

728.1
H15a

NOTICE: This material may
be protected by copyright
law (Title 17, U. S. Code).

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

OCT 6 1980

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

Housing Conditions in Urban Poverty Areas

By ALLEN D. MANVEL
Prepared for the Consideration of
THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS

Research Report No. 9
Washington, D.C. 1968

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 35 cents

Letter of Transmittal

The Honorable Paul H. Douglas
Chairman
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We are forwarding to you and the Commission this report entitled "Housing Conditions in Urban Poverty Areas," another in the series of background studies on key issues and problems which the President and the Congress asked this Commission to examine.

This report was prepared by Allen D. Manvel of the Commission staff. It presents data from two special tabulating operations carried out for the Commission by the U. S. Bureau of the Census, to provide information about (1) the geographic extent of "poverty areas" in the largest metropolitan areas (those that had a 1960 population of 250,000 or more), and (2) the volume and characteristics of housing in such areas, as indicated by the 1960 Census of Housing.

The resulting statistics provide more explicit measures than have previously been available about the geographic concentration of housing problems in metropolitan areas and their central cities.

The defined "poverty areas," as more fully explained in the report itself, consist of groups of Census tracts that were shown by the 1960 Census to rank relatively low in terms of an index reflecting income, family composition, education, employment, and housing conditions.

Appreciation is due the Bureau of the Census, and particularly to its Governments Division and Housing Division, for assembling the basic data summarized in this report. Mrs. Marion Massen, of the Commission staff, handled final editing of the report and arrangements for publication.

Sincerely,
HOWARD E. SHUMAN
Executive Director

l
l
e
a
g
D
o
s
t
f:
Th
Ur
by
si
re
he
Th
at:
tic
The
cit
The
and
in 1
The
anotl
tion
grou
Washi
Octob

FOREWORD

Urban housing problems are especially severe in particular rundown neighborhoods, to which such terms as "slums" or "blighted areas" are commonly applied. Housing problems are also severe in the "ghettos," where poverty and discrimination have concentrated so many Negroes and other minority-group Americans.

Despite the widespread use of such geographic terms, there is a dearth of hard, basic facts about the neighborhoods they involve. One belated step to help overcome this lack has been the Census Bureau's recent detailing of "poverty areas" in major metropolitan areas, in the light of findings from the 1960 Censuses of Population and Housing.

This research report represents an effort by the National Commission on Urban Problems to take advantage of that important new geographic concept by assembling data -- never before thus summarized -- about the geographic size of these poverty areas and about their housing conditions. They represent a considerable improvement over the overall or average figures heretofore used that fail to paint the whole picture.

This report is deliberately limited to a presentation and summary explanation of the statistics. But the findings have many important implications for public policy in dealing with urban housing and ghetto problems. They show that the defined poverty areas of the major metropolitan central cities had, in 1960 --

Six times as high a proportion of substandard housing units as other parts of these cities (25 vs. 4 percent);

More than twice as high a proportion of overcrowded units (18 vs. 7 percent); and

Eight times as high a proportion of nonwhite households (39 vs. 5 percent).

The most striking contrast is between the general conditions in the suburbs and the conditions in the poverty areas of the central cities -- as shown in Table 7 --

Housing density in the central city poverty areas was 40 times as great (3,071 vs. 75 units per square mile);

Two-thirds (68 percent) of the units were rented in the central city poverty areas as against two-thirds (67.4 percent) owner-occupied units in the suburbs; and

Ten times the proportion of nonwhites lived in the central city poverty areas (40 percent) as in the suburbs (4 percent).

The reported statistics are, of course, nearly 10 years "out of date" -- another example of the urgent need for a more frequent Census of Population and Housing. Nevertheless, these data have provided useful background to our Commission, and we are happy to make them publicly available.

Washington, D. C.
October 1968

PAUL H. DOUGLAS
Chairman

CONTENTS

Commission Members.....inside front cover
 Letter of Transmittal.....ii
 Foreward.....iii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

 Table 1. Characteristics of Families in SMSA's of Over 250,000
 Population, By Poverty Area Status and Region: 1960 1

GEOGRAPHIC FINDINGS 2

 Table 2. Territory Within Poverty Areas of SMSA's of Over
 250,000 Population, By Region: 1960..... 3

 Table 3. Distribution of SMSA's of Over 250,000 Population By
 Proportion of Territory Within Poverty Areas--Total, Central
 City and Outlying Portions--By Region: 1960..... 4

POVERTY- AREA HOUSING CONDITIONS 5

 Relation to Area Totals..... 5

 Table 4. Poverty-Area Percentages of Land Area and of Various
 Housing Items, For All SMSA's of Over 250,000 Population:
 1960..... 6

POVERTY AREAS IN CENTRAL CITIES..... 7

 Regional Variations..... 7

 Central City Housing Density..... 7

 Table 5. Distribution of SMSA's of Over 250,000 Population By
 Proportion of All Housing Units Located Within Poverty Areas--
 Entire SMSA's and Central City Portions, By Region: 1960..... 8

 Table 6. Housing Units Per Square Mile Within and Outside
 Poverty Areas of Central Cities of the Largest SMSA's: 1960. 9

DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS.....10

 Table 7. Selected Housing Data for SMSA's of Over 250,000
 Population, Poverty Areas, Other Portions: 1960.....11

INDIVIDUAL-AREA DATA.....13

DEFINITION OF POVERTY AREAS.....13

 Table 8. Data on Land Area and Housing Units, For Poverty
 Areas of SMSA's of Over 250,000 Population: 1960.....14

SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS OF DATA.....20

Ir
 IT
 "b
 pr
 of
 wi
 ob
 es
 An
 Cen
 of
 la
 pop
 bel
 del
 fan
 Thi
 per
 out
 res
 in
 ind
 Tab
 Tot
 Wh
 No
 Perc
 Of
 Of
 Of
 Perc
 pove
 In
 Ou
 * Excl
 pover
 Sourc

Introduction

IT IS COMMON KNOWLEDGE -- as such terms as "slums," "ghettos," and "blighted neighborhoods" attest -- that urban social and economic problems tend to be geographically concentrated. However, few examples of data can be found that show how such poor or deprived areas compare with other parts of cities or metropolitan areas. One long-standing obstacle has been the lack of any set of consistent standards to identify especially poor areas.

An effort to meet that need has recently been made by the Bureau of the Census, for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Bureau used findings of the 1960 Census of Population to define "poverty areas" within the largest metropolitan areas ("SMSA's") -- i.e., those that had a 1960 population of 250,000 or more. (See "The Definition of Poverty Areas," below.) The Census Bureau has published some population data for such defined poverty areas, showing that in 1960 they included 4,795,000 families, or 19.6 percent of all families in the major SMSA's involved. This included 3,653,000 families in central-city poverty areas, or 29.7 percent of all central-city families; and 1,142,000 families in the outlying portions of these SMSA's, or 9.3 percent of all families residing there. Of course, the incidence of poverty averages much higher in these defined poverty areas than in other parts of major SMSA's, as indicated by the Census Bureau data in Table 1.

Table 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES IN SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION, BY POVERTY AREA STATUS AND REGION: 1960
(in thousands)

Item	United States*	North-east	North Central*	South	West
Total	24,506	8,335	6,541	4,906	4,724
White	22,025	7,696	5,878	4,085	4,366
Nonwhite.	2,481	639	663	821	358
Percent in poverty areas:					
Of all families	19.6	17.8	15.5	33.9	13.4
Of white families	13.7	13.6	8.8	24.5	10.4
Of nonwhite families.	71.7	69.2	74.3	80.7	50.7
Percent of families below poverty level:					
In poverty areas	28.5	24.0	27.4	34.5	25.1
Outside poverty areas.	8.5	8.0	7.5	11.0	8.9

*Excluding data for the Davenport-Rock Island-Moline SMSA, for which no poverty area was defined.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Poverty Areas in the 100 Largest Metropolitan Areas, Report PC(S1)-54, November 1967.

This report summarizes the results of two special tabulating efforts carried out by the Census Bureau, at the request of the National Commission on Urban Problems, to supply (1) figures showing the geographic extent of these defined poverty areas, separately for the central city and outlying portions of each of the major SMSA's; and (2) findings of the 1960 Census of Housing on housing conditions in these SMSA's, separately for the poverty area portions and other portions of the respective central cities¹ and noncentral-city territory.

Before detailing the findings about housing conditions in poverty areas, we will first examine the data with respect to the geographic extent of the poverty areas.

GEOGRAPHIC FINDINGS

Each poverty area defined by the Bureau of the Census, as more fully explained below, consists of a group of adjoining Census tracts which ranked relatively low in terms of a composite index based on various measures from the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. Altogether, 193 such areas were delineated, including some territory in all but one of the 101 SMSA's of 250,000 or over (the exception being the Davenport-Rock Island-Moline SMSA).²

Following is a summary distribution of the 101 largest SMSA's, in terms of the geographic incidence of poverty areas within and outside the central cities:

	<u>Number of SMSA's</u>
No poverty area	1
Poverty area only outside central city . . .	1
Poverty area only within central city . . .	43
Poverty area both within and outside, with poverty area proportion of territory:	
Higher in central city	28
Lower in central city than outside . . .	28

Of the 203,303 square miles of land within the largest metropolitan areas, approximately one-fourth, or 52,073 square miles, lie within the defined poverty areas. However, as indicated by Table 2, this proportion differs widely among regions -- from 41 percent for the 32 major SMSA's in the South and 33 percent for the 18 major SMSA's in the West down to only

¹The term "central city" refers to the entire area of the city or cities used in the name of the SMSA, and not merely to the "core" or "downtown" or "inner-city area" of a major city.

²The Office of Economic Opportunity has issued (in three volumes) a set of maps delineating the poverty areas for each of the largest SMSA's, under the title, Maps of Major Concentrations of Poverty in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of 250,000 or More Population.

1 percent for the 25 major SMSA's in the North Central region. This reflects the fact that the North Central poverty areas are found nearly entirely within central cities. In each of the other regions, there is far more poverty-area territory in the suburban parts of the major SMSA's than within the central cities.³

Table 2. TERRITORY WITHIN POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION, BY REGION: 1960

Item	United States	North-east	North Central	South	West
Number of SMSA's	101	26	25	32	18
SMSA land area (sq. miles):					
Total	203,303	30,277	36,435	44,475	92,116
Within central cities	7,663	1,124	1,732	3,018	1,791
Outside central cities	195,640	29,153	34,703	41,457	90,325
Poverty-area land (sq. miles):					
Total	52,073	3,242	347	18,334	30,150
Within central cities	1,785	208	305	941	331
Outside central cities	50,288	3,034	42	17,393	28,819
Poverty area percentage of all land area:					
Entire SMSA's	25.6	10.7	1.0	41.2	32.7
Within central cities	23.3	18.5	17.6	31.2	18.5
Outside central cities	25.7	10.4	0.1	42.0	33.0

Poverty areas within the central cities themselves comprise 23 percent of the cities' total land area -- i.e., 1,785 out of 7,660 square miles. Again, one region differs considerably from the others: the percentage of the central city land within poverty areas is 31 percent for the 32 major SMSA's in the South, as compared with about 18 percent for the SMSA's in each of the other three regions.

The poverty-area proportion of land averages about the same, nationwide, for the central cities and outlying parts of these large SMSA's. Again, however, this is the net result of marked interregional differences: the outlying-area proportion is considerably less in the Northeast and North Central regions, while the reverse is true in the South and West.

³This comparison, it should be emphasized, is entirely geographic. The population of poverty areas outside central cities, as suggested by the housing data in Table 4, is only about one-fourth that of the central-city poverty areas.

Table 3. DISTRIBUTION OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION BY PROPORTION OF TERRITORY WITHIN POVERTY AREAS--TOTAL, CENTRAL CITY AND OUTLYING PORTIONS--BY REGION: 1960

Percent of land in poverty areas	Number of areas					Cumulative percent of areas				
	United States	North-east	North-Central	South	West	United States	North-east	North-Central	South	West
ENTIRE SMSA'S										
Total.....	101	26	25	32	18	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
60 or more.....	16	-	-	11	5	16	-	-	34	28
50 to 59.9.....	9	1	-	6	2	25	4	-	53	39
30 to 49.9.....	6	1	-	4	1	31	8	-	66	44
20 to 29.9.....	3	1	-	2	-	34	12	-	72	44
10 to 19.9.....	4	2	-	2	-	38	19	-	78	44
0.1 to 9.9.....	62	21	24	7	10	99	100	96	100	100
None.....	1	-	1	-	-	100	100	100	100	100
CENTRAL CITIES										
60 or more.....	7	3	-	3	1	7	12	-	9	6
50 to 59.9.....	10	2	-	8	-	17	19	-	34	6
30 to 49.9.....	16	5	5	4	2	33	38	20	47	17
20 to 29.9.....	28	7	3	13	5	50	65	32	88	44
10 to 19.9.....	28	6	13	3	6	88	88	84	97	78
0.1 to 9.9.....	10	3	3	-	4	98	100	96	97	100
None.....	2	-	1	1	-	100	100	100	100	100
OUTLYING PORTIONS										
60 or more.....	16	-	-	11	5	16	-	-	34	28
50 to 59.9.....	10	1	-	6	3	26	4	-	53	44
30 to 49.9.....	4	1	-	3	-	30	8	-	63	44
20 to 29.9.....	4	1	-	3	-	34	12	-	72	44
10 to 19.9.....	3	1	-	2	-	37	15	-	78	44
0.1 to 9.9.....	20	8	5	3	4	56	46	20	88	67
None.....	44	14	20	4	6	100	100	100	100	100

About one-third of all the entire SMSA's, and also of the central cities and outlying portions, have 30 percent or more of their territory within poverty areas. However, as Table 3 shows, the various regions differ a great deal, with these proportions running considerably higher in the South and West than in the Northeast and North Central regions for entire SMSA's and their outlying portions. On the other hand, for central cities as such, high poverty-area proportions of territory are especially evident in the South and Northeast.

POVERTY-AREA HOUSING CONDITIONS

In 1960, the SMSA's of over 250,000 population had 31.2 million housing units, or 53.5 percent of the Nation's total housing stock. Three million of these housing units in the largest metropolitan areas, or nearly 10 percent, were found to be "substandard" when that term is defined as "dilapidated" or, although better than this from a general structural standpoint, lacking hot water, running water, or a private toilet or bath. More than 2.9 million of the occupied housing units in these SMSA's were "overcrowded" -- i.e., they averaged more than one resident per room. (A considerable fraction of these overcrowded units were also substandard by the definition above; so the two figures should not be added.)

Relation to Area Totals

The proportions of substandard and crowded housing -- as defined above -- were considerably higher in the poverty-area parts of the major SMSA's. Substandard units made up 25.1 percent of the total in poverty areas, as against 5.2 percent elsewhere in these SMSA's; and 16.3 percent of the occupied units in poverty areas were overcrowded, compared with 7.4 percent elsewhere. These and other disparities can be seen in another way, as shown in Table 4. In 1960, the defined poverty areas had 25.6 percent of the land area and 22.4 percent of the housing units of the largest SMSA's, but --

- 58 percent of all the substandard units;
- 39 percent of all the overcrowded units;
- 31 percent of all the housing units in structures over 20 years old;
- 35 percent of the units in multi-unit structures; and
- 35 percent of all the renter-occupied units; but only
- 13 percent of all the owner-occupied units.

Also, the poverty areas accounted for 74 percent of all the housing units in the major SMSA's that were occupied by nonwhites.

Table 4. POVERTY-AREA PERCENTAGES OF LAND AREA AND OF VARIOUS HOUSING ITEMS,
FOR ALL SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960

Item	Percent of All-SMSA Totals			Poverty-area Percentages of	
	All Poverty Areas	Central City Poverty Areas	Outlying Poverty Areas	Central City Totals	Outlying Area Totals
Land area	25.6	0.9	24.7	23.3	25.7
All housing units	22.4	17.6	4.8	33.3	10.3
All occupied units	22.0	17.3	4.6	32.6	9.9
Owner-occupied units	12.6	7.9	4.7	18.9	8.1
Renter-occupied units	35.0	30.5	4.5	43.9	14.8
Vacant units	28.7	20.8	7.9	45.0	14.6
Units occupied by nonwhites	73.6	65.6	8.0	79.2	46.7
Substandard units	58.2	44.8	13.4	75.8	32.7
Those occupied by nonwhites	83.3	68.0	15.3	90.9	60.6
Dilapidated units	57.6	42.7	14.9	76.0	34.0
Overcrowded housing units	38.9	30.5	8.4	54.2	19.1
Those occupied by nonwhites	77.6	66.7	10.9	83.5	54.1
Housing units in structures over 20 years old	31.4	26.7	4.7	40.8	13.6
Those occupied by nonwhites	78.8	72.9	5.8	83.1	47.8
Housing units in multi-unit structures	35.1	32.7	2.4	42.2	10.5
Those occupied by nonwhites	79.8	77.1	2.7	83.2	37.6

r
i
f
c
u
f
s
f
w
e
t
c
f
g
c
c
C
T
h
P
t
H
t
g
t
T
i
s
a

POVERTY AREAS IN CENTRAL CITIES

Looking specifically at the central cities of these largest SMSA's, it is found that defined poverty areas, with 23.3 percent of the land area of the central cities, had in 1960 --

- 33 percent of all the cities' housing units;
- 76 percent of the substandard units;
- 54 percent of the overcrowded units;
- 45 percent of the vacant housing units;
- 41 percent of the units in structures over 20 years old;
- 42 percent of the units in multi-unit structures; and
- 44 percent of the renter-occupied units; but only
- 19 percent of all the owner-occupied units in the central cities.

The defined poverty areas accounted for 79 percent of all the central city housing units occupied by nonwhite households.

Regional Variations

In all except 4 of the 101 largest SMSA's, as indicated by Table 5, the defined poverty areas accounted for at least 10 percent of all housing units in 1960, and in 12 of the areas, this proportion was at least 50 percent. Again, a marked regional variation appears, with the Southern SMSA's typically showing a considerably larger fraction of poverty-area housing units.

When the comparison is limited to central-city territory, high proportions are also found among many Northeast areas: in half the 26 large SMSA's in that region, the poverty-area proportion of all housing units in the central cities was at least 35 percent in 1960, and in only 3 instances was this fraction less than 25 percent. The West, with relatively younger and often geographically larger metropolitan centers, offers a contrast: of the 18 central cities there, only 5 showed poverty areas accounting for 25 percent or more of all housing units.

Central City Housing Density

The poverty areas of the central cities typically have a considerably higher "housing density" than other parts of these cities. In 1960, the poverty areas had 3,071 housing units per square mile, or 64 percent more than the 1,874 per square mile average for the remainder of the cities. However, the poverty areas also had a higher proportion of vacancies, so that in terms of occupied housing units the disparity was not quite so great -- 2,839 per square mile in poverty areas, or 59 percent higher than the 1,787 per square mile elsewhere in these metropolitan cities.

This tendency toward a relatively higher housing density in poverty areas is found for most of the 97 metropolitan central cities for which a specific comparison can be made. In 4 cities, there are at least 4 times as many units per square mile in the poverty-area portion as elsewhere;

in 6 cities this ratio is between 3 to 1 and 4 to 1; in 33 cities, it is between 2 to 1 and 3 to 1; and in 32 cities, it is between 1.2 to 1 and 2 to 1. In 12 cities, there is relatively little difference in housing density between poverty areas and other city territory; and in 10 cities, the difference runs the other way.

However, it should not be concluded that all central city poverty areas involve a very high housing density. The poverty areas tend to share the general housing patterns of their respective regions -- typically involving a higher proportion of multi-family housing and higher geographic densities in Northeast and North Central cities than in metropolitan central cities of the South and West. Accordingly, the poverty-area parts of some major cities are less "crowded" from a housing standpoint than even the non-poverty parts of numerous other major cities.

Nonetheless, there is a strong general tendency toward higher density for the poverty areas: as Table 6 shows, housing units in 1960 averaged at least 5,000 per square mile in the poverty-area parts of more than one-fourth of the central cities, while only 3 percent of the cities showed such a high density for their nonpoverty territory; and for half the cities, the poverty-area average was at least 3,000 units per square mile, while less than one-fifth of the cities showed this high a housing density for their nonpoverty territory.

Table 6. HOUSING UNITS PER SQUARE MILE WITHIN AND OUTSIDE POVERTY AREAS OF CENTRAL CITIES OF THE LARGEST SMSA'S: 1960

Housing Units per Square Mile	Number of Cities		Cumulative Percent	
	Poverty Areas	Other Area	Poverty Areas	Other Area
Total*	97	97	xxx	xxx
8,000 or more.	9	1	9.3	1.0
5,000 to 7,999	17	2	26.8	3.1
3,500 to 4,999	12	11	39.2	14.4
3,000 to 3,499	11	4	50.5	18.6
2,500 to 2,999	13	10	63.9	28.9
2,000 to 2,499	7	14	71.1	43.3
1,500 to 1,999	10	15	81.4	58.8
1,000 to 1,499	6	23	87.6	82.5
Under 1,000	12	17	100.0	100.0

*Counting each major SMSA only once (i.e., combining any "twin" central cities), and omitting 4 of the 101 largest SMSA's (2 without any central city poverty area and 2 for which precise geographic data are lacking).

The contrast between housing density in the central city poverty areas and the density outside the central city but within SMSA's is even greater. In the former it is 3,071 units per square mile, compared with 75 units per square mile in the suburbs of the central cities.

Table 7. SELECTED HOUSING DATA FOR SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION, POVERTY AREAS, OTHER PORTIONS: 1960

(housing units in thousands)

Item	Entire SMSA's			Central Cities			Outside Central Cities		
	Total	Within	Outside	Total	Within	Outside	Total	Within	Outside
		Poverty Areas	Poverty Areas		Poverty Areas	Poverty Areas		Poverty Areas	
Land area (thousands of square miles).....	203.3	52.1	151.2	7.7	1.8	5.9	195.6	50.3	145.4
All housing units.....	31,200	6,993	24,207	16,477	5,481	10,996	14,723	1,512	13,211
Owner-occupied.....	16,996	2,142	14,853	7,070	1,339	5,731	9,925	803	9,122
Occupied by nonwhites.....	1,039	639	400	1,767	520	247	271	119	152
Renter-occupied.....	12,217	4,281	7,936	8,487	3,728	4,758	3,730	552	3,178
Occupied by nonwhites.....	2,004	1,601	403	1,774	1,476	278	250	125	126
Vacant.....	1,987	570	1,418	920	414	507	1,067	156	911
Substandard housing units.....	3,018	1,755	1,263	1,784	1,352	432	1,235	404	831
Dilapidated.....	920	530	390	517	393	124	403	137	266
Other.....	2,098	1,225	873	1,267	959	308	832	267	565
Housing units occupied by nonwhites.....	3,044	2,240	803	2,522	1,997	525	522	244	278
Substandard housing units.....	765	637	128	572	520	52	193	117	75
Occupied housing units.....	29,212	6,423	22,789	15,557	5,067	10,489	13,655	1,356	12,300
With recent movers.....	9,564	2,326	7,238	5,149	1,863	3,286	4,414	463	3,951
Occupied by whites.....	26,168	4,183	21,986	13,035	3,070	9,964	13,133	1,112	12,022
With recent movers.....	8,437	1,510	6,927	4,191	1,123	3,067	4,245	387	3,859
Occupied by nonwhites.....	3,044	2,240	803	2,522	1,997	525	522	244	278
With recent movers.....	1,127	816	311	958	740	219	169	76	92
Overcrowded housing units.....	2,933	1,141	1,792	1,650	895	755	1,283	245	1,037
Occupied by whites.....	2,206	577	1,628	1,069	410	659	1,137	166	970
Occupied by nonwhites.....	727	564	164	581	485	96	146	79	67
Housing units in structures over 20 years old.....	17,478	5,492	11,986	11,449	4,674	6,775	6,029	818	5,210
Occupied by nonwhites.....	2,225	1,753	472	1,953	1,623	330	272	130	142
Housing units in multi-unit structures.....	10,690	3,750	6,940	8,283	3,497	4,786	2,407	253	2,154
Occupied by nonwhites.....	1,494	1,192	301	1,385	1,152	233	109	41	68

11

DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS

Table 7 provides nationwide totals and computed proportions for many types of housing characteristics. Especially because of the geographic variations discussed above, these findings obviously should not be taken to reflect closely the housing situation for any one metropolitan area. Nevertheless, they provide a useful summary background -- in a form not previously available -- on some major patterns and relationships of housing conditions within the largest metropolitan areas.

At the time of the 1960 Census, as Table 7 shows, the poverty areas of major SMSA's had:

- A higher rate of vacant housing than other areas (8.2 versus 5.9 percent for entire SMSA's, and 7.6 versus 4.6 percent within central cities);
- A far smaller proportion of homeownership (33 versus 65 percent of occupied units for entire SMSA's, and 26 versus 55 percent within central cities);
- A far higher proportion of nonwhite occupancy (35 versus 3.5 percent for entire SMSA's, and 39 versus 5 percent within central cities);
- A far higher proportion of substandard housing units (25 versus 5 percent for entire SMSA's, and 25 versus 4 percent within central cities);
- A considerably higher proportion of overcrowded units (18 versus 8 percent for entire SMSA's, and 18 versus 7 percent within central cities);
- A larger proportion of housing units in structures more than 20 years old (79 versus 50 percent for entire SMSA's, and 85 versus 62 percent within central cities); and
- A considerably higher proportion of housing in multi-unit structures (54 versus 29 percent in entire SMSA's, and 64 versus 44 percent within central cities).

The direction of difference indicated in each of these instances might have been anticipated merely in terms of "common knowledge" and cursory observation of the urban scene, but until now explicit data have not been available. The reported data have translated such anticipations into explicit measures.

Table 7 also includes at least two sets of ratios that do not conform to common impressions. In the first place, no significant difference appears in the proportion of "substandard" units that were classed in the Census of Housing as "dilapidated," as between poverty and other areas; in each instance, the dilapidated housing made up less than one-third of all the substandard units, with the remainder being so designated because of a deficiency in their plumbing facilities.

Table 7. SELECTED HOUSING DATA FOR SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION, POVERTY AREAS, OTHER PORTIONS: 1960 (Cont.)

Item	Entire SMSA's			Central Cities			Outside Central Cities		
	Total	Within	Outside	Total	Within	Outside	Total	Within	Outside
		Poverty Areas	Poverty Areas		Poverty Areas	Poverty Areas		Poverty Areas	
Housing units per square mile.....	153	134	160	2,150	3,071	1,874	75	30	91
Occupied units per square mile.....	144	123	151	2,030	2,839	1,787	70	27	85
Percent of all housing units vacant.....	6.4	8.2	5.9	5.6	7.6	4.6	7.2	10.3	6.9
Percent of all occupied units owner-occupied.....	58.2	33.3	65.2	45.4	26.4	54.6	72.7	59.2	74.2
Percent nonwhite occupied:									
Of all occupied units.....	10.4	34.9	3.5	16.2	39.4	5.0	3.8	18.0	2.3
Of owner-occupied units.....	6.1	29.8	2.7	25.0	38.8	4.3	2.7	14.8	1.7
Percent substandard housing units:									
Of all units.....	9.7	25.1	5.2	10.8	24.7	3.9	8.4	26.7	6.3
Of nonwhite-occupied units.....	25.1	28.4	15.9	22.7	26.0	9.9	37.0	48.0	27.0
Dilapidated units as percent of all substandard units.....	30.5	30.2	30.9	29.0	29.1	28.7	32.6	33.9	32.0
Percent with recent movers:									
Of all occupied units.....	32.7	36.2	31.8	33.1	36.8	31.3	32.3	34.1	32.1
Of white-occupied units.....	37.0	36.4	38.7	38.0	37.1	41.7	32.4	31.1	33.1
Of nonwhite-occupied units.....	32.2	36.1	31.5	32.2	36.6	30.7	32.3	34.8	32.1
Percent overcrowded:									
Of all occupied units.....	10.0	17.8	7.9	10.6	17.7	7.2	9.4	18.1	8.4
Of white-occupied units.....	8.4	13.8	7.4	8.2	13.4	6.6	8.7	14.9	8.1
Of nonwhite-occupied units.....	23.9	25.2	20.4	23.0	24.3	18.3	28.0	32.4	24.1
Percent of units in structures over 20 years old:									
Of all housing units.....	56.0	78.5	49.5	69.5	85.3	61.6	40.9	54.1	39.4
Of nonwhite-occupied units.....	73.1	78.3	58.8	77.4	81.3	63.5	52.1	53.3	51.1
Percent of units in multi-unit structures:									
Of all housing units.....	34.3	53.6	28.7	50.3	63.8	43.5	16.3	16.7	16.3
Of nonwhite-occupied units.....	49.1	53.2	37.5	54.9	57.7	44.4	20.9	16.8	24.7

Secondly, Table 7 reflects only a slightly higher proportion of "recent movers" for occupied units in poverty areas than in other parts of metropolitan areas and their central cities. (The term refers to households that had moved into the dwelling where they were enumerated in April 1960 within the preceding 27 months -- i.e., after December 1957.) This does not seem to conform with the common impression of a high turnover rate of tenancy for poor areas. Perhaps, however, that phenomenon would show up if a shorter interval than 27 months were being separately recorded. A word of caution is thus in order. It should also be remembered that poverty-stricken areas (both rural and urban) involve especially difficult problems of complete enumeration in the Census, with undercounting most likely to involve some of the transient elements of the population.

INDIVIDUAL-AREA DATA

Statistics on land area and selected key housing items are presented in Table 8 for the poverty-area portions of individual major SMSA's and their respective central cities. In Table 8, as elsewhere throughout this study, the terms "central city" or "central city portion" refer to the city or cities included in the name of the SMSA. Related geographic and housing data for these respective metropolitan areas and major cities appear in various Census Bureau publications, including the County and City Data Book.

In the use of these individual-area data, it should especially be observed that they are based upon 1960 Census findings and do not, accordingly, reflect subsequent changes in the boundaries of individual cities and SMSA's, or in their housing supply. The data do take account of one kind of post-1960 development, however: as indicated below, in the delineation of poverty areas, some Census tracts that would have been included in the light of the 1960 Census findings were deleted because they had been materially affected by urban renewal operations during the period 1960-1966.

DEFINITION OF POVERTY AREAS

The concepts and methods used by the Bureau of the Census to delineate poverty areas in the largest metropolitan areas are fully outlined in its report, Poverty Areas in the 100 Largest Metropolitan Areas.⁴ In brief, the following steps were involved:

a. Ranking all the Census tracts in the 101 SMSA's that had a 1960 population of 250,000 or more in terms of a composite "poverty index" that gave equal weight to the following five characteristics:

1. Percent of families with cash incomes under \$3,000 in 1959;
2. Percent of children under 18 not living with both parents;
3. Percent of males over 25 with less than 8 years of schooling;
4. Percent of unskilled males over 14 in the employed labor force;
5. Percent of substandard housing units.

⁴See fn., Table 1.

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard	Over-crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard housing units	Over-crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
Akron, Ohio	5.65	18,859	6,239	4,554	2,331	1.4	12	63	29	18	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.65	18,859	6,239	4,554	2,331	10.5	20	68	54	32	3,338	1,563
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y.	15.04	42,877	3,993	10,053	2,559	0.7	19	82	38	23	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	13.49	41,032	3,974	9,785	2,456	34.9	41	92	86	55	3,042	2,309
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	954.50	23,930	1,300	6,810	6,447	82.1	31	66	83	52	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	9.07	13,148	889	3,445	2,967	16.1	22	61	80	37	1,450	1,014
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.-N.J.	54.92	22,556	615	4,839	1,195	5.1	14	55	26	15	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	18.92	18,874	599	3,934	1,002	46.9	27	69	63	35	998	2,387
Atlanta, Ga.	1,140.44	111,513	44,923	35,127	25,092	66.2	36	78	71	61	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	39.91	70,629	39,865	21,155	18,091	31.1	46	83	80	77	1,770	946
Bakersfield, Calif.	4,857.99	47,178	4,852	8,391	8,737	59.6	48	90	66	68	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	11.43	7,634	2,444	756	915	71.5	39	97	85	61	668	2,580
Baltimore, Md.	902.42	155,479	71,206	21,087	23,137	49.9	30	78	55	51	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	19.74	126,910	67,876	14,176	20,210	25.0	44	84	88	72	6,429	2,753
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Texas	833.02	38,609	15,973	12,159	7,060	64.0	40	94	81	54	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	36.67	27,677	14,174	9,901	5,233	31.5	45	94	89	66	755	424
Birmingham, Ala.	792.68	116,496	51,709	42,700	25,214	70.9	60	93	88	84	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	34.69	62,457	33,056	21,006	13,668	46.6	57	94	89	84	1,800	1,173
Boston, Mass.	35.07	100,042	3,178	32,930	9,439	3.6	12	57	50	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	10.08	85,314	2,930	29,903	7,994	21.1	36	85	81	44	8,464	4,070
Bridgeport, Conn.	3.11	17,766	3,191	3,950	2,403	1.9	17	70	51	30	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.11	17,766	3,191	3,950	2,403	20.6	34	78	71	51	5,713	2,826
Buffalo, N.Y.	11.29	61,097	18,599	11,663	4,867	0.7	15	80	36	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	11.29	61,097	18,599	11,663	4,867	28.7	34	94	70	52	5,412	4,131
Canton, Ohio	5.12	13,077	2,650	2,617	1,719	0.9	13	61	24	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.12	13,077	2,650	2,617	1,719	35.8	35	97	76	56	2,554	2,626
Charleston, W. Va.	(1)	37,059	1,651	12,207	6,793	(1)	48	42	83	69	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	(1)	3,847	216	998	679	(1)	13	9	33	26	144	15,473
Charlotte, N.C.	158.31	26,875	13,230	8,115	5,813	29.2	33	80	62	57	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	31.44	21,750	12,485	6,382	5,035	48.5	35	87	76	66	692	1,211
Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.	389.07	48,169	12,511	14,789	8,773	38.1	55	94	83	72	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	17.63	29,313	11,688	7,595	5,446	48.0	70	99	95	89	1,663	664
Chicago, Ill.	42.77	380,482	195,364	117,618	80,527	1.2	19	78	59	41	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	32.42	364,874	191,600	112,827	77,957	14.5	30	82	70	58	11,255	4,430
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.	22.68	101,066	27,402	27,748	20,958	3.1	29	72	54	46	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	20.51	75,807	24,031	23,882	16,337	26.5	44	74	69	64	3,696	1,688
Cleveland, Ohio	11.27	97,252	51,606	19,226	15,342	1.6	17	75	62	36	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	11.27	97,252	51,606	19,226	15,342	13.9	34	76	75	56	8,629	2,655
Columbia, S.C.	1,323.84	37,032	14,071	14,759	7,826	90.9	54	92	90	77	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.45	12,213	6,653	4,588	2,538	24.2	43	92	88	73	2,744	1,177

¹ Untraced SMSA; poverty-area territory estimated for summary tables only.

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960 (Continued)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard	Over-crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard housing units	Over-crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
Columbus, Ohio	13.49	48,721	15,351	13,449	7,209	2.5	23	72	59	38	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	13.49	48,721	15,351	13,449	7,209	15.2	32	75	75	51	3,612	1,367
Dallas, Texas	2,643.67	118,320	37,399	31,421	21,310	72.4	33	89	77	55	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	76.24	69,144	32,495	16,780	15,004	27.2	30	92	79	61	907	796
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, Iowa-Ill. ¹	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central city portion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dayton, Ohio	16.83	29,017	12,873	7,203	5,412	1.3	14	71	32	27	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	12.16	27,328	12,252	6,232	5,022	36.2	33	82	66	56	2,247	2,638
Denver, Colo.	16.30	51,586	7,706	13,948	5,905	0.4	17	70	50	22	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	16.30	51,586	7,706	13,948	5,905	23.0	30	75	76	45	3,165	2,240
Des Moines, Iowa	12.65	17,978	2,476	7,076	1,890	2.1	20	78	49	24	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	12.65	17,978	2,476	7,076	1,890	19.6	25	80	62	32	1,421	1,037
Detroit, Mich.	44.80	217,922	101,922	32,696	25,796	2.3	19	69	51	24	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	34.69	188,716	93,641	28,303	22,469	24.9	34	72	82	51	5,440	3,473
Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wisc.	7.05	9,992	170	4,640	581	0.1	10	34	18	6	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	7.05	9,575	170	4,388	553	11.3	20	93	54	16	1,358	687
El Paso, Texas	379.80	35,784	1,236	15,453	12,487	36.0	42	57	93	64	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	33.37	31,546	1,203	13,261	11,237	29.1	40	66	92	64	945	578
Erie, Pa.	4.26	12,003	1,254	2,477	1,118	0.5	15	79	32	20	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.26	12,003	1,254	2,477	1,118	22.7	27	83	67	38	2,818	2,195
Flint, Mich.	3.85	11,667	6,291	2,505	1,673	0.6	10	70	23	13	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.85	11,667	6,291	2,505	1,673	12.9	19	74	50	27	3,030	1,943
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.	(2)	30,679	5,295	3,678	3,962	(2)	24	40	45	34	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,344
Fort Worth, Texas	571.97	47,544	12,699	11,919	7,194	35.7	24	74	63	35	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	28.15	38,954	12,137	9,374	6,277	20.0	31	76	75	47	1,384	769
Fresno, Calif.	3,108.80	64,715	6,563	13,941	11,272	52.1	54	90	90	77	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	6.64	15,641	3,143	2,371	1,877	23.2	35	91	89	54	2,356	1,347
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ill.	13.04	33,051	17,762	9,664	8,011	1.4	20	83	47	30	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	13.04	33,051	17,762	9,664	8,011	17.0	32	85	70	46	2,535	1,111
Grand-Rapids, Mich.	1.93	6,779	1,928	1,697	661	0.2	6	50	18	8	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	1.93	6,779	1,928	1,697	661	7.9	11	52	40	20	3,512	2,325
Harrisburg, Pa.	4.84	16,720	3,806	2,630	986	0.5	15	65	19	16	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.84	16,720	3,806	2,630	986	63.7	58	96	92	68	3,455	4,432
Hartford, Conn.	3.13	20,117	4,914	4,908	2,176	0.6	12	65	43	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.13	20,117	4,914	4,908	2,176	18.0	35	72	67	45	6,427	2,629
Honolulu, Hawaii	214.58	32,204	22,268	8,897	11,116	35.9	26	32	53	35	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.90	16,104	12,509	4,376	6,109	7.0	20	25	41	30	2,729	829

15

¹This SMSA has no defined poverty area.

²Untraced SMSA; poverty-area territory estimated for summary tables only.

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960 (Continued)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard	Over-crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard housing units	Over-crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
Houston, Texas	843.66	116,971	50,976	25,210	22,499	49.3	29	75	72	48	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	55.49	101,154	44,229	19,663	19,443	16.9	32	73	78	54	1,823	777
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ky.-Ohio	(1)	39,967	694	15,541	6,560	(1)	50	31	81	66	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	(1)	2,644	190	392	239	(1)	7	11	12	8	335	2,544
Indianapolis, Ind.	24.72	58,389	21,314	17,046	10,014	6.1	26	77	61	41	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	24.72	58,389	21,314	17,046	10,014	34.7	37	78	76	55	2,362	2,159
Jacksonville, Fla.	17.99	68,087	25,223	22,384	11,249	2.3	48	93	82	67	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	17.99	42,923	21,183	17,966	7,844	59.6	64	98	95	88	2,386	2,013
Jersey City, N.J.	7.13	42,951	8,156	15,529	6,874	15.9	21	71	55	21	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	6.09	29,568	7,764	9,277	4,926	46.8	32	76	65	32	4,855	9,023
Johnstown, Pa.	37.21	50,229	877	14,380	5,190	2.1	60	97	76	65	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.31	12,411	686	2,793	1,095	76.9	69	99	90	72	2,880	4,231
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.	21.62	89,963	28,431	22,730	11,065	1.3	23	81	53	35	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	21.62	64,629	21,890	18,541	8,128	16.7	36	85	73	55	2,989	1,035
Knoxville, Tenn.	11.12	56,038	6,446	21,337	9,807	0.8	50	86	78	66	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	11.12	21,253	5,533	5,353	3,346	43.8	58	97	77	71	1,911	1,086
Lancaster, Pa.	2.63	8,818	582	1,504	650	0.3	10	67	12	14	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.63	8,818	582	1,504	650	36.0	44	94	72	61	3,353	2,431
Lansing, Mich.	2.13	5,052	1,354	822	500	0.1	6	66	8	7	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.13	5,052	1,354	822	500	10.0	14	75	34	19	2,372	1,595
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	78.09	339,972	100,985	49,699	47,606	1.6	14	58	53	25	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	54.18	261,416	84,124	41,387	32,934	10.8	24	63	76	43	4,825	1,810
Louisville, Ky.-Ind.	21.92	64,863	16,857	17,040	12,823	2.4	29	71	50	41	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	15.69	55,707	15,819	14,281	11,472	27.5	43	77	73	61	3,550	1,752
Memphis, Tenn.	596.05	95,017	53,074	28,821	23,969	79.4	51	74	88	79	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	29.17	73,494	45,508	20,204	18,798	22.8	48	96	88	78	2,520	792
Miami, Fla.	217.57	93,014	27,653	17,201	15,269	10.6	27	77	67	47	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	8.29	54,270	17,224	11,729	7,971	24.2	45	90	82	71	6,546	2,537
Milwaukee, Wisc.	7.04	50,968	13,483	13,312	6,202	0.9	14	34	43	21	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	7.04	50,968	13,483	13,312	6,202	7.7	21	85	57	31	7,240	2,268
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	19.20	66,433	4,638	22,813	6,573	0.9	14	61	48	15	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	19.20	66,433	4,638	22,813	6,573	17.7	24	65	84	26	3,460	2,312
Mobile, Ala.	73.09	53,270	22,211	18,572	13,194	5.9	58	95	91	79	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	73.09	29,286	15,067	10,054	7,320	47.8	48	94	90	75	401	398
Nashville, Tenn.	151.23	48,606	18,875	17,099	9,741	30.5	40	94	75	68	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	19.58	37,280	17,306	13,504	7,788	165.3	70	99	92	88	1,904	1,735
Newark, N.J.	9.59	81,597	36,636	21,184	13,421	1.4	15	60	55	37	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	7.26	67,994	33,454	18,487	11,664	30.7	50	96	86	70	9,366	4,090
New Haven, Conn.	3.03	18,170	1,979	4,686	1,629	1.5	18	30	53	24	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.03	18,170	1,979	4,686	1,629	16.9	35	32	70	38	5,997	2,239

¹Untraced SMSA; poverty-area territory estimated for summary tables only.

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960 (Continued)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non- whites	Sub- standard	Over- crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units by non- whites	Sub- standard housing units	Over- crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
New Orleans, La.	611.87	169,053	65,861	43,395	37,195	54.7	62	93	91	78	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	166.84	141,831	59,566	36,110	29,798	81.3	70	95	95	86	850	1,581
New York, N.Y.	182.88	907,990	284,831	194,096	65,875	8.5	25	74	66	77	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	35.11	878,170	280,919	187,818	64,948	11.1	32	80	73	83	25,012	6,712
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	483.99	74,269	32,598	19,186	12,431	72.6	45	86	81	62	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	18.63	51,492	27,265	12,747	8,538	27.4	42	88	82	61	2,764	1,420
Oklahoma City, Okla.	397.07	45,812	11,392	12,775	7,233	18.6	26	86	65	42	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	64.45	34,613	10,905	10,503	5,614	20.0	30	92	79	50	537	313
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	4.72	18,682	5,568	4,905	2,411	0.3	13	76	29	15	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.72	18,682	5,568	4,905	2,411	9.2	19	78	46	24	3,958	1,691
Orlando, Fla.	266.74	31,366	11,359	10,922	5,821	21.6	29	85	71	49	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.83	7,775	5,544	3,298	1,817	13.4	24	100	78	61	2,747	1,316
Paterson-Clifton- Passaic, N.J.	3.44	29,823	5,613	7,444	4,265	0.8	8	50	44	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.44	29,823	5,613	7,444	4,265	29.9	32	83	79	54	8,669	7,854
Peoria, Ill.	4.84	14,137	2,279	4,277	2,003	0.4	15	90	34	23	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.84	13,346	2,279	3,959	1,873	31.8	38	96	78	61	2,757	2,137
Philadelphia, Pa.	661.75	264,127	136,024	37,032	31,877	18.6	20	74	50	39	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	20.50	223,537	121,803	29,077	27,019	16.1	34	82	82	61	10,904	3,987
Phoenix, Ariz.	7,888.72	79,293	8,400	18,323	17,716	85.5	37	92	85	60	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	64.65	34,198	6,132	7,952	7,586	34.5	24	91	79	45	529	887
Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,185.54	188,976	32,618	50,336	23,878	38.9	26	73	52	36	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	18.23	92,405	26,878	26,125	12,945	33.7	47	92	79	67	5,069	2,892
Portland, Oreg.-Wash.	6.89	31,835	4,056	9,508	1,320	0.2	11	59	34	7	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	6.89	31,835	4,056	9,508	1,320	10.3	22	66	67	23	4,620	1,843
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass.	11.72	58,259	3,090	15,440	4,639	1.8	22	75	41	27	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	7.03	41,987	2,898	10,514	3,439	26.5	42	84	70	55	5,973	3,039
Reading, Pa.	2.17	15,998	1,063	2,869	792	0.3	17	86	23	19	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.17	15,998	1,063	2,869	792	22.6	45	94	77	64	7,372	2,603
Richmond, Va.	10.61	34,338	22,605	11,000	7,312	1.5	28	83	64	30	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	10.61	34,338	22,605	11,000	7,312	28.7	50	94	99	61	3,236	1,317
Rochester, N.Y.	5.43	25,961	5,084	6,062	2,845	0.8	14	82	49	28	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.43	25,961	5,084	6,062	2,845	14.9	24	84	66	46	4,781	2,625
Sacramento, Calif.	23.50	20,407	3,367	6,126	2,145	2.4	12	35	55	15	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	1.30	15,004	2,430	4,969	937	2.9	21	36	71	22	11,542	1,295
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.	38.32	162,341	71,574	59,957	35,789	1.2	25	87	56	41	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	23.39	132,240	58,175	47,986	29,434	38.3	50	97	84	72	5,654	3,476
Salt Lake City, Utah	6.68	11,916	658	2,878	1,035	0.9	10	45	42	7	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	6.68	11,916	658	2,878	1,035	11.9	19	56	61	16	1,784	1,059
San Antonio, Texas	784.41	101,123	11,135	33,320	28,890	62.9	51	84	89	76	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	52.77	91,374	10,960	29,452	26,689	32.9	53	86	89	77	1,732	759

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960 (Continued)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard	Over-crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard housing units	Over-crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
San Bernardino-River-side-Ontario, Calif.	2,571.15	62,909	4,963	8,175	8,061	9.4	20	54	25	28	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	18.67	17,238	2,792	1,938	2,621	22.3	23	80	63	45	923	924
San Diego, Calif.	2,628.55	33,756	7,201	9,577	4,415	61.8	10	54	53	14	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	8.26	25,235	6,730	7,629	3,245	4.3	13	60	71	20	3,055	907
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	33.61	176,280	55,473	47,173	18,557	1.0	18	57	68	27	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	21.33	154,326	46,472	44,677	15,758	21.9	32	66	86	54	7,235	4,336
San Jose, Calif.	20.36	28,783	1,363	3,543	3,032	1.6	14	27	40	18	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	20.36	25,132	1,106	2,959	2,215	37.4	36	60	88	44	1,234	1,282
Seattle, Wash.	7.99	39,344	8,623	16,653	1,767	0.2	10	55	44	7	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	7.99	39,344	8,623	16,653	1,767	9.0	18	60	70	19	4,924	2,194
Shreveport, La.	1,587.49	42,523	22,248	20,511	9,663	91.9	48	90	89	69	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	15.40	21,115	13,425	9,284	4,737	42.8	39	88	84	64	1,371	1,606
Spokane, Wash.	4.32	14,481	884	6,321	647	0.2	15	61	61	9	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.32	14,481	884	6,321	647	10.0	21	69	80	16	3,352	1,403
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.	3.98	26,846	2,305	6,435	2,010	0.9	18	61	51	20	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.98	26,846	2,305	6,435	2,010	5.4	28	62	72	29	6,745	970
Syracuse, N.Y.	499.62	21,948	2,306	5,461	1,798	20.6	12	67	25	17	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.74	15,937	2,294	3,547	1,532	11.0	23	77	59	40	5,816	2,449
Tacoma, Wash.	1,103.28	14,904	1,360	4,066	874	65.8	14	41	43	12	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	4.82	10,108	1,327	2,695	458	10.1	19	64	63	16	2,097	1,033
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	698.73	91,466	21,205	26,162	12,271	53.6	30	89	72	51	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	26.82	60,366	18,948	17,863	8,057	19.3	34	99	78	62	2,251	1,033
Toledo, Ohio	5.09	24,158	9,214	4,311	2,596	1.5	16	82	41	25	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.09	24,158	9,214	4,311	2,596	10.6	23	88	67	39	4,746	1,894
Trenton, N.J.	2.74	14,231	4,496	2,432	1,766	1.2	18	56	53	33	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.74	14,231	4,496	2,432	1,766	37.1	41	75	86	63	5,194	4,438
Tucson, Ariz.	6,579.68	20,499	3,043	5,788	5,743	71.2	24	77	71	47	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	16.55	13,915	1,843	3,510	3,827	23.3	20	74	73	43	841	1,014
Tulsa, Okla.	213.86	50,974	9,534	14,317	6,658	5.6	35	85	67	50	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	10.23	26,884	7,234	7,331	3,410	21.4	29	92	84	50	2,628	1,765
Utica-Rome, N.Y.	2.21	10,845	707	3,136	724	0.1	10	53	20	12	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	2.21	10,845	707	3,136	724	2.4	23	63	53	25	4,907	399
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.	616.32	132,355	82,169	22,655	23,355	41.5	21	65	58	41	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	13.82	118,081	77,164	18,068	20,558	22.5	45	69	79	70	8,544	3,038
Wichita, Kans.	6.20	19,821	3,922	5,301	2,306	0.6	17	70	56	20	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	6.20	19,253	3,805	5,067	2,175	11.9	22	71	66	26	3,105	1,515
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.	503.41	64,715	181	10,165	3,666	56.5	57	64	77	63	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	8.76	15,337	156	1,451	790	67.9	49	67	73	55	1,751	3,816

Table 8. DATA ON LAND AREA AND HOUSING UNITS, FOR POVERTY AREAS OF SMSA'S OF OVER 250,000 POPULATION: 1960 (Continued)

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (as defined in 1960)	Land in poverty areas (sq.mi)	Housing units in poverty areas				Poverty-area percentages of					Housing units per square mile in central city	
		Total	Occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard	Over-crowded	Land area	All housing units	Units occupied by non-whites	Sub-standard housing units	Over-crowded housing units	Poverty areas	Other
Wilmington, Del.	433.90	31,799	8,960	6,845	3,099	55.1	28	77	68	42	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	5.59	16,450	6,561	2,387	1,824	57.0	50	95	88	76	2,943	3,972
Worcester, Mass.	3.20	17,442	503	4,939	1,107	0.7	17	73	40	18	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	3.20	17,442	503	4,939	1,107	8.6	30	80	67	33	5,451	1,229
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	12.10	23,504	7,641	5,141	3,302	1.2	15	66	29	23	xxx	xxx
Central city portion	12.10	20,531	7,245	4,177	2,789	27.4	29	74	65	45	1,697	1,550



- b. Selecting the one-fourth of all the tracts which ranked lowest, in terms of this composite index, as "poor" tracts.
- c. Adjusting the selection to add some nonpoor tracts completely surrounded by "poor" tracts, and to drop out some geographically isolated "poor" tracts, to arrive at tentative poverty-area groups of tracts.
- d. Deleting some tracts to take account of urban renewal operations of 1960-1966.

The net result was to derive 193 "poverty areas," in 100 of the 101 largest SMSA's, altogether comprising 4,660 of the 20,915 tracts in the 101 SMSA's.

SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS OF DATA

The reported information on the territory of poverty areas was developed for the National Commission on Urban Problems by the Governments Division of the Bureau of the Census. This involved summing geographic data for individual poverty-area tracts, separately for the central city and outlying parts of each major SMSA. The results have been related here to land area totals for the various metropolitan areas and their central cities by reference to the Census Bureau's County and City Data Book, 1962.

The reported statistics on housing characteristics are from a special computer-run tabulation carried out for the Commission by the Housing Division of the Bureau of the Census. This involved the summation of housing items published by tract in the "Census Tracts" reports of the 1960 Censuses of Population and Housing, separately for the poverty-area portions of the central city and outlying portions of each SMSA and of all of them combined.

Subsequent tallies and summary tabulations were carried out by staff of the National Commission on Urban Problems.

Perhaps the most serious limitation of the data concerns their time reference. Being based upon 1960 Census results, they obviously do not reflect subsequent changes in the volume and condition of urban housing. This limitation is especially serious for the individual-area data given in Table 8, in view of the diversity of developments affecting particular cities and metropolitan areas since 1960. While we point this out, we make no apology for the data, because the figures are a vast improvement over existing published sources.

Only one housing item -- total number of units -- is based upon a 100 percent enumeration in the Census of Housing. The other more detailed items involved sample enumeration at a rate of 1 in 4 or 1 in 5. This use of sampling probably has little effect on the nationwide totals being reported, but may somewhat limit the precision of the individual-area data in Table 8.

The reported statistics are also undoubtedly affected to some extent by the difficulty of obtaining complete coverage and uniform reporting in

the Census of Housing. Since incomplete enumeration, as already mentioned, is especially likely in very poor areas, the numbers and proportions of housing units reported for poverty areas as of 1960 may be somewhat understated. For the same reason, the data probably understate the proportion of "overcrowded" housing units, especially for poverty areas. Also, it is especially difficult to achieve uniform reporting of housing conditions -- in particular, properly to identify "dilapidated" and otherwise deficient units that can meaningfully be counted as "substandard."

