

**Table 5. Highest and Lowest “Youth-Specific” Net Migration, 100 Largest Metro Areas, 1990–2000**

Metropolitan area	Net migration index, cohort aged 25–34, 2000	Net migration index, cohort aged 35–64, 2000	Index difference*	Census region
1 San Francisco, CA PMSA	46.5%	-10.2%	56.7%	WEST
2 Jersey City, NJ PMSA	37.0%	-12.3%	49.3%	NORTHEAST
3 Denver, CO PMSA	50.9%	6.5%	44.4%	WEST
4 San Jose, CA PMSA	28.0%	-10.8%	38.8%	WEST
5 Dallas, TX PMSA	41.7%	2.8%	38.9%	SOUTH
6 Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA PMSA	37.5%	0.5%	37.0%	WEST
7 Atlanta, GA MSA	47.6%	10.9%	36.7%	SOUTH
8 New York, NY PMSA	23.7%	-8.5%	32.2%	NORTHEAST
9 Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA PMSA	40.2%	8.9%	31.3%	WEST
10 Houston, TX PMSA	29.9%	0.4%	29.5%	SOUTH
11 Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV PMSA	24.1%	-3.0%	27.0%	SOUTH
12 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA PMSA	9.0%	-15.8%	24.8%	WEST
13 Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI MSA	25.3%	-1.7%	27.0%	MIDWEST
14 Oakland, CA PMSA	23.5%	-2.8%	26.2%	WEST
15 Fort Lauderdale, FL PMSA	47.6%	18.3%	29.3%	SOUTH
86 Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA MSA	-2.6%	1.8%	-4.4%	NORTHEAST
87 Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI NECMA	-9.6%	-3.7%	-5.9%	NORTHEAST
88 Tucson, AZ MSA	9.0%	12.4%	-3.4%	WEST
89 Mobile, AL MSA	0.5%	5.7%	-5.1%	SOUTH
90 Gary, IN PMSA	-9.3%	-2.2%	-7.1%	MIDWEST
91 Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY MSA	-15.4%	-6.7%	-8.6%	NORTHEAST
92 Youngstown-Warren, OH MSA	-11.7%	-2.3%	-9.3%	MIDWEST
93 Akron, OH PMSA	-11.4%	-1.2%	-10.2%	MIDWEST
94 Sarasota-Bradenton, FL MSA	23.6%	29.0%	-5.4%	SOUTH
95 Toledo, OH MSA	-20.9%	-8.8%	-12.1%	MIDWEST
96 Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY MSA	-16.5%	-4.7%	-11.8%	NORTHEAST
97 Ann Arbor, MI PMSA	-9.8%	2.2%	-12.0%	MIDWEST
98 Syracuse, NY MSA	-26.5%	-8.4%	-18.1%	NORTHEAST
99 Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA MSA	-19.4%	-0.9%	-18.5%	NORTHEAST
100 Springfield, MA NECMA	-31.6%	-3.2%	-28.4%	NORTHEAST

Source: 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses

\* Metros are ranked on the residual of 25-to-34 year-old net migration index regressed on 35-to-64 year-old net migration index. See endnote 33.

migration (all education levels), the West leads, followed in order by the South, the Midwest, and the Northeast.

Despite the growth of the young population in the Sun Belt, however, inter-regional disparities in educational attainment across workers of all ages narrowed little in the 1990s.<sup>32</sup> Thus, it may be that the West and the

South attracted young people in the 1990s simply because these regions were the nation’s overall centers of growth. Instead of seeking out the root causes of overall growth, then, it may prove more useful to compare the migration patterns of younger workers to those of older workers, a subject to which the next section turns.

***D. Compared to older workers (aged 35-to-64), young workers migrated more often to high-amenity, high-human-capital metropolitan areas during the 1990s.***

High rates of youth in-migration appear to relate to employment growth, high technology jobs, and cosmopolitan amenities. This begs the question, do 25-to-34 year-olds differ