

ANALYSIS OF INTRA-URBAN
POPULATION MOVEMENT IN
LARGE URBANIZED AREAS IN THE
UNITED STATES BETWEEN
1950 AND 1970

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PHILIP A. BABCOCK
1975

JHEB:K



6955

ABSTRACT

ANALYSIS OF INTRA-URBAN POPULATION MOVEMENT IN LARGE URBANIZED AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1950 AND 1970

by Philip A. Babcock

The purpose of this study was to examine intra-urban migration in large urbanized areas in the United States between 1950 and 1970. The study of migration concentrated on a concept termed "centralization" which was defined in terms of population movement at the intra-urban level and some of the circumstances influencing those movements.

In conducting the study, emphasis was placed on obtaining a high degree of refinement in its generalization and concepts. This was done in order to obtain information that would have potential for practical uses such as public policy formation or providing a basis from which population projection methods might be developed.

In order to obtain a high degree of refinement in the study, a conceptual model referred to as a "stage theory of growth" was used to test the concept of centralization. This test of centralization was conducted on the twenty-five largest urbanized areas in

the United States as of 1970.

The results of the test of centralization indicated a widespread increase in what was termed "positive centralization" during the 1960's decade when compared to the 1950's decade. This increase in positive centralization was accompanied by a decrease in the reciprocal of positive centralization which was termed "negative centralization".

ANALYSIS OF INTRA-URBAN POPULATION MOVEMENT
IN LARGE URBANIZED AREAS IN THE
UNITED STATES BETWEEN 1950 AND 1970

By

Philip A. Babcock

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Resource Development

1975

Copyright by:
Philip A. Babcock

1975

I wish to express my appreciation to the
committee, Dr. Ral
Development, and
Department of Reso
and Mr. Donn Ander
Landscape Archite

I also wish
to express my research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my thesis committee, Dr. Raleigh Barlowe, Department of Resource Development, and my chairman; Dr. Milton Steinmueller, Department of Resource Development, and my adviser; and Mr. Donn Anderson, School of Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture.

I also wish to thank my wife, Jacqueline, who assisted me with my research effort.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LIST OF TABLES...

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter

1 DEFINITION

I
S
S
S

2 THEORETICAL
DESIGN

3 STUDY

I
I
I
S
C
C
C
C
E
E
C
E

4 ANALYSIS

C
T
D
A
L
C
E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	vii
 Chapter	
1 DEFINITION OF PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction and Statement of	
Study Need.....	1
Study Purpose.....	3
Study Hypothesis.....	4
2 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY	
DESIGN AND REVIEW OF RELATED WORK.....	4
3 STUDY DESIGN.....	14
Introduction and General	
Definitions.....	14
Study Sample.....	15
Operational Definition of a	
Centralized Area.....	15
Operational Definition of	
Population Centralization.....	18
Restatement of Study Hypothesis.	26
Outline and Summary of Study	
Procedure.....	27
4 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS.....	29
Outline of Presentation.....	29
Test of Study Hypothesis.....	29
Detailed Analysis of Data.....	32
New York Urbanized Area.....	42
Los Angeles Urbanized Area.....	48
Chicago Urbanized Area.....	50
Philadelphia Urbanized Area.....	52

Table of Contents

Chapter

Detr
 San
 Urban
 Boos
 Wash
 Cleve
 St. L
 Pitts
 Minne
 Urban
 Hous
 Balti
 Dalla
 Milwa
 Seat
 Miami
 San J
 Atlan
 Cinc
 Kans
 Buff
 Denve
 San

5 SUMMARY A
 SERVICES.....
 DEMOGRAPHY.....

Table of Contents - Chapter 4 (Cont.)

Chapter

Detroit Urbanized Area.....	54
San Francisco - Oakland Urbanized Area.....	56
Boston Urbanized Area.....	60
Washington Urbanized Area.....	62
Cleveland Urbanized Area.....	64
St. Louis Urbanized Area.....	66
Pittsburgh Urbanized Area.....	68
Minneapolis - St. Paul Urbanized Area.....	70
Houston Urbanized Area.....	73
Baltimore Urbanized Area.....	75
Dallas Urbanized Area.....	77
Milwaukee Urbanized Area.....	79
Seattle Urbanized Area.....	81
Miami Urbanized Area.....	83
San Diego Urbanized Area.....	85
Atlanta Urbanized Area.....	87
Cincinnati Urbanized Area.....	89
Kansas City Urbanized Area.....	91
Buffalo Urbanized Area.....	91
Denver Urbanized Area.....	94
San Jose Urbanized Area.....	96
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	98
APPENDICES.....	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Relationship between growth cycle, centralization classification, and census tract classification code.	28
2. Comparison of extent of positive centralization in the 1950's decade with the 1960's decade.	30-31
3. Total centralized areas.	33
4. New York urbanized area.	45-47
5. Los Angeles urbanized area.	49
6. Chicago urbanized area.	51
7. Philadelphia urbanized area.	53
8. Detroit urbanized area.	55
9. San Francisco urbanized area.	58-59
10. Boston urbanized area.	61
11. Washington D. C. urbanized area.	63
12. Cleveland urbanized area.	65
13. St. Louis urbanized area.	67
14. Pittsburgh urbanized area.	69
15. Minneapolis-St. Paul urbanized area.	71-72
16. Houston urbanized area.	74
17. Baltimore urbanized area.	76
18. Dallas urbanized area.	78
19. Milwaukee urbanized area.	80

Table

20. Seattle ur
21. Miami urba
22. San Diego
23. Atlanta ur
24. Cincinnati
25. Kansas Cit
26. Buffalo ur
27. Denver ur
28. San Jose

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table	Page
20. Seattle urbanized area.	82
21. Miami urbanized area.	84
22. San Diego urbanized area.	86
23. Atlanta urbanized area.	88
24. Cincinnati urbanized area.	90
25. Kansas City urbanized area.	92
26. Buffalo urbanized area.	93
27. Denver urbanized area.	95
28. San Jose urbanized area.	97

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR CENSUS TRACTS.....	105
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA.....	106
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA.....	120
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA.....	123
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN PHILADELPHIA URBANIZED AREA.....	129
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DETROIT URBANIZED AREA.....	130
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN FRANCISCO URBANIZED AREA.....	131
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BOSTON URBANIZED AREA.....	133
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN WASHINGTON D. C. URBANIZED AREA.....	136
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CLEVELAND URBANIZED AREA.....	137
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN ST. LOUIS URBANIZED AREA.....	138
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN PITTSBURGH URBANIZED AREA.....	138
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL URBANIZED AREA.....	139

Appendix

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

CENTRALIZED
AREA.....

LIST OF APPENDICES (CONT.)

Appendix	Page
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN HOUSTON URBANIZED AREA.....	140
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BALTIMORE URBANIZED AREA.....	140
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DALLAS URBANIZED AREA.....	141
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA.....	141
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SEATTLE URBANIZED AREA.....	142
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MIAMI URBANIZED AREA.....	142
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN DIEGO URBANIZED AREA.....	143
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN ATLANTA URBANIZED AREA.....	143
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CINCINNATI URBANIZED AREA.....	144
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN KANSAS CITY URBANIZED AREA.....	145
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BUFFALO URBANIZED AREA.....	145
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DENVER URBANIZED AREA.....	146
CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA.....	146

CHAPTER 1

DEFINITION OF PROBLEM

Introduction and Statement of Study Need

There exists today a widely accepted generalization among persons concerned with demographic trends in the United States. This generalization is that recent United States population migration has been characterized by centralization into large metropolitan areas, while population migration in metropolitan areas has been characterized by decentralization.

Because of the dominance of the centralization-decentralization theory many observers have been slow to accept evidence that a possible change may now be occurring in both migration trends. It may, in fact, be necessary to experience another ten or twenty years of change in order to fully understand contemporary migration patterns. It is not necessary, however, to wait until migration patterns become obvious in order to begin documenting them.

This thesis will contend that the established trend of decentralization inside large urbanized areas had already begun to change in the 1960's and that such change

can be demonstrated by comparing the 1960's decade to the 1950's. In demonstrating this view, the thesis will report a study of population migration within large urbanized areas between 1950 and 1970.

The structure of the thesis was designed to contribute information on two separate but related aspects of intra-urban population migration. The first such aspect of intra-urban migration considered for study was the need to re-examine contemporary migration theory in light of the recently completed 1970 United States Census of Population. This examination involved a comparison of intra-urban migration in the 1950's decade with intra-urban migration in the 1960's decade as documented by the United States Census of Population in 1960 and 1970 respectively.

The second aspect of intra-urban migration considered for the study was the need to develop a particular level of demographic information. This level of information was designed to fit between the highly generalized demographic studies used for theory building and the more refined applied research studies which are generally too limited in scope for theory building. In developing this level of information, emphasis has been placed on obtaining information useful in theory building. Hopefully, however, theories based on a precise level of generalization will prove more useful in practical application than highly generalized theories.

Study Pur

The
migration
density c
areas, of
United Sta
compare th
of a conce

A de
is present
fined sim
area. Suc
classified
with posi
lation in
in the ne
defined a
ized area
likely to

The
span was
that are
Such an e
study wh
not only
applicat:

Study Purpose

The purpose of this proposed study of intra-urban migration is to examine migration patterns in the high density centers, here on referred to as centralized areas, of the twenty-five largest urbanized areas in the United States. The aim of this examination will be to compare the 1950's decade to the 1960's decade in terms of a concept described as "population centralization".

A detailed definition of population centralization is presented in Chapter 3, but at present, it can be defined simply as location of population in a centralized area. Such population centralization will be further classified as being either positive or negative in nature, with positive centralization defined as location of population in a centralized area that is likely to continue in the near future, while negative centralization is defined as either movement of population out of a centralized area or location in a centralized area that is not likely to continue in the near future.

The limitation of the study to a twenty year time span was done in order to concentrate on migration patterns that are most relevant for contemporary decision making. Such an emphasis is consistent with the purpose of the study which was to provide a level of information geared not only to theory building, but also to practical application such as public policy creation.

Study Hypothesis

Stated in a general form, the hypothesis of this study is that when the 1960's decade is compared to the 1950's decade there will appear a widespread trend in large United States urbanized areas toward positive population centralization.

The hypothesis as stated does not deny the large dominant trend of negative centralization that existed in both the 1950's and 1960's, but only wishes to demonstrate the relative growth of positive centralization to negative centralization.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY DESIGN AND REVIEW OF RELATED WORK

As implied by the study hypothesis the high level of generalization used in contemporary research on intra-urban migration has resulted in a failure to note a widespread trend of positive centralization in large United States urbanized areas. It would follow then that in testing its hypothesis this research will strive for a high level of refinement in its generalizations.

In choosing to use a highly refined level of generalization there was no intention to imply any inherent goodness about the use of such a generalization level. The level of generalization was chosen instead simply to produce information for sources of need not served by more generalized studies.

In reviewing existing studies of intra-urban population migration the most basic and perhaps most widely applied study design is the large scale demographic approach. This approach compares the population growth of central cities with their suburban areas over a long period of time. In such studies the concept of positive centralization is represented by central city population growth

and negative centralization by population growth in suburban areas. In conceptualizing centralization in such a highly generalized manner studies in this category suffer from a common problem. This problem involves including great amounts of areas in a central city classification which are suburban in character and including a growing number of areas in a suburban classification which are actually central city in character. This problem by itself is enough to invalidate such studies for all but the most general uses.

Two studies which are good examples of large scale demographic research while at the same time possessing some refinements are Amos Hawley's 1956 study of intra-urban migration trends from 1900 to 1950¹ and Leo Schnore and Vivian Klalf's study² of intra-metropolitan population from 1950 to 1970.

The Hawley study in 1956 was one of the more exhaustive studies done in the 1950's on intra-urban migration. In his study Hawley used both the United States Census Bureau's Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (S.M.S.A.'s) and his own Extended Metropolitan Areas for dual levels of analysis. This analysis involved a study of concentration or deconcentration trends in urban

¹Amos Hawley, The Changing Shape of Metropolitan America: Deconcentration Since 1920 (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956).

²Leo F. Schnore and Vivian Klalf, "Suburbanization in the Sixties: A Preliminary Analysis", Land Economics, Vol. 48 (Feb., 1972), 23-33.

population between 1900 and 1950.

In designing his study Hawley resorted to the standard central city - suburban classification scheme but added a major refinement in the suburban area by further subdividing it according to its distance from the city hall of the central city. This was accomplished by extending a radius in five mile intervals from the central city's city hall over the entire metropolitan area. Calculation of population migration inside suburban areas was then done by use of zones created by the intervals along the radius extended from city hall. Strangely enough the central city was excluded from such analysis but the attempt to conceptualize population concentration by more than municipal limits represents a major refinement in study method.

The central conclusion of Hawley's study was that population migration within United States Metropolitan Areas had been dominated by concentration movement from 1900 to around 1920 and deconcentration from 1920 to 1950. Hawley went on to speculate about the causes of this shift in migration patterns but didn't present any research to confirm his speculations.

A study which is similar to Hawley's but of somewhat more interest because of its recency is the Schmore and Klalf study of 1971.³

³Ibid., p. 5.

For their study Schmore and Klalf used preliminary returns from the 1970 census to compare intra-urban migration patterns in the 1950's with the 1960's. The stated purpose of the study was to see if any reversal in the decentralization trends of the 1950's had occurred in the 1960's. In order to test for decentralization Schmore and Klalf used the basic central city - suburban classification scheme without modification. However, the study did include one important refinement in its research method which was to enlarge somewhat the definition of centralization. This enlargement involved including cases as centralizing when a suburban area declined in population at a rate greater than the central city. Although this may seem an obvious step to take in designing the classification systems it does make use of the concept of centralization to imply something other than a movement of people into an area.

As a result of their study Schmore and Klalf found that 74% of the United States S.M.S.A.'s experienced decentralization in the 1960's compared to 70% in the 1950's. Unfortunately Schmore and Klalf did not wait for 1970 census data which was adjusted for annexation so the only thing they really measured was the percent of central city in each decade annexing significant amounts of population. Even if annexation adjusted figures had been used the percent of S.M.S.A.'s experiencing centralization by Schmore and Klalf's measurement would

have been so small for both decades under study that a comparison would have demonstrated little.

With the recognition of the problems involved in standard large-scale demographic study a review was made of theory building at a more refined level of analysis which is generally termed process-oriented studies. Process-oriented studies vary from the large scale demographic studies in that they generally attempt to understand large scale demographic phenomenon by trying to understand the process by which it occurs.

One early process oriented study which provided a possible foundation for a study design was the 1954 study of population movement in the Philadelphia metropolitan area conducted by Hans Blumenfeld.⁴ In his study Blumenfeld hypothesized that a given population density will move outward from a metropolitan core over time like a wave. From his test on Philadelphia and a later test on Toronto Blumenfeld was able to determine a constant ratio between the distance that a particular population density ring moved outward from a metropolitan core and the rate of population growth in the metropolitan area. Blumenfeld admitted that the similarity he found between the ratio of movement to growth in Philadelphia with that in Toronto, .83 and .85 respectively, was probably coincidental.

⁴Hans Blumenfeld, "The Tidal Wave of Metropolitan Expansion", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 20 (Winter, 1954), 3-14.

The fact that the existence of a ratio could be demonstrated at all, however, is strong evidence that intra-urban migration is more structured than might have been imagined before Blumenfeld's work.

The next major process oriented theory that held potential for a study design is what is generally termed a stage theory of growth. A stage theory of growth basically considers growth to occur through a number of ordered stages which are cyclical in nature and usually tied to the life cycle of housing units within a particular urban neighborhood.

If one plots the population growth of a neighborhood as it passes through a life cycle a wave-like formation appears. This wave-like population growth pattern provides a connection between a stage theory of growth and Blumenfeld's wave theory although Blumenfeld's wave theory involved a much larger scale of study. Assuming, however, a general connection between a neighborhood's stage in a growth cycle and its distance from a metropolitan core one can easily transform a stage theory into Blumenfeld's wave theory.

One of the earliest discussions of an actual stage theory of growth occurred in a section of Hoover and Vernon's 1959 book, Anatomy of a Metropolis. The section titled "How a Neighborhood Evolves" listed five stages which a typical metropolitan neighborhood passed through as it experiences an initial cycle of development.

The five stages listed in Hoover and Vernon's

presentation include a first stage of rapid, low density residential development followed by a second stage of higher density apartment development. The stage of higher density development consumes the remaining available building sites in a neighborhood as well as replacing some of the older single family homes with multi-family units.

Following the second stage is a third stage of downgrading in which housing, both single family and multi-family is subdivided. This downgrading stage is further characterized by a transition of housing to lower income groups who often overcrowd it. Hoover and Vernon added that the third stage is optional and may never occur if a neighborhood maintains its original class of residents.

If a third stage does occur Hoover and Vernon list a fourth stage which involves a thinning out of population in a neighborhood. This thinning of neighborhood population is caused by children of the lower income residents leaving the overcrowded housing as they become adults.

Finally there is a fifth stage in which the housing is removed by renewal efforts and the land is reused for higher density or non-residential uses.

After the early discussion of a staged growth cycle by Hoover and Vernon little was done with a stage theory until 1971. In that year David Birch published a population

study on New Haven, Connecticut which was designed to test a stage theory of growth which was similar to that described by Hoover and Vernon.⁵

In order to test his stage theory Birch defined seven separate stages for a single life cycle of a typical metropolitan neighborhood. These seven stages were nearly identical to the five stages in Hoover and Vernon's earlier theory. The only major difference between the two was the addition of a rural stage at the beginning of the process and the addition of a separate final stage in which the land that is cleared in the renewal stage is reused. Using his seven stages Birch then assigned particular statistical parameters to each stage. With the statistical parameters it was possible for Birch to score individual census tracts within New Haven according to the characteristics they possessed from each stage in his cycle. Using census tracts as a form of urban neighborhoods Birch found that census tract characteristics tend to concentrate heavily in or around one particular stage in his cycle and that the stage characteristics of census tracts pass with great consistency through his cycle although not at a uniform rate.

Based on Birch's success in demonstrating the existence of a staged pattern of growth in New Haven it was decided

⁵Edgar M. Hoover and Raymond Vernon, Anatomy of a Metropolis (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959).

to adopt a stage
approach or assumption
centralization. The
theory include, for
vides an explanation
be related to the

The second re
is that a stage t
at the neighborho
a more refined le
at the municipal
using a neighbor
of migration the
migration trends
measurement at t

to adopt a stage theory of growth as a basic theoretical approach or assumption in designing a study of population centralization. The reasons for selecting a stage theory include, first the fact that a stage theory provides an explanation of population migration which can be related to the concept of population centralization.

The second reason for selecting a stage theory is that a stage theory considers population migration at the neighborhood level. This in turn results in a more refined level of generalization than analysis at the municipal or multi-municipal level. Also by using a neighborhood as the basic unit for measurement of migration the problem of mutual cancelation of opposing migration trends is largely avoided when compared to measurement at the municipal level.

Introduction and

As explained

demonstrate the

growth by using

Connecticut. R

detailed explan

felt to hold p

ulation centra

theory of grow

tion it is nec

of population

study populati

location of re

area of intens

concentrated urba

area.

6 The term
to distinguish
geographical a
activity of lo
area.

CHAPTER 3

STUDY DESIGN

Introduction and General Definitions

As explained in Chapter 2, David Birch was able to demonstrate the existence of a staged pattern of urban growth by using a stage theory in a study of New Haven, Connecticut. Because such a stage theory involves a detailed explanation of population growth it was also felt to hold potential for refining the study of population centralization. In order to apply a stage theory of growth to the study of population centralization it is necessary to begin with a general definition of population centralization. For the purpose of this study population centralization will be defined as: location of residential population within a geographical area of intense urban character. An area of such concentrated urban activity will be defined as a centralized⁶ area.

⁶The terms centralized and centralization are to be distinguished as centralized refers to an actual geographical area and centralization refers to the activity of location of population within a centralized area.

Study Sample

The sample used in this study of centralization was a complete count sample of the twenty-five largest United States urbanized areas in 1970 as defined by the United States Census Bureau. The choice of large urbanized areas for a study sample was based on their potential to represent exaggerated urban conditions along with the fact that they are of major concern for purposes such as public policy planning.

Operational Definition of a Centralized Area

Defining a centralized area poses major problems when the definition must be based on a uniform sources of information for twenty-five different urbanized areas over a twenty year time span. The Census Bureau provides some such statistical information but even this information suffers inconsistencies from one census to the next.

Using census information that was reasonably consistent, a relatively simple definition for a centralized area was devised based on spatial proximity to the central business core of an urbanized area and the density type of residential structures in the area. Such a definition rests on the assumption that areas in the central portion of an urbanized area with high density housing tend to have intense urban characteristics. This assumption has some drawbacks but by using two factors to provide a cross check on each other, reasonable results were

obtained.

There is, of course, a statistical measure of this the creation of which involve the persons involved is not a serious matter as long as the basis of observations is not too small.

The actual effect of the central business district is accomplished by the fact that central business district is a restraining factor on the development of the central business district and is considered as a restraining factor.

The length of the central business district is determined by weighting it by the number of persons in the urbanized area and the radius was determined by the distance between the center of urbanization and the center of equal land cover. The origin of the central business district is as close as could be determined.

obtained.

There is, of course, no universally accepted statistical measure for intense urban character. Because of this the creation of such a statistical measure must involve the personal bias of its creator. Such bias is not a serious problem for comparison studies, however, as long as the bias remains constant for both groups of observations being compared.

The actual determination of spatial proximity to the central business core of the urbanized area was accomplished by extending a single radius outward from that central business core. This radius then served as a restraining limit beyond which areas would not be considered centralized.

The length of the restraining radius was determined by weighting it according to the total land coverage of the urbanized area under question. The actual size of the radius was a length that would have extended half way between the central business core and the outer edge of urbanization in a perfectly concentric urbanized area of equal land coverage to the urbanized area under question. The origin of the restraining radius was located as close as could be determined to the so-called 100% corner

of real estate value in the central business core.⁷

By using a restraining radius in the delineation of a centralized area high density cores that were extremely linear in shape were penalized somewhat if they extended beyond the restraining radius. Of the urbanized areas in the study that were limited somewhat by the restraining radius only Miami, with its high density ocean front development, was limited significantly. The intended purpose of the restraining radius, which actually was to eliminate the numerous high density nodes scattered throughout large urbanized areas, was generally fulfilled successfully.

Once the limiting radius was extended, a centralized area within the radial area was defined in terms of the percent of its total housing units classified by the Census Bureau as being in structures with three or more units.⁸

⁷In two cases, Minneapolis-St. Paul and San Francisco-Oakland, twin centers existed and dual radii were extended by dividing the total urbanized land area. In two other cases, New York and Los Angeles, twin 100% corners existed in close proximity (Mid Town-Downtown, Wilshire Blvd.-Downtown, respectively) in which case the radius was extended from a point midway between the two centers.

⁸Areas of less than 25,000 population which were surrounded on all urbanized sides by centralized areas but had retained a predominance of lower density type units such as the Georgetown area in Washington D.C. were still classified as centralized. Such low density areas with over 25,000 population, however, were considered independent sections of the city and not classified as centralized even if surrounded by centralized areas.

The choice of three or more unit structures for a statistical parameter was designed to balance the amount of areas classified as centralized between the older and younger urbanized areas. As an example, areas such as Philadelphia and Boston were developed with large numbers of three and four unit buildings which are generally as high in density as the predominantly five or more unit structures in apartment areas of Los Angeles and Houston.

The exact percentage of high density units required for classification as a centralized area was set at a simple majority of more than 50%, a point at which an area should start appearing high density in character.

Operational Definition of Population Centralization

Once the centralized portion of an urbanized area had been defined the study's second important definition of population centralization was developed by reference to a stage theory of growth.

According to the general definition of population centralization used in this study all areas within the centralized portion of an urbanized area would experience population centralization of some form. The stage theory of growth was then used to define specific types of centralization into which neighborhoods or sub-areas within a centralized area could be classified.

To describe the development of the centralization

classification system it is convenient to start with a basic description of a stage theory of growth.

In a simplified form a stage theory of growth can be described by a three stage cycle of urban growth.⁹ The first stage of growth in such a three stage cycle would involve the initial building of a neighborhood with a particular housing density type usually dominating the development. Population growth in the initial building stage is generally rapid due to the great amount of land available for development.

The second stage of the cycle would follow the initial building stage with an aging process in which the original housing units would age but still receive the degree of maintenance necessary for preservation of the neighborhood. Few new housing units would be built in this stage because of a lack of building sites and population would remain generally stable.

The third and final stage of the cycle would involve the obsolescence of the original housing units as the increasing amounts of maintenance needed to preserve the housing is discontinued. Population generally declines in this stage but may not do so until the very end.

Ultimately the third stage leads to the removal of the obsolete housing which would in turn create building sites for a new growth cycle to begin. A second

⁹A rural stage was not included in this study.

growth cycle would then follow the pattern of the first, except that the initial building would usually be dominated by a higher density housing type.

For the sake of definition in the study a growth cycle began with predominately one or two unit residential structures will be referred to as a first cycle of growth and a growth cycle began with predominantly three or more unit residential structures will be referred to as a second cycle of growth.

In this system of defining growth cycles the terms first and second refer to residential density types and not necessarily a time ordered sequence. Second cycle neighborhoods then, can be developed in non-urbanized areas without a first cycle ever existing. Such a practice was in fact common in the United States before the widespread use of the automobile and has been regaining popularity since the late 1960's.

In theory it is also possible for a second cycle of growth to be followed by a first cycle but the economic factors involved make such developments very rare.

After starting with the basic three stage growth cycle it was necessary to add certain refinements in the description of particular stages in order to more precisely align the stages with certain forms of population centralization.

In the first stage of a growth cycle, titled the initial building stage, two variations were identified

which were labeled the open and the forced variations. The open variation of the initial building stage has the common characteristics of the initial building stage along with possessing new housing that is designed to compete for residents who have a reasonable amount of options in housing location.

The forced variation also exhibits the basic characteristics of the initial building stage but its new housing is designed only for residents whose income generally force them to reside in the area.

The second stage in the growth cycle, titled the stability stage, is measured as the time period for which the housing units constructed in the initial building period continue to fulfill the function they were originally designed to serve. Occasionally the housing in such a neighborhood can experience some change in use with only a minor or temporary instability of its population, but such areas have been rare in large United States urban centers.

The third stage in the growth cycle, titled the obsolescence stage, is the most complex of the three. Because of the complexity in the obsolescence stage an optional stage, titled the overuse stage was identified as existing within it. Along with this optional stage the obsolescence stage itself can follow a number of individual patterns.

The first common pattern found in the obsolescence

stage is characterized by the obsolescence of the social structure within a neighborhood. Such obsolescence will usually lead to decline in the neighborhood's public facilities such as school systems. When social structure obsolescence occurs the neighborhood often suffers rapid declines in population as families with children leave. Occasionally, however, such neighborhoods reestablish themselves as stable areas with childless couples or single persons as residents.

The second common pattern found in the obsolescence stage is characterized by the actual physical obsolescence of the neighborhood's housing. Once such obsolete housing loses utility it is generally removed for reuse of the land or simply abandoned. It is in this physical obsolescence pattern that the optional overuse stage can occur.

The overuse stage of the growth cycle is characterized by the transfer of obsolete housing to lower income groups who cannot afford other housing. Overcrowding of housing is common in the overuse stage as housing units are often subdivided in order to make low rents profitable. Neighborhoods in this stage commonly experience some momentary increase in population but quickly begin to lose population again as the overused housing quickly becomes unlivable.

A third pattern of obsolescence that for purposes of this study will not be classified as such was also identified. This form of obsolescence involves the economic obsolescence

of the housing in a neighborhood. Such economic obsolescence is caused by rapid increases in land value and is most common in rapidly growing areas. This increase in land value generally results in the removal of physically sound housing to make room for higher density development.

Since such economic obsolescence moves a neighborhood directly from a stability stage to the initial building stage of a new cycle, a stage of obsolescence as defined for this study never occurs. In order to explain the sequence of development in a growth cycle, however, economic obsolescence is presented under the topic of the obsolescence stage.

The three basic stages of the growth cycle, initial building, stability, and obsolescence, generally follow in the time sequence presented above. The duration of any particular stage, however, can vary considerably as David Birch discovered in his study.¹⁰

By using a simple three stage cycle it was possible to apply the resulting stage theory to a wide range of urbanized areas in the United States. The somewhat more elaborate growth cycles of Hoover and Vernon and Birch are not so easily applied because of their customized nature.

¹⁰David L. Birch, "Toward a Stage Theory of Urban Growth", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 37 (March, 1971).

After developing basic stages for a simple growth cycle statistical parameters for the various stages were devised from Census Bureau information. The factors used for this process included the actual population growth in an area between ten year census counts, the percentage of new housing units built during the same ten year time span, the medium family income in an area, and the amount of overcrowded housing units in an area. The actual classification system used is presented in the appendix of this paper.

Once a stage classification system has been devised four types of population centralization were identified. These four types of centralization encompassed all of the various stages in a simple growth cycle. Two of the four types of population centralization were then grouped as being positive in nature and two were grouped as being negative in nature. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the determination of whether a particular type of population centralization was positive or negative in nature was not based entirely on population growth. As examples, in areas in which population rose but did so from overuse of residential units, centralization was considered negative in nature; and in areas in which population showed a slight decline (reflecting the nation wide average decline in population per household) but still was generally stable, centralization was considered positive in nature.

Two specific types of population centralization were then identified as being positive in nature and were labeled active centralization and passive centralization. Two types of population centralization were also identified as being negative in nature and were labeled postponed decentralization and decentralization.

Among the four types of centralization, active centralization was intended to correspond to the open variation of the initial building stage of the growth cycle. In this initial building stage population is either generally stable or rising due to large amounts of new housing construction. The term "active" was used for this stage to refer to its construction activity.

The second type of centralization, passive centralization, was intended to correspond to the stabilization stage of the growth cycle. In this stage the population of an area is generally stable due to the preservation efforts of its residents. The term "passive" used to describe this stage refers to the lack of new construction.

The third type of centralization, postponed decentralization, was intended to correspond to both the forced variation of the initial building stage and the optimal overuse stage of the growth cycle. In both of these stages, the population is either stable or rising but will probably begin decentralizing in a very short time. The term "postponed" used for this stage

refers to the fact that decentralization is only being temporarily postponed.

The final type of centralization, decentralization, was intended to correspond to the obsolescence stage of the growth cycle. In this stage the population declines rapidly as large numbers of people move from the area. The term "decentralization" used for this stage refers to the actual migration of population out of an area.

With a system for stage classifications that corresponded to particular types of population centralization it was possible to classify sub-areas within a centralized area as experiencing either positive or negative population centralization. This, in turn, made it possible to test the study hypothesis.

Restatement of Study Hypothesis

States in testable form, the hypothesis of this study is that the population of census tracts classified as experiencing positive centralization will increase between the 1950's decade and the 1960's decade as a proportion of both the total population in a particular urbanized area and the centralized section of that urbanized area. Such increases in areas experiencing positive centralization would be expected to occur in at least 80% of the urbanized areas in the test in order to be considered widespread in nature.

Outline and Summary of Study Procedure

The actual procedure used in the study was designed to be descriptive in nature as well as test the study hypothesis.

Census tracts were selected as the basic unit of analysis in the study because of the variety of information available at that level and because census tracts often roughly approximate an urban neighborhood. Technically the unit of analysis in the study was the census tract and not the neighborhood. However, a limit of 5,000 population was placed on any single tract or groups of adjacent tracts with centralized characteristics below which analysis was not made because the area was considered too small to constitute a single urban neighborhood. Also predominantly institutional census tracts such as military bases, ships, colleges or other institutional facilities were excluded from analysis along with census tracts that contained fewer than 100 total housing units during the period under study.

After all census tracts within a centralized area were classified according to their position or stage in the growth cycle population totals were calculated for each of the various growth cycle stages. This was followed by a further grouping of population into the four major types of population centralization. The population totals collected from the 1960 census for the 1950 to 1959 time span were

then used as an independent variable and the 1970 population totals for the 1960 to 1969 time span served as a dependent variable.

The actual classifications used in the study are presented in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROWTH CYCLE, CENTRALIZATION
CLASSIFICATION, AND CENSUS TRACT
CLASSIFICATION CODE

<u>Stage in Growth Cycle</u>	<u>Type of Centralization</u>	<u>Nature of Centralization</u>	<u>Census Tract Classification Code</u>
Initial Building- Open Variation	Active Centralization	Positive	1A
Initial Building- Forced Variation	Postponed Decentrali- zation	Negative	1B
Stability	Passive Centralization	Positive	2A
Overuse (Optional)	Postponed Decentrali- zation	Negative	3A
Obsolescence	Decentrali- zation	Negative	4A

By using the detailed classification system developed for the study significant gains were made over the standard central city - suburban study design. These gains occurred in both the conceptualization of population centralization and in the level at which generalizations were made about population migration.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Outline of Presentation

The study presentation will begin with a presentation of the results of testing the study hypothesis. This information will be followed by a detailed analysis of the data gathered in the hypothesis testing procedure.

The detailed data analysis will involve a presentation of statistical results followed by an interpretation of the results and a short subjective description of the actual conditions from which the results were derived. This analysis process will be repeated for each of the twenty-five urbanized areas in the study as well as the totals for all twenty-five areas.

Test of Study Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was that the population of census tracts classified as experiencing positive centralizing would increase between the 1950's and the 1960's as a proportion of both the total population in a particular urbanized area and the centralized section of that urbanized area in 80% of the cases tested.

As stated, the study hypothesis was confirmed, as 96% of the twenty-five urbanized areas tested experienced increases in both the proportion of their urbanized and centralized population classified as experiencing positive centralization.

The actual results of the test are listed below in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF EXTENT OF POSITIVE CENTRALIZATION
IN THE 1950's DECADE WITH
THE 1960's DECADE

<u>Urbanized Area</u>	<u>Percent of Urbanized Population Classified as Experiencing Positive Centralization</u>		<u>Percent of Centralized Population Classified as Experiencing Positive Centralization</u>	
	1950's	1960's	1950's	1960's
New York	6.91	11.97	17.23	32.96
Los Angeles	4.85	8.28	61.33	73.25
Chicago	3.60	6.88	10.98	23.55
Philadelphia	.71	2.46	11.36	40.27
Detroit	.39	.88	7.16	19.95
San Francisco- Oakland	4.45	7.60	26.82	48.16
Boston	4.67	9.92	15.62	37.16
Washington D. C.	9.79	11.43	49.77	55.63
Cleveland	.90	3.01	9.16	30.19
St. Louis	.00	.53	.00	6.75
Pittsburgh	.96	1.14	21.96	23.70
Minneapolis- St. Paul	.77	3.82	7.01	42.07

Urbanized Area

Houston

Baltimore

Dallas

Milwaukee

Seattle

Miami

San Diego

Atlanta

Cincinnati

Kansas City

Buffalo

Denver

San Jose

Average for Total
25 Urbanized Areas

As can be seen, the
urbanized area dis-
tributed in all other urban-
ized areas, the
tendency positive
rapid rates. The
large average in
areas.

TABLE 2--Continued

<u>Urbanized Area</u>	<u>Percent of Urbanized Population Classified as Experiencing Positive Centralization</u>		<u>Percent of Centralized Population Classified as Experiencing Positive Centralization</u>	
	1950's	1960's	1950's	1960's
Houston	.66	3.17	25.28	84.26
Baltimore	1.10	1.40	20.76	27.42
Dallas	2.73	5.18	45.03	56.05
Milwaukee	.00	2.45	.00	44.02
Seattle	1.24	2.86	12.88	36.79
Miami	1.21	3.98	9.17	31.18
San Diego	.81	1.81	17.07	49.76
Atlanta	.97	3.40	8.16	25.75
Cincinnati	.00	4.53	.00	28.05
Kansas City	.57	.00	4.52	.00
Buffalo	.00	.39	.00	8.65
Denver	1.46	5.54	18.41	71.86
San Jose	<u>.00</u>	<u>2.96</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>71.23</u>
Average for Total 25 Urbanized Areas	3.52	6.53	18.12	36.19

As can be seen in Table 2, only the Kansas City urbanized area did not confirm the study hypothesis. In all other urbanized areas, with the exception of Pittsburgh, the percentage of population in areas experiencing positive centralization increased at fairly rapid rates. This general trend is reflected in the large average increase for all twenty-five urbanized areas.

Although the rate of increase for population experiencing positive centralization was large the actual numbers of such persons in the 1960's constituted an average of only 36.19% of all centralized population. This is opposed to 63.81% of all centralized areas in the 1960's that experienced negative centralization.

The balance between positive and negative areas is testimony to the continuing large scale negative centralization taking place in large United States urbanized areas. The continuation of large scale negative centralization is not inconsistent with the study hypothesis, however, as long as it declined in relationship to positive centralization.

Detailed Analysis of Data

Since the study was designed to be descriptive in nature much of its value results from descriptive information gathered from the raw data. As was stated earlier the presentation of this information will involve both an interpretation of the data and a short subjective description of the actual condition from which the data was gathered. The presentation will begin with a summary of all twenty-five urbanized areas followed by a look at each of the twenty-five urbanized areas individually.

A summary of data for all twenty-five urbanized areas is shown in Table 3 on the following page. Some

TABLE 3

Area	1950's Decade	Percent of Centralized	Percent of Unbaptized	1960's Decade	Percent of Unbaptized	Percent of Unbaptized
------	------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

CENTRALIZED AREA

TABLE 3

<u>Area Classification</u>	<u>1950's Decade (1960Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>	<u>1960's Decade (1970Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>
Inside						
1A	1,370,350	11.85	2.30	2,811,986	22.01	3.97
1B	415,235	3.59	.70	437,000	3.42	.62
2A	539,543	4.67	.91	1,258,674	9.85	1.78
3A	1,458,715	12.62	2.45	1,745,234	13.66	2.46
4A	7,344,159	63.52	12.34	5,684,892	44.51	8.03
Total	<u>11,128,002</u>	<u>96.25</u>	<u>18.70</u>	<u>11,937,786</u>	<u>93.46</u>	<u>16.85</u>
Outside						
1A	134,293	1.16	.23	436,984	3.42	.62
1B	26,527	.23	.04	56,662	.44	.08
2A	50,520	.44	.08	115,609	.91	.16
3A	11,455	.10	.02	3,983	.03	.01
4A	211,350	1.83	.36	222,426	1.74	.31
Total	<u>434,145</u>	<u>3.75</u>	<u>.73</u>	<u>835,664</u>	<u>6.54</u>	<u>1.18</u>
						33
Total						
1A	1,504,643	13.01	2.53	3,248,970	25.44	4.59
1B	441,762	3.82	.74	493,662	3.86	.70
2A	590,063	.99	5.10	1,374,283	10.76	1.94
3A	1,470,170	12.72	2.47	1,749,217	13.69	2.47
4A	7,555,509	65.35	12.70	5,907,318	46.25	8.34
Total	<u>11,562,147</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>19.43</u>	<u>12,773,450</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>18.03</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization	2,094,706	18.12	3.52	4,623,253	36.19	6.53
Experiencing Negative Centralization	9,467,441	81.88	15.91	8,150,197	63.81	11.51
Total	11,562,147	100.00	19.43	12,773,450	100.00	18.03

caution must be used in interpreting this summary information because the data is heavily weighted by a very few of the twenty-five urbanized areas. New York, in particular, represented 46.07% of the total centralized population in the summary.

Some statements that can be made about the summary data include the fact that while the total population of all centralized areas increased from the 1950's to the 1960's it did not increase at as great a rate as did the non-centralized areas. By individual count twenty out of twenty-five urbanized areas experienced absolute increases in their centralized population. However, only nine out of twenty-five areas experienced increases in their centralized areas that were greater in rate than the non-centralized portion of their urbanized area.

In looking at individual centralization categories both active and passive centralization showed a rapid and wide-spread increase among the twenty-five urbanized areas. Decentralization, on the other hand, showed a moderately rapid and widespread decrease. Postponed decentralization showed a moderately rapid increase but one that was almost entirely contained in the New York urbanized area.

Centralized areas within central city municipal limits followed a pattern of growth similar to the total of all urbanized areas as they represented 93.46%

of that total in the 1960's even after declining as a percentage since the 1950's.

Centralized areas outside of central cities differed from the summary totals in that they possessed a much greater percentage of population in the active centralization category as well as showing a gain in areas experiencing decentralization and a large gain in areas experiencing postponed decentralization.

To consider the four types of centralization, active, passive, postponed decentralization, and decentralization, conditions in urbanized areas that resulted in classification of active centralization seem to fall into three categories. The first such condition involves the rebuilding of areas in or near the major central business district of an urbanized area with high rise luxury apartment towers. Most of the urbanized areas in the study experienced some degree of this form of building, but only in New York, Chicago, and Washington had it reached a point where a significant net gain in population occurred.

A second common condition resulting in the classification of active centralization is the building of high and medium rise luxury apartments in established high income residential areas. These areas are generally removed somewhat from the central business district but are still within close enough commuting range to create a demand for high density housing. Many of these

areas had experienced some luxury apartment house building between World Wars I and II which in turn provided a high density atmosphere that generally lessens neighborhood oppositions to additional high density development. The fact that such areas usually contained relatively low cost building sites also helped make them prime areas for the resurgence of high density luxury building that has occurred throughout the United States since the early 1960's. Classic examples of such areas would include the Pacific Heights section of San Francisco and the Forest Hills section of Queens Borough, New York as well as some suburban areas such as Brookline, Massachusetts and Lakewood, Ohio.

The third common condition resulting in the classification of active centralization is the building of low rise apartment houses for the middle and lower middle income market. Such apartment development has been extremely active since the earlier 1960's both inside and outside the centralized portion of the urbanized areas. Inside centralized areas such development has tended to occur at the outskirts of the centralized area where land prices are lowest and open sites most readily available. In newer urban centers such as Dallas, Houston, and Atlanta where low cost sites were still available relatively close to the central business district such development was especially attractive because it could offer locational convenience as

well as middle income rents.

Areas classified as experiencing passive centralization increased rapidly in total between the 1950's and the 1960's. This increase, however, was largely contained in eight or nine of the larger urbanized areas. A possible explanation of this occurrence could be that moving to the outskirts of a very large urbanized area usually results in a difficult commuting situation back to employment centers in the central area. Consequently, there might be more incentive for persons in very large urbanized areas to preserve their neighborhoods when possible if their jobs remain in the central area. This preservation incentive in turn often results in an area experiencing passive centralization. Other than size no common factor seemed to be present among the urbanized areas that experienced increased passive centralization.

Areas classified as experiencing postponed centralization showed a modest total increase between the 1950's and 1960's but followed no consistent pattern from one urbanized area to the next. Areas experiencing postponed decentralization of the overuse variety were generally characterized by either in-migrations of large rural families or by high rent levels which resulted in doubling up in apartments.

Areas experiencing postponed decentralization of the forced variation of initial building variety usually

involved public aided housing projects. Of all the urbanized areas in the study only New York and Chicago have continued to build large numbers of housing units in the traditional low income family projects during the 1960's. Low income projects for the elderly, however, have been built at an ever increasing rate in most of the urbanized areas in the study.

Two other forms of postponed decentralization that appeared in scattered instances were developments for students around college campuses and high rent, low income retirement projects developed in the Miami area. Neither of these development forms actually follows the intent of the postponed decentralization classification. Both instead represent a statistical misrepresentation because the income of residents in such areas are usually assisted by parental funds or saving accumulations which actually permit a greater degree of housing options than would otherwise be expected. These final two forms of postponed decentralization accounted for nearly all centralized areas so classified outside the central city in both the 1950's and 1960's.

Areas classified as experiencing decentralization showed a fairly uniform decline throughout most of the twenty-five urbanized areas with only three or four exceptions.

To consider in more depth the similarities and variations in trends among individual urbanized areas

it is helpful to begin by referring to Tables 4 - 29 which provide a summary of centralization characteristics for each of the twenty-five urbanized areas in the study.

The first characteristic to be considered for each of the twenty-five urbanized areas was the amount of area classified as centralized. The extremes for this characteristic ran from an understated high of 36.31%¹¹ in New York, to a low of 3.63% in San Diego. Urbanized areas with centralized portions of over 20.00% included Chicago, Boston, and Washington along with New York and urbanized areas with centralized portions of under 5.00% included Houston, San Jose, Detroit, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh, along with San Diego.

Of the areas classified as centralized most were in the municipal limits of central cities. Major exceptions to this were Arlington in the Washington area; Miami Beach in the Miami area; Brookline, Cambridge, and Somerville in the Boston area; Beverly Hills, Glendale, Inglewood, Pasadena, and West Hollywood in the Los Angeles area; and East Cleveland and Lakewood in the Cleveland area.

Detailed analysis of size variations in centralized

¹¹A significant amount of the centralized area of New York and a small amount of centralized area of Washington were not included in the study because of a lack of census data.

areas was not warranted because of the inability of a particular housing density type to be completely accurate in indicating a highly urbanized area. It is possible, however, to compare the degree of growth in centralized areas as a portion of a given urbanized area. As was stated earlier only nine of the twenty-five urbanized areas in the test experienced increases in the proportion of their population classified as centralized during the 1960's. Of the nine areas that did have such increases only four, Los Angeles, Houston, Dallas, and San Jose increased by any significant margin. These same four areas also had very high percentages of their centralized areas classified as actively centralizing and were marked by large amounts of low-rise middle income apartment development.

Urbanized areas experiencing a significant decline in the proportion of their population classified as centralized between the 1950's and 1960's included Detroit, St. Louis, Buffalo, and Kansas City, all of which had large declining central areas with little rebuilding activity. These areas were joined by Seattle and San Diego which experienced such high rates of noncentralized growth that centralized growth suffered in comparison. The three most highly centralized areas, New York, Chicago, and Boston, also suffered declines in their centralized area of a somewhat less severe magnitude, while the fourth most highly centralized area, Washington,

experienced an increase in its degree of centralization.

In order to consider the specific centralization characteristics of each of the twenty-five urbanized areas in the study each area will be covered individually by a short subjective analysis beginning with New York.

NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA

The New York urbanized area contained the largest and one of the most mature centralized areas in the study. The use of the term mature refers to the fact that the centralized portion of the New York area experienced considerable positive centralization during the 1950's. Consequently the New York area entered the 1960's with a history of demand for centralized living unlike most of the other areas in the study.

Even with its early start the New York urbanized area experienced a large increase in positive centralization during the 1960's. Along with this increase positive centralization exhibited a major change in its pattern of occurrence from the 1950's to the 1960's which corresponded quite closely to the national pattern.

During the 1950's positive centralization in the New York area was dominated by the active variety of positive centralization which occurred at the edge of the urbanized area in the boroughs of Queens, Brooklyn, and Bronx. This active centralization took the form of mixed high, medium, and low rise development build on vacant or low density sites passed over by the single family development that had preceded it. The passive variety of positive centralization during this time accounted for less than 4.00% of New York's total centralized area and was largely contained in Brooklyn.

By the 1960's positive centralization has increased in total from 17.23% of the centralized area to 32.96%. This increase was due to a very large increase in active centralization in Manhattan where extensive rebuilding efforts, both public and private, were completed during the 1960's. Large increases in active centralization also occurred in Bronx in the form of extensive high rise building. This building was concentrated in the Riverdale section of the Bronx as well as the initial development of giant Co-op City on the borough's north-east side. Some increases in active centralization were also recorded in Brooklyn and Richmond during the 1960's which more than offsets a slight decline in Queens during the same time.

In general active centralization changed significantly in nature from the 1950's to the 1960's. This change resulted from a shift in building activity from the relatively open sites at the edge of the centralized area to sites requiring extensive clearance at the center of town.

Areas experiencing the passive variety of active centralization during the 1960's had a uniformly rapid increase throughout the boroughs. The only exception to this was Richmond which was still too young in terms of high density development to experience a stable situation. Of the areas experiencing passive centralization those at the outer edge of the centralized area may

have been caused by the relatively new housing stock that was constructed there in the 1950's. The large increases in passive centralization in Manhattan as well as the central parts of Brooklyn, Bronx and Queens, however, is a reflection of the tremendous increase in long term preservation efforts that has occurred in the New York area during the 1960's.

Negative centralization in the New York area experienced large declines of the decentralization variety. These declines centered in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Bronx, reflecting an increasing interest in long term preservation mentioned earlier. Queens and Richmond, however, showed a small increase in this variety of negative centralization as both boroughs have relatively new housing stocks that are just beginning to move into the obsolescence stage of the growth cycle.

The New York area's only growth in negative centralization came in the form of postponed decentralization. Strong growth in this category appeared in Brooklyn, Bronx, and Queens while a sharp decline took place in Manhattan. These trends resulted from migration of lower income families from Manhattan to the other three boroughs.

In summary, the increase in positive centralization in the New York area was largely responsible for New York City being one of the very few large cities in the United States to gain population in the 1960's without annexations.

TABLE 4
NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Bronx						
1A	146,284	1.04	2.58	248,808	1.54	4.23
1B	28,556	.20	.50	77,729	.48	1.32
2A	29,672	.21	.52	109,799	.68	1.87
3A	212,059	1.50	3.75	375,364	2.32	6.38
4A	807,867	5.72	14.27	491,877	3.03	8.36
Total	<u>1,224,438</u>	<u>8.68</u>	<u>21.62</u>	<u>1,303,577</u>	<u>8.04</u>	<u>22.15</u>
Brooklyn						
1A	182,169	1.29	3.22	260,594	1.61	4.43
1B	109,391	.78	1.93	59,755	.37	1.02
2A	90,562	.64	1.60	264,970	1.63	4.50
3A	310,166	2.20	5.48	595,789	3.68	10.12
4A	1,396,926	9.90	24.67	975,317	6.02	16.57
Total	<u>2,089,214</u>	<u>14.80</u>	<u>36.90</u>	<u>2,156,425</u>	<u>13.31</u>	<u>36.64</u>
Manhattan						
1A	68,280	.48	1.21	372,353	2.30	6.33
1B	69,302	.49	1.22	50,204	.31	.85
2A	49,920	.35	.88	92,026	.57	1.56
3A	281,548	1.99	4.97	90,292	.56	1.53
4A	1,216,888	8.62	21.49	922,221	5.69	15.67
Total	<u>1,685,938</u>	<u>11.95</u>	<u>29.77</u>	<u>1,527,096</u>	<u>9.42</u>	<u>25.95</u>
Queens						
1A	367,333	2.60	6.49	336,306	2.08	5.71
1B	4,456	.03	.08	--	--	--
2A	41,484	.29	.73	182,379	1.13	3.10
3A	16,858	.12	.30	92,880	.57	1.58
4A	227,513	1.61	4.02	239,450	1.48	4.07
Total	<u>657,644</u>	<u>4.66</u>	<u>11.61</u>	<u>851,015</u>	<u>5.25</u>	<u>14.46</u>

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Richmond	--	--	--	20,596	.13	.35
Borough	--	--	--	--	--	--
Only	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	5,127	.04	.09	1,309	.01	.02
Total	5,127	.04	.09	21,905	.14	.37
Total	764,066	5.41	13.49	1,238,657	7.64	21.05
Inside	211,705	1.50	3.74	187,688	1.16	3.19
Central	211,638	1.50	3.74	649,174	4.01	11.03
City	820,631	5.81	14.49	1,154,325	7.12	19.62
4A	3,654,321	25.89	64.54	2,630,174	16.23	44.69
Total	5,662,361	40.12	100.00	5,850,018	36.10	99.41
46						
Outside	--	--	--	9,040	.06	.15
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	--	--	--	15,670	.10	.27
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	10,022	.06	.17
Total	--	--	--	34,732	.21	.59

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

<u>Area Classification</u>	<u>1950's Decade (1960Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>	<u>1960's Decade (1970Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>
1A	764,066	5.41	13.49	1,247,697	7.70	21.20
1B	211,705	1.50	3.74	187,688	1.16	3.19
2A	211,638	1.50	3.74	694,844	4.29	11.81
3A	820,631	5.81	14.49	1,154,325	7.12	19.62
4A	3,654,321	25.89	64.54	2,640,196	16.29	44.87
Total	5,662,361	40.12	100.00	5,884,750	36.31	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	975,704	6.91	17.23	1,939,469	11.97	32.96
Experiencing Negative Centralization	4,686,657	33.21	82.77	3,945,281	24.34	67.04
Total	5,662,361	40.12	100.00	5,884,750	36.31	100.00

LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Los Angeles area saw major increases in positive centralization during the 1960's as the urbanized area so famous for its low density sprawl began showing signs of running out of land. This active centralization was dominated by low rise apartment development which was spread more heavily at the edge of the centralized area than at the center. Major growth nuclei for active centralization in the Los Angeles area occurred in the Hollywood, North Hollywood-Van Nays, Westwood and West Los Angeles sections of the city of Los Angeles and in the suburbs of West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Glendale, Inglewood and Pasadena.

Passive centralization in the 1960's was a minor factor in the Los Angeles area and demonstrated no signs of growth between the 1950's and 1960's. This lack of stable areas is typical, however, of very rapidly growing urban areas.

Negative centralization also increased in the Los Angeles area but not at as great a rate as positive centralization. The decentralization variety of negative centralization declined between the 1950's and 1960's but postponed decentralization showed large increases which more than offset the decline in decentralization.

In summary, the centralization portion of the Los Angeles area grew rapidly in the 1960's but may experience reversal of that trend as its areas of postponed decentralization continue to age.

TABLE 5
LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	1A	2.86	36.22	414,770	4.97	43.93
	1B	--	--	22,704	.27	2.40
Central	2A	.77	9.69	51,760	.62	5.48
City	3A	.48	6.03	115,514	1.38	12.23
	4A	<u>2.48</u>	<u>31.44</u>	<u>82,425</u>	<u>.99</u>	<u>8.73</u>
Total		<u>6.59</u>	<u>83.37</u>	<u>687,173</u>	<u>8.23</u>	<u>72.78</u>
Outside	1A	1.07	13.49	215,606	2.58	22.83
	1B	--	--	3,887	.05	.41
Central	2A	.15	1.93	9,503	.11	1.01
City	3A	--	--	--	--	--
	4A	<u>.10</u>	<u>1.20</u>	<u>28,059</u>	<u>.34</u>	<u>2.97</u>
Total		<u>1.31</u>	<u>16.63</u>	<u>257,055</u>	<u>3.08</u>	<u>27.22</u>
	1A	3.93	49.71	630,376	7.55	66.76
	1B	--	--	26,591	.32	2.82
Total	2A	.92	11.63	61,263	.73	6.49
	3A	.48	6.03	115,514	1.38	12.23
	4A	<u>2.58</u>	<u>32.64</u>	<u>110,484</u>	<u>1.32</u>	<u>11.70</u>
Total		<u>7.90</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>944,228</u>	<u>11.31</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization		4.85	61.33	691,639	8.28	73.25
Experiencing Negative Centralization		3.06	38.67	252,589	3.03	26.75
Total		<u>7.90</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>944,228</u>	<u>11.31</u>	<u>100.00</u>

CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA

The highly centralized Chicago urbanized area experienced conflicting trends in the 1960's with negative centralization dominating but losing ground to positive centralization.

Positive centralization in the Chicago area was evenly divided during the 1960's between active and passive centralization. Active centralization, however, exhibited a much greater rate of growth during the 1960's than passive centralization. Active centralization in the Chicago area was concentrated largely in the high rise development areas along the North Lake Shore with smaller pockets existing in the Hyde Park - South Shore area of the city of Chicago and the Oak Park - Elmwood area in the suburbs. Passive centralization was strongest in the newer middle class areas at the edge of the centralized area with the Rogers Park - West Ridge area being the largest of the group.

Negative centralization declined somewhat between the 1950's and 1960's throughout most of the centralized area. The only exception to this was the near west side of the city of Chicago which experienced large declines in population due to the city's clearance efforts.

In summary, if the present trend toward positive centralization continues, and the city starts to rebuild its west side, an end of the dominance of negative centralization might appear in the near future.

TABLE 6
CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside Central City	86,215 44,108 114,832 403,581 1,282,565 <u>1,931,301</u>	1.45 .74 1.93 6.77 21.51 <u>32.40</u>	4.41 2.26 5.87 20.64 65.59 <u>98.77</u>	242,180 73,230 171,555 282,724 1,137,050 <u>1,906,739</u>	3.61 1.09 2.55 4.21 16.93 <u>28.40</u>	12.35 3.73 8.75 14.41 57.96 <u>97.20</u>
Total						
Outside Central City	3,509 -- 10,186 -- 10,316 <u>24,011</u>	.06 -- .17 -- .17 <u>.40</u>	.18 -- .52 -- .53 <u>1.23</u>	24,663 -- 23,618 -- 6,633 <u>54,914</u>	.37 -- .35 -- .10 <u>.82</u>	1.26 -- 1.20 -- .34 <u>2.80</u>
Total						
1A	89,724	1.51	4.59	266,843	3.97	13.60
1B	44,108	.74	2.26	73,230	1.09	3.73
2A	125,018	2.10	6.39	195,173	2.91	9.95
3A	403,581	6.77	20.64	282,724	4.21	14.41
4A	1,292,881	21.69	66.12	1,143,683	17.03	58.30
Total	<u>1,955,312</u>	<u>32.80</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>1,961,653</u>	<u>29.21</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization	214,742	3.60	10.98	462,016	6.88	23.55
Experiencing Negative Centralization	1,740,570	29.20	89.02	1,499,637	22.33	76.45
Total	<u>1,955,312</u>	<u>32.80</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>1,961,653</u>	<u>29.21</u>	<u>100.00</u>

PHILADELPHIA URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Philadelphia urbanized area experienced great growth between the 1950's and 1960's in the positive centralization category while at the same time experiencing some decline in negative centralization.

Most of the growth in positive centralization was due to a large increase in active centralization in the center of the city of Philadelphia concentrated in the Penn Center and Society Hill areas. Fairly large increases in active centralization also occurred in a belt along the Northwest side of the city of Philadelphia running from the Belmont area east to Germantown. The Philadelphia area also experienced an increase in passive centralization which was heavily concentrated in the West Philadelphia section of the city next to the University of Pennsylvania.

Negative centralization in the Philadelphia area declined somewhat between the 1950's and 1960's as areas experiencing postponed decentralization disappeared altogether in the 1960's and areas experiencing decentralization, mainly concentrated in the North side of central Philadelphia, showed some decline.

In summary, the trend toward positive centralization in the Philadelphia area seems to be on the verge of gaining dominance over negative centralization.

TABLE 7
PHILADELPHIA URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	18,405	.51	8.14	50,833	1.26	20.68
Central	--	--	--	316	.01	.13
City	7,277	.20	3.22	48,165	1.20	19.59
3A	20,808	.57	9.20	--	--	--
4A	179,567	4.94	79.43	146,500	3.64	59.60
Total	226,057	6.22	100.00	245,814	6.11	100.00
Outside	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	18,405	.51	8.14	50,833	1.26	20.68
1B	--	--	--	316	.01	.13
2A	7,277	.20	3.22	48,165	1.20	19.59
3A	20,808	.57	9.20	--	--	--
4A	179,567	4.94	79.43	146,500	3.64	59.60
Total	226,057	6.22	100.00	245,814	6.11	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	25,682	.71	11.36	98,998	2.46	40.27
Experiencing Negative Centralization	200,375	5.51	88.64	146,816	3.65	59.73
Total	226,057	6.22	100.00	245,814	6.11	100.00

DETROIT URBANIZED AREA

Even after showing a rapid rate of increase in positive centralization between the 1950's and 1960's the Detroit urbanized area was still overwhelmingly dominated by negative centralization.

Positive centralization in the Detroit area during the 1960's involved continued active centralization on a small scale in the Indian Village section of the city of Detroit as well as new construction in the Lafayette Urban Renewal Project. Positive centralization of both the active and passive variety also showed an increase on the Northwest edge of the centralized area centering along the Boston-Chicago Avenue corridor. Most of the stabilization in this area was due to a large middle income black population which settled in the area. This may, however, involve future problems for the area if the black middle income families move outward as housing opportunities in areas with better school systems become available.

In summary unless the Detroit centralized area can maintain its growing middle class black population, or encourage a greater rate of development along the Jefferson Avenue - Riverfront area, negative centralization will remain the dominant force in the area for the foreseeable future.

TABLE 8
DETROIT URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	10 .43 .29 .42 <u>3.86</u> 5.11	1.91 7.83 5.25 7.57 <u>70.44</u> 93.00	11,796 -- 19,624 17,026 <u>111,058</u> 159,504	.30 -- .49 .43 <u>2.80</u> 4.02	6.74 -- 11.21 9.72 <u>63.41</u> 91.08
Outside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	-- -- -- -- <u>.38</u> .38	-- -- -- -- <u>7.00</u> 7.00	-- -- 3,514 3,983 <u>8,130</u> 15,627	-- -- .09 .10 <u>.20</u> .39	-- -- 2.01 2.27 <u>4.64</u> 8.92
Total	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	10 .43 .29 .42 <u>4.25</u> 5.49	1.91 7.83 5.25 7.57 <u>77.44</u> 100.00	11,796 -- 23,138 21,009 <u>119,188</u> 175,131	.30 -- .58 .53 <u>3.00</u> 4.41	6.74 -- 13.21 12.00 <u>68.06</u> 100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	13,897	.39	7.16	34,934	.88	19.95
Experiencing Negative Centralization	180,139	5.10	92.84	140,197	3.53	80.05
Total	194,036	5.49	100.00	175,131	4.41	100.00

SAN FRANCISCO - OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA

The San Francisco - Oakland urbanized area is comprised of four separate centralized areas with major centers existing in the central cities of San Francisco and Oakland and minor centers existing in the suburban cities of Berkeley and Alameda.

In looking at positive centralization in the San Francisco - Oakland area active centralization developed rapidly between the 1950's and 1960's in the centralized portions of Oakland, San Francisco, and Alameda. The centralized portion of Berkeley, however, remained generally stable in the active centralization category. Major areas of active centralization in the San Francisco - Oakland area included the upper Market Street - Twin Peaks area and the Pacific Heights area of San Francisco, the Lake Merritt area of Oakland and the Southcentral part of Alameda.

Passive centralization in the San Francisco - Oakland area was almost totally contained in the city of San Francisco which experienced a substantial gain in passive centralization due to the city's heavy emphasis on preservation.

Negative centralization in the San Francisco - Oakland area was also greatest in the city of San Francisco. San Francisco did experience a large drop in decentralization but had a sizable increase in postponed decentralization. This was probably due to the city's high rent levels

which resulted in doubling up and overcrowding apartment units. Oakland experienced only a minor amount of negative centralization almost all in the form of decentralizing areas and Berkeley experienced a major increase in both decentralization and postponed decentralization. Berkeley's situation was due to a combination of low income student families replacing higher income families in the centralized area, a rapid conversion of residential property to commercial property and the inclusion of the North Oakland slums into lower Berkeley.

In summary, the city of San Francisco seems to have great potential for continued growth of positive centralization, but at the same time faces a continued potential for negative centralization. Oakland, unlike San Francisco, has not experienced a widespread interest in preservation and may face a slowdown in positive centralization once land for low rise development becomes scarce. Berkeley will probably continue to maintain a large student population in its centralized area irregardless of its postponed decentralization classification and Alameda, like Oakland, will probably face a slowdown in positive centralization as sites for low rise development become scarce.

TABLE 9
SAN FRANCISCO URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
San Francisco						
1A	8,967	.37	2.26	63,425	2.12	13.45
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	47,727	1.99	12.00	71,946	2.41	15.26
3A	10,176	.42	2.56	53,804	1.80	11.41
4A	243,132	10.15	61.16	135,031	4.52	28.63
Total	310,002	12.94	77.98	324,206	10.85	68.75
Oakland						
1A	26,064	1.09	6.56	51,368	1.72	10.89
1B	--	--	--	6,268	.21	1.33
2A	--	--	--	5,061	.17	1.07
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	30,978	1.29	7.79	26,059	.87	5.53
Total	57,042	2.38	14.35	88,756	2.97	18.82
Total Inside Central City						
1A	35,031	1.46	8.81	114,793	3.84	24.34
1B	--	--	--	6,268	.21	1.33
2A	47,727	1.99	12.00	77,007	2.58	16.33
3A	10,176	.42	2.56	53,804	1.80	11.41
4A	274,110	11.44	68.95	161,090	5.39	34.16
Total	367,044	15.32	92.32	412,962	13.82	87.57
Outside Central City						
1A	18,288	.76	4.60	31,689	1.06	6.72
1B	--	--	--	11,118	.37	2.36
2A	5,584	.23	1.40	3,606	.12	.76
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	6,646	.28	1.67	12,211	.41	2.59
Total	30,518	1.27	7.68	58,624	1.96	12.43

CENTRALIZED AREA

TABLE 9 (CONTINUED)

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	53,319	2.23	13.41	146,482	4.90	31.06
1B	--	--	--	17,386	.58	3.69
Total 2A	53,311	2.23	13.41	80,613	2.70	17.09
3A	10,176	.42	2.56	53,804	1.80	11.41
4A	280,756	11.72	70.62	173,301	5.80	36.75
Total	397,562	16.60	100.00	471,586	15.78	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	106,630	4.45	26.82	227,095	7.60	48.16
Experiencing Negative Centralization	290,932	12.15	73.18	244,491	8.18	51.84
Total	397,562	16.60	100.00	471,586	15.78	100.00

BOSTON URBANIZED AREA

The Boston area experienced considerable gain in positive centralization from the 1950's to the 1960's as well as some decline in negative centralization. Negative centralization, however, continued to be the dominate force in the centralized portion of the city of Boston throughout the 1960's.

Positive centralization in the Boston area, both of the active and positive variety, was heavily concentrated in a long belt running along the Charles River. This belt originates at the Central Business District of the City of Boston, passes through the Beacon Hill, Back Bay, and Boston University areas of Boston, continues through the Northern half of the suburb of Brookline, and the Brighton Allston sections of Boston and ends in the suburb of Cambridge.

Negative centralization in the Boston area was not only prevalent in the city of Boston but was also significant and far more persistent during the 1960's in the suburbs of Cambridge and Somerville. Like Boston many of the central suburbs in the area have old housing stocks which require extensive maintenance. This housing often falls into obsolescence resulting in negative centralization.

In summary, the Boston area should have continued potential for positive centralization with its great resource of universities, but will also face continued potential for decentralization because of the general age of housing in the centralized portion of the area.

TABLE 10
BOSTON URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	2.08 .79 1.44 .26 17.91 <u>22.47</u>	6.96 2.64 4.82 .85 59.96 <u>75.23</u>	71,479 10,160 94,031 23,884 286,103 <u>485,657</u>	2.69 .38 3.54 .90 10.79 <u>18.31</u>	10.09 1.43 13.27 3.37 40.38 <u>68.55</u>
Outside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	.31 -- .84 .47 5.77 <u>7.40</u>	1.03 -- 2.82 1.59 19.33 <u>24.77</u>	56,834 -- 40,903 -- 125,074 <u>222,811</u>	2.14 -- 1.54 -- 4.72 <u>8.40</u>	8.02 -- 5.77 -- 17.65 <u>31.45</u>
Total	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	2.39 .79 2.28 .73 23.69 <u>29.87</u>	7.99 2.64 7.64 2.44 79.29 <u>100.00</u>	128,313 10,160 134,934 23,884 411,177 <u>708,468</u>	4.84 .38 5.09 .90 15.50 <u>26.71</u>	18.11 1.43 19.05 3.37 58.04 <u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization		4.67	15.62	263,247	9.92	37.16
Experiencing Negative Centralization		25.20	84.38	445,221	16.78	62.84
Total		29.87	100.00	708,468	26.71	100.00

WASHINGTON URBANIZED AREA

The Washington area, during the 1960's, demonstrated great potential for positive centralization but at the same time faced a relatively small but persistent potential with negative centralization.

Reflecting the large growth of the Washington area, positive centralization was dominated by active centralization. Such active centralization was the result of great building activity in the form of high rise development scattered throughout the whole Northwest side of the city of Washington. This was accompanied by high and low rise development in the Southwest urban renewal area and low rise development on the city's Southeast side. Even more intensive development occurred in the form of high rise development in the Rosslyn-Clarendon and Shirley Highway - Columbia Pike areas of the suburb of Arlington.

Negative centralization, largely of the decentralization variety, showed a small increase in the city of Washington during the 1960's and remained at about the same level in Arlington.

In summary, the Washington area should continue to have great potential for positive centralization as long as the federal government continues to expand. The biggest question facing the centralized portion of Washington is how stable the areas now actively developing will be in the future.

TABLE 11
WASHINGTON D. C. URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside						
1A	118,575	6.56	33.34	171,629	6.92	33.65
1B	8,111	.45	2.28	16,167	.65	3.17
2A	30,712	1.70	8.64	43,769	1.76	8.58
3A	31,013	1.71	9.82	49,716	2.00	9.75
4A	121,955	6.74	34.29	136,234	5.49	26.71
Total	<u>310,366</u>	<u>17.16</u>	<u>87.27</u>	<u>417,515</u>	<u>16.83</u>	<u>81.85</u>
Outside						
1A	23,526	1.30	6.61	64,220	2.59	12.59
1B	---	---	---	---	---	---
2A	4,198	.23	1.18	4,137	.17	.81
3A	---	---	---	---	---	---
4A	17,569	.97	4.94	24,202	.98	4.74
Total	<u>45,293</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>12.73</u>	<u>92,559</u>	<u>3.73</u>	<u>18.15</u>
						63
1A	142,101	7.86	39.95	235,849	9.50	46.24
1B	8,111	.45	2.28	16,167	.65	3.17
2A	34,910	1.93	9.82	47,906	1.93	9.39
3A	31,013	1.71	8.72	49,716	2.00	9.75
4A	139,524	7.72	39.23	160,436	6.47	31.45
Total	<u>355,659</u>	<u>19.67</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>510,074</u>	<u>20.56</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization	177,011	9.79	49.77	283,755	11.43	55.63
Experiencing Negative Centralization	178,648	9.88	50.23	226,319	9.12	44.37
Total	355,659	19.67	100.00	510,074	20.56	100.00

CLEVELAND URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Cleveland area experienced a major movement in the direction of positive centralization in the 1960's when compared to the almost total dominance of negative centralization during the 1950's.

Positive centralization in the Cleveland area was concentrated in areas with easy commuting access to the central business district, and in areas at the edge of the centralized area where low rise middle income apartments could be developed. The only area inside the city limits of Cleveland to experience active centralization was an outgrowth of the high and medium rise development in the suburb of Lakewood which extended somewhat into the western limits of the city of Cleveland. Cleveland did experience some passive centralization on its East side which tied into a larger pattern of positive centralization existing in the suburbs of East Cleveland and Cleveland Heights.

Negative centralization decreased somewhat, both inside and outside of the city of Cleveland. This pattern was especially noticeable in the postponed decentralization category.

In summary, the city of Cleveland is presently promoting a number of renewal projects in the central business district that involve construction of residential units. Negative centralization, however, should continue to be a major force for some time to come.

TABLE 12
CLEVELAND URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A	5,627 -- -- 48,348 96,631	.32 -- -- 2.71 5.42	3.19 -- -- 27.45 54.86	10,772 2,109 21,364 2,822	5.51 1.08 10.94 1.44
Total	150,606	8.44	85.50	123,356	6.29	63.14
				160,423	8.19	82.11
Outside Central City	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A	10,409 -- -- -- 15,135	.58 -- -- -- 1.85	5.91 -- -- -- 8.59	12,188 -- 14,658 -- 8,095	6.24 -- 7.50 -- 4.14
Total	25,544	1.43	14.50	34,941	1.78	17.89
	1A 1B 2A 3A 4A	16,036 -- -- 48,348 111,766	.90 -- -- 2.71 6.27	9.10 -- -- 27.45 63.45	1.17 1.11 1.84 1.14 6.71	11.75 1.08 18.44 1.44 67.29
Total	176,150	9.88	100.00	195,364	9.97	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	16,036	.90	9.10	58,982	3.01	30.19
Experiencing Negative Centralization	160,114	8.98	90.90	136,382	6.96	69.81
Total	176,150	9.88	100.00	195,364	9.97	100.00

ST. LOUIS URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the St. Louis area was dominated overwhelmingly by negative centralization in both the 1950's and 1960's. Even with a small gain in positive centralization areas experiencing negative centralization still accounted for more than 90% of the centralized portion of the St. Louis area in the 1960's.

The areas in St. Louis experiencing positive centralization include two urban renewal projects near the central business district, a small area near Washington University, and a small area near the edge of the St. Louis city limits sheltered from the rest of the city by Forest Park.

Negative centralization in the St. Louis area showed few of the signs of decline that were common in most of the other urbanized areas under study.

In summary, even with the signs of positive centralization that did occur in the 1960's there is little reason to believe that negative centralization will not continue to dominate the centralized portion of the St. Louis area for some time to come.

]

TABLE 1

TABLE 13
ST. LOUIS URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	--	--	--	5,450	.29	3.68
1B	20,833	1.25	12.75	18,924	1.01	12.78
2A	--	--	--	4,538	.24	3.07
3A	11,121	.67	6.81	6,731	.36	4.55
4A	131,388	7.88	80.44	112,389	5.97	75.92
Total	163,342	9.79	100.00	148,032	7.86	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	5,450	.29	3.68
1B	20,833	1.25	12.75	18,924	1.01	12.78
2A	--	--	--	4,538	.24	3.07
3A	11,121	.67	6.81	6,731	.36	4.55
4A	131,388	7.88	80.44	112,389	5.97	75.92
Total	163,342	9.79	100.00	148,032	7.86	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	--	--	--	9,988	.53	6.75
Experiencing Negative Centralization	163,342	9.79	100.00	138,044	7.33	93.25
Total	163,342	9.79	100.00	148,032	7.86	100.00

PITTSBURGH URBANIZED AREA

The Pittsburgh area is unique among large urbanized areas in that it experienced almost no growth during the 1960's. The centralized portion of the Pittsburgh area, which represents only a small part of the total urbanized area, followed this pattern of limited growth with few changes occurring from the 1950's to the 1960's.

Passive centralization did increase enough in the Pittsburgh area during the 1960's to result in a modest increase for positive centralization. The little active centralization that did occur was concentrated in the Pittsburgh central business district and the Oakland district near the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Tech.

Negative centralization remained at about the same level in both the 1950's and 1960's and was the dominate force in the area.

In summary, although there is little reason to believe that the situation in the Pittsburgh area will change much in the near future, there have been some urban renewal efforts of considerable size around the central business district of Pittsburgh including Allegheny Center on the near north side that should stimulate positive centralization in the 1970's.

TABLE 14
PITTSBURGH URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	13,010	.72	16.50	12,449	.67	13.96
1B	--	--	--	972	.05	1.09
2A	4,312	.24	5.47	8,683	.47	9.74
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	61,549	3.41	78.04	67,052	3.63	75.21
Total	78,871	4.37	100.00	89,156	4.83	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	13,010	.72	16.50	12,449	.67	13.96
1B	--	--	--	972	.05	1.09
2A	4,312	.24	5.47	8,683	.47	9.74
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	61,549	3.41	78.04	67,052	3.63	75.21
Total	78,871	4.37	100.00	89,156	4.83	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	17,322	.96	21.96	21,132	1.14	23.70
Experiencing Negative Centralization	61,549	3.41	78.04	68,024	3.68	76.30
Total	78,871	4.37	100.00	89,156	4.83	100.00

MINNEAPOLIS - ST. PAUL URBANIZED AREA

The dual centralized areas in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul experienced major gains in positive centralization in the 1960's compared to the almost total dominance of negative centralization in the 1950's.

The strongest growth in positive centralization occurred in the centralized portion of Minneapolis which experienced significant gains in active centralization. This active centralization was concentrated in the central business district, University of Minnesota area, and along the Hennepin Avenue corridor running southwest from the central business district.

The centralization portion of St. Paul experienced a small growth in positive centralization near the central business district and some low rise active centralization on the northern border of the centralized area.

The centralized portions of both Minneapolis and St. Paul experienced general declines in negative centralization in the 1960's but Minneapolis experienced a large decline while St. Paul experienced only a minor decline.

In summary, the centralized portion of the Minneapolis - St. Paul area in Minneapolis seems to be on the verge of experiencing a dominance of positive centralization while St. Paul shows no real signs of attaining such a position as yet.

TABLE 15
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Minneapolis	10,615	.77	7.01	38,755	2.27	25.07
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	13,645	.80	8.83
3A	--	--	--	6,220	.36	4.02
4A	108,201	7.86	71.46	58,023	3.40	37.54
Total	118,816	8.63	78.47	116,643	6.84	75.46
St. Paul	--	--	--	12,632	.74	8.17
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	32,598	2.37	21.53	25,302	1.48	16.37
Total	32,598	2.37	21.53	37,934	2.23	24.54
Total	10,615	.77	7.01	51,387	3.01	33.24
Inside	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	13,645	.80	8.83
City	--	--	--	6,220	.36	4.02
4A	140,799	10.22	92.99	83,325	4.89	53.91
Total	151,414	10.99	100.00	154,577	9.07	100.00
Outside	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--

CENTRALIZED AREA

TABLE 15 (CONTINUED)

<u>Area Classification</u>	<u>1950's Decade (1960Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>	<u>1960's Decade (1970Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>
1A	10,615	.77	7.01	51,387	3.01	33.24
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total 2A	--	--	--	13,645	.80	8.83
3A	--	--	--	6,220	.36	4.02
4A	<u>140,799</u>	<u>10.22</u>	<u>92.99</u>	<u>83,325</u>	<u>4.89</u>	<u>53.91</u>
Total	151,414	10.99	100.00	154,577	9.07	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	10,615	.77	7.01	65,032	3.82	42.04
Experiencing Negative Centralization	<u>140,799</u>	<u>10.22</u>	<u>92.99</u>	<u>89,545</u>	<u>5.25</u>	<u>57.93</u>
Total	151,414	10.99	100.00	154,577	9.07	100.00

HOUSTON URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Houston urbanized area was small in the 1960's but grew rapidly. Like other young urbanized areas the centralized portion of the Houston area had numerous available sites for development during the 1960's. Because of the available land in the centralized portion of the Houston area, the 1960's were dominated by positive centralization of the active variety. This dominance almost completely reversed an earlier trend in the 1950's of negative centralization.

Positive centralization in the Houston area was concentrated to the south and west of the central business district locating close to Houston's finest residential areas. Negative centralization, on the other hand, remained in the immediate area surrounding the central business district in both the 1950's and 1960's.

In summary, positive centralization in Houston should last as long as the nationwide popularity of apartment living, but may slow down as its centralized area runs out of sites for low rise apartments.

TABLE 16
HOUSTON URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	7,506	.66	25.28	46,382	2.76	73.48
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	6,805	.41	10.78
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	22,191	1.95	74.72	9,932	.59	15.74
Total	29,697	2.61	100.00	63,119	3.76	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	7,506	.66	25.28	46,382	2.76	73.48
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	6,805	.41	10.78
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	22,191	1.95	74.72	9,932	.59	15.74
Total	29,697	2.61	100.00	63,119	3.76	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	7,506	.66	25.28	53,187	3.17	84.26
Experiencing Negative Centralization	22,191	1.95	74.72	9,932	.59	15.74
Total	29,697	2.61	100.00	63,119	3.76	100.00

BALTIMORE URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Baltimore area was comparatively small and dominated by negative centralization in both the 1950's and 1960's. The small growth in positive centralization experienced by the centralized area resulted from urban renewal in the central business district, and some private high rise development in the Washington Monument area. This positive centralization was continued further by high and medium rise development in the traditionally attractive Guilford area north of Johns Hopkins University.

In summary, even though the Baltimore area has experienced successful residential renewal in the central business area and Johns Hopkins University remains a strong attraction for positive centralization, there is little reason to believe that positive centralization will pose a serious challenge to negative centralization in the near future.

TABLE 17
BALTIMORE URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	10,994	.77	14.59	22,068	1.40	27.42
1B	4,095	.29	5.43	5,169	.33	6.42
2A	4,648	.33	6.17	--	--	--
3A	5,859	.41	7.78	9,986	.63	12.41
4A	49,749	3.51	66.03	43,247	2.74	53.74
Total	75,345	5.31	100.00	80,470	5.09	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	10,994	.77	14.59	22,068	1.40	27.42
1B	4,095	.29	5.43	5,169	.33	6.42
2A	4,648	.33	6.17	--	--	--
3A	5,859	.41	7.78	9,986	.74	12.41
4A	49,749	3.51	66.03	43,247	2.74	53.74
Total	75,345	5.41	100.00	80,470	5.09	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	15,642	1.10	20.76	22,068	1.40	27.42
Experiencing Negative Centralization	59,703	4.21	79.24	58,402	3.70	72.58
Total	75,642	5.41	100.00	80,470	5.09	100.00

CENTRALIZED AREA

DALLAS URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Dallas area grew rapidly in the 1960's experiencing gains in both positive and negative centralization. Positive centralization, however, expanded at a much greater rate than the negative.

All of the positive centralization in the Dallas area was in the form of active centralization, basically low rise in form. This low rise development concentrated near the edge of the centralized area to the northeast and northwest of the central business district.

Along with a small growth in decentralizing areas the centralized portion of the Dallas area experienced a gain in the postponed decentralization category due to the construction of low income housing projects.

In summary, even though the Dallas area has experienced some growth in negative centralization and will, as other low density cities, gradually run out of building sites for low rise development, the immediate future still should see a predominance of positive centralization.

TABLE 18
DALLAS URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	25,440	2.73	45.03	69,378	5.18	56.05
1B	--	--	--	22,815	1.70	18.43
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	6,104	.65	10.80	--	--	--
4A	24,956	2.68	44.17	31,594	2.36	25.52
Total	56,500	6.06	100.00	123,787	9.25	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	25,440	2.73	45.03	69,378	5.18	56.05
1B	--	--	--	22,815	1.70	18.43
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	6,104	.65	10.80	--	--	--
4A	24,956	2.68	44.17	31,594	2.36	25.52
Total	56,500	6.06	100.00	123,787	9.25	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	25,440	2.73	45.03	69,378	5.18	56.05
Experiencing Negative Centralization	31,060	3.33	54.97	54,409	4.06	43.95
Total	56,500	6.06	100.00	123,787	9.25	100.00

CENTRALIZED AREA

MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Milwaukee area experienced a large gain in positive centralization during the 1960's along with a significant drop in negative centralization.

Growth in positive centralization in the Milwaukee area was totally of the active variety and involved high rise development along the north lake shore - Prospect Avenue area just north of the central business district. This high rise development gradually merged into low rise development at the edge of the centralized area on the far north side. Some low rise building also took place on the far west side of the centralized area.

Negative centralization in the 1960's declined in those general areas that experienced a growth in active centralization.

In summary, the Milwaukee area would seem to be experiencing a major trend of decline in negative centralization even if the low rise active centralization is not able to continue at the pace it maintained in the 1960's.

TABLE 19
MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	--	--	--	30,745	2.45	44.02
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	69,814	6.07	100.00	39,095	3.12	55.98
Total	69,814	6.07	100.00	69,840	5.58	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	30,745	2.45	44.02
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	69,814	6.07	100.00	39,095	3.12	55.98
Total	69,814	6.07	100.00	69,840	5.58	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	--	--	--	30,745	2.45	44.02
Experiencing Negative Centralization	69,814	6.07	100.00	39,095	3.12	55.98
Total	69,814	6.07	100.00	39,095	3.12	55.98

SEATTLE URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Seattle urbanized area experienced a fairly large gain in positive centralization during the 1960's. This gain in positive centralization was also accompanied by some loss in negative centralization.

The gain in positive centralization in the Seattle area involved mixed high rise and low rise development. This development was largely concentrated between the central business district and Queen Anne Hill district, as well as an urban renewal project on First Hill.

In summary, the Seattle area has experienced only the active variety of positive centralization and has yet to experience any major stabilization efforts. The Seattle centralized area has, however, reversed a trend of negative centralization that occurred in the 1950's.

TABLE 20
SEATTLE URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	1A	1.24	12.88	35,399	2.86	36.79
Central	1B	--	--	10,343	.84	10.75
City	2A	--	--	--	--	--
	3A	--	--	--	--	--
	4A	8.37	87.12	50,480	4.08	52.46
Total	72,330	9.61	100.00	96,222	7.77	100.00
Outside	1A	--	--	--	--	--
Central	1B	--	--	--	--	--
City	2A	--	--	--	--	--
	3A	--	--	--	--	--
	4A	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
Experiencing Positive Centralization	10,691	1.24	12.88	35,399	2.86	36.79
	1A	--	--	10,343	.84	10.75
	1B	--	--	--	--	--
	2A	--	--	--	--	--
	3A	--	--	--	--	--
	4A	8.37	87.12	50,480	4.08	52.46
Total	72,330	9.61	100.00	96,222	7.77	100.00
Experiencing Negative Centralization	10,691	1.24	12.88	35,399	2.86	36.79
	1A	--	--	10,343	.84	10.75
	1B	--	--	--	--	--
	2A	--	--	--	--	--
	3A	--	--	--	--	--
	4A	8.37	87.12	50,480	4.08	52.46
Total	72,330	9.61	100.00	96,222	7.77	100.00

CENTRALIZED AREA

MIAMI URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Miami area is the most complex of the smaller urbanized areas in the study. Part of the area's complexity lies in its tremendous rate of growth in both the 1950's and 1960's. The situation is further complicated by the large percentage of retired residents in the area which results in probable misclassification of many developing areas into the postponed decentralization category.

In the face of its complexity the Miami area did show a major gain in positive centralization in the 1960's, all of which was of the active variety and most of which was located in the city of Miami.

Negative centralization in the Miami area also expanded somewhat during the 1960's and was mostly of the decentralization variety. This negative centralization was totally concentrated in the city of Miami while postponed decentralization existed in both the cities of Miami and Miami Beach.

In summary, the situation in the Miami area is made somewhat unpredictable by the boom town nature of the area, but in the immediate future, positive centralization should continue its rapid growth while negative centralization may also do so.

TABLE 21
MIAMI URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	5,286	.62	4.69	38,741	3.14	24.87
1B	67,169	7.88	59.61	30,448	2.50	19.55
2A	5,052	.59	4.48	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	9,607	.79	6.17
4A	6,246	.73	5.54	25,502	2.09	16.37
Total	83,753	9.82	74.32	104,298	8.55	66.95
1A	--	--	--	9,823	.81	6.31
1B	26,527	3.11	23.54	41,657	3.43	26.74
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	2,405	.28	2.13	--	--	--
Total	28,932	3.39	25.68	51,480	4.22	33.05
1A	5,286	.62	4.69	48,564	3.98	31.18
1B	93,696	10.99	83.15	72,105	5.91	46.29
2A	5,052	.59	4.48	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	9,607	.79	6.17
4A	8,651	1.01	7.68	25,502	2.09	16.37
Total	112,685	13.22	100.00	155,778	12.77	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	10,338	1.21	9.17	48,564	3.98	31.18
Experiencing Negative Centralization	102,347	12.00	90.83	107,214	8.79	68.82
Total	112,685	13.22	100.00	155,778	12.77	100.00

SAN DIEGO URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the San Diego area showed a large trend to positive centralization in the 1960's. This increase was accompanied by a decline in negative centralization.

Most of the positive centralization in the San Diego area during the 1960's involved mixed high and low rise development west and north of Balboa Park. Negative centralization in the San Diego area, however, remained centered around the central business district in both the 1950's and 1960's.

In summary, the San Diego area has experienced some growth in positive centralization during the 1960's but the centralized area remained a small part of the total urbanized area. Future development in San Diego, however, may find additional centralized areas developing in the Crow Point and La Jolla areas of the city along with the existing centralized area surrounding the central business district.

TABLE 22
SAN DIEGO URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	3,479	.42	8.77	21,662	1.81	49.76
1B	--	--	--	7,620	.64	17.50
Central	3,290	.39	8.30	--	--	--
City	4,220	.50	10.64	4,581	.38	10.52
3A	28,664	3.43	72.29	9,668	.81	22.21
4A	<u>39,653</u>	<u>4.74</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>43,531</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Total						
Outside	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	3,479	.42	8.77	21,662	1.81	49.76
1B	--	--	--	7,620	.64	17.50
2A	3,290	.39	8.30	--	--	--
3A	4,220	.50	10.64	4,581	.38	10.52
4A	28,664	3.43	72.29	9,668	.81	22.21
Total	<u>39,653</u>	<u>4.74</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>43,531</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization	6,769	.81	17.07	21,662	1.81	49.76
Experiencing Negative Centralization	32,884	3.93	82.93	21,869	1.82	50.24
Total	<u>39,653</u>	<u>4.74</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>43,531</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>100.00</u>

ATLANTA URBANIZED AREA

The rapidly growing Atlanta centralized area experienced an increase in both positive and negative centralization in the 1960's. Although positive centralization increased at a greater rate during this time, negative centralization remained dominate.

Positive centralization in the Atlanta area was of the active variety during the 1960's and took the form of low and medium rise apartment development. This apartment development was heavily concentrated on the north side of the city of Atlanta just south of the high income single family residential areas of North Atlanta.

Negative centralization in the Atlanta area was concentrated in an expanding area around the central business district.

In summary, the Atlanta area seems to have great potential for continued growth in positive centralization but also shows no signs of experiencing a decline in negative centralization.

TABLE 23
ATLANTA URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	5,182	.67	5.67	35,056	2.99	22.65
1B	15,816	2.06	17.29	12,698	1.08	8.20
Central	2,285	.30	2.50	--	--	--
2A	5,300	.69	5.79	--	--	--
3A	62,887	8.19	68.75	102,229	8.72	66.04
4A	91,470	11.91	100.00	149,983	12.79	96.89
Total						
Outside	--	--	--	4,807	.41	3.11
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total				4,807	.41	3.11
1A	5,182	.67	5.67	39,863	3.40	25.75
1B	15,816	2.06	17.29	12,698	1.08	8.20
2A	2,285	.30	2.50	--	--	--
3A	5,300	.69	5.79	--	--	--
4A	62,887	8.19	68.75	102,229	8.72	66.04
Total	91,470	11.91	100.00	154,790	13.20	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	7,467	.97	8.16	39,863	3.40	25.75
Experiencing Negative Centralization	84,003	10.94	91.84	114,927	9.80	74.25
Total	91,470	11.91	100.00	154,790	13.40	25.75

CINCINNATI URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Cincinnati area is still another example of an area experiencing a large growth in positive centralization but still being dominated by negative centralization during the 1960's.

The growth in positive centralization in the Cincinnati area during the 1960's occurred in the form of low, medium, and high rise development. This development concentrated on the northwest and northern edge of the urbanized area. An area of mixed high rise and low rise development running in a belt along the Ohio River from the Walnut Hills area east to the Hyde Park area also experienced positive centralization.

Negative centralization in the Cincinnati area was centered in the areas surrounding the central business district on the north where the oldest housing in Cincinnati now exists.

In summary, the Cincinnati area seems to be progressing rapidly toward positive centralization but the very old housing stock in the area will retain a potential for negative centralization for some time to come.

TABLE 24
CINCINNATI URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
1A	--	--	--	43,594	3.93	24.29
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	6,743	.61	3.76
3A	38,906	3.92	25.28	7,438	.67	4.14
4A	<u>115,012</u>	<u>11.58</u>	<u>74.72</u>	<u>121,687</u>	<u>10.96</u>	<u>67.81</u>
Total	153,918	15.49	100.00	179,462	16.16	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	43,594	3.93	24.29
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	6,743	.61	3.76
3A	38,906	3.92	25.28	7,438	.67	4.14
4A	<u>115,012</u>	<u>11.58</u>	<u>74.72</u>	<u>121,687</u>	<u>10.96</u>	<u>67.81</u>
Total	153,918	15.49	100.00	179,462	16.16	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	--	--	--	50,337	4.53	28.05
Experiencing Negative Centralization	153,918	15.49	100.00	129,125	11.63	71.95
Total	153,918	15.49	100.00	179,462	16.16	100.00

KANSAS CITY URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Kansas City area was totally dominated by negative centralization in the 1960's and became the only area to experience a decline in positive centralization between the 1950's and 1960's. The size of the negatively centralizing area in Kansas City did not expand from the 1950's to the 1960's but no sizeable rebuilding efforts took place in the centralized area either.

In summary, the Kansas City area should continue to be dominated by negative centralization for some time to come, but rebuilding activities that were started in the 1960's should produce at least a small amount of positive centralization in the near future.

BUFFALO URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Buffalo area was almost completely dominated by negative centralization in both the 1950's and 1960's. The only exception to this was a small area of passive centralization on the north side of the centralized area.

In summary, even though the city of Buffalo is presently sponsoring some rebuilding effort in the central business district the general slow growth of the Buffalo area does not present much potential for rebuilding in the centralized area.

TABLE 25
KANSAS CITY URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside Central City	5,264 5,063 --	.57 .55 --	4.52 4.35 --	-- -- --	-- -- --	-- -- --
4A Total	106,182 116,509	11.56 12.65	91.42 100.00	856 103,943 104,799	.08 9.43 9.51	.82 99.18 100.00
Outside Central City	-- -- -- -- --	-- -- -- -- --	-- -- -- -- --	-- -- -- -- --	-- -- -- -- --	-- -- -- -- --
4A Total	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
1A 1B 2A 3A 4A Total	5,264 5,063 -- -- 106,182 116,509	.57 .55 -- -- 11.56 12.65	4.52 4.35 -- -- 91.42 100.00	-- -- -- -- 856 103,943 104,799	-- -- -- -- .08 9.43 9.51	-- -- -- -- .82 99.18 100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	5,264	.57	4.52	--	--	--
Experiencing Negative Centralization	111,245	12.08	95.48	104,799	9.51	100.00
Total	116,509	12.65	100.00	104,799	9.51	100.00

CENTRALIZED AREA

TABLE 26
BUFFALO URBANIZED AREA

<u>Area Classification</u>	<u>1950's Decade (1960Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>	<u>1960's Decade (1970Pop.)</u>	<u>Percent.of Centralized Area</u>	<u>Percent.of Urbanized Area</u>
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	4,096	.39	6.77	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	4,271	.39	8.65
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	56,440	5.35	93.23	45,128	4.15	91.35
Total	60,536	5.74	100.00	49,399	4.55	100.00
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	4,096	.39	6.77	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	4,271	.39	8.65
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	56,440	5.35	93.23	45,128	4.15	91.35
Total	60,536	5.74	100.00	49,399	4.55	100.00
Experiencing Positive Centralization	--	--	--	4,271	.39	8.65
Experiencing Negative Centralization	60,536	5.74	100.00	45,128	4.15	91.35
Total	60,536	5.74	100.00	49,399	4.55	100.00

DENVER URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the Denver area experienced a very large growth in positive centralization during the 1960's along with a large decline in negative centralization.

Positive centralization dominated the Denver area in the 1960's and involved both high and low rise building stretching outward from the central business districts in a southeasterly direction. This positive centralization was especially concentrated in the Capitol Hill area and around the Colorado Boulevard corridor.

Negative centralization during this time remained concentrated around the central business district of the city of Denver.

In summary, Denver should continue to experience a dominance of positive centralization in the near future as additional residential building efforts were in the planning stages in the late 1960's.

TABLE 27
DENVER URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	--	--	--	52,109	4.98	64.52
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	11,735	1.46	18.41	5,928	.57	7.34
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	<u>52,011</u> 63,746	<u>6.47</u> 7.93	<u>81.59</u> 100.00	<u>22,726</u> 80,763	<u>2.17</u> 7.71	<u>28.14</u> 100.00
Outside	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
City	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
1A	--	--	--	52,109	4.98	64.52
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	5,928	.57	7.34
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	<u>52,011</u> 63,746	<u>6.47</u> 7.93	<u>81.59</u> 100.00	<u>22,726</u> 80,763	<u>2.17</u> 7.71	<u>28.14</u> 100.00
Total	--	--	--	--	--	--
Experiencing Positive Centralization	11,735	1.46	18.41	58,037	5.54	71.86
Experiencing Negative Centralization	52,011	6.47	81.59	22,726	2.17	28.14
Total	63,746	7.93	100.00	80,763	7.71	100.00

SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA

The centralized portion of the San Jose area is unique among the areas under study in that it developed during the 1960's in the midst of sprawling suburban development similar to that of Southern California. The development of a centralized area in the San Jose area is a direct outgrowth of the nationwide trend toward apartment living that occurred in both the central city and suburbs during the 1960's.

Centralization in the San Jose area was dominated by positive centralization of the active variety. This development took the form of low rise development scattered throughout the centralized area in both the cities of San Jose and Santa Clara.

In summary, the future of centralization in the San Jose area will be closely tied to the general popularity of apartment living. This is because no real dominate centralized business area has yet developed in the San Jose urbanized area capable of attracting centralized development when development sites became scarce.

TABLE 28
SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA

Area Classification	1950's Decade (1960Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area	1960's Decade (1970Pop.)	Percent.of Centralized Area	Percent.of Urbanized Area
Inside	--	--	--	20,657	2.01	48.43
1A	--	--	--	9,369	.91	21.96
1B	--	--	--	1,612	.16	3.78
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	2,905	.28	6.81
3A	--	--	--	<u>34,543</u>	<u>3.37</u>	<u>80.98</u>
4A	--	--	--			
Total	--	--	--			
Outside	--	--	--	8,114	.79	19.02
1A	--	--	--	--	--	--
1B	--	--	--	--	--	--
Central	--	--	--	--	--	--
2A	--	--	--	--	--	--
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	--	<u>8,114</u>	<u>.79</u>	<u>19.02</u>
1A	--	--	--	28,771	2.81	67.45
1B	--	--	--	9,369	.91	21.96
2A	--	--	--	1,612	.16	3.78
3A	--	--	--	--	--	--
4A	--	--	--	2,905	.28	6.81
Total	--	--	--	<u>42,657</u>	<u>4.16</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Experiencing Positive Centralization	--	--	--	30,383	2.96	71.23
Experiencing Negative Centralization	--	--	--	12,274	1.20	28.77
Total	--	--	--	42,657	4.16	100.00

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

By using a detailed method of analysis the study has demonstrated a widespread trend towards positive centralization in large United States urbanized areas when the 1960's are compared to the 1950's. Positive centralization in this case was defined as location of population in a manner that would indicate either population stability or growth has occurred and will probably continue to occur in the near future. Negative centralization on the other hand was defined as location of population in a manner that would indicate either population loss has occurred or probably will occur in the near future.

With few exceptions the amount of positive centralization in both the 1950's and 1960's has been small in comparison to the more dominate force of negative centralization. The percentage of centralized areas experiencing positive centralization, however, has risen from 18.12% to 36.19% between the 1950's and 1960's, while its reciprocal negative centralization has declined from 81.88% to 63.81%.

By referring to Table 3, Page 33, it can be seen

that the increase in positive centralization was due to rapid growth in both the 1A, Initial Building-Open Variation, and the 2A, Stability, stages in the growth cycle. The decrease in negative centralization, however, is totally the result of a decline in the 4A, Obsolescence Stage.

At this point a question may be asked as to the relation of the decline in the obsolescence stage to the increase in the initial building stages. Unfortunately the study cannot answer this question directly, as it was not designed as a test of the stage theory of growth. However, in spot checking individual census tracts from the 1950's to the 1960's one can see that numerous areas experiencing obsolescence in the 1950's reverted back to the stability stage in the 1960's. This, of course, is in direct contradiction to the stage theory.

A number of explanations can be offered for the apparent inconsistency resulting from using a stage theory of growth. These include the use of imperfect test measures such as census tracts and arbitrary classification limits. Perhaps a better explanation of the stage theory is that it is a general explanation of urban growth. Such a general explanation can in turn be greatly affected by factors such as transportation systems, court ordered school busing programs, land scarcity, mortgage

markets, taxation policies, and the rate of local economic expansion to mention only a few.

Because of the large numbers of factors affecting a growth cycle each urbanized area in the study was somewhat unique. By generalizing somewhat, however, it is possible to talk about major categories of centralized areas.

The first such major category included areas located in rapidly developing urbanized areas sometimes referred to as "young" cities or areas. The first major characteristic of a young urbanized area is that the central city in the area is still considered a safe place by developers to market new housing. This means a centralized area located in that central city can attract new development without having to contend too heavily with the city's bad reputation.

A second characteristic of a young city is a rapid growth rate which provides a large market demand for new housing construction. In these cases centralized areas can usually capture at least a share of that market demand.

The last major characteristic of a young city is that it has generally developed at low densities. This results in low cost land so new higher density development usually has an easy time finding suitable construction sites.

Centralized areas in the study that generally fall

into the "young" area category include Houston, Atlanta, Seattle, San Diego, Dallas, Denver, San Jose and possibly Los Angeles and Oakland, although these final two are presently moving out of the category.

A second major category of centralized area includes those located in urbanized areas with strong central business districts. In these cases the central business districts generally are attractive enough to overcome the serious problems the centralized areas may face in the form of old housing, bad schools, poverty, crime, and congestion.

Urbanized areas in the strong centers category usually have centralized areas that are not popular with middle class family-oriented persons. They can, however, attract the more adventurous urban types, as well as families who will make some sacrifices to live near large business and institutional centers.

Residential development in a centralized area with a strong central business district is generally difficult. This is because building site costs are high and usually require clearance which means development must generally be very high density in nature.

Centralized areas in the study that generally fall into the category of strong central business districts include New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Boston, Washington, and Minneapolis.

The final major category of centralized area includes

those located in an urbanized areas with strong business districts. All of the areas in this category are presently struggling with their urban problems but as yet have not clearly demonstrated the ability to attract positive centralization.

Areas in the study that generally fall into the category of weak central business districts include Detroit, St. Louis, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Buffalo, Kansas City, and Cincinnati.

These three major categories of centralized areas included all of the major areas in the study with the exception of Miami, St. Paul and Milwaukee. Miami is truly unique among United States urbanized areas, while St. Paul and Milwaukee have not yet begun to face the serious urban problems that characterized other older urban centers.

In conclusion, due to the large numbers of variables effecting a growth cycle, its present use is best limited to descriptive studies. There exists, however, great potential for using a stage theory of growth in population projection if additional research along the line of David Birch's work¹² can be conducted. Such research would involve tracing the path of particular neighborhoods through a growth cycle in order to measure time durations between stages. From this point research

¹²David L. Birch, "Toward a Stage Theory of Urban Growth".

would have to be done into the factors affecting the time duration of particular stages in the cycle. Research on growth cycles could also involve consideration of variations between urbanized areas or types of urbanized areas all of which would involve a considerable research effort. There is, however, great potential for reward from such research in understanding and projecting intra-urban migration patterns.

APPENDIX

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR CENSUS TRACTS

1A. A ten year loss in population of 5% was chosen as a lower limit for stable or actively centralizing areas because it corresponds closely to the situation that would occur in a stable residential area due to the nationwide decline in population per residential unit that occurred in urban areas in both the 1950's and 1960's.

2A. An area with 15% of its housing stock constructed in the previous ten years was chosen as a lower limit for classification as an actively centralizing area because such an area roughly approximates one with a level of new residential construction that would normally result in a significant population gain. An exception to this 15% limit for new construction was made for areas without signs of overcrowding that gained 10% or more population in the previous ten years but did not have 15% of its units listed as new. The reason for this exception is based on the fact that some forms of residential construction such as college boarding houses and other group housing structures are not counted as housing units by the Census Bureau.

3A. An area with 10% or more of its housing units occupied by 1.01 or more persons per room was chosen as a limit for classification as experiencing significant overcrowding because it was felt, based on past trends, that such a percentage of units with 1.01 or more persons per room has great potential for population loss due to uncrowding of residential units.

4A. An area with a median family income of 30% or more below the national median income for urban areas was chosen for a rough approximation of an area in which a large proportion of the population would not have sufficient income to afford a reasonable choice in residential location.

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Bronx		78	4A	197	4A	257	4A
Borough-50's		79	4A	198	4A	261	1A
		83	4A	199	4A	263	3A
4	4A	85	4A	201	4A	264	3A
5	4A	87	4A	202	4A	265	4A
11	4A	89	3A	204	4A	266	3A
15	4A	91	3A	205	1A	267	4A
17	3A	92	4A	206.1	4A	269	1A
20	1A	97	4A	207	4A	271	1A
23	3A	98	4A	208	4A	273	4A
25	4A	99	4A	210	4A	277	1A
27.0	4A	115.0	4A	211	4A	279	1A
27.1	4A	115.1	4A	212	4A	281	1A
28	4A	119	3A	213.0	4A	283	1A
31	4A	121	4A	213.1	4A	285	3A
33	4A	123	4A	214	4A	287	4A
35	4A	125	3A	215	4A	289	4A
37	3A	127	4A	216	4A	291	1A
39	4A	129	3A	217.0	4A	293	1A
40.1	2A	131	3A	217.1	4A	295	1A
41	4A	133	4A	218	4A	297	1A
42	1B	135	4A	219	4A	299	1A
43	3A	137	4A	220	4A	300	3A
44	1B	139	3A	221	4A	301	1A
46	1B	141	4A	223	4A	307	1A
47	1B	143	3A	224	4A	321	1A
48	4A	144	1B	225	4A	323	1A
49	3A	145	4A	227.0	4A	324	3A
50	4A	147	4A	227.1	4A	328	1A
52	3A	149	3A	228	4A	329	1A
54	4A	151	4A	229.0	4A	330	1A
56	4A	153	3A	229.1	4A	332	1A
57	2A	155	4A	230	4A	336	1A
59	2A	157	4A	231	3A	338	4A
60	4A	159	4A	233	4A	340	4A
62	1A	161	4A	235	4A	342	1A
64	1A	165	3A	236	4A	347	1A
65	1B	167	3A	237	4A	351	1A
66	4A	169	4A	239	4A	357	3A
67	1A	173	4A	240	4A	359	4A
68	1A	175	4A	241	4A	361	4A
69	4A	177	4A	243	4A	363	4A
70	4A	179	4A	245	4A	365	4A
71	4A	181	4A	247	1A	367	4A
72	4A	183	2A	248	1A	369.0	4A
73	4A	189	3A	251	4A	369.1	4A
75	3A	193	1A	253	4A	371	4A
77	3A	195	4A	255	4A	372	3A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
373	3A	13	1A	70	4A	139	4A
374	1A	20	3A	71	4A	140	4A
375.0	3A	21	1B	72	4A	141	4A
375.1	3A	22	4A	74	4A	142	4A
376	4A	23	1B	75	4A	143	4A
377	4A	25	4A	76	4A	145	4A
378	4A	27	1A	77	4A	147	4A
379	3A	29.0	4A	78	4A	149	4A
380	4A	29.1	4A	80	4A	151	4A
381	4A	30	2A	82	4A	153	4A
383	4A	31	1A	84	4A	155	3A
385	4A	32	1A	85	4A	156	1A
387	4A	33	3A	88	4A	157	4A
389	4A	34	4A	90	4A	158	4A
390	4A	35	3A	92	4A	159	3A
391	4A	36	1A	93	4A	160	4A
392	3A	37	4A	94	4A	161	3A
393	4A	38	1A	96	4A	162	1A
394	1A	39	3A	98	4A	163	3A
396	4A	40	2A	100	4A	165	2A
397	4A	41	3A	101	4A	167	4A
399	4A	42	2A	102	4A	169	4A
401	4A	43	3A	104	4A	171	4A
403	4A	44	2A	108	4A	173	4A
405	4A	45	3A	110	4A	176	1A
407	2A	46	2A	112	4A	178	4A
408	4A	47	4A	113	4A	179	3A
411	3A	49	4A	114	4A	181	3A
413	4A	50	4A	117	4A	182	4A
415	2A	51	4A	118	4A	183	3A
419	4A	52.0	1A	120	4A	185.0	4A
421	4A	52.1	1A	121	4A	185.1	4A
423	4A	54	4A	122	3A	187	4A
425	4A	55	4A	123	4A	189	4A
429.0	4A	56.0	1A	124	4A	190	4A
429.1	3A	56.1	1A	125	4A	191	4A
431	4A	57	4A	127	3A	193	4A
		58	4A	128.0	4A	194	4A
Brooklyn		59	4A	128.1	4A	195	4A
Borough-50's		60	4A	129.0	3A	196	4A
		62	4A	129.1	3A	197	4A
1	4A	63	4A	130	4A	199	3A
2	4A	64	4A	131	4A	201	3A
3.0	2A	65	4A	133	4A	203	4A
5	2A	66	4A	135	4A	205	4A
7	4A	67	4A	136	4A	207	3A
9	4A	68	4A	137	4A	210	4A
11	4A	69	4A	138	4A	212	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
213	4A	271.0	4A	335	2A	411	3A
214	4A	271.1	4A	337	4A	412	4A
215	4A	272	4A	339	3A	413	3A
217	4A	273	4A	341	3A	414.0	1A
219	2A	275	4A	343	1B	414.1	4A
220	4A	276	4A	345	4A	415	4A
221	4A	277	4A	347	4A	417	4A
222	4A	278	3A	349	4A	418	2A
223	4A	279	3A	351	4A	419	4A
224	4A	280	3A	353	4A	421	4A
225	4A	281	3A	354	4A	422	4A
226	4A	282	1A	355	4A	423	3A
227	4A	283	1B	356	4A	424	4A
228	4A	284	4A	357	4A	425	4A
229	3A	285.0	1B	359	4A	426	4A
230	4A	285.1	1B	361	4A	427	4A
231	4A	286	4A	362	4A	428	4A
232	4A	287	3A	363	4A	429	4A
233	4A	288	4A	364	4A	430	4A
234	4A	289	3A	365.0	4A	431	4A
235	4A	290	4A	365.1	3A	432	4A
236	4A	291	4A	366	4A	433	4A
237	3A	292	4A	367	4A	434	4A
238	3A	293	4A	369	4A	435	4A
239	3A	294	1A	371	4A	436	4A
240	4A	295	4A	373	3A	437	4A
241	4A	296	4A	374	1A	438	4A
243	4A	297	4A	375	3A	439	4A
245	4A	298	4A	377	3A	440	4A
247	3A	299	1B	379	4A	441	4A
248	4A	300	3A	381	1B	443	4A
249	4A	301	4A	382	1A	444	4A
251	4A	303	3A	383	4A	445	4A
252	4A	307	3A	385	4A	446	4A
253	3A	309	4A	386	1A	447	4A
255	4A	311	1B	387	3A	448	1A
257	4A	313	4A	389	3A	453	4A
258	4A	315	3A	391	4A	455	4A
259.0	4A	317.0	3A	392	1A	456	4A
259.1	4A	317.1	2A	393	4A	458	1A
261	3A	319	4A	395	3A	460	2A
263	3A	321	4A	397	3A	462.0	1A
264	4A	323	4A	399	2A	465	1B
265	4A	325	4A	401	3A	469	4A
267	4A	327	4A	403	3A	472	4A
268	4A	329	4A	405	4A	473	4A
269	4A	331	4A	406	4A	475	4A
270	4A	333	2A	409	4A	477	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
478	4A	529	4A	606	1A	890	4A
480	4A	530	4A	608	1A	892	4A
481	4A	531	3A	610	4A	894	4A
482	1A	532	4A	632	1A	896	4A
483	4A	533	4A	642	4A	898	4A
484	4A	534	4A	760	4A	900	4A
486	4A	535	4A	762	4A	902	3A
487	3B	536	4A	764	1A	904	1B
488	4A	537	4A	766	1A	906	1B
489	1A	538	4A	770	2A	908	3B
490	4A	539	4A	772	4A	910	1B
491	1A	540	4A	774	1A	912	1B
492	4A	542	4A	776	1A	914	1B
493	4A	544	4A	782	1A	916	4A
494	4A	545	3A	786	4A	918	3A
495	4A	546	4A	790	4A	920	3A
496	4A	547	3A	792	4A	922	1A
497	4A	549	4A	794	4A	938	4A
498	1A	550	4A	796	4A	972	1A
500	1A	551	3A	798	4A	974	1A
501	4A	552	4A	800	2A	1078	1A
502.0	4A	553	4A	802	4A	1102	1A
502.1	4A	554	4A	804	4A	1106	1A
503	4A	555	4A	806	4A	1110	1A
504	2A	556	1A	810	1A	1112	1A
505	4A	557	4A	814	4A	1114	1A
506	4A	559	4A	818	4A	1126	4A
507	4A	560	4A	820	4A	1128	4A
508	4A	563	4A	822	4A	1130	4A
509	4A	565	4A	824	4A	1132	4A
510	4A	567	4A	826	4A	1134	3A
511	4A	569	4A	828	4A	1136	4A
512	2A	570	1A	830	1A	1138	4A
513	4A	571	4A	856	1A	1140	4A
514	1A	572	1A	860	4A	1152	4A
515	4A	573	4A	862	4A	1154	4A
516	2A	575	4A	866	4A	1156	3A
517	4A	577	4A	868	4A	1160	4A
518	1A	579	4A	870	4A	1190	1B
519	4A	580	4A	872	1A	1194	4A
520	4A	582	4A	874	1A	1196	1B
522	4A	588	1A	876	1A	1200	1B
523	4A	589	4A	878	4A	1208	1B
524	2A	591	4A	880	1A	1210	1B
525	4A	592	4A	882	1A	1214	1B
526	4A	593	4A	884	4A	1220	1B
527	3A	596	1A	886	4A		
528	4A	600	1A	888	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Manhattan		59	1A	109	4A	158	4A
Borough-50's		60	4A	110	4A	159	2A
		61	2A	111	4A	160	4A
2	4A	62	4A	112	4A	161	4A
6	4A	63	1A	113	4A	162	3A
8	4A	64	4A	114	4A	163	3A
10.0	1A	65	4A	115	4A	164	1B
10.1	4A	66	4A	116	4A	165	3A
12	4A	67	4A	117	4A	166	4A
13	4A	68	4A	118	4A	167	4A
14	4A	70	4A	119	4A	168	4A
15	1B	71	4A	120	4A	169	3A
16	4A	72	4A	121	4A	170	4A
18	3A	73	4A	122	4A	171	3A
20	4A	74	2A	123	4A	172	4A
21	4A	75	3A	124	4A	173	3A
22	4A	76	4A	125	4A	174	4A
24	3A	77	4A	126	4A	175	4A
25	1B	78	4A	127	4A	177	3B
26	4A	79	2A	128	4A	178	4A
27	1B	80	4A	129	4A	179	4A
28	4A	81	4A	130	2A	180	4A
29	3A	82	1A	131	4A	181	4A
30	4A	83	4A	132	4A	182	3A
31	1B	84	4A	133	4A	183	3A
32	4A	85	4A	134	4A	184	4A
34	4A	86	1A	135	4A	185	4A
36	4A	87	4A	136	1B	186	1B
38	4A	88	4A	137	4A	187	3A
39	4A	89	3A	138	4A	190	4A
40	4A	90	4A	139	4A	191	3A
41	4A	91	4A	140	4A	192	1B
42	1B	92	4A	141	2A	193	3A
43	4A	93	4A	142	2A	194	1B
44	4A	94	4A	144	4A	195	2A
45	4A	95	4A	145	4A	196	3A
47	4A	96	4A	146	4A	197.0	4A
48	4A	97	4A	147	4A	197.1	3A
49	4A	98	4A	148	4A	198	3A
50	4A	99	4A	149	4A	199	3A
51	4A	100	4A	150	1A	200	4A
52	4A	101	4A	151	3A	201	2A
53	3A	102	4A	152	1A	201.1	4A
54	4A	103	4A	153	4A	202	4A
55	1A	104	4A	154	4A	203	3A
56	4A	106.0	1A	155	4A	204	4A
57	1A	106.1	1A	156	4A	205	3A
58	4A	108	4A	157	4A	206	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
207.0	4A	255	4A	65	4A	259	4A
207.1	4A	261	4A	69	4A	260	1B
208	3A	263	4A	71	4A	261	4A
209.0	1B	265	4A	73	4A	263	4A
209.1	3A	267	3A	75	4A	267	1A
210	3A	269	4A	77	4A	269	1A
211	3A	271	4A	79	4A	271	1A
212	3A	273	2A	81	4A	273	1A
213.0	4A	275	4A	83	4A	275	1A
213.1	4A	277	4A	87	1A	277	1A
214	3A	279	3A	103	1A	279	1A
215	3A	281	2A	105	3A	281	1A
216	4A	283	3A	113	4A	283	1A
217.0	4A	285	4A	115	4A	285	2A
217.1	4A	287	4A	134	1A	287	1A
218	4A	289	1A	136	1A	289	1A
219	3A	291	4A	138	1A	291	2A
220	4A	293	4A	140	1A	295	4A
221.0	4A	295	4A	147	4A	339	1A
221.1	4A	297	4A	149	4A	351	1A
222	4A	303	4A	151	4A	375	4A
223	4A	307	3A	153	3A	405	4A
224	4A	309	1A	155	4A	407	4A
225	3A			157	4A	409	3A
226	4A			159	4A	446	4A
227	4A	Queens		161	4A	446-I	1A
227-I	3A	Borough-50's		163	3A	454	1A
228	4A			169	1A	458	1A
229	4A	7	4A	179	4A	460	1A
230	4A	19	4A	181	4A	463	4A
231.0	4A	25	4A	183	4A	465	4A
231-I	3A	27	4A	185	4A	466	1A
232	4A	29	4A	189	1A	467	1A
233	3A	31	4A	197	4A	469	1A
234	4A	35	4A	214	1A	471	1A
235	4A	39	4A	216	1A	473	1A
235-I	4A	41	4A	220	1A	478	1A
236	3A	43	1A	220-I	1A	481	1A
237	4A	45	1A	232	1A	485	1A
239	4A	47	1A	235	4A	500	1A
241	4A	49	4A	238	1A	545	2A
243.0	1A	51	4A	240	4A	547	4A
243.1	1A	53	1A	247	4A	549	4A
245	4A	55	4A	249	2A	551	4A
247	4A	57	4A	251	2A	553	4A
249	4A	59	4A	252	1A	555	4A
251	4A	61	4A	253	4A	557	4A
253	4A	63	4A	257	4A	559	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
585	4A	1227	1A	64	1B	155	3A
587	4A	1127-I	1A	65	4A	157	3A
589	4A	1347	2A	66	3A	161	3A
591	2A	1367	1A	67	4A	165	4A
679	1A	1463	1A	68	1A	167	4A
683	1A	1467	1A	69	1B	169	4A
687	4A			70	3A	173	3A
693	1A	Richmond		71	4A	175	3A
697	1A	Borough-50's		72	3A	177	3A
711	1A			73	4A	179	3A
713	1A	3	4A	74	1A	181	3A
713-I	1A	7	4A	75	4A	183	1A
717	1A			77	4A	189	4A
719	1A	Bronx		78	1A	193	3A
721	1A	Borough-60's		79	1B	195	4A
725	4A			83	3A	197	4A
737	4A	11	3A	85	4A	198	4A
739	1A	17	4A	86	1A	199	4A
741	1A	20	1A	87	4A	201	3A
743	1A	23	1B	88	1A	202	4A
745	1A	25	4A	89	3A	204	3A
757	1A	27.1	3A	92	4A	205	3A
769	4A	27.2	4A	97	2A	206.2	4A
769-I	4A	28	1A	99	3A	208	1A
773	4A	31	3A	115.1	1A	210	4A
773-I	4A	33	3A	115.2	3A	211	3A
775	2A	35	1B	119	3A	212	4A
779	1A	36	1A	121.1	3A	213.1	4A
779-2	2A	37	4A	121.2	3A	213.2	3A
797	1A	39	3A	123	4A	214	3A
851	1A	40.1	1A	125	4A	215.1	3A
853	1A	41	1B	127.1	3A	215.2	3A
855	1A	43	4A	127.2	4A	216.1	4A
857	1A	44	4A	129.1	4A	216.2	4A
859	1A	46	1A	129.2	4A	217.1	3A
861	1A	47	4A	131	4A	217.2	4A
863	1A	48	3A	133	1B	218	3A
865	4A	49	4A	135	4A	219	2A
871	1B	50	3A	137	3A	220	4A
889	1A	52	3A	139	4A	221	4A
991	1A	54	3A	141	3A	223	4A
997-I	1A	56	1A	143	4A	224.1	4A
1047	1A	57	2A	144	3A	224.2	4A
1147	1A	59.1	4A	145	1B	225	4A
1159	1A	59.2	4A	147	1B	227.1	2A
1161	1A	60	4A	149	4A	227.2	4A
1163	1A	61	1A	151	4A	227.3	4A
1175	1A	62	1A	153	4A	228	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
229.1	1A	324	4A	399.2	4A	27	3A
229.2	4A	328	1A	401	4A	29.01	4A
230	2A	329	4A	403.1	4A	29.02	4A
231	4A	330	1A	403.2	4A	30	2A
233.1	2A	332	1A	405	2A	31	4A
233.2	2A	333	4A	406	1A	32	4A
235.1	2A	336	1A	407.1	4A	33	4A
235.2	2A	338	4A	407.2	2A	34	2A
236	2A	339	1A	408	3A	35	4A
237.1	4A	340	4A	409	1A	36	4A
237.2	4A	341	1A	411	2A	37	3A
239	4A	342	2A	413	1A	38	4A
240	4A	343	1A	415	4A	39	4A
241	3A	345	1A	418	2A	40	2A
243	1A	341	4A	419	4A	41	4A
245	3A	351	1A	420	2A	42	4A
247	1A	359	3A	421	2A	43	4A
248	1A	361	4A	422	2A	45	4A
251	3A	363	3A	423	4A	46	2A
253	2A	365.1	3A	425	4A	47	4A
255	4A	365.2	3A	429.1	4A	48	2A
256	1A	367	3A	429.2	4A	49	4A
257	4A	369.1	3A	432	4A	50	4A
261	4A	369.2	1B	449.1	1A	51.1	4A
263	2A	371	4A	449.2	2A	52.1	1A
265	4A	372	1A	451.1	4A	52.2	2A
266.1	1A	373	3A	451.2	2A	54	4A
266.2	1A	374	4A	458	1A	55	4A
267	4A	375.1	3A	462.1	1A	56.1	1A
269	2A	375.2	3A	462.2	1A	56.2	1A
271.1	4A	375.3	3A			57	4A
273	1A	376	2A	Brooklyn		58	4A
277	2A	377	3A	Borough-60's		59	4A
279	1A	378	1A			60	4A
281	4A	379	4A	1	1A	62	4A
283	4A	380	1A	2	4A	63	4A
285	1A	381	4A	3.01	2A	64	4A
286	4A	383	4A	5	4A	65	4A
287	1A	385	3A	7	4A	66	1A
289	1A	386	2A	9	1A	67	4A
293	1A	387	3A	11	4A	68	2A
295	1A	389	4A	13	4A	69	4A
296	1A	391	3A	18	3A	70	4A
297	1A	392	4A	20	4A	71	4A
300	1A	393	3A	21	4A	72	4A
301	2A	394	4A	22	3A	74	3A
307	1A	397	4A	23	4A	75	3A
323	1A	399.1	2A	25	4A	76	3A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
77	4A	151	4A	223	3A	284	4A
78	3A	153	3A	224	2A	285.1	4A
80	3A	155	4A	225	4A	285.2	3A
82	3A	156	2A	226	3A	286	2A
84	4A	157	2A	227	4A	287	1B
85	4A	158	2A	228	3A	288	4A
88	4A	159	4A	229	4A	289	4A
90	3A	160	4A	230	4A	290	1A
92	2A	161	4A	231	4A	291	4A
94	4A	162	4A	232	4A	292	4A
96	2A	163	3A	233	1B	293	4A
98	3A	164	4A	234	2A	294	1A
100	4A	165	2A	235	3A	295	3A
101	4A	167	4A	236	2A	296	4A
102	2A	169	3A	237	4A	297	3A
104	2A	171	2A	238	1A	298	4A
108	2A	173	4A	239	4A	299	4A
110	2A	176	4A	240	2A	300	1A
112	4A	178	4A	241	3A	301	4A
114	4A	179	4A	243	3A	302	1A
117	4A	181	4A	245	3A	303	4A
118	4A	182	2A	247	4A	304	1A
120	4A	183	3A	248	2A	306	1A
121	4A	185.1	3A	249	3A	307	4A
122	4A	185.2	3A	251	4A	308	1A
123	3A	187	4A	252	4A	309	4A
124	4A	190	4A	253	4A	311	4A
125	4A	191	4A	255	4A	313	3A
127	4A	193	1A	257	1B	314	1A
128.1	1A	194	4A	258	2A	315	3A
128.2	4A	195	4A	259.1	4A	317.1	3A
129.1	4A	196	4A	259.2	1B	317.2	3A
129.2	4A	197	4A	261	3A	319	3A
130	4A	199	4A	263	4A	320	4A
131	4A	201	3A	264	4A	321	4A
133	4A	203	4A	265	4A	323	3A
135	4A	205	3A	271.2	4A	325	1A
136	4A	207	3A	272	4A	326	4A
137	3A	210	4A	273	4A	327	3A
138	4A	212	4A	275	3A	328	4A
139	2A	213	3A	276	4A	329	4A
140	4A	214	4A	277	3A	330	4A
141	4A	215	3A	278	1A	331	4A
142	4A	217	3A	279	4A	333	3A
143	4A	219	3A	280	4A	335	3A
145	4A	220	4A	281	4A	336	4A
147	4A	221	3A	282	1A	337	3A
149	3A	222	4A	283	3A	339	3A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
340	4A	401	3A	456	4A	518	2A
341	3A	403	3A	458	4A	519	4A
342	4A	405	3A	460.1	1A	520	1A
343	3A	406	4A	460.2	4A	522	4A
345	3A	409	3A	462.1	1A	523	4A
347	4A	411	3A	465	4A	524	1A
348.1	4A	412	4A	472	2A	525	1B
348.2	4A	413	3A	473	4A	526	1A
349	3A	414.1	2A	477	4A	527	3A
350	1A	414.2	4A	478	4A	528	4A
351	3A	415	3A	480	4A	529	4A
352	1B	416	2A	481	4A	530	2A
353	3A	417	3A	482	1A	531	3A
354	1A	418	4A	483	4A	532	4A
355	3A	419	3A	484	1A	533	3A
356	1A	420	4A	486	4A	534	2A
357	3A	421	3A	487	4A	535	3A
359	3A	422	4A	488	1A	536	4A
360.1	1B	423	4A	489	1B	537	4A
360.2	4A	424	2A	490	1A	538	1A
361	3A	425	4A	491	4A	539	4A
362	4A	426	4A	492	1A	540	4A
363	4A	427	3A	493	4A	542	2A
364	1A	428	4A	494	1A	544	2A
365.1	1A	429	4A	495	4A	545	1A
365.2	4A	430	4A	496	4A	546	4A
366	1A	431	3A	497	4A	547	4A
367	3A	432	2A	498	2A	549	4A
369	3A	433	3A	499	2A	550	4A
371	4A	434	2A	500	4A	551	4A
373	3A	435	3A	501	4A	552	4A
374	1A	436	4A	502.1	2A	553	3A
375	4A	437	4A	502.2	1A	554	1A
377	3A	438	4A	503	4A	555	4A
379	3A	439	2A	504	1A	556	1A
381	4A	440	2A	505	1B	557	3A
382	4A	441	3A	506	3A	558	2A
383	3A	442	2A	507	4A	560	4A
385	3A	443	2A	508	2A	563	4A
387	3A	444	2A	509	4A	565	4A
388	1A	445	2A	510	2A	566	1A
389	4A	446	4A	511	1B	567	4A
391	4A	447	2A	512	4A	569	4A
392	1A	448	1A	513	3A	570	4A
393	3A	450	1A	514	1A	571	4A
395	3A	452	4A	515	4A	572	4A
397	3A	453	4A	516	2A	573	4A
399	3A	454	2A	517	4A	575	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
578	2A	820	1A	1110	4A	25	4A
579	4A	822	4A	1118	3A	26.1	1A
580	1A	824	4A	1120	3A	26.2	4A
582	4A	826	2A	1122	3A	27	1A
584	1A	828	2A	1124	3A	28	1B
586	1A	830	4A	1126	3A	29	3A
588	1A	856	2A	1128	3A	30.1	4A
589	2A	858	4A	1130	3A	30.2	3A
590	2A	860	4A	1132	3A	32	1A
591	4A	862	2A	1134	4A	34	1A
592	2A	864	2A	1136	4A	36.1	4A
593	2A	866	4A	1138	4A	36.2	4A
594.1	4A	868	2A	1140	4A	38	4A
596	4A	870	4A	1148	4A	40	4A
600	1A	872	2A	1150	4A	41	3A
606	1A	874.1	1A	1152	3A	42	1A
608	1A	874.2	4A	1154	4A	43	4A
610.1	4A	876	4A	1156	4A	44	4A
610.2	1A	878	4A	1158	3A	45	3A
622	1A	880	4A	1160	4A	47	3A
632	1A	882	1A	1162	3A	48	1A
642	2A	884	3A	1164	3A	49	2A
736	4A	886	3A	1166	3A	50	1A
738	4A	888	2A	1168	3A	51	1A
760	4A	890	3A	1194	3A	52	1A
762	2A	892	4A	1196	3A	53	4A
764	4A	894	3A	1210	4A	54	1A
766	2A	896	3A	1214	4A	55.1	1A
770	4A	898	3A			55.2	4A
772	2A	900	3A	Manhattan		56	4A
774	3A	902	4A	Borough-60's		57	1A
776	1A	904	4A			58	4A
782	4A	906	4A	2.01	4A	59	1A
786	1A	908	1B	2.02	1A	60	4A
788	2A	910	4A	6	1B	61	1A
790	2A	912	1B	8	3A	63	2A
792	3A	914	4A	10.1	4A	64	1A
794	3A	916	4A	10.2	3A	65	4A
796	2A	918	4A	12	4A	66	4A
798	2A	920	4A	13	4A	67	4A
800	3A	922	1A	14.1	1A	68	1A
802	2A	928	1A	14.2	4A	69	1A
804	4A	938	4A	16	3A	70	1A
806	4A	982	4A	18	4A	71	1A
810	2A	1034	4A	20	4A	72	1A
814	2A	1078	1A	22.1	1A	73	4A
816	4A	1102	1A	22.2	4A	74	2A
818	1A	1106	4A	24	4A	75	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
76	3A	124	1A	167	4A	210	1A
77	2A	125	4A	168	4A	211	4A
78	1A	126	1A	169	4A	212	1A
79	1A	127	4A	170	1A	213.1	4A
80	2A	128	1A	171	4A	213.2	4A
81	4A	129	4A	172.1	4A	214	1A
82	4A	130	4A	172.2	4A	216	4A
83	4A	131	4A	173	4A	217	4A
84	3A	132	1A	174.1	1B	217.1	4A
86	1A	133	4A	174.2	4A	217.2	4A
87	4A	134	1A	175	4A	218	4A
88	1A	135	4A	177	4A	219	1A
89	4A	136	1A	178	4A	220	4A
90	1A	137	4A	179	4A	221.1	4A
91	4A	138	1A	180	4A	221.2	4A
92	4A	139	1A	181	4A	222	4A
93	1A	140	2A	182	4A	223	4A
94	4A	142	2A	183	4A	224	4A
95	4A	144.1	1A	184	1B	225	3A
96	4A	144.2	1A	185	1A	226	4A
97	1A	145	4A	186	4A	227.1	4A
98	1A	146.1	4A	187	4A	227.2	4A
99	4A	146.2	1A	188	4A	228	4A
100	4A	147	4A	189	4A	229	4A
101	4A	148.1	1A	190	4A	230	4A
102	4A	148.2	4A	191	4A	231.1	4A
103	4A	149	4A	192	4A	231.2	4A
104	4A	150.1	4A	193	4A	232	4A
106.1	2A	150.2	1A	194	4A	233	4A
106.2	1A	151	4A	195	4A	234	4A
108	1A	152	1A	196	4A	235.1	4A
109	2A	153	4A	197.1	1B	235.2	3A
110	1A	154	4A	197.2	4A	236	1A
111	4A	155	1A	198	4A	237	3A
112.1	4A	156.1	4A	199	4A	239	3A
112.2	1A	156.2	4A	200	4A	241	2A
112.3	1A	157	4A	201.1	4A	243.1	4A
113	4A	158.1	4A	201.2	4A	243.2	1B
114.1	4A	158.2	4A	202	4A	245	4A
114.2	1A	159	4A	203	4A	247	2A
115	4A	160.1	2A	204	4A	249	4A
116	4A	160.2	4A	205	4A	251	4A
117	4A	161	4A	206	4A	253	4A
118	1A	162	1B	207.1	4A	255	4A
119	4A	163	4A	207.2	4A	261	3A
120	1A	164	4A	208	4A	263	1A
121	4A	165	4A	209.1	4A	265	4A
122	4A	166	4A	209.2	4A	267	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
269	4A	79	3A	252	2A	471	1A
271	4A	81	4A	253	2A	472	1A
273	4A	83	4A	257	1A	473	1A
275	2A	87	4A	259	1A	478	3A
277	3A	95	4A	260	3A	481	1A
279	4A	103	3A	261	4A	483	1A
281	2A	105	2A	263	1A	485	2A
283	1A	111	2A	265	1A	492	4A
285	4A	113	3A	267	1A	500	2A
287	4A	115	4A	269	3A	535	4A
289	4A	119	1A	271	3A	539	4A
291	3A	132	4A	273	3A	545	4A
293	4A	134	2A	275	4A	547	2A
295	4A	136	4A	277	4A	549	2A
297	4A	138	1A	278	1A	551	2A
303	4A	140	2A	279	4A	553	2A
307	4A	141	3A	281	4A	555	4A
309	4A	143	4A	283	4A	557	4A
		145	2A	285	4A	559	4A
Queens		147	2A	287	4A	579	4A
Borough-60's		149	2A	289	4A	581	3A
		151	2A	291	1A	583	3A
7	4A	153	2A	295	2A	585	4A
19	4A	155	2A	309.2	1A	587	2A
22	1A	157	4A	334.2	1A	589	4A
25	4A	159	2A	339	4A	591	2A
27	4A	161	2A	351	4A	593	2A
29	4A	163	4A	375	3A	641.1	4A
31	4A	169	2A	381	3A	679	3A
43	4A	179	2A	401	3A	683	1A
45	4A	181	2A	407	3A	687	2A
47	3A	183	4A	409	3A	693	2A
49	2A	185	4A	437	1A	695	4A
51	4A	189	1A	443	1A	697.1	1A
53	4A	197	4A	446.1	1A	711	1A
55	4A	214	2A	446.2	1A	713.1	1A
57	3A	216	1A	454	1A	713.2	1A
59	2A	220.1	1A	455	1A	717	1A
61	2A	220.2	2A	457	1A	719	2A
62	1A	232	2A	458	2A	721	4A
63	4A	235	2A	459	1A	737	2A
65	4A	236	4A	460	1A	739	1A
67	1A	238	1A	462	1A	741	2A
69	3A	240	4A	463	3A	743	4A
71	3A	245	1A	464	1A	745	1A
73	1A	247	1A	466	1A	747	1A
75	1A	249	1A	467	1A	757	1A
77	4A	251	1A	469	1A	769.1	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN NEW YORK URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------

769.2	4A
773	4A
775	1A
779.1	4A
779.3	4A
779.4	1A
779.5	3A
797	1A
845	1A
851	1A
853	1A
855	1A
857	1A
859	4A
861	2A
863	1A
865	1A
871	4A
889	1A
991	2A
997.2	1A
1157	1A
1159	1A
1161	1A
1163	1A
1175	2A
1227.1	4A
1227.2	3A
1283	1A
1291.1	4A
1347	2A
1463	2A
1467	2A

Richmond
Borough-60's

3	4A
7	1A
29	1A
33	1A
39	1A
40	1A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Los Angeles City-1950's							
1882	4A	2079	4A	2202	1A	6013	1A
1891	1A	2081	4A	2211	3A		
1892	1A	2082	4A	2212	2A	Pasadena	
1895	1A	2083	2A	2213	2A	City-1950's	
1899	1A	2084	1A	2215	3A		
1901	1A	2085	1A	2217	3A	4619	1A
1902	4A	2086	2A	2218	2A	4622	1A
1903	1A	2087	4A	2219	3A	4636	1A
1904	1A	2088	4A	2241	4A		
1905	1A	2089	4A	2242	4A	West Hollywood	
1906	1A	2091	4A	2243	3A	Unincorporated	
1907	1A	2092	4A	2244	4A	1950's	
1908	1A	2093	4A	2245	4A		
1909	1A	2094	4A	2246	4A	7001	1A
1911	1A	2095	4A	2247	4A	7002	1A
1912	1A	2096	4A	2262	4A	7003	1A
1914	4A	2097	4A	2361	1A	7005	1A
1915	4A	2098	4A	2362	1A		
1916	1A	2111	1A	2652	1A	S. Pasadena	
1917	4A	2112	2A	2653	1A	City-1950's	
1918	1A	2113	2A	2655	1A		
1923	4A	2114	1A	2656	1A	4806	1A
1924	1A	2115	2A	2657	1A		
1925	1A	2117	1A	2673	4A	Los Angeles	
1926	4A	2118	1A	2674	1A	City-1960's	
1927	4A	2119	1A	2696	1A		
1959	2A	2121	1A	2699	1A	1232	1A
1975	2A	2122	4A			1241.1	1A
1976	3A	2123	4A	Beverly Hills		1242.2	1A
2034	4A	2124	2A	City-1950's		1249.1	1A
2044	4A	2125	1A			1251	1A
2045	4A	2126	1A	7008	4A	1254	1A
2051	3A	2129	2A	7009	1A	1255	1A
2061	4A	2132	2A	7010	2A	1431	2A
2062	4A	2133	3A			1432	1A
2063	4A	2134	4A	Glendale		1436.1	1A
2064	4A	2144	4A	City-1950's		1436.2	1A
2065	4A	2145	1A			1882.2	2A
2072	4A	2148	1A	3020	1A	1891	1A
2073	4A	2149	1A	3022	2A	1892	2A
2074	4A	2151	4A			1895	1A
2075	4A	2164	1A	Inglewood		1897.2	1A
2076	4A	2166	1A	City-1950's		1898	1A
2077	4A	2181	4A			1899	1A
2078	4A	2201	1A	6006	1A	1901	1A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
1902	1A	2077	4A	2164	1A	2656	1A
1903.1	1A	2078	3A	2166	4A	2657	1A
1903.2	4A	2079	4A	2167	1A	2671	1A
1904	4A	2081	4A	2181	1A	2672	1A
1905	1A	2082	3A	2182	1A	2673	1A
1906	4A	2083	3A	2188	1A	2674.1	1A
1907	3A	2084	1B	2189	2A	2674.2	1A
1908	4A	2085	1A	2202	2A	2675.1	1A
1909	1A	2086	1A	2211	3A	2675.2	1A
1911	1A	2087	1A	2212	3A	2679	1A
1912.1	1A	2088	4A	2213	1A	2691	1A
1912.2	4A	2089	3A	2214.1	1A	2696	1A
1913	1A	2091	3A	2214.2	1B	2698	4A
1914	1A	2092	3A	2215.1	1A	2699.1	1A
1915	1A	2093	3A	2215.2	1B	2699.2	1A
1916.1	1A	2094	3A	2216.1	4A	2701	1A
1916.2	2A	2095	1B	2216.2	4A	2702	1A
1917	1A	2096	4A	2217.1	3A	2717.1	1A
1918	1A	2097	4A	2217.2	3A	2717.2	1A
1919.1	1A	2098	3A	2218	1B	2718	1A
1921	2A	2111	1A	2219	1B	2722	1A
1923	2A	2112	2A	2221	3A	2723.2	1A
1924	2A	2113	1A	2222	2B	2761	1A
1925	1A	2114	1A	2241	3A	2772	1A
1926	1A	2115	1A	2242	1B		
1927	1A	2117	1A	2243	3A	West Hollywood Unincorporated 1960's	
1944	1A	2118	1A	2244	2B		
1945	1A	2119	1A	2245	3A		
1953	1A	2121	1A	2246	3A		
1957	3A	2122	3A	2247	1B	7001	1A
1959	1A	2123	2A	2261	3A	7002	1A
1975	3A	2124	1A	2262	3A	7003	1A
1976	3A	2125	1A	2311	3A	7004	1A
1977	1A	2126	1A	2312	2B	7005	1A
2044	3A	2129	1A	2317	2B		
2045.1	3A	2131	1A	2343	2A	Alhombra City-1960's	
2051	3A	2132	3A	2349	1A		
2061	3A	2133	1A	2352.2	1A		
2062	4A	2134	1A	2361	3A	4803	1A
2063	4A	2144	4A	2362.1	1A		
2064	4A	2145	4A	2362.2	1A	Beverly Hills City-1960's	
2065	3A	2146	1A	2364	1A		
2071	4A	2147	2A	2641.1	1A		
2072	3A	2148	2A	2643.1	1A	7008	1A
2073	4A	2149	1A	2651	1A	7009.1	2A
2074	4A	2151	4A	2652	1A	7009.2	1A
2075	4A	2162	1A	2653.2	1A	7010	2A
2076	4A	2163	4A	2655	1A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN LOS ANGELES URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Burbank City-1960's		6019	1A
3107	1A	Pasadena City-1960's	
3116	1A		
3118	1A	4619	4A
		4620	1B
Culver City 1960's		4622	1A
		4623	1A
		4635	1A
7030	1A	4636	1A
Glendale City-1960's		Santa Monica City-1960's	
3012.1	1A	7018.1	4A
3018	4A		
3019	4A	S. Pasadena City-1960's	
3020	1A		
3021.1	1A	4806	1A
3022	1A		
3023	1A		
3024	1A		
3025	1A		
Hawthorne City-1960's			
6021.1	4A		
6021.2	4A		
6024.1	1A		
Hunting Park City-1960's			
5326	1A		
5331	1A		
Inglewood City-1960's			
6006	2A		
6007.1	1A		
6009.2	1A		
6010	1A		
6011	1A		
6012.1	1A		
6013	1A		
6014.1	1A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Chicago							
City-1950's							
1	4A	58	2A	103	4A	187	2A
2	2A	59	4A	104	3A	188	4A
3	4A	60	4A	105	4A	189	4A
5A	4A	61	4A	106	4A	190	4A
5B	4A	62	2A	107	4A	192	4A
9	2A	63	4A	108	4A	227	4A
10	1A	64	2A	109	4A	228	4A
11	1A	65	4A	110	4A	229	4A
18	4A	66	2A	111	4A	231	4A
19	4A	67	4A	112	4A	232	4A
20	4A	68	4A	113	4A	233	4A
21-Z	1A	69	4A	114	4A	234	4A
22	4A	70	4A	115	4A	235	4A
23	4A	71	4A	116	4A	237	4A
24	4A	72	4A	117	4A	238	4A
26	4A	73	4A	118	3A	239	4A
27	4A	74	4A	119	4A	240	2A
28	4A	75	4A	121	4A	241	4A
29	4A	76	4A	122	4A	242	4A
30	4A	77	2A	123	4A	243	4A
31	4A	78	4A	124	4A	244	4A
32	4A	79	1A	125	1A	245	2A
33	2A	80	4A	126	4A	246	4A
34	4A	81	4A	127	1B	247	4A
35	4A	82	4A	128	4A	248	4A
36	4A	83	1A	129	4A	250	4A
37	2A	84	2A	130	4A	252	4A
38	4A	85	4A	131	4A	253	4A
39	1A	86	4A	132	1A	254	2A
40	4A	87	4A	133	3A	255	4A
41	4A	88	4A	134	4A	256	4A
42	4A	89	4A	135	4A	257	3A
43	4A	90	4A	136	4A	258	4A
44	4A	91	4A	137	4A	259	3A
45	4A	92	4A	162	4A	260	4A
46	4A	93	4A	163	4A	261	4A
47	1A	94	4A	164	4A	262	4A
49-Z	2A	95	4A	165	2A	263	4A
51	4A	96	4A	166	2A	264	4A
52	2A	97	4A	167	4A	265	2A
53	4A	98	4A	182	2A	266	4A
54	4A	99	1A	183	4A	267	3A
55	2A	100	4A	184	4A	272	4A
56	2A	101	4A	185	4A	273	4A
57	4A	102	4A	186	4A	274	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
275	4A	343	2A	408	4A	472	3A
276	4A	345	2A	410-Z	4A	473	3A
277	4A	346	4A	412	4A	483-Z	2A
280	4A	347	4A	413	3A	487	3A
281	3A	348-Z	4A	414	4A	488	4A
282	3A	349-Z	4A	415	4A	489	4A
283	2A	350	4A	416	4A	495	3A
284	3A	351	4A	417	4A	496	3A
285	2A	352	3A	418	4A	497	4A
286	4A	353-Z	4A	419	4A	499	3A
287	4A	354	3A	420	3A	500	3A
288	4A	355	4A	421-Z	4A	501	4A
289	4A	357	3A	422	4A	502	4A
290	4A	358	3A	423-Z	4A	505	4A
291	4A	359	4A	428	3A	508	4A
292	4A	360	4A	429	4A	509	4A
293	4A	361	4A	431-Z	4A	510	4A
294	4A	362	4A	432	4A	511	4A
295	4A	363-Z	3A	434-Z	1B	514	4A
296	4A	364	3A	435	4A	515	4A
298	3A	365	4A	436	4A	516	2A
299	4A	366	3A	438-Z	4A	517	4A
300	4A	367	3A	440	4A	519-Z	4A
301	4A	368	4A	441	4A	520	4A
302	4A	369	4A	442-Z	4A	521	1B
303	4A	370	3A	445	3A	522	4A
304	4A	371	3A	446	3A	523	4A
305-Z	4A	372	4A	447	3A	524	4A
306	4A	373	4A	448	4A	527-Z	4A
307	4A	375-Z	3A	449	3A	532-Z	4A
308	4A	376-Z	4A	450A	3A	539-Z	4A
309	3A	377-Z	4A	450B	3A	541-Z	4A
310	4A	378-Z	1B	451	3A	542	1B
311	4A	379	4A	452	3A	543	4A
312	4A	380	3A	453	3A	544	4A
313	4A	381	4A	454	3A	545	4A
314	4A	382	1B	455	3A	546	4A
315	4A	383	3A	457	3A	547	4A
316	4A	384-Z	4A	459	4A	548	4A
317	4A	389-Z	4A	460	3A	549	4A
318-Z	4A	390-Z	4A	461	3A	550	4A
320	4A	391	3A	463	3A	551	4A
334	4A	392	4A	466	3A	552	4A
335	4A	395	3A	467	3A	553	4A
338	4A	399-Z	4A	468	3A	554-Z	4A
339	4A	401-Z	4A	469-Z	3A	556	4A
340	4A	403	4A	470	3A	557	4A
341	4A	407	4A	471	4A	558	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
559	4A	616	3A	Chicago City-1960's		408	2A
560	4A	617	4A			409	2A
561	4A	619	4A			410	2A
562	4A	620-Z	4A	101	4A	501	2A
569-Z	4A	621-Z	4A	102	2A	502	2A
573	4A	623	4A	103	1A	503	2A
574	4A	624	4A	104	1A	504	4A
575	4A	625	4A	105	1A	505	4A
576	4A	626	3A	106	1A	506	4A
577	4A	627	3A	107	1A	507	4A
578	4A	628	3A	108	2A	508	4A
579	4A	629	3A	109	2A	509	4A
580	4A	630	3A	201	1A	510	4A
581	4A	631	3A	203	1A	511	4A
582	4A	632	3A	204	1A	512	4A
583	4A	633	3A	205	2A	513	4A
584	4A	634	4A	206	4A	514	4A
585	4A	635	4A	207	2A	515	4A
586	4A	636	4A	208	2A	601	4A
587	4A	637	4A	209	4A	602	4A
588	4A	638	4A	301	1A	603	4A
589	4A	639	4A	302	4A	604	2A
590	4A	782	4A	303	1A	605	1A
591	4A	783	4A	304	2A	606	4A
592	4A	785-Z	4A	305	2A	607	4A
593	3A	787	4A	306	1A	608	1A
594	3A	790	4A	307	1A	609	1A
595	3A	791	4A	308	4A	610	3A
596	3A	792	4A	309	2A	611	4A
597	3A	798	4A	310	4A	612	2A
598	3A	876	3A	311	2A	613	4A
599	1A	877	3A	312	4A	614	4A
600	4A	878	4A	313	1A	615	4A
601	4A	879	4A	314	1A	616	4A
602	4A	880	3A	315	1B	617	3A
603	4A	885	3A	316	4A	618	4A
604	4A	886	4A	317	4A	619	1A
605	4A	895	4A	318	2A	620	4A
606	4A	898	3A	319	2A	621	4A
607	4A			320	4A	622	4A
608	3A	Oak Park City-1950's		321	3A	623	4A
609	3A			401	2A	624	4A
610	3A			402	2A	625	4A
611	4A	OPV133	2A	403	2A	626	4A
612	4A	OPV135	2A	404	2A	627	4A
613-Z	4A	OPV136	4A	405	4A	628	4A
614	4A	OPV137	1A	406	2A	629	4A
615	3A	OPV138	4A	407	2A	630	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
631	4A	1408	2A	2305	4A	2520	2A
632	1A	1603	1A	2306	1A	2521	3A
633	1A	1604	4A	2309	3A	2522	3A
634	4A	1605	4A	2310	3A	2601	1B
701	4A	1606	2A	2315	3A	2602	3A
702	4A	1607	4A	2316	3A	2603	3A
703	4A	1608	4A	2317	3A	2604	3A
704	4A	1609	4A	2318	4A	2605	3A
705	4A	1610	4A	2401	4A	2606	3A
706	4A	1611	2A	2402	3A	2607	3A
707	4A	1613	4A	2403	4A	2608	3A
708	4A	2101	2A	2404	4A	2701	4A
709	3A	2102	4A	2405	4A	2702	4A
710	4A	2103	2A	2406	3A	2703	4A
711	4A	2105	4A	2407	3A	2704	4A
712	4A	2106	4A	2408	3A	2705	4A
713	4A	2107	4A	2409	3A	2706	3A
714	4A	2108	4A	2410	3A	2707	4A
715	4A	2109	4A	2411	3A	2708	4A
716	4A	2201	4A	2412	4A	2709	4A
717	4A	2202	4A	2413	4A	2710	4A
718	4A	2203	3A	2414	4A	2711	4A
719	4A	2204	4A	2415	4A	2712	4A
720	3A	2205	2A	2416	4A	2713	4A
801	1A	2206	4A	2417	4A	2714	4A
802	1A	2207	4A	2418	4A	2715	4A
803	4A	2210	3A	2419	4A	2716	4A
804	3A	2211	4A	2420	4A	2717	3A
805	1B	2212	3A	2421	4A	2718	4A
808	4A	2213	2A	2422	4A	2719	4A
809	4A	2214	4A	2423	4A	2801	4A
810	4A	2215	4A	2424	4A	2802	4A
811	4A	2216	4A	2425	4A	2803	4A
812	4A	2217	4A	2426	3A	2804	4A
813	1A	2218	4A	2427	4A	2805	1B
814	1A	2219	4A	2428	4A	2806	4A
815	4A	2220	4A	2429	4A	2807	4A
816	4A	2221	4A	2430	4A	2808	4A
817	4A	2222	4A	2431	4A	2809	4A
818	4A	2223	3A	2432	4A	2810	4A
819	4A	2224	3A	2433	4A	2811	4A
1303	4A	2225	4A	2434	4A	2812	4A
1305	2A	2226	3A	2435	4A	2813	4A
1401	2A	2227	4A	2436	4A	2814	4A
1402	4A	2228	2A	2514	4A	2815	4A
1403	4A	2301	3A	2515	4A	2816	4A
1406	4A	2302	3A	2518	3A	2817	4A
1407	4A	2303	3A	2519	3A	2818	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
2819	4A	3003	3A	3512	4A	4104	4A
2822	4A	3005	3A	3513	4A	4105	4A
2823	4A	3007	3A	3514	4A	4106	4A
2824	4A	3008	3A	3515	3A	4107	4A
2825	1A	3009	3A	3601	4A	4108	4A
2826	1B	3010	3A	3602	1B	4109	2A
2827	4A	3011	3A	3603	4A	4110	4A
2828	3A	3012	3A	3604	1B	4111	1A
2829	4A	3101	4A	3605	4A	4112	4A
2830	4A	3102	4A	3701	4A	4114	4A
2831	4A	3103	3A	3801	4A	4201	4A
2832	4A	3104	3A	3802	4A	4202	4A
2833	4A	3105	3A	3803	4A	4203	4A
2834	4A	3106	3A	3804	4A	4204	4A
2835	4A	3107	3A	3805	1B	4205	4A
2836	4A	3108	4A	3806	1B	4206	4A
2837	4A	3109	4A	3807	4A	4207	4A
2838	1B	3110	4A	3808	4A	4208	4A
2839	4A	3112	3A	3809	4A	4209	4A
2840	4A	3113	4A	3810	1B	4210	4A
2841	4A	3114	4A	3811	4A	4211	4A
2842	4A	3201	1A	3812	4A	4212	4A
2843	4A	3202	4A	3813	4A	4301	1A
2902	4A	3204	4A	3814	4A	4302	2A
2903	4A	3205	4A	3815	4A	4303	4A
2904	4A	3206	4A	3816	1B	4305	1A
2905	4A	3301	4A	3817	1B	4306	2A
2906	4A	3302	1B	3818	4A	4307	1A
2907	4A	3303	4A	3819	4A	4308	2A
2908	4A	3304	4A	3820	4A	4309	2A
2909	4A	3305	4A	3901	4A	4311	1A
2910	4A	3401	4A	3902	4A	4313	2A
2911	4A	3402	4A	3903	4A	4314	1A
2912	4A	3403	4A	3904	4A	4401	1A
2913	4A	3404	4A	3905	4A	4402	4A
2914	4A	3405	1A	3906	4A	4408	1A
2915	4A	3406	4A	3907	4A	6001	4A
2916	4A	3501	1A	4001	4A	6002	4A
2917	4A	3502	4A	4002	1B	6003	4A
2918	4A	3503	4A	4003	4A	6004	4A
2919	4A	3504	4A	4004	4A	6005	4A
2920	4A	3505	3A	4005	4A	6006	4A
2921	4A	3506	4A	4006	4A	6007	4A
2922	4A	3507	4A	4007	4A	6008	4A
2923	4A	3508	4A	4008	1B	6009	4A
2924	4A	3509	3A	4101	4A	6010	2A
3001	3A	3510	4A	4102	4A	6011	4A
3002	4A	3511	4A	4103	4A	6012	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CHICAGO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
6013	3A	Benwyn	
6014	4A	City-1960's	
6102	3A		
6103	3A	8149	3A
6104	3A		
6105	4A	Elmwood Park	
6111	4A	City-1960's	
6112	4A		
6113	4A	8107	1A
6114	4A		
6119	4A		
6808	4A		
6809	4A		
6812	4A		
6813	3A		
6901	4A		
6902	3A		
6903	4A		
6904	4A		
6905	4A		
6906	4A		
6909	4A		
6911	4A		
6912	3A		
7105	2A		
7106	1A		

Evanston
City-1960's

8102 2A

Oak Park
City-1960's

8123 1A
8125 2A
8126 2A
8127 1A
8128 1A

Cicero
City-1960's

8133 2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN PHILADELPHIA URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Philadelphia City-1950's		Philadelphia City-1960's			
7A	4A	2	4A	239	1A
7C	4A	3	1A	240	2A
8A	1A	4	1A	241	4A
8B	4A	6	1B	268	1A
8C	1A	7	4A		
8D	4A	8	1A		
9A	4A	9	1A		
9B	4A	10	1A		
10A	4A	11	4A		
10B	4A	12	4A		
13A	4A	14	4A		
13B	4A	77	4A		
14A	4A	78	2A		
14B	4A	79	2A		
15A	4A	86	2A		
15B	1A	87	2A		
15E	4A	88	4A		
20B	4A	89	4A		
20D	4A	90	4A		
21A	2A	91	4A		
24A	1A	92	4A		
24F	4A	110	4A		
24I	4A	120	1A		
24J	4A	121	1A		
27A	4A	122	1A		
27B	4A	125	2A		
27C	4A	126	4A		
27D	4A	127	4A		
32A	4A	131	4A		
32C	4A	132	4A		
32D	3A	133	4A		
37C	3A	134	4A		
38C	1A	139	4A		
46A	4A	140	4A		
46I	4A	141	4A		
47A	4A	145	4A		
47B	4A	147	4A		
47D	4A	152	4A		
59D	1A	153	4A		
59E	4A	154	4A		
59F	2A	201	4A		
59G	1A	206	4A		
		208	1A		
		237	2A		
		238	2A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DETROIT URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Detroit City-1950's					
1	4A	545	4A	163	3A
2	4A	546	4A	165	2A
18	4A	551	4A	167	3A
22	4A	757	4A	175	3A
23	4A	758	1A	178	1A
24	4A	774	4A	181	2A
25	4A	779	4A	182	2A
27	4A			183	2A
28	1B	Highland Park		184	2A
29	4A	City-1950's		187	4A
30	4A			189	3A
31	4A	904	4A	502	4A
32	4A	905	4A	503	4A
33	4A	909	4A	505	4A
34	4A	912	4A	506	2A
35	4A			507	1A
67	4A	Detroit		508	4A
151	4A	City-1960's		509	1A
152	4A			527	4A
153	3A	1	4A	529	4A
154	2A	2	4A	530	4A
163	4A	4	4A	531	4A
165	4A	7	4A	533	4A
178	4A	16	4A	542	4A
180	3A	17	4A	544	4A
181	4A	18	4A	545	4A
183	2A	22	4A	546	4A
184	4A	23	4A	547	4A
187	4A	24	4A	551	4A
189	4A	25	4A	757	4A
504	4A	27	4A	758	1A
505	4A	28	4A	759	4A
506	4A	29	4A		
507	4A	30	4A	Highland Park	
508	4A	31	4A	City-1960's	
509	4A	32	4A		
528	4A	33	4A	904	2A
529	1B	35	4A	905	4A
530	4A	40	4A	909	3A
531	4A	43	4A	911	4A
532	4A	67	4A	912	4A
533	4A	151	4A	913	4A
535	4A	152	4A		
543	4A	153	4A		
544	4A	154	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN FRANCISCO URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
San Francisco City-1950's				Berkley City-1950's		152	4A
A1	1A	J15	4A	BE3B	1A	153	4A
A2	4A	J16	4A	BE3C	4A	154	4A
A3	2A	J17	4A	BE5A	4A	155	4A
A4	2A	J18	2A	BE5BA	1A	157	1A
A5	4A	J20	2A	BE5BB	1A	158	4A
A6	3A	K2	4A	BE5BC	1A	159	1A
A7	3A	K3	4A			160	1A
A8	4A	K4	4A	San Francisco City-1960's		161	4A
A9	4A	K6	4A			162	4A
A10	2A	L5A	4A			163	4A
A11	4A	N1	4A	101	1A	164	4A
A12	4A	N2	4A	102	2A	165	4A
A13	4A	N3	2A	103	2A	166	3A
A14	4A	N7	2A	104	2A	167	4A
A15	4A	N8	4A	106	3A	168	4A
A16	4A	N9	4A	107	3A	169	4A
A17	4A	N10	2A	108	3A	171	4A
A18	4A			109	3A	176	4A
A19	4A	Oakland City-1950's		110	2A	177	4A
A20	4A			111	3A	178	4A
A21	4A			112	2A	180	3A
A22	2A	OK12	4A	113	1A	201	4A
A23	4A	OK13	4A	114	3A	202	3A
B1	4A	OK17B	4A	115	3A	203	2A
B2	4A	OK18A	4A	116	3A	204	1A
B3	4A	OK18B	4A	117	4A	206	2A
B4	4A	OK19	4A	118	1A	207	2A
B5	4A	OK20	4A	119	3A	208	3A
B6	4A	OK23	4A	120	4A	209	3A
B7	4A	OK24	4A	121	2A	210	2A
B9	4A	OK26	1A	122	2A	231	4A
B10	4A	OK27	4A	123	4A	301	1A
J1	4A	OK28	4A	124	2A	302	1A
J2	4A	OK29	4A	125	4A	401	2A
J3	4A	OK30	1A	126	1A	402	1A
J4	1A	OK31	1A	127	4A		
J6	4A	OK32	1A	128	2A	Oakland City-1960's	
J7	4A	OK33A	1A	129	4A	4011	4A
J8	4A	OK33B	1A	130	4A	4013	4A
J9	4A			131	1A	4024	4A
J10	4A	Alameda City-1950's		132	3A	4026	4A
J11	4A			133	3A	4027	4A
J12	4A			134	3A	4028	4A
J13	4A	AL14	2A	135	1A	4029	4A
J14	4A			151	4A	4030	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN FRANCISCO URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------

4031	4A
4033	4A
4034	1A
4035	1A
4036	1A
4037	1A
4038	2A
4039	1A
4040	1A
4041	1A
4052	1A
4053	1A
4054	1A
4055	1A
4056	4A
4057	4A
4060	4A
4062	1B
4072	1A

Alameda
City-1960's

4279	1A
4280	1A
4284	1A
2285	1A

Berkley
City-1960's

4224	1A
4225	4A
4227	1A
4228	4A
4229	1B
4235	1B
4236	1A
4237	2A
4239	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BOSTON URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Boston City-1950's				Brookline City-1950's			
A1	1A	K2	2A	T1	1B	NC1	4A
A2	4A	K3	2A	T2	4A	NC2	4A
A3	4A	K4A	1A	T3A	4A	NC3	4A
A4	4A	K4B	4A	T3B	4A	NC4	4A
A5	4A	K5	4A	T4A	4A	NC5	4A
A6	4A	L1	4A	T4B	2A	NC6	4A
B1	4A	L2	4A	T5A	4A	NC8	4A
B2	4A	L3	4A	T5B	4A	NC9	4A
B3	4A	L4	4A	T6	4A	NC10	1A
B4	4A	L5	4A	T7A	4A	Cambridge City-1950's	
B5A	4A	L6	4A	T7B	4A		
B5B	4A	M1	4A	T8A	1A	MC1	4A
C1	4A	M2	4A	T8B	4A	MC2	4A
C2	4A	M3	4A	T9	2A	MC3	4A
C3	4A	M4	4A	T10	2A	MC4	4A
D1	4A	N1	4A	U1	4A	MC5	4A
D2	4A	N2	4A	U2	4A	MC6	4A
D3	4A	N3	4A	U3	4A	MC7	1A
D4	4A	N4	4A	U4	4A	MC8	4A
E1	4A	O1	4A	U5	4A	MC9	4A
E2	4A	O2	4A	U6A	4A	MC10	4A
F1	4A	O3	4A	U6B	4A	MC11	4A
F2	4A	O4	4A	V1	4A	MC12	4A
F3	4A	P1A	4A	V2	3A	MC13	4A
F4	4A	P1B	4A	V3	4A	MC14	4A
F5	4A	P1C	4A	V4A	2A	MC15	4A
F6	4A	P2	4A	V4B	4A	MC16	2A
G1	4A	P3	4A	V5	4A	MC17	4A
G2	4A	P4	4A	V6	4A	MC18	4A
G3	4A	P5	4A	W2	4A	MC19	4A
G4	4A	P6	4A	W3A	1A	MC20	2A
H1	4A	Q1	4A	X1	4A	MC21	4A
H2	4A	Q2	4A	X4A	4A	MC25	2A
H3	4A	Q3	4A	X4B	2A	Somerville City-1950's	
H4	4A	Q4	4A	X5A	1A		
I1	4A	Q5	4A	X5B	4A	MC39	4A
I2	4A	R1	4A	X5C	4A	MC41	3A
I3	4A	R2	4A	X6A	4A	MC42	4A
I4	1B	R3	4A	Y2	4A	MC43	4A
J1	4A	S1	1B	Y3A	4A	MC45	4A
J2	4A	S2	4A	Y3B	1A		
J3	4A	S3	4A	Y5B	4A		
J4	4A	S4	4A	Y5C	4A		
J5	4A	S5	4A				
K1	4A	S6	4A				

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BOSTON URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Chelsea		505	4A	815	4A	Brookline	
City-1950's		506	4A	816	4A	City-1960's	
		507	4A	817	4A		
SC4	4A	508	4A	818	4A	4001	2A
SC6	4A	509	4A	819	4A	4002	2A
SC7	3A	510	1A	820	4A	4003	2A
		511	4A	821	4A	4004	1A
Revere		512	4A	901	3A	4005	1A
City-1950's		601	2A	902	4A	4006	1A
		602	4A	903	4A	4007	2A
SC12	4A	603	4A	904	4A	4008	1A
		604	2A	905	4A	4009	1A
Boston		605	4A	906	4A	4010	3A
City-1960's		606	4A	907	4A		
		607	4A	908	2A	Cambridge	
4	2A	608	4A	909	4A	City-1960's	
5	4A	609	4A	910	4A		
6	1A	610	4A	911	2A	3521	4A
7	2A	611	4A	912	2A	3522	4A
8	1A	612	1A	913	4A	3523	4A
101	1A	613	4A	914	4A	3524	4A
102	4A	614	4A	915	1A	3525	2A
103	1B	701	1A	916	4A	3526	4A
104	1A	702	4A	917	4A	3527	4A
105	4A	703	4A	918	4A	3528	4A
106	4A	704	4A	919	3A	3529	2A
107	1A	705	4A	920	2A	3530	1A
108	4A	706	4A	921	4A	3531	1A
201	2A	707	4A	922	2A	3532	4A
202	2A	708	4A	923	4A	3533	4A
203	1A	709	4A	924	4A	3534	4A
301	4A	710	4A	1001	3A	3535	4A
302	4A	711	4A	1002	1A	3536	4A
303	4A	712	4A	1003	3A	3537	4A
304	4A	801	4A	1004	4A	3538	4A
305	4A	802	4A	1005	2A	3539	1A
401	4A	803	4A	1006	2A	3540	4A
402	4A	804	4A	1011	2A	3541	1A
403	4A	805	4A	1101	4A	3545	4A
404	4A	806	4A	1102	1A	3547	4A
405	4A	807	4A	1202	2A	3548	1A
406	4A	808	4A	1203	4A	3549	1A
407	4A	809	4A	1204	4A		
408	4A	810	4A	1205	4A	Chelsea	
501	4A	811	4A	1206	2A	City-1960's	
502	4A	812	4A	1207	1A		
503	4A	813	1B			1601	4A
504	4A	814	4A			1602	1A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BOSTON URBANIZED AREA (CONT.)

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
----------------------	-------------------------

1604	4A
1605	4A
1606	2A

Revere
City-1960's

1707	4A
------	----

Somerville
City-1960's

3501	4A
3502	4A
3509	2A
3511	4A
3512	4A
3513	2A
3514	4A
3515	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN WASHINGTON D. C. URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Washington
City-1950's

5	1A	74.2	1A	35	1A	74.4	1B
6	2A	74.3	1A	36	4A	74.5	1A
7	1A	75	1A	37	4A	75.1	1A
10	1A	76.2	1A	38	3A	75.2	1A
12	1A	76.3	4A	39	1A	76.1	1A
13	1A	77.1	2A	40	2A	76.2	1A
27	1A	77.3	1A	41	4A	76.3	2A
28	2A	78.1	1B	42.1	4A	77.1	3A
30	4A	88.1	3A	42.2	2A	77.3	1A
36	3A	89	3A	43	4A	77.5	1A
37	3A			44	3A	77.6	1A
38	4A	Arlington		45	3A	78.1	1B
39	4A	County-1950's		47	4A	88.1	3A
40	4A			48.2	4A	89.1	4A
41	4A	16	1A	49.1	4A	89.2	3A
42	4A	17	1A	49.2	4A	91.2	3A
43	4A	18	4A	50	4A	92	2A
49	4A	20	4A	51	4A	95.01	1A
50	4A	29	1A	52.1	4A		
51.1	4A	30	2A	52.2	4A	Arlington	
52.1	4A	32	1A	53.1	4A	County-1960's	
52.2	4A	38	4A	53.2	4A		
53.1	4A			54.1	4A	1014	4A
53.2	4A	Washington		54.2	4A	1015	1A
54.1	4A	City-1960's		55	4A	1016	4A
54.2	4A			56	1A	1017	1A
55	4A	1	4A	57.1	1A	1018	4A
56	4A	2	2A	57.2	4A	1020	4A
57.1	4A	3	4A	58	4A	1022	1A
57.2	4A	4	4A	59	4A	1025	1A
58	4A	5	2A	60.1	1A	1026	1A
59	4A	6	4A	61	1A	1027	1A
60	4A	7	1A	62	1A	1028	1A
61	4A	8	1A	63.1	1A	1029	1A
62	4A	10.2	4A	65	4A	1030	2A
63	4A	12	2A	66	4A	1031	1A
65	4A	13	1A	71	1B	1032	1A
66	4A	22.2	4A	72	4A	1035	1A
72	4A	25.2	4A	73.2	3A	1036	1A
73.2	2A	27.1	1A	73.3	1A	1038	4A
73.3	1A	27.2	4A	73.4	1A		
73.4	1A	28	3A	73.6	1A		
73.5	1A	29	4A	73.7	1A		
73.6	1A	30	4A	74.1	4A		
73.7	2A	34	4A	74.2	1A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CLEVELAND URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Cleveland City-1950's		E. Cleveland City-1950's		1126	4A
				1127	4A
A3	4A			1128	4A
C2	4A	EC8	4A	1129	4A
C3	4A	EC10	4A	1131	4A
D2	4A			1132	4A
D3	4A	Lakewood City-1950's		1134	4A
G1	4A			1137	4A
G2	4A			1138	4A
G3	4A	LW-6	1A	1143	4A
G6	4A	LW-18	4A	1144	4A
G7	4A			1147	4A
G8	4A	Shaker Hts. City-1950's		1161	4A
G9	4A			1165	4A
H6	4A			1166	2A
H7	4A	SH-1	1A	1169	2A
H8	4A			1186	4A
H9	4A	Cleveland City-1960's		1187	4A
I5	4A			1188	4A
I6	4A			1189	4A
I7	4A	1011	1A	1191	4A
I9	4A	1012	4A	1195	2A
J3	4A	1013	1A		
L3	3A	1032	4A	Cleveland Hts. City-1960's	
L4	3A	1033	4A		
L5	3A	1036	4A		
L7	4A	1037	1B	1411	2A
L8	3A	1042	4A		
L9	4A	1043	3A	E. Cleveland City-1960's	
M1	4A	1076	4A		
M2	4A	1078	4A		
M7	4A	1079	4A	1505	4A
M8	4A	1085	4A	1506	2A
N4	4A	1086	4A	1508	1A
N5	4A	1087	4A	1509	2A
P6	3A	1088	4A	1510	2A
R6	3A	1089	4A		
R8	4A	1093	4A	Lakewood City-1960's	
R9	4A	1097	4A		
S1	4A	1098	4A		
S5	1A	1099	4A	1606	1A
		1112	4A	1618	4A
		1113	2A		
Cleveland Hts. City-1950's		1114	4A	Shaker Hts. City-1960's	
		1123	4A		
		1124	4A		
CH11	4A	1125	4A	1831	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN ST. LOUIS URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

St. Louis
City-1950's

5E	3A	22C	4A	1053	4A	1213	4A
12A	4A	23B	4A	1054	4A	1214	4A
12B	4A	25A	5A	1055	4A	1224	4A
12D	4A	25B	4A	1121	4A	1232	4A
17A	4A	25C	4A	1122	4A	1234	4A
17B	4A	25D	4A	1124	4A	1251	1A
17C	4A	26A	4A	1171	4A	1252	4A
17D	4A	26B	4A	1172	4A	1253	4A
19A	4A	26C	4A	1173	4A	1254	1A
19B	4A			1184	1A	1262	4A
19C	4A	St. Louis		1191	4A	1263	4A
21A	4A	City-1960's		1192	4A		
21C	1B			1193	4A		
21D	4A	1051	2A	1211	4A		
22B	4A	1052	3A	1212	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN PITTSBURGH URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Pittsburgh
City-1950's

3G	4A	8H	4A	401	4A	805	4A
3H	4A	11C	2A	403	1A	806	4A
4A	4A	11F	4A	404	4A	807	4A
4D	1A	11L	4A	405	2A	808	4A
4E	4A	14B	1A	406	4A	1101	4A
5F	4A	22A	4A	503	4A	1103	2A
5G	4A	22B	4A	504	4A	1104	4A
5J	4A	22H	4A	505	4A	1105	4A
7A	1A	22I	4A	507	2A	1107	4A
7B	4A	23B	4A	701	1A	1108	4A
7C	4A			702	4A	1402	4A
7D	4A	Pittsburgh		703	4A	1407	4A
7E	4A	City-1960's		704	4A	2201	4A
7F	4A			705	4A	2202	4A
7G	1A	101	1B	706	2A	2204	4A
7H	4A	102	4A	707	4A	2205	4A
8C	4A	201	4A	708	4A	2302	4A
8F	4A	302	1A	801	4A		
8G	4A	304	4A	803	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Minneapolis
City-1950's

M34	4A	SP55	4A	91	1A
M36	4A	SP56	4A	92	1A
M37	4A	SP58	4A		
M38	4A	SP59	4A		
M39	4A				
M42	4A				
M43	4A	Minneapolis			
M44	4A	City-1960's			
M45	4A			304	1A
M46A	4A	36	4A	305	1A
M46B	4A	37	1A	328	4A
M47	4A	38	1A	336	4A
M49	1A	39	4A	337	4A
M52	4A	43	4A	339	4A
M53	4A	44	4A	340	4A
M54	4A	45	4A	342	1A
M55	4A	46.1	4A	355	4A
M56	4A	46.2	4A	356	4A
M57	4A	47	4A	358	4A
M58	4A	48	4A	359	4A
M59	4A	49	3A	361	4A
M60	4A	52	4A		
M66	4A	53	4A		
M67	4A	54	4A		
M68	4A	55	1A		
M69	4A	56	4A		
M70	4A	57	4A		
M71	4A	58	4A		
M77	4A	59	4A		
M78	4A	60	4A		
M80	4A	61	4A		
M81	4A	62	4A		
M83	4A	64	1A		
M92	1A	66	2A		
		67	1A		
		68	1A		
		69	4A		
		70	1A		
		71	4A		
		77	4A		
		78	4A		
		80	4A		
		81	2A		
		82	4A		
		83	4A		
		85	2A		

St. Paul
City-1950's

SP37	4A		
SP39	4A		
SP40	4A		
SP41	4A		
SP42	4A		
SP43	4A		
SP54	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN HOUSTON URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Houston
City-1950's

25	4A	405	1A
26	4A	407	1A
31	4A	420	1A
32	4A		
39	4A		
41	4A		
67A	1A		

Houston
City-1960's

121	4A
124	4A
125	4A
316	1A
403	1A
404	2A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BALTIMORE URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Baltimore
City-1950's

Baltimore
City-1960's

4-1	4A	302	3A	1703	4A
4-2	4A	401	1A	2711	1A
5-2	1B	402	4A		
11-1	4A	501	4A		
11-2	4A	605	4A		
11-3	4A	1101	1A		
12-1	1A	1102	4A		
12-2	1A	1201	1A		
12-4	4A	1202	1A		
12-5	4A	1205	4A		
12-6	4A	1206	4A		
13-1	2A	1301	1B		
13-2	3A	1302	4A		
14-1	4A	1401	4A		
14-2	4A	1402	4A		
16-1	4A	1601	3A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DALLAS URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Dallas City-1950's		Dallas City-1960's			
6A	1A	4.2	1A	28	4A
7A	1A	5	1A	29	1B
13B	4A	6.1	1A	31.1	1A
14	1A	6.2	1A	32.1	4A
15A	1A	7.1	4A	32.2	4A
15B	1A	7.2	1A	33	4A
18	4A	9	1A	34	1B
20	4A	13.2	1B	35	1B
21	4A	14	1A	47	1A
22A	4A	15.1	4A	48	1B
22B	4A	15.2	4A	68	1A
31A	4A	16	4A	69	1A
31B	4A	18	1A	71.1	4A
32	4A	20	1A	78.3	1A
34	3A	21	4A	79.1	1A
48	4A	22.1	4A		
71A	1A	22.2	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MILWAUKEE URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Milwaukee City-1950's					
1	4A	25	4A	114	4A
2	4A	42	4A	116	4A
3	4A	43	4A	132	4A
4	4A	44	4A	135	1A
5	4A	72	4A	136	1A
6	4A			137	4A
7	4A	Milwaukee		139	4A
9	4A	City-1960's		141	4A
11	4A			142	4A
16	4A	44	1A	143	4A
17	4A	76	1A	144	4A
18	4A	77	1A	147	4A
19	4A	108	1A	148	4A
20	4A	109	1A	149	4A
21	4A	110	1A	150	4A
23	4A	111	4A	151	4A
24	4A	113	4A	152	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SEATTLE URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Seattle
City-1950's

D6	4A	M5	4A	71	4A	92	4A
G6	1A	01	4A	72	4A		
H2	1A	02	4A	73	4A		
H3	4A			74	1A		
K1	4A	Seattle		75	4A		
K2	4A	City-1960's		76	4A		
K3	4A			79	4A		
L1	4A	47	4A	80	4A		
L2	4A	49	1A	81	4A		
L3	4A	53	1B	82	4A		
L4	4A	58	1A	83	4A		
L5	4A	61	1A	84	4A		
M1	4A	65	4A	85	4A		
M2	4A	66	4A	86	4A		
M3	4A	67	1A	90	4A		
M4	4A	70	1A	91	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN MIAMI URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

Miami
City-1950's

27	1B	45	4A	52	1B
28	1B			53	1B
31	1B	Miami		54.2	1B
34	1B	City-1960's		66	1A
36	1B			67.1	1A
37A	3A	13	1A	67.2	1A
37B	3A	27.1	1A		
52	2A	27.2	1A	Miami Beach	
53	1B	28	4A	City-1960's	
67	1A	30.1	1A		
		31	4A	41.1	1A
Miami Beach		34	4A	41.2	1A
City-1960's		36.1	3A	42	1B
		36.2	3A	43	1B
42	1B	37.1	4A	44	1B
43	1B	37.2	4A	45	1B
44	1B	45	1A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN DIEGO URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
San Diego City-1950's		San Diego City-1960's			
B3	4A	3	1A	59	3A
K45	1A	4	1A	60	1A
K46	4A	7	1A	66	4A
K51	4A	9	1B	68	1A
K52	4A	13	1A		
L53	3A	45	1B		
L54	4A	46	3A		
M56	4A	47	4A		
M57	4A	52	4A		
M59	4A	53	4A		
M60	2A	54	4A		
N66	4A	56	4A		
N67	4A	57	4A		
N68	4A	59	3A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN ATLANTA URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Atlanta City-1950's							
D2	2A	F87	1B	22	4A	83.2	1B
F4	4A	F91	1A	25	4A	84	1A
F11	4A			27	4A	87.1	1B
F12	4A	Atlanta		28	4A	91	1A
F13	4A	City-1960's		29	4A	94	1A
F14	4A			30	4A	96	1A
F15	4A	4	4A	33	4A	202	4A
F18	4A	8	4A	35	4A		
F19	4A	10	4A	36	4A	DeKalb	
F20	4A	11	4A	37	4A	County-1960's	
F21	4A	12	4A	42	4A		
F27	4A	13	4A	43	4A	224.02	1A
F28	4A	14	4A	44	4A		
F30	4A	15	4A	45	4A		
F33	4A	16	4A	46	4A		
F35	4A	17	4A	48	4A		
F45	4A	18	4A	55.2	4A		
F46	3A	19	4A	56	4A		
F48	4A	20	4A	67	4A		
F55B	1B	21	4A	76.1	1A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN CINCINNATI URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Cincinnati City-1950's		Cincinnati City-1960's			
1	4A	1	4A	35	4A
2	4A	2	1A	36	4A
3	4A	3.01	4A	37	4A
4	4A	3.02	4A	39	4A
5	4A	4	4A	42	1A
6	4A	5	4A	50	1A
7	4A	6	4A	66	4A
8	4A	7	4A	67	4A
9	4A	8	4A	68	4A
10	4A	9	4A	69	4A
11	4A	10	4A	71	2A
12	4A	11	4A	72	1A
14	4A	12	4A	85	1A
15	4A	13	4A	86.1	4A
16	3A	14	4A	90	4A
17	4A	15	4A	91	4A
19	4A	16	4A	93	1A
20	4A	17	4A	100	1A
22	3A	18	4A		
23	3A	19	4A		
24	3A	20	2A		
25	3A	21	4A		
28	4A	22	3A		
31	4A	23	4A		
33	4A	24	4A		
34	4A	25	4A		
35	4A	26	4A		
36	4A	27	4A		
37	4A	28	4A		
42	4A	29	1A		
66	3A	30	4A		
67	3A	32	4A		
68	3A	33	3A		
91	4A	34	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN KANSAS CITY URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Kansas City City-1950's				Kansas City City-1960's			
3	1B	47	4A	3	4A	41	4A
11	4A	48	4A	10	4A	42	4A
12	4A	49	4A	11	4A	43	4A
13	4A	50	4A	12	4A	44	4A
14	4A	51	4A	13	4A	47	4A
15	4A	52	4A	14	4A	48	4A
16	4A	53	4A	15	4A	49	4A
17	4A	65	4A	16	4A	50	4A
18	4A	66	4A	17	4A	51	4A
25	4A	67	4A	18	4A	52	4A
27	4A	68	4A	25	4A	53	4A
28A	4A	69	4A	26	4A	65	4A
28B	4A	73	1A	28.1	4A	66	4A
31	4A			28.2	4A	67	4A
32	4A			29	4A	68	4A
38	4A			31	3A	69	4A
42	4A			32	4A	71	4A
43	4A			38	4A	73	4A
44	4A			40	4A	74	4A

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN BUFFALO URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>	<u>Tract No.</u>	<u>Tract Class.</u>
Buffalo City-1950's		Buffalo City-1960's			
13	4A	13.1	4A	67.1	4A
14	4A	13.2	4A	67.2	4A
66A	4A	14.1	4A	68	4A
66B	4A	14.2	4A	71.1	4A
67	4A	25.1	4A	71.2	4A
68	4A	65.2	2A	72.1	4A
71	4A	66.1	4A	72.2	4A
72	1B	66.2	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN DENVER URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
Denver City-1950's		Denver City-1960's			
16	4A	17.1	4A	32.1	1A
17A	4A	17.2	4A	32.2	1A
17B	4A	20	4A	37.1	1A
20	4A	24.1	4A	37.2	1A
24A	4A	24.2	4A	37.3	1A
25	4A	25	4A	43.1	1A
26A	4A	26.1	4A		
26B	4A	26.2	4A		
27A	4A	27.1	2A		
27B	4A	27.2	1A		
27C	4A	27.3	1A		
31A	4A	28.1	1A		
31B	4A	28.2	1A		
32A	2A	28.3	1A		
32B	2A	31.2	4A		

CENTRALIZED TRACTS IN SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA

<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Tract</u> <u>Class.</u>
San Jose City-1950's		San Jose City-1960's	
None		5007	2A
		5008	4A
		5009	1B
		5010	1B
		5016	1A
		5019	1A
		5021.2	1A
		5022	1A
		5037.1	1A
		Santa Clara City-1960's	
		5052.2	1A
		5053.3	1A

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

CITED PUBLICATIONS

- Birch, David L. "Toward a Stage Theory of Urban Growth", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 37 (March, 1971), 78-87.
- Blumenfeld, Hans. "The Tidal Wave of Metropolitan Expansion", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 20 (Winter, 1954), 3-14.
- Hawley, Amos. The Changing Shape of Metropolitan America: Deconcentration Since 1920. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956.
- Hoover, Edgar M., and Vernon, Raymond. Anatomy of a Metropolis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Schnore, Leo F. and Klaf, Vivian. "Suburbanization in the Sixties: A Preliminary Analysis", Land Economics Vol. 48 (February, 1972), 23-33.
- United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1950, Census Tracts.
- United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1960, Census Tracts.
- United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1970, Census Tracts.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONT.)

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

- Adams, John S. "Directional Bias in Intra-Urban Migration", Economic Geography Vol. 45, No. 4 (October, 1960), 302-323.
- Alonso, William. "The System of Intermetropolitan Population Flows", The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future Research Reports Edited by S. M. Mazie. Vol. 5. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Borchert, John R. "American Metropolitan Evolution", Geographical Review Vol. 57, No. 3 (July, 1967), 301-332.
- Bourne, Larry S. "Location Factors in the Redevelopment Process", Land Economics Vol. 45 (May, 1969), 183-193.
- Bourne, Larry S. Internal Structure of the City, Reading on Space and Environment. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Brodsky, Harold. "Residential Land and Improvement Values in a Central City", Land Economics Vol. 46 (Aug., 1970), 229-247.
- Brown, Lawrence A. and Holmes, John. "Intra-Urban Migrant Life Lines: A Spatial View", Demography, Vol. 8 (1971), 103-122.
- Burgess, Ernest W. "The Growth of the City". The City. Edited by Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1925.
- Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. "Selected Theories of Urban Growth and Structure", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 30 (Feb., 1964), 51-58.
- Greenberg, A. and Boswell, Thomas D. "Neighborhood Deterioration as a Factor in Intra-Urban Migration: A Case Study in New York City", Professional Geographer, Vol. 24 (Feb., 1972), 11-16.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONT.)

- Hoyt, Homer. The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939.
- Leven, Charles L. "Changing Sizes, Forms, and Functions of Urban Areas", The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future Research Reports Edited by S. M. Mazie. Vol. 5. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Morrison, Peter A. "Population Movement and the Shape of Urban Growth: Implications for Public Policy", The Commission on Population Research Reports Edited by S. M. Mazie. Vol. 5. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Ross, H. L. "Reasons for Moves to and from a Central City Area", Social Forces Vol. 40 (1962) 261-263.
- Sabagh, George. "Some Detriments of Intra-Metropolitan Residential Mobility: Conceptual Considerations", Social Forces Vol. 48 (Sept., 1969), 88-98.
- Schnore, Leo F. "Metropolitan Growth and Decentralization", American Journal of Sociology Vol. 63 (1957), 171-180.
- Simmons, James W. "Changing Residence in the City: A Review of Intra-urban Mobility", Geographical Review Vol. 58 (October, 1968), 622-651.
- Tunnard, Christopher and Reed, Henry H. American Skyline, The Growth and Form of Our Cities and Towns. New York: Mentor Books, 1966.
- Webber, Melvin M. "The Urban Place and the Non Place Urban Realm". Explorations into Urban Structures. Edited by Melvin M. Webber. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967.
- White, Harrison C. "Multipliers, Vacancy Chains, and Filling in Housing", Journal of the American Institute of Planners Vol. 37 (March, 1971), 88-94.
- Winsborough, H. H. "City Growth and City Structure", Journal of Regional Science Vol. 4 (1962), 35-49.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03082 5263