater orientation towards public transportation in Canadian cities.

American metropolitan areas are characterized by a more extensive transportation system. The average American metropolitan resident has access to more than four times as many lane miles of freeway than the average Canadian resident (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.152). The authors also found that on a per capita basis, Americans own 50 percent more automobiles. In Canada, the metropolitan public transporta-

tion systems have about 2.5 times the number of revenue miles per capita than U.S. metropolitan areas (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.152).

Social Factors

There are important differences in the social geographies of urban areas in Canada and the United States. It is suggested that Canada is more of an immigrant society than the U.S. Immigration has had a marked impact on cities in North America. On average, however, Canadian cities and metropolitan areas have shares of foreign-born persons about four to five times larger than American cities. In 1986, on average, just under 15 percent of Canada's metropolitan population was foreign-born. In metropolitan Toronto this figure is over one-third (Mercer 1991, p.55). Goldberg and Mercer propose that Canada is better able to cope with an immigrant society and the higher rates of immigration have been a central feature in maintaining an effective demand for inner city accommodation, especially in cities such as Toronto and Vancouver.

Goldberg and Mercer (1986), Mercer (1991) and Ley (1991) propose that there are greater disparities in socioeconomic status in U.S. metropolitan areas. Mercer (1991) reports that in terms of the ratio of central city to metropolitan household income, spatial disparities in affluence are more pronounced in U.S. metropolitan areas. In other words, U.S. central cities are poorer relative to the metro-

politan area as a whole. Central city poverty is not found to the same extent in Canadian urban areas. The U.S. average central city per capita income represented 93 percent of that of the metropolitan area in 1980. For Canadian central cities in 1981, the average was 99.7 percent (Mercer 1991, pp.53-54).

As stated in Chapter Two, many U.S. central cities are marked by significant concentrations of minority and disadvantaged groups. In particular, the central cities of large Central and Northeastern metropolitan areas contain high proportions of poor black persons. It was also revealed that Canadian inner cities contain disadvantaged groups. However, according to Goldberg and Mercer (1986) American central cities have become more dominated by an "underclass". This underclass is primarily non-white, is demographically youthful, has low levels of education and high drop out rates and generally lives in poor areas with substandard housing. The authors argue that no equivalent underclass exists in any Canadian central cities (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.50). Broadway's (1989) comparison of Canadian and American cities found that levels of urban deprivation were greater in U.S. inner cities.

Racial integration in U.S. cities is rare and levels of residential segregation, particularly among non-whites, are much higher. Segregation is visible in some Canadian cities such as Vancouver, Toronto and Halifax, but on the whole,

Canadian cities are more ethnically and racially diverse and integrated. Goldberg and Mercer (1986, p.140) argue that as a reflection of their value system, Canadians are generally more racially and ethnically tolerant than Americans. They suggest that Canadians are much less likely than Americans to move out of a neighbourhood when there is a large influx of a minority group. Racial intolerance, they believe, is at the root of inner city problems in the U.S., and has contributed significantly to the decline of these areas in major metropolitan centres (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.24).

By contrast, Lipset (1990, p.187) argues that as a result of large waves of immigration over the past several decades, Canadians have become less tolerant of minorities and that a "backlash" against newcomers is occurring. A 1989 Maclean's-Decima crossborder survey found that a greater proportion of Americans than Canadians (47 to 34 percent) felt that newcomers should preserve their culture rather than assimilate (Lipset 1990, p.189).

Goldberg and Mercer also state that the departure of middle-income families to the suburbs has been much more pronounced in the U.S. In recent decades, U.S. central cities have witnessed a decline of family households and a growth of non-family households. Goldberg and Mercer (1986) and Mercer (1991) propose that the traditional family household (two parents with children) as a social unit is more prevalent in Canadian cities.

Canadian central city neighbourhoods are still seen as eminently suitable locales for family life, supported by fiscally sound school systems and a prevailing sense of public order, evidenced in the substantially lower crime rates of Canadian central cities (Mercer 1991, p.54).

Additionally, in U.S. cities there has been a significant growth of the white population in suburban areas and a growing concentration of the black population in central cities. For example, in central city Detroit between 1970 and 1980, the white population declined by 425,000, while the black population increased by about 100,000 (Mercer and Goldberg 1986, p.348).

Crime is an important indicator of urban decline and distress and has a significant impact on the perceptions of quality of life by local residents. Using aggregate metropolitan statistics, Goldberg and Mercer (1986, pp.220-221) found that violent crime is more than four times as high in the U.S. than in Canada. When they compared the central cities of both countries, Goldberg and Mercer discovered that violent crime was six times greater in the U.S. Suburban American areas also had crime rates that were four times higher than those in Canada. Surprisingly, rates of property crime were found to be broadly similar in the metropolitan areas of both countries.

According to Driedger (1991, p.252) crime rates in the U.S. vary considerably by city size. Violent crime is highest in cities with a population over 250,000. Property crimes are also higher in large cities. These trends do not

apply in Canada. There is not as great a variation in violent crime and property crime by city size in Canada.

Driedger states that there are some regional differences in crime in Canada. Cities in Eastern Canada tend to have lower crime rates, while cities on the west coast, especially Victoria and Vancouver, have the highest (Driedger 1991, p.253).

Mercer and Goldberg (1986) discuss how Canadians, and even Americans, have a perception of Canadian cities as much safer and less stressful.

It is tempting to conclude that this reflects a Canadian value system that is deferential to authority and accepting of the rule of law, whereas violent crime in America is an outgrowth of excessive individualism and decidedly non-deferential ways of behaviour (Mercer and Goldberg 1986, p.351).

Survey evidence demonstrates that there are also important differences with respect to perceptions of the quality of life in cities in both countries. Mercer (1991) reports on the findings of several surveys that compared attitudes and perceptions on inner cities and outer areas in Canada and the United States. The surveys found that Canadians generally enjoy living in cities and prefer some central areas over suburban areas. In the U.S., while there was also general satisfaction with the central city, many respondents expected to move in the near future and were less enthusiastic about the central city as a place to raise children. It was also found that residents of suburban and non-metropolitan areas in the U.S. held a very poor image of the city

(Mercer 1991, p.57).

As stated in Chapter Two, the process of urban revitalization is occurring in many central cities in North America. Broadway (1989), however, argues that gentrification is more extensive in Canadian inner cities. Following significant population losses in the 1970s, Canadian inner cities experienced a growth in the number of households and now contain a higher proportion of residents with a university education than U.S. inner cities (Broadway 1989, p.536).

Additionally, in U.S. cities there is a stronger opposition to gentrification. Local residents are often concerned that elderly and low-income minority residents will be displaced and that there will be a shortage of affordable housing. There has been less opposition to this process in Canada because it has been suggested that "the middle class never really left the inner city" (Broadway 1989, p.537). Broadway states that Canadian inner cities have witnessed significant redevelopment efforts and have not experienced the decay evident in U.S. inner cities.

There appears to be general agreement among urban scholars that the Canadian central city is a more attractive place to live than its American counterpart. It is likely, however, that this perception is based on overall comparisons between cities in the two countries. As stated in Chapter 1, it should be emphasized that there is a great deal of variability in the U.S. urban system. Indeed, many

U.S. cities are equally as attractive and safe as Canadian cities. The problems evident in the largest U.S. urban centres cannot be imposed on the entire system.

Economic Condition and Government Intervention

As discussed in Chapter 2, Canadian and American cities have experienced economic problems. During the 1970s and 1980s, central cities witnessed losses in manufacturing employment and experienced shrinking revenue bases, resulting in the declining fiscal health of many cities, particularly those in the largest U.S. metropolitan areas.

Cities in both countries have experienced economic decentralization. According to Goldberg and Mercer (1986, p.167), the outmigration of manufacturing activity to suburban and non-metropolitan areas has been greater in the U.S. Using data from the early 1970s, their study demonstrated that proportionately, manufacturing activity and employment is concentrated more in Canadian central cities than in the U.S. Within the industrial heartland of North America, manufacturing activity in the U.S. regions of New England, the Middle Atlantic and the East North Central, is primarily located in suburban areas. By contrast, in the metropolitan areas of Ontario and Quebec, about two-thirds of manufacturing plants and employment are located in the central city (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.167).

In many U.S. cities the relative decline of economic activity in the central business district has been docu-

mented. In Canadian CBDs, there has also been a loss in retail activity, attributable to the considerable growth of retail development in suburban communities. Mercer (1991, p.55), however, states that the downtown retail sector has fared much better in Canadian cities, due to joint public and private redevelopment initiatives. Central city economic

activity has been stronger in Canada. Relative to the metropolitan area, the central cities retained a higher proportion of various classes of economic activity such as retailing, business services, and to a lesser extent, wholesaling and manufacturing (Mercer 1991, p.55).

Studies indicate that Canadian central cities are fiscally healthier than U.S. cities. Mercer and Goldberg (1984) compared the fiscal condition of cities in both countries by using municipal bond ratings provided by Moody's Investors Service. Municipal bond ratings are used by investors as a guide to assess the default risks associated with owning bonds sold by municipalities to raise capital. A bond rating is an indication of the creditworthiness and thus the financial strength of the municipality. A low bond rating results in a higher cost of borrowing and an increase in the financial burden of the municipality (Mercer and Goldberg 1984, p.234).

All ten Canadian cities examined by Mercer and Goldberg had a credit rating of "A", with six of the ten falling in the "Aaa" and "Aa" categories indicating their strong fiscal health. The municipal bonds of over 90 percent of U.S. cities were also rated in the "A" category. However, there

were 23 central cities (including New York, Buffalo, Boston, Detroit and Philadelphia) with ratings of "Baal" or lower, indicating some fiscal problems. The authors then examined changes in bond ratings over the period 1970-1980. During this period, no Canadian cities experienced declines in their ratings, while 16 percent of American cities did (Mercer and Goldberg 1984, p.238). Table 3.1 shows Moody's bond rating system.

Table 3.1

Moody's Municipal Bond Rating System

Bond Rating	Rank	Characterization of Bonds
Aaa	1	High grade
Aa	2	High grade
A1	3	Upper medium-strong
A	4	Upper medium
Baal	5	Medium strong
Baa	6	Medium
B ₂	7	
B	8	Lacks desirable investment characteristics
Caa	9	Poor
Ca	10	High speculative
C	12	

Source: Mercer and Goldberg (1984, p.235).

As a result of their better fiscal condition, Canadian cities have been successful in attracting private capital which has contributed to the redevelopment of CBDs and residential areas in the inner city. This infusion of private investment increases bond values. Conversely, in many

U.S. cities, there has been a serious lack of private investment, resulting in poorer bond ratings. Municipalities in the U.S. have become increasingly reliant on federal programs such as Urban Demonstration Action Grants to attract private investment (Mercer and Goldberg 1984, p.242). As an indication of their poorer health, American cities receive proportionally more transfer funds from higher levels of government than do Canadian cities of equivalent size (Goldberg and Mercer 1986, p.209).

Two other factors have contributed to the relative health of Canadian cities. First, central cities generally contain a higher proportion of the metropolitan area population than equivalent cities in the U.S. Second, in many Canadian inner cities since the early 1980s, there has been a growth of high status households with greater disposable incomes. This trend has not occurred to the same extent in U.S. inner cities. As a result of these factors, Canadian cities appear to have stronger economic and population bases (Mercer and Goldberg 1984, p.242).

There are important differences in government involvement in urban development in Canada and the United States. In the U.S., there is a strong federal presence in urban affairs, while in Canada, the federal government plays only a minor role. Urban policy in Canada is primarily the responsibility of the provinces.

With respect to differences in political culture,

Mercer and Goldberg (1986) argue that there is a greater acceptance of government involvement in economic affairs in Canada and a greater interest in collective action. Conversely, in America, the authors suggest that there is more distrust of government and greater stress placed on the pursuit of individual goals.

Governments are more fragmented in the U.S. Due to the presence of independent school districts and other special purpose districts there are many more governments at different levels in the U.S., particularly at the local municipal level (Driedger 1991, p.203). In the U.S. in 1979, there were 79,913 governments at all levels for 223.8 million people, representing one government for every 2,801 Americans. In Canada in 1978, there were 4,740 governments for 23.4 million people, representing one government for every 4,954 Canadians. In the U.S., in other words, there are 80 percent more government bodies per capita than in Canada (Mercer and Goldberg 1986, p.360).

Such fragmentation in the American urban system has provided individualized services to residents but has also made it difficult to deal effectively with regional (as opposed to local municipal) concerns, as would again be expected given the private and individualistic ethics (Mercer and Goldberg 1986, p.360).

The stronger American federal presence in urban affairs is reflected by marked differences in the financing of municipalities in the two countries. Mercer and Goldberg (1986, p.378) report that in Canada in 1978, only 2.1 percent of transfers to local governments were from federal sources. By

contrast, in the U.S. in 1980, 21.5 percent of transfers were from the federal government. Presently, the primary source of direct federal involvement in Canada is the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). CMHC's main objective is to assist in the improvement of housing and living conditions in Canada. In the 1960s and 1970s, it funded urban renewal and neighbourhood improvement programs.

In the U.S., federal agencies such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have established important ties with central cities through programs such as Urban Renewal, Model Cities and Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG). According to Mercer (1991, p.59), there appears to be a degree of unwillingness on the part of state governments to become involved in urban affairs. The federal government has played a large role in housing programs and funding of local public housing authorities and has provided support for improvements in mass transportation (Mercer 1991, p.59).

The Role of Public Policy in Urban Development

This section presents a brief overview of recent urban policy issues in Canada and the United States. The impact of public policy on the condition of urban areas is significant. For example, the U.S. federal government's massive freeway construction program during the 1950s and 1960s contributed to the considerable growth of suburban communities and the eventual decline of many central cities.

Additionally, in both countries, federal housing policy encouraged urban deconcentration. The Central (later, Canada) Mortgage and Housing Corporation and its American counterpart, the Federal Housing Authority (FHA), invested heavily in suburban development following the Second World War. Both agencies placed guarantees on loans to increase the availability of mortgage money, resulting in a boom in suburban housing construction (Fowler 1992, p149) (Des Rosiers 1992, p.16).

In the U.S., suburbanization was further promoted when the federal government allowed mortgage payments to be deducted from taxable income (Fowler 1992, p.149). CMHC also encouraged suburbanization by placing price limits on houses eligible for insurance (Mercer 1991, p.59). These types of policies appear to have had a greater impact on U.S. central cities, decreasing their attractiveness as a place to live and invest.

Urban decentralization, however, has been less extensive in Canada. Bourne (1984 p.5) states that during the post-war period, stricter limits on urban sprawl and suburban expansion in Canada slowed the growth of new housing opportunities on the urban fringe and decreased the rate of out-migration. As a result, "the rate of decline in residential densities in older neighbourhoods has been less rapid" (Bourne 1984, p.5). Additionally, the redevelopment of many older areas in the city has been encouraged by zoning

bonuses. Furthermore, continued investment in public transit in Canadian central cities has reduced the incidence of out-migration while directing new investment to core areas (Bourne 1984, p.7).

Recent Urban Policy Developments in the United States

In the U.S., by the early 1970s, there was a growing awareness of the serious problems afflicting many cities. Urban policies were developed in an attempt to deal with these problems. Between 1970 and 1978, direct federal aid to cities increased fourfold and throughout the decade local governments had access to a growing number of grant instruments (Reischauer 1990, p.227).

President Carter's administration (1976-1979) was the first to promise a comprehensive urban policy. Its strategy was aimed at strengthening local economies by encouraging business activity to return to the central city. The strategy also sought to improve the condition of neighbourhoods, to create jobs and to improve local services (Kaplan 1990, p.176). The proposed strategy, which emerged in 1978, consisted of an \$8.3 billion aid package including grants, loans and other incentives (Orlebeke 1990, p.198). This proposal was rejected by Congress and the administration was forced to accept a scaled down version.

Kaplan (1990) argues that the policy was seriously flawed as it failed to target the appropriate areas requiring support.

What emerged as the Carter urban policy was primarily "place-oriented"; that is, it dealt with cities as geographic entities and jurisdictions rather than as the home of specific populations or groups that needed different kinds of direct federal help, including help to leave the city (Kaplan 1990. p.176).

Under Carter, federal aid to cities peaked in 1978 with 12.4 percent of federal expenditures going to real urban outlays (payments to cities) (Florida and Jonas 1991, p.373). The last two years of Carter's administration, however, were marked by a reduction in this assistance.

In the early 1980s, President Reagan's administration initiated some important public policy shifts which included the departure from an explicit urban policy. The new administration felt that cities had become overly dependent on federal aid and that domestic programs were not working. It set out to reduce significantly federal urban assistance.

Reagan's 1982 Urban Policy Report proposed that state and local governments should assume more responsibility for dealing with the problems of cities. The Reagan strategy "reflected a market approach that places greatest emphasis on national economic performance and envisioned a relatively minor and residual federal role toward urban areas" (Wolman 1986, p.313).

The administration's policy was to eliminate or reduce federal spending on urban social programs, to privatize certain government services, reduce taxes and increase defense spending. In the fiscal year 1982, the Medicaid program was cut by \$1.1 billion, the foodstamp program by \$1.7 billion,

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFCD) by \$1.2 billion, and unemployment insurance by \$200 million. Public housing programs were also cutback, and between 1980 and 1985 there was a 10 percent reduction in income maintenance and other social programs (Florida and Jonas 1991, p.375).

Additionally, during its first term, the Reagan administration eliminated or reduced funding to a number of urban programs. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), the General Revenue Sharing program, and Urban Development Action Grants were terminated. Moreover, funding to a number of programs was cut, including Economic Development Administration, urban-oriented infrastructure, the Community Development Block Grant, the Social Services Block Grant and Community Services Block Grant (Peterson 1986, p.30). Between 1978 and 1988, nonentitlement federal grants to cities were cut by 41 percent (Reischauer 1990, p.228) and between 1980 and 1986, grant funding for distressed cities decreased by 14 percent (Cuciti 1990, p.244). Meanwhile, between 1980 and 1987, defence spending grew by 111 percent, as response to Reagan's desire to build large-scale weapons systems (Cuciti 1990, p.239).

Kaplan (1990) is critical of federal urban policy in the United States. He argues that federal programs to assist residents of older, declining neighbourhoods to revitalize have been too limited. In some cases, federal initiatives aimed at neighbourhood improvement have created higher

housing costs and have decreased housing opportunities for local residents. Moreover, Kaplan (1990, p.179) contends that a large proportion of federal assistance has not been aimed at the worst areas.

Cuciti (1990) states that cities did not fair well during the Reagan administration.

Programs of importance to cities bore a disproportionate share of the cuts; within programs there has been a shift in resources away from the most distressed cities; structural changes in programs put cities at a disadvantage; and, overall, distressed cities have lost out in the competition for federal spending (Cuciti 1990, p.239).

During Reagan's first term, less-fortunate urban residents, especially the poor, were the hardest hit. For example, between 1979-80 and 1983, the poverty rate in Chicago grew from 24 to 34 percent while in Miami, it increased from 32 to 42 percent (James 1990, p.29). According to Florida and Jonas (1991, p.375) annual benefits from AFDC and food-stamps dropped from a high of \$8,743 for a four person family in 1972 to \$6,955 in 1984. Primarily as a result of these cuts, the number of people living below the poverty line in the U.S. grew from 24 million in 1978 to over 33 million in 1984 (Florida and Jonas 1991, p.375). Additionally, during the 1980s, there was a dramatic increase in child poverty and infant mortality.

Shafroth (1989, p.117) argues that the policy shifts of the 1980s contributed to growing disparities between cities in the United States. A large share of the cuts and elimin-

ations in federal assistance were in programs designed to alleviate poverty. The poorest communities suffered the most.

The result was perverse. For as municipalities shifted to other revenue sources to balance their budgets and to assume formerly federal burdens and mandates, they became more dependent on local taxes and impact fees. This shift benefited areas with greater growth and stronger revenue bases but further weakened those with disproportionate levels of children, poverty or crime (Shafroth 1989, p.117).

Public Policy Issues and Canadian Cities

In contrast to the situation in the United States, direct federal government involvement in urban affairs in Canada is minimal. Since the end of the Second World War, provincial responsibility for cities has grown considerably (Siegel 1990, p.15). Most of the funding to municipalities comes from the provinces. Provincial governments have control over health care, education and social services. Urban policies at this level include the subsidization of housing, sewage treatment, water-supply systems, and public transit (Sancton 1991, p.466).

The federal government in Canada has been active in urban housing policy. During the 1950s and 1960s, it promoted suburbanization while central areas in the city were vacated and slums were cleared. As a result of the subsequent displacement of low-income groups, the federal government initiated an urban renewal program in the 1960s that included the construction of large-scale public-housing projects in inner cities. Despite these efforts, however,

several government reports in the early 1970s emphasized the need for more low-income housing (Carroll 1990, p.92).

Under the Trudeau government in the early 1970s, the urban renewal program was suspended and two new programs, Neighbourhood Improvement and Residential Rehabilitation Assistance, were introduced to redevelop inner city neighbourhoods instead of clearing them. Also during this period, a non-profit and co-operative housing program was designed to promote income-integrated housing (Carroll 1990, p.93). By the early 1980s, the federal government began transferring more responsibility for housing policy to the provinces. By 1986, it operated only five housing programs.

The federal government in Canada has more of an implicit role in urban affairs through its fiscal and social policies.

Its policies concerning taxation and intergovernmental transfers have much to do with determining the capacity of provincial governments to respond to municipal demands for additional funds for urban services (Sancton 1991, p.466).

According to Sancton (1991, p.467), over the past several decades, municipal spending in Canada has increased significantly. Between 1947 and 1980, per capita local government expenditures in 1971 constant dollars grew from \$163.96 to \$406.75. While local government spending has grown, its ability to generate revenue has become increasingly difficult, creating an important public policy issue.

Between 1953 and 1988, own-source revenues as a share

of total local government revenues in Canada fell from 76.5 percent to 53.0 percent. There was a substantial drop in real property tax revenues. As a result, since the 1950s, local governments have become increasingly dependent on transfers from higher levels of government. The share of local revenue coming from transfers increased from 23.2 percent in 1953 to 47.0 percent in 1988 (Lithwick and Coulthard 1993, pp.266-267).

Since 1984, the Mulroney government followed a strategy of spending restraint and cutbacks in social policy. Program spending was restricted or reduced in social housing, legal aid, unemployment insurance, health care, social assistance and post secondary education (Rice and Prince 1993, p.386). Since the mid 1980s, federal government spending on social programs has grown very little.

During the Mulroney years, federal transfers to other levels of government were significantly limited. Between 1984-85 and 1991-92, federal transfers increased from \$20 billion to \$24.4 billion, representing an average annual growth of only 2.9 percent (Rice and Prince 1993, p. 396). As a result of these limitations on federal transfers, the provinces have been forced, in turn, to reduce social assistance and to transfer some social services to local governments.

Canadian cities have been placed under increasing financial strain. Lithwick and Coulthard (1993, p.269) argue

that transfers from provincial governments have not increased enough to meet the needs of municipalities. Local governments have been forced to limit the delivery of services. Cutbacks have been evident in snow removal, garbage collection, recreation and in the maintenance of infrastructure. Municipalities are also experiencing difficulty in supporting an increasing number of welfare recipients (Lithwick and Coulthard 1993, p.268).

Lithwick and Coulthard propose that these recent trends have contributed to a decline in the quality of urban life, especially in the largest cities. They contend that there is a growing dependency among disadvantaged urban residents on social programs and public institutions created to help them. This dependency has "reduced their ability to control their own lives" (Lithwick and Coulthard 1993, p.262).

Urban poverty levels have increased significantly. Between 1965 and 1990 in metropolitan areas with a population greater than 500,000, the incidence of family poverty grew from 12 percent to 24 percent, while the incidence of poverty among individuals increased from 10 percent to 33 percent (Lithwick and Coulthard 1993, p.265). There have also been large increases in poverty among lone-female parent families and children.

Rice and Prince (1993) propose that changes to the unemployment insurance system have forced more people onto social welfare assistance. In 1984, there were 1,742,706

Canadians living on welfare, representing 7 percent of the total population. By 1987, this figure had grown to an estimated 1,904,900 (7.4 percent of the population) and by 1991 to an estimated 2,282,200 (8.5 percent) (Rice and Prince 1993, p.409).

Futhermore, during the 1980s, there was a dramatic increase in the number of foodbanks and homeless people in Canada. In 1981, there was only one foodbank in the country (Edmonton); by 1991, there were more than 350. Foodbanks are used by about 1.4 million people each year. Between 1984 and 1991, the estimated number of homeless people in Canada grew from 100,000 to between 150,000 and 260,000 (Rice and Prince 1993, p.410). Most of these homeless are found in urban centres, particularly the central cities of the largest metropolitan areas.

Conclusion

There are important differences between cities in Canada and the United States. As this chapter has demonstrated, the notion of the "North American city", so prevalent in the teaching of urban geography in the past, is now outdated. This review also indicates that overall, urban problems such as poverty, population loss, crime, segregation and fiscal constraint are greater in the United States.

It is also apparent that public policy has a considerable impact on the condition of cities. In the United States during the 1980s, the Reagan administration significantly

reduced federal urban programs and financial aid to cities. These policy changes are viewed as having a negative effect on cities. Similarly, in Canada, the Mulroney government reduced its support for social policy and limited transfer payments to the provinces. As a consequence, provinces and municipalities are experiencing difficulty in providing effective levels of service. This overview of urban differences and public policy trends is important in providing an appropriate context to the empirical analysis of Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

STUDY METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the project's methodology. As stated in Chapter 1, the main objective of the thesis is to compare levels of urban decline and distress in Canada and the United States during the 1980s. A sample of five paired Canadian and American cities is used to make this comparison. The first part of the chapter describes the criteria used to select the five pairs of cities. The second section discusses the geographic scope of the empirical analysis and the third outlines data sources and the selection of variables. The final part describes the methods employed to analyse the data.

First, however, a clear definition of urban "decline" and "distress" in the context of the project's empirical analysis is required. Urban distress refers to important social and economic problems experienced in a city or neighbourhood, disadvantaging residents, particularly certain groups, such as the poor. Urban decline is a worsening of conditions or a deterioration in the quality of life in an area over a period of time. It occurs when a city or a neighbourhood becomes less attractive as a place to live and invest in. As demonstrated in Chapters 2 and 3, urban decline and distress can be measured by such indicators as population decline, employment loss, poverty, unemployment, crime, and an ageing housing stock.

Description of City Pairs

The five pairs of cities chosen for this project were: Halifax-Savannah, Montreal-Baltimore, Hamilton-Toledo, Regina-Lincoln and Vancouver-Portland. As part of the selection criteria, each pair was required to have similar metropolitan and central city populations as well as similar economic functions and geographic locations. These criteria ensure the representativeness of each pair of cities and create a more appropriate scale for comparing levels of urban decline and distress in Canada and the United States.

The sample of cities is geographically representative. Vancouver and Portland are located near the Pacific coast, while Halifax and Savannah are located on the Atlantic coast. Hamilton and Toledo, in the Great Lakes region, and Montreal and Baltimore, in the eastern part of the continent, are all within the industrial heartland of North America. Finally, Regina and Lincoln are situated on the western plains.

In terms of size, Montreal-Baltimore and Vancouver-Portland are large metropolitan areas with populations greater than one million. (It should be noted, however, that while Montreal and Vancouver are the second and third largest metropolitan areas in Canada, Baltimore and Portland are the eighteenth and twenty-seventh largest in the United States). Hamilton and Toledo can be classified as medium sized metropolitan areas with populations over half a mil-

lion, while Halifax-Savannah and Regina-Lincoln are small metropolitan centres having populations under 350,000. Table 4.1 shows the comparative populations for each pair of cities.

The paired cities also have similar economic structures. Montreal and Baltimore are important port cities and transportation centres with considerable manufacturing, commercial and institutional activity. Vancouver and Portland are major seaport cities as well as industrial and commercial centres involved in the export of raw materials. Hamilton and Toledo are both lake port and transportation centres engaged heavily in manufacturing. Hamilton manufactures products such as steel, iron and electric equipment while Toledo manufactures automobiles and machine tools and is involved in shipbuilding.

Halifax and Savannah are also principal seaport cities involved in shipyard and manufacturing activity. Halifax is an important regional service centre for Atlantic Canada with several large universities and colleges. Savannah is home to two state colleges. Regina and Lincoln are transportation and commercial centres located within important agricultural regions. In addition to being important regional service centres they are also engaged in agricultural activities including the handling of livestock, grain, and dairy products.

Geographic Scope

The primary area of study is the central city of each of the ten metropolitan areas in the sample. The central city was selected for several reasons. First, it is usually the largest and oldest municipality within the metropolitan area and contains a high proportion of business and commercial activity. Second, urban problems are often most pronounced within its boundaries. Third, limiting the analysis to the central city, as opposed to the entire metropolitan area, allows for the building of a more manageable data set.

Within the central city, the principal geographic unit of analysis is the census tract. Census tracts are small standardized units of measurement used to divide large urban communities. They are defined in the same way by Statistics Canada and the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census tracts are designed to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status and living conditions. They usually have a population of between 2,500 and 8,000 and their boundaries follow permanent and recognized lines on the ground (White 1987, pp.288-289). Bourne (1989, p.2) refers to census tracts as "crude approximations to urban neighbourhoods." Detailed census information on demographic, social, economic and housing characteristics is available for each tract.

The number of census tracts varies according to the size of the urban area. For example, for the 1991 census,

the City of Halifax was divided into 30 tracts, while the City of Montreal was divided into 320 tracts. There are several advantages to examining data at this level. Census tracts are relatively permanent and consistent in size and can be used for comparisons between censuses if their boundaries have not changed. Their small size makes them ideal for statistical analysis, providing an abundance of information about an area and hence a neighbourhood (White 1987, p.290). They are also useful in examining spatial differences within urban areas.

The study period for the project is 1980-81 to 1990-91. For 1980-81, a total of 1028 census tracts from the ten central cities are examined. For 1990-91, a total of 1103 census tracts are examined. Table 4.2 shows the number of census tracts in each city for the two time periods. The increase in the number of census tracts over the ten year period is primarily the result of two factors. First, several municipalities expanded their boundaries to incorporate new territory and second, some census tracts were split because of large population growth.

Data Sources and Selection of Variables

All of the data for the project were obtained from Statistics Canada and the U.S. Bureau of the Census. They were drawn from the 1981 and 1991 Canadian censuses and from the 1980 and 1990 U.S. censuses. Both Statistics Canada and the U.S. Bureau of the Census publish individual reports at

the census tract level for large urban areas.

The number of comparable indicators of urban decline and distress is limited because of differences in the Canadian and American censuses. At the census tract level, a set of ten variables, focusing primarily on social and economic dimensions of decline and distress, is examined. The ten variables and their acronyms are:

1. Rate of population change (1970-71 to 1980-81 and 1980-81 to 1990-91) (**PopChg**);
2. Male unemployment rate (**UnempM**);
3. Female unemployment rate (**UnempF**);
4. Male labour force participation rate (**MalePart**);
5. Female labour force participation rate (**FemPart**);
6. Percent of population with education less than grade 9 (**Grade9**);
7. Percent of lone-female parent families (**LoneFem**);
8. Percent of families living in poverty (**FamPov**);
9. Percent of unattached individuals living in poverty (**IndPov**);
10. Percent of old housing (built before 1945-46) (**OldHouse**).

These ten variables are analysed for each census tract in the sample of ten cities for the two time periods (1980-81 and 1990-91).

The project focuses entirely on quantitative, census-based indicators of urban decline and distress. There is

also an important subjective element to the examination of urban problems. Possible subjective indicators include the overall satisfaction of residents with their city or neighbourhood as well as attitudes and perceptions of their quality of life. Kennedy (1983, pp.137-142) discusses the advantages of sample surveys as an alternative to census information as a way of evaluating the quality of life in urban areas. However, because of the small geographic scale of the principal unit of analysis in this project (the census tract) and the large number of cases, it would be virtually impossible to add appropriate subjective indicators to the analysis.

The definition of each variable according to the Canadian and U.S. censuses is provided in Appendix I. The definitions of some of the variables differ slightly between the two countries. In Canada, labour force participation is calculated as the rate of all persons fifteen years of age and over who are employed. In the U.S., the rate is measured as a percentage of all persons sixteen years of age and over. Also, in Canada, educational attainment is calculated from a population base aged fifteen years and over, while in the U.S., it is measured from a population base aged twenty-five years and over.

Additionally, Statistics Canada and the U.S. Bureau of the Census employ different measures of poverty. The low income cut-off, used to calculate the incidence of poverty, is

higher in Canada than it is in the United States. According to Statistics Canada, families or individuals who spend 62 percent or more of their pre-tax income on food, clothing and shelter are living in poverty (Crane 1980, p.263). In the United States, families or individuals are considered to be poor if their food budget exceeds one-third of their total expenditures (Ruggles 1990, p.4). As a result, it is possible that more families and unattached individuals are considered to be poor in Canada compared to the United States. This situation may place some limitations on the empirical findings in Chapter 5.

From the list of ten variables, it is fairly clear that population change (loss), unemployment and poverty are direct measures of urban decline and distress. As outlined in Chapters 2 and 3, these indicators are often used in empirical studies. The lone-female parent variable is not, itself, a direct measure of urban decline or distress but is included because of the numerous problems that are associated with these families. As discussed in Chapter 2, lone-female parent families are becoming increasingly visible in Canadian and American cities. Many of these families are living in poverty and are dependent on welfare assistance. Single mothers often lack access to employment opportunities and find it difficult to advance through education and training. Not all single-female parent families, however, are experiencing these problems.

Distressed neighbourhoods with high unemployment and poverty can also be expected to have lower rates of labour force participation. Low rates of participation may reflect a lack of job opportunities in a neighbourhood or city. With the economic restructuring of the central city during the 1980s and a growing polarization of the workforce, this variable is particularly useful as an indicator of urban problems. According to Broadway (1989, p.539), however, a low rate of participation may be the result of other factors besides a lack of job opportunities. "Other possible explanations for a low rate would include high student and elderly populations and cultural constraints on participation by women" (p.539).

It is likely that the problems of unemployment, poverty, and low labour force participation in a neighbourhood or city (particularly one that is experiencing significant economic restructuring) are also associated with lower levels of educational attainment. As indicated in Chapter 2, many central city residents with low education and skill levels (including those formerly employed in the manufacturing sector) face a lack of job opportunities. Frey and Speare (1989, p.119) report that in U.S. cities during the 1970s, outmigration lowered the average level of education in an area.

The old housing component has been disputed as an appropriate measure of urban decline because it is proposed

that many old housing units are as sound and attractive as new ones (Bradbury 1984, p.42). This variable is included in the study, however, for several reasons. As Bradbury (1984) proposes, the age of the housing stock is a useful indicator of the vintage of the city government's capital stock and associated maintenance and replacement expenses. Also, numerous studies in the U.S. have found that the presence of older housing in central cities inhibits population growth and promotes outmigration (Nelson 1988, p.35). An increase in the proportion of old housing over a period of time could mean that an area has become less attractive for new development. Furthermore, Frey and Speare (1988, p.134) discuss the condition of old housing:

It may be of poorer quality if it has been allowed to deteriorate, does not conform to new building codes or construction standards, or does not take account of changing housing preferences. For example, newer homes tend to have better insulation, more electrical outlets, and more bathrooms than older houses.

While gentrification has resulted in the renovation of older homes in central city neighbourhoods in North America, this process has been selective of certain cities and certain areas within cities and its significance should not be overestimated.

Method of Analysis

The data analysis is both cross-sectional and vertical. It is cross-sectional in the sense that the cities are compared to each other in both time periods alone (1980-81 and 1990-91). It is vertical in the sense that the changes oc-

currence in each city over the ten year period are examined and compared. The ten indicators of "decline" and "distress" for each city pair are analysed using four main techniques: (1) descriptive statistics, (2) standard score analysis, (3) principal components analysis, and (4) cluster analysis. Microsoft Excel 4.0 is used to conduct the first two techniques, while the latter are performed using SPSSPC+.

A raw data matrix was constructed for each of the ten cities for the two periods. The matrix consists of variables and cases. The cases comprise the census tracts in each city. Each census tract has a numerical value for each of the ten variables previously listed. All of the data is at the ratio scale. The matrices are in Appendix III.

1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics (the mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and count) are calculated for each of the ten variables in the ten cities. From these statistics, initial cross-sectional comparisons of levels of urban decline and distress between cities are made. The rate of change for each variable between 1980-81 and 1990-91 in each city is also calculated. This is the first step in identifying cities with declining conditions during the 1980s.

2. Standard Score Analysis

Standard score analysis is employed as a way to compare individual census tracts in terms of their condition. Census

2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

tracts are ranked to create an overall index of urban distress. This method involves the transformation of raw data into "z" scores. Z-scores have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. As Hamelin (1987, p.106) states, "the conversion thus allows for any degree of aggregation or disaggregation since the values are standardized." For this project, all of the raw data for each city are combined to create one large data set for both the 1980-81 and 1990-91 periods.

The z-scores of the ten variables for all the census tracts in the sample are calculated. The scores are then summed across all the variables to produce a total score of "decline" and "distress" for each census tract. The census tracts are then ranked from highest to lowest on the basis of their total scores. An index is created by dividing the total number of tracts into quartiles (assuming that the total scores are normally distributed). The first quartile represents the "distressed" tracts, while the fourth represents the "least distressed" tracts. The number and percentage of each city's tracts in these quartiles is then determined. According to Hamelin (1987, p.106), "the utility of the model lies in the ease with which the analyst can quickly scan the results to pick out the more extreme cases."

Standard score analysis has been used in studies of social well-being. For example, Hamelin (1987) employed this technique to examine indicators of social well-being in

Canadian cities. It is used in the United States by the Brookings Institution in two of its urban distress indices: The Intrametropolitan Hardship Index and the Intercity Hardship Index.

3. Principal Components Analysis

Principal components analysis is the first of two multivariate statistical techniques employed in the data analysis. It is performed using SPSS software. Essentially, it is a data reduction technique. It replaces a set of variables with a smaller number of components. The components are made up of inter-correlated variables representing as much of the original data set as possible. The correlation coefficients between all variables in a data set are calculated and placed into a correlation matrix. Each correlation represents an angle or a vector in space. For example, the ten variables used in a data set for this project are represented by ten vectors in a ten-dimensional space.

Principal components are then extracted from this ten-dimensional vector space. The first principal component represents a new vector which is located as close as possible to the ten vectors already present. It is placed in the average location of all the vectors. The relationship between the first component and the original variables is then determined. The correlations between the component and the ten variables (vectors) are calculated and are referred

to as component loadings. The variables located closest to the first component are the most inter-correlated and have the highest loadings. The first component accounts for a greater portion of statistical variation in the data set than any other component.

The component loadings are squared indicating the degree to which the new variable replaces an original variable. The squared component loadings are summed producing an eigenvalue, which indicates the total variance assumed by the component (Johnston 1980, p.138). A second component, uncorrelated to the first, is then extracted. It is located at a 90 degree angle (orthogonal) to the first component and accounts for as much of the remaining variation as possible. Its component loadings and eigenvalue are computed.

This procedure is repeated until ten components are extracted, accounting for all the variation. Usually, however, only those components with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 (or those that account for over 5% of the variance) are retained for further analysis. For example, in a ten variable data set, usually only the first two or three components (accounting for a high proportion of the original variance) are kept. The principal components are orthogonal (90 degrees) to each other and therefore uncorrelated. They are then subjected to a varimax rotation, whereby they are rotated at a 90 degree angle. Component loadings are useful in identifying groups of inter-correlated variables in a

data set.

It is from these loadings that a component score for each case in the data matrix is calculated. In this project, the cases are census tracts. According to Johnston (1980, p.151), component scores are

weighted summed values for the observations over the variables, the weights being the component loadings. The larger the value which an observation has on the variables which have high loadings on a component, the larger the score.

Component scores are standardized by computing their z-values, which usually have a range of +3.0 to -3.0. This standardization permits the relative position of each census tract on each component to be compared. Johnston (1980, Chapter 5) provides a good review of principal components analysis in a geographical context.

Principal components analysis and factor analysis have a long tradition in urban geography. For example, King (1966) used the former to conduct a cross-sectional analysis of social and economic indicators in urban Canada in 1951 and 1961. Simmons (1986) employed factor analysis to examine spatial patterns of social change in Canadian cities between 1971 and 1981. Goldberg and Mercer (1986) conducted a factor analysis to assess the major differences between Canadian and American cities. Broadway (1989) used principal components analysis to examine the nature and pattern of urban deprivation in a sample of Canadian and U.S. inner cities for 1980-81. More recently, Davies and Murdie (1991; 1993)

studied intra-urban variations of social dimensions in the census tracts of Canada's 24 metropolitan areas by way of factor analysis.

Principal components was selected as a method of analysis for this project because it was suspected during the assembly of the data matrices that there is a good deal of inter-correlation among the ten variables. As a result, it was felt that it would be more appropriate to compare levels of urban decline and distress using a smaller number of underlying components. Also, this technique allows individual census tracts to be compared according to their component scores. Furthermore, the nature of urban decline and distress as indicated by the component structure (groups of inter-correlated variables) can be assessed.

Principal components analysis is conducted on a combined Canada - U.S. data set for both time periods (1980-81 and 1990-91). The advantage of joining the data sets is that any census tract from the Canadian and American cities can be directly compared with any other census tract.

4. Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis involves "the search for relatively homogeneous groups of objects" (Norusis 1986, p.71). In this instance, the geographical character of urban decline and distress can be considered by the grouping of census tracts based on the similarity (or distance) between their scores across each of the major principal components. This tech-

nique is used to determine the extent to which Canadian and American neighbourhoods are linked to each other based on levels of distress.

The grouping method used in the cluster analysis is Ward's algorithm, in which the means for all variables in each cluster are calculated. The squared Euclidean distance between each case and the cluster means is then calculated. These distances are summed for all the cases. "At each step, the two clusters that merge are those that result in the smallest increase in the overall sum of the squared within-cluster distances" (Norusis 1986, p.83).

Cluster analysis has been employed often by urban geographers, although less frequently than principal components and factor analysis. King (1966) conducted a cluster analysis on Canadian urban areas based on social and economic data drawn from the 1951 and 1961 censuses. Goldberg and Mercer (1986) used this technique to determine how Canadian and American cities differ from one another according to a large set of variables. Hamelin (1987) performed a cluster analysis on Canadian metropolitan areas to examine the geographical character of indicators of social well being. Davies and Donoghue (1993) used cluster analysis to study changes in the economic diversification of Canadian cities between 1951 and 1986. For this study, cluster analysis is carried out for both time periods (1980-81, 1990-91) on the large data sets combining all the census tracts.

TABLE 4.1
COMPARATIVE POPULATION DATA FOR SAMPLE CITIES

Canada 1991	CMA	CENTRAL CITY
Halifax	320,501	114,455
Montreal	3,127,242	1,017,666
Hamilton	599,760	318,499
Regina	191,692	179,178
Vancouver	1,602,502	471,844
 United States 1990	 MSA	 CENTRAL CITY
Savannah	242,622	137,560
Baltimore	2,382,172	736,014
Toledo	614,128	332,943
Lincoln	213,641	191,972
Portland	1,239,842	435,415

Sources:

U.S. Department of Commerce (1993). 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas.

Statistics Canada (1993). 1991 Census of Canada. Profile of Census Tracts, Part A.

TABLE 4.2
TOTAL NUMBER OF CENSUS TRACTS EXAMINED IN SAMPLE CITIES

CANADA	1981	1991
Halifax	28	30
Montreal	293	319
Hamilton	92	95
Regina	35	45
Vancouver	77	87
Total	525	576
 UNITED STATES	 1980	 1990
Savannah	47	48
Baltimore	202	201
Toledo	97	99
Lincoln	40	43
Portland	117	136
Total	503	527
Combined Total	1,028	1,103

CHAPTER FIVE

URBAN DECLINE AND DISTRESS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

Tables 5.1A to 5.1F show the descriptive statistics for the ten variables for each city pair in 1980-1981 and 1990-1991. As indicated by the tables, some of the variables are slightly skewed and therefore not normally distributed. However, all of the variables have 99% of their cases lying within ± 3 standard deviations of the mean. Additionally, many of the variables have means and medians which are close to one another. Data transformations were not undertaken for this project.

The statistics reveal several important trends. For both periods, Halifax, Montreal and Hamilton had average rates of male and female labour force participation higher than their American counterparts. Lincoln recorded higher average participation rates than Regina. Between 1980-81 and 1990-91, the average female labour force participation rate increased in every city.

In 1980-81 and 1990-91, Montreal, Regina and Vancouver had higher average rates of poverty among families and individuals than their U.S. counterparts. Both both periods, Savannah had higher average rates of poverty than Halifax. Hamilton recorded average rates of poverty among unrelated individuals substantially higher than Toledo. Montreal had the highest rates of family and individual poverty in the

sample (29.3% and 49.6% in 1991, respectively). Over the study period, Montreal experienced increases in average family poverty, while Vancouver and Toledo witnessed increases in both family and individual poverty. During the same period, meanwhile, Baltimore saw a slight decrease in average family poverty and a larger drop in individual poverty.

With the exception of Halifax, the average incidence of low education (below grade 9) was greater in the Canadian cities in 1990-91. Montreal had the highest rate of low education (22.0% in 1991), while Lincoln had the lowest (3.9% in 1990). The average incidence of low education, however, decreased markedly in each city in the sample between 1980-81 and 1990-91.

In 1990-91, Montreal, Regina and Vancouver had average rates of male and female unemployment substantially higher than their U.S. counterparts, while Savannah and Toledo registered higher average rates than their Canadian counterparts. Between 1981 and 1991, all five Canadian cities in the sample experienced increases in average male and female unemployment. Of particular note is the dramatic increase in the average male unemployment rate in Hamilton (6.4%) and a corresponding decline in the average male labour force participation rate (-5.6%). On the other hand, between 1980 and 1990, all of the U.S. cities in the sample experienced either slight drops or no change in average male and female

unemployment rates (with the exception of male unemployment in Savannah).

With respect to population change during the 1980s, all five Canadian cities recorded growth among their census tracts, while three U.S. cities (Savannah, Baltimore and Toledo) experienced decline. Significant population growth was evident in the four western cities, particularly Vancouver and Portland.

Overall, there was very little difference in the average rates of lone female-parent families between cities in the two countries. Baltimore had the highest average rates (20.5% in 1980 and 21.6% in 1990), while Lincoln had the lowest (9.2% in 1980 and 10.7% in 1990). Baltimore also had the highest average incidence of old housing in the sample (61.4% in 1980 and 52.6% in 1990). As expected, the incidence of old housing decreased in each city between 1980-81 and 1990-91.

In summary, the five Canadian cities experienced population growth in the 1980s, while three U.S. cities witnessed population declines. Between 1980-81 and 1990-91, all of the cities in the sample recorded declines in the average incidence of old housing and low education. The five Canadian cities were subjected to increases in average rates of male and female unemployment, while four of the U.S. cities witnessed either slight declines or no change. Two Canadian cities, Montreal and Vancouver, experienced growth in the

average rate of family poverty. Toledo was the only American city to record increases in the average rate of family and individual poverty.

TABLE 5.1A

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS : HALIFAX - SAVANNAH

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	Halifax UnempF	1981 Grade9	LongTerm	OldHome	FamPov	IndPov
Mean	-8.8	78.0	57.0	7.4	6.8	12.1	13.5	31.3	13.9	33.3
Median	-13.1	79.2	55.8	7.0	6.4	11.8	12.1	28.6	11.3	32.8
Stand.Deviation	20.2	5.1	7.1	2.5	2.2	7.7	6.1	21.8	9.1	11.8
Minimum	-42.8	63.4	43.1	2.6	3.7	0.2	4.6	0.5	1.9	13.4
Maximum	56.2	88.1	69.8	12.5	11.7	34.1	27.3	81.0	34.4	70.5
Count	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
Mean	0.8	76.9	62.6	9.1	9.2	1991	14.5	27.6	13.8	33.6
Median	-2.3	76.7	60.7	9.0	8.7	7.4	12.7	24.7	12.4	35.1
Stand.Deviation	17.2	4.7	9.0	3.3	3.2	6.8	7.0	20.4	9.6	10.3
Minimum	-18.9	68.0	44.0	3.6	4.7	5.3	6.4	0.5	2.2	15.5
Maximum	81.8	86.2	87.2	19.3	16.3	0	37.9	72.3	44.2	54.7
Count	30	30	30	30	30	20.9	30	30	30	30
Mean Percent Change 1981-91	0.8	-1.1	5.6	1.7	2.4	-4.7	1.0	-3.7	-0.1	0.3
Mean	-3.2	69.0	46.6	7.2	11.5	1980	17.7	37.0	24.1	37.1
Median	-11.3	70.3	46.3	5.5	10.3	27.0	14.7	39.0	21.2	38.4
Stand.Deviation	26.5	12.8	9.5	4.8	7.4	27.6	13.7	26.5	19.4	20.5
Minimum	-70.9	30.1	28.6	0	1.2	15.8	3.0	1.0	0.9	6.8
Maximum	62.7	99.0	75.6	18.8	39.8	2.9	63.3	95.3	72.2	100
Count	39	47	47	47	47	64.5	47	47	46	47
Mean	-9.0	66.6	53.3	9.9	11.1	1990	20.9	33.0	24.4	37.2
Median	-8.4	66.4	53.3	8.1	10.1	14.7	18.3	26.5	22.6	35.0
Stand.Deviation	18.3	11.8	11.2	7.6	8.7	14.0	14.8	25.3	20.2	19.8
Minimum	-53.6	37.1	27.5	0.8	0	9.9	3.0	0.3	0	4.8
Maximum	41.5	96.8	76.0	42.2	47.5	1.5	63.4	85.3	81	90.2
Count	45	48	48	48	48	38.9	48	48	48	48
Mean Percent Change 1980-90	-9.0	-2.4	6.7	2.7	-0.4	-12.3	3.2	-4.0	0.3	0.1

TABLE 5.1B

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: MONTREAL - BALTIMORE

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	Montreal UnempF	1981 Grade9	LoncFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Mean	-21.7	72.2	48.8	11.3	11.4	32.4	16.6	44.8	25.8	51.3
Median	-22.5	73.7	49.1	10.6	10.5	34.2	15.2	48.4	24.0	50.8
Stand. Deviation	17.2	7.7	9.0	4.8	4.9	11.4	6.7	29.2	11.8	13.1
Minimum	-69.9	35.6	19.9	0	0	3.6	0	0	4.3	16.8
Maximum	154.5	87.5	79.5	32.7	33.3	64.3	53.4	97.5	70.3	96.9
Count	292	293	293	293	293	293	293	293	292	292
					Montreal	1991				
Mean	0.7	71.2	55.3	16.2	14.0	22.0	18.2	33.7	29.3	49.6
Median	-6.2	71.0	54.6	15.8	13.3	23.0	17.8	30.5	28.3	49.3
Stand. Deviation	34.3	6.4	9.4	5.7	5.7	9.3	6.4	23.6	12.7	12.3
Minimum	-39.7	37.8	17.8	0	0	1.9	3.8	0	0	0
Maximum	425.8	90.0	81.5	38.8	45.5	52.6	54.0	86.2	81.0	94.5
Count	319	319	319	319	319	319	319	319	319	319
Mean Percent										
Change 1981-91	0.7	-1.0	6.5	-4.9	2.6	-10.4	1.6	-11.1	3.5	-1.7
					Baltimore	1990				
Mean	-11.9	66.8	47.0	12.2	10.8	30.7	20.5	61.4	20.5	34.8
Median	-14.8	68.0	46.3	9.7	9.6	31.3	17.3	65.7	16.4	33.2
Stand. Deviation	18.8	10.3	10.2	8.0	6.7	12.2	14.1	26.9	16.4	15.5
Minimum	-51.9	22.3	7.8	0	0	1.4	1.5	0	0.7	5.6
Maximum	95.4	89.4	72.5	39.5	42.4	55.4	70.9	99.8	71.3	78.5
Count	194	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	201	201
					Baltimore	1990				
Mean	-4.8	68.0	54.6	11.0	9.1	15.6	21.6	52.6	19.4	29.9
Median	-8.3	68.7	54.4	9.4	7.6	15.1	18.8	52.7	14.1	27.3
Stand. Deviation	23.7	10.1	9.9	7.4	6.3	7.2	13.9	23.9	16.1	16.8
Minimum	-59.2	22.6	25.9	0	0	1	1.9	0	0	2.2
Maximum	225.2	87.2	79.9	37.8	33.1	37.0	70.5	98	78.1	80.1
Count	197	201	201	201	201	201	201	201	201	201
Mean Percent										
Change 1980-90	-4.8	1.2	7.6	-1.2	-1.7	-15.1	1.1	-8.8	-1.1	-4.9

TABLE 5.1C

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: HAMILTON - TOLEDO

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	1981 Grade9	LongTerm	OffHousc	FamPov	IndPov
Mean	-4.4	77.2	50.7	5.6	8.1	22.6	10.8	31.5	16.4	41.2
Median	-14.3	77.1	50.3	5.0	7.6	19.8	9.7	15.0	13.8	38.8
Stand.Deviation	29.6	7.4	7.5	3.0	4.3	10.2	5.2	32.6	9.6	16.8
Minimum	-42.9	46.5	28.2	0	0	7.2	0	0	4.1	0
Maximum	154.8	90.6	70.0	14.3	29.6	55.6	26.7	92.1	51	100
Count	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	90	90
					Hamilton	1991				
Mean	7.8	71.6	56.5	12.0	9.7	15.6	13.1	28.5	18.0	40.9
Median	-4.5	71.4	56.7	11.3	9.0	14.4	12.0	16.7	15.3	41.3
Stand.Deviation	44.9	7.6	8.7	5.3	5.4	7.1	5.1	29.4	10.2	14.9
Minimum	-23.6	45.6	36.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	239.9	88.0	80.0	28.3	29.3	37.8	25.5	86.8	46.3	71.2
Count	94	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Mean Percent Change 1981-91	7.8	-5.6	5.8	6.4	1.6	-7.0	2.3	-3.0	1.6	-0.3
					Toledo	1980				
Mean	-3.0	72.8	47.6	15.2	11.9	18.4	13.4	49.7	13.6	24.2
Median	-12.4	74.1	48.5	13.0	8.7	15.9	9.5	58.1	6.6	21.1
Stand.Deviation	59.5	10.8	8.7	8.5	8.1	17.5	10.8	29.9	15.3	13.2
Minimum	-50.8	25.6	17.8	2.1	0	1.8	1.3	0.5	0.5	4.2
Maximum	518.4	93.7	69.7	36.6	42.6	44.6	53.8	92.1	66.7	64.8
Count	94	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	96	96
					Toledo	1990				
Mean	-7.6	67.9	53.1	13.4	11.9	9.7	16.6	43.6	19.2	29.4
Median	-6.4	70.5	53.9	9.4	9.0	8.0	13.6	50.3	12.7	27.0
Stand.Deviation	13.3	12.3	9.0	11.0	10.0	6.7	11.3	28.7	17.5	16.2
Minimum	-53.3	13.6	23.2	0	0	0.5	1.9	1.0	0	0
Maximum	40.8	84.0	73.6	67.1	60.7	33.9	62.6	85.9	78.8	80.1
Count	96	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
Mean Percent Change 1980-90	-7.6	-4.9	5.5	-1.8	0	-8.7	3.2	-6.1	5.6	5.2

TABLE 5.1D

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: REGINA - LINCOLN

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	Regina UnempF	1981 Grade9	LowFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Mean	21.5	79.8	57.7	5.0	5.4	16.3	11.6	18.3	13.5	33.4
Median	-15.0	51.0	58.0	3.8	5.1	14.0	10.7	5.8	10.3	34.0
Stand.Deviation	116.8	8.4	6.8	4.0	2.3	9.9	5.3	23.8	8.9	12.4
Minimum	-31.4	58.3	38.5	0.9	0	3.6	0	0	1.9	9.1
Maximum	623.9	93.6	67.9	19.5	11.3	40.0	21.6	76.1	32.6	60.4
Count	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	34	34
Regina										
Mean	13.4	77.3	64.2	7.6	8.8	10.9	13.0	12.2	14.1	30.8
Median	-5.5	78.5	64.7	6.5	7.0	8.1	12.9	3.9	12.5	32.2
Stand.Deviation	71.3	12.6	14.0	4.7	5.3	8.7	5.8	17.2	10.0	11.9
Minimum	-17.2	18.5	15.0	0	3.5	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	447.7	96.9	94.4	20.8	25.0	40.0	27.9	61.8	40.1	59.7
Count	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Mean Percent Change 1981-91	13.4	-2.5	6.5	2.6	3.4	-5.4	1.4	-6.1	0.6	-2.6
Lincoln										
Mean	41.4	79.5	62.4	4.5	3.0	9.5	9.2	29.3	7.5	20.8
Median	-5.7	80.7	62.4	3.6	2.6	8.0	7.5	23.7	4.7	18.6
Stand.Deviation	124.9	9.3	8.3	3.1	2.0	6.9	5.3	26.4	7.8	11.7
Minimum	-43.0	48.3	46.7	0.4	0	0	2.1	0	0.5	2.0
Maximum	431.9	94.1	76.3	13.2	8.8	25.7	27.6	82.9	42.5	60.0
Count	36	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Lincoln										
Mean	11.1	81.6	68.4	3.4	3.5	3.9	10.7	24.7	8.3	24.9
Median	3.5	82.5	69.4	2.8	3.4	3.6	8.1	15.5	5.9	20.1
Stand.Deviation	34.6	7.8	7.6	2.8	1.7	3.0	6.5	25.6	8.8	14.5
Minimum	-13.0	55.7	49.7	0	0.6	0	2.4	0	0	4.9
Maximum	202.7	97.2	85.8	14.5	7.7	11.2	30.9	96.2	41.3	68.3
Count	38	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Mean Percent Change 1980-90	11.1	2.1	6.0	-1.1	0.5	-5.6	1.5	-4.6	0.8	4.1

TABLE 5.1E

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: VANCOUVER - PORTLAND

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LongFem	OldHose	FamPev	IndPev
Mean	-3.2	75.8	56.9	6.2	5.9	15.8	11.6	33.7	14.5	40.0
Median	-5.1	76.4	55.7	5.5	5.8	17.2	11.1	29.9	13.5	38.4
Stand.Deviation	12.4	7.3	9.2	3.5	2.5	9.6	4.0	20.7	8.4	13.3
Minimum	-54.5	41.0	37.0	1.4	1.4	2.8	0	0.5	0	17.0
Maximum	33.0	88.6	92.7	24.0	14.0	48.2	24.1	97.0	47.2	86.3
Count	76	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
Vancouver										
Mean	14.3	74.1	61.2	11.6	10.2	10.8	12.6	27.0	19.9	42.9
Median	10.3	73.7	61.2	10.4	9.5	9.2	12.3	22.3	18.8	42.7
Stand.Deviation	19.3	8.4	10.2	6.1	4.6	8.1	4.2	17.9	10.7	12.4
Minimum	-9.4	31.3	24.6	2.5	3.1	1.4	6.0	0	2.6	24.3
Maximum	121.0	89.5	82.9	40.2	29.6	36.1	25.4	73.9	67.0	85.5
Count	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	87
Mean Percent										
Change 1981-91	14.3	-1.7	4.3	5.4	4.3	-5.0	1.0	-6.7	5.4	2.9
Portland										
Mean	0.6	73.5	53.0	7.9	5.9	12.2	10.8	53.5	9.4	21.6
Median	-7.2	75.0	52.9	6.6	5.1	11.9	9.2	53.4	7.0	20.8
Stand.Deviation	34.6	9.0	8.7	5.3	0.4	6.9	6.3	23.3	7.6	9.5
Minimum	-66.3	21.8	26.3	0	0	0.6	0	8.7	0.4	5.2
Maximum	172.2	87.6	77.7	33.8	29.5	47.0	31.7	100	42.2	63.7
Count	113	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	112	116
Portland										
Mean	15.7	74.3	58.6	7.5	5.9	5.6	11.5	45.9	11.2	23.7
Median	1.2	75.8	58.7	5.6	4.8	5.4	9.7	47.6	7.9	21.5
Stand.Deviation	57.3	9.1	9.3	7.0	4.5	3.4	7.0	24.8	10.8	11.9
Minimum	-18.5	20.2	17.5	0	0	0	0	0.9	0	0
Maximum	359.2	91.3	92.9	57.1	26.9	13.9	32.1	94.8	53.1	61.5
Count	120	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136
Mean Percent										
Change 1980-90	15.7	0.8	5.6	-0.4	0	-6.6	0.7	-7.6	1.8	2.1

TABLE 5.1F

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: CANADA - UNITED STATES

	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LatexFem	OldRevee	FamPov	IndPov
Mean	-12.4	74.4	51.4	8.9	9.4	26.1	14.4	38.4	21.1	45.7
Median	-17.7	75.1	51.4	8.0	8.5	25.4	13.4	33.4	18.9	45.1
Stand. Deviation	37.4	8.0	9.2	5.0	4.9	13.1	6.5	29.1	11.9	15.2
Minimum	-69.9	35.6	19.9	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0
Maximum	623.9	93.6	82.7	32.7	33.3	64.3	53.4	97.5	70.3	100
Count	523	525	525	525	524	525	525	525	521	521
Canada										
Mean	4.9	72.5	57.5	13.8	12.1	17.7	15.9	29.8	24.0	44.9
Median	-3.5	72.5	57.2	13.1	11.3	17.7	15.2	24.3	22.3	45.7
Stand. Deviation	38.3	7.8	10.3	6.3	5.8	10.0	6.4	24.0	13.1	14.0
Minimum	-39.7	18.5	15.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	447.7	96.9	94.4	40.2	45.5	52.6	54.0	86.8	81.0	94.5
Count	575	576	576	576	576	576	576	576	576	576
Mean Percent										
Change 1981-91	4.9	-1.9	6.1	4.9	2.7	-8.4	1.5	-8.6	2.9	-0.8
U.S.										
Mean	-2.4	70.7	49.7	10.7	9.3	22.0	15.7	52.5	15.9	28.8
Median	-11.0	72.3	49.4	8.8	7.8	19.3	11.5	56.7	10.1	25.1
Stand. Deviation	50.1	11.0	10.4	7.7	7.0	13.7	12.3	28.3	15.4	15.5
Minimum	-70.9	21.8	7.8	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	2.0
Maximum	518.4	99.0	77.7	39.5	42.6	64.5	70.9	100	72.2	100
Count	476	503	503	503	503	503	503	503	495	500
U.S.										
Mean	0.5	70.6	56.4	9.8	8.5	10.9	17.1	45.1	16.8	28.5
Median	-4.9	72.6	56.6	7.4	6.2	9.2	13.6	47.2	11.4	25.6
Stand. Deviation	35.5	11.1	10.4	8.3	7.3	7.9	12.4	26.6	15.8	16.1
Minimum	-59.2	13.6	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	359.2	97.2	92.9	67.1	60.7	38.9	70.5	98.0	81.0	90.2
Count	496	527	527	527	527	527	527	527	527	527
Mean Percent										
Change 1980-90	0.5	-0.1	6.7	-0.9	-0.8	-11.1	1.4	-7.4	0.9	-0.3

5.2 Standard Score Analysis

As outlined in Chapter 4, for each period (1980-81 and 1990-91), the z-scores for each variable were calculated in the large data set combining all the census tracts from the ten cities. The total scores for each census tract were ranked from highest to lowest. The tracts were then divided into quartiles, the first being "distressed" and the fourth "least distressed". Table 5.2A shows the total number and percentage of each city's census tracts in the two categories for both periods. Table 5.2B lists the tracts with high and low standard scores.

In 1980-81, table 5.2A shows that Canada and the United States both placed about 25% of their sample census tracts in the "distressed" category. Montreal and Baltimore were the most distressed cities with 40.6% and 37.1% of their tracts respectively in this category. They were followed by Savannah (29.8%), Toledo (26.8%), and Hamilton (10.9%). Portland, Toledo and Savannah all had substantially higher percentages than their Canadian counterparts.

Within the sample of cities, a distinct regional concentration of urban decline and distress is apparent. Montreal, Baltimore, Toledo and Hamilton, located in the industrial heartland of North America, accounted for 89.5% of all the census tracts in the "distressed" category.

In the "least distressed" category in 1980-81, the U.S. cities placed 31.2% of their tracts while the Canadian

cities placed 19.0% of their tracts. Lincoln and Regina were the least distressed cities in the sample with 77.5% and 57.0% of their tracts respectively in this category. The two west coast cities, Vancouver and Portland, were also well represented with 35.1% and 44.4% of their tracts respectively.

As table 5.2A shows, by 1990-91, the percentage of U.S. tracts in the "distressed" category fell to 21.4, while the percentage of Canadian tracts increased to 28.3. Of particular note is the drop in the percentage of Baltimore's tracts in this category from 37.1 in 1980-81 to 28.2 in 1990-91. For this period, the most distressed city by far was Montreal with 139 (43.6%) of its tracts in the "distressed" category, followed by Savannah (33.3%), Toledo (31.3%) and Baltimore (28.2%).

In 1990-91, in the "least distressed" category, the percentage of U.S. tracts grew to 36.4, while the percentage of Canadian tracts fell to 14.6. Lincoln and Regina were again the least distressed cities in the sample with 79.1% and 53.3% of their tracts respectively in this category, followed by Portland (50.7%) and Halifax (36.7%).

Table 5.2B lists the top 30 and bottom 30 standard scores for both periods. (For this chapter, a coding system was devised to identify each census tract in the sample. The first letter in the code refers to the city, while the numbers following the letter refer to the location of the

census tract. For example, B501 refers to Baltimore census tract # 501, T0034 refers to Toledo census tract # 0034 and M068 refers to Montreal census tract # 068. The census tract maps are in Appendix 4). In 1980-81 in the "most distressed" category, 22 of the top 30 census tracts are American, located primarily in the core areas of Baltimore, Toledo and Savannah. Montreal accounted for the remaining 8 census tracts, most of which are also located in the core area of the city (see maps - Appendix 4). The bottom 30 or "least distressed" tracts in 1980-81 are located mostly in Lincoln and Regina.

As Table 5.2B shows in 1990-91, in the top 30 or "most distressed" category, there were fewer Baltimore census tracts than in 1980-81 and several more from Savannah. The most distressed tract with the highest standard score (M060) is located in inner city Montreal. Also of note is the presence of two Vancouver tracts (V058 and V059.01) located in the Vancouver harbour area, east of downtown. Census tract V058 contains the city's "skid row" area as well as a portion of Vancouver's Chinatown. The bottom 30 scores were dominated by census tracts in Lincoln, Regina and Portland.

The results of the standard score analysis indicate that in 1980-81, on a comparative basis, incidence of urban decline and distress occurred to a similar extent in both countries. Montreal and Baltimore were the most distressed cities in the sample. By 1990-91, it is clear that urban

distress occurred to a greater extent in the Canadian cities, primarily the result of declining conditions in Montreal. In 1980-81 and 1990-91, within the sample of Canadian cities, urban problems were overwhelmingly concentrated in Montreal. However, for both periods, Halifax and Hamilton had incidences of urban distress substantially lower than their U.S. counterparts.

TABLE 5.2A
STANDARD SCORE ANALYSIS: RESULTS

1980-1981
Distressed Category (Top 257 Tracts)

	% of City			% of City	
	Tracts	Total		Tracts	Total
Baltimore	75	37.1	Montreal	119	40.6
Portland	8	6.8	Vancouver	3	3.9
Toledo	26	26.8	Hamilton	10	10.9
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	1	2.8
Savannah	14	29.8	Halifax	1	3.6
Total	124	24.6	Total	133	25.3

Least Distressed Category (Bottom 257 Tracts)

	% of City			% of City	
	Tracts	Total		Tracts	Total
Baltimore	27	13.4	Montreal	9	3.1
Portland	52	44.4	Vancouver	27	35.1
Toledo	35	36.1	Hamilton	31	33.7
Lincoln	31	77.5	Regina	20	57.0
Savannah	13	27.6	Halifax	11	39.3
Total	157	31.2	Total	100	19.0

1990-1991
Distressed Category (Top 276 Tracts)

	% of City			% of City	
	Tracts	Total		Tracts	Total
Baltimore	57	28.2	Montreal	139	43.6
Portland	9	6.6	Vancouver	3	3.4
Toledo	31	31.3	Hamilton	16	16.8
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	4	11.4
Savannah	16	33.3	Halifax	1	3.3
Total	113	21.4	Total	163	28.3

Least Distressed Category (Bottom 276 Tracts)

	% of City			% of City	
	Tracts	Total		Tracts	Total
Baltimore	39	19.3	Montreal	12	3.8
Portland	69	50.7	Vancouver	19	21.8
Toledo	36	36.4	Hamilton	18	18.9
Lincoln	34	79.1	Regina	24	53.3
Savannah	14	29.2	Halifax	11	36.7
Total	192	36.4	Total	84	14.6

TABLE 5.2B
STANDARD SCORE ANALYSIS: HIGH AND LOW SCORES

1980-1981
High Scores (Top 30) "Most Distressed"

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
T0034	25.0	B0301	20.4	M043	19.2	B1703	18.3	S001	17.3
B1801	22.7	S0101.01	20.0	T0028	18.7	M060	18.1	B1702	17.1
T0037	22.5	M068	20.0	B2506	18.6	B1004	17.7	S0010	16.5
B1802	22.2	T0023	19.9	M078	18.6	B1501	17.6	B2502.04	16.5
B501	21.1	B1002	19.5	B1901	18.4	T0029	17.4	M067	16.0
B2503.02	20.5	M057	19.5	M053	18.3	B0302	17.4	M077	15.9

Low Scores (Bottom 30) "Least Distressed"

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
R008.02	-24.9	R023.01	-14.9	L0011	-13.3	L0012	-11.9	L0030	-10.7
L0037.01	-23.6	R002.01	-14.6	L0027.02	-13.3	L0038.02	-11.8	L0010	-10.7
L0031.01	-20.0	R028.02	-14.4	L0037.02	-12.9	L0037.03	-11.2	R023.02	-10.7
T0080	-18.9	P0065.01	-14.3	R016	-12.6	P0089	-11.1	L0025	-10.6
L0034	-18.7	Hn080.02	-13.7	T0072.04	-11.9	Hx025.02	-11.0	T0083.01	-10.6
L0038.01	-16.7	L0036.03	-13.4	L0029	-11.9	T0073	-10.8	P0068.02	-10.5

1990-1991
High Scores (Top 30) "Most Distressed"

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
M060	30.2	B501	20.8	M021	18.9	B1703	16.7	T30	14.7
T37	30.1	T34	20.4	B2502.04	18.0	M068	16.6	S18	14.7
T28	29.9	S12	20.3	M057	17.9	T23	16.5	M075	14.6
S101.01	23.8	S1	20.3	B1801	17.8	M025	16.3	B1903	14.1
T29	23.0	B1004	19.8	M038	17.5	V059.01	16.0	B2606.04	13.8
V058	21.7	S17	19.7	B402	16.8	B1702	15.9	M039	13.8

Low Scores (Bottom 30) "Least Distressed"

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
R100.02	-21.8	L31.02	-13.5	L37.04	-12.5	P64.02	-11.7	Hx026	-11.1
L37.03	-17.7	R100.09	-13.2	P69	-12.2	Hn026.03	-11.6	P64.01	-11.1
R100.04	-15.5	L37.07	-13.2	M187.02	-12.2	V049.01	-11.6	T72.04	-11.1
Hn001.06	-14.4	P75	-12.9	P083.02	-12.0	P65.01	-11.5	P83.01	-11.0
R100.08	-14.4	L34	-12.5	R100.01	-11.8	L11	-11.5	S42.06	-10.9
L37.05	-14.0	L36.03	-12.5	R028.03	-11.7	L37.06	-11.3	M055.02	-10.9

5.3 Principal Components Analysis

Principal components analysis (PCA) was performed for both periods (1980-81 and 1990-91) on the large data sets combining all the census tracts from the 10 cities in the sample. As discussed in Chapter 4, PCA was used to reduce the 10 variables, measuring urban decline and distress, into a smaller number of underlying components. Table 5.3A shows the principal components and their loadings on each variable as well as the percent variance explained by each component.

In 1980-81, PCA produced a two-component solution, assuming 65.1% of the total variance. Component 1 loads highly on family poverty (FamPov), individual poverty (IndPov), lone female-parent families (LoneFem), male and female unemployment (UnempM, UnempF) and incidence of low education (Grade9). It also loads negatively on male and female labour force participation (MalePart and FemPart). It is a bipolar component that indexes the contrast between high male and female unemployment (as well as other characteristics such as poverty) and higher labour force participation rates. Component 1 exhibits a high degree of intercorrelation among 8 of the 10 variables and is termed "Social Hardship/Impoverishment".

Component 2, which assumes 11.7% of the total variance, loads negatively on rate of population change (PopChg) and positively on incidence of old housing (OldHouse) and more moderately (and negatively) on male and female labour force

participation. This component displays an inverse relationship and measures specifically population decline in areas with a high incidence of old housing and is termed "Old Housing/Population Decline".

For 1990-91, PCA produced a three component solution accounting for 72.1% of the total variance. Component 1, assuming just under 50% of the total variance, again loads highly on the poverty, unemployment and lone female-parent variables, but has lower loadings on male and female labour force participation and low education. It is again termed "Social Hardship/Impoverishment". Component 2 is tied to labour force participation and has a negative loading on low education. Component 3 (like Component 2 in 1980-81) measures population decline in areas with a high incidence of old housing.

The component scores for each census tract were then computed. Table 5.3B shows the mean component scores for each city in 1980-81 and 1990-91. Positive scores refer to distressed conditions while negative scores refer to "healthy" or least distressed conditions. In 1980-81, on Component 1 "Social Hardship/Impoverishment", Savannah had the highest mean score (0.45) followed closely by Montreal (0.45) and Baltimore (0.27), indicating that urban problems were concentrated most in these cities. The remaining 7 cities all had negative mean scores. The least distressed cities with respect to Component 1 were Lincoln (-0.82),

Portland (-0.76) and Halifax (-0.42). Overall, the Canadian census tracts in the sample had a slightly higher mean Component 1 score than the U.S. tracts.

On Component 2 "Old Housing/Population Decline", three U.S. cities and only one Canadian city recorded positive mean scores. Positive scores refer to a high incidence, while negative scores refer to a lower incidence. Baltimore (0.44), Toledo (0.18) and Portland (0.16) had the highest scores while Regina (-1.10), Lincoln (-0.94), and Halifax (-0.51) recorded the lowest. This result indicates that older neighbourhoods experiencing population outmigration were more more prominent in U.S. cities.

As Table 5.3B shows, in 1990-91, for Component 1 "Social Hardship/Impoverishment", Montreal was clearly suffering the worst conditions with a mean score of 0.66. Vancouver and Savannah were the only other cities having positive mean scores. Interestingly, Baltimore went from a positive mean Component 1 score in 1980-81 to a negative mean Component 1 score in 1990-91, reflecting its improving condition. In 1990-91, the least distressed cities with respect to Component 1 were Portland (-0.81), Lincoln (-0.76) and Regina (-0.25). Overall, the Canadian census tracts had a substantially higher mean score (0.33) than the U.S. tracts (-0.38).

On Component 2 "Labour Force Participation", three of the five Canadian cities had positive mean scores, indicat-

ing their higher rates, while three U.S. cities recorded negative mean scores. Lincoln had the highest mean score (0.90) while Savannah had the lowest (-0.46).

On Component 3 "Old Housing/Population Decline" all five Canadian cities recorded negative mean scores, while all but one of the American cities had positive mean scores. Baltimore (0.64), Toledo (0.44) and Portland (0.22) again had the highest scores, while Regina (-0.73), Vancouver (-0.52) and Hamilton (-0.39) had the lowest.

Table 5.3C shows the total number and percent of each city's census tracts having Component 1 scores greater than 1 and 2 standard deviations for 1980-81 and 1990-91. In 1980-81, in the "distressed" category, there were 76 U.S. tracts and 53 Canadian tracts with scores greater than 1 standard deviation, representing 15.1% and 10.1% of each country's tracts respectively. Baltimore had the highest percentage of its tracts in this category (24.7), followed by Savannah (19.1), Montreal (16.4) and Toledo (14.4). Among the Canadian cities Montreal was dominant.

In the "most distressed" category (census tracts with a Component 1 score greater than 2 standard deviations), there were 31 U.S. tracts (6.2% of the U.S. total) and 10 Canadian tracts (1.9% of the Canadian total). Baltimore had the greatest number of tracts in this category (21). All 10 of the Canadian tracts were located in Montreal.

As Table 5.3C indicates, the results in 1990-91 are

very different. (It should be kept in mind, however, that the component structure changed slightly between 1980-81 and 1990-91). There were fewer U.S. tracts and a much larger number of Canadian tracts in the "distressed" category. Of the 120 Canadian tracts having a Component 1 score greater than 1 standard deviation, 103 were located in Montreal, representing 32.3% of the city's total tracts. In 1990-91, Baltimore again had the highest proportion among the five U.S. cities (14.4%), but down considerably from 24.7% in 1980-81. In the "most distressed" category in 1990-91 (scores greater than 2 standard deviations), Montreal had the most tracts with 10, followed by Toledo with 6 and Baltimore with 5 (a considerable drop from 21 in 1980-81).

Table 5.3D lists the high and low Component 1 scores for both periods. The Table indicates that in 1980-81, among the high scores, there was a strong presence of Baltimore census tracts, most of which are located in or adjacent to the inner city (see Maps - Appendix 4). Most of the 10 Montreal tracts are also located in the core area of the city. Among the low scores for 1980-81, most are located in the outer areas of Portland, Lincoln and Baltimore. There were no Canadian census tracts in this group.

In 1990-91, there were fewer Baltimore tracts among the high scores while there were 10 from Montreal and one from Vancouver, V058. The low scores were again dominated by Baltimore, Portland and Lincoln. Generally, the same spatial

pattern is evident in 1990-91 (high scores in the core areas and low scores in the outer areas). An interesting exception, however, is the third lowest score in 1990-91 (R013), located in the core area of Regina.

The results from the principal components analysis support the findings of the descriptive statistics and the standard score analysis. Most important is the indication that the Canadian cities in the sample, particularly Montreal, experienced relative decline during the 1980s. PCA revealed that in 1980-81, urban distress occurred at comparable levels in both countries. In fact, there was a larger number of U.S. census tracts with Component 1 scores greater than 1 and 2 standard deviations. In 1980-81, three U.S. cities, Baltimore, Toledo, and Savannah had higher percentages of their tracts in the "distressed" category than their Canadian counterparts.

However, by 1990-91, the Canadian tracts in the sample had a significantly higher mean score on the "Social Hardship/Impoverishment" component. The U.S. tracts in the sample recorded a markedly higher mean score on the "Old Housing/Population Decline" component. Additionally, in 1990-91, there was a far greater number of Canadian census tracts with Component 1 scores higher than 1 standard deviation, the large majority of which were located in Montreal. Montreal and Vancouver had greater percentages of their tracts in the "distressed" category than their U.S. counter-

parts.

TABLE 5.3A
COMBINED CANADA - UNITED STATES DATA SET
COMPONENT LOADINGS 1980-1981
(Varimax Rotation)

Variable	Components	
	1	2
PopChg	-0.05	-0.71
MalePart	-0.64	-0.48
FemPart	-0.50	-0.57
UnempM	0.71	0.29
UnempF	0.79	0.17
Grade9	0.70	0.46
LoneFem	0.85	0.01
OldHouse	0.15	0.78
FamPov	0.91	0.16
IndPov	0.75	0.19
% Variance Explained	53.4	11.7

COMPONENT LOADINGS 1990-1991
(Varimax Rotation)

Variable	Components		
	1	2	3
PopChg	-0.08	0.07	-0.75
MalePart	-0.32	0.81	-0.14
FemPart	-0.22	0.91	-0.09
UnempM	0.82	-0.22	0.09
UnempF	0.81	-0.20	0.04
Grade9	0.58	-0.55	0.00
LoneFem	0.75	-0.13	0.26
OldHouse	0.04	-0.07	0.79
FamPov	0.90	-0.25	0.09
IndPov	0.77	-0.32	-0.11
% Variance Explained	49.7	12.4	10.0

TABLE 5.3B
MEAN COMPONENT SCORES 1980-1981

	Component 1 "Social Hardship/ Impoverishment"	Component 2 "Old Housing/ Population Decline"
Halifax	-0.42	-0.51
Regina	-0.36	-1.10
Hamilton	-0.24	-0.28
Vancouver	-0.39	-0.41
Montreal	0.44	0.09
Savannah	0.45	-0.09
Lincoln	-0.82	-0.94
Toledo	-0.12	0.18
Portland	-0.76	0.16
Baltimore	0.27	0.44
Canada	0.10	-0.16
United States	-0.11	0.17

MEAN COMPONENT SCORES 1990-1991

	Component 1 "Social Hardship/ Impoverishment"	Component 2 "Labour Force Participation"	Component 3 "Old Housing/ Population Decline"
Halifax	-0.21	0.65	-0.14
Regina	-0.25	0.59	-0.73
Hamilton	-0.11	-0.17	-0.39
Vancouver	0.06	0.39	-0.52
Montreal	0.66	-0.05	-0.23
Savannah	0.05	-0.46	0.17
Lincoln	-0.76	0.90	-0.03
Toledo	-0.22	-0.28	0.44
Portland	-0.81	0.19	0.22
Baltimore	-0.22	-0.29	0.64
Canada	0.33	0.08	-0.34
United States	-0.38	-0.09	0.39

TABLE 5.3C

COMPONENT 1 "SOCIAL HARDSHIP/IMPOVERISHMENT"

1980-1981

Component Scores Greater than 1 Standard Deviation - "Distressed" Category

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	50	24.7	Montreal	48	16.4
Portland	2	1.7	Vancouver	2	2.6
Toledo	14	14.4	Hamilton	2	2.2
Lincoln	1	2.5	Regina	1	2.8
Savannah	9	19.1	Halifax	0	0
Total	76	15.1	Total	53	10.1

Component Scores Greater than 2 Standard Deviations - "Most Distressed" Category

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	21	10.4	Montreal	10	3.4
Portland	0	0	Vancouver	0	0
Toledo	6	6.2	Hamilton	0	0
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	0	0
Savannah	4	8.5	Halifax	0	0
Total	31	6.2	Total	10	1.9

1990-1991

Component Scores Greater than 1 Standard Deviation - "Distressed" Category

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	29	14.4	Montreal	103	32.3
Portland	4	2.9	Vancouver	8	9.2
Toledo	12	12.1	Hamilton	6	6.3
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	2	4.4
Savannah	7	14.6	Halifax	1	3.3
Total	52	9.9	Total	120	20.8

Component Scores Greater than 2 Standard Deviations - "Most Distressed" Category

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	5	2.5	Montreal	10	3.1
Portland	1	0.7	Vancouver	1	1.1
Toledo	6	6.1	Hamilton	0	0
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	0	0
Savannah	4	8.3	Halifax	0	0
Total	16	3.0	Total	11	1.9

TABLE 5.3D
COMPONENT 1: HIGH AND LOW SCORES

1980-81
High Scores

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
B0501	4.39	B2502.04	3.58	M078	3.11	B1004	2.53	B0909	2.17
T0034	4.05	B2506	3.46	B1801	3.10	M053	2.52	M047	2.17
B2503.02	3.96	B0402	3.41	B0302	3.05	B1901	2.51	T0028	2.13
S012	3.94	B1002	3.41	T0023	3.00	B2603.03	2.46	M038	2.13
M068	3.79	B1703	3.33	B1802	2.86	B1501	2.45	B2604.03	2.12
T0037	3.77	M060	3.29	T0029	2.71	T0022	2.41	M057	2.12
S0101.01	3.70	B0301	3.18	M077	2.60	M043	2.39	B1602	2.10
S001	3.68	B1702	3.11	S010	2.54	B0704	2.21	M052	2.07

Low Scores

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
L0024	-1.80	P0019	-1.64	L0038.02	-1.57	B2712	-1.55	P0015	-1.50
P0022.02	-1.75	P0027.01	-1.61	P0025.01	-1.57	S0030	-1.53		
S0029	-1.70	B2703.02	-1.58	B2713	-1.56	P0067.02	-1.51		
P0046.01	-1.66	P0046.02	-1.58	B1201	-1.55	T0064	-1.51		

1990-1991
High Scores

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
T28	4.20	S1	3.28	S12	2.70	B302	2.23	M224	2.02
S101.01	4.14	B501	3.15	M057	2.50	M075	2.13	T12.02	2.02
M060	3.96	M166	2.85	M021	2.26	M039	2.10	S17	2.00
B1801	3.74	T29	2.79	T23	2.25	V058	2.07		
T37	3.56	T34	2.79	M038	2.24	M220	2.04		
B2502.04	3.51	M068	2.71	B1703	2.24	P22.02	2.03		

Low Scores

Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score	Tract	Score
B2720.02	-2.15	B2401	-1.83	B2705.01	-1.75	B2501.03	-1.68	L2.01	-1.61
B1307	-1.98	P46.01	-1.82	B2605.01	-1.75	B2704.02	-1.68	T72.03	-1.60
R013	-1.95	P58	-1.80	B2715.03	-1.74	B2701.02	-1.66	Hn072.01	-1.60
S29	-1.93	T77	-1.80	T55.02	-1.74	L24	-1.65	B2707.03	-1.59
P94	-1.89	L13	-1.79	P73	-1.71	B2705.02	-1.63	P66.01	-1.58
S30	-1.88	T45.04	-1.79	P46.02	-1.70	B2701.01	-1.63	P67.01	-1.58
T83.02	-1.84	P3.02	-1.79	P54	-1.68	P57	-1.62	P19	-1.58
B2712	-1.83	T60	-1.76	B1201	-1.68	P61	-1.61	Hx007	-1.57

5.4 Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis was performed for each period on the large data set combining all the census tracts. This technique was used to identify groups of census tracts based on the similarity between their component scores. Tables 5.4A and 5.4B show the results from the two cluster analyses.

For 1980-81, six cluster groups were formed. On SPSSPC+, a cluster membership of between 2 and 8 was specified. The dendrogram was sliced at the point where there was a large and sudden increase in the coefficient. The first cluster, containing the most census tracts (306), consists of those cases with Component 1 (Social Hardship/Impoverishment) scores centred closely around the mean. As indicated at the bottom of table 5.4A, the census tracts in this cluster have a mean Component 1 score of 0.069. On a continuum ranging from the "least distressed" to the "most distressed", these cases can be considered as "average" census tracts or neighbourhoods. As Table 5.4A shows, the majority of census tracts in this cluster are Canadian, representing almost 45% of all the Canadian tracts in the sample. On the other hand, only 16.0% of all U.S. tracts are in this cluster.

Cluster 2 consists of "healthy" or the "least distressed" census tracts in the sample, having a mean Component 1 score of -0.763. This cluster contains 123 U.S. tracts and 93 Canadian tracts. As indicated in the table,

the cities with the highest percentage of their tracts in this group are Lincoln (47.5%), Halifax (46.4%), Vancouver (37.7%) and Portland (37.6%).

Cluster 3 consists of "distressed" census tracts with old housing and declining populations. The tracts in this group have mean Component 1 and 2 scores of 0.384 and 0.653 respectively. Of the 127 Canadian tracts in this group, 101 are located in Montreal, confirming earlier findings about the high concentration of urban problems in that city.

Cluster 4 is made up of relatively healthy census tracts which also have higher incidences of old housing and population decline. As indicated in the table, the mean scores for this group are -0.943 for Component 1 and 0.986 for Component 2. The large majority of tracts in this group are American (131), representing 28.0% of all U.S. tracts. It appears that population decline and old housing were evident in both "healthy" and "distressed" American neighbourhoods.

Cluster 5 contains only five census tracts, all having very high rates of population growth (greater than 100%). Three of the five tracts are located in Lincoln. The five cases in this group have a mean Component 2 score of -6.56. Cluster 6 comprises the "most distressed" census tracts in the sample, having a mean Component 1 score of 1.99. Of the 105 tracts in this group, 63 are American and 42 are Canadian. As expected, Baltimore and Montreal have the most

tracts in this cluster. It is interesting to note, however, that besides Montreal, there is only one other Canadian census tract in this group. Conversely, of the U.S. cities in the sample, there are several census tracts from Toledo and Savannah.

When the two "distressed" clusters are combined (Cluster 3 and Cluster 6) it is found that Montreal has 142 (48.5%) of its tracts in this group. Toledo has the second highest incidence with 37.1%, followed by Baltimore (35.6%) and Savannah (31.9%).

The cluster analysis for 1980-81 revealed two major findings. First, supporting previous evidence, it was found that urban distress in Canada was concentrated primarily in Montreal, while in the U.S., it was highly visible in three cities -Baltimore, Savannah and Toledo. Second, among the American cities, there was a greater disparity between healthy and distressed neighbourhoods, as evidenced by the higher percentage of U.S. tracts in Clusters 2 and 6. Conversely, about 45% of the Canadian census tracts are in Cluster 1, indicating less disparity and greater stability among the neighbourhoods in the Canadian cities.

As Table 5.4B shows, for 1990-91, six cluster groups were again formed. The same procedure for determining the number of clusters was used. The six clusters resemble those of 1980-81 in terms of their association with the principal components. There are, however, some important differences

in the composition of several of the clusters. In 1990-91, cluster 1 is again composed of "average" census tracts, the majority of which are Canadian (292), representing just over 50% of all the Canadian tracts in the sample. The mean Component 1 score for the tracts in this group is 0.051. There are only 45 U.S. tracts in this group.

Cluster 2 is largely made up of U.S. cases and like cluster 4 in 1980-81, is composed of "healthy" census tracts which are also experiencing higher incidences of population decline and old housing. The cases in this group have mean Component 1 and 3 scores of -0.665 and 0.674 respectively. Cluster 3 contains the "healthiest" or the "least distressed" census tracts in the sample, having a mean Component 1 score of -1.336. There are only 18 Canadian tracts in this group.

Cluster 4 consists of the "most distressed" census tracts, with a mean Component 1 score of 1.749. Compared to the equivalent cluster in 1980-81 (Cluster 6), there are more Canadian tracts and fewer American. Of the 87 Canadian census tracts in this group, 75 are located in Montreal. Cluster 5 consists of "distressed" census tracts with declining populations and old housing. The mean Component 1 and 3 scores for this group are 0.691 and 0.801 respectively. Once again, Montreal has the highest percentage of its tracts in this group (23.5%), followed by Savannah (20.8%), Baltimore (20.4%) and Toledo (20.2%). As Table 5.4B shows,

Portland, Toledo and Savannah all have higher percentages of their tracts in this cluster than their Canadian counterparts. Cluster 6 contains just 12 census tracts, and like cluster 5 in 1980-81, all have very high rates of population growth. The mean Component 3 score was -5.039.

The results from the 1990-91 cluster analysis again indicate some stability among the Canadian cities, with 50.7% of the Canadian tracts located in cluster 1. The major difference from the earlier results is the presence of a larger number of Canadian tracts in the "most distressed" cluster and fewer in the "healthy" groups. On the other hand, in 1990-91, there was a greater number of U.S. tracts in the "healthy" clusters compared to 1980-81. The large majority of Canadian tracts in the "distressed" clusters were located in Montreal. These findings add even further support to the evidence that during the 1980s, urban decline and distress occurred to a greater extent in the Canadian cities in the sample, particularly Montreal.

TABLE 5.4A
CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1980-81 RESULTS
(Ward's Method)

Cluster 1 - 306 census tracts total (231 Canadian 75 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1. Consists of "average" census tracts with scores centred closely around the mean ($x = 0$).

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	32	15.8	Montreal	121	41.3
Portland	15	12.8	Vancouver	39	50.6
Toledo	8	8.2	Hamilton	41	44.6
Lincoln	7	17.5	Regina	21	60.0
Savannah	13	27.6	Halifax	9	32.1
Total	75	14.9	Total	231	44.0

Cluster 2 - 216 census tracts total (93 Canadian 123 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (negative). Composed of relatively "healthy" census tracts.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	32	15.8	Montreal	22	7.5
Portland	44	37.6	Vancouver	29	37.7
Toledo	23	23.7	Hamilton	21	22.8
Lincoln	19	47.5	Regina	8	22.6
Savannah	5	10.6	Halifax	13	46.4
Total	123	24.4	Total	93	17.7

Cluster 3 - 198 census tracts total (127 Canadian 71 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (positive) and Component 2 (Positive) Consists of "distressed" census tracts with declining populations.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	30	14.8	Montreal	101	34.5
Portland	10	8.5	Vancouver	1	1.3
Toledo	23	23.7	Hamilton	19	20.6
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	3	8.6
Savannah	8	17.0	Halifax	3	10.7
Total	71	14.1	Total	127	24.2

TABLE 5.4A (CONT.)

CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1980-81 RESULTS

Cluster 4 - 155 census tracts total (24 Canadian 131 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (negative) and Component 2 (Positive).
 Consists of "healthy" census tracts experiencing population decline/old housing

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	57	28.2	Montreal	5	1.7
Portland	38	32.5	Vancouver	6	7.8
Toledo	24	24.7	Hamilton	9	9.8
Lincoln	7	17.5	Regina	1	2.8
Savannah	5	10.6	Halifax	3	10.7
Total	131	26.0	Total	24	4.6

Cluster 5 - 5 census tracts total (1 Canadian 4 American)

Cluster associated with Component 2 (high negative). Composed of
 census tracts with very high rates of population growth.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	0	0	Montreal	0	0
Portland	0	0	Vancouver	0	0
Toledo	1	1.0	Hamilton	0	0
Lincoln	3	7.5	Regina	1	2.8
Savannah	0	0	Halifax	0	0
Total	4	0.8	Total	1	0.2

Cluster 6 - 105 census tracts total (42 Canadian 63 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (high positive). Consists of "most
 distressed" census tracts in the sample.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	42	20.7	Montreal	41	14.0
Portland	1	0.8	Vancouver	1	1.3
Toledo	13	13.4	Hamilton	0	0
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	0	0
Savannah	7	14.9	Halifax	0	0
Total	63	12.5	Total	42	8.0

TABLE 5.4A (CONT.)
CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1980-81 RESULTS

Mean Cluster Scores

	Component 1	Component 2
Cluster 1	0.069	-0.846
Cluster 2	-0.763	-0.159
Cluster 3	0.384	0.653
Cluster 4	-0.943	0.986
Cluster 5	0.913	-6.566
Cluster 6	1.992	0.441

TABLE 5.4B
CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1990-91 RESULTS

(Ward's Method)

Cluster 1 - 337 census tracts total (292 Canadian 45 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (scores centred closely around the mean). Consists of "average" census tracts.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	6	3.0	Montreal	137	42.9
Portland	5	3.7	Vancouver	59	67.8
Toledo	11	11.1	Hamilton	49	51.6
Lincoln	10	23.2	Regina	31	68.9
Savannah	13	27.1	Halifax	16	53.3
Total	45	8.5	Total	292	50.7

Cluster 2 - 331 census tracts total (77 Canadian 255 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (negative) and Component 3 (positive).
 Composed of "healthy" census tracts experiencing population decline/old housing.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	120	59.7	Montreal	26	8.1
Portland	73	53.7	Vancouver	17	19.5
Toledo	34	34.3	Hamilton	19	20.0
Lincoln	15	34.9	Regina	6	13.3
Savannah	13	27.1	Halifax	9	30.0
Total	255	48.4	Total	77	134

Cluster 3 - 95 census tracts total (18 Canadian 77 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (negative) and Component 3 (negative).
 Consists of relatively "healthy" census tracts.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	13	6.5	Montreal	4	1.2
Portland	29	21.3	Vancouver	6	6.9
Toledo	20	20.2	Hamilton	4	4.2
Lincoln	11	25.6	Regina	2	4.4
Savannah	4	8.3	Halifax	2	6.7
Total	77	14.6	Total	18	3.1

TABLE 5.4B (CONT.)

CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1990-91 RESULTS

Cluster 4 - 122 census tracts total (87 Canadian 35 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (high positive). Composed of "most distressed" census tracts in the sample.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	16	8.0	Montreal	75	23.5
Portland	2	1.5	Vancouver	5	5.7
Toledo	12	12.1	Hamilton	4	4.2
Lincoln	0	0	Regina	2	4.4
Savannah	5	16.7	Halifax	1	3.3
Total	35	6.6	Total	87	15.1

Cluster 5 - 174 census tracts total (94 Canadian 80 American)

Cluster associated with Component 1 (positive) and Component 3 (positive). Consists of "distressed" census tracts with declining populations/old housing.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	41	20.4	Montreal	75	23.5
Portland	8	5.9	Vancouver	0	0
Toledo	20	20.2	Hamilton	15	15.8
Lincoln	1	2.3	Regina	2	4.4
Savannah	10	20.8	Halifax	2	6.7
Total	80	15.2	Total	94	16.3

Cluster 6 - 12 census tracts total (7 Canadian 5 American)

Cluster associated with Component 3 (high positive). Consists of census tracts with very high rates of population growth.

	Tracts	% of City Total		Tracts	% of City Total
Baltimore	1	0.5	Montreal	2	0.6
Portland	3	2.2	Vancouver	0	0
Toledo	0	0	Hamilton	3	3.1
Lincoln	1	2.3	Regina	2	4.4
Savannah	0	0	Halifax	0	0
Total	5	0.9	Total	7	1.3

TABLE 5.4B (CONT.)

CLUSTER ANALYSIS: 1990-91 RESULTS

Mean Cluster Scores

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
Cluster 1	0.051	0.143	-0.744
Cluster 2	-0.665	0.058	0.674
Cluster 3	-1.336	-0.426	-0.542
Cluster 4	1.749	-0.310	0.001
Cluster 5	0.691	0.083	0.801
Cluster 6	-0.313	-0.322	-5.039

Interpreting the Results

The overall decline of the Canadian cities in the sample during the 1980s can be attributed to several important factors. As a result of a weakening economy, unemployment in Canada has climbed steadily since the mid 1980s. Traditionally, Canada has had higher rates of unemployment than other Western industrial nations, including the United States. Between 1981 and 1991, the national unemployment rate in Canada increased from 7.5 to 10.3 percent, while in the U.S. it fell from 7.6 to 6.6 percent. The rise in unemployment in Canadian cities has led to a growing dependence on social assistance among urban residents and thus growing poverty rates in many cities.

It appears that the process of economic restructuring during the 1980s and the recession of the early 1990s had a greater impact on Canadian central cities. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, substantial employment losses in the manufacturing and service sectors had an adverse impact on many cities, particularly those with larger industrial bases such as Montreal and Hamilton. These employment losses were coupled with the federal government's cutbacks in social programs and constraints on transfers to other levels of government. As a result, Canadian municipalities have been placed under considerable fiscal and social strain. They have experienced difficulty in maintaining effective levels

of service.

The empirical analysis revealed that Montreal was the most distressed city in the sample and experienced declining conditions during the 1980s. Montreal had the highest average rates of unemployment, poverty and low educational attainment among the ten cities. The city's decline is attributable to a number of important economic, social and political issues.

Since the mid 1970s, unemployment in Montreal has increased markedly. Manufacturing activity, which has traditionally assumed a large role in the city's economy, has declined considerably as a result of factors including restructuring, recessions, foreign competition and suburban relocation. The relative importance of the oil and sugar refining and textile industries in the city has fallen (Robinson 1989, p.112). Between 1981 and 1991, total employment in the manufacturing sector in central city Montreal declined by over 28,000. The city has experienced difficulty in replacing some of these lost jobs.

In particular, the business and professional services sector has not witnessed the growth evident in many other large North American cities. Business and professional services include law firms, consultants, accounting firms, insurance companies and head offices, which tend to cluster together in the downtowns of major cities. In large part, the poor performance of this sector in Montreal since the

mid 1970s is due to linguistic tensions between English and French speaking residents and political uncertainty regarding the future of Quebec as part of Canada. The departure from Montreal of large corporations, such as the Bank of Montreal and Sun Life Insurance, has been well documented.

The city's English minority, which accounts for about 40 percent of the employment in business services in downtown Montreal, has increasingly felt alienated. As a consequence, its members are gradually leaving the city, "taking their expertise, capital and business contacts with them" (The Gazette 1993b, p.B2). By contrast, the mobility of the French speaking population in Quebec is much lower. Many jobless and lower-income Francophone residents do not exercise the option of leaving Montreal, thereby increasing levels of unemployment and dependence on social assistance (The Gazette 1993b, p.B2). All of these factors have no doubt contributed to the growing levels of urban distress evident in many of Montreal's neighbourhoods during the 1980s. Bourne's (1980) "Structural Change, Economic Efficiency, and the Recession" stage of his theoretical examination of urban decline as outlined in Chapter 2, can be applied to the situation in Montreal.

While Montreal witnessed decline, its American counterpart, Baltimore, experienced relatively improving conditions during the 1980s. Between 1980 and 1990, average rates of unemployment and poverty fell slightly in the city.

Furthermore, the empirical analysis revealed that the number of Baltimore census tracts in the "distressed" and "most distressed" categories declined substantially between 1980-81 and 1990-91.

Like Montreal, central city Baltimore also lost considerable manufacturing employment during the 1980s (almost 20,000 jobs between 1980 and 1990). However, this sector remains strong in the surrounding suburban communities, particularly in the production of aerospace and electronic equipment. While manufacturing activity declined during the 1980s, Baltimore was successful in creating new jobs in the wholesale and retail sectors as well as the business services sector, especially finance, insurance and real estate (FIRE).

Baltimore has been described as one of the most successfully revitalized cities in the United States (Rubenstein 1989, p.30). During the 1970s, the city received massive federal financial support for urban renewal projects, including large scale waterfront redevelopment. Baltimore's Inner Harbour was revitalized into a retail, commercial and tourist complex and has proved to be a huge financial success (Hiss 1991, p.40). These urban renewal efforts encouraged private developers and financial institutions to invest heavily in downtown Baltimore during the 1980s. As a consequence, several inner city neighbourhoods surrounding the central business district have recently been

gentrified, contributing to the social upgrading of the city.

Despite these events, however, Baltimore remains a highly segregated city and Rubenstein (1989, p.32) argues that the city's large Black population (over 435,000) has not fully shared in the benefits of the Inner Harbour. Indeed, as indicated in Chapter 3, Mercer (1991) and Goldberg and Mercer (1986) found that, overall, U.S. central cities have much higher levels of racial segregation, are more dominated by an "underclass" and contain high proportions of poor black persons. Several of the predominantly black neighbourhoods in the core area of Baltimore suffer from very high levels of poverty and distress. From the list of high scores in the standard score analysis and principal components analysis these neighbourhoods include census tracts B302, B501, B1801 and B2502.04.

The analysis indicated that Hamilton and its counterpart, Toledo, experienced an increase in urban problems during the 1980s. To a large extent, the decline of these cities is attributable to the process of deindustrialization which has been prominent in the Great Lakes region of North America since the early 1980s.

While Hamilton recorded only a slight increase in average family poverty during the study period, it witnessed a substantial growth in average male unemployment and a considerable drop in average male labour force participation.

Between 1980-81 and 1990-91, the number of Hamilton census tracts in the "distressed" categories increased.

Historically, Hamilton has had a large manufacturing employment base. A sizeable proportion of employment in this sector is tied to the steel industry, which dominates not only the city, but the surrounding region as well. Between 1981 and 1991, employment in the manufacturing sector in central city Hamilton declined by over 16,000. Since the late 1980s, the city's two major steel producers, Stelco Inc. and Dofasco Inc. have cut 30 to 40 percent of their workforces, resulting in thousands of lost jobs (The Toronto Star 1993, p.H1). Employment losses have also been evident in other sectors such as retail and business services. Consequently, there has been a marked increase in both unemployment and the number of welfare recipients in the city.

The decline of the steel industry in Hamilton is the result of several factors including heavy competition from steel producers in the U.S. and other countries, growing U.S. protectionism and increasing automation in steel plants. The industry is becoming much less labour-intensive. While the city is attempting to develop new high-tech industries, many of the former steel workers lack the education and skills required to participate.

The situation in Toledo is similar to that of Hamilton. According to the analysis, however, for both periods (1980-81 and 1990-91) Toledo had substantially higher incidences

of urban distress than Hamilton. It also recorded higher average rates of unemployment and witnessed considerable increases in average rates of family and individual poverty during the 1980s.

Toledo is primarily an industrial city dependent on the manufacturing of durable goods such as automobiles, auto parts, and glass. Like Hamilton, the process of deindustrialization appears to have had a negative impact. Between 1980 and 1990, the population of central city Toledo declined by almost 22,000 and employment in the manufacturing sector fell by 8,500. Additionally, over the same period, there was no growth in total employment, and losses in the transportation-communications and business and professional services sectors.

The automobile industry in North America has been subjected to significant changes since the early to mid 1980s. Plant closures and massive lay-offs due to growing foreign competition, economic recession and increased automation, have seriously affected cities dependent on the industry, such as Toledo. Since the mid 1980s, employment declines in Toledo have also been evident in the glass and machine equipment industries (Toledo Area Chamber of Commerce 1990). Like Hamilton, the city is attempting to develop and attract new high tech industries.

In 1990-91, Toledo had several of its inner city census tracts among the high scores in the standard score analysis

and P.C.A., including the most distressed tract in the entire sample - T28. This neighbourhood had unemployment rates of over 60 percent and a family poverty rate of almost 80 percent. The problems experienced by Hamilton and Toledo can be applied, in part, to Friedrichs' (1993) theory of urban decline (Chapter 2) in which he tied the concept of the product life cycle to cities with dominant industries.

The empirical analysis revealed that Lincoln was the "least distressed" or "healthiest" city in the sample for both periods. It's counterpart, Regina, had the fewest urban problems among the Canadian cities in the sample. Both cities experienced substantial population and employment growth during the 1980s. Between 1980 and 1990, the population of central city Lincoln increased by over 20,000 and total employment grew by almost 15,000, while in Regina between 1981 and 1991, the population increased by about 16,500 and total employment by over 12,000.

The relative health of these two cities is due to several factors. In addition to being important regional service centres, Regina and Lincoln are also the capitals of their respective province and state and, therefore, contain substantial employment in the government and professional services sectors. Both cities also have small industrial bases, although Lincoln's manufacturing sector is larger than Regina's.

Because of their relatively small size and economic

structure, it appears that Regina and Lincoln were not as susceptible to the severe shocks of restructuring and recession as were larger industrial cities such as Hamilton and Toledo. As a result of a more stable employment base, they recorded lower rates of unemployment and poverty. Between 1981 and 1991, however, Regina experienced moderate increases in male and female unemployment.

In 1980-81, Portland and Vancouver were well represented in the "least distressed" categories of the analysis. However, while Portland experienced improving conditions during the 1980s, Vancouver, surprisingly, saw a relative increase in urban problems. Of the ten central cities in the sample, Portland recorded the largest gains in population and employment during the study period. Between 1980 and 1990, the city's population grew by almost 70,000 and total employment increased by almost 44,000. Every sector of Portland's economy, including manufacturing, witnessed employment growth. The greatest increases were in the wholesale/retail and business and professional services sectors (8,900 and 6,300 respectively).

Portland's relative prosperity and growth during the 1980s is almost certainly tied to its geographic location on the U.S. West Coast and its emergence as an important outpost of the Pacific Rim. Massive quantities of raw materials, particularly wheat, are shipped overseas through its port. Portland has established important economic ties in

Southeast Asia and several large Japanese firms, including NEC, Matsushita and Fujitsu have set up electronics plants in the city (Clifton 1989, p.45).

Portland has a large and diversified manufacturing sector, accounting for 15 percent of the city's employment. Traditional manufacturing firms, such as Freightliner Corp., Boeing of Portland, and Nabisco Brands have remained a key component of the metropolitan area's economy. During the 1980s, the city was successful in further developing its high-tech industry. As of 1990, there were over 450 high-technology firms in the metropolitan area, employing almost 25,000 people. One firm alone, Tektronix, Inc. employs over 11,000 (Portland Chamber of Commerce 1990). The solid performance of Portland's economy during the 1980s was obviously reflected by the relatively "healthy" condition of most of its neighbourhoods.

While the Greater Vancouver area also developed as an important centre for Pacific Rim trade and investment during the 1980s, it's central city did not fare as well as Portland's. According to the analysis, central city Vancouver had higher average rates of unemployment and poverty than Portland and recorded substantial increases in these indicators between 1981 and 1991. Furthermore, between 1980-81 and 1990-91, the number of Vancouver census tracts in the "distressed" categories increased. These trends occurred despite the fact that during the 1980s, there was considerable

growth in central city Vancouver's population and total employment. Between 1981 and 1991, the city's population grew by 57,500 and total employment rose by 40,300. There are several possible explanations for this paradox between growth and decline.

It appears that the benefits of increased trade, large scale investment, and development during the 1980s were not shared by all areas in metropolitan Vancouver. In particular, many central city neighbourhoods did not experience the economic growth and prosperity evident in other neighbourhoods such as Kerrisdale and Shaughnessy, and suburban municipalities such as West Vancouver, Surrey and Richmond. Ley, Hiebert, and Pratt (1992, p.245) report that poverty rates have also risen in suburban areas since the early 1990s, and that the municipality of New Westminster and the City of Langley have rates higher than the City of Vancouver.

Several central city neighbourhoods located in the industrial area, east of the downtown, experienced high levels of distress and declining conditions during the 1980s. This area, which includes census tracts V056, V057, V058, and V059.01, is largely low-income with older housing and contains the city's skid row district as well as Vancouver's Chinatown (V057 and V058). Despite the large influx of wealthy immigrants to Vancouver from Hong Kong, there still exists poverty and distress among some Chinese residents. These conditions have been identified with other Chinatowns

in large cities in North America.

It is possible that population growth in Vancouver during the 1980s outstripped employment opportunities, particularly in stable, higher paying professional and manufacturing jobs. While there has been considerable growth in the service sector since the early 1970s, much of the new employment in consumer services consists of low-paying, unskilled and part-time or temporary work, particularly in the city's rapidly expanding tourist industry (Barnes, Edgington, Denike, and McGee 1992, p.188). Between 1981 and 1991, employment in Vancouver's manufacturing sector fell by nearly 4,000.

It appears that Vancouver's economic structure is not as diversified as in other cities such as Portland. Vancouver remains a regional centre highly dependent on the distribution and administration of natural resources, particularly forest products, from the hinterland of British Columbia. Unlike Portland, the city has relatively small durable goods and high technology industries. This lack of employment stability and economic diversification coupled with the recession of the early 1990s and cutbacks in social programmes likely had a negative impact on many of Vancouver's central city neighbourhoods.

The empirical analysis revealed that Halifax was prominent among the "least distressed" cities in the sample. Despite being located within a traditionally "depressed"

region, Atlantic Canada, the city fared relatively well during the 1980s. According to the standard score analysis, in 1990-91, Halifax placed 11 of its 30 tracts in the "least distressed" category and only 1 in the "distressed" category. Between 1981 and 1991, the city recorded no change in average rates of poverty, and only slight increases in average unemployment.

Halifax's stability during the 1980s is likely due to the fact that it is an important, diversified regional service centre for Atlantic Canada. The city's naval yards and port activity are an integral component of the local economy. With several major hospitals and universities as well as a large provincial and federal government presence, Halifax has a strong employment and economic base. Furthermore, several neighbourhoods in the city underwent social upgrading during the 1980s, and a revitalized waterfront and growth in commercial activity has attracted tourism and middle-class settlement (Broadway 1992, p.193). Like Regina and Lincoln, Halifax has a relatively small manufacturing base, making it less susceptible to the impacts of economic restructuring.

By contrast, Halifax's counterpart, Savannah, was one of the most distressed cities in the sample. It recorded higher average rates of unemployment, poverty, low education and lone female-parent families than Halifax and substantially lower average rates of labour force participation.

Also, Savannah had the highest average rates of family and individual poverty among the U.S. cities in the sample. For both periods, 1980-81 and 1990-91, the city had a high percentage of its census tracts in the "distressed" and "most distressed" categories. Despite a large scale preservation movement which resulted in the revitalization of the historic waterfront and many large 19th century homes, and increased tourism, Savannah's local economy is struggling. In particular, there has been a lack of development in the city's business community (Applebome 1989, p.A16). Between 1980 and 1990, central city Savannah lost 3,600 jobs in the business and professional services sector and 1,500 jobs in the manufacturing sector. It is argued that President Reagan's cutbacks in federal programs, including housing, community development, and job training, had a negative impact on the city during the 1980s (Gottlieb and Applebome 1991, p.A1). These cutbacks were described in Chapter 3.

Relatively high levels of racial segregation have also contributed to Savannah's social and economic problems. The city's black community (over 50 percent of the population) has not fully participated in or benefitted from the revitalization efforts and related tourist activities. It has also experienced considerable difficulty in developing business activity (Gottlieb and Applebome 1991, p.A1).

Most of the predominantly black central city neighbourhoods have very high rates of poverty, unemployment, low

education, and lone female-parent families and have witnessed increases in drug abuse and violent crime (Gottlieb and Applebome 1991, p.A1). These neighbourhoods are associated with census tracts S1, S10, S12, S17, S18, and S101.01, which all appear on the lists of high scores ("most distressed") in the analysis. On the other hand, two Savannah neighbourhoods, which are over 90 percent white in racial composition (S29 and S30), are prominent on the list of low scores ("least distressed") in 1990-91. These two groups of census tracts are located within a few blocks of each other, creating a very steep social gradient in the city.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this project was to compare levels of urban decline and distress in Canada and the United States during the 1980s. Using a sample of five paired cities, the study found that in 1980-81, on a comparative basis, urban distress occurred to a similar extent in both countries. The two largest cities in the sample, Montreal and Baltimore, were the most distressed, while Lincoln, Regina and Portland were the least distressed. In 1990-91, the results indicated that urban distress was more prevalent in the Canadian cities, with a particularly high concentration in Montreal. Lincoln, Regina and Portland were again the least distressed cities in the sample.

The study also revealed that during the 1980s, the central cities of Montreal, Vancouver, Hamilton and Toledo experienced declining conditions, while Baltimore and Portland witnessed relatively improving conditions. The remaining four cities in the sample were characterized by relatively stable conditions during the 1980s. In 1990-91, Montreal and Vancouver had higher incidences of urban distress than their U.S. counterparts, Baltimore and Portland, while Toledo and Savannah recorded greater incidences than their Canadian counterparts, Hamilton and Halifax.

An important trend to emerge from the analysis was the marked increase in average rates of unemployment in the five

Canadian cities between 1981 and 1991. All of the American cities in the sample, with the exception of Savannah, recorded either slight declines or little change in average rates of unemployment between 1980 and 1990. Additionally, between 1981 and 1991, the five Canadian cities experienced declines in the average rate of male labour force participation and increases in the average rate of female labour force participation. The five American cities also witnessed growth in average rates of female labour force participation. Over the study period, Montreal, Vancouver, and Toledo were subjected to substantial increases in the average rate of family poverty, while Hamilton and Portland recorded slight rises.

It is apparent that the process of economic restructuring combined with cut-backs in government programmes and the recession of the early 1990s, had a relatively greater impact on Canadian central cities. In particular, cities with large traditional industrial bases, such as Montreal and Hamilton, suffered the greatest decline. These cities saw massive declines of employment in the manufacturing sector during the 1980s and experienced difficulty in replacing lost jobs.

By contrast, it appears that many U.S. central cities, including those with larger industrial bases, were better able to absorb the shocks of restructuring and recession. For example, the study found that Baltimore and Portland,

both having significant manufacturing sectors, witnessed relatively improving conditions during the 1980s. They were able to adjust by attracting new investment, by creating new jobs in other sectors such as retail/wholesale and business/professional services and by further developing high-technology industries. However, some U.S. cities reliant on traditional industries, such as Toledo, were not as successful in making this transition.

To a large extent, the Canadian economy remains dependent on the processing and distribution of natural resources. As a result, Canadian cities are generally not as economically diversified as U.S. cities and have been slower in developing new industries such as high-technology. As appears to be the case in Vancouver, many of the new jobs in the service sector consist of low-paying and part-time or temporary work.

On the other hand, cities from both countries with smaller manufacturing sectors and a greater reliance on service and administrative functions, such as Halifax, Regina, and Lincoln, fared relatively well during the 1980s. Because of their stable employment and economic structures, they were less prone to the affects of restructuring and recession.

The study also revealed that there is greater diversity in the socio-economic status of American central city neighbourhoods. Relatively high levels of segregation are visible

in many cities, including Baltimore and Savannah. In the cities, some of the most distressed neighbourhoods in the entire sample are located within short distances from the healthiest or most affluent neighbourhoods, creating very steep social gradients. While the social geography of Canadian central cities is also marked by contrasts between wealth and poverty (particularly in Vancouver) there is generally more stability in the socio-economic condition of neighbourhoods.

The results of the project suggest that the Canadian central city is in decline, reflecting wider trends in the weakening of the national economy since the mid 1980s. It is apparent that the perception of Canadian cities as being healthier and free from the severe problems of U.S. cities is not supportable on a controlled comparative basis. The study confirms the notion that the problems evident in the largest U.S. cities cannot be imposed on the entire system. It also demonstrates that there is a continuing need for comparative studies to acquire a better understanding of the Canadian urban system.

APPENDIX 1

DEFINITION OF VARIABLES

Statistics Canada**PopChg (1981)**

Rate of population change - 1971 to 1981.

PopChg (1991)

Rate of population change - 1981 to 1991.

MalePart

The percentage of the total male labour force (in the reference week) forms of the total male population 15 years of age and over, excluding inmates, in an area.

FemPart

The percentage of the total female labour force (in the reference week) forms of the total female population 15 years of age and over, excluding inmates, in an area.

UnempM

The percentage of the unemployed male force forms of the total male labour force (in the reference week) in an area.

UnempF

The percentage of the unemployed female force forms of the total female labour force (in the reference week) in an area.

Grade9

The percentage of the population 15 years of age and over whose highest level of schooling is less than grade 9.

LoneFem

The number of lone-female parent families (a mother with no spouse present, living in a dwelling with one or more never-married children) as a percentage of total census families in private households in an area.

OldHouse

The percentage of total occupied private dwellings built

before 1946 in an area.

FamPov

The percentage of all economic families below the low income cut-offs in an area. The incidence of low income is determined on the basis of the total income of a family unit adjusted for federal Child Tax Credit, size of the family unit and size of the area of residence. The 1981 low income cut-offs were based on the 1978 Family Expenditure Survey and updated by changes in the consumer price index. For example, in 1981, the low income cut-off for a family of four living in an area with a population of 500,000 or more was \$14,545 (based on 1980 income). In 1991, it was \$28,081 (based on 1990 income).

IndPov

The percentage of all unattached individuals below the low income cut-offs in an area. Unattached individuals are non-family persons who do not belong to a census family. A person living alone is an unattached individual. In 1981, the low income cut-off for an unattached individual living in an area with a population of 500,000 or more was \$7,152 (based on 1980 income). In 1991, it was \$14,155 (based on 1990 income).

U.S. Bureau of the Census

PopChg (1980)

Rate of population change - 1970 to 1980

PopChg (1990)

Rate of population change - 1980 to 1990

MalePart

The percentage of all male persons 16 years of age and over who are employed in the labour force.

FemPart

The percentage of all female persons 16 years of age and over who are employed in the labour force.

UnempM

The percentage of the male civilian labour force unemployed during the reference week.

UnempF

The percentage of the female civilian labour force unemployed during the reference week.

Grade9

The percentage of the population 25 years of age and over whose highest level of schooling is less than grade 9.

LoneFem

The total number of female householders, no husband present with own children under 18 years as a percentage of all families in an area.

OldHouse

The percentage of all housing units built before 1945 in an area.

FamPov

The percentage of all families with 1979/1989 income below the poverty level in an area. Poverty is determined using a poverty index which provides a range of income cutoffs or "poverty thresholds" varying by size of family, number of children, and age of the family householder or unrelated individual. The income cutoffs are updated each year to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index. In 1980, the poverty threshold for a family of four was \$7,412 (based on 1979 income). In 1990, it was \$12,674 (based on 1989 income).

IndPov

The percentage of all unrelated individuals with 1979/1989 income below the poverty level in an area. An unrelated individual is: (1) a householder living alone or with non-relatives only, (2) a household member who is not related to the householder, or (3) a person living in group quarters who is not an inmate of an institution. In 1980, the poverty threshold for an unrelated individual was \$3,686 (based on 1979 income). In 1990, it was \$6,310 (based on 1989 income).

APPENDIX II

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Census Metropolitan Area (CMA)

Refers to the main labour market area of an urbanized core (or continuously built-up area) having 100,000 or more population. CMAs are created by Statistics Canada and are usually known by the name of the urban area forming their urbanized core. They contain whole municipalities (or census subdivisions). CMAs are comprised of (1) municipalities completely or partly inside the urbanized core; and (2) other municipalities if (a) at least 40% of the employed labour force living in the municipality works in the urbanized core, or (b) at least 25% of the employed labour force working in the municipality lives in the urbanized core.

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA)

SMSAs are designated and defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Each SMSA has one or more central counties containing the area's main population concentration: an urbanized area with at least 50,000 inhabitants. An SMSA may also include outlying counties which have close economic and social relationships with the central counties. The outlying counties must have a specified level of commuting to the central counties and must also meet certain standards regarding metropolitan characteristics, such as population density, urban population, and population growth.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

MSAs are relatively free standing metropolitan areas and are not closely associated with other metropolitan areas. These areas are typically surrounded by nonmetropolitan counties.

Census Tract

Statistics Canada and the U.S. Bureau of the Census have basically the same definition for a census tract. A census tract is a permanent small census geostatistical area established in large urban communities with the help of local specialists interested in urban and social science research. The boundaries of census tracts must follow permanent and easily recognized lines on the ground. The population must be between 2,500 and 8,000, except for census tracts in the central business district, major industrial zones, or in the peripheral rural or urban areas that may have either a lower or higher population. The area must be as homogeneous as possible in terms of economic status and social living.

conditions and the shape must be as compact as possible.

Central City

In each metropolitan statistical area (MSA) and census metropolitan area (CMA) the central city is the largest place or municipality. It has the largest population and is usually the oldest place in a metropolitan area. For example, in Montreal CMA (with a 1991 population of 3,127,242) the central city is the City of Montreal (with a 1991 population of 1,015,420).

Appendix III - Census Data Matrix 1980-81

Appendix III - Census Data Matrix 1980-81										
Halifax 1981										
Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Hx001	10.7	78.9	52.8	10	7	15	17.3	2.6	26.6	41.1
Hx002	5.9	81.4	56.8	8	6.3	15.8	14.8	14.3	23	41.9
Hx003	-5.5	80.4	62.2	5.6	8	6.1	16.7	36	9.1	32.7
Hx004	11.1	83.9	67.3	7.1	6.4	10	7.9	30.3	16.4	39.6
Hx005	-10.1	74.2	50	3.4	8.9	0.2	12	48.8	2.6	34.5
Hx006	-18.8	79.1	55.1	8.8	6.4	3.6	10.5	59	5.7	26.1
Hx007	-10.6	77.8	55.5	2.6	8.3	3.6	8	11.4	1.9	22
Hx008	-42.8	78.4	67.1	6.9	3.7	7.5	20	47.1	18	36.1
Hx009	-30.5	75.5	64	12.5	7.9	19.1	22.2	33.3	27.5	26.1
Hx010	-31.6	63.4	43.5	9.3	11.7	34.1	25.8	35	34.4	57.6
Hx011	-14.4	76.4	62	6.6	6.5	14	16	66.1	14.3	38.3
Hx012	-21.6	79.4	62.8	4.4	5.4	6.3	8	81	8	32.3
Hx013	-14.3	74.5	49.8	5.7	4.1	4.8	9.4	54.5	5.8	22.8
Hx014	-10.1	80.2	53.8	8.2	7.7	14.1	10.2	20.6	16	35.3
Hx015	56.2	81.5	60.4	6.6	11.3	18.6	22.4	18	27.9	35.5
Hx016	-21.2	81.9	55.2	12.4	4.4	14.6	9.5	27	11.2	27.4
Hx017	-1	80.4	60.8	10.5	5	5.9	4.6	19.6	7.1	19.2
Hx018	-12.5	77.6	53.1	6.5	4.2	8.4	9.7	7.6	6.6	38.1
Hx019	-25.1	72.3	51.1	8	4.3	14.7	13.5	61.7	11.5	32
Hx020	-20.5	69.7	43.1	9.8	10.1	26.8	18.1	49.2	21.4	70.5
Hx021	-26.6	70.7	45	9.4	8.2	23.4	27.3	55.8	29.4	43.9
Hx022	-4.2	72.4	55	6.6	5.8	17.3	10.8	31.4	9.1	36.5
Hx023	-16.4	79	54.3	4.9	7.8	15.1	16.5	24.9	16.9	23.7
Hx024	-16.1	79.3	61.3	8	4.9	13.6	9.3	13.4	11.1	30.9
Hx025.01	-5.1	81	65.1	6.7	9.2	6.2	13.7	0.5	12.5	16.8
Hx025.02	36.3	88.1	69.8	3.8	6.1	5.8	12.3	3.1	10	13.4
Hx026	-13.8	83.2	56.2	6.6	4.5	6.8	4.9	7.6	4.3	32.9
Hx027	5.7	83.3	61.5	8.8	5.1	8.8	5.9	15.5	2.2	25.8
Regina 1981										
R001.01	-9.8	86.9	67.7	2.2	5.7	4.9	4.6	0	4.6	27.1
R001.02	-12.6	83.5	61	5.8	3.9	4.8	10.5	0	4.8	23.8
R002.01	86.6	91.4	66.4	0.9	4.2	4.1	4.3	0	1.9	12.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
R002.02	-4.2	82.1	55.4	2.3	3.2	7.3	5.6	0	4.3	23
R003	-17.9	83.1	58	2.3	3.5	5.8	7.6	4	6.5	37.8
R004	-29.6	76	51.2	1.6	2.3	17.9	15.9	66.8	18.4	30.4
R005	-20.5	76.1	54.9	1.4	6.6	9.4	8.8	28	4.8	23.9
R006	16.2	81.4	66.4	3.7	4.7	3.9	10.5	0.4	6.9	19.9
R007	-15.4	72	38.5	5.6	6.7	20.2	19.3	5.8	28.5	53.8
R008.01	-13.4	75.2	55.7	3.2	4.4	20.8	8.6	12.7	8.9	33.6
R008.02	623.9	90.5	63.9	2.5	11.3	3.6	6.1	1	2.3	9.4
R009.01	-15	76	49.2	5.3	6.3	35.1	15.5	40.1	23.1	43.8
R009.02	13.9	88.5	65.7	5.6	5.1	14	18.3	1	18.4	36.3
R010	-21.8	72.5	53.6	14.6	6.1	23.2	20.7	52.9	29.5	41.2
R011	-26.3	72	46.5	5.4	3.8	25	14.1	35.4	17	44.5
R012	-31.4	78.5	60.2	8	7.7	13.3	14.8	69.4	17.2	42.6
R013	-30.8	58.3	55.6	14.3	0	40	0	76.1		
R014	-22.8	61.5	52.1	19.5	10.3	33.4	21.6	58.9	31	60.4
R015	-17.1	77.3	54.4	5.7	3.8	22.6	12.9	11	17.3	49
R016	182.8	87.4	62.6	2.8	6.3	10.2	12.6	0	13.9	22.7
R017	-26.2	72.7	51.2	3.4	7	32.9	20	34	32.6	32
R018	-26.4	70.1	49.6	6.9	5.5	27.6	18.9	50.9	28.8	41.9
R019	-25.2	72.5	53	10	4.7	22.3	16	37.7	17.1	37.6
R020	-22.8	78.2	51.8	5.4	3.2	20.1	11	16.9	9.1	40.3
R021	-17.4	81.9	60.4	5	7.4	12.3	10.1	1.5	8.9	34.5
R022	38.7	84.9	59.9	3.8	4.9	13.7	8.9	7.7	10.4	50.1
R023.01	130.2	92.7	61.4	1.2	4.4	7.1	4.4	1	4.9	9.1
R023.02	-12.5	89.8	67.9	3.9	4.1	7.6	9.8	0	5.2	16
R024	-22.7	81	52.9	3.5	9.2	15.7	10.7	4.6	10.3	42.4
R025.01	-10.8	81	60.3	4.2	5.8	16.8	15.6	6.5	13	32.5
R025.02	-11.7	83.2	64.2	2.5	6.7	10.6	8.4	1	7.1	24.2
R026	-1.8	78.9	63.7	3.8	7.6	22.8	12.9	4.4	19.9	31.8
R027	-17.1	80.3	57.1	5.6	7.7	23.5	11.1	10.6	17.5	39.2
R028.01	4.5	89.7	63.3	2.4	2.8	9.9	8.5	0	9.1	41.5
R028.02	141.4	93.6	63.5	2	2.5	6.9	6.2	1	6.2	26
Hamilton 1981										
Hm001.01	37.1	87	44.4	0	0	10	8.3	14.3	7.2	100
Hm001.02	117.2	88.3	50.3	4.9	5.2	12.7	8.9	1.2	10.9	35.7
Hm001.03	39.5	87.1	54.9	4.3	8.6	14.4	6.2	12.6	8.9	25.1

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Hn002.01	14.7	84.9	52.8	3	11.9	11.1	11	2.9	10.1	23
Hn002.02	19.4	88.1	62.1	3.5	5.5	16.9	8	5.2	8.3	14.7
Hn002.03	47.8	84.1	54	2.1	5.1	11	8	1.3	8.9	21.3
Hn003.01	30.7	85.2	60.1	1.9	4.4	12.1	9.3	0.7	7.3	24.6
Hn003.02	50.6	88.8	53.1	1.6	7.8	9.6	8.8	0	10.9	39.7
Hn003.03	1.3	73.1	54	5	7	13	20.5	0.7	24.2	68.8
Hn003.04	-3	80.4	57.3	7.4	8.4	16	13.3	2.2	15	47.5
Hn004.01	-6.5	82.4	57	3.4	5.3	20.5	12.8	1.6	11.7	39.2
Hn004.02	-9.5	85.5	59.4	2.6	7.3	16.2	9.5	0.9	10	31.9
Hn005.01	-2.3	82.3	56.3	4.4	4.7	17.9	10.7	0.3	8.8	31.3
Hn005.02	7.1	81.4	52.5	3.3	6.3	12.6	9	0.9	12.7	40.4
Hn005.03	45.9	84	58.9	3.6	5.3	19.6	9.4	0	9.8	0
Hn006	-20.3	80.1	57	3.7	6.3	16.6	8.4	0.7	6	23.2
Hn007	-15.2	80.5	46.8	5.6	5.4	19.9	8.7	2.3	9.4	65.6
Hn008	-18.1	75.2	40	6.4	1	22.1	6.2	1.8	12.2	46.4
Hn009	-39.7	77.5	44.8	8.5	12.1	22.8	17.6	3.2	24.6	74.2
Hn010	-22.3	78.5	55.3	6.1	4.9	18.9	6.4	3.3	3.4	47.3
Hn011	-18.7	80.2	51.3	4.9	4.2	21.3	3.8	3.9	8.5	18
Hn012	-24.6	72.1	47.1	5.4	11.3	17.0	14.8	4.1	16.5	32.9
Hn013	-19.7	80.1	55.6	3.2	7.1	11.9	3.9	3.2	4.6	45.8
Hn014	-14.7	81.8	58.1	4.9	2.6	15.6	3.8	5.5	4.5	16.1
Hn015	-18.7	84.8	61	3	12.8	11.5	3.6	0	4.1	18.1
Hn016	-22	54.5	63.6	0	0	13.6	0	12.5		
Hn017	-17.5	79.9	55	1.5	3.9	8.1	7.9	84.9	7.9	27.2
Hn019	-17.7	72.4	52	2.6	5.1	13.8	6	38.3	6.3	32.8
Hn020	-16.5	72	47.2	5	4.9	17.9	9.2	29.1	8.4	46.1
Hn021	-18.2	77.8	46.4	4.8	5.5	18.6	8.9	37.8	11.2	45.9
Hn022	-18.7	76.8	53.7	4.4	10	16	9.1	15.2	13	29.6
Hn023	-22.5	76.2	47.6	4.3	5.4	15.7	5.3	5.3	6.4	26.1
Hn024	-15.9	81.4	59.7	5	6.1	14.6	7.2	0	4.6	22.8
Hn025	-17.3	81.1	49.6	2.9	7.9	17.1	6	13.6	9.9	12.1
Hn026.01	-10.4	76.3	47.9	5.4	6.5	26.6	7.9	2.7	14.7	38.9
Hn026.02	-3.5	84.7	57.2	3	9.5	26.3	4.8	3.9	6.3	41.3
Hn026.03	6	87.8	53.5	5.4	9.7	16.8	16.9	1.7	20.5	34
Hn026.04	5.2	89	64.4	2.2	7.8	22.6	2.5	0	5.4	39.5
Hn026.05	26.7	84.8	56.1	2	6.9	18.4	21.8	2.1	21.3	29.2

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Hn027	-18.7	74.3	51.9	1.2	5.4	28.7	4.5	3.3	4.8	38.1
Hn028	-8	76.6	47.1	4	7.6	26	8	14.9	8.5	53.1
Hn029	-6.2	72.5	45.7	4.1	7.7	25.8	9.9	27.6	14.1	42.2
Hn030	-18.7	73	46.3	4.8	8.7	22.9	8.4	81.3	7.1	37.7
Hn031	-22.6	75.9	50.3	5.4	4.3	21.5	8.3	83	10.5	36.8
Hn032	-18.4	78.4	50	4.9	10.9	17.7	14.8	70.9	17.5	33.9
Hn033	-15.9	75.7	46.4	6	14	19.4	14.6	81.3	23.7	43.6
Hn034	-13.9	84	70	3.9	4.1	10.2	14.7	20.4	20.7	24.7
Hn035	-17.8	72.4	50.6	7.8	13.4	19.7	23.7	64.5	30.7	49.9
Hn036	3.5	72.6	60.3	9.1	8.5	18.7	12.6	27.6	30.5	35.4
Hn037	-11	46.5	28.2	9.7	3.8	40.5	5.6	10.3	31.2	73.1
Hn038	-10.1	67.6	43.4	7.3	5.1	17.2	8.8	26.4	11.9	41.5
Hn039	23.5	77.3	65.2	6.1	2.8	12.4	14	26	13.3	28.8
Hn040	-28.2	78.8	52.4	6	8.1	20.5	11.5	65.7	20.5	35.3
Hn041	-34.2	74.1	52.9	9.3	8	25	13.8	61	25.2	34.5
Hn042	-23.2	71.1	53.3	7.2	7.4	21.2	12.4	73.1	17.8	38.7
Hn043	-15.6	74.1	48.5	5	4.6	15.4	9.3	28.7	11.7	38.5
Hn044	3.6	78.7	56.8	5.2	6.1	10.9	11.8	2.5	13.1	29.8
Hn045	-10.2	77	49.5	5.1	6.6	8.4	8.4	75.1	6.6	32.3
Hn046	-9.4	73.1	48.8	5.6	5	16	13.4	34.8	13.5	35.2
Hn047	-10.8	73	45.9	9.3	8.3	33.5	10.4	59.4	20.4	57.7
Hn048	25.2	79.9	59.2	4.2	3.1	20.8	15.4	16.7	16.6	37.1
Hn049	6.4	61.4	33.3	12.8	15.3	40.5	26.7	33.3	51	72.1
Hn050	-12.4	67.6	39.3	10	11.7	35.7	15.6	53.8	28.4	56.7
Hn051	-13.3	73.6	44.4	9.4	10.8	29.3	14.1	62.2	21.7	65.8
Hn052	-26.4	76	52.6	7.5	8.1	26.4	10.4	87.6	18.2	41.5
Hn053	-25.6	82.1	45.1	6.1	11.6	30.6	12.4	88	17.6	51.5
Hn054	-16.8	70.7	43.1	4.3	7.1	27.7	11.6	84.9	16.8	56.6
Hn055	-15.4	75.5	49.8	0.5	4.3	30	8.8	82.6	11.2	58.7
Hn056	-17.7	77.8	51.3	5.4	9.4	33.4	7.7	54.6	17.5	41.2
Hn057	-17.4	74.5	43.8	5.5	9.4	29.3	13.1	71.4	17.6	46.2
Hn058	-24.6	71.4	44.8	5.2	9.7	38.6	15.3	69	26.7	53.5
Hn059	-23.6	75	41.5	7.4	10.9	35.4	10.4	85.6	23.9	56.5
Hn060	-25	72	49.8	4.8	13.9	41.6	12.7	92.1	18.9	50.1
Hn061	-7	72.2	49.3	9.6	12	40.2	12.2	76.1	29.2	52.2
Hn062	-24.9	70.4	42.4	9	11.2	41.5	13.6	84.1	27.1	57.6

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Hn063	7.3	69.4	42.9	13.6	13.2	41.1	25	55.6	44.6	54.1
Hn064	-33.3	64.9	48.9	13.5	9.3	55.6	15.2	69.9	24	73.9
Hn065	16.1	78	48.7	12.2	11	40.5	11.1	44.7	35.5	62.7
Hn066	-21	70.6	40.6	12.4	14	43.3	19.9	64.3	30.7	62.7
Hn067	-31.6	75	42.1	9.3	15.3	35.9	16.2	85	29.7	59.5
Hn068	-42.9	65.8	34.4	5.5	21.2	44.4	11.3	87.5	36.8	38.2
Hn069	-40.3	65.8	35.5	6	29.6	39.2	12.2	70.6	24.4	60.5
Hn070	-15.8	80.1	46.6	6.4	3.3	24.7	5.2	30.3	14.9	35.8
Hn071	-17.6	73.8	49	9.2	12.2	25.8	25.5	13.8	36.3	36.1
Hn072.01	-2.8	87.5	44.4	14.3	0	30.8	0	20		
Hn072.02	5.5	79.8	44.4	6.3	10.8	30.9	14.2	1.3	21.5	62
Hn072.03	20	84.4	57	4.3	11	15.3	15.3	0.2	19.7	18.9
Hn072.04	57.5	90.6	65.9	3.8	10.4	23.4	7.8	1.2	10.6	10.7
Hn080.02	154.8	90.5	62.5	2.1	7.4	7.2	4.6	1.9	5.2	24.7
Hn081	-11	73.9	51.6	4.6	5.5	16.7	7.3	8.5	5.3	47.4
Hn082	-4	74.8	44.9	5.5	7.5	20	9.2	8.7	20.3	30.7
Hn083	-7	81.3	53	5.9	7.5	11.9	13.5	11	18	37.4
Vancouver 1981										
V001	33	88.6	67.6	2.6	4.2	7.7	18.4	0.5	14.5	41.7
V002	-15.3	80.5	54	5.5	6.2	14.5	8.2	9.8	9.4	43.6
V003	3.9	78.8	54.3	4.6	9.8	21.5	11.1	18.2	15.5	27.6
V004	8.3	76.3	50.1	4.6	5	20.7	9.1	19.2	13	38
V005	-11.1	85.5	73.3	6.3	1.8	7.6	10.5	4	12.9	21.3
V006	-2.4	78.3	58.7	5.9	3.7	10.2	10.6	31.2	8.3	25.9
V007	-8.6	75.4	45.6	3.8	5.3	5	8.7	55.5	5.5	37.1
V008	23	76.4	49.6	5.8	6.9	2.9	7.2	40.1	2.1	34.4
V009	-12.8	76.7	47	3.4	4.9	6	8.4	35.1	7	29.5
V010	-10.4	67	44.7	4.7	5.8	8.3	7.3	15.8	5.8	28.1
V011	11.5	70.7	47.7	7.6	5.9	19.2	9.9	29.9	12.7	48.2
V012	-6.8	73.8	53	4.7	3.5	18.7	11.2	39.1	14.4	47.1
V013.01	-0.3	72.8	53.3	4.1	7.8	23.1	9.4	26.5	18.4	48.3
V013.02	0.7	72.7	44.6	5.6	7.1	22.6	9.8	21.2	13.8	40.6
V014	7.3	72.5	51.1	5.5	5.1	24	11.9	27.1	15.7	58.5
V015.01	-1.2	80	59.6	4.2	6.5	16.5	8	19.7	5.7	32.4
V015.02	-5	74.5	46.5	3.2	8.2	17.2	9.1	4.7	9.5	67.5
V016.01	6.3	78.1	53.5	4.1	6.5	21.8	10.1	37.7	11.7	58.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
V016.02	4.5	75.6	54.7	6.2	7.1	21.7	11.1	27.6	16.8	48
V017	-0.4	75.8	56.4	5.2	6.9	22.9	11.4	23.6	13.3	49.8
V018.01	0.4	76.4	54.3	2.5	2.6	24.4	8.4	40.1	11.9	32.3
V018.02	6.9	76.9	55.7	5.3	6.4	22.4	9.3	36.3	13.5	38.1
V019	-10.3	71.9	51.4	7.1	10.2	18.2	18.7	28.1	17.8	36.8
V020	-7.3	74	41.4	6.7	1.4	7.7	8.1	21.2	6.4	33.8
V021	-9.5	75.8	51.7	2.8	6.1	2.8	8.8	8.3	1.9	50
V022	-8	63.8	40.2	5.4	1.5	6	10	12	7.6	18.7
V023	-5.4	81.6	53.7	3	4	3.8	8.5	81.1	5.1	36.5
V024	-10.3	79.2	56	1.8	4.1	3.5	9.5	79.4	6.1	38.5
V025	-5	78.3	58.2	3.1	3.5	5.3	10.5	68	5.8	39.6
V026	-11.5	71.2	46.7	1.4	5.6	9.6	9	50.3	4.8	34.5
V027	0.9	71.6	47.2	3.8	3	5	9.4	33.2	4.8	17
V028	-39.4	77.1	55.5	3.9	1.9	7.1	7.8	65.4	5	30.7
V029	-14.6	75.5	58.5	4	4.3	9	12.8	63.1	11.7	22
V030	-7.9	74.1	55.9	11.5	7.5	19	11.9	55	16	45.1
V031	-10.9	73.7	56.9	5.9	5.4	17.8	13.5	64.9	18.4	42.8
V032	-5.1	73.6	56.7	7.2	6.4	22.9	11.6	59.9	19.4	44
V033	1.6	77.1	53.3	6.4	6.4	25	11.2	43.3	16.7	47.8
V034	4.4	76.4	54	7.9	6.1	24.7	13.3	39.6	20.3	51.1
V035	1.7	74.7	56.1	5.1	4.8	23.2	8.4	29.4	14.5	52.7
V036.01	2.2	78.9	56.9	5.7	5.8	22.7	10.1	26.8	12.2	38.5
V036.02	-1.3	79.6	56	5.3	5.8	20.4	10.6	21.7	16.1	33.1
V037	-7.1	75.7	57.9	6.5	6.4	17.8	20.1	47.9	26.9	38.4
V038	2.9	79.4	65	9.8	2.8	17.5	16.7	30.8	23.7	32.7
V039	-8.4	75.5	64.6	8.9	4.4	12.6	14.1	34.2	19.9	40.3
V040	-10.5	82.6	70.9	5.6	5.2	6.8	10	20	10	23
V041	-4.3	80.2	64.2	5.5	4.1	7.9	12.9	41.9	9.2	30.4
V042	-12.7	74.3	61.7	3.2	6.5	11	12.9	72	10	38.1
V043	-11.2	75.1	58.9	5.2	7.2	5.3	12.1	67.9	6.4	31.2
V044	4.7	74.5	54	4.7	4.7	5.2	9.8	37.5	6.7	44.6
V045	-13.7	82.5	71.6	6	6.6	6.6	16.6	62.3	12.5	31.5
V046	-7.4	83.4	71.6	6.2	3.8	7.8	18.3	27.7	18.9	38.5
V047	-9.3	87.6	74.6	7.3	4.1	4.9	11.7	18.4	8.2	21.8
V048	-8.1	84.1	72.5	3.8	4.2	5.6	16.1	20.7	13.9	26
V049.01	9.1	79.9	68.9	8.2	8.1	9.4	16	52	25.5	42.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M012.02	0.4	82.6	60	8.8	6.3	26.7	15.2	1	18.9	39.4
M013	-26.5	74.2	44.9	9.8	7.7	34.5	13.5	26.3	13.8	59.7
M014	-19.3	71.9	44.8	11.1	10.5	33.6	19.8	26.7	27.6	44.6
M015	-28.3	74.7	39.4	11.3	7.6	37.3	16.9	69.3	29.6	59.9
M016	-35.3	66.9	38.4	12.3	15.8	41.2	17.6	83.5	28.1	65.6
M017	-37.1	74	45.1	11.3	19.6	38.9	19	86.3	30.3	41.8
M018	-34.4	66.3	38.3	14	10.6	38.9	19.1	75.1	25.7	58.7
M019	-44.4	69.4	37.9	11	17.3	41.6	26.5	80.2	43.6	57.7
M020	-32.5	69.3	37.2	12.8	11.9	42.1	21.7	71.7	33.5	59.6
M021	-22.7	69.8	34.1	12.9	10.6	38.9	20.1	69.1	32.7	66.8
M022	-44.3	70.7	22.5	12.8	6.3	45.8	20.2	92.5	33.9	57.8
M023	-49.1	72	38.2	16.9	14.7	37	26.3	69.7	52	56
M024	-32.9	65.9	32.5	16.7	18.4	48.5	19.5	79.7	35.7	60.9
M025	-31	67.5	40.9	14.3	12.2	46.8	20	83.6	40.5	71.4
M026	-28.2	69	37	12.5	14.7	47.8	17.4	79	34.7	61.9
M027	-31.9	66.7	40.5	17.9	18.7	40.7	27.5	78.5	40.4	64.4
M028	-31.9	68.9	38.9	15.3	10.2	44.4	23.1	77.2	35.1	61.9
M029	-20.5	71.8	44.2	10.6	10.8	37.3	19.4	53.2	28.2	59.2
M030	-25.8	77.1	51.4	9.3	18.6	33.7	16.9	37.8	27.4	45.6
M031	-21.4	73.2	53.3	10.1	9.7	30.4	13.4	19.7	16.5	51.7
M032	-21.6	70.1	38.9	14.9	19	40.9	17.7	45.3	37.7	57.2
M033	-28.4	72.9	36.8	16.9	10.4	43.5	18.9	67.3	35.4	62.8
M034	-23	62	34.9	12.9	13.8	44.3	24.5	50.9	46.8	72.3
M035	-30.3	74.6	44.9	12.2	19.8	37.2	17.8	83.7	27	52.4
M036	-26.7	79	45.5	17.7	14.7	35.9	19.5	58.9	38.4	46.4
M037	21.5	63.8	42.8	12.9	15.7	42.1	24.2	32.1	28.8	53.1
M038	-10.4	56.6	29.2	16.7	14	44.8	36.4	61.1	49.2	75.4
M039	-49.3	56.4	31.6	19.7	12.5	45.1	32.2	69.1	54.4	75.2
M041	-22.3	73	41.8	22.5	6.8	36.2	21	43.2	38.3	53.3
M042	-45.1	74.7	52.1	11.8	8.1	36.6	37.1	75.6	35.3	50.3
M043	-54.3	61.8	35.7	32.7	30	47.6	29.2	90.1	43.1	75
M044	-40.5	55.7	37.1	18.3	17.7	48.9	24.4	61.1	43.9	71.3
M045	-39.6	63	39.6	22.1	17	43.9	15.6	62.2	27.9	64
M046	-40.2	55.8	35	9.8	14.3	52	21.5	73.7	53	74.9
M047	-33.4	63.2	42.9	16.3	20.8	50.4	38.2	87.7	52.2	72.4
M048	-36.5	65.8	43.1	16	16.5	40.6	23.4	81.7	43.4	68.4

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M049	-40.6	67.6	45.8	14.5	12.2	33.5	35.7	71	42.9	62.4
M050	-18.8	50.9	39.3	29.8	9.1	44.2	13	34.5	34.2	73.5
M051	-61.1	60	50	20.8	15.2	40	29.2	80.6	37.2	63.5
M052	-9.3	48.5	26.7	19.2	16	47.3	30.8	51.1	39	75.8
M053	-27	45.8	33.3	30.3	28	61.9	9.1	48.4	55.6	75.9
M054	-39.1	52.1	41.7	22	33.3	47	11.1	86.9	45.1	59
M055	-9.8	74.3	52.6	10.7	7.5	14.7	8.1	52.2	5.1	36
M056	-62.3	45.9	39.1	14.3	0	57.1	14.3	94.6	46.1	87.6
M057	-22.6	35.6	23.1	31.3	0	64.3	42.8	82.9	30.6	88.3
M058	-29.8	50	44.6	7	8	48.6	14.3	52.4	37	63.7
M059	-57	60.9	50	18.9	0	40.3	7.7	86.5	24.9	65.8
M060	-18.3	45.5	19.9	16	17.9	51.6	42.7	2.5	57.8	98.9
M061	-52.9	57.9	52	0	7.7	32.8	30	97.5	53.2	50.2
M062	-69.9	87.5	62.5	19	0	14.6	0	78.3		
M063	-51.5	59.2	56.9	20	6.1	24.1	33.3	69	40	48.4
M064	-35.7	80.8	72.6	12.4	12.2	7.9	3.4	24.9	24.3	34.3
M065.01	-8.2	83.8	79.5	7.7	6.8	9.3	7.7	12	23.6	26.9
M065.02	4.2	78.3	63.3	6	3	11.8	14.4	43.7	24.5	28.3
M066.01	-6.6	78.5	68.4	6.7	5.1	17.9	16.7	41.6	19.6	35.7
M066.02	-12.8	75.9	54.5	14.4	8.3	20.9	9.7	37.6	17.6	56.1
M067	-38.2	63.6	35.2	14.3	15.6	36.4	30.1	59.2	34.5	55.2
M068	-13	42	26.5	15.9	20	50.7	53.4	15.6	70.3	90.3
M069	-57.7	84.1	47.6	13.2	20	40.5	22.2	91.2	49.7	29.7
M070	-57.8	78.3	46.7	13.9	28.6	36.7	19	71.8	40.3	34.4
M072	-22.9	59.9	41.9	11.2	9.9	44.8	22.9	53.5	30.4	65.8
M073	-32.7	60.8	36	18.6	16.1	45.6	11.8	50.5	47.7	70.8
M074	-32.7	58.7	31.4	13	15.9	41	24.4	77.8	45.9	61.8
M075	-23.6	61	33.3	14	20	50.5	29.2	60.2	50.5	65.3
M076	-34.4	46.8	27	12.3	17.1	56.5	26.7	66.2	53.3	71
M077	-34.9	53.7	25	21.6	19.2	51.2	25	12.5	53.8	69.6
M078	-56	59.3	32.2	25.9	23.7	53.1	43.1	26.7	58.5	76.1
M079	-31	65.6	40.2	16.3	13.2	49.8	25.3	68.4	38.3	65.8
M080	-43.7	65.9	38.6	15.5	25	42.1	17.4	87.8	35	67.6
M081	-34.6	66.9	39	11.8	15.2	36.5	24.2	84.7	39.3	47.4
M082	-30.7	61.8	43.7	18.5	17.4	42.2	23	64.1	33.7	60.8
M083	-26.9	73.4	37	9.8	14.4	45.6	16.5	86	29.5	57.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M084	-30.5	56.5	27.3	18.9	9.8	57.8	24	69.4	32.7	75.7
M085	-33.7	65.1	40.7	13	27.3	42.4	19.3	78.8	19.1	84.5
M086	-21.6	73.4	47.3	11.5	12.4	35.1	17.7	38.6	17.2	50.4
M087	-23.1	65.6	41	15.8	19.1	43.6	...	55.5	28.8	55.1
M088	-30.2	71.8	40.2	12.1	7.8	37.8	11.3	52.4	18.2	55.3
M089	-21.3	75.4	50.7	8.7	6.8	33.7	12.7	28.1	15	54.9
M090	-18.1	75.2	47.7	8.1	7.5	36.6	13.5	16.8	15.2	45
M092	-21.6	75.1	48	7.7	8.8	38.9	11.3	34.2	20.2	47
M093	-22.5	70.8	41.4	7.3	13.6	41.6	17.1	62.5	28.9	58.1
M094	-22.5	74.7	52.1	8	11.9	32.4	14.3	28.3	21.9	55.8
M095	-26.3	76.9	65.3	13.8	7.8	12.7	21.6	64.1	33.1	48.9
M096	-29.8	76	62.3	14	5.8	17.8	20.7	80.3	21.2	45.9
M097.01	-11.6	77	63.8	8.3	9.7	16.6	15.8	30.5	19.1	32.3
M097.02	-13.8	74	57	7.1	1.8	14.4	20.2	20.7	13.5	31.5
M098	-12.5	75.1	52.3	6.4	7.1	17.9	10.3	18.4	13.2	40.6
M099	-19.1	73.9	46.2	6.6	5.5	12.5	14.3	42	16.9	50
M100	-14	75	50.1	6.9	7.6	17.8	12.6	14.8	11.5	40.3
M101	-13.4	69.5	54.1	10	8.4	20.2	15.8	6.1	21.2	45.7
M102	-15.4	75.3	54.5	5.7	6.4	11.5	13.3	46.3	10.9	33.1
M103	-10.4	77.7	58.9	9.4	9	8.7	14.6	80	10.3	41.7
M104	-14	78.9	54.6	9.5	11.3	9.1	8.3	85.6	10.6	41.3
M105	-18.5	79.6	60.5	5.8	8.1	9.3	15.8	74.4	13.5	31.6
M106	-10.5	83.7	56.5	7.6	10.5	11.5	19.3	59.9	8.1	35.4
M107	-19.8	73.1	60.1	5.1	9	14.4	21.7	53.8	18.2	43
M108	-15.7	75.4	57.6	7.1	7.7	11.6	13.8	65.2	10.6	32.2
M109	-16.7	72.3	61.8	4.7	5.6	11.9	10.6	58.3	16.4	21.1
M110	-12.7	73	47.8	4.6	10.9	17.7	17.3	42.4	15.1	33.6
M111	-13.5	75.9	52.8	5.5	9.2	18.3	12.5	36.6	11.7	39.1
M112	-8.4	64.1	43.4	9.6	13.9	31.1	15.9	11.4	30	61.2
M113	-16.1	72.6	54.8	6.8	7.3	17.6	13.6	47.9	13.7	33.6
M114	-11.7	82.1	56.5	4.5	7.6	5.4	8.9	48.4	4.3	30.2
M115.01	-9.2	82	68.9	4.9	6.9	3.6	11.3	54.2	8.3	28.9
M115.02	-7.3	80.7	64.5	3.6	6.4	6.5	13.8	19.4	11.4	17.8
M116	-11.7	68.9	57	9.9	7.3	15.8	16.7	19.7	23	37.3
M117	-13.5	73.5	50.9	11.3	11.6	27.9	16.6	16.8	29.3	54.1
M118	-15.3	72.6	48.8	8.6	3.7	26.4	13.6	17.4	22.2	51.6

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M119	-13.8	68.8	55.8	6.7	9.6	28.5	16.9	14.2	34.9	54
M120	-18.3	81.5	62.3	10.8	13.4	16.4	10.2	5.3	22.3	38.7
M121	-12.8	79.3	54.9	4.2	7.5	6.2	10.1	8.9	7.9	16.8
M122	-8.2	70.7	60	13.6	12.5	22.3	21	17.5	31.4	55
M123	-13.8	77.5	66.5	6.1	6.7	14.2	16.4	19.2	17.5	33.9
M124	-16.5	72.2	55.6	10.7	13.6	19.6	12.2	14.3	29.2	49.7
M125	-0.5	68.5	48.8	7.1	5.4	21.5	8.8	17.5	17.1	47.3
M126	-22.1	80.6	65.4	6.8	5.9	5.1	10.2	57.7	9.4	51.8
M127	-14.4	79.6	63.1	8.9	9.7	10.5	14.5	27.3	12.6	33.9
M128	-18.9	80.2	54.5	5.8	6.2	5.1	9.7	52.1	8.4	27.3
M129	7	79.6	63.2	5.8	6	5.7	9.1	19.7	9.4	27.5
M130	-34.8	75.1	72.2	12.8	7.1	7.9	4.5	40.9	24.7	45.6
M131	-8.3	80.8	63.2	9.5	10.8	12.7	10.7	33.4	16.3	38.6
M132	-12.6	79.6	63.9	9.6	9.1	15.9	12	30.6	25.7	37
M133	-29.7	67.9	61.1	12.2	13.8	34.5	12.7	55.2	30.2	39.3
M134	-33.4	77.7	59	20	21.7	23.7	14.3	79.6	20.9	48.2
M135	-37.3	73.8	51.3	12.8	7.6	38.1	19	83.4	40.3	61.8
M136	-31.4	71.3	53.5	10.8	12.5	47.6	11.3	67.6	35.8	60
M137	-20.4	72.4	53.3	9.5	12.5	34.7	11.5	61.7	24.7	58.8
M138	-39.1	80.3	65.9	9.5	15.5	35.8	9	86.2	27.4	62
M139	-29.8	70.9	51.3	10.3	21.3	40.2	20	68	42.3	70.8
M140	-37.4	72.4	51.4	20	15.8	28.3	17.4	91.7	28.5	57.5
M141	-34.3	64.7	49.4	21	13.8	34.7	20.4	90.1	34.1	61.5
M142	-28.7	63.5	39.7	17.8	14.5	35.4	27.7	67.2	41.9	65
M143	-28.4	73.8	53.8	10.7	10.4	24	20	47.3	24.9	34.4
M144	-25.4	77.6	59.2	15.2	11	20.6	14.3	58.8	24.3	45.7
M146	-31.2	73.2	50.8	19.2	11.4	33.1	14.5	60.1	25.5	55.6
M147	-28.3	67.6	44.8	14.8	15.9	32.7	22	72.6	26.8	52.6
M148	-20.1	71.8	38	13.5	2.6	34.3	12.5	93.6	17.9	51
M149	-18.8	76.1	53.7	14	9.9	24.5	19.7	55.2	27.2	39.7
M150	-22.8	74.6	43.3	16.7	8.7	34.6	27.3	51.9	32.4	58.5
M151	-26.5	75.4	47.1	22.4	19	35.9	22.6	83.6	36	51
M152	-30.2	77.1	58.1	9.3	14	30.1	15.6	72.8	24.6	39.7
M153	-25	68.7	44.3	13	9.3	43.6	18.2	46.9	21.5	49.4
M154	-20.1	74.4	42.6	21.9	13	40.2	19.3	65.3	22.2	60.5
M155	-25	76.8	47.1	10.8	12.1	38.6	17.3	75.4	23.8	51.9

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M156	-25.5	66.8	36.3	11.8	8.5	35.2	21.4	85.7	28.5	57.2
M157	-29.5	72.5	49.8	9.7	10.1	33.9	17.9	89	21.1	58.3
M158	-25.3	70.4	47.9	7.9	18.4	37	19.6	73.4	25.7	52.9
M159	-34.3	76.6	49.3	12.7	14.2	32.1	18.2	80.1	24.1	49.3
M160	-23.6	58.1	46.2	14.4	17.5	37.5	17.6	61.5	35.5	59.6
M161	-30.1	65.5	30.3	13.7	15.2	44.8	23.5	62.7	55.4	74.4
M162	-33.5	72.6	49.1	15.4	19.6	29.8	9.7	65.4	35.8	37.8
M163	-26.2	77.3	56.4	8.3	14.7	45.6	11.6	84.8	26.6	48.4
M164	-20.2	81.6	61.9	14.7	13.5	23.3	7.7	46.7	28.5	46.6
M165	-29.9	71.2	49.1	9	8.3	35.5	21.9	74.4	52.7	63.2
M166	-24.9	71.4	39.1	10	11.1	34.1	28.6	73.7	40.4	63.7
M167	-28.1	71.1	60.8	13.9	16.4	37.7	14.5	79.6	39.9	50.6
M168	-26.6	74.8	53.1	14.9	18.1	35.9	10.6	86	33.1	53.3
M169	-32.3	79.2	52.7	13.1	8.7	43.1	14	79.6	28.6	57.7
M170	-28.2	73.6	49.8	8.3	10.7	44.7	16.3	74.9	37.5	63.9
M171	-36.2	70.4	52.3	11.2	11.7	33.2	21.1	73.1	43.5	64.7
M172	-26.3	73.8	47.8	15.3	10.5	34.2	14.9	51.1	35.3	54.8
M173	-20.4	72.5	52.2	13.7	6.5	28.7	16.1	64.6	26.4	63
M174	-26.1	73	53.3	11.1	9.3	33	21.9	75.9	27.1	50.3
M175	-30.7	69	44.4	15	10.5	32.3	20	79.9	18.4	49.3
M176	-32.4	71.4	47.8	15.5	15.9	34.7	15.2	80.9	34.6	58
M177	-35.7	73.7	41.9	19	16.7	33	21.4	85.1	36.3	58.9
M178	-27.8	73.5	50.7	10.5	10.2	36.1	21.4	77.2	30.2	51.9
M179	-29.9	72.8	45.2	15.3	12	32.7	19.1	61.9	31.5	67.1
M180	-26.3	71.7	47.2	15.7	10.7	34.4	20	45.4	26.1	51.4
M181	-25.7	74	46.8	10.8	16.1	32.1	15.3	49.6	28.5	62.4
M182	-28.8	74.8	40.8	11	8.2	36.8	19	71.5	24.6	64.6
M183	-25.1	71.9	48.2	10.9	11.9	35	13.8	68.4	22.1	60.5
M184	-23.8	80.3	43	14.4	7.9	33.3	16.4	61.6	25.6	57.3
M185	-22.8	72.2	44.6	10.3	10.4	33.3	15.1	38.7	19.1	54.9
M186	-23.5	72	52.3	10.6	11.5	30.6	17.9	15.4	26.3	53.4
M187	-17.7	81.4	51	10.1	14.2	27.2	14.5	24.6	21.9	39.1
M188.01	-14.7	80.1	55	10.7	8.6	30.3	15.9	21.5	19.6	38.3
M188.02	-10.7	76.9	52.9	5.6	9.2	25.4	13.8	30.4	16.7	43.7
M189		56.4	40.3	9.1	2.8	26.2	13.9	0	18.3	26.4
M190	-16.3	79	59.6	7.5	7.3	25.3	9.5	6	10.2	36.1

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades9	LonFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M191	-0.1	80.1	57.2	6	7.6	18.9	9.8	1	7.7	26.1
M192	-10.2	77.4	53.1	11.5	11.8	22.8	19.7	6	13.2	74.6
M193	-10.8	79.1	51.5	4.7	13.6	26.9	8.3	12.9	15.4	44.8
M194	12.9	81.7	52.8	7.2	9	24.7	15.3	0.3	19.9	35.5
M195.01	20.6	69.7	48.3	4.3	8.5	30.4	10.5	2.4	12.8	36.9
M195.02	42.1	80.3	60.8	4.3	8.4	22.6	10.9	1.1	10	30.7
M196	-20.2	74	53.9	4.8	10.3	20.2	13.1	9.1	15.6	34.6
M197	-21.7	74.8	54.8	8.8	9	33.2	13.4	3.6	12.7	41.8
M198	-14.7	74.3	50.9	6.5	9.2	26.2	14.7	5.8	16.2	47.2
M199	-19.1	70.5	48.4	9.4	12.4	29.1	14.4	21.5	20.8	43.7
M200	-19.1	74.2	51.9	9.3	15.9	31.6	15.2	11	18.4	52
M201	-9.4	72.7	47.5	12	11.4	29	17.8	9	23.7	49.8
M202	-19.9	70.1	46.3	9.1	9	31.4	14.5	18.9	16.7	46.2
M203	-23.3	68.1	51.1	8.7	9.8	33	12.1	59.5	16	48.7
M204	-22.8	73.9	47.5	10.8	6.6	30.9	14	60.3	16.2	47.5
M205	-22.1	76.3	46	9.5	7.9	38.9	9.9	64.3	14.8	44.6
M206	-20.4	75.1	41.3	5.7	13.5	36.3	9.7	66.7	21.3	52.9
M207	-20.8	75.1	49.7	8.7	12.3	40.1	14.3	46	21.1	57
M208	-29	71.1	45.7	14	14.7	37.6	15.3	66.3	22.9	59.4
M209	-22.5	72.7	45.4	9.2	8.5	39.9	15.8	39.2	21.6	51.1
M210	-27.2	73.7	45.5	12.9	9.6	34.5	21	51.3	29.9	54
M211	-24.9	73	47.8	16.8	16	34.9	21.7	74	25.7	49.5
M212	-29	73.4	50.4	13.7	7.6	31.4	12.9	68.9	15.7	64.7
M213	-25.9	79.3	45.6	9.3	10.2	35.4	13.1	69.4	24	52.6
M214	-26.9	68.3	43	10.6	14.6	38.2	17.8	78.6	34.6	66.8
M215	-35.9	74.4	43	16	13.5	37.7	18	81.3	22.6	45.4
M216	-32.6	71	46	12.8	21.8	39	20.7	73.6	37.8	61.4
M217	-23.8	66.8	45.8	12.1	20.2	42.7	21.2	7.7	41.2	60.7
M218	-12	71.5	46.5	11.5	12.6	42.5	21.2	65.9	27.7	54.4
M219	-24	71.4	46.6	10.6	10.2	45.3	18.8	69.5	43	49.1
M220	-12.3	76.5	47.4	10.5	12.8	47.9	12.5	28.9	43.7	59.9
M221	-12.3	71.9	45.5	12.8	15.5	42.6	11	23.6	37.5	65.1
M222	-8.9	77.1	48.1	11.1	12.8	44.4	7	24.9	25.8	60.1
M223.01	-7	79.5	49.1	10.7	10.2	44	12.1	8.4	37	40.4
M223.02	-9.7	69.5	45.2	7.4	5.3	40.8	12	10.3	26.3	55.8
M224	-12.3	73.5	43.2	7.3	14.4	48.7	12.1	18.3	35	62

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M225	-19.5	77.9	50.3	5.7	10.4	28.9	10.7	1.5	10.8	41
M226	-22.9	78.2	48.1	6.1	9.7	30.7	11.7	67.5	18.4	45.1
M227	-28	78.7	51.1	7	14.1	35.7	12.6	73.5	10.9	49.7
M228	-22	72.9	48.1	8.8	11.5	32.8	9.8	75.6	9.4	42.4
M230	-24.1	75	58.4	5.2	9.3	36.6	14.1	69.1	19.4	39.1
M231	-19.4	72.8	53.5	10.6	14	37.3	14.5	74.7	26.7	45.6
M232	-23.4	72	48.2	14.9	13.4	37.7	17.3	70.3	27.8	59.5
M233	-20	80.7	54.1	12.6	12.3	28.7	14.6	60.4	27	55
M234	-25.4	68.5	50.3	17.4	17.6	39.5	15.8	58.5	34.1	64.6
M235	-27.6	75.7	52.9	12.9	11.8	35.4	12.5	76.5	21.8	59
M236	-19.3	68.5	41.8	11.7	3.9	36.7	16.8	58	22.4	59.6
M237	-26.7	75.3	47.5	10.3	10	31.6	16.7	85.9	18.8	47.1
M238	-24.6	79.8	53.2	12.1	7.7	32.4	13.4	56.4	16.2	48.7
M239	-16.5	71.7	49.3	11.2	2.9	28.4	17.4	19.2	21.4	51.7
M240	-22.7	67.9	49.4	12.4	12.8	40.1	19.7	8.9	23.6	51.9
M241	-25	75.4	51.3	12.1	9.2	42.1	13.5	9.4	24.4	53.4
M242	-22.8	73.9	49.8	9.6	10	44.8	13.2	15.5	24.1	52
M243	-21.6	72.5	47	8.3	8.8	39.2	17.8	7.2	28.9	47.6
M244	-24.5	74.6	51.5	7.8	7.6	30.7	18.4	29.6	23.6	47.1
M245	-26.2	70.7	48.6	17.2	12.9	33.5	16.8	52.2	22.7	60.8
M246	-28.8	65.8	46.5	19.5	6.8	36.1	22.7	70.6	32.1	43.7
M247	-28.8	67.8	43.7	5	12	41.1	12.4	73.4	23.4	57.6
M248	-19.8	70.9	47.8	13.4	9.2	41.9	12.6	37	25.1	55.3
M249	-18.9	74.2	49.3	7.8	11.5	38.2	11.4	23	21.4	45.1
M250	-21.5	78.1	55.4	7.1	7.8	39.4	12.4	16.4	22.9	58.5
M251.01	-5	75.3	47.3	6.1	6.7	39.8	13.6	5.8	21.3	49
M251.02	-12.8	77.2	55.5	9.2	13.7	37.6	16.4	19.8	24	42.8
M252	-20.8	72.3	47.8	11.4	13.1	36.8	17.3	18	26.7	57.8
M253	-25.3	83	49.8	9.4	14.2	40.2	15.8	3.4	19	51.7
M254	-21.3	78.8	51.9	9.1	5.7	28.6	14.5	6.5	20.3	46.6
M255	-20.6	79.2	49.4	8.7	14	38.4	10.6	20.7	18.2	40.7
M256	-21.3	75.5	51.7	7.1	15.9	38.7	13.1	12.3	27.4	43
M257	-15.9	83.6	57.5	9.2	8.9	38.2	12.3	0.7	20.8	48.6
M258	-5.5	70.2	46	12.4	16	33.8	22.8	11.2	32.4	53.2
M259	-19.5	77.2	50	7.9	13.9	36.4	21.4	4.3	32.9	53.2
M260	-12	79.3	52.6	8.7	13.6	34.1	16.5	1.9	27.7	46.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M261	-16.5	83.5	50.6	6.6	9	36	12.9	1.9	22.3	62.1
M262	-18.9	74.3	50.8	9.7	14.1	40.2	12.8	1.8	24	64.4
M263	-18.8	81.4	55.2	7.5	10.9	40.1	8	3.6	19.8	50.1
M264	45.8	72.4	48	9.3	10.4	21	15.7	0	14	50.7
M265	-23.6	75.7	54.4	7.2	9.4	28.9	11.7	22.8	10.1	41.8
M266	-17.3	73.6	47.3	9.9	8.2	33.4	13.8	17.7	18.5	50.7
M267	-22.7	73.4	54	5.6	6.1	43.8	9.1	6.1	18.1	44.4
M268	23.6	86.2	64.9	1.2	6	14.8	13.8	0	13.6	33
M269	-9	77.5	58.8	6.9	8.5	21.8	16.7	4.3	21.5	39.7
M270	-19	76.7	58.9	9	8.5	21.6	9.2	11.6	14	41.1
M271	-24.5	75.8	50.9	9.8	10.5	29.2	9.6	18.7	11.2	36.1
M272	-4	78.4	57.1	9.3	8.8	19.3	13.7	3.5	18.3	32.9
M273	-19.8	76.8	56.1	7.8	6	34.1	11	5.5	17.6	46.5
M274	-18.3	78.9	55.1	5.5	9.2	37.5	9.8	1.5	11.2	44.5
M275	-18.3	75.1	55.3	6.9	10	27.2	13.2	9.8	14.9	44.2
M276	-14.7	75.3	55.8	7.4	9.2	24.5	13.4	12.1	16.7	46
M277	-6.3	78.9	55.2	6.4	9.3	21.7	14.9	7.7	22.2	41.2
M278	-25.5	78.6	51.9	8.3	7.9	22.1	12.7	25.2	11.7	41.3
M279	-16	76.9	56	8	12.6	17.5	12.8	28.9	14.5	41.8
M280	-15.9	77.6	58.9	7.7	9.7	17.8	11.9	7.6	8.4	35.3
M281	-17.9	75.9	54.6	9	6.8	18.9	12.1	13.3	6.9	38.4
M282	-11.2	76.6	52.3	6.4	7.6	24.1	10.2	13.6	12.5	33.9
M283.01	-3.1	78.2	55.5	7.7	8.2	21.8	9.6	0.5	15.9	37.9
M283.02	-8.6	78.9	51.6	9.9	10.8	20.2	10.6	2.6	13.1	49
M284	-13.1	72.7	44.6	6.8	4.8	17.6	9.6	6.9	10.2	37.8
M285	-8.8	75.9	59.3	7.1	4.5	16.9	13.6	11.4	15.1	36.5
M286	-6.6	76.3	56.1	8.3	7.3	15.6	14.1	2.5	14.8	31.9
M287	12.1	78.3	55.1	8.9	12.9	21.4	13.5	11.5	21.1	41.2
M288	154.5	68.2	31.2	6.7		24	6.8	5.5	5.8	47.6
Savannah 1980										
S0001	34.9	57.4	42	18.8	23	34.7	63.3	69.4	72.2	69.7
S0003	9.9	47.8	46.3	5.6	3.2	16.9	5.4	81	20	22.5
S0006.01	-27.3	55.7	39.9	12.4	15.6	43.8	28.3	39	43.8	65.2
S0006.02		53	36.9	3.6	16.7	49.1	12.7	44	28.8	42.4
S0008	-13.2	89.6	75.6	5.3	5.4	9.1	9.3	95.3		12.3
S0009	23.2	85.4	47.7	1.5	2.3	10.4	7.2	73.8	7.3	17

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
S0010	-22.6	47.2	33.5	11.5	39.8	61.2	22.8	41.1	40.4	65.5
S0011	-70.9	68.6	39.3	5.5	10.3	43.6	21.4	68.5	48.1	52.4
S0012	62.7	30.1	40	9.9	17.4	32.3	61.9	1.1	68.1	76.3
S0013	-28.9	71.6	33.4	12.2	11	45	22.2	77.4	27.9	51.7
S0015	-11.3	77.3	43.3	1.6	4.2	20.9	19.3	77.2	34.9	25
S0017	-24.8	72.8	30.7	9.6	19.6	52.4	25.5	55	47.1	40.7
S0018	-18.1	50.5	28.6	12.8	12.3	64.5	25.1	65.1	58	55.2
S0019	-22.7	66.5	45.3	17.9	5	36	31.1	57.4	51	55.4
S0020	-25.8	65.4	42.3	5.2	19.9	50.1	24.4	70.2	44	56.6
S0021	5.9	70.3	46.5	6.5	16.2	31.5	23.8	51.7	27.2	43.4
S0022	6.8	72.6	48.1	10.1	14.1	20.9	23.1	28.7	27.7	33.5
S0023	-12.4	58.6	44.3	11.8	10.6	33.7	23.2	52	28.2	45.5
S0024	-14.7	68.8	41.4	6.1	10.1	36.6	26.6	46.5	36.2	47.2
S0025	-29	60.4	50.8	6.5	16.9	27.6	9.6	49.2	17.4	16
S0026	13.6	66.3	57.1	9.7	10	30.4	21.8	47.4	20.9	22.6
S0027	30.3	73.6	52	7	15.7	20.7	19.1	43.2	15	30.7
S0028	-7.9	58.6	42	4.3	12.3	30.7	16.9	28	21.6	43.7
S0029	-10.1	76.6	48.8	1.4	1.9	6.3	3.4	62.4	1.1	11.9
S0030	-11.5	71.6	43	3.5	1.2	11.3	5.2	62.5	3.1	10.5
S0032	1.9	68.2	37.9	15.5	9.9	39	16.3	31.7	29.6	47.1
S0033.01		64.7	48.8	14.1	12.1	37.2	15.3	22.3	31	43.7
S0033.02		76.9	60	3.9	14	15.8	12.5	2.3	6.4	25.6
S0034	-14.7	65.1	42.5	4.4	10.1	19.7	6.8	22.2	10.1	23.2
S0035.01	-10	71.3	47	3.3	9.9	23.5	7.5	21.6	14.2	38.4
S0035.02	-12.1	78.5	46.3	3.6	5.2	11.4	6.1	8.8	4.4	6.8
S0036.01	-9	70.7	46.5	7.8	12.6	31.6	14.7	31	21.5	48.8
S0036.02	0.6	76.2	46.4	5.3	4.7	19	11.6	26.8	9.8	25.9
S0037	-15.1	59.9	37.9	5.5	6.6	27.9	6.8	44	6.5	32.1
S0038	36.9	71.2	58.9	11.2	3.1	13.7	18.7	6.2	10.6	46.7
S0039	-3.8	77.7	53.1	4.3	4.4	10.5	7.5	2.9	1.7	14.4
S0040.01		74.9	48.4	5.4	5.5	7.9	5.8	4.8	0.9	19.8
S0040.02		73.7	48.9	5	4.8	10.8	8.3	3.5	4.8	7.1
S0042.02	51.3	87.3	58.2	2.6	8.2	7.6	11.4	2.1	6.8	16.2
S0042.03		88.5	59.8	2.5	3.5	6.2	8.1	1	4.6	14.4
S0042.04		87	61.1	2	8.2	3.5	6.2	1.8	3.1	29.2
S0043	-18.4	99	43.4	0	18	2.9	3	7.5	8.4	100

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
S0044	52.1	61.8	59.2	2.9	17.5	26.6	19.8	8.2	26.3	24.4
S0045	-24.2	67.9	50.9	12.7	15.5	30.8	12.4	18.2	24.4	39.2
S0101.01	-16	52.2	28.8	17.9	29.1	45.7	58.1	41.8	70	63.3
S0108.04		68.2	44.1	8.7	11.5	40.9	13.2	38.2	15	49.3
S0109	20.9	83.9	64.6	17	10.2	15.1	10.9	4.2	9.4	15.3
Lincoln 1980										
L0001	-4.3	75	48.3	8.2	5.4	16	7.1	44.9	10.2	24.6
L0002.01	-16.6	82.8	60.9	6.3	3	8.9	5.1	16	1.4	11.5
L0002.02	-10.1	64.7	63.7	6.3	1.9	8.6	13.8	30.7	10.1	24.4
L0003	5	81.7	62.3	6.9	4.7	12.8	9.5	30.5	12.1	35.5
L0004	-1.1	71.6	62.7	6.9	5.8	17.6	15.6	60.9	15.9	31.8
L0005	-16.3	79.7	46.7	2.8	0	22.8	8.5	73.9	15	43.6
L0007	8	63.4	54.5	13.2	8.8	18.7	27.6	38.4	42.5	43.3
L0008	-11.1	79.2	62.5	10	8.1	20.1	15.2	68	16.1	25
L0009	-7	75.8	58.1	2.3	1.6	6.9	5.3	36	7.6	28.7
L0010	-5.5	81.9	69.7	3.5	2.1	7.8	6.2	10	3.3	17.2
L0011	73.2	89.3	70.4	3.9	3.7	3.2	6.1	10.2	1.4	18.9
L0012	-18.3	83.6	69.6	2.5	1.7	3.3	5.8	2.8	1	11.2
L0013	-0.3	79.2	47.7	2	1.8	5.1	3.4	3.5	2.1	8.6
L0014	-12	72.3	52.9	2.3	2.7	6.7	6.6	20.3	2.9	18.4
L0015	-13.7	75.2	53.1	3.3	2	7.3	6	25.3	2.1	19.3
L0016	-15.4	78.1	60.1	5.4	1.8	8	8.1	61.4	7.3	21.5
L0017	7.2	73.9	65.8	3.8	2.5	9.3	10.4	37.8	8.3	30.7
L0018	-27.3	73	62	5.3	5.3	22.8	16.1	59.3	7.2	27.5
L0019	-43	48.3	50.9	13	3.7	25.7	15.1	82.9	24.5	32.5
L0020	-5.9	77.8	70.7	4.8	2.5	9.3	12	45.7	13.3	27.4
L0021	-8.3	73.2	54.2	11.3	0	24.3	10.2	72.6	10.9	24.5
L0022	-7.9	75.8	55.8	6.6	3.9	15.7	10.9	63.6	4.4	22.8
L0023	-10.7	76.1	62.5	3.8	4.9	8	7.9	71.8	8.3	21.9
L0024	-6.9	81.7	55.8	1.6	3.3	2.3	4.5	70.1	3.4	2
L0025	2.8	82.1	60.1	1.6	2.4	3.6	4.4	22.5	1.7	11.7
L0027.01	-2	82.7	72.1	3.7	2	10.4	11.5	28.2	4.6	17
L0027.02	44.2	87.4	67.4	1.4	1	4.1	5.1	5	4.7	13
L0028	-16.6	79.6	55.9	2.2	2.9	5.7	5.9	25	2.1	17
L0029	41.5	82.8	75.3	3.6	1.5	10.8	10.4	4	6.5	14.2
L0030	58.8	84.8	69.8	5.4	5.2	10.7	8.8	5.8	5.1	25.4

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade8	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
L0031.01	429.7	92.2	71	5	5.2	13.4	11.2	7.6	4.7	17.1
L0032.02		94.1	70.2	6.1	2.8	6.6	24.4	11.5	15.5	14.3
L0033	33.7	85.7	55.9	2.5	4.4	9	12.6	13.7	7.6	12.6
L0034	419.8	61	74.1	3.4	4.1	6.8	6.9	9.2	3.4	10.3
L0036.03		90.4	76.3	2	1.8	0.4	6.7	0	2.2	16.7
L0037.01	431.9	92	75.8	1.6	1.3	1.5	7.2	0	3.6	13
L0037.02		92.1	64.8	2.2	1.8	3.3	3.5	1.1	1.2	9.8
L0037.03		89.3	71.4	0.6	0	0	2.1	0	3.9	60
L0038.01	204.7	85.6	59.9	2.6	2.7	1	5	0	0.5	4.2
L0038.02	-9.4	84.2	55.4	0.4	0	2.7	5.4	0.8	2.6	2.6
				Toledo 1980						
T0002	-12.7	80.4	49.8	7.2	9	9.6	5.1	65.3	3.1	4.2
T0003	-10.6	82.1	51.9	11.7	5.8	10.7	11.2	57.9	6.8	11.7
T0004	-9.1	79	54.2	17.2	6	12.5	7.4	68.3	3.9	15.6
T0006	-15.2	66.1	50.4	13	6.9	12.4	6.7	80	2.1	15.1
T0007	-9.7	78	49.1	7.6	6.7	15.9	7.4	62.7	3.7	15.5
T0008	-16.9	74.1	60.5	12	25.1	21.3	2.8	78.2	21.9	23.7
T0009	-12	72.7	45.8	19.6	19.8	27.5	9.6	85.9	9.4	28.7
T0010	-16.9	69.2	40.2	15.7	6	29.1	6.7	71.1	4.1	19.5
T0011	-18.5	73.7	51.4	16.3	14.7	19.9	12.3	61	6.4	15.8
T0012.01	-31.1	83.4	51.2	12.5	14.4	11.3	12.5	9.8	7.9	18.1
T0012.02		58.4	35.2	25.6	21	28.3	26.4	46.6	26.3	35.8
T0013.01	-6.9	73.7	46	2.7	7.9	3.6	2.2	55.5	1.8	15.6
T0013.02	2.2	71.1	42.3	10.4	6.9	11.6	7.1	20.3	10.5	14.9
T0013.03	-18.1	78.6	49.4	7	8	9.4	5.7	58.1	4.7	16.1
T0013.04	38.6	34.2	47.9	10.4	3.2	11.7	2.7	30.2		24.9
T0014	-8.6	75.6	56.6	9	16.9	16.9	29.5	71.2	18.3	24.1
T0015	-18.1	71.5	48.8	14.7	18.6	23.4	26.2	72.3	22.7	35.5
T0016	-15.3	65.3	55	21.9	18.8	14.4	27.1	84.9	19.8	24.1
T0017	-17.6	69.8	41.8	35.5	17.6	27.7	17.3	68.7	23.7	31.4
T0018	-11.3	74.1	42	17.5	20.4	28.9	15.4	92.1	15.7	29.1
T0019	-15.9	67.1	46.4	20.8	21.2	28.7	19.6	69	26.9	22.9
T0020	-10.9	73.6	37.6	20.3	16.9	26.5	15.5	89.7	21.8	26.2
T0021	-17.7	71.9	53.9	16.1	8.4	16.4	25.8	84.7	22.3	28.9
T0022	-35.2	55.5	41.2	27.8	25.6	26.9	42.5	73.6	47.2	55
T0023	-46.5	51.3	26.5	29.2	32.1	43.7	41.5	51.3	59.6	43.1

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Graded	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
T0024.01	-12	74.2	56.8	11.9	7.7	8.8	9.4	58	4.4	16.6
T0024.02	-17.1	66.1	51.7	17.9	12.2	19.5	22.3	69.8	15.8	29.1
T0025	-27.7	63.5	47.9	31.6	24.5	29	30.1	79.5	33.4	49.7
T0026	-33.9	62	41.1	22.1	22.4	31.5	24.5	77.5	23.1	46.9
T0027	-35.8	57.2	32	20.5	27	27.3	31.2	61.4	45.6	35.8
T0028	-38	25.6	17.8	16.5	25.4	28.3	22.4	74.5	65.1	51.9
T0029	4.7	52.3	25	34.1	28.3	41.1	30.2	55.6	48.1	52.7
T0030	-18.1	67.5	35.2	26.8	28.1	36.1	27.9	88.3	30.8	43.1
T0031	-19.3	63.4	52.2	18.8	11.5	26	16.6	69.9	12.2	34.8
T0032	-16.6	65.8	43.2	35	15.2	27.2	26.1	77.3	30.4	48.2
T0033	-25.5	60.3	49	36.6	27.1	33.1	27.8	70.7	32.7	46.2
T0034	-50.8	54.6	28	34	42.6	44.6	52.1	60.3	64.9	64.8
T0035	-12.2	70.4	45.1	28	25.2	41.6	24.5	76.3	20.6	31
T0036	-23.2	61.6	46.1	30	11.8	34.8	27.3	83	23.5	44.6
T0037	6.7	39.9	26.6	35.1	25.3	41.5	53.8	65.2	66.7	58.3
T0038	-37.5	69	41.3	21.1	21.8	34.1	20.2	76	30	41.7
T0039	-13	76.2	45.3	13.2	8.5	16.9	9.9	65.2	9.5	22.5
T0040	-14.7	71.8	44.1	21.2	16.9	24.2	15	82.9	13.9	42.8
T0041	-14.5	72.3	37.1	29.4	16.2	33.1	20	88.4	26.2	38.5
T0042	-19.8	74.6	42.4	20.2	15.1	25.7	16.5	86.9	25.9	19.3
T0043.02	-15.5	76	48.5	4.9	2.8	13.9	6.4	54.7	3	14.3
T0044	-9.8	77.6	49.7	13.2	3	12.9	6.6	83.5	3.5	17.8
T0045.01	-10.7	83.5	50.4	11.8	3.4	7.3	9.4	82.5	3.6	22.8
T0045.03	-16.3	71.7	51.2	10.3	2.3	8.7	5.4	19.7	0.5	5.2
T0045.04	-15.4	76.8	42.7	4.4	6.7	5.3	3.1	36.2	0.5	8.2
T0046	-14.7	71.4	42.9	19	12.3	3.3	11	79	11.8	28.1
T0047.01	-16.7	69.2	47.8	20	10.4	26.8	18.1	66.4	20.9	23.5
T0047.02	-1.7	76.3	40.6	17.7	11.2	23.6	14.3	59.4	15	27.9
T0048	-13	74.6	49.5	20	15.2	22.7	13.9	83.4	16.9	19.9
T0049	-8.3	73.9	40.1	19.8	8.3	17.3	12.8	85.5	9.2	21.7
T0050	-3.1	72.8	43.4	18.5	6.3	28.5	8.7	70.7	8.9	27.1
T0051	-12.8	71.8	39.4	19.3	15.3	25	20.7	84	22	33
T0052	-12.9	75.2	41.2	18.1	6.8	24.7	7.9	66.8	4.2	24.2
T0053	-15.6	75.9	45.3	16.7	11.4	29.5	11.5	68.5	8.9	27.7
T0054	-12.1	73.3	42.5	22.5	10.8	24.9	15.2	86.4	18.7	27.9
T0055.01	-13.9	76.9	48.7	14.2	17.1	10.7	8.6	45.8	8.7	17

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndiPov
T0055.02	-11.8	73.9	39.2	12.2	10.9	16.2	5.2	47.3	5.2	10.5
T0055.03	-6.6	77.6	52.5	10.8	6.7	12.2	4.4	12	2.1	11.5
T0056	44.9	84.7	53.2	7.2	3.1	6.8	7	1	1.1	12.6
T0057.01	9.4	85.1	62.5	11.2	10.2	9.4	11.1	3.6	6.5	10.8
T0057.02	2.2	77.3	53.6	10.6	9	15.9	7.5	15.8	4.8	16
T0057.03	-10.3	70.4	46.6	12.6	2.3	19.4	4.7	44.6	2.9	17.2
T0058.01	32.3	86.7	61.3	8.7	12.9	10.2	6.8	12.1	7.5	10.6
T0058.02	-8.9	76.5	54.7	11.5	5	12.9	6.1	16.1	0.9	14.1
T0059.01	6.1	82.7	56	10.7	7	11.2	5	19.7	2.6	16.3
T0059.02	-3.7	78	47.8	11.2	8.6	14.8	9.5	15.8	6.7	16.2
T0060	-12.2	78.5	48.1	4.7	4.5	8.7	4.5	7.2	2.1	11.6
T0061	-15.8	79.4	55	9.1	4.1	11	4.2	39.7	3	8.9
T0062	-11.1	75	58.3	7.7	7.8	10.1	5.3	50.9	3.4	9.9
T0063	-13.4	78.8	57.4	8.1	3.5	5.4	6.2	58.2	3	9.5
T0064	-10.1	77.7	52.6	5.8	4.5	3	3.8	53.4	1.5	8.9
T0065	-15.9	72	46.5	7.7	4.6	9.7	9.4	25.8	5.8	16.5
T0066	-10.7	66.3	49.7	15	12	27.6	10	30.9	6.6	28.5
T0067	-19.2	66.3	50.9	15.3	7.9	30.9	6.7	42.9	4	11.6
T0068	54.1	73.5	53.6	7.7	8.7	17.4	15.1	9.1	7.6	21.9
T0069	-42	77.4	46.2	10.5	4.7	14.2	4.6	22.9	3.9	9.9
T0072.02	9.2	83.7	55.6	4	6.4	4.8	3.9	2.1	2.5	13.2
T0072.03	6.6	82.3	53.9	7.3	5.5	4.3	4.1	0.5	0.8	11.6
T0072.04		93.7	69.7	3.4	8.7	1.8	5.3	1.2	3.3	10
T0072.05		83.6	61.5	3.4	6.7	8.2	10.4	1	3.7	10.7
T0073	152.9	87.9	62.6	12.2	8.2	12	12.3	4.9	4.1	20.1
T0074	52	80.1	58.2	15.7	12.2	12.5	7.9	8.4	4.1	23
T0075	4.2	72	46.8	6.4	5.5	7	3.9	14.9	5.5	32
T0077	-13.2	87.6	42.3	2.1	2.8	4.5	4.3	4.7	2	30.5
T0078	-8.4	75.1	51	7	7	10.5	6.8	8.2	3.2	18.8
T0079.01	-10.7	83.1	50.6	11.6	8.5	11.6	5.6	15.9	1.5	20.5
T0079.02	6.1	85.6	56.5	10.9	8.6	11	5.2	9.5	4.3	12.1
T0080	518.4	83.9	39.7	7.2	0	9.3	10.4	7.7	4.5	16.5
T0083.01	10.7	86.4	40.6	5.4	2.6	7.2	5.2	3.4	2.4	18
T0083.02	-18.4	79.1	3.7	3.6	2.8	7.1	1.3	2.9	4.3	
T0085	-5.5	83.3	57.6	10.9	6.7	11.9	4.5	16.4	3.4	38.6
T0086	4.4	80.4	52.7	8.9	8.6	16.4	5.8	24.5	3	17.8

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	Portland 1980				OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
				UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem			
P0001	-12.3	77.2	52.5	7.5	5.4	11.8	11.7	70	7	21.3
P0002	-3.7	68.3	48.7	8.8	4.1	17.3	7.2	47.8	6.7	21.8
P0003.01	38.4	71.5	58.2	2.5	2	8.9	6.2	21.4	3.4	19.7
P0003.02	-14	78	52.5	6.6	0.8	4.5	5.9	57.2	3.7	15.5
P0004.01	-9.2	75.3	47.3	6.2	3.9	10.1	7.1	50.4	6.9	21.5
P0004.02	-2.7	77.5	53.2	7	10.2	14.7	8.8	47.5	4.6	16.9
P0005.01	-6.1	74.4	50.1	6.3	7.3	16.1	12.8	54.1	8.2	13.2
P0005.02	-3.2	71.9	48	10.7	8.4	18.1	10.9	45.9	8.9	12.3
P0006.01	-13.9	81.2	52.3	7.3	10.3	17	11.6	37.8	12	15.1
P0006.02	-1.8	81.6	51.7	7.3	4	16.2	14	44.2	13.1	16.7
P0007.01	-2.6	73.1	52.2	6.1	4.5	13.1	7.4	30.4	7.9	8.3
P0007.02	-8.7	76.8	54.2	10.3	3.7	15.9	10.2	52.3	6.9	9.9
P0008.01	-10.9	73.7	49.4	5.7	5.5	13.4	9.1	50.5	6.5	9.7
P0008.02	-6.4	78.8	57.4	8.9	4.1	13	12.3	43.3	5.8	9.3
P0009.01	-14.7	75.3	56.5	7.3	5	14.2	13.2	62.4	8.2	13.7
P0009.02	-15.7	75.6	64.6	7	4.5	11.9	17.3	36	7.9	12.1
P0010	-8.5	81.4	59.5	10.2	5.7	13.7	16.1	60.3	15.7	17.7
P0011.01	-28.1	75.5	65.2	14	4.8	12.4	19.1	82.3	17.4	23
P0011.02	-19.8	79.2	52.4	6.3	14	19.6	7.7	91.6	16.2	22.4
P0012.01	-7.6	82.8	61.5	11.9	9.2	10.8	17.4	60.2	17.3	22.8
P0012.02	-5.4	75.3	54.2	11.4	3.9	13.8	5.2	74.5	2.9	24.7
P0013.01	-8.2	77.3	54.8	16.3	9.3	16.5	14.9	75	10.3	25.7
P0013.02	-11.8	71.3	57.7	9.7	7	11.9	9.4	88.4	3.4	12.6
P0014	-10.3	73.4	52.5	6.4	2.9	12.2	10.2	73.3	6.7	20.4
P0015	-10.1	80	48.3	7	0.7	5.4	7.7	82.2	3.1	20.7
P0016.01	-12.3	75	53.3	4.8	5.3	11.4	7.3	42.9	5.2	18
P0016.02	-23.3	78.2	57.2	4.6	10.4	11.6	7.7	37	5.5	23.5
P0017.01	-12	76.8	46.6	4.9	5.5	11.2	8.2	56.6	5.3	24.8
P0017.02	-4.3	73.6	59.4	4.4	4.8	9.8	9.9	32.9	5.6	22.6
P0018.01	-7.2	75	49.3	3.2	1.5	12.4	9.7	47.8	5.3	13.5
P0018.02	-3.2	70.4	53	3.6	3	9.5	6.9	51.2	7.8	13.4
P0019	-17	81.7	56.7	3.7	2.8	5.4	7.2	84.6	3.3	15.2
P0020	-6.6	80.3	62.5	10.4	6	13	14.3	66.7	13.1	25.1
P0021	-19	78.8	59.1	2.8	14	17.9	15.8	75.2	9.5	29.2
P0022.01	-66.3	85.6	46.3	20	7.1	13	24.3	75.4	17.4	24.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P0022.02	-61	63.5	67.9	0	0	21.4	3.8	96.9	15.9	8.6
P0023.01	3.2	62.6	47	17.5	10.4	27.2	26.3	66.5	23.8	42.8
P0023.02	-13.9	45.3	27.1	9.3	14.7	18.2	16.5	47.3	25.9	30.5
P0024.01	-14.8	82.7	60.9	14.2	8.6	10.3	14.8	88.8	7.1	26.6
P0024.02	-5.8	71.6	48.8	5.2	6.9	10.4	12.2	42.1	7.6	21.8
P0025.01	-13.6	80.8	55.3	4.6	6.8	3.6	7.8	92.5	0.4	13.6
P0025.02	-6.8	79.4	53.4	3.2	2.7	9.6	8.8	59.3	7.5	16.8
P0026	-13.8	75.7	55.7	5.3	5.5	7.3	7.9	92.1	5	18.7
P0027.01	-12.7	80.4	55.5	5.9	4.5	5.6	5.3	93.1	2.9	15.3
P0027.02	-9.7	68.8	33.5	6.3	8.6	16.7	8.6	49.2	12.4	25.1
P0028.01	-13.6	74	54.1	7.1	0.5	8.8	6.8	8.7	1.5	15.6
P0028.02	-16.5	73.5	53.4	3.7	5.2	8.4	8.6	64.6	4.6	6.7
P0029.01	-9.8	75.7	48.4	4.1	2.1	13.4	7.1	62.5	2.8	16.2
P0029.02	-1.3	73.2	51.8	10.5	5.5	13.4	9.1	58.7	8	17.7
P0029.03	-5.2	80.7	58.7	5	6.2	8.4	6.2	29.8	2.6	15
P0030	-14.1	71.6	47.8	5.4	3.5	10.9	5.4	64.4	3.1	11.9
P0031	-1.4	75.2	50.3	5.5	3.3	9.6	13.3	79.1	10.1	19.8
P0032	-4.5	73	59.6	12.6	9.3	10.7	20	72.4	10.1	19.8
P0033.01	-5.8	69.2	53.5	14.7	15.6	19.2	29.2	71.5	25.1	33.5
P0033.02	8.5	60.3	41.2	14.7	11.8	23.3	26	74.1	33.5	36.9
P0034.01	-5.6	67.4	41.9	14.4	7.3	25.6	29.8	61.4	32.7	31
P0034.02	3.5	59.3	42.9	20.5	16.5	27.7	31.7	73.1	42.2	42.8
P0035.01	-8.2	73.3	52	11.1	3.3	14.4	14.2	64.8	11.9	21.1
P0035.02	-10	68.3	52.3	6	10.7	10.3	10.3	76.4	15.5	18
P0036.01	-8.5	69.9	55.4	8.1	8.5	21.1	21.9	57.7	17.3	31.8
P0036.02	-11.1	73	52.9	8.4	8.3	10.7	14.4	52.8	12.2	19.8
P0036.03	-11.9	73.2	49.6	4.9	0	15.5	5.3	37.4	4	19.4
P0037.01	-7.8	69.6	48.5	10.1	12.3	17.1	14.7	65.8	13.6	16.7
P0037.02	-7.6	71.4	59.3	6.8	9.8	10.2	16.4	70.2	11.3	27
P0038.01	-20.2	61.3	47.6	11	14.3	15.6	9.8	71.2	7.3	24.5
P0038.02	-5	63.6	43.9	5.7	3.2	13	8.2	66.5	9	16.2
P0038.03	2.7	72.6	44.4	15.2	10.6	13.8	12	66.5	12	18.4
P0039.01	-7.3	72	47.9	13.9	9.1	15.9	13.1	38.4	11.6	23.4
P0039.02	-5.3	68.3	47.5	17.4	3.3	10.8	7.2	69.7	5	6.4
P0040.01	5.9	70.4	42.7	14	12.8	17.9	24.3	36.2	26.8	29.2
P0040.02	-10.1	64.3	45.5	10	4.8	13.2	5.1	52.4	4.8	29.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P0041.01	10.2	75.5	50.8	7.1	7.2	15.1	15.9	34.8	11.4	28.4
P0041.02	-7.3	74.5	69.7	6.3	5.5	19.3	10.1	50.6	7	20.9
P0042	-3.8	69	38.7	16.1	9.2	21.5	15.2	48.8	14.9	35.6
P0043	-3.4	82	46.5	16.5	5.2	12.7	5.6	65.4	5.9	30.2
P0045	-25.6	71.8	60.9	11.1	6.7	14.4	17.4	63.3	16.2	33.1
P0046.01	-3.3	72.9	45.3	3.9	0.9	0.9	3.1	61.8	1	12.3
P0046.02	-6.1	82.2	56.4	3.8	5.1	1	7.7	75	1.3	11
P0047	-9.1	75.1	61.9	4.6	4.4	9.3	13	72.4	5.8	19.8
P0048	-16.2	66.7	57.5	6.6	3.3	12.5	11.1	74.5	15.7	20.6
P0049	-15.2	68.5	43.6	12.7	9.1	20.5	17.6	70	13.6	35.3
P0050	-26.6	74.4	77.7	8.4	0	14	30.9	92	22.9	25.5
P0051	-6.5	52.7	48.8	33.8	29.5	33.6	7.7	90.2	24.7	56.1
P0052	-1	60.2	46.1	12.6	3.8	11.2	3.8	61.5	8.8	22.5
P0053	-3.1	61.6	56.3	27.2	26.1	23	11.1	91.8	5.9	38.7
P0054	-54.8	21.8	36.7	11.2	0	40.7	7.7	93.1		63.7
P0055	11.8	75.2	65.4	10.9	4.3	3.4	9.5	56.7	3.2	21.3
P0056	1	65.9	50.5	5.7	3.4	7.7	6.8	49.4	22.7	35.6
P0057	44.7	69.2	50.8	1.4	2.7	5.3	3.2	12.6	2.9	12.7
P0058	-7.9	68.1	50	3.9	2.5	2.4	4.9	33.3	0.9	20.8
P0059	4.5	79.8	71.5	4.2	5.7	7.3	10.9	44.4	11.3	21
P0060.01	24.4	72.7	58	8.5	5.6	0.6	4.1	35		20.3
P0060.02	-13.7	77.7	63.4	4.4	0	4.1	4.7	21.5	3.3	13.6
P0061	-12.7	76.4	46.2	3.4	3.2	4.1	4.6	19.7	3	5.2
P0062	-1.4	76.7	52.9	1.5	4.4	5.8	5.1	38.8	1.4	22.8
P0063	-7.2	65.3	53.6	3.4	2.3	7.5	7.1	40.5	4.7	31.2
P0064.01		87.6	73.1	5.9	6.1	3.4	11.4	9.9	4	21.9
P0064.02		79.8	54.4	2.3	1.3	2.5	3.7	12.1	0.8	34.5
P0065.01	172.2	82.6	61.9	4.1	3.4	2.8	5	16.2	3.7	10.4
P0065.02	37.8	80.2	71.2	7.5	3.2	4.8	8.4	33.5	9.9	23.5
P0066.01	15.8	85.4	54.8	4.7	3	4.4	6	32.5	0.7	14.5
P0066.02	9.7	82	64.8	4.2	5.6	4	15.2	21.3	6.6	18.2
P0067.01	6.2	81.4	55.1	6.4	5.4	8	6.1	19.7	2.3	11.6
P0067.02	-44.6	77.5	60	3.6	1.6	2.1	7.4	19.3	1.4	10.5
P0068.01	11.5	85.9	58.1	2	5.8	3.6	7.5	11.1	9.8	30
P0068.02	24.8	79.9	62.9	1.8	4.3	2.1	8.7	9.5	4.3	15.8
P0069	10.1	75.5	46.5	1.7	5.5	0.7	4.6	31.4	2.7	5.9

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P0070	65.3	84.7	47.5	2.6	0	2.4	3.4	25.5		20.3
P0072	119.9	76.1	43.2	8.8	1.9	18.1	7.5	31.9	3.7	22.2
P0073	51.1	71.7	59.7	9.3	5.4	16.9	9.6	53.4	22.3	22.5
P0074	23.6	83.4	59.1	4.8	0	11.3	14.7	32.2	10.4	29.3
P0075	-4.8	70.8	56.2	9	13.7	21.9	12.2	28.2	7.3	24.5
P0083.01		75.6	65.9	9	0	12.5	8.9	37	4.4	31.5
P0083.02		81.7	46.3	0	0	7.9	0	10.1	5.7	26.3
P0087	136.5	78.3	27.2	0	0	11	6.3	32.4		31.3
P0088	94.2	40.9	26.3	0	0	25.6	0	100		
P0089	154.9	86	49.9	6.6	3.8	8.1	9.6	10.4	5	23.2
Baltimore 1990										
B0101	-11.5	66.9	38.3	7.7	11	41.5	9.2	97.4	11.3	30.6
B0102	-22.5	66.2	40.6	9.1	5.5	44.5	6.2	97.9	7.1	21.2
B0103	-16.6	68.4	34	3.3	2.4	47.6	7.1	97.6	8.8	38.2
B0104	-17	64	46.3	5.3	10	52.1	9.8	94.9	15.5	35.1
B0105	-20.8	67.9	42.9	8.8	10.4	46	14.1	95.3	13.1	40.1
B0201	-9.4	63.9	41.7	14.4	21	38.2	19.5	98.3	25.1	35.3
B0202	-24.6	61.4	39.5	8.5	7.3	41.9	15.1	95.9	31.9	22.3
B0203	-29.6	59.3	42.5	4.3	0	43.3	10.1	99.2	15.3	33.8
B0301	-24.2	47.2	31.7	27.1	20.3	42.5	56	71.9	54.5	72.6
B0302	-26.1	45.3	35.2	11.3	29.7	37.3	52.3	51.3	66.4	47.7
B0401	-24.7	49.2	67.7	5.6	14.7	17	10	28.4	18.4	23.8
B0402	-21	59.4	42.5	15.2	21.1	31.3	66.5	22	67.6	59.4
B0501	-19.5	48.3	40.5	27.3	31.5	36.9	70.9	24.3	71.3	58.8
B0601	-1.1	73.5	48.6	4.9	12	45.3	8.9	95.9	8.2	12.3
B0602	-13.9	69	38.5	7.2	9.5	43.7	13.3	94.5	12.1	29.1
B0603	-17.6	55.6	40.1	23.6	11.8	41.9	26.9	87.9	36.2	38.1
B0604	-4.7	45.7	46.3	14.2	17.7	40	41.4	39	34	52.5
B0605	-10.7	60.8	46	10.4	19	26.3	33.4	27.3	46.6	49.7
B0701	-15.5	64.6	38.2	8.5	9.6	40.8	12.1	95.5	7.3	21.1
B0702	0.4	67.9	43.1	13.7	16.7	40.1	25.6	88.6	18.8	35
B0703	-4.9	57.9	52	26.1	17.2	37.6	36.2	81.8	33.1	35.2
B0704	-27.8	52.4	38.6	15.8	19.1	44.7	42.5	74.2	52.4	57.7
B0801.01	-29.8	66.8	42.6	7.4	6.5	30	5.5	76.7	5.8	23.3
B0801.02	42.2	69.5	50.4	18.4	8.3	33.3	16	79.3	12	31.4
B0802	-24.3	58.8	41.6	21.9	17.7	40.1	33.6	74.6	39.1	53.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B0803.01	-33	62.3	44.6	14.9	10.9	37.7	25.8	77.6	26.5	63.4
B0803.02	-0.1	67.8	51.1	15.2	10.4	32.2	13.5	58.9	11.7	43.4
B0804	-17.3	61.2	43.6	23.2	23.3	38.1	36.8	83.7	37.4	35.6
B0805	-28.1	67	51.1	10.5	10.5	31.5	20.6	85.6	21.6	34.8
B0806	-10.9	56	46.5	24.5	12	37.8	28	85.4	32.8	46.8
B0807	-27.7	52.9	40.6	21.6	13.2	44.4	32.4	82.8	40.3	56
B0808	-12.9	55.8	37.2	23	12.6	37.7	36.3	71.5	35.5	63.1
B0901	13.5	75	56.3	14.5	12.3	22.2	21.4	53.7	16.4	36.1
B0902	9.4	58.5	48.3	4.8	3.9	17.1	7.9	46.2	2.7	16.1
B0903	-6.7	72.4	55.5	12.2	6.6	19.9	13.5	74.9	9.3	16.8
B0904	-12.5	63.4	52.9	4.8	4.6	29.2	26.9	62	18.2	30.5
B0905	-19.5	68	52.1	9.3	8.7	28.8	22.1	76.4	19.3	32.6
B0906	-5	71.9	57.3	9.6	17	30	28.5	81.3	18.9	46.2
B0907	-12.7	69.5	54.6	18.9	13.2	39.5	26.9	63.1	28.7	45.1
B0908	-20.6	63.5	44.7	26.1	12.2	34.7	25.3	84	27	52.5
B0909	-25.2	45.8	44.9	27.1	17.4	39.9	37.6	61.6	40.6	58.8
B1001	-26.5	55.3	39.6	20.1	14	48.7	34.4	72.8	53.3	62.6
B1002	-29.3	51	30.2	21.4	18	47.9	60.1	42.9	64.7	72.1
B1004	-42	51.7	45.7	31.2	28.4	34.9	38.6	84.2	45.8	61.6
B1101	7.5	78.9	65.3	11.4	4	9.4	10.3	79.2	12.6	21.3
B1102	25.8	66.9	55	7.3	3	18.2	6.8	69.8	12.5	33.1
B1201	2.5	72.2	45.4	2.3	0.6	4.3	3.3	48	1.2	14
B1202	-16.2	58.8	50.6	7.3	2.8	9.2	7.3	76.4	9	38.5
B1203	-4.5	69.5	50.1	7.5	10.6	26.1	26.5	76.4	22.5	37.5
B1204	-21.4	54.9	41.3	3.6	18.3	28.7	34.9	83.1	41.5	53.5
B1205	-33	57.3	28.4	23.1	16.2	39.9	34.9	74.6	55	61.9
B1206	8.7	66.7	37.2	17.1	5.8	32.3	17.3	64.2	21.5	43
B1207	-17.2	67.5	38.7	8	7.7	41	14.8	90.7	19.3	33.2
B1301	-9.8	62.9	45.7	12.2	13.1	33.7	29.7	68.8	26.8	34.6
B1302	-8.9	70.2	52.9	22.5	17.6	26	41.9	77.7	42.3	35.8
B1303	-14.5	57.6	40.9	23.8	14.9	33.5	30.8	86.4	46.4	47.9
B1304	-10.5	63.7	44.2	10.7	11.3	31.2	21.8	85.6	25.6	52.3
B1305	-10.5	70.8	48.6	4.3	4.8	38.4	10	95.9	9.4	25.7
B1306	-7.9	70	39.7	8.9	9	45	10.6	86.3	11.1	43.1
B1307	-6.5	70.5	39.1	5.5	3.8	27.1	6.3	72.5	7.5	16.8
B1308.01	8	76.7	50.8	3.7	7.2	33.4	9	58.8	11	16.2

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IncPov
B1308.03		79.2	54	5.4	0.8	21.1	9.3	31.4	6.7	21.2
B1308.04		63.5	43.2	4.8	6.4	48.3	10.8	80.4	9.3	31.5
B1401	11.4	70.2	49.2	4.6	3.7	18.9	16.5	50.4	18.1	26.6
B1402	-41	59.2	48.2	15.8	11.4	33.5	37.9	75.3	35.2	53.8
B1403	-28.3	54.9	39.3	20	14.2	37.4	29.1	82.7	41.8	53.2
B1501	-22.6	48.5	33.2	24	19.5	47.6	41.6	78.2	49.1	63.1
B1502	-11.8	58.9	47.1	26.7	18	35.3	26.3	85.1	26.2	54
B1503	-20.2	57.3	51.8	23.5	4.1	31.4	20.4	87.2	21.8	35.5
B1504	-30.8	64.9	43.3	13.5	12.9	25.3	21.5	82.5	19.8	40.4
B1505	-9.3	66.9	59.5	9.1	8.5	21.1	24.5	59.4	22.3	36.9
B1506	-15	61.8	48.4	17.3	12.7	32.8	25.3	78.4	33.2	50.4
B1507.01	-18.8	72.6	54	9.2	5.8	18.5	15.1	62.5	12.8	20.2
B1507.02	-20.9	69.9	62	13.7	10	19.4	17.4	51.2	18.4	25.2
B1508.01	-17.8	71.8	60.6	6.7	5.5	21.8	26	72.3	20.5	28.8
B1508.02	-17	54	43.1	9.9	11	30.9	31.9	71.9	36.1	48.8
B1509	-23.5	71.2	59.7	9.3	6.6	23.3	20.2	63.1	13.3	25.3
B1510	-4.1	68.1	60.1	16	11.5	21.4	24.7	61.5	24.1	29.3
B1511	-16.7	68.6	64.2	9.2	9.9	16.9	15.8	52.4	9.3	21.3
B1512	2.6	57.6	50.2	15.6	15.7	33	31.4	61	29.1	55.3
B1513	-1.6	66.3	53.3	22.6	20.9	26.4	31.5	48.4	27.1	49.8
B1601	-16.1	54	40.5	19.4	12.9	42.1	31.6	77.4	39.1	59.1
B1602	-21.3	54.6	44.9	29.6	19.2	41.3	36.6	84.4	40.6	60.4
B1603	-16.5	54	39.4	26	14.5	40.9	35.8	87.4	47.9	56.3
B1604	-20.2	58.2	45.4	17.5	22.1	36.7	25.4	85.2	32.8	42.2
B1605	-8.6	59.3	53.2	15.4	8.6	24.6	23.3	68.4	20.9	39.7
B1606	-15.7	60.4	52.7	20	13.7	30.3	26	73.3	20.6	34.7
B1607	-9.3	62.4	49.3	14.9	10.4	31.1	20	67.2	19.9	44.6
B1608.01		79.1	66.3	12.3	8.1	25.9	19.1	40.8	14.7	30.1
B1608.02		70.4	55.8	16.2	7	27.9	18.7	67.7	18.4	45.1
B1701	0.7	51.1	44.9	5.4	4.9	37.4	41.7	49.7	22.3	40.8
B1702	37.5	37.8	34	35.8	12.8	52	41.4	39.3	52.5	60.8
B1703	-12.9	47.9	29.9	21	24.5	41.6	55.2	37.3	60.3	58.1
B1801	-43.1	51.2	27.7	36	28	53.4	40.5	80.1	51.4	73.1
B1802	-44.1	45	34.3	39.5	24.4	53.6	32.7	85.1	49.1	78.5
B1803	-33.9	43	26.7	19.3	16.8	55.4	21.5	88	37.5	56.9
B1901	-33.2	50.4	41.8	38.9	23.4	46.5	36.4	80.1	39.3	61.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LonFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B1902	-21.6	70.6	33	18.7	8.4	43.6	19.2	94.4	32.4	35.2
B1903	-14.4	57.8	29.4	20.6	13.2	51.9	21.7	83.2	46.2	47.7
B2001	-20.2	60.6	46	14.4	11.1	45.4	21.9	86.9	24.8	54.3
B2002	-24.6	64.1	47.3	17.7	17.3	41.9	20.7	85.1	26.7	37.1
B2003	-18.3	57.8	35.6	13	13.8	48.6	23.3	88.7	25.5	51.2
B2004	-21.7	59.7	48.8	18.6	12.3	42.1	31.5	80.3	39.1	35.2
B2005	-14.9	68.9	35.9	9.4	14.2	49.4	11.3	90.9	15.4	32.6
B2006	-28.2	77.1	47.9	13.8	8.7	35.1	14.1	74.8	11.3	41.8
B2007.01	-11.5	72.4	62.5	14.3	9.7	26.5	14.1	65.3	10.4	33.7
B2007.02	-27.6	69.9	52.6	14.6	14.3	30	19.9	73.5	12.4	59.2
B2008	-9.8	72.6	54.2	9.7	7.7	27.6	16.6	83	7.3	25.8
B2101	-50.1	61.6	40.9	7.4	18.2	46.2	21.7	87.3	23.2	49.6
B2102	-17.2	68.6	35	15.6	17.5	47.9	16.4	91.1	23.4	33.4
B2201	-42.1	45.7	25.3	2.6	4.2	37.8	4.3	25.9	7.2	35
B2301	-51.9	58.2	36.1	16.4	21.3	49.8	15.9	95.4	28.1	51.4
B2302	-20.6	74.2	40.6	15.1	6.9	41.5	13.3	94.6	17.3	26.4
B2303	-9.1	64.3	33.3	5.4	8	41.8	13	96.6	20.9	25.3
B2401	-18.3	78.4	31.1	1.2	10.7	41.3	5.1	97	7.9	25.1
B2402	-27.9	74	29.5	4.4	6.5	43.5	7.1	99.8	6.6	28.6
B2403	-24.3	58.7	37.8	4.2	15.6	43.2	12.9	96.2	17.1	37.2
B2404	-11.4	74.3	37	10	5.1	42	7.4	97.9	8.4	30.8
B2501.01	-12.9	84.9	64.1	5.9	6.3	13	9.9	15.5	0.7	23.8
B2501.02	-21	77.5	60.1	6.5	11.2	21.5	14.4	21.1	11.5	29.8
B2501.03	-4.6	67.7	38.9	5.3	5.2	32	3.1	44.6	6.4	24.6
B2502.01	-32	69.4	63	5.3	9.8	16.9	40.2	4.2	13	33.3
B2502.02	49.3	79.7	63	26.4	8.6	15.9	26.2	17.6	21.6	27.9
B2502.03	-36.2	74.5	63.3	14.3	11.3	22.7	29.2	31.5	20	31.5
B2502.04	-8.2	58.5	46.8	29.2	26.7	26.9	59.4	34.2	56.6	54.9
B2502.05	-9.4	83.5	49.6	5.9	10.2	26.8	11.9	13.7	8.8	18
B2502.06	-13.1	76.8	47.5	5.5	5.2	35.7	6.5	57	5	31.4
B2503.01	-36.9	78.2	46.1	19.7	5	40.9	15.3	87.7	25.2	22.2
B2503.02	15.1	54.3	25	33.3	30.3	40.4	56.1	36.8	64	57.1
B2503.03	-20.4	67.6	36	7.4	5.7	38	6	59.9	9.2	35.5
B2504.01	-29.4	74.1	42.6	9.5	12.5	31.2	8.6	71.2	9.3	30.3
B2504.02	-5	76.1	41.7	10.8	13.9	33.7	22.1	56.5	23.9	23.5
B2505	-18.1	71.4	42	12.8	8	40	15.2	61.3	20.5	30.9

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B2506	-16.4	77.9	31.6	19.2	42.4	33	55	72.6	62.6	61.1
B2601.01	-20.1	77.6	51.8	6.7	6.7	20.4	7.5	36.5	3	14.9
B2601.02	-14.4	79.9	54.4	7.7	3.1	21.3	5.3	26.4	2	10.5
B2602.01	21.8	78.5	53.8	10.1	8.1	19.8	15.5	26.1	11.8	21.4
B2602.02	-10.7	79.5	54.6	10.5	8.3	22	16	26.6	10.2	26.4
B2602.03	-7.6	78.5	63.4	9.7	18	19.5	18.7	4	12.7	17.3
B2603.01	-4.4	69.1	40.4	2.8	4.9	33.6	5.4	66.1	4.4	28.3
B2603.02	-25.1	74.7	48.2	6.6	6.1	27.3	5.3	20.2	3.8	20.4
B2603.03	36.4	61.7	36	16.8	13.3	37.7	49.2	22.1	44.2	55
B2604.01	-39.7	72.2	40.5	8.7	6.9	38.7	9.9	56.1	10	36
B2604.02	50.3	88.2	71.2	9.6	9.1	16.4	41.7	2.3	29.7	34.8
B2604.03	65.5	66.4	46.3	16.6	11.7	26.5	45.7	0.8	34.8	46.2
B2604.04	2.8	67	36.8	14.6	9.9	48.4	9.6	87.8	6.2	14.7
B2605	-18.4	70.8	45.3	9.3	6.5	40.9	4.6	48.5	7.1	26.7
B2606.01	-3	65.8	33.4	13.4	20.2	38.9	32.7	50.8	41	51
B2606.02	-19.7	74.9	44.3	11.7	14.4	38.9	20.3	31.7	26.2	33.3
B2607	-31.2	74.1	42	6.8	12.5	52.5	9.6	69.4	10	40.7
B2608	-14.8	69.1	36.8	9.5	3.2	47.7	8.2	93.5	11	37.5
B2609	-14.9	65.4	44.2	8.9	8.8	35.1	6.8	94.7	11.4	27.2
B2610	-17.6	67.6	39.9	8	8.8	41	7.3	94.8	9.3	32.8
B2611	-14.4	60	37.9	7.8	9.8	48.2	6.8	99.3	14.1	28.5
B2612	-25.2	22.3	7.8	0	0	42.9	11.8	0		
B2701.01	-15.7	63.8	42.9	8.3	5.4	23.5	4.7	85.6	4.7	15.7
B2701.02	-17.3	71.8	43.5	2.1	4.8	22.8	4.8	59.6	3.1	17.4
B2702	-5.3	78.3	56.6	5.1	8.3	16.9	7.9	91	5.6	18.5
B2703.01	-18.2	75.9	50.5	8.8	6.1	21.6	6.9	66.7	1.7	16.7
B2703.02	-12.3	78.7	48.1	4.3	4.4	21.6	5.6	86.1	1.8	6.4
B2704.01	-17.5	76.5	45.1	6.3	4.6	26.3	6.4	42.4	1.6	13.5
B2704.02	-36.4	79.2	49	4.5	1.6	21.8	5.2	63.7	2.7	21.3
B2705.01	-10.1	74.9	46	1.8	4.5	23.4	3.4	46.1	4	14.6
B2705.02	-17.8	75.5	51.4	4.4	3.9	19.3	4.7	48.4	2.5	20.5
B2706	-12.1	80.7	49.2	4.3	2.3	16.2	4.6	63.4	3.2	15.7
B2707.01	34.3	83.2	72.5	6.5	5.8	9	34.2	1.4	14.9	18.5
B2707.02	9.9	81.2	54.1	5.3	7.7	10.8	17.6	35.3	2.7	13
B2707.03	-17.1	78.6	49.3	3.9	5.5	22.8	3.5	49.4	3.1	12.7
B2708.01	-23	82.7	62.7	5.6	2.9	9.9	9.7	2.7	2.9	10.2

3 of/de 3

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B2709.02	-18.8	76.1	50.9	5.4	2.8	16.6	7.1	23.8	5.2	17.2
B2709.03	-4.5	70	48.7	5.6	3.4	17	8.3	20.9	4	19.9
B2709.04	-7.2	79.2	54.9	5.1	4.6	14	8.2	35.4	4.7	15.8
B2709.05	-4.8	80.3	65.3	8.5	8.2	13.1	16.5	34.8	7.5	21.1
B2709.01	1	81.3	68.8	10.2	7	18.8	17.9	21.6	5.5	31
B2709.02	-8.6	75	53.7	4.8	7.6	11.3	11	20.5	1.5	26.7
B2709.03	-4.5	70.5	51.6	10.4	3.2	14.4	11.4	55.3	8.6	23.1
B2710.01		70.4	60.6	11.7	16.9	21.4	28.9	46.7	21.1	30.3
B2710.02		69.4	57.2	14.3	12.2	21.8	19.6	61.1	11.3	31
B2711.01		55.6	35.8	5.8	6.4	21	6.7	35.2	5.2	36.6
B2711.02		66.1	37.7	0	8.4	9.8	2.2	44.7	2.7	11.8
B2712	-12	73.5	43.1	2.5	2.8	6.2	4.3	63.3	4.7	10.2
B2713	-16.8	70.6	53.1	0.5	3.2	4.9	5	64.7	3.1	15.6
B2714	-18.8	72.5	49.6	2.4	5.6	5.1	4.3	71.7	2.9	19.6
B2715.01	-13.8	81.9	55.6	2.1	4.6	9.5	7.2	43.5	1.8	13.4
B2715.03	95.4	76.9	43.6	5.6	5.8	1.4	5.9	5.2	6.3	5.6
B2716	-14.9	68.9	55.3	15.5	16.3	26.6	31.9	43.4	31.1	39.2
B2717	-2.5	67.4	52.3	14.6	13.3	27.9	26.7	38.3	22.3	35.9
B2718.01	9	66.4	51.6	13.5	12.7	34.2	25.7	49.5	18.4	43.1
B2718.02	0.7	67.1	56.1	22.6	12.8	24.5	33.5	52.8	31.6	37.3
B2719	6.4	77.1	56.1	8.6	5.9	16.4	12	45.8	7.4	22.5
B2720.01	3.4	65.1	38.2	4.4	8.5	20	3.5	18	5.6	23
B2720.02	21.2	71.1	41.4	2.8	2.6	12.8	1.5	10.4	4.6	13.2
B2720.03	0.1	76.4	56.9	6.5	5.4	9.7	9.7	20.4	5.3	19.5
B2801.01	-14.2	71.5	51	5.9	6.7	23.9	9.6	17.9	7.5	22.3
B2801.02	-8.5	74.2	58.8	7.6	9.3	13.5	20.3	45.5	12.3	28.2
B2802	-9.7	72	63.4	9.2	11.2	17.7	15.8	64.7	6.7	27.1
B2803.01	6.6	84.1	67	7.4	4.9	17.3	34.2	16.3	15.9	27.5
B2803.02	-21.4	76	66.6	12.1	8.3	13.1	35.5	30.8	19.7	23.6
B2804.01	-6.2	79.2	53.6	5.6	8.4	13.3	11.2	25.9	6	16.3
B2804.02	-11.3	70.5	68.4	9.7	11.4	26.3	12.7	32.1	5	42.5
B2804.03	-0.4	72.6	55.6	2.3	3.6	12.4	12.2	35.2	3.9	16.1
B2804.04	3.8	65.3	58.7	8.7	8.1	26.9	37.7	27.9	25.1	26.8

Appendix III -- Census Data Matrix 1990-91											
Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnemplM	UnemplF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov	
Hx001	-8.9	73.4	55.5	11.5	14	11.1	23.5	7.0	29.8	45.2	
Hx002	-0.4	72.7	57.2	11.3	12.9	13.4	18.5	12.4	20.3	51.3	
Hx003	9.9	80.2	71.5	8	11.9	2.4	11.8	30.9	12.4	34.7	
Hx004.01	-12.7	80.2	87.2	14	12.5	4.6	6.4	27.7	14.1	40.2	
Hx004.02	-2.7	76.7	63.2	11.1	13.5	4.0	9.6	29.1	21.6	42	
Hx005	-2.7	77.2	70.0	8.5	8.6	0.0	6.9	45.1	3.8	32.6	
Hx006	1.7	78.9	60.2	8.0	5.7	3.0	9.7	59.2	5.2	33.7	
Hx007	-2.8	69.5	44	5.5	6.2	1.4	8	12.4	2.3	18.6	
Hx008	9.7	75.4	66.9	11.9	10.9	1.4	13.2	36.4	12.9	35.7	
Hx009	5	86.2	74.2	9.5	5.2	9.0	12.3	25.4	15.5	24.3	
Hx010	7.4	71.5	53.1	19.3	16.3	20.9	37.9	25.9	44.2	54.7	
Hx011	-1.9	82	72.0	11	8.6	5.5	14.1	57.3	12.4	43.3	
Hx012	-4.3	83.5	67.2	4.0	10.0	2.7	11.6	72.3	11.4	36.3	
Hx013	-4.1	75.0	58	6	5	3.6	7.3	55.4	3.8	24.6	
Hx014	8.5	70.5	58.6	10	6.7	8.9	13.1	19.4	10.1	43.8	
Hx015	-8.9	77.5	60.1	13.4	10.3	12.4	23.2	11.8	24.8	36.6	
Hx016	5.7	76.4	61.3	6.2	8.3	8.3	14.8	20.9	12.5	17.6	
Hx017	-7	83.5	57.1	9.9	6	7.0	10	20.0	2.2	18.1	
Hx018	-13.2	69	50.6	3.6	5.4	8.9	12.3	10.8	6.7	37.6	
Hx019	-9.4	74.0	57.7	7.5	4.7	9.2	12.3	54.0	7.0	33.2	
Hx020	-9.6	76	57.7	7.0	9.3	16.9	23.1	56.0	25.3	41.2	
Hx021	-18.9	68	48.7	9.1	8.9	18.3	25.3	57.4	27.6	44.3	
Hx022	1	76.7	59.2	11.1	6	9.8	15.3	24.4	7.5	33.7	
Hx023	-8.2	73.4	58	7.5	8.6	12.5	22.5	24.9	19.1	28.5	
Hx024	-0.4	79.5	68.2	9.0	10.6	9.0	13.5	12.0	11.4	35.8	
Hx025.01	-10.8	76.5	63.3	11.5	15.8	6.7	17.9	1.9	17.5	35.6	
Hx025.02	5.7	77.9	62	8.5	6.5	4.8	10.2	3.2	6.5	19.8	
Hx025.03	6.4	82.9	74.5	10.6	8.6	4.2	17.5	0.5	15.9	26.6	
Hx026	81.8	83.0	71.5	5	9.5	1.1	8.1	4.0	5.7	20.8	
Hx027	9.7	81.5	71.7	4.7	10.0	3.1	6.4	10.3	5.7	15.5	

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	Regina 1991							IndPov
				UnempM	UnempF	Grades9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov		
R001.01	-13.1	81.4	68.5	4.7	4	2.4	6.7	0.8	0.2	34.6	
R001.02	-8.9	79.4	74.5	6.5	7.4	4.1	12.9	0.0	12.5	20.3	
R002.01	18.4	79.5	64.7	6.5	5.4	3.4	7.5	0.0	3.7	15.3	
R002.02	-6.2	78.5	62.8	7.5	5.9	5.9	6.4	2.1	6.2	21.1	
R003	-8	77.9	60.3	6.0	9	6	10.4	7.6	11.4	37	
R004	-8.6	79.5	58	8.5	20.6	8.4	18.8	61.8	13.8	31	
R005	-8.2	74	66.5	6.4	4.5	4.0	10.5	29.7	6.5	24.3	
R006	1	78.9	64.4	4.9	5.0	3.5	9.5	0.6	6.2	35.2	
R007	-0.2	66.7	52.7	5.7	7.9	18.5	20.5	11.2	12.6	51.6	
R008.01	-13.5	73.2	58.6	9.3	6.0	14.4	12	18.2	11	26.1	
R008.02	19.1	82.2	68	1	4.0	4.4	5.1	0.0	2.5	22.3	
R009.01	-11.7	69.5	47.7	13.8	17.5	26.5	17.1	39.9	31.5	34.8	
R009.02	59.6	84.0	68.7	6.7	11.6	5.7	17.1	0.7	24.6	31.5	
R010	-8.1	71.5	48.1	18	8.5	19.5	15	38.7	22.6	43.1	
R011	2.4	66.5	39.3	8.5	11.5	17.3	12.6	24.4	25.6	40.7	
R012	-0.9	77.2	65.5	12.9	10	8	18.5	57.0	15	37	
R013	107.8	18.5	15.0	0	25	40	0	9.7	0	48.2	
R014	-16.6	53.7	34.1	14.3	14.3	33.1	19.7	44.2	37.1	54	
R015	-11.9	77.2	69.4	10.0	4	21	16.9	10.1	13	38.6	
R016	-0.7	83.5	69.5	8.0	6.2	8.7	16.4	0.5	20.1	25.5	
R017	-12.5	72.7	61	14.5	22.8	20.3	19.2	26.1	39.2	32.2	
R018	-2.5	65	48.2	20.8	20.6	20.2	27.9	47.0	40.1	47.3	
R019	-5.5	69.9	55.2	14.9	12.0	17.8	20.4	38.1	23.8	34	
R020	-10.2	70.2	52.1	5.4	9	14	15.5	18.1	16.6	33.2	
R021	-7	71.4	60.7	15.3	10.1	11.0	19.9	6.4	19.1	32.2	
R022.01	4	73.2	53.3	2.1	7	18	15.3	23.0	17.3	33	
R022.02	-5.6	83.2	74.2	6.5	4.5	7.6	12.5	1.4	10.5	23.3	
R023.01	-11.8	84.9	77.0	4.5	5	5	9	0.0	5.7	33.7	
R023.02	-6.1	88.2	73.7	7.2	6.5	7.0	13	0.0	14	35.1	
R024	-17.2	74.9	62.2	8.5	8.4	12.9	14.1	5.0	14.9	39.7	
R025.01	-12.2	68.5	62.3	11.1	11.5	14.0	21.1	3.9	22	26.6	
R025.02	-15.9	71.5	64.7	3.7	7	10	12.9	1.2	5.7	32	
R026	-9.1	74.2	57.2	10.9	6.5	19.6	18.7	4.8	17.1	30.1	
R027	-7.3	73.5	61.3	9.8	13.9	17.5	18.7	9.2	23.1	36	
R028.01	-2	84.9	76.0	5.0	7	5	12	0.0	8.5	29.6	

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
R028.02	1.2	81.0	75.7	7.5	6.4	6.3	16.1	0.0	19.3	38.5
R028.03	-3.2	88.2	76.4	3.2	3.8	5.2	5.5	0.0	4	8.9
R100.01	1.8	89.9	82.0	4.0	4.7	3.6	7.2	0.0	6.4	15.9
R100.02	447.7	96.9	77.7	5.2	6.7	2.1	2.6	0.0	4.9	59.7
R100.03	1.5	89.9	76.4	4.4	6.0	3.0	11.8	0.5	11	21.1
R100.04	6	96.5	94.4	0	5.9	0.0	4	7.7	6.2	0
R100.05	-3.9	86.9	73.5	9.3	3.5	8.4	6.9	0.0	10.4	12.5
R100.06	25.5	89.4	80.0	4.5	9.5	3.8	10.1	0.0	10.8	20.1
R100.08	70.5	90.9	78.7	1.8	3.5	2.2	7.1	0.7	3	13.8
R100.09	85.5	89.7	77.7	2.7	5.4	4.0	9.1	0.0	4.2	22.3
					Hamilton 1991					
Hr001.01	37.2	81.7	62.2	4.2	5.9	12.2	13.8	3.3	15.1	40.7
Hr001.02	179.2	85.5	67.2	8	9.5	8.7	8.9	0.9	13.9	46.2
Hr001.03	89.3	82.9	65.7	8.8	11	9.6	8.3	1.5	13.1	31.1
Hr001.04		85.9	73.4	5	6.7	8.6	7.8	0.0	9.5	10.8
Hr001.05	233.7	72.5	63.5	16.1	9.0	18.5	10.4	5.6	22.3	36.6
Hr001.06	239.9	88	69.2	10.1	7.5	9.7	8.8	0.7	12.5	14.6
Hr001.07	7	85.4	69	12.0	11.5	8.6	17.8	0.8	21.5	23.6
Hr002.01	6.8	86.9	73.0	8.5	8.9	6.3	11.9	4.1	10.5	47.8
Hr002.02	88.1	69.5	56.3	4.2	7	13.8	8.4	2.7	5.9	30.5
Hr002.03	9.2	82.5	74.2	10.3	5	8.5	13.1	1.4	10	23.3
Hr002.04	63.9	85.5	71.7	12	10	10.7	12.3	0.7	12	17.1
Hr003.01	-10.1	74.7	64	12.1	5.5	5.7	9.6	0.7	6.2	20.3
Hr003.02	14.1	77.7	66.2	7.0	7.2	8.7	11.5	0.0	7.7	18.6
Hr003.03	19	75.2	61.5	14.3	9.5	13.3	18.1	1.5	19	49.8
Hr003.04	-3.2	73.7	56.7	11.5	9.5	12.8	19.8	2.6	21.3	15.9
Hr004.01	-0.6	73.9	55.2	9.3	7.0	18.0	11.7	2.2	15.9	47.3
Hr004.02	13.4	76.4	62.6	12.9	8.6	11.3	15	1.6	19.1	28.6
Hr005.01	13.5	78.2	59.5	9	6.5	14.9	11.2	1.9	13.3	33.6
Hr005.02	-3.5	80.9	58.3	7.2	6.0	8.6	14.2	1.5	13.5	39.2
Hr005.03	28.4	77.5	65.0	10.1	9.4	13.2	11.5	0.0	13	28.5
Hr006	-14.2	70.5	57.8	8.9	5.4	11.4	10.1	4.4	12.8	31.1
Hr007	-10.6	62.7	46.8	10	9.9	14.8	8.7	8.5	12	56.3
Hr008	-15.3	61.8	41.3	7.2	2.1	17.7	7.5	4.6	8.5	48.2
Hr009	32.2	74.0	57.6	10.0	6.5	14.7	15	11.0	15.9	65.7
Hr010	-11.2	64.5	54.7	6.2	10.0	14.8	8.2	4.5	15.3	36.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
Hrn011	-17.1	65.7	44.3	12.5	5.7	22.6	6.2	6.7	8.8	53.7
Hrn012	-10.5	70.4	52.2	12.5	5.0	15.0	9.5	10.6	12.9	44.7
Hrn013	-17.5	67.9	56.7	7.2	4.7	11.4	5.9	5.6	6.2	29.8
Hrn014	-7.7	68.5	56.8	4.7	6.2	10.1	6.1	3.9	9.8	29.1
Hrn015	-16.4	65.7	50.7	6.7	2.7	7.0	7	4.9	2.5	39.2
Hrn016	1.7	63.6	80	0	25	9.5	0	0.0	0	0
Hrn017	-2	74.5	64	8.8	6.9	5.4	9.9	81.7	7.5	17.1
Hrn019	-6.1	73.4	53.7	9.1	8.1	10.0	9	34.3	8	31.3
Hrn020	-8.7	67.5	54	9.0	6.2	14.0	9.1	32.8	10.6	42.6
Hrn021	-5.2	74.4	56	10	9.1	10.1	8.9	33.5	13.5	36.6
Hrn022	-11	65.0	51.5	10.6	7	14.6	11.7	21.4	18.1	45.1
Hrn023	-12.3	60.8	49.2	10.3	5.7	13.0	6	3.7	11.5	39.3
Hrn024	-14.3	67.9	57.7	12.8	4.9	10.9	11	0.9	9.5	21.6
Hrn025	0.3	67.9	52.2	8.8	5.7	19.7	7.4	12.9	9.4	52.1
Hrn026.01	-10.3	69.7	49.3	11.0	11	23.9	11.4	1.8	9	39.2
Hrn026.02	-12.6	65	48.6	7.7	9.4	34.0	8.2	2.5	18.6	42.2
Hrn026.03	134.5	83.7	74.2	6.2	6.2	23.6	3.8	1.9	2.3	21
Hrn026.04	-10.9	79.4	68.2	4.9	10.8	13.9	6.1	0.0	7.2	57.7
Hrn026.05	2.9	69.7	56.6	8.5	9.5	14.4	21.2	0.9	24.3	29.1
Hrn026.06	-8.9	84.2	65.2	12.8	10.4	9.6	19.7	0.5	18.6	46.8
Hrn027	-8.3	57.1	48.3	10.6	0	20.8	9.1	9.7	9.5	34.7
Hrn028	-11.7	64.5	49.2	15.9	11.0	19.0	8.2	20.7	10	54.6
Hrn029	-6.7	62.3	48.6	15.4	13.4	19.2	12	30.0	11.3	37.2
Hrn030	-6.5	71.5	58.5	11.6	11	11.4	10.6	82.5	11.1	34.2
Hrn031	-3.7	73.4	62.3	12.0	2.7	10.9	12.2	86.8	19.1	36.2
Hrn032	-4.9	75.9	57.5	6.0	6.5	12.1	16.4	63.1	17.6	44
Hrn033	-5.3	77.2	62.6	12.1	12.1	10.6	18.5	66.5	22.5	41.3
Hrn034	-0.1	77.5	63.3	12.5	9	8.8	15	18.8	20	37.1
Hrn035	0	72.7	58.5	20.5	12.1	13.5	20.9	53.1	37.1	51.3
Hrn036	0.3	64.2	56.3	17.3	11.8	17.7	14.4	20.6	44.6	61.7
Hrn037	3.6	45.6	36	15.6	4.2	27.6	7.8	15.3	19.5	65.5
Hrn038	-0.7	61.8	46.2	9.9	7.7	13.5	10.1	24.6	14.3	38.5
Hrn039	1.1	79.4	59.8	11.4	8.1	8.3	13.2	25.0	20.1	28.8
Hrn040	-4	75.2	58.2	3.7	5	14.9	13.8	61.8	11	43
Hrn041	-1.2	75.9	57.1	10.5	9.5	12.0	15.5	59.1	16.8	36
Hrn042	-7.5	75.7	58.7	14.9	7.2	14.9	13.9	72.8	13.5	44.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	Vancouver 1991				LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
					UnempF	Grades	UnempF	Grades				
V001.01	1.2	78.2	67.5	7.2	6.9	8.1	20.4	0.0	15.4	37.7	15.4	37.7
V001.02	-2.7	73.9	65.9	5.0	12.8	5.6	18.3	1.1	18	27.6	18	27.6
V002.01	1.8	70.9	52	5	11.9	8.5	11.6	3.6	18.8	38.2	18.8	38.2
V002.02	20.8	67.9	61.1	11.9	10.4	12.2	11.2	10.8	15.4	51	15.4	51
V003	19.5	71.9	63.8	14.6	17.8	23.9	10	12.5	20.8	56.3	20.8	56.3
V004	18.1	72.9	59.2	10.4	15	13.7	12.4	12.5	22.5	38.3	22.5	38.3
V005	8	86.5	77.7	9.5	7.0	3.6	11.2	4.7	20.3	24.5	20.3	24.5
V006	19	72	55.7	6	8.8	7.1	12.3	21.7	14.6	34	14.6	34
V007	22.5	72.7	56.1	4.9	6.2	3.6	10.4	38.6	10	34.8	10	34.8
V008	5.5	76.9	57	5.5	6	1.9	6.9	34.9	2.6	48.7	2.6	48.7
V009	2.9	71.5	48.7	4.2	7.2	3.0	9.2	31.2	10.9	27.1	10.9	27.1
V010.01	-0.1	69.7	43.2	3.7	5.5	6.1	7.9	15.7	8.9	39.7	8.9	39.7
V010.02	5.7	58.7	39.6	5.5	10.6	3.5	3.9	7.8	11.5	35.2	11.5	35.2
V11	17.6	72.4	55.3	12	12.1	18.8	9.7	22.5	17.6	47.8	17.6	47.8
V12	14.7	69.7	57.8	9	12	13.3	12.6	26.3	20.5	47.2	20.5	47.2
V013.01	7.1	67.4	56.3	9.5	10.4	18.4	14.1	19.0	19.8	52.8	19.8	52.8
V013.02	22	74.0	57.2	11.9	13.8	19.8	9.8	15.4	18.1	44.2	18.1	44.2
V014	13.2	72.7	56	14	11.8	20.8	14.9	17.1	23.5	54.2	23.5	54.2
V015.01	10.5	70.9	56.2	8.0	10.5	10.5	7.2	12.6	19.8	45	19.8	45
V015.02	2.5	63.2	48.1	10.8	6.0	14.2	8.8	5.2	17.8	59.2	17.8	59.2
V016.01	50.1	69.2	61.7	16.1	12.5	15.2	14.8	14.0	27.8	58.1	27.8	58.1
V016.02	16.7	77	64.4	16.1	15.5	16.4	12.9	17.0	22.6	45.7	22.6	45.7
V017.01	16.9	71.5	57	11.4	13	18.7	10.8	16.4	20	53.1	20	53.1
V017.02	10.1	72.5	58	9.1	13.0	17.6	11.2	23.6	20.1	49	20.1	49
V018.01	24.7	69.5	61.5	14.3	12.5	19.3	12.3	26.5	22.8	49	22.8	49
V018.02	15.3	73.5	59	13.3	8.3	15.5	12.6	24.8	22.5	48.2	22.5	48.2
V019	8.6	73.5	50.1	9.5	9.3	13.1	18.1	28.6	25.3	59.5	25.3	59.5
V020	5.3	62.2	43.2	6	7.9	6.3	6.7	19.7	15.0	33.7	15.0	33.7
V021	-0.6	76.0	53.3	5.7	4.5	3.5	6	73.9	7.5	37	7.5	37
V022	-9.4	63.7	44.7	8.6	3.2	2.3	8.9	12.3	11.1	26.6	11.1	26.6
V023	10.7	77.5	61.3	2.5	8	1.5	8.3	60.5	5.9	45.3	5.9	45.3
V024	9.8	75.0	63.2	5	4.2	2.2	8.7	59.2	7.0	32.5	7.0	32.5
V025	9.4	77.5	60.5	8.6	6.2	4.4	9.5	56.1	7	32.6	7	32.6
V026	11	73.5	54.3	7.9	8.8	4.3	7.4	41.1	9.5	51.7	9.5	51.7
V027	5.3	65.9	49.7	7.9	3.1	2.4	8.8	25.6	8.1	31.6	8.1	31.6

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LongFem	OldHouse	FemPov	IndPov
V028	-1.1	77	58.7	3.7	5.5	3.7	8.3	58.8	9.5	30.1
V029	10.4	83.4	67.5	10	6.2	4.8	14	44.5	14.0	33.6
V030	12.9	73	64.5	8.9	10.4	17.0	13.6	41.8	19.6	43.3
V031.01	7.1	78.2	68	8	7.9	9.3	15.6	57.3	19	37.2
V031.02	16.9	74.7	57.2	17.3	9.8	17.3	14.8	48.5	28.3	52.5
V032	20	72.9	64.7	14.3	11.6	17.8	14.8	51.9	21.1	44.5
V033	15.8	68.7	61.7	11.5	11.9	21.3	12.1	30.3	18.6	50.7
V034.01	10.6	69.5	54	12.4	15.6	19.8	13.2	20.3	21.6	57.7
V034.02	8.3	74.5	61.1	14.9	12.1	15.6	16	27.8	24.1	51.2
V035.01	12.5	72.5	58.6	11.5	8.8	18.5	13.4	27.1	23.8	51.2
V035.02	5.4	73.7	57.2	12.5	6.0	18.6	12.1	19.2	12.9	51.1
V036.01	11.2	76.9	62.6	9.9	10	18.5	9.9	22.3	16.8	42.1
V036.02	10.4	73.4	57.8	9.3	8.1	15.0	10.4	13.9	17.6	58.7
V037	21.5	75	63.6	18	16.6	15.3	19.3	40.5	38.1	52.5
V038	5.3	79.0	61.7	19	14	14.7	20.1	24.9	37.8	52.8
V039.01	6.2	83	76.2	12.4	8.0	6.1	12	37.5	18.6	38.3
V039.02	31.6	80.7	75.4	9	9.5	3.3	20.5	10.6	22.3	30.3
V040	1.3	85.5	76.5	8.5	6.7	2.7	7.5	20.0	12.9	24.8
V041	8.8	83.9	74.2	9.5	5.2	2.3	12.7	34.0	10.4	28.3
V042	15.7	82.0	70.7	7.7	6.2	4.7	11.5	60.0	14.3	35.2
V043	17.7	75.7	67.5	6.0	5.2	1.9	10.5	55.9	6.9	37.8
V044	6.8	72.2	57.2	4.5	8.6	2.1	9.2	35.3	10	40.5
V045.01	4.9	85	74.4	11.3	5.4	1.7	13.5	58.8	13.5	30.6
V045.02	10.2	78.7	76	8	5.0	3.5	14.4	45.6	16.8	37.7
V046	14.4	85.9	76.4	10	9.3	3.9	14.1	21.9	16.3	30.8
V047	10	86.9	78.2	9.4	8.1	2.1	9.5	13.9	10.6	24.3
V048	15.9	86.4	75.2	8.5	8.3	2.9	14	16.5	16.6	30.6
V049.01	96.9	88.2	82.9	6.5	6.2	2.0	12.9	20.0	11.5	25.8
V049.02	121	77.7	74.2	7.9	6.9	1.4	18.4	0.3	12.6	28.3
V050.01	14.8	71.5	63.7	20	17	13.2	20.5	8.9	45.5	51.1
V050.02	29.9	78	66.2	19.8	16.6	14.1	24	16.6	42.3	52.1
V051	10.3	73.4	58.7	12.0	10.5	20.5	14.6	39.1	20	40.6
V052.01	8.9	70.7	53.7	13.5	10.5	21.0	17.5	16.4	23.8	59.6
V052.02	9.8	74.7	60.5	10.1	11.8	17.3	11.8	24.3	20.6	57.7
V053	9.8	72.2	58.7	11	9.5	20.1	11.9	48.4	16.8	43.8
V054	2.6	72.2	62.6	11.6	11	23.6	13.2	51.8	19	49.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
V055.01	5.8	70.7	56.6	15.5	13.6	21.0	21	26.1	29.1	54.6
V055.02	7.1	72.5	67.0	19.6	11.9	12.7	17.4	15.7	37.7	41
V056	16.4	73.9	65.2	19.6	18.1	14.2	25.4	30.9	37.8	53.7
V057	2.7	56.2	43.8	20.6	18.5	36.1	18.1	43.1	49.2	72.9
V058	24.1	31.3	24.6	37.8	29.6	34.3	19.5	46.5	67.0	85.5
V059.01	21.9	48	39.8	40.2	29.1	23.4	7.6	73.5	48.2	82
V059.02	89.6	70.2	65	23	10.5	9.8	6.3	11.3	19.6	42.7
V060	10.9	82.9	75.9	13.8	9.9	3.5	12.5	7.5	26.6	30.8
V061	1.9	83.4	69.0	11.8	8.5	2.7	8.3	5.1	18.8	27
V062	0.4	74.4	53.5	8.3	4.9	3.8	6.1	5.7	7.4	25.8
V063	1.2	83.9	72	16.3	12.1	3.6	14.6	13.7	22.8	30.1
V064	11.2	82.5	78	13.8	11.6	4.4	12.9	16.6	27.1	37.3
V065	2.5	79.2	72.5	17.1	8.5	4.4	12.1	13.1	23.3	43.7
V066	40.9	89.5	65.7	13	8.6	1.4	10.7	47.1	16.6	30.8
V067	2.1	74	61.2	14.6	9.3	7.3	12.9	7.1	27.3	45.1
V068	-2.5	79.2	64.5	13	8.1	3.2	7.7	11.1	11.6	27.6
Montreal 1991										
M001	-10.2	69.2	54.3	13.1	10.5	28.4	14.3	24.5	23.8	41
M002	-7.5	69.9	47.3	10.5	12.5	33.5	15.4	17.1	32.3	55.2
M003	-8.2	75.7	55.1	10.1	10.3	23.6	13.4	7.0	19.3	39.3
M004	-1.5	64.7	45.3	14.8	12.1	29.3	16.7	18.9	25.6	41.7
M005	-5.2	71.4	49.7	11.3	9.9	22.4	13.1	24.4	16.5	43.7
M006	-21.2	75.2	55.2	18.3	16.8	23.9	23.8	2.9	27.3	45.7
M007	-1	70.0	51.5	8.9	11.8	24.4	15.3	6.7	18.6	38.6
M008	-7.1	75.7	53.7	16	9.3	20.0	12.7	20.9	17.1	42.7
M009	-8.7	73.0	53.2	9.8	12.5	26.7	17.2	26.0	20.6	43.7
M010	-3.3	72.9	51.3	11.8	11.3	25.9	10.7	28.8	23.3	38.7
M011	-7.7	68.0	47.2	12.1	8.5	25.7	12	8.4	16.6	46.2
M012.01	-13.7	72.5	56.2	19.6	11.9	28.6	22	7.8	30.3	46.2
M012.02	-11.3	72.7	50.8	15.3	11.6	28.9	17.7	4.4	20.1	46.2
M013	-10.4	66	48.6	10	9.9	23.5	15.3	24.0	19.1	41.8
M014.01	0.2	68.0	44.1	20.1	15.6	25.1	19.7	23.6	33.5	52.7
M015	-14.9	63.1	45.1	26.1	18	32.7	27.5	45.2	40.5	59.1
M016	-12.7	62.2	52.2	15.6	14	29.4	26.8	70.3	43.6	62.2
M017	-14.6	64.5	44.6	17.3	20.6	32.5	20.2	66.1	35	62.1
M018	-13.4	64.4	49.7	20.6	19.3	30.3	23.8	61.8	31	49.8

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M019	-4.2	62.7	38.2	25.6	15.5	35.4	26.8	55.4	43	67.2
M021	-2.8	57	29.3	24.6	35	37.5	31.4	54.9	53.1	78.2
M022	-5.6	70.5	45.7	22.5	9.5	28.9	31.3	52.8	43.3	57.2
M023	-3.5	64.7	39	19.3	15.5	25.3	27.8	57.3	48.2	70.2
M024	-2.2	61.2	40.3	20.6	19.3	35.7	29.7	57.6	55	66
M025	-13.8	55.2	38.7	21.8	27.3	37.2	30.6	69.3	41.7	72.7
M026	-7.7	68.7	42.2	27.6	25.6	31.4	25.7	66.5	44.1	61.7
M027	-14.6	66.7	44.7	19.6	21.1	32.8	31.4	65.9	44.8	62.5
M028	-13.6	70.5	44.5	23.3	14.0	33.2	25	67.0	29	54.1
M029	-6.8	66.5	47	15.0	17	30.4	23.1	45.1	41.1	58.1
M030	-5.7	63.8	58	14.6	9	25.5	18.2	30.3	31.3	53.8
M031	-10.5	68.7	52.5	13.9	19.3	22.7	16.4	25.8	29.8	49.7
M032	-17.8	72.7	47.8	18.8	26.3	24.4	20.7	40.6	32.6	59.7
M033	-10.3	59.2	42.8	17.1	15.1	31.8	20	52.9	37.5	55.7
M034	-8.5	64.2	46.8	20.3	17.8	29.7	30.4	39.4	56.3	61.8
M035	-10.8	78.2	51.1	19	13.3	23.9	24.2	67.5	40.1	50
M036	-14.1	66.7	49.6	21.3	8.8	21.8	19.4	40.8	27.1	58.2
M037	-13	61	38	20.6	14.9	36.8	25	26.1	42.5	52.7
M038	-8.2	63.1	29.5	27.3	30.3	40.6	37.2	41.5	50.5	65.4
M039	-18.3	68.0	39.5	30.8	22.3	27.0	33.3	43.2	48.1	66.5
M041	-10.6	74.9	54	19.6	24.6	18.5	23.5	28.8	45.2	62.1
M042	-3	87.0	62.2	11.4	15.1	12.3	12.5	46.5	15.1	64
M043	-2.8	65.2	68.2	23.3	17.8	29.1	20	56.9	32.6	45.5
M044	0.2	74	52.3	13.0	16	25.4	23.9	42.6	39.7	48.8
M045	-9.4	65	41.7	21.6	19.6	25.6	22.4	39.8	42.2	50.2
M046	-7.5	70.2	51.5	18.6	17.8	23.8	26.2	46.5	50.2	52.6
M047	3.7	74.4	57.6	25	8.8	22.1	29	36.7	37.2	57.7
M048	-11.8	71.4	58.3	19	23.5	22.8	23.8	61.1	46.6	55.1
M049	-0.9	69.7	46.2	22.3	16.3	23.4	27	38.5	39.2	53.3
M050	-2	70.2	52	15.5	19.6	25.0	35	32.6	56.6	56.3
M051	18.5	77	80.7	15.4	13.4	13.3	16.7	51.1	43.7	43.8
M052	-11.6	58.3	41.1	25.1	12.9	29.6	26.9	30.1	46.8	70
M053	-9.5	62.7	31.8	13.5	0	35.7	7.7	29.9	44.7	62.5
M054	8.6	63	80.4	22.1	10.8	12.2	6.2	53.9	15.0	48.7
M055.01	7.8	82.2	79.7	8.4	11.4	5.4	5.8	65.7	17	33.1
M055.02	32.1	81.4	65.7	5.7	0	2.4	3.8	0.0	6.5	19

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M057	13.6	58.7	32.3	29.6	45.5	48.8	16.7	30.0	62.7	49.6
M058	-10.9	60.2	39.6	14	9.5	34.6	13.3	25.5	47.3	61.7
M059	33.7	77	74.0	22.1	10	10.0	12.5	72.2	33.5	49.3
M060	-18.9	37.6	17.8	38.8	42.8	52.6	50.7	10.0	81	94.5
M061	26	74.5	75	14.3	14.8	3.7	14.3	69.2	9.3	31.1
M062	-11.6	85.7	61.8	16.6	15.4	16.3	9.1	60.0	0	0
M063	-39.7	72	58.6	11.0	11.8	6.3	12.5	72.0	22.6	72.0
M064	-21.3	71.5	59.7	26.1	23.3	13.8	7.1	16.1	47	64.9
M065.01	9	70.2	60.6	18.1	16.6	4.9	10.3	10.5	48.5	46
M065.02	-22	73.2	60.8	17	15.9	4.7	10.1	44.7	27.8	38.8
M066.01	-9	76.0	49.7	20.6	17.3	8.7	12.1	25.1	38	49.2
M066.02	3.8	60.2	60.7	18.1	18.3	9.7	17.8	23.8	42.5	47.7
M067	15.2	66.2	58.6	17	13	16.7	26.8	36.6	36.5	45.2
M068	-4.3	55.5	38.5	31.8	17	28.2	54	12.1	64.4	71.4
M069	114	82.5	69.2	3.5	7.4	4.3	10.9	13.6	12.5	29.1
M070	20.6	64.2	46.2	33.2	0	23.5	23.1	54.8	20.8	65.2
M072	-14.6	62.2	42.2	16	13.6	30.4	29.7	45.1	36.2	69.5
M073	-4.4	66.2	51.2	26.6	11.5	32.8	23.4	37.9	43.7	54.8
M074	-12	63.2	47.1	16.8	11	27.9	29.7	67.3	41.5	55.8
M075	-2.2	62.1	44.7	26.3	24.6	40.1	28.9	43.5	48.3	73.7
M076	24.7	61.7	36.2	20.6	17.6	34.2	29.4	33.0	58.5	60.7
M077	88.4	61.1	43.2	14	15.5	24.4	35.4	6.3	49.2	53.7
M078	103.6	67.5	53.6	13	8.0	13.9	25.7	16.2	31.6	45.8
M079	4.6	63.8	38.3	20.1	11.4	35.5	28.5	50.1	43.2	70.5
M080	-19.8	76.2	73.5	20.6	16	15.3	16.7	64.1	25.8	48.1
M081	-15.2	70.4	57.2	24.3	13.5	25.5	18.5	71.5	29.8	54.5
M082	5	68.7	54.2	15.6	13.5	28.0	24.2	39.3	36.5	67.2
M083	-9.2	65.5	45.8	12.6	14.5	33.5	19.2	77.2	36.1	54.6
M084	-4.9	57.7	36.2	15.5	20.3	40.3	27.3	41.3	51.7	63.7
M085	-11	63.2	57.6	13.1	7.9	29.4	18.6	66.1	26.1	48.6
M086	-8.9	67.5	46.5	11.1	8.4	26.1	15.2	34.2	20	47.2
M087	1.3	70.5	47	18.1	11	32.5	23.7	42.8	41.8	46.7
M088	-3.2	62.5	43.3	18.1	13.8	29.1	18.5	40.9	33.2	56.8
M089	-5.6	66.7	46.2	14	9.3	28.9	14.2	30.5	22.3	52.3
M090	-5	71.2	54.6	11.1	9.4	25.3	16.7	17.2	21	40
M091	36.4	90.9	60	0	33.2	9.5	14.3	0.0	0	0

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M082	5.9	70.9	50	16.5	11	30.5	15.7	28.3	22.1	57.6
M093	-10.7	72.5	47.8	14.9	10.0	29.9	18.9	49.5	25.5	48
M094.01	-7.1	72.9	53.5	18	15.6	21.7	22.4	33.0	36	53.2
M095	0.8	78.7	77.9	19.1	18.8	5.5	23.5	61.9	40.2	58.2
M096	-6.2	79	58.1	20.1	16.3	9.9	22.8	68.8	31.8	53.5
M097.01	-5.2	71.7	63	13.4	13.3	11.9	21.3	27.8	28.1	43.3
M097.02	9.3	71.2	52.6	14.4	11.9	8.4	19.2	18.9	22.6	46.7
M098	-4	72.9	59.2	13	7.7	12.9	14.2	17.8	11.6	37.3
M099	1.1	64.2	47.2	13.4	12.0	8.8	12	40.1	13.0	48.7
M100	-3	68.9	52.1	10.1	11.3	13.5	16.7	19.3	21.6	39.3
M101.01	2.5	63.7	49.8	13.5	9.9	16.9	17.8	14.4	28.1	48.5
M101.02	-2.4	71.5	58.5	19.3	17.6	21.6	24.6	11.6	38.5	57.5
M102	-5.3	71.2	60.2	11.9	10.5	9.4	15.2	41.6	12.6	30.3
M103	-8.6	77.5	68.2	17	11.6	2.9	12.7	77.7	7.5	40.2
M104	-28.5	80.7	66.0	9.1	6.9	5.0	12.4	76.5	7	46.2
M105	-7.6	79.9	70.5	9.5	11.5	6.5	19.2	69.1	10	28.1
M106	-8.5	77	63.1	20.6	9.6	5.0	20.2	60.5	14.3	35
M107	-2.1	72.0	59.8	17.5	13.4	5.6	20.4	41.3	28.8	29.5
M108	-1.1	76.4	58.3	7.0	7.7	4.1	13.9	66.2	9.5	38.7
M109	0.7	79	67.9	8.0	16.3	6.9	15.5	51.2	25.8	42.3
M110	-4.9	68.0	57	18.3	17.6	6.8	19.8	39.8	28.6	41.5
M111	4.1	68	55.2	14.1	10.4	13.9	16	23.2	20.6	48.5
M112.01	-2.1	68.2	54.2	20.1	19.1	17.6	19.3	13.8	47.8	65.2
M112.02	11.8	56.7	44.5	26.6	20	24.3	18	15.3	42.7	74.2
M113	-4.6	71.0	57.1	11.5	12.6	10.8	15.3	34.1	23.3	48.8
M114	-4.5	78.7	62.3	13.0	11.4	6.0	11.1	45.3	10.1	36
M115.01	3.4	77.7	67.7	8.9	9.6	3.5	16.2	54.0	12.4	33.6
M115.02	2.3	72.9	59.2	11.5	12	5.3	12	16.5	15.1	25.3
M116	2.1	72.4	59.6	18.1	15.6	10.0	20.1	25.9	37.7	49.7
M117	10.3	65.2	52.2	22.3	20.1	18.5	18.1	15.2	45.2	64
M118	2.8	68.2	59.2	24.3	15.8	17.7	16.7	26.2	29.6	63.5
M119	0.5	60.7	55.6	21.3	17.1	22.4	21.9	14.1	54.2	72.5
M120	33.3	66	57.1	18.3	17.1	14.3	14.9	5.0	41	61.7
M121	-3.2	75.9	62.2	17.6	8.0	4.8	10.4	12.2	9.1	23.6
M122	12.3	67.5	54.2	21.8	18.8	19.6	22.6	22.7	53.7	63.7
M123	3.2	72.5	60.5	25.1	13.1	9.1	16.4	21.4	37.8	48.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M124	0.9	68.7	57.6	26.1	18.1	12.0	20.5	16.8	44.8	57.3
M125	32.1	70.5	51.7	12.0	12.1	9.9	9.7	13.0	16.3	39.3
M126	23.6	76.4	70.5	14.3	11.4	3.5	19	52.4	23.1	53.2
M127.01	1	73.7	63.6	13.4	10.5	6.3	16.3	23.0	30.3	42.2
M128	13	72.7	62.2	5	11.3	2.6	8.9	40.5	8.9	32.1
M129.01	-5.9	76.7	61.3	7.2	10.5	1.9	7.3	18.3	14.9	27.1
M129.02	-6.8	77.5	66.2	8.8	10.9	2.5	7	16.8	16.8	27.3
M130	6.6	73.7	63.1	14	12.1	4.6	11.7	36.2	33.7	52.1
M131	22.2	74.7	61.5	13.5	15.0	7.6	11.8	23.4	37.7	49.2
M132	9.3	76.5	63	18.3	9.1	9.8	14.6	25.7	28.3	45.6
M133	-14.1	79.5	70.0	17.1	13.5	12.4	15.8	41.1	31.3	47.2
M134	-11.5	80.2	77.5	28.1	12.6	5.3	13.3	74.0	28	52.2
M135	-19.8	73.7	71.7	15.3	18.3	19.4	17.4	66.9	33	52.6
M136	-12.2	78.2	63.2	20.6	13.6	27.1	14.7	60.1	30.8	54.2
M137	-21.9	80.2	58.6	22.1	20	19.0	18.4	49.6	32.1	47.7
M138	-1.3	81.2	68.0	14	15	17.1	14.8	65.3	28.3	60.7
M139	-22.9	66.7	60.1	12	15.6	30.9	17.5	59.6	40.2	56.1
M140	-10.3	71.0	68.9	11.9	13.1	15.7	14.1	83.0	19.8	42.7
M141	-21.1	76.7	72.4	10.8	2.8	14.4	20.6	75.2	17.8	49.6
M142	-18.2	67.4	66.7	25.6	11.4	18.1	26.7	54.9	32.2	51
M143	-3.1	68.9	50	16.8	3.7	14.0	18.3	40.4	26.1	40.2
M144	-7.6	75.9	72.0	15.3	15.8	11.7	17.4	48.2	23	47
M146	-15.7	67.9	65	13.9	13	15.2	23.4	51	31.5	51.2
M147	-16.1	67.0	64.2	14.3	9.5	20.9	25	56.1	16.8	56.3
M148	-16.2	67.7	74.7	15.5	18.6	8.7	17.5	66.2	23.6	41.2
M149	-17.3	74.0	59.5	16.5	11.8	15.1	19.1	50.1	30.3	43.7
M150	-5.2	74.2	59.5	20.1	16.3	19.5	25.8	43.8	36.6	54.2
M151	-16	70.7	59.8	17.5	16.5	23.3	22.3	67.5	29.1	47.8
M152	-12.5	73.7	66.7	21.6	11.5	18.2	24.3	60.6	27.3	46.2
M153	-7.9	63.8	51.3	19.6	13.1	26.7	20	53.2	39	57.1
M154	7.4	68.5	42.1	20	0	25.9	23.1	31.9	35.6	46.7
M155	-12	76.4	65.4	19	15.4	20.6	24.4	60.7	27.3	38.7
M156	-16	69.9	51.5	17.1	23.3	29.8	19.8	67.1	26	55.8
M157	-18.7	83	65.5	11.3	13.8	14.7	19.6	82.5	26.8	40.8
M158	-16.2	70.5	54.6	18.3	7.9	22.8	21.4	63.9	28.1	58.2
M159	-19.4	77.2	69.4	9.0	14.1	16.2	18.9	75.1	24	42

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LonFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M160	-10.6	71	59	12.6	9.8	21.5	19	57.7	28.3	52.7
M161	-4	79.0	61	11.0	12.8	30.4	20.5	51.3	37.8	58.8
M162	1.4	86.9	65	11.8	7.9	13.0	21	55.8	26.8	46.8
M163	-21.5	81.4	72.5	17.3	21.3	22.7	14.4	70.3	20.8	53.7
M164	-12.7	88	81.5	9.4	10.5	10.4	12.1	37.2	24.1	32.7
M165	-17	70.7	62.7	20	14	19.5	19.4	62.5	47.6	52.8
M166	-24.6	82.0	73.0	26.1	21.1	15.2	25	52.5	65.9	61.5
M167	-16.9	75.9	64.7	17.3	16.6	23.4	24	65.5	43.7	60.5
M168	-23	76.5	59.1	17.3	22.6	23.3	19.1	73.0	32.5	58.8
M169	-20.5	72.0	66.2	19.6	16.5	24.1	18.3	74.7	30.1	56.7
M170	-19.5	71.5	58.8	19	15.0	26.8	18.4	58.1	36.3	66.7
M171	1.8	73.7	50	21.6	10.3	23.4	21.5	42.7	41.7	58.7
M172	-17	72.2	66.9	26.6	15.5	17.1	16.9	45.6	38.1	61.2
M173	-12.7	73.2	60.2	13.4	11.4	16.7	16.4	53.8	22.3	46.1
M174	-15.3	77.7	69.0	13.3	14.3	19.2	20	62.6	18.1	46.5
M175	-12.5	70	67.9	13.1	12.3	21.4	21.9	69.8	30	38.2
M176	-11.6	82.2	64.2	12.4	7.7	15.4	17.6	72.5	23.6	34.2
M177	-14.5	81	68.5	11.8	20.3	12.2	23.3	65.9	32.6	40.2
M178	-16.9	75.7	60.8	13.5	7.0	19.8	20.9	65.9	26.6	56.5
M179	-13.9	75.5	54.7	25.8	19.3	23.1	24.1	50.5	37.1	54.2
M180	-13.8	68.2	52	19	16.5	26.8	23.5	44.6	39.5	58.6
M181	-10.3	70.5	50.1	16	22	29.7	23.4	43.8	26.5	56.2
M182	-15.6	66.5	54	17.8	14	30.5	19.2	50.9	27.6	58.5
M183	-19	70.7	53	12	9.5	26.5	20.5	55.4	22.8	47.7
M184	-16.1	72.2	53.3	16.1	18.1	25.0	20	50.5	27.3	47.2
M185	-12.1	71.5	47.2	15.4	12.4	27.0	15.1	33.9	20.1	56.5
M186	-10.8	71.5	50.1	17.8	12.3	28.9	19	12.6	29.1	49.1
M187.01	-6.2	67.9	51.2	17.1	15.0	24.4	14.7	23.5	26.3	50.1
M187.02	425.8	78	61.1	15.8	11.3	14.7	19.6	3.3	25.3	40.1
M188.01	-10	73.5	53.3	17.6	14.6	20.3	19.8	19.4	29.8	44.5
M188.02	-9.2	69.7	56.5	19.3	19.8	21.3	21.8	21.0	24	44.2
M190.01	-9.4	67.9	53.7	9.0	8.5	18.5	12.8	3.8	15.3	45.1
M190.02	9.4	56	44.2	7	6.7	12.0	7.9	6.5	7.2	20.6
M191	1.4	75.2	54.6	8.6	7.2	13.3	13.6	1.4	12.1	30.8
M192	24	74	53.8	5.5	5.2	15.9	14.1	3.1	19.3	46
M193	-3.2	75.0	61.8	15	8.5	13.7	12.9	10.3	17.1	33

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M194	22.1	78.4	60.5	6.4	10.6	20.8	18.8	3.6	23	51
M195.01	25.3	63.7	47.3	5.9	9	24.3	9.4	2.8	9.3	41.3
M195.02	-1.2	74.2	54.7	11.4	7.9	20.8	15.4	0.0	18.1	42.1
M195.03	-4.6	77.9	65.5	7.7	8	21.7	10.4	0.0	11.5	33.3
M196	-5.1	71.5	59.1	5.5	10.8	18.7	16	7.6	17.5	32.5
M197	-8.7	66.2	50.2	13.5	9.4	26.3	17.7	7.7	22.5	42.8
M198	-7.9	66.9	51.1	13.0	9.0	23.8	18.6	8.5	26.1	43.1
M199	-9.6	70.7	55.2	9.5	7.9	20.7	17.5	24.3	29.1	48.5
M200	-11	69.0	49.3	16.8	13	29.3	18.9	16.7	25.3	48.8
M201	-8	63.5	45.2	19	14.4	23.2	22.1	11.1	31.5	56
M202	-5.5	68.5	49.2	12.6	11.1	27.7	17.4	21.7	13.5	55.5
M203	-12.6	67.2	52.7	13	8.9	25.5	13.8	44.6	20.1	42.2
M204	-13.3	70	52.2	12.1	8.4	20.3	16.3	57.6	21.3	46.3
M205	-13.6	70	44.7	15.0	9.5	20.8	13.5	59.7	16.1	43.5
M206	-10	68.7	55.1	15.1	11.6	24.1	12.8	53.6	14	41.7
M207	-12	71.2	53.3	16.5	17.1	29.3	21.1	45.0	25.6	54.7
M208	-10.1	67.5	53.1	16.8	11	23.1	19.4	61.1	29.1	41.2
M209	-3.1	70	50.7	16.8	14.5	27.9	16.6	36.2	28.5	55.8
M210	-8.6	69.7	52.3	20.3	16.3	25.6	23	46.7	39.3	51.6
M211	-10.7	77.2	55.8	21.1	8	19.9	21.3	59.6	32	57.2
M212	-13.4	66.7	56.8	19.8	16.8	26.0	20.5	62.7	21.5	54.2
M213	-5.6	75.5	54.6	10.0	8.4	21.5	20.5	56.3	26.8	39
M214	-3	63.2	51.5	11.5	10.6	29.7	20	60.5	36.2	58.6
M215	-1.5	74.0	48.1	15.8	11	27.6	21.3	69.7	32.2	51.2
M216	-12.7	75.9	53.7	15.9	23.1	23.5	26.4	60.2	37.2	54.5
M217	-5.7	70.5	47.2	25	16.1	30.2	23.2	52.5	45	66.9
M218	-15.1	68.0	49.7	24.6	18.8	28.7	21.7	42.9	42.6	63.8
M219	-6.5	70.5	46.6	18.1	17.8	37.9	20.2	52.4	48.7	54.8
M220	-0.4	72.5	48.2	23.1	25.3	34.2	18.2	22.0	50.2	73.7
M221	-5.3	65.7	50	24.3	21.8	35.2	17.7	22.0	50.2	70.2
M222	-6	66.9	52	26.6	22.1	35.9	17.4	22.8	45.2	71
M223.01	-9.9	67.5	49.3	18.1	27.1	31.4	18.8	9.9	51.8	70
M223.02	-6.6	67.5	47.6	25.1	20.3	40.7	15.5	13.7	53.7	54
M224	-3.3	66.5	46.8	29.3	21.6	36.5	16.5	17.9	50.2	78.5
M225	-10.2	68.5	56.7	13.5	13.3	27.7	10.5	12.1	17	45.2
M226	-14.4	74.0	60.1	11	9.6	22.6	14.4	57.3	20.3	41.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M227	-8.3	70.7	57.6	18.1	18.3	25.8	14.3	55.3	29.3	37.2
M228	-11.7	71.7	61.8	12.0	3	21.3	13.6	61.3	24.6	40.1
M230	-11.5	73.7	62.2	13.6	12.8	26.2	18.2	61.8	28.1	43
M231	-5.5	74	63.2	15.6	13.3	33.4	21.3	67.9	29.5	48.5
M232	-6.7	72.5	60.1	15.5	16.1	24.0	17	59.4	28.5	50.7
M233	-8.4	75.4	58	24.6	20.8	22.3	17.2	54.0	48.3	54.5
M234	8.5	61.8	43.7	26.8	12	31.9	19.6	33.7	40.6	71.2
M235	-12.6	76.7	62.7	22.5	11.1	26.9	16.2	65.8	26.3	49.6
M236	-9.5	64.2	51.5	18.1	12.5	28.0	12.8	53.4	24.3	51.3
M237	-9.9	79.2	62.1	16.3	10.8	20.8	18.7	59.8	19.3	48.7
M238	-12.4	70.0	54.7	13.1	11.1	22.7	16.8	49.4	20.8	43.6
M239	-3.5	66.2	52.1	20.5	17	26.1	15.4	22.3	32.2	53.6
M240	8.3	64.5	43.7	16.8	11.9	32.3	22.7	10.3	42	66.0
M241	-12.2	70.5	45.6	19.3	20.8	33.0	21.4	17.1	33.2	57
M242	-6.8	65.2	50.7	15.1	16.8	34.2	19.1	20.9	39.1	58.6
M243	-14.1	68.9	52.2	21.1	14.9	31.4	18.6	12.6	33.7	48.7
M244	-7.5	67.9	50.7	16	9.5	25.4	18	32.1	34.2	50
M245	0.6	69.0	53.6	16.1	9.9	24.3	19.7	36.7	35.3	58.7
M247	-4.2	69.7	51.8	22.6	11.0	27.2	19.3	59.7	23.3	50.1
M249	-9.6	65.4	47.7	15.5	17.1	32.1	13.8	30.3	23.3	55.2
M250	-5.7	65.5	50.8	18.3	13.8	32.5	16.8	15.7	28.1	64.4
M251.01	-4	66.2	48	11.4	12.8	35.4	17	7.4	27.1	52.8
M251.02	-6.1	70.4	53.1	16.6	21.6	32.2	22.1	11.1	38.8	52
M252	-10.2	65.5	47	17.6	17	33.2	19.5	15.8	34.8	65.2
M253	-20.4	74	53.2	15.8	20.8	37.2	18.6	6.4	31.3	67.2
M254	16.6	63.5	50.7	25.1	14.1	27.7	19.5	10.2	33.7	58.7
M256	-5.7	68.4	50	16.6	18.1	37.5	21.7	17.3	39.2	58.8
M257	-4.5	72.7	47	14.5	16.3	35.3	21.4	8.3	35.3	63
M258	-18.6	62.1	46.5	17.1	22.8	29.2	29.4	8.4	43.2	65.9
M259	-11.9	70.5	51	22.6	19.3	36.3	29.7	6.7	45.2	63.8
M260	-11.7	69.5	49.2	16.5	22.1	30.6	23.1	6.1	35.3	64.5
M261	-9.3	70.2	54.7	15.4	12.5	30.7	21.6	7.9	34.1	58.3
M262	-10.1	72.2	55	14.5	21.8	37.4	18.6	5.0	33.7	59.7
M263	-6.6	73.7	57.2	13.5	16.1	32.7	14.6	1.7	18.8	43.7
M264.01	1	70	56.2	7.9	12.5	13.4	14.4	0.0	10.4	36.1
M264.02	8.9	85.5	75.5	8.3	4.7	6.3	13.8	0.0	12.9	16.8

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M265	-7.2	72.2	57.2	11.5	11.5	20.7	13.4	22.5	13.9	41.5
M266	-6.9	66	47.6	16	12.8	27.8	16.5	19.2	29.3	59.6
M267	-11.7	70.7	58.6	14.6	14.0	32.7	13.5	6.9	26.3	49.3
M268.01	60.6	72.5	53.2	13.9	11.4	13.6	11	0.4	24.6	31.6
M268.02	131.8	77.7	65.7	21.8	23	14.3	10.6	0.7	39.6	39.6
M269	-2.5	73.9	52.1	21.1	18.8	20.0	18.6	7.7	35.3	52.3
M270	-3.2	70.2	54.2	15.0	15.0	17.3	14.8	12.8	16.1	42.7
M271	-12.5	74.9	53.7	5.4	9.6	22.4	14.3	16.1	14.6	41.2
M272	2.8	69.9	55	12.5	14.9	17.7	14.9	3.7	22.3	40.7
M273	-9.5	72.7	55.6	9.5	11.1	28.1	15	8.2	16.1	27.6
M274	-17.5	66.7	53	15.5	13.6	34.5	13.9	3.7	26	37.3
M275	-11.2	71.0	54.6	13.0	10.5	24.4	16.7	8.4	29.1	47.1
M276	-9.3	70.7	55.6	15.4	11.5	20.3	17.8	10.3	21.6	46.5
M277	-4.9	73.0	54.2	17.6	16.8	19.8	13.9	8.4	24.8	45.7
M278	-4	74.7	57.2	14.9	8.5	14.6	15.3	21.8	17.6	47.7
M279	-4.3	74.2	47.2	19.8	8.0	12.4	13.2	25.9	17.5	48.1
M280	-6.8	69.5	57.8	15.0	14.3	16.1	15.4	5.5	19.3	45
M281	-3.8	67.4	54.7	5.7	7.0	13.1	11.3	12.1	12.0	36.7
M282	3.4	73.7	57.3	14.3	12.1	19.8	14	10.8	25.6	34.8
M283.01	-31.6	74.2	53.7	10.8	12.1	20.7	7.9	1.5	14.4	36.3
M283.02	-1.8	67.5	51.3	18.3	16	19.6	11.6	2.5	17.8	57.2
M284	1.7	68.2	51.7	13.3	9.5	19.3	10.5	4.6	19.1	41.2
M285	-0.7	72	53.3	12.6	9.6	24.6	15.6	11.1	23.1	52.1
M286	2.8	70.7	52.5	16.8	21.6	17.8	15.7	7.6	30.8	47.7
M287.01	17.5	72.4	59.6	25.5	21.1	19.9	22.3	12.8	42	61.3
M287.02	0	74.5	57.7	10.5	9	14.6	9.7	9.4	13.9	47.8
M288	40.4	66.9	39.2	3.2	5.7	9.3	7.9	6.3	6.7	26.6
M290.01	52.1	80.7	64.7	12	15.5	24.4	11.1	0.0	22.8	47.3
M290.02	85.5	83.0	66.5	15.4	17.1	30.2	9.5	1.4	21.8	31.6
M290.03	104.2	79	63.7	12.3	13.4	22.1	14.8	0.8	26.1	24.3
M290.04	32.5	81.5	63.7	9.0	12.3	24.2	10.2	3.4	14.1	61.7
M290.05	46.4	69.4	52.6	12.6	13.9	25.5	10.2	1.4	20	41.1
M290.06	12	78.0	60.3	9.9	16.6	26.7	11.7	1.1	23.8	50.2
M290.07	85.3	80.7	60.7	10.0	9.5	26.2	10.7	1.4	18.3	45
M290.08	8.9	75	59.7	8	9.4	21.8	6.8	3.3	12.3	21.6
M290.09	12	73.2	57.6	12.8	15.8	27.5	13	0.9	26.6	43.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
M201	113.8	79.9	59.7	8	16.3	21.0	8	3.4	18.5	61.2
M580.01	-0.2	73.4	59.2	14.6	13.5	25.9	16.5	4.3	25.1	45.2
M580.02	69.3	84.2	72.7	18.8	0	9.8	12.5	10.0	0	43.7
M580.03	46.6	81.5	67.9	7	9	16.0	8.8	6.6	10	23.6
M581.01	10.7	82.5	62.2	9.1	11.5	16.3	10.8	4.0	11.4	41.6
M581.02	11.7	80.2	61.7	9.9	9.9	17.5	17.3	0.7	16.1	29.5
M582.01	202.4	79.9	66.7	6.2	7.5	16.9	11.3	2.9	11	34
M582.02	-6.8	79	57.3	10.6	13.0	20.3	16.7	2.5	20.1	45.7
M583	-9.3	75.4	57	12.3	11.0	21.7	10.9	11.1	16.3	34.5
M584	6.2	73.9	52.5	9	9.9	23.4	13.4	12.4	21.1	49.3
M585.01	11.9	80.7	73.9	3.3	7.7	14.7	5.7	8.1	4.0	50.6
M585.02	10.1	77.5	61.6	10	5.4	22.5	10.2	3.0	13.8	37.7
Savannah 1990										
S1	-53.6	54.3	45.9	17.1	31.6	24.5	63.3	48.2	77.1	71
S3	13.3	54.3	52.5	12.8	12.4	6.2	10.6	71.3	0	27.9
S6.01	-19.2	62.6	46.4	19.2	12.6	27.1	18.2	40.7	33.7	55.5
S8	-12	77.6	76	7	11.2	3.3	6.2	85.3	8.2	35.8
S9	0.2	76.6	44.7	6.1	4.9	5.5	8.2	72.1	2.3	29.2
S10	-47.9	49.1	44.1	8.3	0	18.7	22.4	58.2	46.4	68.7
S11	1.8	49.6	42.2	14.5	15.1	16.6	40.8	34.7	30	59.6
S12	-19.2	45.2	27.5	29.6	12.3	22	63.4	12.5	75.2	90.2
S13	-23.8	58.8	66.6	3.3	14.7	17.5	35.3	59.1	45.3	43.3
S15	-3.3	63.9	66.7	11.6	9.1	9.3	24.8	67.2	30.2	49.5
S17	-45.3	49.6	34.4	20.6	47.5	34.9	22.9	69.7	50.3	58.4
S18	-20.7	37.1	47.5	12.4	24.6	29.1	35.6	68.5	39.1	61.3
S19	-19.7	72.1	56.3	4.4	21.4	22.8	45.5	59.2	50.2	56.1
S20	-24	60.5	45.7	20.3	11.2	32.9	31.2	58.7	45.9	59.6
S21	-14.6	67	60.7	9	9.6	19.6	24.8	56.4	28.7	43.1
S22	-5.6	74.6	52.3	8.2	11.6	9.2	32	23	31.8	35.2
S23	-26.6	56.2	36.8	16.3	11.1	21.7	20.8	34.1	35.2	47.1
S24	-23.8	62.5	52.5	13.4	9.6	23.3	26.1	55.1	31.7	52.7
S25	23.6	64.8	33.5	8	9.2	25.5	22.4	61.3	29.4	45.9
S26	-17.4	79.2	65	11.2	11.6	12.8	24.8	56.5	20.3	34.9
S27	-13.3	71.5	59.5	11.6	11.7	9.5	20.8	42.6	33.3	42.4
S28	-7.2	65.8	49.8	6.9	5.1	16.9	18.4	23.1	21.8	32
S29	-8.4	71.2	48.5	0.9	3.9	1.8	6.1	66.1	4.4	10.4

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
S30	-7.2	73.7	49.1	1.2	2.3	3.7	9.2	59.7	2.6	8.7
S32	-29.1	64.8	43.9	15.1	15.1	30	21.5	27.6	34	43.2
S33.01	-15.9	63.6	54.1	16.5	15	26.9	14.9	20.5	23.5	38.3
S33.02	-14.2	72.8	64.1	6.2	9.2	10.3	10.8	3.4	7.5	17.3
S34	-6	60.8	43.9	5.8	5.3	8.9	9.5	26.5	11.3	26
S35.01	9.9	53.8	47.6	6.7	10.3	14.6	14.5	21.3	12.8	34.2
S35.02	-10	73.1	58	3.8	5.9	7.3	6.7	8	4.9	19.2
S36.01	-23.6	70.3	61	11.4	14.4	18.4	18.8	26.6	21	27
S36.02	1.6	72	57	8.4	11.1	11.4	13.4	22.2	10.3	29.2
S37	-12.2	63.5	48.5	6.2	4	14.2	10.5	39.2	15.1	19.8
S38	4.6	70.8	61.9	3.9	6.4	13.9	29.4	10.9	27.9	38.8
S39	-5.3	77.5	55.6	4	5.3	7	9.1	3.7	5.5	16.2
S40.01	-4.6	69.8	58.1	8.2	4.9	3.8	7.8	2.8	8.2	21.5
S40.02	13.9	70.2	52.3	2.9	3	5.7	8.8	0.4	9.5	13.7
S42.02	19	82.9	66	6.7	10	3.7	13.4	2	9.9	16.8
S42.03	41.5	82.5	64	3.9	5.4	4.7	16.1	0.7	10.4	17.4
S42.05	4.1	79	64.8	2.9	8.2	1.5	6.7	0.3	2.7	17.4
S42.06		83.7	75	6.7	0	5.3	3	11.4	2	14.8
S43	7.3	96.8	59.4	6	15.1	3.8	4.9	9	1.9	45.9
S44	-5.6	61.6	62.5	11.8	6.9	20.8	23.6	10.8	30.7	30.2
S45	-1.2	53.8	56.9	12.1	10.4	19	12.8	6.8	23.5	35.5
S101.01	-22	52.4	30.1	42.2	32.9	15.9	61.4	17.2	81	89.2
S106.04	16.1	63.5	42.9	5.2	12.8	38.9	30.4	21.9	34.9	33.5
S109.01		82.5	57.8	0.8	3.9	3.5	15.6	2.2	6.7	23.5
S109.02		79.1	71	4.2	2.7	1.7	5.6	4.7	5.4	4.8
Lincoln 1990										
L1	-3.4	75.4	64.3	2.4	3.4	7.6	11.7	43.1	10.9	20.4
L2.01	-5.7	71.6	63.9	1.8	1	4	6.8	15.5	0.8	10.5
L2.02	4.3	75.8	71.9	2.3	3	7.7	18.4	24.8	10.9	20.1
L3	6.6	78.7	74.2	2	5.2	5.3	15.9	21	11.7	26.2
L4	7.9	77.2	60	6.6	3.9	11.2	17.7	46.5	21.3	41.1
L5	25.4	77	69.4	4.7	7.7	7.9	15.2	73.4	7.4	49.6
L7	22.8	70.3	62.3	9.1	5.1	9.8	30.9	35	41.3	56.8
L8	4.3	84.4	67.6	5.2	4.8	5	23.1	59.8	23.2	37
L9	-2.1	67.7	67.3	2.7	2.4	2.4	7.1	33.5	16.4	37.6
L10	3.5	81.4	70.2	4	3.2	3.6	7.7	9.5	4.4	22.8

[illegible]

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	Toledo 1990				LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
				UnempM	UnempF	Grade9					
T2	-3.2	79.9	65.1	3.8	5.3	4.9		9.2	60.4	3.2	13
T3	-6.4	73	55.9	5.2	10.2	5.5		12.1	52.7	7.5	11.7
T4	-5.8	75.5	59.5	9.7	4	6.5		10.2	51.5	8	18.3
T6	-1.9	79.8	65.4	5.5	9	4.1		9.9	75.6	7.7	16.1
T7	1	76.4	65.3	7.5	10.1	8		10.7	61.4	6.1	18.6
T8	-7.5	64.6	57.4	20.4	30.1	11.2		35.1	66	43.2	50.1
T9	-6	72.4	47.7	15.8	14.8	10.7		16.4	83.1	22.8	26.4
T10	-5	64.1	47.8	8.4	9.5	11.7		11.1	68.3	7.1	17.8
T11	-4.1	62.9	48.4	23.5	13.4	12.9		17.5	55.1	21.9	27
T12.01	-7.4	77.3	59.1	4.3	5.8	10.4		12.5	8.9	11.8	25.7
T12.02	-11.1	55.5	44.7	26.8	29.5	13		35.8	37.4	48	55.3
T13.01	-7.5	81.8	60.6	5.9	5.1	2.2		2.3	53.3	1	21.4
T13.02	38.1	56.6	49.1	8.6	3.9	9.4		22.5	24.1	18.2	41.9
T13.03	-6.8	78	61.9	4.3	7.2	4.8		10.6	50	7.5	18.2
T13.04	11.1	46.3	47	8.8	11.4	12.9		6.2	26.3	45.6	67
T14	-22.2	67.5	65	19.6	20.3	7.6		34.9	59.9	27.7	36.7
T15	-30.2	69.8	59.4	15.5	14.1	11.2		29.2	62	36.3	35.7
T16	-19.6	68.4	59.7	17.9	15.4	8.7		26.8	81.3	25.4	29.7
T17	-5	63.4	37.9	27.9	12.9	21.3		29.4	85.9	43.1	41.6
T18	-5	61.6	46.2	18.9	19.4	18.3		21.7	83.1	30.6	39.4
T19	-18.2	66	51.9	22.2	21.1	9.8		24.2	66.2	27.1	25
T20	-12.8	71.6	43.2	23.4	11.4	14.4		20.9	81	30.2	38.3
T21	-14.7	68.1	49	17.4	11.1	13.1		25.9	77.9	29.4	32.3
T22	-36.5	55.6	52.5	28.3	21.2	15.6		36.8	56.3	48.7	55.5
T23	3	46.8	32.8	35.4	31.3	18.5		43.6	16.7	39.9	64.2
T24.01	-5.7	73.9	66.6	10.1	6.3	3		14.2	55.6	6.5	41.1
T24.02	-22.1	55.8	56.3	12.3	12.3	9		24.3	64.4	28	5
T25	-29.7	53	49	18.2	14.1	11.1		29.3	64.6	37.5	47.7
T26	-24.3	43.5	42.6	40.3	6.8	18.2		27.2	73.8	27.2	37.6
T27	-48.7	48.2	43.3	20.2	23.8	19		8.5	28	28.9	42.4
T28	-23.3	13.6	33.5	67.1	60.7	18.1		21.4	26.7	78.8	66.4
T29	-8.2	42.1	23.2	35.4	36.4	30.5		43.9	38.5	72.6	60.3
T30	-13.2	52.9	37.5	30.7	22.8	25.7		28.8	56.6	46.1	58.1
T31	-6.3	65.4	47.4	15.7	24.4	15.5		31.1	67.8	19.2	27.7
T32	-21.5	55.3	52.3	27	18.8	16.9		26.7	82	31.7	39.9

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	Unempl	UnempF	Graded	LonFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
T33	-24.3	60.1	43.9	26.2	29	18	31.6	74.1	33.6	48.8
T34	-16.5	37.2	38.7	34.1	23.4	15.4	62.6	40.8	64.2	66.1
T35	-18.4	50.8	39.1	24.4	25.9	16.6	24.4	62.2	32.1	37.3
T36	-24.3	48.1	47.9	22.9	20.9	16.9	28.8	68.1	40.7	41
T37	-53.3	26.7	32	45.6	47.5	33.9	41.9	70.9	66.7	60.1
T38	-24.8	62	44.4	29.8	26.1	29.5	21.8	75.1	42.7	28.6
T39	-3.7	76.6	55.4	13.2	6.1	9.8	12	62.8	11	26.2
T40	-10	67.5	51.8	8.2	20	9.7	22.8	71.8	30.5	30.9
T41	-14.7	74.4	43.2	26.2	10.4	19.3	29.1	85.9	38.5	41.9
T42	-8.6	75.1	47.9	14.5	16.7	12.8	23.4	81.7	39.7	29.2
T43.02	-1.4	76.4	54.4	7.5	7.8	3.6	6.6	62.5	6.7	15.6
T44	1.5	83.8	64.6	11.4	5	3.1	10	75.2	5.6	13.7
T45.01	-4.8	82.9	63.1	4.7	4.9	1.3	9.2	77.9	7.3	16
T45.03	-5.3	70.1	57.7	3	5	3.5	5.4	20.4	3.9	15
T45.04	-5.5	68.4	56.4	3.8	4.7	2.1	2.7	38.5	2.7	5.6
T46	-9.9	66.9	45.2	17.2	4.7	15.9	14.3	63.5	21.4	28.9
T47.01	-3.5	68.1	50.5	12.9	13.5	12.5	22.8	64.7	24.4	29
T47.02	-8.1	68.7	47.2	14.5	13.8	14.6	18.8	51	24.4	26.5
T48	-4.6	76.5	48.6	12.4	16.1	10.4	22.4	84.3	27.6	38.3
T49	-5.9	76.9	49.9	15.4	8.2	9.3	18	83.8	20.4	25.3
T50	-10.1	72.9	50.1	9.7	5.7	4.7	11.2	72.7	7.4	20.2
T51	-9.7	75.1	46	17	17.3	8.5	25.4	81.9	30.2	37.7
T52	-6.2	68.5	51.6	12.5	9.1	11.5	13.6	53	16.3	25.3
T53	-6.4	79.2	51.8	19.2	15.1	16.9	16.7	73	22.1	32.5
T54	-7.4	70.5	47	18	16.3	9.8	20.2	85.6	32.6	26.7
T55.01	-8.4	76.6	54.3	10.6	8.1	6.9	9.9	38.2	8.4	21.2
T55.02	-8.3	68.2	51.1	6.1	3	6.6	5.2	50.3	0.5	15.5
T55.03	-8.4	69.9	53	8.8	7.4	8	4.3	8.6	2.1	17.9
T56	15.7	71.5	62.2	8.8	12.2	3.5	18.2	3.4	18.2	9.8
T57.01	0.9	79.2	65.4	3.7	11.1	5.9	14.7	3.5	9.4	15.7
T57.02	-2.4	71.3	56.9	5.2	6.1	8	9.5	10.9	8	24.6
T57.03	-4.1	76.1	54.4	5.6	4.2	6.6	7.8	37.8	2.9	19.4
T58.01	-4.2	76.4	64.8	3.4	2.1	4.4	9.3	10.6	6.2	19.7
T58.02	-7.3	79.2	56.2	5.2	4.2	6.1	7.8	11.1	4.7	13.7
T59.01	-13.6	76.1	56.6	5.9	8.2	3.7	3.9	17.3	4.9	9.3
T59.02	-6.8	74.1	54.2	5.7	8.4	5.5	10.5	12.3	5.4	17.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouses	FamPov	IndPov
T60	-8.1	65.1	53.5	3.7	2.5	3.3	5	6.9	6.8	8.6
T61	-4	72	58.2	7.8	6.7	3.5	8.5	31.4	4.7	9.6
T62	-2.7	76	65.4	3.7	5.7	5.6	7.8	49.4	2.2	20.3
T63	-5.5	82	61.3	4.4	0.7	3	6.6	67	1	21.6
T64	-6.1	79.6	63.9	4	1.4	1.9	5.9	49.3	3.3	15.7
T65	-6.3	63.1	49.2	1.3	11.4	3.1	15.8	20.7	18.2	35.2
T66	-10.3	62.1	51.2	14.2	13.9	15.1	14.4	23.6	16.8	35.9
T67	-5.9	60.8	49.3	9.6	7.8	13.2	13.3	40.1	8.7	34.7
T68	2.3	62.2	47	8.7	7.7	12.8	20.9	6.8	28.1	34.5
T69	-8.1	69.4	57.6	6.6	1.7	7	6.4	20.8	2.3	16.4
T72.02	1.8	79.8	60.1	2.9	3.5	2.9	4.5	5.4	3.1	19.1
T72.03	-15.7	74.2	60.2	4.3	4.8	2.1	3.1	1.4	0.8	3.1
T72.04	24	84	66.7	7.3	1.8	0.5	7	2	2	11.3
T72.05	0	77.7	59.4	4.5	5.3	4.8	11.1	1	7.3	15.7
T73.01		82.9	73.6	8.1	5.2	2.4	8	1.7	2.3	15.9
T73.02		77	59.5	6.5	10.3	5.6	15.1	3	13.7	30.7
T73.03		67.1	66.9	9.4	12.3	4.2	24.9	3	28	54.7
T74	-0.1	71.2	59.2	8.2	5.8	5.3	15.2	5.9	9.1	33.8
T75	40.8	58.7	54.2	3.7	3.9	3.3	5.1	10.7	5.3	63.8
T77	3.7	63.2	43.9	4.5	3.6	3.7	3.5	4.4	0.6	29
T78	-6.4	71.6	53.9	4.6	4.4	5.1	8.2	7.5	8.9	16.2
T79.01	-10.6	77.8	56.7	4.8	5.4	7	6.4	9.3	3.7	13.7
T79.02	-3.8	76.2	57.9	5.4	5.5	5.2	7.8	12	6.5	19.5
T80	17.9	77.8	66.8	0	0	3.4	7.5	5.9	0	19.6
T83.01	-8.5	74.7	60.6	3.7	2.1	5.6	7.6	1.2	5.6	9.7
T83.02	-9.1	69.3	43.4	6.7	9.8	2.8	1.9	5.7	0	0
T85	10	79.2	56	11.1	7	7	9	19.2	12.7	20.7
T86	4.7	75.7	62.1	7.7	4	8.7	6.8	17.5	2.7	30
Portland 1990										
P1	4.7	81.8	65.5	4.5	4.6	5	12.1	63.5	5.3	16.1
P2	1.9	75.3	57.1	3.8	6.1	5.4	10.3	48.5	3.8	15.9
P3.01	3.3	70.6	55.8	4.1	3.1	6.1	6.1	23.1	2.5	27.2
P3.02	-1.3	74.2	55.7	1.6	2.8	2.3	5.5	58.8	2.4	9.1
P4.01	-0.2	71.8	49.8	4.5	4.3	4.4	8.2	49.7	6.3	24
P4.02	0.5	76.9	59.7	9.5	4.6	9.2	9.6	42.3	6.5	29.1
P5.01	4.9	75.8	55.2	12.6	7	7.5	9.8	56.4	18.1	29.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades9	LoncFam	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P5.02	6.2	71.7	54.2	4.8	4.8	7.9	11.9	46.8	11.3	27.3
P6.01	1.4	79.2	63	5.3	7.2	6	10.2	30.3	8.8	18.2
P6.02	4.4	77.3	56.7	9	4.2	9.2	14.6	39.9	16.2	36.4
P7.01	4.6	67.2	49.7	6.6	6.3	7.9	9.9	31.9	8.2	24
P7.02	2.2	79.9	55.8	4.4	4.4	9.5	11.6	44.5	7.6	18.4
P8.01	1.5	73.9	57.3	5.5	4.7	6.5	9.5	50.7	7.3	24.6
P8.02	3.5	78.5	61	3	7	7.7	13.9	42.6	10.7	27.2
P9.01	0.5	78.3	63.9	5.7	3	11.7	14.1	59.9	15.7	23.1
P9.02	6.4	80.6	68.7	10.5	6.2	5.2	17.9	32.6	13.8	23.7
P10	-2.7	81	64.1	6.9	7.7	8.1	16	67.9	17.9	27
P11.01	11.4	75.9	61.3	2.6	6.9	6	19.8	88.1	23.3	31.1
P11.02	-9.5	81.8	68	8.1	0	4.4	11.3	89.1	11.9	17.6
P12.01	5	83.4	73.5	5.8	7.3	5	17.6	68.3	8.7	23.2
P12.02	-4.8	78.6	68.2	3.4	2	5.4	7.1	78.9	3.2	15
P13.01	-4.9	77	62.9	7.4	5.2	7.4	19.4	73.8	12.2	23.5
P13.02	-5.5	79	65.8	7.6	6	5.5	9.9	84.9	4.6	19.4
P14	0.9	75.3	69.5	7.4	6.2	4.6	12.6	75.9	3.7	24.7
P15	-0.4	76.4	63.3	3.8	4.3	4.1	7.3	78.5	3.7	19.4
P16.01	10.1	68.4	53.8	5	4.9	9.6	6.6	40	9.7	22.9
P16.02	15.4	70.5	56.6	7.3	5.2	7.9	9.6	29.9	7.1	21.5
P17.01	7.1	76	53.4	11.5	3.4	9.4	9.9	50.4	7.1	15.9
P17.02	0	78.4	61	3	3.3	6.3	9	26.5	4.8	19.7
P18.01	-6.5	78.6	61.7	7.3	3.7	6.2	10.1	52.4	11.2	17.9
P18.02	0.8	77.3	53.1	2.4	4.9	2	9	52	6.2	15.1
P19	-5.4	75.7	60.7	2.8	3.4	1.4	7.7	87.2	3.2	9.8
P20	-1.4	83.3	68.2	8	6.4	8.8	19	66.1	14.4	20.2
P21	0	74.7	66	3.5	4.7	6.6	21.6	74.2	20.6	28.4
P22.01	30.3	68.7	52.8	57.1	0	7.5	26	8.1	50	15.4
P22.02	2.2	42	92.9	16.2	26.9	4.2	20.6	76.1	53.1	61.5
P23.01	-7.6	58	42.3	10.5	21.7	10.7	31.1	61.7	36.5	51.6
P23.02	-10.5	60.3	29.2	14.7	0	6.4	16.5	51.3	28.6	15.9
P24.01	-11.4	69.2	65.1	4.3	6.4	4.3	10.9	91.8	5.8	20.8
P24.02	1.6	75.3	56.5	4.3	4.4	6.8	15.8	50.7	7.8	21.1
P25.01	-2.7	82.1	61.7	2.5	4.3	0.6	6.5	91.9	0.6	14.4
P25.02	-1.7	85	67.9	4.1	3.8	2.1	11.4	56.6	4.8	18
P26	-3.2	79.4	62.5	0.8	4.4	1.3	7.2	89.3	1.8	12.6

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouses	FamPov	IndPov
P27.01	-4.6	82.8	65.8	0	2	1.7	6.5	94.3	4.5	10.3
P27.02	-0.4	66.1	49.6	8.9	5	5.4	9.7	49.1	3.5	26.8
P28.01	0	76.4	65.7	8.1	4.7	3.1	8.3	84.3	4.1	9.2
P28.02	4	76.3	61.3	4.6	4.8	4.4	9.8	67.7	5.5	11
P29.01	16.1	72.1	58.1	3.9	5.2	4.1	8	61.1	7.3	16.7
P29.02	-7.4	74.5	60.9	4.1	7.2	5.6	10.8	48.4	7.8	11.8
P29.03	0.7	76.8	53.1	4.4	2.1	5.3	6.6	21	4.5	18
P30	2.8	76.2	56.3	4.6	3.1	2.5	10	68.9	3.5	5.8
P31	-2.7	77.7	64.3	10.7	3.9	5	16.2	71.5	11.9	28.4
P32	-4	75.9	62.5	10.8	7.8	7.3	23.2	74.1	18.1	29.1
P33.01	-11.6	68.3	60.9	20.2	12.2	9.2	28.7	69.1	35.9	51.6
P33.02	-13.4	70.6	54.8	11.4	15.8	10.3	31	66.7	29.1	39.7
P34.01	-15	62.1	49	19.9	15.3	12.1	29.4	74.7	40.2	61.2
P34.02	-18.5	66.3	52.7	22.6	5.9	9.4	32.1	62.3	39.8	42.4
P35.01	-5.3	76.7	58.6	12.4	4.9	8.1	16.4	63.3	16.9	25.1
P35.02	-12	72.7	66.8	9.7	5.7	2.8	17.4	78.7	15.5	18.6
P36.01	-2.3	76.6	57.2	16.2	15.6	9.3	30.2	50.7	29.1	34.2
P36.02	-0.9	73.4	59.6	13.3	3.6	4.7	19.4	54.6	14.8	20.9
P36.03	-3.9	68.9	53.4	6.7	2.6	3.7	9.6	36.5	8.1	17.5
P37.01	0	75	57.1	18.4	7.6	4.3	20.4	55.9	19.8	27.2
P37.02	-7.6	73.4	60.8	16.8	9.8	5.9	15.6	70.8	9.8	30.1
P38.01	1.1	70.1	53.3	8.8	10.8	9.6	15.7	69.4	23.3	27.6
P38.02	-2.5	71.9	54.4	10.2	10.4	8.4	11.5	65.5	12	26.5
P38.03	4.4	76	54.9	5	8.7	8.3	16.8	65.7	16.5	29.9
P39.01	1.9	72.8	54.5	9.2	16.1	7.3	17.5	42.1	18.1	29.8
P39.02	-6.7	71.1	49.3	7.7	11.4	7.5	9.2	67	6.1	18
P40.01	-1.7	72.7	50.2	9.7	11.7	11	28.8	43	38	33.5
P40.02	-1.7	63.3	55.9	6.8	5.7	7.6	5.9	51.3	7.7	24.4
P41.01	-1.3	76.3	54.3	13.1	9.8	9.1	18.3	31.8	19.1	30.1
P41.02	0.7	74	53.5	5	5.6	9.5	13.6	50.9	9.4	24.2
P42	-2.7	69	48.2	16.8	11.6	11.8	18.5	37.6	14.2	32.9
P43	-6.1	69.6	66.9	7.2	5	4.6	6.9	53.5	1.8	0
P45	10.8	61.7	70.6	3.1	1.1	3.2	16.8	70.3	16.3	14
P46.01	3.2	78.2	56.3	2.2	2.3	0.5	2.3	60.5	0.8	10.8
P46.02	-5.5	78.8	54	2	5.9	0.5	4.7	75.7	1.4	9.6
P47	-2.3	85.1	72.4	3.4	2.3	3	10.5	74.1	2.1	19.8

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P48	0.2	83.7	70.6	5	5.6	3.9	9.7	66.2	5.5	26.8
P49	2.4	80.1	58.6	6.3	5.6	8.9	17.8	67.9	23.4	38.4
P50	5.1	77.5	72.8	4.8	8.6	13.9	6.7	94.8	47.5	38
P51	14.4	62.7	62.1	22.5	26.4	8.8	4.2	50.1	0	53.8
P52	-2.6	65.8	59.4	10.1	9.9	3.6	5.1	54.6	14.8	27.9
P53	-6	39.9	43.9	14.5	15.2	13.3	2.6	82.5	17.4	51.7
P54	99.1	20.2	17.5	37.6	0	11.4	0	61.4	0	60.9
P55	1.4	83.2	80.6	4.3	1.3	0	9.4	43	17.5	30.7
P56	22.3	72	61.3	12.7	4	2.5	7.9	34.3	21.7	43
P57	20.8	77.6	50.6	0	2.8	0.8	2.3	9.8	15.8	9.4
P58	-6.6	70.6	51.7	0.7	3.1	0.3	3.9	32.4	2.3	21.5
P59	17.5	85.8	77.4	4.3	3	1.4	8.9	37.8	6.1	14.8
P60.01	16.3	81.2	63.5	1.9	2.5	0	4.6	37.7	2.5	12.1
P60.02	-2.7	72.7	63.4	2.4	6.2	0.9	5.7	23.2	0.8	21.8
P61	20.9	72.7	52.8	5	4.8	2.6	2.5	20.3	0.9	15.5
P62	-1.1	82	61.8	2.4	3.9	2.7	6.6	33.8	3.5	14.8
P63	18.9	66.3	61.1	5.6	6	2.1	5.7	25.6	1.2	28.1
P64.01	57.7	83.9	67.7	2.8	4.2	1.4	7.7	9.9	5.3	20.3
P64.02	47.4	80.3	66.2	3.6	2.9	0.4	3.5	10.9	1.3	12.3
P65.01	14.4	86	65.4	2.1	2.1	0.6	6.2	13.5	1.2	6.8
P65.02	17.9	83.9	77.2	6.2	3.4	1	10.9	23.1	6.7	18.2
P66.01	9.8	74.4	58.2	1.9	4.7	4.3	6	27.5	3.2	5.8
P66.02	2.3	78.7	72.2	2.8	3.1	0.9	13.9	25	8.6	23.2
P67.01	5.7	77.5	56.9	3.9	2.6	4.2	6.6	20.1	0.6	7.9
P67.02	12.5	75.8	66.3	2	3.4	2	5.9	17.5	1	13.6
P68.01	3.4	85.2	59	1.3	2.3	0.7	8.1	3.9	5.1	14.8
P68.02	1.5	77.4	65.4	3	2.4	2.8	6.8	9.3	5	19.4
P69	36.1	83.6	66.8	2.1	0	0	2.6	22.5	0	11.4
P70	43.2	81.2	64.7	5.6	4.5	0	2.2	17.8	0	20.7
P72.01		69.1	68.6	0	0	1.5	0.9	8.5	0	17.5
P72.02		75.3	57.7	8.3	2.6	6.5	9.9	28.4	13.4	11.1
P73	124.4	43.5	47.6	6	0	6.2	6.2	39.4	13.9	30.4
P74	156.5	72.4	59.6	10.2	11.9	8.6	20.4	30.5	17.9	40.1
P75	359.2	73.1	49.4	1.9	8.1	11.1	12.1	38.6	12.6	19.8
P76		78.1	60	8	4.1	8.3	16.7	28.5	14.6	40.5
P77		74.6	58.9	7.1	4.8	9.8	6.8	40.6	12.3	19.7

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
P78	70.2	70.4	38.4	2.6	9.4	9.4	21.1	67.9	27.2	38.4
P79	8.7	73.9	60.6	4.1	7.9	8.9	9.2	31.7	8.4	13.3
P80.01	-4.7	72.7	52.9	7.2	4.1	5.7	6.8	13.9	7.8	8.8
P80.02	-1.3	69.5	52.8	6.2	8	6.2	7.7	10.7	1.7	12.7
P81		75.9	51	8.2	5.8	8.3	8	11.5	4.8	12.5
P82.01		77.3	58.6	3.9	2.9	4.1	5.3	12.7	8.9	20.7
P82.02		73.9	53.8	6.5	4.2	5.4	10.5	15.1	7.5	23.7
P83.01	353.2	64.5	43.6	16.4	0	12	8.6	32.9	6.1	27.1
P83.02	302.6	76.5	49.9	2.1	11.3	5.8	11.2	12.3	9.2	39
P84		76.6	51.5	2.6	14.2	4.1	8.8	15.1	8.3	23.5
P85		64.4	44.6	19.8	0	8.5	29	14.1	36.7	15.1
P86		79.3	56	6.1	10.8	10.2	15.1	28	13.8	20.4
P87		75.3	54	7.5	8	6.7	10.6	44.7	14.3	32.4
P88		76.5	60.1	10.3	6.7	12.2	8.9	27.3	14.4	33.5
P89	53.4	80.6	65.1	6	5.8	1.6	7.3	10.7	8.1	25.8
P91		87.7	64.6	0	9.7	0	6.9	12.2	0	36.5
P92.01		62.6	41.2	6.2	6.8	7.3	17.4	2.7	8.9	31.5
P93		73.3	39.2	4.8	7.2	1.8	4.2	9.6	3.1	26.3
P94	12.1	65.1	50.6	5.3	2.2	3.7	4	2.4	2.3	6.6
P95	21	75.6	58.3	4.6	5.8	3.5	7.3	0.9	4.1	14.7
P102		91.3	61.9	15.9	0	0	1.4	4.3	0	53.3
Baltimore 1990										
B101	0.2	71.5	45.8	5.8	4.1	21.8	10.8	88.9	7.9	20.6
B102	-6.6	68	45.4	8.8	5.3	23.8	6.5	93.5	5.7	27.5
B103	-8.4	64.7	48.4	9	11.1	28.1	10.7	94.8	11.9	20.5
B104	25.8	76	66	4.8	6.7	15.4	8.4	75.6	14.6	11.9
B105	-13.2	71.3	55.7	9.4	4.4	26	17.3	95.9	14	34.2
B201	-20	74.3	60.5	12.8	8.8	22.2	18.5	89.9	17.2	27
B202	-14	74.2	54.8	9.1	6.3	21.7	13.6	93.3	19	38.1
B203	17.4	67.2	54	8.4	3.8	24.6	9.3	81.3	14	31.4
B301	-43.5	62.6	38.1	13.3	16.6	21.2	39.3	74.6	50.3	36
B302	-4.8	66.3	42.2	31.6	18.5	14.9	49.2	48.9	57.1	43.9
B401	-12.9	81.4	70.6	6.6	5.8	6.7	7.9	31.1	7.6	25.6
B402	-52.9	33.6	33.6	7	16.6	21.5	59.5	58.3	50.6	50.2
B501	-12	46.9	30.8	19.9	28.2	21.2	70.5	15.5	78.1	75.2
B601	-5.8	68.3	45.7	6.9	7	27.4	15.9	81.4	16.2	27.3

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OddHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B602	-2	70.8	51.2	13.3	11.1	21.3	20.4	84.3	16.7	29.7
B603	-12.3	69.7	62.6	8.9	11.7	18.3	33.9	85.7	31.4	31.5
B604	-1.4	56.4	47.8	13.2	5.4	21.3	32.9	21.5	24.5	45.3
B605	-55.6	46.5	38.6	9.3	15.2	24.6	35.4	26.7	56.4	63.8
B701	6.5	66.1	56.2	10.2	9.4	16.6	22.9	82.9	19.8	41.7
B702	-0.4	63.4	51	14.4	15.4	18.4	21.4	70.9	32.4	37.8
B703	-0.9	61.5	58	18	17.4	20.6	43.8	62.3	37.7	39.5
B704	-4	54.8	48.8	11.6	12.6	13.2	44.5	48.9	37.7	55.4
B801.01	-5.4	74.6	52.8	2.2	4.7	13.3	10.3	71.5	5.8	13.9
B801.02	-0.4	66.7	64.3	12.9	4.2	12.6	22.9	55.4	15.3	31.5
B802	-10.5	60	50.9	23	11.2	20.9	36.2	49.5	31.8	50.9
B803.01	-9.6	66.3	54.4	17.4	7.6	18.8	29.6	64.6	32.4	44.3
B803.02	-8	57.7	54	6.4	5.6	23.5	11.1	55.2	17.6	37
B804	-11.1	52.1	54.9	12.1	21.4	19.1	36.6	52.6	31	52.7
B805	-8.3	66.6	57.7	29.8	5.7	18.8	21	67.7	18.4	41.2
B806	-6.8	57.9	49.7	22.2	14.7	18.1	31.2	71.2	34	48.7
B807	-10	52.6	43.3	17.2	29.1	22.4	35.7	68.3	51.2	6.2
B808	-17.8	58.6	53.7	14.9	14.2	15.1	37.4	51.9	33.7	7.7
B901	-9.5	78.4	67.3	12.4	9.1	11.7	18.9	52.7	7.9	5.2
B902	-15.2	75.9	67.1	6	3.1	5.9	7.9	44.6	3.2	3.8
B903	-4.1	78.5	71	9.3	3.7	8.7	17.5	67.8	6.4	2.3
B904	-6.6	59	50.5	11.2	10.5	12.9	36.4	43.3	36.5	11.1
B905	5.4	77.5	66.6	12.7	12.2	12	27.1	55.7	21.1	4.9
B906	-9.1	71.2	59.9	14.5	12.3	14.5	25	49.7	15.1	4.7
B907	-12.5	70	59.2	19	12.6	11.8	25.3	60.6	17.2	3.1
B908	-12.1	64.1	56.7	14.9	7.5	19.1	24.4	61.6	22.3	8.9
B909	-0.8	63.1	47.1	23.8	16.4	17.1	39.6	45.6	34.3	52.6
B1001	4.5	67.3	53.3	30.7	17.8	21.7	36.8	39.1	32.6	46.1
B1002	33.3	35	39.6	22.5	13.4	18.6	44	24.4	44.3	69.6
B1004	-0.6	22.6	25.9	29.4	29.4	31.2	29.8	30.6	42.7	72.9
B1101	1.8	78	76.6	4.6	4.8	2.3	6.7	70.9	7.1	18.3
B1102	-21.7	73.1	50.1	3.1	3.8	14	10.5	60.6	23.8	26.2
B1201	-3.1	75.2	61.1	1.1	4.1	1	5	49.7	5.4	17.2
B1202	4.5	63.1	65.8	1.3	4.6	4.8	7.5	76.9	12	48.4
B1203	-8.7	70.7	62.8	12.1	4.9	12.2	26	72.9	25.1	27.7
B1204	10.5	68.3	55.1	19.8	15.9	17.7	43.9	62.7	31	37.5

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B1205	-7	57.2	44.8	16.4	17.5	21.4	36.7	78.1	50	38.1
B1206	-12.4	68.1	46.4	3.7	8.3	20.5	19.8	56.4	9.6	38.2
B1207	-9	68.1	46.6	8.4	5.9	25.2	14.4	85.5	20.9	40.6
B1301	-11.7	57.2	47.1	9.1	7.2	22.7	35.8	47.1	37.8	47.9
B1302	-19.6	69.7	55.1	16.2	16.8	11.9	37.3	62.5	38.6	30.5
B1303	-10	57.1	51.2	12.9	8.4	17.1	34.4	82.1	38.9	41.6
B1304	-12.7	72.6	54.3	9.4	11.7	17	25.5	78.9	23.1	41
B1305	-20.7	78.4	62.8	7.3	3	16.3	8.9	92.5	9.9	27
B1306	-9.3	77	59.5	5	10.7	21.6	11.7	82.9	11.3	15
B1307	1.1	68.7	41.8	3.8	3.5	15	7.5	59.8	3.1	4.9
B1308.03	-9.9	76.2	63.1	6.9	5	11.1	8.8	27.9	3.3	4.4
B1308.04	-14.6	65.6	50.5	2.1	7.2	22.8	14.5	64.2	11.6	5.5
B1308.05		75.7	63.6	3.5	0	8.7	6.2	0	0	13.2
B1308.06		87.2	60.3	8.4	2.6	18.9	8.9	60.8	13.2	2.2
B1401	2.5	66.7	50.8	6.4	7.5	13.7	18.5	51.3	20.8	16.2
B1402	13	58.1	61.4	14.5	20.1	13.6	51.9	63.7	36.9	7.2
B1403	-8.9	58.7	56.7	13.9	6.4	19.5	32	65	36.1	9.9
B1501	-20.1	52.3	41.3	20.2	16.9	22.2	40.4	64.7	50.7	10.9
B1502	-15.6	61.5	51.2	15.5	14.9	18.5	26	81.1	30.5	3.5
B1503	-12.1	57.9	50.6	21	9.2	12.2	20.5	81.3	14.4	41.3
B1504	-7.8	54	46.3	13.6	12.2	14.8	22.5	73.3	22.9	49.5
B1505	-14.3	61.9	55.6	8	3.2	11.9	25.6	64.4	20.4	41.4
B1506	-14.8	60.7	52.4	17.6	17.8	19.8	25.9	62.2	20.5	41.7
B1507.01	-11.4	64	51.6	15.4	0	7.4	15	44.4	8.4	21.3
B1507.02	-8.9	69.2	59.9	12.4	6.7	11.3	22.4	46.1	12	25.5
B1508.01	-15.2	62.8	57.3	11.6	4	10.3	26.6	59.1	18.2	35.3
B1508.02	2.1	66.2	75.2	34	10.6	19.8	38.1	42.2	23.6	50.7
B1509	-12.3	64.1	62.8	13.3	11.4	9.6	18.8	49.7	7.3	25.1
B1510	-10.7	68.2	63.2	12.4	10.3	13.8	22	45.5	12.7	39.2
B1511	-7.1	67.4	57.5	10	8.2	10.8	13	50.2	5.3	22
B1512	-19.1	61.5	50.3	12.7	8.9	16.1	27.1	29.7	24.1	58.2
B1513	-15.3	68.6	49.8	15.2	15.8	15.5	27.9	41	28.9	44.5
B1601	-9.7	58.6	44.1	12.8	14.9	19.8	39.9	53	44.2	55.6
B1602	-18.6	53.3	40.5	16.2	21.4	18	40.3	59.6	50.1	62.7
B1603	-21.2	69.7	37.1	20.6	29.6	23.3	39.5	59	39	43.9
B1604	-13.6	59.9	51.1	20.2	16.8	17.2	26.8	74.8	24	33.9

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B1605	-12.5	65.6	55.4	13.7	10.8	13.9	21.8	57.7	11.4	33.2
B1606	-9.3	63.8	53	20.3	9	20.1	19.9	47.1	19.2	43.6
B1607	-10.2	61.9	54.7	19.3	10.2	18.8	20.8	58.8	12.5	34
B1608.01	-6.6	74.8	69.9	9.2	7	10.2	23.6	38.3	12.9	18.4
B1608.02	-11.3	67.4	58.4	12.2	9.5	15	16.9	39	13.9	39.7
B1701	-26.9	63.3	70	0	4.9	3.4	38.7	38.9	34.4	32.2
B1702	-11	45.7	30.4	14.6	18.9	27.4	48.8	34.9	57.3	63
B1703	-12.6	45	40.8	25.3	21.8	20.4	52.2	34.5	58.9	65.7
B1801	148.6	49.3	32.7	37.8	25.5	17.8	66.9	27.1	75	80.1
B1802	-0.6	51.1	38.7	16.9	4.3	37	28.7	45.2	41.9	63.3
B1803	-1.2	62.8	55.8	13.6	8.7	23.5	24.7	72.3	24.8	47.6
B1901	5.7	60.5	53.9	16.4	8	18.4	45.2	50.2	41.2	53.7
B1902	-10.1	59.2	47.5	11.8	7.9	19.7	23.7	74.9	26.7	38.1
B1903	-11.1	52	35.6	13.6	17.4	32.8	33.7	73	54	54.9
B2001	-15.2	57.8	44.5	23.5	14.6	17.6	22.4	52.6	39.3	45.8
B2002	-15.5	54.1	50.9	22.1	13.8	21.6	21.2	71.8	20.5	37.5
B2003	-5.8	63.3	37.7	28.6	14.4	27.5	29.3	80.8	37.6	46.9
B2004	-8.4	62.6	47.6	22.5	13.1	17.9	32.1	81	40.8	58.3
B2005	-2.1	68.2	41.9	8.3	3.2	33	18.2	89.3	20.1	27.9
B2006	-10	64.1	55	10.5	7.6	20.2	16.8	58.9	14.4	41.1
B2007.01	-11.1	64.9	52.3	10.1	12.2	17.7	13	47.2	13.6	40.6
B2007.02	-14.6	63.1	65.8	13.6	5.8	13.8	16.3	52	6	41.3
B2008	-3.7	84.4	63	9.3	2.8	11.5	21.8	79.1	10.8	20.5
B2101.01	43.3	66	44.6	7.8	10.7	21.5	23.9	80.3	30.6	37.6
B2102.01	-25	63.2	37.8	11.9	16.5	28.9	20.7	78.7	26.2	42.1
B2201.01	225.2	72.8	48.4	1	3.4	9.8	6.6	44.5	10.7	28
B2301	13.6	71.5	48.9	8.6	10.1	29.2	29.2	59	27.1	39.6
B2302	-10	75.3	53.3	6	8.1	20.5	9.6	90.4	15.8	19.2
B2303	-6.8	70.8	46	5.6	9.4	32.7	11.8	91.7	16.6	27.3
B2401	-7.7	64.2	45.5	7	0	22.7	7	96.2	5.2	17.8
B2402	-9	76.8	56.2	3.3	1.1	19.6	7.3	95.9	6.6	18.6
B2403	-8	72.8	56.3	9	4.8	16.2	6.3	88.7	14.4	27.7
B2404	-15.1	71	53.3	6.2	2.4	17.6	9	98	11.1	21.3
B2501.01	-0.8	81.6	67	3.5	5.7	8.1	20.4	16.8	12.2	9.5
B2501.02	-4.1	85.4	74.6	6.9	3	8	21	21.2	7.5	12.9
B2501.03	11.3	68.7	46.8	1.3	2.8	17.5	7.6	29.7	3.1	22.2

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B2502.03	9.9	71.4	63.8	15.9	10.8	14.1	29	36.8	26.5	35.8
B2502.04	-21	63.4	42.1	34.7	33.1	13.3	56.7	34.5	60	72
B2502.05	-8.2	76.4	57.3	7.2	5.7	14.6	14.5	11.9	6.1	33.1
B2502.06	-11.8	77	50.7	6	10.1	15.7	7.7	46.1	7.3	20.7
B2502.07		71.7	62.5	15.7	14.3	6.8	35.9	17.7	22.7	18.3
B2503.01	-2.5	72	51.4	16.8	10.2	20.3	15.4	60.3	24.3	31.6
B2503.02	-23.8	64.1	51.1	25.1	22.5	7	45.6	27.5	44.5	39.7
B2503.03	-5.3	63.6	44.6	5.4	1.5	26.6	9.1	18.8	11.3	39.8
B2504.01	-3.9	74.9	47.9	4.7	7.6	18.8	11.9	64.9	8.8	23.2
B2504.02	-8.3	75.9	59.1	6.3	8	16.3	22.3	43.8	20.8	27
B2505	-5.9	74.4	49.6	4.3	12.7	21	17.8	56.1	17.3	20
B2506	-59.2	65.5	50.9	32.7	21.4	20.6	41.5	58.5	36.5	47.6
B2601.01	-6	74.8	56	3.9	0.5	11.5	7.9	39.1	1.7	15.7
B2601.02	-10.2	73.5	54.9	2.2	3.2	13.3	8.8	24	11.4	21.7
B2602.01	-4.1	81.1	66.5	6.7	1.8	11.6	19.2	26.6	9.2	12
B2602.02	-5.9	81.6	64	9.8	5.2	9.8	20.8	21.8	9.2	19.3
B2602.03	-1.1	73.1	68.6	10.8	6.5	9.5	22.3	7.2	11.5	20.8
B2603.01	-4.5	76	54.4	7	5.8	14.2	8.6	59.4	5.6	20.4
B2603.02	-8.3	75.5	58.5	3.6	5.1	13.2	12.8	23.4	1.2	18.9
B2603.03	-9.6	68.5	34.6	15.8	13.3	24.2	53.6	24.4	60.2	54.6
B2604.01	-6.9	70.9	46.4	7.3	8.1	23.2	13.8	56.7	14.1	31.5
B2604.02	-6.8	85.6	66.1	16.4	11.7	7.9	43.1	13	26.5	31.8
B2604.04	-4.4	61.8	47.2	2.9	6.4	23.3	10.6	77.1	10.8	28.8
B2604.96		66.2	51.4	13.5	18.9	15.1	42.8	1	39.8	48.1
B2605.01	-1.8	64.3	48.3	2.7	1.3	22	6.4	44.6	7.3	17.9
B2606.04	-18.3	54.3	35.1	7.4	21.3	25.7	54.2	41.9	52.4	52.2
B2606.05	-3.8	72.7	49.6	9.8	3.5	22.3	8.2	23.8	7.2	21.2
B2607	-9.7	76.4	41.8	11.9	7	25.8	10	88.5	11.9	31.6
B2608	-6.1	66.5	44.1	9.5	8.5	35	12	87.4	7.6	43.5
B2609	-8.6	72.6	46.2	9	10.7	25.9	8.6	92.3	12.4	26.9
B2610	4.9	71	48.8	9.9	11.8	21	11.9	94.4	7.9	30.6
B2611	-2.4	72.2	56	4.2	3.9	21.1	9	84.2	7.5	15.5
B2701.01	1.3	78.7	57.3	1	1.8	8.6	8.7	78.4	3.8	9.9
B2701.02	-8	68.9	53.2	2.7	4.5	11.1	5.9	56.7	4	14.4
B2702	2.1	67.2	67.1	2.7	4.9	11	9.5	79.8	5.9	10.8
B2703.01	-6.1	77.5	61.9	3	3.3	7.6	7.5	66.2	3.1	19.4

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grades	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B2703.02	-10.2	65.6	63.2	4.7	1.1	10	6.8	80.8	0	14.3
B2704.01	-5.9	73.3	53.4	5.4	1.7	14.5	7.1	34	1.5	15
B2704.02	-9.3	71.4	52.1	2.6	3	12.7	6.7	62.9	5.1	13.3
B2705.01	-13.3	74.7	52	1.4	3.8	8.9	3	45.4	1.7	17.7
B2705.02	-7.3	72.7	58.2	2	3.7	11.6	5.4	48.5	2.1	10.6
B2706	-9.1	82.1	58.9	4.3	2.7	9.6	7.5	58.8	5	10.9
B2707.01	-0.7	84.1	79.9	16.9	7.2	4.1	34.5	7.3	13.4	17.8
B2707.02	-8	77.9	59.6	5.6	4.4	9.2	17.3	27	8.4	18.7
B2707.03	-8.9	71.9	59	1.9	3.2	10.6	6	40.1	3	11.7
B2708.01	-8.4	80.8	67.5	6	1.2	7.2	11.8	11.2	2.4	11.4
B2708.02	2.6	80.7	71.4	6.3	2.5	5.6	14.5	17.9	4.5	14.3
B2708.03	0.8	75.5	57.6	6.4	2	10.6	13.7	16.3	3	15.5
B2708.04	-1.3	78.5	65.3	2.2	5.2	7.8	13.3	31.4	5.9	24.9
B2708.05	-4.8	79.1	75.8	11.2	6.6	7.2	18	34.8	7.5	18
B2709.01	-11.4	77	78.2	9.5	9.1	5.9	15.7	23.9	6.4	19.6
B2709.02	-14.5	78.9	61.5	7	2.6	7.2	12.5	17.9	6	22.7
B2709.03	17.5	69	59.8	9.2	8.8	6.3	13.6	51.3	6.3	22.9
B2710.01	-10.5	74.2	60.8	19	9.7	6.6	23.6	35.1	14.5	24
B2710.02	-6	66.1	61.9	13.3	9.4	12.1	17.6	44.4	10.8	36.6
B2711.01	10.1	50	49.8	9.1	9.6	9.5	7.3	26.5	3.4	36.8
B2711.02	76.5	55.4	50.8	1.9	3.8	3.1	5.5	57.5	5.8	68.6
B2712	-0.9	80.8	50.1	4	0.8	4.8	4	61.3	0.6	13
B2713	-2.4	68.3	55.7	0.7	9.4	1.4	4.1	63	2.9	25.1
B2714	7.8	77.6	69.8	3	2.5	1.6	4	61.7	0	14.1
B2715.01	-5.9	82.3	68	3.2	1.6	3.5	5.7	42.1	0.4	11
B2715.03	1.8	83.1	57.9	0	0	2.3	1.9	9	4.3	9.1
B2716	-14	67.3	61	11.4	15.3	11.6	28.4	23.7	27.2	32.3
B2717	-9.5	68.4	55.6	13.7	13.3	13.6	21.1	25.3	19.6	33
B2718.01	-11.8	74.6	59	14.2	3.3	21.4	21.7	35.7	13.2	49.4
B2718.02	-13.5	70.6	59	17.7	9.4	14.6	31.6	38.3	18.7	46.3
B2719	-10.6	75.7	62.8	10.5	6.8	9.3	13.8	44.1	6.2	20.2
B2720.01	15.5	64.3	42.9	5.4	5	11.4	8.4	17.8	6.3	26.8
B2720.02	13	41.4	47.6	2.1	7.3	6.1	2.1	8.1	5.5	10.5
B2720.03	-2.1	74.3	59.8	3.6	6.2	7.2	6.8	20.7	6.1	8.8
B2801.01	-15.7	83	65.4	10.3	1.9	9.1	16.1	13.8	1.9	20.7
B2801.02	-9.1	71.6	65.9	8.4	6	8.7	17.5	30.6	7.5	26.2

Tract	PopChg	MalePart	FemPart	UnempM	UnempF	Grade9	LoneFem	OldHouse	FamPov	IndPov
B2802	-10.4	74.5	61	15.3	9.8	8.3	14.3	60.3	7	23.6
B2803.01	7.1	82	72.5	5.7	7.6	6.9	31.1	15.2	9.2	24
B2803.02	-9.9	77.6	73.9	3.4	15.1	6.9	34.7	24.9	14.6	20.9
B2804.01	-12.5	83.8	65.7	8.6	3.7	5.2	8.3	25.8	2.9	12.4
B2804.02	-5.8	67.4	64.7	7.2	5	10.7	12.6	28.3	3	15.1
B2804.03	7.4	81.4	69.4	5.2	2.4	5.9	14.8	29.2	6.6	11.5
B2804.04	4.3	73.2	60.7	6.9	11.8	14.5	36.2	21	26.1	29.8

Appendix IV Maps
Halifax Census Tracts - Statistics Canada

Regina Census Tracts - Statistics Canada

Hamilton Census Tracts - Statistics Canada

Vancouver Census Tracts - Statistics Canada

Montreal Census Tracts - Statistics Canada

Savannah Census Tracts - U.S. Bureau of the Census

Lincoln Census Tracts - U.S. Bureau of the Census

Toledo Census Tracts - U.S. Bureau of the Census

Baltimore Census Tracts - U.S. Bureau of the Census

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alonso, W. (1982): "The Current Halt in the Metropolitan Phenomenon." in: Urban Change and Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Reader. London, Harper and Row Publishers.
- Applebome, P. (1989): "Savannah Torn Over its Direction: Past or Future?" in: The New York Times. Dec.27. p.16.
- Barnes, T.J., D.W. Edgington, K.G. Denike, and T.G. McGee. (1992): "Vancouver, the Province, and the Pacific Rim." in: Vancouver and its Region. G. Wynn and T. Oke (eds). Vancouver, UBC Press.
- Black, J.T. (1980): "The Changing Economic Role of Central Cities and Suburbs." in: The Prospective City. Arthur P. Solomon (ed). Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- Bourne, L.S. (1980): "Alternative Perspectives on Urban Decline and Population Deconcentration." in: Urban Geography. vol.1, no.1. pp.39-52.
- Bourne, L.S. (1984): Canadian Perspectives on Urban Growth and Decline. The Centre for Human Settlements, The University of British Columbia.
- Bourne, L.S. (1989): On the Spatial Structure of Metropolitan Areas in Canada: A Discriminant Analysis. Research Paper no. 172. Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- Bourne, L.S. (1991): "Addressing the Canadian City: Contemporary Perspectives, Trends, and Issues." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Filion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Bourne, L.S. (1992): "Population Turnaround in the Canadian Inner City: Contextual Factors and Social Consequences." in: The Canadian Journal of Urban Research. vol.1, no.1. pp.66-89.
- Bourne, L.S. and T. Bunting. (1993): "Housing Markets, Community Development and Neighbourhood Change." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley (eds). Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bradbury, K. (1984): "Urban Decline and Distress: An Update." in: New England Economic Review. July/August. pp.39-55.
- Bradbury, K., A. Downs and K. Small. (1982): Urban Decline and the Future of American Cities. Washington, The Brookings Institution.

- Broadway, M.J. (1989): "A Comparison of Patterns of Urban Deprivation Between Canadian and U.S. Cities." in: Social Indicators Research. vol.21. pp.531-551.
- Broadway, M.J. (1992): "Differences in Inner-City Deprivation: An Analysis of Seven Canadian Cities." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.36, no.2. pp.189-196.
- Burchell, R.W. and D. Listokin. (1981): Cities Under Stress: The Fiscal Crisis of Urban America. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Butler, E.W. (1977): The Urban Crisis: Problems and Prospects in America. Santa Monica, California, Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.
- Cadwallader, M. (1985): Analytical Urban Geography. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cadwallader, M. (1991): "Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States." in: Growth and Change. vol.22, no.3, pp.1-16.
- The Canadian World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1990. (1989): Toronto, Global Press.
- Carroll, B.W. (1990): "Housing." in: Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives. R. Loreto and T. Price (eds). Toronto, McClelland & Stewart, Inc.
- Clark, D. (1982): Urban Geography. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Clark, D. (1989): Urban Decline: The British Experience. London, Routledge.
- Clifton, T. (1989): "The Riches of Good Citizens." in: Newsweek. Feb.6. pp.44-45.
- Crane, D. (1980): A Dictionary of Canadian Economics. Edmonton, Hurtig Publishers.
- Cuciti, P.L. (1990): "A Nonurban Policy: Recent Public Policy Shifts Affecting Cities." in: The Future of National Urban Policy. M.Kaplan and F. James (eds). Durham, Duke University Press. pp.235-250.
- Davies, W.K.D. (1984): Factorial Ecology. Aldershot, Gower Publishing Company Limited.

- Davies, W.K.D. and D.P. Donoghue. (1993): "Economic Diversification and Group Stability in an Urban System: The Case of Canada, 1951-86." in: Urban Studies. vol.30, no.7, pp.1165-1186.
- Davies, W.K.D. and R.A. Murdie. (1991): "Consistency and Differential Impact in Urban Social Dimensionality: Intra-Urban Variations In The 24 Metropolitan Areas of Canada." in: Urban Geography. vol.12, no.1, pp.55-79.
- Davies, W.K.D. and R.A. Murdie. (1993): "Measuring the Social Ecology of Cities." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley (eds). Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Des Rosiers, F. (1992): "Urban Sprawl and the Central City." in: Plan Canada. November. pp.14-18.
- Driedger, L. (1991): The Urban Factor: Sociology of Canadian Cities. Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Edmonston, B, M.A. Goldberg and J. Mercer. (1985): "Urban Form in Canada and the United States: An Examination of Urban Density Gradients." in: Urban Studies. vol.22, pp.209-217.
- Evenden, L.J. and G.E. Walker. (1993): "From Periphery to Centre: The Changing Geography of the Suburbs." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley (eds). Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ewing, G.O. (1992): "The Bases of Differences Between American and Canadian Cities." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.36, no.3. pp.266-279.
- Filion, P. (1987): "Concepts of the Inner City and Recent Trends in Canada." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.31, no.3, pp.223-32.
- Filion, P. and D. Mock. (1991): "Manufacturing in Canadian Cities." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Filion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Florida, R. and A. Jonas. (1991): "U.S. Urban Policy: The Postwar State and Capitalist Regulation." in: Antipode. vol.23, no.4, pp.349-384.
- Fowler, E.F. (1992): Building Cities That Work. Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Frey, W.H. and A. Speare. (1988): Regional and Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States. New York, Russel Sage Foundation.
- Friedrichs, J. (1993): "A Theory of Urban Decline: Economy, Demography and Political Elites." in: Urban Studies. vol.30, no.6. pp.907-917.
- Garn, H.A. and L.C. Ledebur. (1980): "The Economic Performance and Prospects of Cities." in: The Prospective City. Arthur P. Solomon (ed). Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- The Gazette. (1993a): "The Stain of Poverty Spreads: While Studies Drag On, Montreal Slips Further." July 25. p.B2.
- The Gazette. (1993b): "Montreal: How to Turn it Around." April 10. p.E1.
- The Globe and Mail. (1992): "Single Mothers Hit Hardest By Poverty." December 1. p.A14.
- Goldberg, M.A., and J. Mercer. (1980): "Canadian and U.S. Cities: Basic Differences, Possible Explanations, And Their Meaning For Public Policy." in: The Regional Science Association Papers. vol.45, pp.159-183.
- Goldberg, M.A. and J. Mercer. (1986): The Myth of the North American City. Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press.
- Gottlieb, M. and P. Applebome. (1991): "Ways of Older South Linger in City of Thomas's Boyhood." in: The New York Times. Aug.8. p.A1.
- Griffith, D.A. and C.G. Amrhein. (1991): Statistical Analysis for Geographers. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hamelin, P. (1987): Social Well-Being: An Analysis Of The Canadian Urban System. M.A. Thesis, Department of Geography, Carleton University.
- Herbert, D.T. and R.J. Johnston. (1978): "Geography and the Urban Environment." in: D.T. Herbert and R.J. Johnston (eds). Geography and the Urban Environment: Progress in Research and Applications. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.
- Hiss, T. (1991): "Reinventing Baltimore." in: The New Yorker. April. pp.40-44.
- Jacobs, B.D. (1992): Fractured Cities: Capitalism, Community and Empowerment in Britain and America. London, Routledge.

- James, F.J. (1981): "Economic Distress in Central Cities." in: Cities Under Stress: The Fiscal Crisis of Urban America. R.W. Burchell and D. Listokin (eds). Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- James, F.J. (1990): "City Need and Distress in the United States: 1970 to the Mid-1980s." in: The Future of National Urban Policy. M. Kaplan and F.J. James (eds). Durham, Duke University Press.
- Johnston, R.J. (1980): Multivariate Statistical Analysis in Geography. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kaplan, M. (1990): "National Urban Policy : Where Are We Now? Where Are We Going?" in: The Future of National Urban Policy. M. Kaplan and F. James (eds). Durham, Duke University Press.
- Kasarda, J.D. (1985): "Urban Change and Minority Opportunities." in: The New Urban Reality. Paul E. Peterson (ed). Washington, The Brookings Institution.
- Katzman, M.T. (1980): "The Contribution of Crime to Urban Decline." in: Urban Studies. vol.17, no.3. pp.277-286.
- Kennedy, L.W. (1983): The Urban Kaleidoscope: Canadian Perspectives. Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- King, L.J. (1966): "Cross-Sectional Analysis of Canadian Urban Dimensions: 1951 and 1961." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.10, no.4. pp.205-224.
- Klodawsky, F. and A. Spector. (1988): "New Families, New Housing Needs, New Urban Environments: the Case of Single Parent Families." in: Life Spaces: Gender, Households, Economy. C. Moore and B.M. Milroy (eds). Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press.
- Knox, P. (1987): Urban Social Geography. New York, John Wiley & Sons.
- Ladd, H.F., and J. Yinger. (1989): America's Ailing Cities: Fiscal Health and the Design of Urban Policy. London, the Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Landis, J.D. (1987): "The Future of America's Central Cities." in: Built Environment. vol.13, no.4. pp.223-243.

- Lemon, J.T. (1993): "Social Planning and the Welfare State." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley (eds). Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ley, D.F. (1983): A Social Geography of the City. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Ley, D.F. (1988): "Social Upgrading in Six Canadian Inner Cities." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.32, no.1, pp.31-45.
- Ley, D.F. (1991a): "The Inner City." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Filion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Ley, D.F. (1991b): "Gentrification: A Ten Year Overview." in: The Canadian City. K. Gerecke (ed). Montreal, Black Rose Books.
- Ley, D.F., D. Hiebert and G. Pratt. (1992): "Time to Grow Up? From Urban Village to World City, 1966-91." in: Vancouver and its Region. G. Wynn and T. Oke (eds). Vancouver, UBC Press.
- Ley, D.F. and L.S. Bourne. (1993): "Introduction: The Social Context and Diversity of Urban Canada." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D.F. Ley (eds.) Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Lipset, S.M. (1990): Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada. New York, Routledge.
- Lithwick, N. H. and R. Coulthard. (1993): "Devolution and Development: The Urban Nexus." in: How Ottawa Spends - 1993-1994. S.D. Phillips (ed). Ottawa, Carleton University Press, Inc.
- Mercer, J. (1979): "On Continentalism, Distinctiveness, and Comparative Urban Geography: Canadian and American Cities." in: The Canadian Geographer. vol.23, no.2, pp.119-139.
- Mercer, J. (1991): "The Canadian City in Continental Context: Global and Continental Perspectives on Canadian Urban Development." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Filion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Mercer, J. and M.A. Goldberg. (1984): "The Fiscal Condition of American and Canadian Cities." in: Urban Studies. vol.21, no.3, pp.233-243.

- Milroy, B.M. (1991): "People, Urban Space, and Advantage." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Fillion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, K.P. (1988): Gentrification and Distressed Cities. Madison, the University of Wisconsin Press Ltd.
- Norris, G. (1979): "Defining Urban Deprivation." in: Urban Deprivation and the Inner City. Colin Jones (ed). London, Croom Helm Ltd.
- Norusis, M.J. (1986): Advanced Statistics SPSS/PC+ For The IBM PC/XT/AT. Chicago, SPSS inc.
- Orlebeke, C.J. (1990): "Chasing Urban Policy: A Critical Retrospect." in: The Future of National Urban Policy. M. Kaplan and F. James (eds). Durham, Duke University Press.
- O'Hare, W.P. (1985): "Poverty in America: Trends and New Patterns." in: Population Bulletin. vol.40, no.3. pp.3-43.
- Peterson, P.E. (1985): "Introduction: Technology, Race, and Urban Policy." in: The New Urban Reality. Paul E. Peterson (ed). Washington, the Brookings Institution. pp.1-29.
- Peterson, G.E. (1986): "Urban Policy and the Cyclical Behavior of Cities." in: Reagan and the Cities. G.E. Peterson and C.W. Lewis (eds). Washington, D.C., The Urban Institute Press.
- Portland Chamber of Commerce (1990): Portland Economic Profile.
- Ram, B., M. Norris and K. Skof. (1989): The Inner City in Transition. Ottawa, Statistics Canada.
- Reischauer, R.D. (1990): "The Rise and Fall of National Urban Policy: The Fiscal Dimension." in: The Future of National Urban Policy. M. Kaplan and F. James (eds). Durham, Duke University Press. pp.225-234.
- Rice, J.J. and M.J. Prince. (1993): "Lowering the Safety Net and Weakening the Bonds of Nationhood: Social Policy in the Mulroney Years." in: How Ottawa Spends - 1993-1994. S.D. Phillips (ed). Ottawa, Carleton University Press, Inc.
- Robinson, J.L. (1989): Concepts and Themes in the Regional Geography of Canada. Vancouver, Talonbooks.
- Rubenstein, J.M. (1989): "Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A: Would H.L. Mencken Recognize It?" in: Focus. vol.39, no.1. pp.30-32.

- Ruggles, P. (1990): Drawing the Line: Alternative Poverty Measures and Their Implications for Public Policy. Washington, D.C., The Urban Institute Press.
- Sancton, A. (1991): "The Municipal Role in the Governance of Canadian Cities." in: Canadian Cities in Transition. T. Bunting and P. Filion (eds). Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, D. (1990): "The Financial Context for Urban Policy." in: Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives. R. Loreto and T. Price (eds). Toronto, McClelland & Stewart, Inc.
- Shafroth, F. (1989): "The Reagan Years and the Nation's Cities." in: The Municipal Yearbook 1989. Washington, D.C., International City Management Association. pp.115-128.
- Sim, D. (1984): "Urban Deprivation: Not Just the Inner City." in: Area. vol.16, no.4. pp.299-306.
- Simmons, J.W. and L.S. Bourne. (1984): "The Canadian Urban System." in: Urbanization and Settlement Systems: International Perspectives. L.S. Bourne, R. Sinclair and K. Dziewonski (eds). New York, Oxford University Press.
- Simmons, J.W. and B. Speck. (1986): Spatial Patterns of Social Change: The Return of The Great Canadian Factor Analysis. Research Paper no.160. Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- Smith, P.W. and P.W. Moore. (1993): "Cities as a Social Responsibility: Planning and Urban Form." in: The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities. L.S. Bourne and D. F. Ley (eds). Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Solomon, A.P. and K.D. Vandell. (1982): "Alternative Perspectives on Neighbourhood Decline." in: The American Planning Association Journal. Winter. pp.81-98.
- Statistics Canada. (1983): 1981 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics - Halifax. Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services Canada. cat. 95-951 (Volume 3 - Profile series B).
- Statistics Canada. (1983): 1981 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics - Hamilton. Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services Canada. cat. 95-952 (Volume 3 - Profile series B).

- Statistics Canada. (1983): 1981 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics - Montreal. Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services Canada. cat. 95-959 (Volume 3 - Profile series B).
- Statistics Canada. (1983): 1981 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics - Regina. Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services Canada. cat. 95-966 (Volume 3 - Profile series B).
- Statistics Canada. (1983): 1981 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics - Vancouver. Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services Canada. cat. 95-978 (Volume 3 - Profile series B).
- Statistics Canada. (1993): Electronic Shelf - 1991 Census of Canada. Census Tracts: Part B Profile - Halifax, Montreal, Hamilton, Regina, Vancouver.
- Sternlieb, G. and Hughes, J.W. (1983): "The Uncertain Future of the Central City." in: Urban Affairs Quarterly. vol.18, no.4. pp.455-472.
- Thomas, J.M. (1991): "The Cities Left Behind." in: Built Environment. vol.17, no.3/4. pp.218-231.
- Toledo Chamber of Commerce (1990): Toledo Area Business Profile.
- The Toronto Star. (1993): "Steel Town's Search for New Jobs." January 31. p.H1.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1975): Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983): 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Census Tracts - Baltimore, MD. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983): 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Census Tracts - Lincoln, NE. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983): 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Census Tracts - Portland, OR. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983): 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Census Tracts - Savannah, GA. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983): 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Census Tracts - Toledo, OH. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993): 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas - Baltimore, MD MSA. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 1990 CPH-3-80.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993): 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas - Lincoln, NE MSA. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 1990 CPH-3- 212.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993): 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas - Portland, OR PMSA. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 1990 CPH-3-266A.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993): 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas - Savannah, GA MSA. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce. 1990 CPH-3-299.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1993): 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas - Toledo, OH MSA. 1990 CPH-3-321.
- White, M.J. (1987): American Neighbourhoods and Residential Differentiation. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wolman, H. (1986): "The Reagan Urban Policy and Its Impacts." in: Urban Affairs Quarterly. vol.21, no.3. pp.311-335.

END

0 8 1 1 9 4

FIN