

Population Estimates

Series P-25, No. 282
April 14, 1964

ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: JULY 1, 1962

(This report is the first to be based on a new program of postcensal estimates of population for the larger standard metropolitan statistical areas. Publication of such estimates is planned on a regular basis)

This report presents estimates of the population for July 1, 1962, of the 15 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas in the country (in terms of the 1960 population), as defined in 1963. Also shown are estimates for the constituent counties as well as the components of population change for each area for the period April 1960 to July 1962. These estimates relate to the total resident population in each area--that is, the civilian population plus members of the Armed Forces stationed in the area. Thus, these estimates are comparable with the 1960 Census counts.

The 15 SMSA's shown here include a total of 68 counties and independent cities (including six major central cities that are county equivalents, viz., Baltimore, New York City, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.) In 1960, these 15 SMSA's contained a population of 51.4 million, or about 29 percent of the total United States population, and about 46 percent of the total population living in metropolitan areas.

By July 1, 1962, the total population in the 15 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas in the country numbered 52.8 million, an increase of 1.4 million, or 2.7 percent, since April 1, 1960, the date of the last census. The rates of growth varied considerably among and within metropolitan areas. As in the past decade, outlying counties in the SMSA's grew substantially faster than other parts of

the metropolitan areas. For these areas as a whole, between 1960 and 1962, outlying counties grew at about three times the rate of central counties. In the 1950-60 decade, the differential rate of growth was about four to one in favor of outlying counties. The estimates also indicate that the average annual population growth in these 15 SMSA's in the 1960-62 period was somewhat less than that of the 1950-60 period, as shown by the following:

Area	Population (thousands)			Average annual rate of growth (percent)	
	July 1, 1962	Apr. 1, 1960	Apr. 1, 1950	1960-1962	1950-1960
Total.....	52,800	51,432	42,664	+1.2	+1.9
Counties:					
Central.....	35,590	35,042	31,822	+0.7	+1.0
Outlying.....	17,212	16,390	10,842	+2.2	+4.1
Total U.S. resident population	185,890	179,323	151,326	+1.6	+1.7

Methodology.--Except as noted, an average of the results of three procedures was used in developing the estimates of the population shown here. Starting with the 1960 Census as a base, the methods use available current series of figures to estimate the population growth or decline since 1960. The methods used were: (a) The Census Bureau's Component Method II,

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, 15 cents.
Annual subscription (Series P-20, P-23, P-25, P-27, P-28 summaries, P-60, and P-65, combined), \$4.00; foreign mailing, \$5.25.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Luther H. Hodges, *Secretary*
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, Richard M. Scammon, *Director*



which employs vital statistics to measure natural increase and school enrollment (or school census data) as a basis for estimating net migration; (b) the Vital Rates method, which employs data on births and deaths as indicators of total population change; and (c) the Housing Unit method, in which estimated changes in the number of occupied housing units are used as the basis for estimating changes in population.

More specifically, Component Method II involves (1) subtracting Armed Forces from the 1960 Census count to arrive at an estimate of the civilian population on April 1, 1960, (2) adding to this civilian population an estimate of births for the period between the census and the estimate date, (3) subtracting an estimate of civilian deaths, (4) adding an estimate of net civilian migration, (5) subtracting an estimate of the net movement of civilians into the Armed Forces, and (6) adding an estimate of the number of persons in the Armed Forces stationed in the area on the estimate date. The net movement of civilians into the Armed Forces was first estimated for each State and then apportioned to counties on the basis of the 1960 population. The initial estimates for States were obtained in connection with State estimates of the total population for July 1, 1962, published in report No. 272 of this series.

The basic steps involved in the estimation of net civilian migration according to Component Method II are as follows: (1) Net migration rates for children between exact age 7.5 years and exact age 15.5 years at the estimate date are developed on the basis of data from the 1960 Census and statistics on school enrollment in the elementary grades 2 to 8. Essentially, the procedure compares actual school enrollment on the estimate date with the "expected" enrollment based on the survivors of the 1960 population in the appropriate ages. The difference between the actual and expected enrollment is assumed to represent net migration of the school age population. (2) The rates are multiplied by a factor to obtain the estimated migration rate for the total population. This factor is based on the age structure of interstate migrants as shown by the annual Current Population Survey on population mobility.¹ (3) The resulting rates are applied to the civilian noninstitutional population of all ages in each area in 1960 (plus one-half the births and minus one-half the deaths and net loss to Armed Forces since 1960) to obtain

estimates of net civilian migration for the period since 1960. This general procedure has been illustrated in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 133, by a step-by-step application to a particular area.

The single factor for use in converting the net migration rate of school-age children to the net migration rate for the total population recommended in Series P-25, No. 133, has been replaced by a series of factors varying with the length of the period between the census and the date of estimate. The factor used in the computation of the estimates of net migration for the period April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962, is 1.28. A discussion of the reasons for the variable factors and of the way in which they are derived is found in Series P-25, No. 165.

The Vital Rates method of estimating current population is based on the assumption that changes in the number of births and deaths in an area reflect changes in the size of the population in which the births and deaths occur. The steps in applying this method to obtain estimates for each area are as follows:

1. Compute the crude birth rate for the United States and for each area using birth statistics for the 2-year period centered on April 1, 1960,² and the civilian population on April 1, 1960, as estimated from decennial census counts and Armed Forces data.

2. Compute the crude birth rate for the United States using birth statistics for the 12-month period centered on the estimate date and the estimated civilian resident population on the estimate date. (Estimates of total population are published monthly for the United States in this series of reports.)

¹ U.S. Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 127, "Mobility of the Population of the United States: April 1961 to April 1962," January 15, 1964, and the corresponding reports for earlier years. A factor based on interstate migrants was used inasmuch as the factor had already been computed in connection with State population estimates, and appropriate migration data for metropolitan areas were not yet available. Preliminary review of the available data indicates that for this period the factor for interstate migrants is substantially the same as the factors for all intercounty migrants or for intercounty migrants living in metropolitan areas.

² Births for a 2-year period centered on April 1, 1960, were averaged in order to reduce the impact of annual fluctuations. It would also have been desirable to use a corresponding 2-year average centered on the estimate date. The time lag in the availability of the basic vital statistics necessitated the use of figures for the single calendar year.

3. Prepare an estimate of the crude birth rate for each area for the 12-month period centered on the estimate date on the assumption that the change in the rate for each area from the 1960 period was the same as for the United States as a whole.

4. Compute the estimated civilian resident population for each area on the estimate date, dividing its current crude birth rate as obtained above into the number of births for this period.

5. Compute a corresponding set of estimates for each area based on statistics of civilian deaths and estimated crude civilian death rates.

6. Compute a combined estimate of the civilian population of each area by averaging the population estimates from (4) and (5).

7. Add an estimate of the number of Armed Forces stationed in the area on the estimate date to obtain the total resident population.

The Housing Unit method of estimating population rests on the assumption that changes in the number of occupied housing units in an area reflect changes in the population. The estimate of change in the number of housing units between 1960 and the postcensal estimate date is derived from data on building permits and demolitions, or from data on residential electric utility connections, or from other types of data which reflect new residential construction in an area, such as "certificates of occupancy." Changes in the population, however, depend not only on changes in the number of new housing units, but also on changes in the vacancy rates and in the number of persons occupying a unit. It is desirable, therefore, to take into account possible changes in these factors between the benchmark date and the estimate date.

In the specific application here, the estimated number of occupied housing units on the estimate date is used to derive estimates of the population 18 years old and over. The estimated number of occupied housing units on the estimate date was obtained by adding to the 1960 Census count of housing units in each area an estimate of new housing units built since April 1960 and subtracting losses. These changes were derived mainly from building permit and demolition data. The vacancy rate in each area was assumed to be the same as in 1960.

The estimated number of occupied housing units on the estimate date was multiplied by the estimated average number of persons 18 years old and over per household to yield the estimated population 18 years old and over living in households on the postcensal estimate date. In the absence of specific information on adults per household for the individual areas, postcensal changes in this ratio were estimated on the basis of the national trend. Since national data available from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey³ indicated no change in this average number between 1960 and 1962, 1960 values were used for all areas. As a final step, it was necessary to add in an allowance for the population living in group quarters, such as hotels, rooming houses, and institutions. Here, too, 1960 Census counts of these groups were used.

The estimates of the population under 18 years of age that were added to these estimates of the population 18 years old and over were developed by a component procedure, similar to that described earlier under "Component Method II." The procedure, as applied to the population under 18 years of age, involves (a) obtaining the April 1, 1960, population in the group that would be under 18 years of age on July 1, 1962 (between exact ages 0.0 and 15.75 years in 1960); (b) adding births for the period April 1960 to July 1962; (c) subtracting deaths from this group for the same period; and (d) adding an estimate of net migration.

Estimates of net migration for this group were obtained from the migration rate for the school-age population derived earlier as part of the Component Method II procedure. The factor used to convert the school-age-population migration rate to the migration rate for the population under 18 years of age was based on national ratios. For the 1960-62 period, the factor was 1.19.⁴

Estimates by all three methods were first developed separately for the constituent counties of each metropolitan area and then summed

³ Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 125, "Household and Family Characteristics, March 1962," September 12, 1963.

⁴ A more detailed description of the use of Component Method II for deriving population estimates, by age, is given in report No. 280 of this series.

to obtain an estimate for the standard metropolitan statistical area as a whole.

Special cases.--For a number of areas, additional data were available that were used as bases for the population estimates. The estimate for Rockland County in the New York Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area was based on interpolation between the April 1, 1960 Census and the April 1, 1963, Special Census conducted by the Bureau of the Census.⁵

The estimate for Macomb County, Michigan (Detroit SMSA) is based on data from the expanded Annual School Census provided by the Macomb County Planning Commission.

The estimate for the District of Columbia is that prepared earlier and published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 272.

Sources of data.--The basic data used in preparing the population estimates presented here were provided by Federal, State, and local agencies. School enrollment data were obtained from the State and local Departments of Education, and from the appropriate Catholic school officials. Vital statistics were provided by the Division of Vital Statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Public Health Service. The birth and death statistics represent final figures classified on a residence basis, for each year through 1962.⁶ The figures on military station strength were obtained from the Department of Defense. Data on new residential building permits are collected regularly by the Bureau of the Census from local governmental agencies and are published in the Construction Reports series.⁷ These data were supplemented by data on demolitions supplied by local agencies. In general, demolition data were limited to the large cities in the central counties. For outlying counties, satisfactory statistics on demolitions are not regularly available, but in most cases, the number of demolitions is considered to be relatively small. In New York City, figures on certificates of occupancy issued were used in lieu of the build-

⁵ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-28, No. 1338, November 8, 1963.

⁶ Because of the estimated nearly complete registration of births in major metropolitan areas, no corrections were made for incomplete reporting of births.

⁷ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Construction Reports, Building Permits Series C-40, monthly and annual summaries.

ing permit series. In Cuyahoga County, the results of the annual Real Property Inventory of Metropolitan Cleveland were used to measure changes in number of households. Figures on the number of residential electric meters were provided by the electric utility companies in the central counties.⁸

Limitations.--Total population change in an area between the census date and the estimate date consists of the net contribution of births, deaths, and migration, the latter comprising net movement of net civilian migration and Armed Forces. The estimates of net migration shown in this report are subject to a considerably greater percentage error than the figures for the other components of population change. Since net migration is frequently an important component of change, however, the estimates of total population change between a census date and the estimate date may also be subject to substantial error. Moreover, although the estimates of total population change and the population estimates themselves have the same absolute errors, the relative errors in the population estimates are considerably smaller, of course, than those in the estimates of population change.

Two of the methods used here to derive the estimates have been extensively tested and evaluated over the past two decades. As mentioned earlier, one of the methods, Component Method II, is essentially the same (with modifications in application) as that used over the years to prepare annual postcensal estimates of State population, published regularly in this series of reports. The other method, the Vital Rates method, has been used in the past in conjunction with Component Method II to prepare population estimates for local areas for special projects.⁹ Tests of accuracy of these methods (in comparison with other methods) of preparing postcensal population estimates have been conducted over the years, and the results have been summarized in a number of publications.¹⁰

The most recent tests indicate that 1960 population estimates for large metropolitan areas, based on an average of Component Method

⁸ The utility data series were used for several areas directly but were valuable as background data in reviewing and evaluating the estimates for all areas.

⁹ See, for example, Series P-25, Nos. 137, 155, 156, 181, and 190.

II and the Vital Rates method, differed from the 1960 Census count by about 3.3 percent, on the average (for counties, the corresponding average error was 4.3 percent). The test estimates were conducted for the 46 largest SMSA's, including 132 counties. The percentage of difference between the estimates and the Census counts varied considerably from area to area. The errors were highest for the fastest growing counties and relatively modest for counties that grew at or below the national rate of growth.

These average errors apply to a 10-year time period. It is likely that over a shorter time period such as that between April 1960 and July 1962, the average error of the estimates is substantially smaller. On the other hand, even for short time periods, large fluctuations in the migration component occur. Deficiencies in the basic data, differences in the relationship between migration of the total population to that of the school-age population, or changes in the relationship of the area's vital rates to national vital rates could have an appreciable impact on the accuracy of the estimates.

No similar tests of accuracy have been carried out for the Housing Unit method, mainly because of lack of adequate data for the 1950 decade. The technique is beset with a number of hazards and, as mentioned earlier, involves a variety of assumptions concerning such important uncertainties as (a) the completeness of reporting of the basic data on new residential construction and demolition; (b) the pattern of time lag between issuance of permits and the time when the unit is completed and ready for occupancy;¹⁰ (c) changes in the average size of household; (d) changes in vacancy rates; and (e) changes in the size of the nonhousehold population.

¹⁰ Some recent studies are: (a) "Accuracy of Methods for Preparing Postcensal Population Estimates For States and Local Areas," Meyer Zitter and Henry S. Shryock, Jr. (to be published in 1964 in Volume I of *Demography*, a new annual journal of the Population Association of America); (b) National Vital Statistics Division (now the Division of Vital Statistics), U.S. Public Health Service, Preliminary Report of the Study Group on Post-censal Population Estimates, The Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics (Document No. 500.6), Washington, D.C., Junell, 1962; and (c) "A Partial Evaluation of Four Estimating Techniques," David T. Goldberg and T. R. Balakrishnan, Michigan Population Studies No. 2, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961.

The use of this source was limited here to estimating the adult population, on the assumption that school enrollment statistics are better indicators of population change of the school-age population and hence of the population under 18. The weight of this source, therefore, in the final result is somewhat less than one-third. It has been demonstrated in the past that the averaging together of several estimates tends to improve the over-all results provided that the methods use symptomatic data which are largely independent of one another and provided that the methods are of roughly comparable average accuracy.

The use of these three methods for the 1962 estimates is not necessarily intended to limit the methodology for the estimates in future years. On the contrary, work is continuing on the availability and use of other indicators of population change. Experimentation is in process on the use of data on the number of exemptions reported on individual income tax returns available from the Internal Revenue Service. Investigation is also being conducted on the use of regression methods in which a number of independent variables, such as, births, deaths, school enrollment, number of automobile registrations, and number of individual income tax returns filed, are correlated against an independent variable (population). Furthermore, there may be available for some areas statistics particularly well suited for population estimation purposes. For example, school censuses, where appropriately conducted, should provide highly reliable figures on the population in selected school ages. In some instances, in conjunction with the school census, counts of the adult population are also obtained. Information concerning such special data for the specific areas covered in this report should be sent to the Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 20233.

¹¹ As indicated earlier, permit data were used for all but a few central counties. The lag between issuance date and completion date varies by type of structure and from area to area. For convenience, permit data were used uniformly with a 3-month lag for all areas. The choice of lag can be very important over short periods of time, particularly where the number of permits fluctuates sharply, or where large multi-unit structures are covered by a single permit. Over longer estimating periods, the choice of time lag has considerably less impact. Studies at the national level indicate that all but about 2 percent of units authorized are eventually built.

Definitions.--Except in New England, a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) is a county or group of contiguous counties which contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more, or "twin cities" with a combined population of at least 50,000. In addition to the county, or counties, containing such a city or cities, contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if, according to certain criteria, they are essentially metropolitan in character and are socially and economically integrated with the central city. In New England, SMSA's consist of towns and cities, rather than counties.¹²

For purposes of this report, each county containing a central city is designated as "central" county. A detailed explanation of the criteria used in establishing SMSA's is given in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, 1961. The 1963 revisions of definitions are given in a Bureau of the Budget release dated October 18, 1963.

¹² In this report, estimates are shown for the Massachusetts State Economic Area C (Boston SEA) which consists of whole counties.

ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY CONSTITUENT COUNTIES, JULY 1, 1962,
AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE, 1960 TO 1962

(Standard metropolitan statistical areas are as defined in 1963 and are ranked according to 1960 population. Asterisk (*) indicates central county. Figures rounded to nearest thousand without adjustment to totals; hence, sum of parts may differ slightly from totals shown. Derived figures based on unrounded numbers)

Standard metropolitan statistical area and county	Population		Net change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962		Components of change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962		
	July 1, 1962	April 1, 1960 (Census)	Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net migration
NEW YORK, N.Y.							
Total.....	11,047,000	10,694,633	+353,000	+3.3	494,000	253,000	+112,000
New York City*.....	7,947,000	7,781,984	+166,000	+2.1	356,000	200,000	+10,000
Nassau.....	1,345,000	1,300,171	+45,000	+3.5	55,000	21,000	+11,000
Rockland.....	156,000	136,803	+19,000	+13.8	7,000	2,000	+14,000
Suffolk.....	756,000	666,784	+89,000	+13.4	40,000	12,000	+61,000
Westchester.....	843,000	808,891	+34,000	+4.2	36,000	17,000	+15,000
CHICAGO, ILL.							
Total.....	6,356,000	6,220,913	+135,000	+2.2	340,000	139,000	-67,000
Cook*.....	5,196,000	5,129,725	+66,000	+1.3	280,000	120,000	-94,000
Du Page.....	341,000	313,459	+28,000	+8.8	16,000	4,000	+15,000
Kane.....	219,000	208,246	+11,000	+5.3	12,000	4,000	+3,000
Lake.....	308,000	293,656	+14,000	+4.8	16,000	5,000	+3,000
McHenry.....	89,000	84,210	+4,000	+5.3	5,000	2,000	+1,000
Will.....	204,000	191,617	+12,000	+6.3	11,000	4,000	+5,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH, CALIF.							
Total.....	6,353,000	6,038,771	+314,000	+5.2	309,000	122,000	+127,000
Los Angeles*.....	6,353,000	6,038,771	+314,000	+5.2	309,000	122,000	+127,000
PHILADELPHIA, PA.-N.J.							
Total.....	4,460,000	4,342,897	+117,000	+2.7	221,000	100,000	-4,000
Philadelphia, Pa.*.....	2,022,000	2,002,512	+20,000	+1.0	100,000	55,000	-24,000
Bucks, Pa.....	317,000	308,567	+8,000	+2.7	17,000	5,000	-4,000
Chester, Pa.....	222,000	210,608	+11,000	+5.3	11,000	4,000	+4,000
Delaware, Pa.....	564,000	553,154	+11,000	+2.0	27,000	11,000	-6,000
Montgomery, Pa.....	540,000	516,682	+23,000	+4.5	24,000	10,000	+10,000
Burlington, N.J.....	249,000	224,499	+25,000	+11.1	13,000	3,000	+15,000
Camden, N.J.....	405,000	392,035	+13,000	+3.3	21,000	8,000	+1,000
Gloucester, N.J.....	140,000	134,840	+5,000	+3.6	8,000	3,000	(1)
DETROIT, MICH.							
Total.....	3,783,000	3,762,360	+21,000	+0.6	201,000	69,000	-111,000
Wayne*.....	2,632,000	2,666,297	-35,000	-1.3	134,000	54,000	-114,000
Macomb.....	446,000	409,804	+40,000	+9.8	29,000	5,000	+16,000
Oakland.....	706,000	690,259	+16,000	+2.3	39,000	10,000	-13,000
BOSTON, MASS.²							
Total.....	3,152,000	3,109,158	+43,000	+1.4	157,000	76,000	-38,000
Suffolk*.....	778,000	791,329	-13,000	-1.7	39,000	23,000	-29,000
Essex.....	579,000	568,831	+11,000	+1.9	28,000	15,000	-2,000
Middlesex.....	1,267,000	1,238,742	+28,000	+2.3	65,000	27,000	-9,000
Norfolk.....	528,000	510,256	+18,000	+3.4	25,000	11,000	+3,000
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND, CALIF.							
Total.....	2,766,000	2,648,762	+117,000	+4.4	132,000	56,000	+41,000
Alameda*.....	953,000	908,209	+44,000	+4.9	47,000	19,000	+16,000
San Francisco*.....	741,000	740,316	(1)	(1)	33,000	22,000	-11,000
Contra Costa.....	438,000	409,030	+29,000	+7.2	21,000	6,000	+14,000
Marin.....	160,000	146,820	+13,000	+8.9	8,000	2,000	+8,000
San Mateo.....	475,000	444,387	+30,000	+6.8	23,000	7,000	+14,000
PITTSBURGH, PA.							
Total.....	2,357,000	2,405,435	-48,000	-2.0	111,000	55,000	-104,000
Allegheny*.....	1,594,000	1,628,587	-35,000	-2.1	76,000	39,000	-72,000
Beaver.....	204,000	206,948	-3,000	-1.7	10,000	4,000	-9,000
Washington.....	211,000	217,271	-6,000	-2.8	9,000	5,000	-10,000
Westmoreland.....	348,000	352,629	-4,000	-1.2	16,000	7,000	-13,000

See footnotes at end of table.

ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY CONSTITUENT COUNTIES, JULY 1, 1962,
AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE, 1960 TO 1962--Con.

(Standard metropolitan statistical areas are as defined in 1963 and are ranked according to 1960 population. Asterisk (*) indicates central county. Figures rounded to nearest thousand without adjustment to totals; hence, sum of parts may differ slightly from totals shown. Derived figures based on unrounded numbers)

Standard metropolitan statistical area and county	Population		Net change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962		Components of change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962		
	July 1, 1962	April 1, 1960 (Census)	Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net migration
ST. LOUIS, MO.-ILL.							
Total.....	2,132,000	2,104,669	+27,000	+1.3	115,000	47,000	-41,000
St. Louis city, Mo*.....	704,000	750,026	-46,000	-6.2	42,000	23,000	-65,000
Franklin, Mo.....	46,000	44,566	+2,000	+4.3	2,000	1,000	+1,000
Jefferson, Mo.....	71,000	66,377	+5,000	+7.0	4,000	1,000	+2,000
St. Charles, Mo.....	61,000	52,970	+8,000	+15.2	4,000	1,000	+5,000
St. Louis, Mo.....	755,000	703,532	+51,000	+7.3	37,000	11,000	+26,000
Madison, Ill.....	230,000	224,689	+6,000	+2.6	12,000	4,000	-2,000
St. Clair, Ill.....	264,000	262,509	+1,000	+0.6	15,000	6,000	-8,000
WASHINGTON, D.C.-MD.-VA.							
Total.....	2,148,000	³ 1,989,377	+158,000	+8.0	120,000	36,000	+74,000
District of Columbia*.....	789,000	763,956	+25,000	+3.3	46,000	20,000	-1,000
Montgomery, Md.....	378,000	340,928	+37,000	+11.0	18,000	5,000	+24,000
Prince Georges, Md.....	405,000	357,395	+48,000	+13.3	25,000	5,000	+28,000
Alexandria city, Va.....	95,000	91,023	+4,000	+3.9	6,000	1,000	-1,000
Arlington, Va.....	168,000	163,401	+4,000	+2.8	10,000	2,000	-3,000
Fairfax, Va. ⁴	313,000	² 272,674	+40,000	+14.7	16,000	3,000	+27,000
CLEVELAND, OHIO							
Total.....	1,924,000	1,909,483	+15,000	+0.8	97,000	41,000	-42,000
Cuyahoga*.....	1,653,000	1,647,895	+5,000	+0.3	82,000	37,000	-41,000
Geauga.....	51,000	47,573	+4,000	+7.8	3,000	1,000	+2,000
Lake.....	153,000	148,700	+5,000	+3.0	9,000	2,000	-2,000
Medina.....	66,000	65,315	+1,000	+1.7	4,000	1,000	-1,000
BALTIMORE, MD.							
Total.....	1,760,000	1,727,023	+33,000	+1.9	94,000	37,000	-23,000
Baltimore city*.....	939,000	939,024	(¹)	-0.1	51,000	25,000	-27,000
Anne Arundel.....	222,000	206,634	+15,000	+7.5	12,000	3,000	+7,000
Baltimore.....	505,000	492,428	+12,000	+2.5	26,000	7,000	-6,000
Carroll.....	54,000	52,785	+1,000	+2.6	2,000	1,000	(¹)
Howard.....	40,000	36,152	+4,000	+11.4	2,000	1,000	+3,000
NEWARK, N.J.							
Total.....	1,735,000	1,689,420	+45,000	+2.7	81,000	39,000	+3,000
Essex*.....	943,000	923,545	+20,000	+2.1	45,000	24,000	-1,000
Morris.....	273,000	261,620	+11,000	+4.3	13,000	5,000	+3,000
Union.....	519,000	504,255	+15,000	+2.9	23,000	10,000	+2,000
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINN.							
Total.....	1,525,000	1,482,030	+43,000	+2.9	91,000	28,000	-20,000
Hennepin*.....	858,000	842,854	+15,000	+1.8	48,000	17,000	-16,000
Ramsey*.....	420,000	422,525	-2,000	-0.5	26,000	9,000	-19,000
Anoka.....	103,000	85,916	+17,000	+19.6	8,000	1,000	+10,000
Dakota.....	86,000	78,303	+8,000	+9.9	6,000	1,000	+3,000
Washington.....	58,000	52,432	+5,000	+10.4	4,000	1,000	+2,000
BUFFALO, N.Y.							
Total.....	1,303,000	1,306,957	-4,000	-0.3	67,000	29,000	-42,000
Erie*.....	1,068,000	1,064,688	+3,000	+0.3	54,000	24,000	-27,000
Niagara.....	235,000	242,269	-8,000	-3.2	13,000	5,000	-16,000

¹ Less than 500 or 0.05 percent.

² Massachusetts State Economic Area C.

³ Adjusted to exclude 12,520 erroneously reported in Fairfax County.

⁴ Includes Falls Church and Fairfax independent cities.