

Population Estimates

Series P-25, No. 298
February 12, 1965

ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF THE LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: JULY 1, 1963

(SMSA's are as defined in 1964 by the Bureau of the Budget. Estimates shown here supersede those published in Series P-25, No. 291.)

This report presents estimates of the population on July 1, 1963, of the 38 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) in the country (in terms of 1960 population) and their component counties. Also shown are estimates of the components of population change for each area for the period April 1960 to July 1963. These estimates relate to the total resident population in each area--that is, the civilian resident population plus members of the Armed Forces stationed in the area.

The 38 metropolitan areas shown here include a total of 148 counties and independent cities. In 1960, each of these 38 areas contained a population in excess of 700,000. Their overall total population was 72.9 million, or

about 41 percent of the total United States population, and about 65 percent of the total population living in metropolitan areas.

The total population in the 38 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas in the country on July 1, 1963, is estimated at 77.1 million, an increase of 4.3 million, or 5.9 percent, since April 1, 1960, the date of the last census. During this period the rate of growth for these metropolitan areas only slightly exceeded that for the United States as a whole, which was 5.2 percent. This difference thus represents a relative slowing down of metropolitan growth since the 1950's, when the population of these 38 areas grew considerably more rapidly than the national population:

Area	Population (in thousands)			Percent of change		Average annual rate of change (percent)	
	July 1, 1963	Apr. 1, 1960 (census)	Apr. 1, 1950 (census)	1960- 1963	1950- 1960	1960- 1963	1950- 1960
Total (38 SMSA's).....	77,149	72,868	57,884	+5.9	+25.9	+1.8	+2.3
Central counties.....	55,010	52,546	44,382	+4.7	+18.4	+1.4	+1.7
Outlying counties.....	22,139	20,322	13,502	+8.9	+50.5	+2.6	+4.1
U.S. resident population.....	188,616	179,323	151,326	+5.2	+18.5	+1.6	+1.7

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, John T. Connor, Secretary
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS



The average annual population growth in these 38 SMSA's in the 1960-63 period (1.8 percent) compares with the 1.9 percent average annual growth of the population in all metropolitan areas during roughly the same time period as estimated from the Current Population Survey.¹

There was considerable variation among SMSA's in rate of growth during the early 1960's. As compared with the average increase of about 6 percent for the 38 areas, the Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove SMSA in Southern California (Orange County) grew by 36 percent, or almost 10 percent a year. Adjacent San Bernardino-Riverside was the next fastest growing of the largest SMSA's, with an increase of over 15 percent. The Denver, Washington, Miami, Houston, Dallas, and Atlanta areas all increased by more than 10 percent during the 3 1/4-year period. The Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, San Bernardino-Riverside, Los Angeles-Long Beach, and San Diego areas in Southern California continue to experience the rapid population growth characteristic of this general area over the last several decades.

The number of metropolitan areas with a million or more population has now increased to an estimated 26 with the addition of Denver and Miami since 1960 (table 3). In terms of rank, Los Angeles-Long Beach has replaced Chicago as the second largest metropolitan area. A number of other shifts in population rank took place among these areas, most notable of which was that of Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove which rose from 38th in rank in 1960 to 29th, as the result of its extremely rapid growth during the recent period. It is quite possible, however, that areas not covered in this report (below 700,000 population in 1960) may have grown rapidly enough since 1960 to rank now with those shown here.

Rates of growth also varied considerably from county to county within these 38 metropolitan areas. About 16 of the 148 counties shown here increased by 20 percent or more from 1960 to 1963, two of them by well over 30 percent. On the other hand, 20 counties are estimated to have lost population or increased by less than one percent since 1960. As in the past decade, outlying counties in the SMSA's--that is, counties outside the counties containing the central cities--grew substantially faster than the central counties of the metropolitan areas. For the combined 38 areas, between 1960 and 1963, outlying counties grew at nearly twice the rate of central counties. In the 1950-60

¹ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 131, "Growth of Metropolitan Areas in the United States: 1960 to 1963," September 4, 1964.

decade, the differential rate of growth between central and outlying counties had been slightly greater--2½ to 1 in favor of outlying counties.

Slightly more than one in four counties were found to have been growing more rapidly (or losing less rapidly) in the period since 1960 than in the 1950's. Forty-two of the 148 counties show an increase in their average annual rate of growth (that is, counties that increased in population between 1950 and 1960 had higher average annual rates of increase in the 1960-63 period; counties that lost population in the 1950's had population gains in the 1960-63 period, or had smaller average losses). Generally, increases occur in mature central counties that showed a loss in the 1950-60 period, or in outlying counties that have only recently acquired a metropolitan character. Decreases in the annual rate of change, on the other hand, seem to be most typical of the less mature central counties and of outlying counties where heavy suburban development occurred in the 1950's.

METHODOLOGY

Except as noted, the estimates for July 1, 1963 are based on an average of the results of four estimating procedures. 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 are: (1) The Census Bureau's Component Method II, which employs vital statistics to measure natural increase and school enrollment (or school census data) as a basis for measuring net migration; (2) the Vital Rates Method, which employs data on births and deaths as indicators of total population change; (3) 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; and (4) a Composite Method, in which separate estimates are prepared for different segments of the population using different types of current data for each group.

Component Method II--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 within the State 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, 1963, published in report No. 289 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 intercounty migrants as shown by the annual Current Population Survey on population mobility.² (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 movement of civilians into the Armed Forces since 1960) to obtain estimates of net civilian migration for the period since 1960. The general procedure has been illustrated in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 133, by a step-by-step application to a particular area. An unpublished revision of this report is available on request to: Chief, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 20233.

The factor used in the computation of the estimates of net migration for the period April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963, is 1.18. (The corresponding factors for earlier periods were: April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1962, 1.25; and April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1961, 1.34.)

Vital Rates Method.--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

² U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, "Mobility of the Population of the United States: March 1962 to 1963," to be published in early 1965, and the corresponding reports for earlier years.

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, 1960,³ 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.)

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.

Generally, the above computations are carried through separately, by color, where the vital statistics are available in this form, and the results are summed to provide a single estimate of total population.

Composite Method.--In the Composite Method⁴ separate estimates are prepared for the population under 18 years, 18 to 44 years, and 45 years and over. In the application here, the number of deaths 45 years old and over, by age, sex, and color, is used to estimate the population 45 years

³ 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.

⁴ Donald J. Bogue and Beverly Duncan, "A Composite Method For Estimating Postcensal Population of Small Areas by Age, Sex, and Color," in National Office of Vital Statistics, Vital Statistics--Special Reports, Vol. XLVII, No. 6 (August 24, 1959).

and over; the number of births is used to estimate females in the childbearing ages (18 to 44 years) which, in turn, is used to estimate the number of males in the corresponding age groups; school enrollment is used to estimate the population of school ages (5 through 17 years old); and the number of births in the previous 5-year period, in conjunction with school enrollment data, are used to estimate the population under 5 years of age. The estimates for these broad ages are then summed to yield an estimate of the population at all ages.

The steps in applying this method are as follows:

A. Population 45 years old and over: (1) Compute the age-sex-color specific death rate by 10-year age groups for 1960, starting with the population 45 to 54 years up through 75 years old and over, for the United States and each area, using death statistics for 1960 and the population on April 1, 1960, obtained from the decennial census counts.⁵ (2) Compute the corresponding death rate for the United States for the 12-month period centered on the estimate date. (3) Prepare an estimate of the specific death rates for each area for the 12-month period centered on the estimate date, on the assumption that the change in the death rate for each area from 1960 was the same as for the United States as a whole. (4) Compute the estimated population for each area on the estimate date in each age-sex-color group, dividing the number of deaths for each group in the period by its current specific death rate as obtained above. (5) Add together the specific age-sex-color estimates so as to derive an estimate of the population 45 years old and over for each area on the estimate date.

In the smaller areas, when deaths were distributed by age, sex, and color, there were extremely small numbers of deaths in some age-sex-color groups. The thinness of these data made their use as bases for estimates by this technique very questionable. Consequently, in all counties where the 1960 population was less than 100,000, the procedure was modified so that estimates were prepared for the age group 45 years old and over as a whole, by sex.

B. Population 18 to 44 years of age: Estimates of the number of females 18 to 44 years old as a group are first developed in a manner corresponding to steps (1) through (4) above using data on the number of births in the United States, by color, and the number of females 18 to 44 years

⁵ It would have been desirable to have used figures for a 2-year period centered on April 1, 1960, in order to reduce the impact of the annual fluctuations on the data. However, data in the required detail by counties are not available for 1959.

of age. Then, the ratio of the number of males to females in 1960 in the area in this age range, adjusted for change in this ratio for the United States as a whole between 1960 and the estimate date, is used to arrive at an estimate of the number of males in each area. The number of males and the number of females are summed to yield an estimate of the population 18 to 44 years. (Estimates are derived for the civilian resident population; the number of Armed Forces in the area is included as a final step.)

C. Population under 18 years of age: The estimated population in this age group was developed by a component procedure similar to that described for Component Method II above. The procedure as applied to the population under 18 years of age involves: (1) Obtaining the April 1, 1960, population in the group that would be under 18 years old on the estimate date; (2) adding births for April 1, 1960, to the estimate date; (3) subtracting deaths for the group for the same period; and (4) adding an estimate of net migration.

Estimates of net migration for this group were obtained from the migration rate of 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 rate for the population under 18 years of age was based on national ratios. For the 1960-63 period the factor was 1.10.⁶

Housing Unit Method.--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

⁶ A more detailed description of the use of Component Method II for deriving population estimates by age is given in report No. 294 of this series.

ate 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, demolition, and utility 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. (National data available from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey⁷ indicated a decline of .0197 in this average number between 1960 and 1963.) 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 the component procedure described above in section C of the "Composite Method."

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

For the Louisville SMSA, the estimates are based on interpolation between the 1960 Census and a special census of the area conducted by the Bureau of the Census on May 14, 1964. Similarly, for Monroe County, New York (Rochester SMSA), the estimates represent an interpolation between the 1960 Census and the special census of April 1, 1964.

The estimates for Suffolk County in the New York SMSA incorporate the results of a number of special censuses taken in various towns in April 1964. The areas in which such special censuses were taken represented about 90 percent of the county population in 1960.

The estimates for Macomb County, Michigan (Detroit SMSA), are based on data from the expanded

⁷ Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 130, "Households and Families, by Type: 1964," July 27, 1964.

annual school census provided by the Macomb County Planning Commission.

The estimates for the District of Columbia are those prepared earlier and published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 289.

For Johnson and Wyandotte Counties, Kansas (Kansas City SMSA), the estimates are based on the annual Kansas State census, taken as of January 1 of each year, and are adjusted to be consistent with definitions of usual residence employed in Federal censuses.

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 State and local Departments of Education, and from the appropriate Catholic school officials and The Official Catholic Directory. 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 1963.⁸ The figures on military 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.⁹ 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 building permit series. In Cuyahoga County, Ohio, the results of the annual Real Property Inventory of Metropolitan Cleveland were used to measure changes in the number of households.

Figures on the number of residential electric meters were provided by the electric utility companies in the central counties. These utility data series were used in lieu of building permit and demolition data for most central counties.

⁸ Because of the nearly complete registration of births in major metropolitan areas, no corrections were made for incomplete reporting of births.

⁹ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Construction Reports, Building Permits, Series C-40, monthly and annual summaries.

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.

Three 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 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.¹⁰ Tests of accuracy of these and the Composite Method (compared 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.¹¹

The most recent tests indicate that 1960 population estimates for large metropolitan areas, based on an average of Component Method 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 4.7 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 1963, the average error of the estimates is substantially smaller.¹² 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;¹³ (c) changes in the average size of household; (d) changes in vacancy rates; and (e) changes in the size of the nonhousehold population.

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

¹⁰ See, for example, Series P-25, Nos. 137, 155, 156, 181, and 190.

¹¹ Some recent studies are: (a) Meyer Zitter and Henry S. Shryock, Jr., "Accuracy of Methods For Preparing Postcensal Population Estimates For States and Local Areas," *Demography*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1964; (b) National Vital Statistics Division (now the Division of Vital Statistics), U.S. Public Health Service, Preliminary Report of the Study Group on Postcensal Population Estimates, The Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics (Document No. 500.6), Washington, D.C., June 11, 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.

¹² For the nine counties where special census (or local census) data were available, estimates based on the averaged results of the four uniform procedures differed from those published here by an average of 2.3 percent.

¹³ 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.

population and hence of the population under 18. The weight of this source, therefore, in the final result is somewhat less than one-fourth. 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.

The use of these four methods for the 1963 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).¹⁴ Furthermore, for some areas, statistics particularly well suited for population estimation purposes may be available. 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: Chief, Population

Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 20233.

RANGE OF ESTIMATES

As indicated above, the estimates shown here are derived by giving equal weight to each of the results of four separate estimating procedures using different symptomatic data. The use of equal weights implies that the methods provide estimates of roughly comparable average accuracy. The results of tests of the separate methods are not yet conclusive enough to warrant the assignment of differential weights. A method that tends to be more accurate, on the average, may also be less accurate in a particular area.

The table below summarizes the consistency of the individual estimates. Two kinds of summary measures are shown: (a) The percentage deviation of a given method from the published estimate, averaged over the specified set of areas; and (b) the percentage excess of the highest over the lowest estimate for an area, again averaged over the specified set of areas. The latter indicates the range among the results of the four methods. The differences among the several estimating methods are relatively small for SMSA's and the more populous counties but are somewhat larger for many of the outlying counties. A set of estimates for these areas based on any one of the procedures shown would have differed at most, on the average, from the estimates shown here by about 2.3 percent for counties and 1.4 percent for SMSA's.

AVERAGE DIFFERENCE OF EACH METHOD FROM PUBLISHED ESTIMATE AND AVERAGE RANGE OF ESTIMATES: JULY 1, 1963
(Averages expressed as percentages)

Area	Number of areas	Average difference from published estimate, by method ¹				Average range of estimates of four methods ²
		Method II	Vital rates	Composite	Housing unit	
Total SMSA's.....	38	1.4	1.0	0.6	1.1	3.1
Total counties.....	148	2.3	2.0	1.1	1.7	5.0
Central.....	50	1.9	1.3	0.8	1.4	4.2
Outlying.....	98	2.5	2.4	1.3	1.9	6.6

¹ Disregarding sign.

² Highest estimate minus lowest estimate divided by the lowest.

Research is under way on how best to derive the final estimates, given results by separate procedures. It is hoped that a technique will be developed which may provide the means of determining more

precisely the weights to be given to each method, if research indicates that differential weighting would tend to improve the overall estimates.

DEFINITIONS

Except in New England, a standard metropolitan statistical area is a county or group of contiguous counties which contains at least one city

¹⁴ This procedure is now being used, in part, in developing the regular annual State estimates. The specific application is described in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 289, pp. 4, 5.

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. 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, 1964. Current SMSA definitions and the changes in definitions made since the 1960 Census are indicated in that report.

In New England, SMSA's consist of towns and cities, rather than counties. In preparing the series of estimates presented in this report, however, no attempt was made to compile data for areas below the county level, basically because of the considerably increased workload which this would have necessitated and the great difficulty of assembling basic data for these small areas. Consequently, for the two New England metropolitan areas presented here, the SMSA has been replaced by the metropolitan State economic area, which is defined in terms of whole counties.¹⁵ Data presented for Boston and Providence-Pawtucket-Warwick cover Massachusetts State Economic Area C and Rhode Island State Economic Area A, respectively; and summary data for metropolitan areas substitute these metropolitan SEA's for the comparable SMSA's.

For purposes of this report, the cities listed in the title of each SMSA are treated as central cities. Each county containing a central city is designated as "central" county. All other counties are designated as "outlying."

¹⁵ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, Selected Area Reports, State Economic Areas, Final Report PC(3)-1A, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963.

RELATED REPORTS

Estimates for the 15 largest SMSA's and their component counties for July 1, 1962, approximately consistent with those here, are published in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 291. Estimates for 1962 for all areas shown here are planned for publication along with forthcoming 1964 estimates later this year. Estimates of the components of population change for the periods 1950-60 and 1940-50 for SMSA's as defined for the 1960 Census and for 1950-60 for counties are shown in Series P-23, No. 7.

For SMSA's as currently defined, both 1960 and 1950 Census counts for each area and its component parts are published in Series P-23, No. 10. The report also includes a ranking of SMSA's by population size in 1960.

Estimates of the population of the United States by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan residence as of March 1963 are shown in Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 131. Although these estimates are subject to certain limitations and cover a somewhat different universe,¹⁶ they provide a useful background for the summary estimates for the metropolitan population contained in this report.

ROUNDING OF ESTIMATES

Estimates presented in the tables of this report have been rounded to the nearest thousand without being adjusted to group totals, which are independently rounded. Percentages are based on unrounded numbers.

¹⁶ These estimates are based on the Current Population Survey, the continuing sample survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census, and as such they are subject to sampling variability and to errors of response. They relate to a population which excludes resident Armed Forces living in barracks, and in addition they relate to the SMSA's as defined for the 1960 Census.

Table 1.--ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF 38 LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY CONSTITUENT COUNTIES, JULY 1, 1963, AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE, 1960 TO 1963

(Includes all standard metropolitan statistical areas with 1960 populations of 700,000 or more as defined in 1964 by the Bureau of the Budget. Asterisk (*) indicates central county)

Standard Metropolitan statistical area and county	Population		Net change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		Components of change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		
	July 1, 1963	April 1, 1960 (census)	Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net Migration
ANAHEIM-SANTA ANA-GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.....	957,000	703,925	+253,000	+36.0	67,000	16,000	+202,000
Orange*.....	957,000	703,925	+253,000	+36.0	67,000	16,000	+202,000
ATLANTA, GA.....	1,125,000	1,017,188	+108,000	+10.6	85,000	28,000	+50,000
De Kalb*.....	294,000	256,782	+37,000	+14.4	22,000	5,000	+21,000
Fulton*.....	591,000	556,326	+35,000	+6.3	45,000	18,000	+8,000
Clayton.....	59,000	46,365	+13,000	+27.7	4,000	1,000	+9,000
Cobb.....	131,000	114,174	+17,000	+14.8	10,000	2,000	+9,000
Gwinnett.....	49,000	43,541	+6,000	+13.5	4,000	1,000	+3,000
BALTIMORE, MD.....	1,811,000	1,727,023	+84,000	+4.8	134,000	55,000	+5,000
Baltimore city*.....	938,000	939,024	-1,000	-0.1	74,000	37,000	-38,000
Anne Arundel.....	233,000	206,634	+26,000	+12.8	17,000	4,000	+14,000
Baltimore.....	537,000	492,428	+45,000	+9.1	37,000	11,000	+19,000
Carroll.....	58,000	52,785	+5,000	+9.1	4,000	2,000	+3,000
Howard.....	45,000	36,152	+8,000	+23.4	3,000	1,000	+6,000
BOSTON, MASS. ¹	3,174,000	3,109,158	+65,000	+2.1	225,000	111,000	-49,000
Suffolk*.....	765,000	791,329	-26,000	-3.3	56,000	33,000	-49,000
Essex.....	589,000	568,831	+20,000	+3.5	40,000	22,000	+2,000
Middlesex.....	1,288,000	1,238,742	+49,000	+3.9	93,000	40,000	-4,000
Norfolk.....	532,000	510,256	+22,000	+4.3	36,000	15,000	+2,000
BUFFALO, N.Y.....	1,306,000	1,306,957	-1,000	-0.1	95,000	42,000	-53,000
Erie*.....	1,070,000	1,064,688	+5,000	+0.5	77,000	35,000	-36,000
Niagara.....	236,000	242,269	-6,000	-2.5	18,000	7,000	-17,000
CHICAGO, ILL.....	6,480,000	6,220,913	+259,000	+4.2	489,000	204,000	-26,000
Cook*.....	5,282,000	5,129,725	+152,000	+3.0	401,000	176,000	-73,000
Du Page.....	358,000	313,459	+44,000	+14.1	24,000	7,000	+26,000
Kane.....	228,000	208,246	+20,000	+9.4	17,000	6,000	+9,000
Lake.....	313,000	293,656	+19,000	+6.6	23,000	7,000	+3,000
McHenry.....	92,000	84,210	+8,000	+9.2	7,000	3,000	+4,000
Will.....	208,000	191,617	+17,000	+8.6	16,000	5,000	+6,000
CINCINNATI, OHIO-KY.-IND.....	1,295,000	1,268,479	+26,000	+2.1	102,000	41,000	-34,000
Hamilton, Ohio*.....	876,000	864,121	+11,000	+1.3	69,000	29,000	-29,000
Clermont, Ohio.....	89,000	80,530	+8,000	+10.4	6,000	2,000	+4,000
Warren, Ohio.....	70,000	65,711	+5,000	+6.9	6,000	2,000	(Z)
Boone, Ky.....	24,000	21,940	+2,000	+9.3	2,000	1,000	+1,000
Campbell, Ky.....	87,000	86,803	(Z)	-0.2	7,000	3,000	-4,000
Kenton, Ky.....	119,000	120,700	-2,000	-1.3	10,000	4,000	-7,000
Dearborn, Ind.....	30,000	28,674	+2,000	+5.3	2,000	1,000	(Z)
CLEVELAND, OHIO.....	1,956,000	1,909,483	+47,000	+2.5	138,000	60,000	-31,000
Cuyahoga*.....	1,673,000	1,647,895	+25,000	+1.5	117,000	54,000	-39,000
Geauga.....	53,000	47,573	+6,000	+11.6	4,000	1,000	+3,000
Lake.....	163,000	148,700	+14,000	+9.5	12,000	3,000	+5,000
Medina.....	68,000	65,315	+3,000	+3.8	5,000	2,000	-1,000
COLUMBUS, OHIO.....	795,000	754,924	+41,000	+5.4	63,000	22,000	-1,000
Franklin*.....	722,000	682,962	+39,000	+5.8	58,000	20,000	+1,000
Delaware.....	36,000	36,107	-1,000	-1.5	2,000	1,000	-2,000
Pickaway.....	38,000	35,855	+2,000	+4.6	3,000	1,000	(Z)

Z Less than 500.

¹ Data shown for Massachusetts State Economic Area C (see text). Population of Boston SMSA in 1960 is 2,595,481.

Table 1.--ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF 38 LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY CONSTITUENT COUNTIES, JULY 1, 1963, AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE, 1960 TO 1963--Con.

(Includes all standard metropolitan statistical areas with 1960 populations of 700,000 or more as defined in 1964 by the Bureau of the Budget. Asterisk (*) indicates central county)

Standard metropolitan statistical area and county	Population		Net change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		Components of change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		
	July 1, 1963	April 1, 1960 (census)	Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net Migration
DALLAS, TEXAS.....	1,211,000	1,083,601	+127,000	+11.7	91,000	28,000	+64,000
Dallas*.....	1,066,000	951,527	+115,000	+12.1	82,000	23,000	+56,000
Collin.....	46,000	41,247	+5,000	+12.1	3,000	1,000	+3,000
Denton.....	54,000	47,432	+6,000	+13.4	3,000	1,000	+4,000
Ellis.....	45,000	43,395	+1,000	+2.6	3,000	2,000	(Z)
DAYTON, OHIO.....	741,000	727,121	+14,000	+1.9	57,000	20,000	-23,000
Montgomery*.....	533,000	527,080	+6,000	+1.2	42,000	15,000	-21,000
Greene.....	100,000	94,642	+6,000	+5.8	7,000	2,000	(Z)
Miami.....	75,000	72,901	+2,000	+2.4	5,000	2,000	-1,000
Preble.....	33,000	32,498	(Z)	+0.8	2,000	1,000	-1,000
DENVER, COLO.....	1,051,000	929,383	+122,000	+13.1	80,000	26,000	+68,000
Denver*.....	499,000	493,887	+5,000	+1.0	38,000	17,000	-16,000
Adams.....	149,000	120,296	+29,000	+23.8	13,000	2,000	+18,000
Arapahoe.....	135,000	113,426	+21,000	+18.6	10,000	2,000	+13,000
Boulder.....	93,000	74,254	+18,000	+24.7	6,000	2,000	+14,000
Jefferson.....	176,000	127,520	+49,000	+38.2	12,000	3,000	+39,000
DETROIT, MICH.....	3,889,000	3,762,360	+127,000	+3.4	284,000	102,000	-56,000
Wayne*.....	2,691,000	2,666,297	+25,000	+0.9	189,000	80,000	-83,000
Macomb.....	471,000	405,804	+65,000	+16.1	41,000	8,000	+32,000
Oakland.....	727,000	690,259	+36,000	+5.3	55,000	14,000	-4,000
HOUSTON, TEXAS.....	1,394,000	1,243,158	+151,000	+12.1	108,000	30,000	+72,000
Harris*.....	1,394,000	1,243,158	+151,000	+12.1	108,000	30,000	+72,000
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.....	964,000	916,932	+47,000	+5.2	77,000	29,000	-1,000
Marion*.....	725,000	697,567	+27,000	+3.9	59,000	22,000	-10,000
Hamilton.....	44,000	40,132	+4,000	+9.9	3,000	1,000	+2,000
Hancock.....	30,000	26,665	+3,000	+12.7	2,000	1,000	+2,000
Hendricks.....	46,000	40,896	+5,000	+11.5	3,000	1,000	+2,000
Johnson.....	47,000	43,704	+4,000	+8.2	4,000	1,000	+1,000
Morgan.....	37,000	33,875	+4,000	+10.5	3,000	1,000	+2,000
Shelby.....	35,000	34,093	+1,000	+2.9	3,000	1,000	(Z)
KANSAS CITY, MO.-KANS.....	1,143,000	1,092,545	+50,000	+4.6	88,000	34,000	-4,000
Clay, Mo.*.....	94,000	87,474	+7,000	+7.7	7,000	2,000	+2,000
Jackson, Mo.*.....	626,000	622,732	+4,000	+0.6	50,000	22,000	-24,000
Cass, Mo.....	36,000	29,702	+6,000	+19.6	2,000	1,000	+5,000
Platte, Mo.....	25,000	23,350	+2,000	+8.2	2,000	1,000	+1,000
Johnson, Kans.....	173,000	143,792	+30,000	+20.5	11,000	3,000	+21,000
Wyandotte, Kans.....	188,000	185,495	+2,000	+1.3	16,000	6,000	-8,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH, CALIF.....	6,559,000	6,038,771	+520,000	+8.6	449,000	180,000	+251,000
Los Angeles*.....	6,559,000	6,038,771	+520,000	+8.6	449,000	180,000	+251,000
LOUISVILLE, KY.-IND.....	760,000	725,139	+35,000	+4.8	58,000	23,000	-1,000
Jefferson, Ky*.....	642,000	610,947	+31,000	+5.0	50,000	20,000	+1,000
Clark, Ind.....	66,000	62,795	+3,000	+4.6	5,000	2,000	(Z)
Floyd, Ind.....	53,000	51,397	+1,000	+2.5	4,000	2,000	-1,000
MIAMI, FLA.....	1,049,000	935,047	+114,000	+12.2	63,000	29,000	+80,000
Dade*.....	1,049,000	935,047	+114,000	+12.2	63,000	29,000	+80,000
MILWAUKEE, WIS.....	1,254,000	1,232,731	+21,000	+1.7	99,000	37,000	-42,000
Milwaukee*.....	1,038,000	1,036,041	+2,000	+0.2	83,000	32,000	-48,000
Ozaukee.....	40,000	38,441	+1,000	+2.8	3,000	1,000	-1,000
Waukesha.....	176,000	158,249	+17,000	+11.0	13,000	4,000	+8,000

Z Less than 500.

Table 1.--ESTIMATES OF THE POPULATION OF 38 LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY CONSTITUENT COUNTIES, JULY 1, 1963, AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE, 1960 TO 1963--Con.

(Includes all standard metropolitan statistical areas with 1960 populations of 700,000 or more as defined in 1964 by the Bureau of the Budget. Asterisk (*) indicates central county)

Standard metropolitan statistical area and county	Population		Net change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		Components of change, April 1, 1960, to July 1, 1963		
	July 1, 1963	April 1, 1960 (census)	Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net migration
ROCHESTER, N.Y.....	774,000	732,588	+42,000	+5.7	54,000	25,000	+13,000
Monroe*	618,000	586,387	+31,000	+5.4	43,000	20,000	+8,000
Livingston.....	47,000	44,053	+3,000	+6.4	3,000	2,000	+1,000
Orleans.....	37,000	34,159	+3,000	+7.4	3,000	1,000	+1,000
Wayne.....	73,000	67,989	+5,000	+7.3	5,000	3,000	+2,000
ST. LOUIS, MO.-ILL.....	2,180,000	2,104,669	+76,000	+3.6	164,000	69,000	-19,000
St. Louis city, Mo.*.....	711,000	750,026	-39,000	-5.2	59,000	33,000	-64,000
Franklin, Mo.....	48,000	44,566	+3,000	+7.1	4,000	2,000	+1,000
Jefferson, Mo.....	77,000	66,377	+10,000	+15.3	6,000	2,000	+6,000
St. Charles, Mo.....	65,000	52,970	+12,000	+23.5	6,000	1,000	+8,000
St. Louis, Mo.....	781,000	703,532	+77,000	+11.0	53,000	17,000	+41,000
Madison, Ill.....	234,000	224,689	+10,000	+4.3	17,000	6,000	-1,000
St. Clair, Ill.....	264,000	262,509	+2,000	+0.7	21,000	8,000	-11,000
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.....	771,000	716,168	+55,000	+7.6	67,000	18,000	+6,000
Bexar*.....	741,000	687,151	+54,000	+7.8	64,000	17,000	+6,000
Guadalupe.....	30,000	29,017	+1,000	+3.2	2,000	1,000	(Z)
SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO, CALIF.....	936,000	809,782	+127,000	+15.6	66,000	24,000	+85,000
Riverside*.....	359,000	306,191	+52,000	+17.1	24,000	10,000	+38,000
San Bernardino*.....	578,000	503,591	+74,000	+14.7	41,000	14,000	+47,000
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.....	1,113,000	1,033,011	+80,000	+7.7	87,000	25,000	+18,000
San Diego*.....	1,113,000	1,033,011	+80,000	+7.7	87,000	25,000	+18,000
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND, CALIF.....	2,838,000	2,648,762	+189,000	+7.1	190,000	82,000	+81,000
Alameda*.....	984,000	908,209	+76,000	+8.4	68,000	28,000	+36,000
San Francisco*.....	741,000	740,316	-1,000	+0.1	47,000	32,000	-14,000
Contra Costa.....	455,000	409,030	+46,000	+11.3	30,000	9,000	+25,000
Marin.....	167,000	146,820	+20,000	+13.5	11,000	3,000	+12,000
San Mateo.....	490,000	444,387	+46,000	+10.3	33,000	10,000	+23,000
SEATTLE-EVERETT, WASH.....	1,169,000	1,107,213	+61,000	+5.5	83,000	34,000	+12,000
King*.....	976,000	935,014	+41,000	+4.4	69,000	29,000	+1,000
Snohomish*.....	192,000	172,199	+20,000	+11.6	14,000	5,000	+12,000
TAMPA-ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.....	844,000	772,453	+72,000	+9.3	49,000	33,000	+56,000
Hillsborough*.....	431,000	397,788	+33,000	+8.3	30,000	13,000	+16,000
Pinellas*.....	414,000	374,665	+39,000	+10.5	19,000	20,000	+40,000
WASHINGTON, D.C.-MD.-VA.....	2,250,000	1,989,377	+260,000	+13.1	174,000	53,000	+139,000
District of Columbia*.....	798,000	763,956	+34,000	+4.5	65,000	29,000	-2,000
Montgomery, Md.....	392,000	340,928	+52,000	+15.1	26,000	7,000	+32,000
Prince Georges, Md.....	443,000	357,395	+85,000	+23.9	36,000	7,000	+56,000
Alexandria city, Va.....	100,000	91,023	+9,000	+9.5	9,000	2,000	+2,000
Arlington, Va.....	180,000	163,401	+17,000	+10.4	14,000	4,000	+7,000
Fairfax, Va. ²	336,000	1272,674	+63,000	+23.3	23,000	4,000	+45,000

Z Less than 500.

¹ Adjusted to exclude 12,520 erroneously reported in Fairfax County.² Includes Falls Church and Fairfax independent cities.

Table 2.--AVERAGE ANNUAL RATE OF POPULATION INCREASE FOR CENTRAL AND OUTLYING COUNTIES OF 38 LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960 TO 1963 AND 1950 TO 1960

(Figures are expressed as percentages and are based on the formula for continuous compounding, $P_t = P_0 e^{rt}$. Minus sign (-) denotes decrease)

Area	Average annual rate of increase		Area	Average annual rate of increase	
	1960 to 1963	1950 to 1960		1960 to 1963	1950 to 1960
ANAHEIM-SANTA ANA-GARDEN GROVE, CALIF...	9.5	11.8	MILWAUKEE, WIS.....	0.5	2.3
Central county.....	9.5	11.8	Central county.....	0.1	1.7
			Outlying counties.....	2.8	5.9
ATLANTA, GA.....	3.1	3.4	MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINN.....	1.5	2.5
Central counties.....	2.6	2.9	Central counties.....	0.6	2.0
Outlying counties.....	4.9	5.6	Outlying counties.....	6.1	6.0
BALTIMORE, MD.....	1.5	2.1	NEW ORLEANS, LA.....	2.1	2.4
Central county.....	(Z)	-0.1	Central county.....	0.6	1.0
Outlying counties.....	3.1	5.5	Outlying counties.....	5.2	6.8
BOSTON, MASS. ¹	0.6	0.8	NEW YORK, N.Y.....	1.7	1.1
Central county.....	-1.0	-1.2	Central counties.....	1.2	-0.1
Outlying counties.....	1.2	1.6	Outlying counties.....	2.9	5.6
BUFFALO, N.Y.....	(Z)	1.8	NEWARK, N.J.....	1.7	1.4
Central county.....	0.1	1.7	Central county.....	1.4	0.2
Outlying county.....	-0.8	2.4	Outlying counties.....	2.0	3.1
CHICAGO, ILL.....	1.3	1.8	PATERSON-CLIFTON-PASSAIC, N.J.....	1.5	3.0
Central county.....	0.9	1.3	Central county.....	1.4	1.9
Outlying counties.....	2.9	4.9	Outlying county.....	1.6	3.7
CINCINNATI, OHIO-KY.-IND.....	0.6	2.1	PHILADELPHIA, PA.-N.J.....	1.5	1.7
Central county.....	0.4	1.8	Central county.....	0.7	-0.3
Outlying counties.....	1.1	3.0	Outlying counties.....	2.1	3.8
CLEVELAND, OHIO.....	0.7	2.2	PITTSBURGH, PA.....	-0.6	0.8
Central county.....	0.5	1.7	Central county.....	-0.8	0.7
Outlying counties.....	2.5	6.0	Outlying counties.....	-0.4	1.1
COLUMBUS, OHIO.....	1.6	2.9	PORTLAND, OREG.-WASH.....	1.4	1.5
Central county.....	1.7	3.1	Central county.....	0.1	1.0
Outlying counties.....	0.5	1.9	Outlying counties.....	3.6	2.5
DALLAS, TEXAS.....	3.4	3.8	PROVIDENCE-PAWTUCKET-WARWICK, R.I. ¹	0.9	0.5
Central county.....	3.5	4.4	Central counties.....	0.8	0.4
Outlying counties.....	2.8	0.3	Outlying county.....	3.6	2.4
DAYTON, OHIO.....	0.6	2.9	ROCHESTER, N.Y.....	1.7	1.7
Central county.....	0.4	2.8	Central county.....	1.6	1.8
Outlying counties.....	1.1	3.1	Outlying counties.....	2.1	1.4
DENVER, COLO.....	3.8	4.2	ST. LOUIS, MO.-ILL.....	1.1	1.8
Central county.....	0.3	1.7	Central county.....	-1.6	-1.3
Outlying counties.....	7.3	8.0	Outlying counties.....	2.5	4.1
DETROIT, MICH.....	1.0	2.2	SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.....	2.3	3.1
Central county.....	0.3	0.9	Central county.....	2.3	3.2
Outlying counties.....	2.7	6.3	Outlying county.....	1.0	1.3
HOUSTON, TEXAS.....	3.5	4.3	SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO, CALIF.....	4.5	5.8
Central county.....	3.5	4.3	Central counties.....	4.5	5.8
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.....	1.5	2.7	SAN DIEGO, CALIF.....	2.3	6.2
Central county.....	1.2	2.3	Central county.....	2.3	6.2
Outlying counties.....	2.7	3.7	SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND, CALIF.....	2.1	2.2
KANSAS CITY, MO.-KANS.....	1.4	2.5	Central counties.....	1.4	0.8
Central counties.....	0.5	1.9	Outlying counties.....	3.3	4.8
Outlying counties.....	3.0	3.8	SEATTLE-EVERETT, WASH.....	1.7	2.7
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH, CALIF.....	2.5	3.7	Central counties.....	1.7	2.7
Central county.....	2.5	3.7	TAMPA-ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.....	2.7	6.4
LOUISVILLE, KY.-IND.....	1.4	2.3	Central counties.....	2.7	6.4
Central county.....	1.5	2.3	WASHINGTON, D.C.-MD.-VA.....	3.8	3.1
Outlying counties.....	1.1	2.1	Central county.....	1.4	-0.5
MIAMI, FLA.....	3.5	6.4	Outlying counties.....	5.2	6.2
Central county.....	3.5	6.4			

Z Less than 0.05 percent.

¹ Metropolitan State economic area.

Table 3.--POPULATION OF 38 LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, BY RANK: 1963 AND 1960

(Includes all standard metropolitan statistical areas with 1960 populations of 700,000 or more as defined in 1964 by the Bureau of the Budget)

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Population		Rank	
	July 1, 1963	April 1, 1960 (census)	1963	1960
New York, N.Y.....	11,291,000	10,694,633	1	1
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.....	6,559,000	6,038,771	2	3
Chicago, Ill.....	6,480,000	6,220,913	3	2
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.....	4,554,000	4,342,897	4	4
Detroit, Mich.....	3,889,000	3,762,360	5	5
Boston, Mass. ¹	3,174,000	3,109,158	6	6
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.....	2,838,000	2,648,762	7	7
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	2,356,000	2,405,435	8	8
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.....	2,250,000	1,989,377	9	10
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.....	2,180,000	2,104,669	10	9
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1,956,000	1,909,483	11	11
Baltimore, Md.....	1,811,000	1,727,023	12	12
Newark, N.J.....	1,784,000	1,689,420	13	13
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.....	1,556,000	1,482,030	14	14
Houston, Texas.....	1,394,000	1,243,158	15	17
Buffalo, N.Y.....	1,306,000	1,306,957	16	15
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.....	1,295,000	1,268,479	17	16
Milwaukee, Wis.....	1,254,000	1,232,731	18	18
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.....	1,247,000	1,186,873	19	19
Dallas, Texas.....	1,211,000	1,083,601	20	22
Seattle-Everett, Wash.....	1,169,000	1,107,213	21	20
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.....	1,143,000	1,092,545	22	21
Atlanta, Ga.....	1,125,000	1,017,188	23	24
San Diego, Calif.....	1,113,000	1,033,011	24	
Denver, Colo.....	1,051,000	929,383	25	
Miami, Fla.....	1,049,000	935,047	26	25
New Orleans, La.....	971,000	907,123	27	28
Indianapolis, Ind.....	964,000	916,932	28	27
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, Calif.....	957,000	703,925	29	38
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.....	936,000	809,782	30	30
Portland, Oreg.-Wash.....	860,000	821,897	31	29
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.....	844,000	772,453	32	31
Columbus, Ohio.....	795,000	754,924	33	32
Rochester, N.Y.....	774,000	732,588	34	33
San Antonio, Texas.....	771,000	716,168	35	37
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.....	760,000	725,139	36	35
Providence-Pawtucket-Warwick, R.I. ¹	741,000	718,543	37	36
Dayton, Ohio.....	741,000	727,121	38	34

¹ Metropolitan State economic area.