Fact Sheet

Characteristics of Major Metropolitan Destinations of Immigrants

JAMES LEE

In recent years, a small group of major metropolitan areas has received most of the nation's new immigrants. While cities such as New York and Los Angeles remain popular destinations for immigrants, some of the greatest increases in the immigrant population now occur in cities located in the South and West. This Office of Immigration Statistics *Fact Sheet* provides information on leading metropolitan destinations of immigrants ranked by immigrant population growth rates and selected economic and social indicators.

DATA

Immigration is measured by the number of persons obtaining legal permanent resident (LPR) status. The 25 leading metropolitan areas in total LPR flow for 2001–2006 were selected. The immigrant population growth rate is defined as the percentage change in LPR flow during the 2001–2006 period compared to the previous six-year period (1995–2000). LPR data were obtained from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).[1]

The economic and social indicators include the percentage of the total population that is foreign-born, median household income, percentage of the population ages 25 and over with a college degree, index crime rate (for seven serious offenses per 100,000 population), and percentage of adults in "good or better health."[2] Data on the foreign-born, income, and education in 2006 were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2006 American Community Survey (ACS). Crime data came from *Crime in the United States, 2006* of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Estimates of health status in 2006 were generated from data from the Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

FINDINGS

Tables 1 and 2 list the 25 leading metropolitan destinations for LPRs during the 2001-2006 period and report

[1] For LPR data, a year refers to the fiscal year (October 1 to September 30).

[2] Refers to the percentage of adults ages 18 and over who rated their health status as "good," "very good," or "excellent" (on a five-category scale) on a question about their health. Calculations exclude some outlying suburban counties because of missing data.

Table 1.

Leading Metropolitan Destinations of Legal Permanent Residents (LPRs): 2001–2006

(Ranked by percentage change in LPR flow from 1995–2000 to 2001–2006)

Metropolitan area[2]	Percent change in LPR flow[1]		Total LPR flow 2001–2006	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Average[3]	77	X	200,814	X
Phoenix, AZ	177	1	80,764	17
Atlanta, GA	126	2	115,789	12
Tampa, FL	123	3	59,970	20
Las Vegas, NV	98	4	52,915	23
Riverside, CA	96	5	114,430	13
Boston, MA	94	6	163,412	9
Orlando, FL	94	7	58,206	21
Minneapolis, MN	88	8	73,636	18
Houston, TX	86	9	194,134	7
Portland, OR	79	10	56,906	22
Denver, CO	78	11	51,875	24
Sacramento, CA	78	12	71,661	19
Dallas, TX	69	13	164,521	8
San Jose, CA	67	14	148,951	10
Seattle, WA	65	15	107,332	15
Los Angeles, CA	65	16	757,571	2
Baltimore, MD	62	17	43,151	25
San Diego, CA	61	18	128,967	11
Philadelphia, PA	58	19	114,142	14
Washington, DC	56	20	261,407	5
Miami, FL	47	21	469,267	3
Detroit, MI	47	22	92,270	16
Chicago, IL	44	23	297,931	4
San Francisco, CA	38	24	243,574	6
New York, NY	25	25	1,097,565	1

X Not applicable.

[1] Percent change in the LPR flow from the 1995–2000 period to 2001–2006 period.

[2] Metropolitan areas defined based on the U.S. Census Bureau's Core-Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs). Only the first city of the CBSA is shown. Complete CBSA names as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are (in the order listed): Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ; Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA; Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL; Las Vegas-Paradise, NV; Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA; Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH; Orlando-Kissimmee, FL; Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI; Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX; Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA; Denver-Aurora, CO; Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville, CA; Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX; San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA; Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA; Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA; Baltimore-Towson, MD; San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA; Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD; Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV; Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL; Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI; Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI; San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA; New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA.

[3] Average of all 25 metropolitan areas.

Note: All years for LPR data refer to fiscal years (October 1 to September 30). Caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions about the metropolitan areas based on rankings.

Source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

selected economic and social indicators for each area. To stream-line the discussion, all comparisons highlighted below are made between the five metropolitan areas with the highest and lowest LPR growth rates. It should be noted that many of the differences between metropolitan areas reflect local and regional variation in demographics, economic conditions, and historic migration patterns, among other factors.

Highlights

- The largest percentage increases in the LPR flow occurred in Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ, Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA, Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL, Las Vegas-Paradise, NV, and Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA.

- The smallest percentage increases in LPR flow are found in New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA, San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA, Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI, Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI, and Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL.

- Metropolitan areas with the highest LPR growth generally did not have the highest household median income or proportion of population with a college degree.

- Metropolitan areas with the lowest LPR growth were also those with higher median income and a larger percentage of the population with a college degree.

- On average, crime rates were higher in metropolitan areas experiencing higher versus lower LPR growth.

- A higher proportion of residents in low-growth metropolitan areas reported being in good or better health compared to residents of high-growth areas.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Visit the Office of Immigration Statistics web page at http://www.dhs.gov/immigrationstatistics.

Table 2.

Economic and Social Indicators in the Leading Metropolitan Destinations of Legal Permanent Residents (LPRs): 2006

(Ranked by percentage change in LPR flow from 1995–2000 to 2001–2006)

Metropolitan area[3]	Percent foreign-born		Median household income (in 2006 dollars)		Percent ages 25+ with college degree		Index crime rate[1]		Percent adults in good or better health[2]		Total population (in millions)	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Average[4]	19	X	57,492	X	32	X	4,291	X	85	X	4.9	X
Phoenix, AZ	17	14	51,862	21	27	20	5,388	2	83	19	4.0	13
Atlanta, GA	13	18	55,552	13	33	11	NA	NA	89	2	5.1	9
Tampa, FL	12	20	43,742	25	25	23	4,934	7	81	23	2.7	18
Las Vegas, NV	22	8	53,536	16	20	24	5,362	3	82	21	1.8	25
Riverside, CA	22	7	53,243	17	18	25	3,921	15	80	24	4.0	14
Boston, MA	16	16	64,144	4	41	4	NA	NA	88	7	4.5	11
Orlando, FL	16	15	48,934	23	28	19	5,200	4	84	17	2.0	23
Minneapolis, MN	9	22	62,223	5	36	5	NA	NA	91	1	3.2	16
Houston, TX	22	9	50,250	22	27	21	4,830	8	87	9	5.5	6
Portland, OR	12	21	52,480	18	32	12	3,968	14	87	11	2.1	21
Denver, CO	13	19	54,994	15	36	7	4,111	13	89	3	2.4	20
Sacramento, CA	17	13	56,953	11	30	15	4,566	9	87	10	2.1	22
Dallas, TX	18	11	52,001	20	29	16	4,953	6	86	14	6.0	4
San Jose, CA	36	2	80,638	1	43	2	3,034	20	88	8	1.8	24
Seattle, WA	16	17	60,663	7	36	6	5,425	1	88	5	3.3	15
Los Angeles, CA	34	3	55,516	14	29	17	3,147	19	79	25	13.0	2
Baltimore, MD	8	25	61,010	6	34	9	4,307	12	87	12	2.7	19
San Diego, CA	23	6	59,591	8	33	10	3,613	16	81	22	2.9	17
Philadelphia, PA	9	23	55,593	12	31	14	3,563	17	86	13	5.8	5
Washington, DC	20	10	78,978	2	46	1	3,367	18	89	4	5.3	8
Miami, FL	37	1	46,637	24	28	18	5,158	5	84	18	5.5	7
Detroit, MI	8	24	52,004	19	26	22	4,351	11	85	15	4.5	10
Chicago, IL	18	12	57,008	10	32	13	NA	NA	84	16	9.5	3
San Francisco, CA	30	4	70,463	3	42	3	4,566	10	88	6	4.2	12
New York, NY	28	5	59,281	9	34	8	2,343	21	83	20	18.8	1

NA Not available.

X Not applicable.

[1] Rate per 100,000 population. Index crimes include four violent crimes (murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and three property crimes (burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft).

[2] Adults include the population from ages 18 and up. "Good or better health" is a combination of three categories ("good," "very good," and "excellent") out of a total of five which Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) interviewees were given to describe their own health. Percentages shown here may differ slightly from the CDC's estimates.

[3] Metropolitan areas defined based on the U.S. Census Bureau's Core-Based Statistical Areas (CBSAs). Only the first city of the CBSA is shown. Complete CBSA names as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are (in the order listed): Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ; Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA; Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL; Las Vegas-Paradise, NV; Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA; Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH; Orlando-Kissimmee, FL; Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI; Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX; Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA; Denver-Aurora, CO; Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville, CA; Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX; San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA; Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA; Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA; Baltimore-Towson, MD; San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA; Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD; Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV; Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL; Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI; Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI; San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA; New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA.

[4] Average of all 25 metropolitan areas.

Note: All years for LPR data refer to fiscal years (October 1 to September 30). Caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions about the metropolitan areas based on rankings.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Center for Disease Control and Prevention.