

# POLICY IMPLICATIONS

**Polling Place**

**Centro Electoral  
Lugar ng Botohan  
Địa Điểm Phòng Phiếu**



Some commentators have begun to refer to the 2000s as “the lost decade,” largely on the basis of the lack of job and economic growth nationally over the decade.<sup>1</sup> President Obama himself referred to the decade as such in his January 2010 State of the Union address.

But the decade was lost in another sense, too; the nation lost time and opportunity to respond to the challenges and prospects that its new demographic realities portend.

We now stand on the precipice of a “decade of reckoning.” The economic rollercoaster of the past 10 years has distracted the United States and its major metropolitan areas from grappling with the urgent implications of the longer-run shifts afoot in our society. Issues such as how to support communities with rapidly aging populations, how to meet family and labor market needs through immigration, how to build workforce skills to maintain American economic leadership, and how to help lower-paid workers support themselves and their families simply cannot go unaddressed for another decade without risking serious degradation to our collective standard of living, not to mention the quality of our democracy. Tackling these and other challenges will require coherent, purposeful leadership at the national scale in the coming years.

This reckoning must occur at the metropolitan level, too. National policy will be necessary, but not sufficient, for addressing the wide range of challenges facing metropolitan areas. Indeed, the increasingly distinct profiles of major metro areas along the key dimensions outlined in this report demand that their own agendas—at the state, regional, and local levels—confront the issues most

pressing to their own futures. For all metropolitan areas, that includes embracing governance adaptations that recognize and take advantage of the increasingly common demographic, social, and economic trajectories of their cities and suburbs.

---

## THE MACRO—SECURING THE PLATFORM FOR METROPOLITAN PROSPERITY

The issues that the five new realities documented here raise are by no means completely off the national radar. Government fiscal analysts, financial planners, and hospital administrators, for instance, are only too aware of the challenges and opportunities raised by the impending retirement and ongoing aging of the boomers. Likewise, the future of America’s immigration policies remains in flux amid contentious debate over how they should treat undocumented workers.

Yet in these areas and others, national conversations tend to overlook the fact that these new realities affect not only “macro” conditions such as the federal budget and the U.S. labor market. They are also experienced in places—mostly in our nation’s largest metropolitan areas. Actors at the metropolitan level cannot, on their own, tackle the enormous challenges emerging from these social, demographic,

**The economic rollercoaster of the past 10 years has distracted the United States and its major metropolitan areas from grappling with the urgent implications of the longer-run shifts afoot in our society.**

and economic shifts. Only national policy makers have the fiscal and jurisdictional reach, and authority to make the truly market-shaping decisions needed to address these new realities. However, this requires an agenda that goes beyond the conventional ways in which these issues are framed at the national level, to confront aspects of particular concern for the metropolitan communities on the front lines of these trends.

### Accommodating More Efficient Growth

America's growth, as described earlier, confers both blessings and challenges. The economic and fiscal future of our nation would be in much greater doubt if we were not managing to continuously replenish our younger population through natural increase and immigration. At the same time, the volumes of people that we expect to add in the coming decades—a projected 90 million between now and 2050—are without equal in the industrialized world. Moreover, that growth will coincide with urgent new challenges for energy consumption and global climate change. Quite naturally, the debate at the national level around growth and the future of our environment has focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions by raising the relative market price of the energy sources that produce them, through a carbon tax, “cap and trade,” and investment in cleaner energy technologies.

In addition to these strategies, however, national leaders makers must address flaws in federal policy that have enabled the sort of energy-intensive, distended growth patterns familiar to most metropolitan areas:

- Because transportation is the single largest contributor to the nation's carbon footprint, federal **transportation policy** must also play a role in reducing wasteful growth patterns. The reauthorization

of the federal transportation law should reward and direct greater alignment between housing and transportation planning at the state and local levels; condition federal affordable housing and transit funds on the coordinated use of both; and issue “sustainability challenge contracts” to states and metropolitan areas that allow them to pursue coordinated growth strategies that collectively reduce their carbon footprints<sup>2</sup>

- Reducing the **deductibility of mortgage interest** could help discourage the over-consumption of housing, which not only contributes to sprawling development patterns within metro areas, but also fueled the economic crisis of the late 2000s and over-supply in many Western and Southeastern growth centers. Proposals to lower the rate at which higher-income taxpayers can itemize deductions, convert the mortgage interest deduction to a credit, or phase out the deduction for larger, more expensive, or second homes could all preserve society's implicit preference for homeownership, while encouraging more environmentally prudent housing patterns<sup>3</sup>

### Integrating and Incorporating Diverse Populations

The notion of America as a great “melting pot,” popularized during the last great wave of immigration at the dawn of the 20th century, implied that new arrivals to this country would absorb the ways of their new society, preserving a more homogeneous “American culture.” That notion was always a bit of a myth, because as immigrants assimilated into American society, they expanded the boundaries of its culture. That expansion and its accompanying tensions continue today, especially given the dramatic regional shift in the sources of U.S. immigration, the rising share of population born abroad, and the

labor market challenges currently facing the country. Moreover, underlying concerns extend beyond the foreign born to include other growing non-white shares of the U.S. population, such as African Americans and the “second generation” children of immigrant parents.

As others have persuasively argued, the demographics of our society require the successful economic and social incorporation of diverse younger populations.<sup>4</sup> As the ratio of seniors to working-age residents grows in the coming decades, how these populations fare will largely dictate our ability to support older populations economically, maintain a stable housing market, and supply the human capital for the institutions and occupations on which seniors will depend. In this sense, comprehensive immigration reform that protects our borders, meets our labor market needs while protecting U.S. workers, and provides a fair pathway to legal status for long-time residents is surely an immediate national policy priority.

While this approach may resolve for now the future of U.S. immigration policy, it does not amount to a coherent U.S. *immigrant* policy that assists in the incorporation of these new populations and others like them. In its absence, metropolitan communities on the receiving end of recent waves of immigrants have responded in hundreds of conflicting, often counter-productive ways to these influxes. Responding in a timely and strategic way to new and existing immigrant populations at the regional level may require federal support to bolster programs and practices—such as literacy training, workforce assistance, civic engagement and citizenship classes—that facilitate incorporation but may be destined for cuts in the current fiscal environment. One proposal would create a **national Office of New Americans** to elevate the largely makeshift, localized efforts

toward integration to form a strategic nationwide network.<sup>5</sup> Such a network should focus on metropolitan approaches, as individual jurisdictions do not serve the broader set of communities (e.g., workplaces, schools, places of worship, social networks) that form the locus of immigrant integration.

### Enhancing Community Affordability and Vitality for Seniors

The national conversation around aging has recently focused, with good reason, on the fiscal impacts of boomer retirements—particularly on public health care expenditures. The recently enacted health care reform law probably represents only the beginning of what will be a long-running debate on the topic. Still to be fully reckoned with are decisions to ensure the fiscal future of the Social Security system, while preserving and encouraging the labor market contributions of boomers as they advance beyond age 65.

We cannot know for sure what the retirement of the boomers will mean for the landscape of America’s metropolitan areas, especially the suburbs in which most are located. The generation’s demographic, social, and economic diversity suggests that communities will both benefit and face new challenges from the aging in place of the boomers.

Federal policy has an important role to play in helping communities accommodate these diverse older populations in ways that enhance quality of life and community vitality for all residents. On priority must be to meet increased demand for **affordable housing** for seniors, such as units subsidized through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD’s) Section 202 program, and coordinate supportive services for those populations (funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services). For the home-owning majority of boomers, HUD should also exact greater oversight of

**The generation’s demographic, social, and economic diversity suggests that communities will both benefit and face new challenges from the aging in place of the boomers.**

counseling around **home equity conversion mortgages (HECMs)**. These products allow seniors to convert their home equity into cash advances while still living in their homes, but which are too often marketed and sold in misleading ways.<sup>6</sup> To preserve and enhance senior mobility, federal **transportation planning requirements** could obligate grantees to take into account the specific highway and transit needs of older populations, and funding could be conditioned on their success in meeting accessibility targets.<sup>7</sup> Likewise, greater coordination of federal affordable housing and transit programs could be a further lever to improve seniors' access to walkable communities with a range of transportation options.<sup>8</sup>

### Accelerating Higher Educational Attainment

Improving the quality of education is no less than a public policy obsession for many public- and private-sector leaders, at all levels of the system. And with good reason—the rising human capital levels of our population explained much of America's economic success in the 20th century, and will probably be an even more important contributor to our standards of living into the future.<sup>9</sup>

In that regard, it is difficult to see how much longer the United States can abide widely divergent educational outcomes by race and ethnicity, given our changing population characteristics. By 2050, non-Hispanic whites will represent less than half of the nation's prime working-age (25 to 64) population. Over the next 40 years, blacks and Hispanics are projected to account for roughly 90 percent of total growth in that age range.<sup>10</sup> But post-secondary educational attainment rates for those groups track below 20 percent, roughly half those for whites and Asians. Although racial and ethnic gaps in educational achievement and access to college have

narrowed over time, they have persisted in college completion. Increasing diversity in the younger college-going population may go some way toward explaining the lower rate of college degree attainment among 25 to 34 year-olds than the previous cohort.

Thus, federal policies that promote access to higher education, such as the recently enacted increase in the Pell Grant program, are important but not sufficient for significantly raising attainment. First, strategies to reduce inequities in preparedness for higher education are crucial. The U.S. Department of Education should continue to focus, through multiple programs such as **Race to the Top**, **Investing in Innovation Fund**, and **Title I**, on enhancing teacher quality for students in need and promoting effective interventions for low-performing schools, which locate disproportionately in large metropolitan centers, both inner-city and suburban. Second, research indicates that rewarding institutions and students not just for enrollment, but also for persistence and completion, in higher education can result in improved rates of attainment.<sup>11</sup> The proposed **College Access and Completion Innovation Fund** and **American Graduation Initiative** would focus more federal resources, and leverage state and local resources, to promote pathways to degrees. Their biggest targets would be the community colleges that are present in multiple parts of all metropolitan areas, and which serve a large and growing share of their racial and ethnic minority students. Both programs were dropped from recent legislation enacting the Pell Grant increase, but their ideas deserve continued support from federal policy makers concerned with reducing racial and ethnic disparities in higher education.

## Reducing Income Inequality

Throughout most of the 1980s and 1990s, middle-income households and middle-wage workers derived limited benefit from economic growth in the form of rising earnings. Higher-income families and workers began to pull away from the pack, and income inequality increased. But the 2000s put an exclamation point on this pattern, resulting in real income and wage losses at the middle and bottom of the distribution, even as those at the higher end posted gains. The combination of the types of jobs lost during the recession, and those sustained and now growing in its wake, could in fact contribute to a labor market with even greater wage and income inequality than what preceded the downturn.<sup>12</sup>

At the moment, lessening income inequality has taken a back seat to resolving the plight of unemployed workers and creating jobs among federal economic policy priorities, with good reason. As the federal government considers strategies and investments to reduce unemployment, it should seek to create and sustain jobs that not only fill critical functions in the economy, but also provide employment opportunities and decent wages for low- to middle-skilled workers. Along these lines, investments that restore and grow the productive capacity of the nation's **auto communities** would help keep the nation on the front lines of innovation and the move to a low-carbon economy, rebalance U.S. trade, and bolster a sector that has traditionally generated good middle-class jobs.<sup>13</sup> Given the suffering these communities endured at the hands of the economic crisis, investments to modernize their infrastructure and land use, support their leadership in clean energy production, and keep and grow their advanced manufacturing industries now lie clearly and uniquely within the purview of federal policy.

Over the longer run, educational policies that

prepare a larger segment of the workforce to serve in higher-paying industries and occupations are another wise investment. But for the foreseeable future, there will remain jobs that pay wages insufficient to help workers meet basic costs of living for themselves and their families. This is especially the case now that unemployment rates will likely remain high for an extended period of time. Federal policy must thus continue to supplement the wages and incomes of low- and moderate-income families. Subsidizing their purchase of health insurance, as the recently enacted health care reform law will, is an important step in this direction. Stepped-up **labor standards enforcement**, which the Obama administration has begun to undertake, could help improve wages for vulnerable workers and communities toward the bottom of the income distribution.<sup>14</sup> Equally critical are tax credits that support lower-income working families—a majority of whom live in suburbs—such as the **Earned Income Tax Credit** and the **Child Tax Credit**.<sup>15</sup> Federal policy makers should renew provisions of these credits in the coming years that are scheduled to expire, as well as consider strategies to combine and expand these and related credits as part of a more fundamental re-writing of the federal tax code.

**it is difficult to see how much longer the United States can abide widely divergent educational outcomes by race and ethnicity, given our changing population characteristics.**

---

## THE METRO-UNDERSTANDING AND TAILORING RESPONSES TO REGIONAL REALITIES

National policy makers have the unique obligation to address aspects of the five new realities that affect all metropolitan areas, or are simply beyond metropolitan areas' own capacity to tackle. As this report demonstrates, however, different challenges assume varying levels of prominence in different types of

metropolitan areas. The future of second generation Americans, for instance, is a much more pressing issue in Diverse Giant and Border Growth metro areas than in Industrial Core areas. National policy responses must recognize the diverse starting points of metropolitan areas and, where necessary, ensure that interventions are tailored to those differing on-the-ground realities.

The 2010s will be metropolitan areas' decade of reckoning, too. Because these places pulled even farther apart from one another on several dimensions of the new realities in the 2000s, federal policy alone cannot provide a solution tailored to each metropolitan area's individual situation. Therefore, leaders at the state, regional, and local levels must now more than ever understand and respond purposefully to the demographic, social, and economic changes most affecting their places. In doing so, they can look to the experience and support of metro areas with which they share important characteristics, as no metropolitan area is so unique that it stands totally alone in the face of these dynamics.

### **Border Growth and Mid-Sized Magnets**

In the once booming, now sputtering growth centers of the Southwest and Southeast, the 2000s were an ephemeral decade in which housing and in-migration grew to play too important a role in the metropolitan economy. The subprime mortgage crisis originated in many of these places, and eventually triggered a full-blown international economic crisis that shut down the engines of their growth. Much of that growth was not only economically unsustainable, but also environmentally wasteful.

Over the next decade, these metropolitan areas must seek greater balance. This applies first and foremost to their economies, which policies must

seek to diversify away from housing, toward productive industries that can contribute to America's emerging next economy. Smart infrastructure investments in these metro areas could promote growth of alternative energy production and distribution, international travel and tourism, and linkages with larger nearby centers of global commerce (e.g., Los Angeles, Houston, Miami). This also applies to their own growth patterns, which in many cases have strained natural resources by concentrating development in low-density locations. Their current oversupply of housing and slowed rates of in-migration obligate these places to reconfigure their housing and transportation plans, to provide more sensible options for homeowners and renters in an aging society (especially in the Southeast) and carbon-constrained economy.

The other, even more existential challenge facing these places is to equip their emerging workforce with the education and skills necessary to attract and retain productive, competitive industries and occupations. With many of these metro areas located in states suffering severe fiscal challenges, their institutions of higher education—both 2-year and 4-year colleges—face severe cuts in their own budgets. Local and regional leaders in these areas must be fierce champions for the continued viability of these institutions, which offer the best hope for ensuring that their large and growing young, minority populations can contribute meaningfully to future economic growth, and provide an even better life for their families than their parents could.

### **Diverse Giant/Next Frontier**

The large coastal and growing Western metro areas that make up the Diverse Giant and Next Frontier categories will retain an economic advantage in

the next decade from their built-in stocks of human capital, innovative firms and research institutions, and denser urban cores that attract and retain highly educated workers. While their increasingly diverse demography confers numerous strengths, it also raises challenges in the form of high and rising educational and income inequality.

The 18 metropolitan areas in these categories contain 56 percent of the nation's foreign-born population, and a majority of its "second generation" children, too. These populations are highly diverse in their national origin, educational background, and recentness of entry to the United States. Moreover, 57 percent of their foreign born are located in suburban communities, many of which are quite new to the phenomenon of immigration. As changes in these populations occur relatively quickly, public, private, and non-profit leaders in Diverse Giant and Next Frontier metro areas should undertake region-wide efforts to monitor the size and status of their foreign-born populations. They should also adopt the most innovative practices for accelerating the civic and labor market integration of these populations, such as intergenerational and vocational literacy training, and programs that help immigrants become U.S. citizens.<sup>16</sup>

The high levels of inequality that mark many of these areas also create intense price pressures for low-income, and even middle-income, workers and families. Providing high-quality, affordable communities for these segments of the population is important not only to ensure that basic public needs are met (e.g., by key workers in health care, education, and safety), but also to keep retail prices in check more generally, and to provide viable options for families as they climb the economic ladder.<sup>17</sup> The housing price crash has perhaps ameliorated the affordability pressures in these markets temporarily,

but they are sure to grow again in the coming decade. More cities and regions in these metro categories could benefit from the sort of bold, long-term thinking that undergirded New York City's ambitious PlaNYC, or the Sacramento Region's Blueprint, each of which provide a roadmap for addressing future local and regional population needs in an environmentally sustainable, fiscally efficient manner.<sup>18</sup> In addition, strategies to promote greater affordability within these regions should take into account the costs of not just housing but also household transportation, as the latter can represent an equally heavy burden on the budgets and time of moderate-income working families.<sup>19</sup>

### **New Heartland**

New Heartland metropolitan areas, as indicated by their title, represent in some ways the "middle of the road" on the new demographic realities transforming America. Their population characteristics—more educated, somewhat less diverse, younger, and with lower levels of educational and income inequality—reflect in large part the selective in-migration they experienced in the 2000s and earlier decades. As the recovery gets underway, the diverse economic specializations of these places will likely position them well to participate in the next wave of U.S. economic growth during the 2010s. However, with migration rates likely to remain somewhat lower in the near term, an "import strategy" for augmenting their human capital may not be as reliable as in the recent past.

To that end, these metropolitan areas would do well to focus on growing a more educated pipeline of workers, both present and future, from within their own borders. Some are home to challenged urban and inner-suburban school systems with high proportions of lower-income minority students (e.g.,

**Leaders at the state, regional, and local levels must now more than ever understand and respond purposefully to the demographic, social, and economic changes most affecting their places.**



Atlanta, Indianapolis, Minneapolis), that may now have an opportunity to attract new, young, middle-class families who are choosing to live in the urban core. This could mean improved learning prospects for disadvantaged kids as well as a wider constituency for continued investment in and improvement of these systems.<sup>20</sup> In addition, most of these metropolitan areas are home to major public universities that educate many of their own residents, or those elsewhere in the state. Closer partnership between regional economic development and university officials could be geared toward convincing more of their students to begin their careers—and build the next middle class—in their alma mater’s region.

### **Skilled Anchor and Industrial Core**

Economically, the Skilled Anchor and Industrial Core metro areas are quite distinct. The former have lower shares of their populations in manufacturing industries, and higher shares in services industries such as health and education. This difference has insulated them from the recent, deep economic suffering visited on the Industrial Core areas. Indeed, some of the larger cities among the Skilled Anchors (e.g., Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis) showed renewed signs of residential strength in the 2000s that were less apparent in the Industrial Cores.

Yet on most of the five new demographic realities transforming metropolitan areas, Skilled Anchor and Industrial Core areas are more similar than distinct. They experienced rapid decentralization amidst only modest growth in the 2000s, and an above-average share of their commuting occurs by car (the highest rate in Industrial Cores). Immigration to these metro areas—with a couple of notable exceptions—is quite low, though most retain significant African American populations as a consequence of their former

manufacturing might. They have among the oldest age profiles of the metropolitan types, the result of low in-migration and a significant aging-in-place boomer and senior population.

While both types of areas have similar challenges to tackle, then, their different economic positions may dictate different approaches. Slowing the tide of decentralization should be a priority for all of these metropolitan areas. Skilled Anchors have, as their name implies, significant anchor institutions in the form of universities and hospitals that can be effective partners in both economic and residential development.<sup>21</sup> Many such institutions are present in the Industrial Cores, too, but in light of their vast but now unutilized industrial and population footprints, those regions likely need more radical land-use interventions to revive residential and economic vitality.

These strategies should also take account of the particular opportunities and challenges accompanying the rapid aging of their populations. Many experienced a “brain drain” of younger workers in recent decades, even the Skilled Anchors where educational attainment remains above average. For that reason, efforts to keep the boomers connected to the labor market, even as they reach retirement age, could benefit these regions both socially and economically.<sup>22</sup> Integrating housing and social services for their larger-than-average senior populations, in both urban and suburban settings, as well as supporting the use of home and community-based services (versus institutional care) to care for the elderly should be additional priorities.

Finally, the out-migration these regions have experienced reflects not only a decline in their economic functions, but also the perception among departing younger workers and married-couple families that areas like the New Heartland and the Next Frontier may offer themselves and their

children better educational opportunities, or a more diverse and vibrant cultural environment. Thus, priorities that apply to other metropolitan categories around welcoming and incorporating new (if still small) immigrant populations, and improving (if not completely overhauling) the human capital pipeline, apply at least equally to the Skilled Anchors and Industrial Cores.<sup>23</sup>

### **Enabling Metropolitan Action**

Finally, new demographic realities must be met with new governance arrangements. More than ever, the lines between cities and suburbs—and the long, fruitless history of battles and mistrust between them—must be transcended. Cities and suburbs increasingly share challenges like poverty, growing elderly populations, and influxes of new Americans. At the same time, the fiscal crisis has dramatically undermined the capacity of individual jurisdictions to address familiar existing needs, and has compromised their ability to react to new realities. States are facing their own intense fiscal stresses, which will get worse before they get better, and thus they cannot be counted on to support the local government status quo.

The demographic and fiscal outlook demands three kinds of changes from local leaders. First, they must create regional solutions to new, shared regional challenges. Changes in suburban demographics and the challenges they raise will not abate in the 2010s. Local leaders need to recognize that these trends are playing out to a greater or lesser extent across most of the jurisdictions in their metropolitan area, and work toward regional solutions to regional issues. Older, larger jurisdictions, with greater experience in dealing with poverty, or the needs of second-generation children, have valuable insights that can structure regional

responses and keep other places from reinventing the wheel. Sometimes, new institutions are needed. For instance, in a growing number of metro areas, regional workforce intermediaries serve as critical links between the supply and demand sides of the labor market, working with employers, educational institutions, workforce training providers, and workers at the regional scale.<sup>24</sup>

Second, metropolitan areas need to overcome their legacy of fragmented “little box” governments, either through greater collaboration between jurisdictions, or outright consolidation of outdated, inefficient local government units. The Pittsburgh metropolitan area, for example, which declined in population in the 2000s, still contains 775 separate local governments that include municipalities, townships, counties, and special districts. Fragmentation such as this keeps governments weak: the vast majority of municipalities have limited tax bases and struggle to provide even the most basic services. Fragmentation also increases the cost of government, often leading competing jurisdictions to duplicate infrastructure, staffing and services that could otherwise be provided more cost effectively. Finally, fragmentation exerts weakens long-term regional economic performance: parochial jurisdictions compete against each other rather than working together to resolve shared challenges and compete in the world economy. Consolidation, particularly of school districts, has yielded savings, better services, or both. Maine has saved \$36 million by reducing the number of school districts from 290 to 215, and hopes to make additional reductions. School district consolidation has also been proposed in Pennsylvania (from 500 districts to 100) and Indiana.

Third, metropolitan areas have to act like metropolitan areas, especially in their dealings with states. In 29 states, large metropolitan areas contain a

**More than ever, the lines between cities and suburbs—and the long, fruitless history of battles and mistrust between them—must be transcended.**

majority of the population; in some of those states, just one or two metropolitan areas alone make up a majority of the population. Yet state legislators from these large centers, together with their smaller metropolitan counterparts, do not reliably unite to exercise their numerical advantage. They are divided by party, by race, by class, and by the outdated view that cities, suburbs, exurbs, and rural areas (all of which are found within metropolitan areas) have incompatible interests. As metropolitan areas grow and share an increasingly unified demographic profile—and attendant challenges—they should consolidate their influence on common issues that concern the well-being of their populations.

These governance ideas are, admittedly, not necessarily new, nor have they been widely practiced to date. But the recent pace and scale of demographic change in metropolitan areas, and the challenges those trends raise amid a bleak fiscal environment, mean that the time has come for individual metropolitan jurisdictions to govern together, in ways befitting their increasingly common destinies.

---

## CONCLUSION

Specific policy responses that truly engage and make the most of America's potential in the face of emerging demographic realities must be priorities for national, metropolitan, and local actors alike in the coming decade. This chapter presents a policy framework for approaching these issues from both "macro" and "metro" perspectives.

But a higher-order leadership is just as needed. Notwithstanding the long-term sweep of many of the trends described here, the pace of change and complexity of U.S. society only seems to multiply with each passing decade. Now, as the nation and its major metropolitan areas reach a series of critical demographic junctures, forging a constructive path forward to the "next society" is as much about helping communities manage the velocity of change as it is about responding to its specific character. Failure to maximize shared responses to the inevitable challenges of change, and to promote common ownership of the solutions, will only serve to sow the seeds of intergenerational and inter-racial, inter-ethnic conflict. The resulting polarization, already evident in our national politics, impedes adaptation and the timeless American struggle to form a more perfect union.

Understanding—from the ground up—who Americans are, and who they are becoming, is a critical step toward building those bridges before they become impassable divides. We hope that the *State of Metropolitan America* proves a useful platform from which to build that understanding. ■

---

## ENDNOTES

1. See, e.g., Neil Irwin, "Aughts Were a Lost Decade for U.S. Economy, Workers." *The Washington Post*, January 2, 2010; Chris Farrell, "A Lost Decade?" *Marketplace Money*, June 25, 2009, online at [www.publicradio.org/columns/marketplace/farrell/](http://www.publicradio.org/columns/marketplace/farrell/) [accessed April 2010].
2. Robert Puentes, "Creating Livable Communities: Housing and Transit Policy in the 21st Century." Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Housing, Banking, and Urban Affairs, March 26, 2009.
3. One such proposal is included in the Obama administration's FY 2011 budget, which would limit the tax rate at which itemized reductions—including mortgage interest—reduce tax liability to 28 percent. "General Explanations of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2011 Revenue Proposals."
4. See, e.g., Dowell Myers, *Immigrants and Boomers: Forging a New Social Contract for the Future of America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007).
5. Brookings-Duke Immigration Policy Roundtable, "Breaking the Stalemate: From Deep Disagreements to Constructive Proposals" (Washington, D.C. and Durham, NC: Brookings Institution and Duke University Kenan Institute for Ethics, 2009).
6. Government Accountability Office, "Reverse Mortgages: Product Complexity and Consumer Protection Issues Underscore Need for Improved Controls Over Counseling for Borrowers" (GAO-09-606, 2009).
7. Sandra Rosenbloom, "The Mobility Needs of Older Americans: Implications for Transportation Reauthorization" (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2003).
8. Rodney Harrell, Allison Brooks, and Todd Nedwick, "Preserving Affordability and Access in Livable Communities: Subsidized Housing Opportunities Near Transit and the 50+ Population" (Washington: AARP Public Policy Institute, 2009).
9. Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz, *The Race Between Education and Technology* (Harvard University Press, 2008).
10. Alan Berube, *MetroNation: How U.S. Metropolitan Areas Fuel American Prosperity* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2007).
11. See, e.g., Molly F. McIntosh and Cecilia Elena Rouse, "The Other College: Retention and Completion Rates Among Two-Year College Students" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2009).
12. Alan Berube, "The Great Recession and Inequality." *The Avenue*, November 6, 2009, online at [www.tnr.com/blog/the-avenue/the-great-recession-and-inequality](http://www.tnr.com/blog/the-avenue/the-great-recession-and-inequality) [accessed April 2010].
13. Jennifer Vey and others, "The Next Economy: Rebuilding the Nation's Auto Communities" (Washington: Brookings Institution, forthcoming 2010).
14. Melanie Trottman, "Employees Urged to Seek Wage Rights." *The Wall Street Journal*, April 6, 2010, p. A4.
15. For more on the spatial distribution of those benefiting from the Earned Income Tax Credit, see Alan Berube and Thacher Tiffany, "The 'State' of Low-Wage Workers: How the EITC Benefits Urban and Rural Communities in the 50 States" (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2004).
16. Audrey Singer and others, "Recent Immigration to Philadelphia: Regional Change in a Re-Emerging Gateway" (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2008).
17. David M. Frankel and Eric D. Gould, "The Retail Price of Inequality." *Journal of Urban Economics* 49 (2001): 219-39; Jason Booza, Jackie Cutsinger, and George Galster, "Where Did They Go? The Decline of Middle-Class Neighborhoods in Metropolitan America, 1970-2000" (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2006).
18. "PLANNYC: A Greener, Greater New York" (City of New York, 2007); "Sacramento Region Blueprint:

- Transportation/Land Use Plan” (Sacramento Area Council of Governments, 2004).
19. Barbara J. Lipman, “A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burdens of Working Families” (Washington: Center for Housing Policy, 2006).
  20. A selective return of the middle class to public schools has begun to occur in some of these cities; see, e.g., Kristina Torres, “More Kids Stick with Buckhead Schools.” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, March 15, 2010.
  21. Timothy J. Bartik and George Erickcek, “The Local Economic Impact of ‘Eds and Meds’: How Policies to Expand Universities and Hospitals Affect Metropolitan Economies” (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2008); Jennifer Vey, “Higher Education in Pennsylvania: A Competitive Asset for Communities” (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2005).
  22. See, e.g., analysis and recommendations of various government reports on the subject of engaging older workers including: Government Accountability Office, “Highlights of a GAO Forum: Engaging and Retaining Older Workers” (GAO-07-4385P, 2007); Expert Panel on Older Workers, “Supporting and Engaging Older Workers in the New Economy” (Toronto, ON: Workplace Institute, 2007).
  23. The cities of New Orleans and Detroit, among others, have embarked upon significant restructuring of their public school systems; see: Paul Tough, “A Teachable Moment.” *New York Times Magazine*, August 14, 2008; Excellent Schools Detroit, “Taking Ownership: Our Pledge to Educate All of Detroit’s Children” (Detroit, MI, 2010). The City of Boston created an Office of New Bostonians in 1998 to coordinate its responses to the needs of the city’s growing and changing population of newcomers from abroad; see [www.cityofboston.gov/newbostonians/](http://www.cityofboston.gov/newbostonians/)
  24. For examples of workforce intermediary efforts in Ohio and Pennsylvania regions, see Jennifer Bradley, Lavea Brachman, and Bruce Katz, “Restoring Prosperity: Transforming Ohio’s Communities for the Next Economy” (Columbus, OH and Washington, D.C.: Greater Ohio Policy Center and Brookings Institution, 2010).