

# State-to-State Migration Flows: 1995 to 2000

Issued August 2003

## Census 2000 Special Reports

CENSR-8

By  
Marc J. Perry

Although every state gained population during the 1990s, the magnitude of domestic migration for the 50 states and the District of Columbia varied widely, according to Census 2000 data. This report highlights some of the most dramatic patterns of state-to-state migration between 1995 and 2000 for the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It identifies the largest interstate migration flows, examines origins and destinations of flows for the states with the highest and lowest rates of net domestic migration, and notes the pairs of migration flows that are the most imbalanced.

### **PATTERNS OF MIGRATION FLOWS**

#### **The largest interstate migration flows were from New York and California.**

Between 1995 and 2000, 308,000 people moved from New York to Florida, creating the largest state-to-state flow in the United States (see Table 1).<sup>1</sup> This flow has been sizable for a number of decades and reflects in part substantial retiree migration. Other large flows were from New York to New Jersey—as people moved to the suburbs—and from California to Nevada,

<sup>1</sup> The estimates in this report are based on a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All comparisons made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

perhaps due to both economic factors and retiree migration. Many of the largest interstate flows originated in either New York or California, in part because of their large populations.

#### **Most large state-to-state flows were to adjacent or nearby states.**

For most states, the largest migration inflows and outflows between 1995 and 2000 were with the same state, often an

#### **Common Migration Terms**

*Migration:* For this report, moves that crossed state boundaries within the United States.

*Domestic Migration:* Moves occurring within the United States (the 50 states and District of Columbia). Also known as internal migration.

*Inmigration:* Migration into an area during a given period. A migration inflow is immigration to a particular area.

*Outmigration:* Migration out of an area during a given period. A migration outflow is outmigration from a particular area.

*Gross Migration:* The sum of immigration and outmigration, or inflow and outflow, for an area for a given period. This measure shows, in other words, the total amount of movement in and out of an area.

*Net Migration or Net Flow:* The difference between immigration and outmigration, or inflow and outflow, during a given time. A positive net, or net immigration, indicates that more migrants entered the area than left the area during that time. A negative net, or net outmigration, means that more migrants left the area than entered it.

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

U.S. Department of Commerce  
Economics and Statistics Administration  
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

United States  
**Census  
2000**

Table 1.  
**The 20 Largest State-to-State Migration Flows: 1995 to 2000**

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

State of origin	State of destination	Migration flow	Reverse flow	Gross migration <sup>1</sup>	Net migration <sup>2</sup>
New York	Florida	308,230	70,218	378,448	238,012
New York	New Jersey	206,979	97,584	304,563	109,395
California	Nevada	199,125	60,488	259,613	138,637
California	Arizona	186,151	92,452	278,603	93,699
California	Texas	182,789	115,929	298,718	66,860
Florida	Georgia	157,423	99,225	256,648	58,198
California	Washington	155,577	95,469	251,046	60,108
California	Oregon	131,836	67,642	199,478	64,194
New Jersey	Florida	118,905	34,896	153,801	84,009
Texas	California	115,929	182,789	298,718	-66,860
New York	Pennsylvania	112,214	67,213	179,427	45,001
California	Colorado	111,322	56,050	167,372	55,272
New Jersey	Pennsylvania	110,436	88,202	198,638	22,234
New York	North Carolina	100,727	20,262	120,989	80,465
Georgia	Florida	99,225	157,423	256,648	-58,198
New Jersey	New York	97,584	206,979	304,563	-109,395
Florida	North Carolina	96,255	57,564	153,819	38,691
New York	California	95,952	65,160	161,112	30,792
Washington	California	95,469	155,577	251,046	-60,108
California	Florida	94,265	65,211	159,476	29,054

<sup>1</sup>Sum of migration flow and reverse flow.

<sup>2</sup>Migration flow minus reverse flow.

Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from rates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

adjacent or nearby neighbor (Table 2). For instance, Arizona's largest migration inflow was from California, and its largest outflow was to California. In addition, many outflows from cold, wealthy, northern states (e.g., Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania) ended in Florida. These examples probably illustrate the combined influence of retirement and labor-force migration.

Some pairs of states, such as Minnesota and Wisconsin, had flows to each other that were balanced, resulting in very little net migration. In other cases, such as Nevada's migration to and from California, the flow sizes were very unequal, resulting in sizable net migration.

Table 2 illustrates the great degree of interconnection and complexity in state-to-state migration flows.

Most states gained migrants from and lost migrants to a number of different states, and most net flows were not large. No two states' migration patterns were so intertwined that both their largest inflow and their largest outflow were with each other. For instance, Minnesota's largest inflow and outflow were with Wisconsin, while Wisconsin's largest outflow was to Minnesota, but its largest inflow was from Illinois. Similarly, South Carolina's largest inflow and outflow were with North Carolina, and North Carolina's largest outflow was to South Carolina, but its largest inflow was from New York.

### ORIGINS OF MIGRANTS TO HIGH NET DOMESTIC IMMIGRATION STATES

From 1995 to 2000, the states with the highest rates of net domestic immigration (expressed as net

migration per 1,000 population in 1995) were Nevada (151.5), Arizona (74.3), Georgia (48.6), North Carolina (48.4), Florida (44.0), and Colorado (43.8).<sup>2</sup> This section will address two related questions. First, which states had the largest outflows to each of these high net domestic immigration states? Second, after accounting for migration flows in both directions, which states were the source of the most net migration to these states with high immigration?

<sup>2</sup> The net migration rate in this report is based on an approximated 1995 population, which is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net migration rate is the 1995-to-2000 net migration divided by the approximated 1995 population and multiplied by 1,000. The differences in net migration rates between Georgia and North Carolina and between Florida and Colorado were not statistically significant. For 1995-to-2000 net domestic migration numbers and rates for all states, see Table A-1 in the Appendix.

**Table 2.**  
**Largest Migration Inflow and Outflow by State: 1995 to 2000**

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

State	Largest inflow was from:	Size of inflow	Largest outflow was to:	Size of outflow
Alabama	Georgia	48,597	Georgia	54,238
Alaska	California	12,518	Washington	16,635
Arizona	California	186,151	California	92,452
Arkansas	Texas	41,132	Texas	37,988
California	Texas	115,929	Nevada	199,125
Colorado	California	111,322	California	56,050
Connecticut	New York	75,945	Florida	47,224
Delaware	Pennsylvania	28,317	Pennsylvania	16,659
District of Columbia	Maryland	27,404	Maryland	64,393
Florida	New York	308,230	Georgia	157,423
Georgia	Florida	157,423	Florida	99,225
Hawaii	California	32,321	California	44,192
Idaho	California	35,529	Washington	26,214
Illinois	California	67,970	1	1
Indiana	Illinois	84,760	1	1
Iowa	Illinois	32,317	Illinois	28,695
Kansas	Missouri	53,622	Missouri	58,785
Kentucky	Ohio	49,328	1	1
Louisiana	Texas	57,289	Texas	86,283
Maine	Massachusetts	19,436	1	1
Maryland	1	1	Virginia	79,242
Massachusetts	New York	72,805	Florida	68,058
Michigan	Ohio	47,634	Florida	74,949
Minnesota	Wisconsin	51,512	Wisconsin	51,692
Mississippi	Louisiana	33,011	Tennessee	26,397
Missouri	1	1	Kansas	53,622
Montana	1	1	Washington	14,909
Nebraska	Iowa	20,503	Iowa	20,130
Nevada	California	199,125	California	60,488
New Hampshire	Massachusetts	60,731	Massachusetts	33,572
New Jersey	New York	206,979	Florida	118,905
New Mexico	Texas	41,760	Texas	49,566
New York	New Jersey	97,584	Florida	308,230
North Carolina	New York	100,727	South Carolina	65,189
North Dakota	Minnesota	19,177	Minnesota	26,450
Ohio	Florida	47,389	Florida	90,833
Oklahoma	Texas	73,359	Texas	83,477
Oregon	California	131,836	Washington	82,641
Pennsylvania	1	1	Florida	92,385
Rhode Island	Massachusetts	27,015	Massachusetts	24,190
South Carolina	North Carolina	65,189	North Carolina	61,237
South Dakota	Minnesota	11,532	Minnesota	14,087
Tennessee	Florida	52,918	Georgia	45,483
Texas	California	182,789	California	115,929
Utah	California	60,389	California	31,843
Vermont	New York	11,026	New York	9,052
Virginia	Maryland	79,242	North Carolina	89,149
Washington	California	155,577	California	95,469
West Virginia	Ohio	21,431	Ohio	25,801
Wisconsin	Illinois	80,569	Minnesota	51,512
Wyoming	Colorado	10,444	Colorado	14,039

<sup>1</sup>No flow was statistically the largest.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

---

### **New migrants to Nevada and Arizona were often from California.**

Domestic migration to Nevada between 1995 and 2000 was dominated by migration from neighboring California: 199,000 of the 466,000 people who moved to Nevada during this time came from California. Other states with outflows of more than 10,000 migrants to Nevada were Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, New York, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

While many of the new migrants to Nevada were from western states, these were not necessarily the states that accounted for the highest net migration to Nevada, because much of the outmigration from Nevada was back to these same nearby states.<sup>3</sup> California's net migration to Nevada was a sizable 139,000 (199,000 migrants from California minus 60,000 migrants to California), the second highest of any net state-to-state flow of migrants. (The highest was the net migration of 238,000 people from New York to Florida: 308,000 migrants from New York minus 70,000 migrants to New York.) Other states contributing net migration gains of more than 10,000 to Nevada included Illinois and New York.

Arizona's domestic migration was similarly affected by California,

which sent 186,000 people, nearly one quarter of the 796,000 people who moved to Arizona from other states. Other states with outflows of at least 30,000 migrants to Arizona included Colorado, Illinois, Texas, and Washington.

Arizona's net migration gains came from almost every state; only Nevada and Arkansas received more migrants from Arizona than they sent. Arizona's net migration from California of 94,000 was the most from any state and represented nearly one third of Arizona's total net domestic migration of 316,000. Other states that contributed more than 10,000 in net migration to Arizona included Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Washington.

### **Many migrants to Georgia were from Florida.**

Nearly 1 million people moved to Georgia from elsewhere in the United States between 1995 and 2000, and many came from other southern states. Florida contributed the most migrants to Georgia: 157,000. Other states with outflows of more than 40,000 migrants to Georgia were Alabama, California, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

However, while many of the new migrants to Georgia were from neighboring states, these same states also received many migrants from Georgia, thereby diminishing their net migration to Georgia. For instance, North Carolina's outflow of 51,000 migrants to Georgia was nearly counterbalanced by the inflow of 48,000 migrants from Georgia to North Carolina. The states with net migration to Georgia of 10,000 or more included California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia.

### **Migration to North Carolina came from both the Northeast and the South.**

States in the Northeast and South contributed most of the 919,000 immigrants to North Carolina, with nearly equal numbers from New York (101,000) and Florida (96,000), and smaller numbers from California, South Carolina, and Virginia.

North Carolina had a net immigration of 80,000 people from New York, and more than 10,000 from California, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

### **Migration to Florida was often from the Northeast and Midwest.**

Florida's net domestic migration of 607,000, the largest of any state, came primarily from states in the Northeast, particularly New York, which had a net contribution of 238,000 to Florida. Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania also had substantial net outmigration to Florida.

Neighboring states in the South received more people from Florida than they sent. In fact, there was net outmigration from Florida to Georgia (58,000), North Carolina (39,000), Tennessee (16,000), and South Carolina (7,000). Other southern states with net migration gains from Florida of more than 1,000 included Alabama (4,000), Texas (3,000), and Mississippi (2,000).<sup>4</sup> Thus, while Florida experienced sizable net immigration at the national level (607,000), within the South it sent far more migrants to neighboring states than it received from them. The substantial net outmigration from Florida to both Georgia and North Carolina

---

<sup>3</sup> The Northeast Region includes the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The Midwest Region includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The South Region includes the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a state equivalent. The West Region includes the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

---

<sup>4</sup> The difference between the net migration with Alabama and Texas was not statistically significant.

---

illustrates Florida's role as both origin and destination.

**California contributed greatly to Colorado's net migration.**

Between 1995 and 2000, 644,000 people moved to Colorado from other states, led by 111,000 migrants from California. Other states with outflows of at least 20,000 people to Colorado included Arizona, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, New York, and Texas.

Approximately one-third of Colorado's net domestic gain of 163,000 was attributable to California, which sent twice as many migrants (111,000) to Colorado as it received (56,000). Other states that had net outmigration to Colorado of more than 10,000 included Illinois, New York, and Texas.

**Nearby and populous states were major contributors to the high net domestic immigration states.**

In summary, migrants to each of the highest net domestic immigration states came from several different sources. The first source was, not surprisingly, adjacent or nearby states. Migration most frequently occurs over short distances, and most migrants to the six highest states came from nearby states. The second major source of new migrants was a group of five states that are both populous and major entry points for migrants from abroad: California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois. Each of these states had outmigration of more than 1 million people between 1995 and 2000, led by California (2.2 million). It should be noted that Texas and Florida continued to have overall positive net domestic migration, since their large domestic outflows were matched by even larger domestic inflows.

As the state with both the largest population and the second largest net domestic outmigration, California had a major impact on state-to-state migration flows nationwide. By itself, California had an outflow of more than a half-million people (and net outmigration of 380,000) to the fast-growing states of Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, North Carolina, and Colorado. The most obvious example was Nevada, where migration gains were the result of a large outflow from California. Moreover, 13 other states each had an inflow of more than 50,000 people from California and 27 states had inflows of between 10,000 and 50,000 people. Only the District of Columbia and nine states had inflows from California of fewer than 10,000 people.

**DESTINATIONS OF MIGRANTS FROM HIGH NET DOMESTIC OUTMIGRATION STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA<sup>5</sup>**

From 1995 to 2000, the highest rates of net domestic outmigration were in the District of Columbia (which lost 81.7 migrants per 1,000 residents), Hawaii (65.4), Alaska (51.0), New York (48.8), and North Dakota (40.6).<sup>6</sup> Not surprisingly, the District of Columbia's largest outflows were primarily to the neighboring states of Maryland (64,000) and Virginia (24,000). New York and California each had an inflow of more than 8,000 from the District of Columbia. Net migration from the District of Columbia was also highest to Maryland (37,000) and Virginia (9,000).

---

<sup>5</sup> The District of Columbia, treated in this report as a state equivalent, had a population loss from 1990 to 2000.

<sup>6</sup> The net migration rates between Alaska and New York and between Alaska and North Dakota were not statistically significantly different.

**Outmigration from Hawaii and Alaska was to states in the West.**

The chief destinations for the outmigration from Hawaii of 201,000 migrants were California, Florida, Nevada, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. The largest net outmigration from Hawaii was to California, Nevada, and Washington.

Alaska's outmigration of 126,000 was mainly to other states in the West, with Arizona, California, Oregon, Texas, and Washington all receiving inflows of more than 5,000 people. Alaska's net outmigration of 30,000 extended to many states but was concentrated in the western states of Arizona, Oregon, and Washington.

**New York had net outmigration to nearly every other state.**

The most common destinations for the 1.6 million people who left New York from 1995 to 2000 were Florida (308,000), New Jersey (207,000), and Pennsylvania (112,000). Other states with large inflows from New York included North Carolina (101,000), California (96,000), Connecticut (76,000), Virginia (75,000), Massachusetts (73,000), and Georgia (67,000).<sup>7</sup>

New York's net domestic outmigration of 874,000 was the largest of any state, and it extended to every state except Nebraska and the District of Columbia. Three states—Florida, New Jersey, and North Carolina—received about half of the net outmigration. The

---

<sup>7</sup> The differences between the New York outflows to North Carolina and California were not statistically significant. Likewise, the outflows from New York to Connecticut, Virginia, and Massachusetts were not statistically significant.

Table 3.  
**The 15 Most Efficient Migration Exchanges: 1995 to 2000**

(Restricted to all state pairs where both flows are at least 1,000. Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

State of origin	State of destination	Migration flow	Reverse flow	Gross migration	Net migration	Efficiency rate <sup>1</sup>	
						Value	90-percent confidence interval <sup>2</sup>
Hawaii .....	Nevada	12,079	1,853	13,932	10,226	73.4	65.8 - 81.0
New York .....	North Carolina	100,727	20,262	120,989	80,465	66.5	64.4 - 68.6
New York .....	Nevada	17,153	3,558	20,711	13,595	65.6	59.5 - 71.7
New York .....	Florida	308,230	70,218	378,448	238,012	62.9	61.4 - 64.4
New York .....	South Carolina	40,398	9,255	49,653	31,143	62.7	58.9 - 66.5
New Jersey .....	Nevada	6,531	1,699	8,230	4,832	58.7	49.3 - 68.1
New Jersey .....	South Carolina	16,740	4,477	21,217	12,263	57.8	52.2 - 63.4
New York .....	Georgia	67,499	18,358	85,857	49,141	57.2	54.2 - 60.2
New Jersey .....	North Carolina	37,299	10,339	47,638	26,960	56.6	53.3 - 60.0
New Jersey .....	Georgia	27,139	7,842	34,981	19,297	55.2	50.8 - 59.6
New Jersey .....	Florida	118,905	34,896	153,801	84,009	54.6	52.5 - 56.7
Illinois .....	Nevada	17,570	5,184	22,754	12,386	54.4	49.1 - 59.7
California .....	Nevada	199,125	60,488	259,613	138,637	53.4	51.8 - 55.1
New York .....	Arizona	31,258	9,501	40,759	21,757	53.4	49.3 - 57.5
New York .....	Delaware	9,254	2,872	12,126	6,382	52.6	45.4 - 59.8

<sup>1</sup>Net migration per 100 gross migration.

<sup>2</sup>When the margin of error is added to and subtracted from the point estimate, it produces a 90-percent confidence interval.

Note: Because of sampling error, the estimates in this table may not be significantly different from one another or from rates for other geographic areas not listed in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

net outmigration of 238,000 from New York to Florida was the largest for any pair of states. New Jersey had a net gain of 109,000 migrants from New York, while North Carolina's was 80,000 migrants.

Florida and New Jersey have long been migration destinations for New Yorkers, due to retiree migration, suburbanization, and other causes. North Carolina, however, is a more recent major destination for New Yorkers. The imbalanced nature of the flows with North Carolina is also noteworthy: five times as many people moved from New York to North Carolina as moved in the opposite direction.

Other states with sizable net migration gains from New York included California, Connecticut, Georgia, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia.

### Outflows from North Dakota were to Minnesota and other states.

The main destination for North Dakota's outmigration of 85,000 was neighboring Minnesota (26,000). Colorado, Montana, South Dakota, and Texas all received more than 3,000 migrants from North Dakota. Many states, however, received fewer than 1,000 migrants from North Dakota.

North Dakota's net outmigration of 25,000 was spread across a large number of states, led by Minnesota (7,000), Arizona (2,000), and Colorado (2,000).<sup>8</sup>

### MIGRATION EFFICIENCY

The previous section noted many cases in which the migration flows between two states were highly

<sup>8</sup> The difference between the net migration from North Dakota to Arizona and Colorado was not statistically significant.

imbalanced. One measure of the relationship between a migration flow and its reverse flow is the migration efficiency rate, which is defined as net migration per 100 gross migration. Values of the rate thus vary from zero (completely inefficient—i.e., equal flows in both directions) to 100 (completely efficient—i.e., a flow in only one direction). For example, a migration efficiency rate of 30 indicates that one flow is just under twice as large as the reverse flow, and a rate of 50 indicates that one flow is three times the size of the reverse flow.<sup>9</sup>

Migration efficiency is useful when examining how various states

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that the migration efficiency rate is purely a statistical measure and a low value does not mean that the component migration flows were similar in characteristics. For example, a state could have equal numbers of immigrants who were primarily young adults and outmigrants who were primarily retirees.

---

contributed to a particular state's net migration, because small but efficient flows can result in higher net migration than flows that are much larger but inefficient. For instance, from 1995 to 2000, there was gross migration of about 50,000 people between New York and South Carolina, while over 160,000 moved between New York and California. In both cases the result was net migration of just over 30,000 people from New York, but since the migration between New York and South Carolina involved fewer total moves to achieve the same net migration result, it was more efficient.

Between 1995 and 2000, most state-to-state flows could be characterized as fairly balanced. Highly imbalanced flows—those with efficiency rates greater than 50—were quite uncommon. Only 11 flows, which represent less than 1 percent of all state-to-state flows, had a migration efficiency rate greater than 50 (Table 3).

One of these highly efficient migration exchanges involved Hawaii and Nevada, where, between 1995 and 2000, the flow of migrants from Hawaii to Nevada was an amazing six times the size of the reverse flow. Hawaii's economic downturn in the mid-1990s and Nevada's fast-growing economy may have been important factors in shaping this particularly lopsided migration pattern.

With the exception of the Hawaii-to-Nevada flow and the California-to-Nevada flow, every other migration exchange in Table 3 involves a state from the Northeast or the Midwest as the origin and a state from the South or the West as the destination. Indeed, of the migration exchanges shown in the table, 12 involved either New York or New Jersey as the state of origin.

## SUMMARY

States gained migrants from some states and lost migrants to other states in a complex web of interrelated migration. High net domestic immigration states gained many migrants from California, New York, and Illinois—a trio of “gateway” states that simultaneously lost migrants to other states while gaining migrants from abroad. The considerable migration from California to other states, particularly in the West, greatly influenced their net migration levels. Future reports will examine the demographic characteristics of state-to-state migration flows, helping us to understand the dynamics behind these migration patterns.

## ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

The data contained in this report are based on the sample of households who responded to the Census 2000 long form. Nationally, approximately 1 out of every 6 housing units was included in this sample. As a result, the sample estimates may differ somewhat from the 100-percent figures that would have been obtained if all housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters had been enumerated using the same questionnaires, instructions, enumerators, and so forth. The sample estimates also differ from the values that would have been obtained from different samples of housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters. The deviation of a sample estimate from the average of all possible samples is called the sampling error.

In addition to the variability that arises from the sampling procedures, both sample data and 100-percent data are subject to

nonsampling error. Nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the various complex operations used to collect and process data. Such errors may include: not enumerating every household or every person in the population, failing to obtain all required information from the respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent information, and recording information incorrectly. In addition, errors can occur during the field review of the enumerators' work, during clerical handling of the census questionnaires, or during the electronic processing of the questionnaires.

Nonsampling error may affect the data in two ways: (1) errors that are introduced randomly will increase the variability of the data and, therefore, should be reflected in the standard errors; and (2) errors that tend to be consistent in one direction will bias both sample and 100-percent data in that direction. For example, if respondents consistently tend to underreport their incomes, then the resulting estimates of households or families by income category will tend to be understated for the higher income categories and overstated for the lower income categories. Such biases are not reflected in the standard errors.

While it is impossible to completely eliminate error from an operation as large and complex as the decennial census, the Census Bureau attempts to control the sources of such error during the data collection and processing operations. The primary sources of error and the programs instituted to control error in Census 2000 are described in detail in *Summary File 3 Technical Documentation* under Chapter 8, “Accuracy of the Data,” located at [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf).

---

All statements in this Census 2000 Special Report have undergone statistical testing and all comparisons are significant at the 90-percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted. The estimates in tables, maps, and other figures may vary from actual values due to sampling and nonsampling errors. As a result, estimates in one category may not be significantly different from estimates assigned to a different category. Further information on the accuracy of the data is located at [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf). For further information on the computation and use of standard errors, contact the Decennial Statistical Studies Division at 301-763-4242.

### **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

More detailed information on decennial migration products,

including additional tables and other product announcements, is available on the Internet and can be accessed via the Census Bureau's decennial census migration Web page at [www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/migration.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/migration.html).

The decennial migration Web page contains: additional detailed migration tables not included in this report, a schedule of upcoming migration data releases, and migration-related Census 2000 Special Reports.

For more information on decennial census migration products, please contact:

Population Distribution Branch  
Population Division  
U.S. Census Bureau  
301-763-2419

or send e-mail to [pop@census.gov](mailto:pop@census.gov).

Information on other population and housing topics is presented in the Census 2000 Brief and Special Reports Series, located on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at [www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html). These series presents information about race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, household type, housing tenure, and other social, economic, and housing characteristics.

Census 2000 information and data can also be accessed via the Census 2000 Gateway Web page at [www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html](http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html).

For more information about Census 2000, including data products, call our Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail [webmaster@census.gov](mailto:webmaster@census.gov).



## APPENDIX

Table A-1.  
**Domestic Immigration, Outmigration, and Net Migration: 1995 to 2000**

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see [www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf))

Area	Immigration		Outmigration		Net Migration	
	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>
Alabama	326,212	80.0	300,389	73.7	25,823	6.3
Alaska	95,562	159.9	126,060	210.9	-30,498	-51.0
Arizona	796,420	187.2	480,272	112.9	316,148	74.3
Arkansas	252,100	104.3	209,984	86.9	42,116	17.4
California	1,448,964	47.1	2,204,500	71.7	-755,536	-24.6
Colorado	643,820	173.6	481,187	129.7	162,633	43.8
Connecticut	260,823	82.9	325,433	103.5	-64,610	-20.5
Delaware	101,461	145.4	84,078	120.5	17,383	24.9
District of Columbia	113,029	203.8	158,360	285.5	-45,331	-81.7
Florida	1,860,772	135.0	1,253,749	91.0	607,023	44.0
Georgia	965,558	137.7	624,853	89.1	340,705	48.6
Hawaii	125,160	107.6	201,293	173.0	-76,133	-65.4
Idaho	182,929	160.2	149,082	130.5	33,847	29.6
Illinois	665,122	57.7	1,007,738	87.4	-342,616	-29.7
Indiana	451,397	81.2	429,772	77.3	21,625	3.9
Iowa	214,841	78.6	247,853	90.7	-33,012	-12.1
Kansas	276,786	112.7	284,578	115.8	-7,792	-3.2
Kentucky	318,579	86.2	284,452	77.0	34,127	9.2
Louisiana	253,520	60.5	329,279	78.6	-75,759	-18.1
Maine	107,999	90.8	104,359	87.7	3,640	3.1
Maryland	495,152	102.8	514,875	106.9	-19,723	-4.1
Massachusetts	446,849	77.0	501,557	86.4	-54,708	-9.4
Michigan	467,638	50.8	559,568	60.8	-91,930	-10.0
Minnesota	355,250	79.3	326,081	72.8	29,169	6.5
Mississippi	226,788	87.6	199,858	77.2	26,930	10.4
Missouri	473,369	92.6	427,316	83.6	46,053	9.0
Montana	111,530	131.9	116,696	138.0	-5,166	-6.1
Nebraska	154,025	97.4	169,378	107.1	-15,353	-9.7
Nevada	466,123	301.8	232,189	150.3	233,934	151.5
New Hampshire	162,250	145.4	134,347	120.4	27,903	25.0
New Jersey	534,578	69.2	717,407	92.8	-182,829	-23.7
New Mexico	205,267	122.1	235,212	139.9	-29,945	-17.8
New York	726,477	40.6	1,600,725	89.4	-874,248	-48.8
North Carolina	919,336	131.7	581,453	83.3	337,883	48.4
North Dakota	60,252	97.0	85,459	137.6	-25,207	-40.6
Ohio	588,650	55.6	705,590	66.6	-116,940	-11.0
Oklahoma	322,500	102.6	305,613	97.2	16,887	5.4
Oregon	399,328	131.3	324,663	106.8	74,665	24.6
Pennsylvania	668,753	58.1	800,049	69.5	-131,296	-11.4
Rhode Island	96,980	101.4	93,744	98.0	3,236	3.4
South Carolina	442,449	124.4	310,244	87.2	132,205	37.2
South Dakota	72,548	102.3	85,016	119.9	-12,468	-17.6
Tennessee	567,966	111.5	421,652	82.8	146,314	28.7
Texas	1,362,849	74.2	1,214,609	66.1	148,240	8.1
Utah	242,189	125.2	216,893	112.2	25,296	13.1
Vermont	69,748	123.4	67,494	119.4	2,254	4.0
Virginia	821,738	129.7	746,008	117.7	75,730	11.9
Washington	618,395	117.8	543,065	103.4	75,330	14.3
West Virginia	138,487	81.0	149,241	87.3	-10,754	-6.3
Wisconsin	338,108	68.3	330,826	66.8	7,282	1.5
Wyoming	72,834	154.9	85,361	181.6	-12,527	-26.6

<sup>1</sup>The in-, out-, and net migration rates in this table are based on an approximated 1995 population, which is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in the area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net domestic migration rate is the 1995 to 2000 net domestic migration divided by the approximated 1995 population and multiplied by 1,000.

Note: A negative value for net migration is indicative of net outmigration, meaning that more migrants left an area than entered it.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.