WORK IN PROGRESS

DO NOT CITE

Political Environment and Domestic Migration

Selcuk Eren** and Andrew W. Nutting***

October 2013

ABSTRACT: We test whether political environment is a local amenity that affects domestic migration within the United States. Using metropolitan level migration data over the period 2006-10, we find that more-conservative areas are associated with both higher in-migration as well as out-migration. Differentiating between economic and social conservatism gives a different picture. Fiscally conservative areas are associated with higher mobility rates which can mostly be accounted by controlling for local climate and economic indicators. College graduate households without children are significantly less likely to move to socially conservative areas even after controlling for climate and economic factors, suggesting that an area's liberal leanings on social issues are a local amenity valued by highly educated potential migrants. Actions of high school-educated migrants who move between large MSAs differ substantially from other high-school-educated migrants, especially if they have children.

** = Research Scholar, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson NY. eren@levy.org

*** = Visiting Assistant Professor of Economics, Hamilton College, Clinton NY. anutting@hamilton.edu

I. Introduction

From a human capital perspective, the decision to migrate is an outcome of a cost-benefit analysis comparing expected benefits of migrating to the costs of migrating. In much empirical economic research, the benefits and costs of migration are quantified via pecuniary economic measures in the labor or housing markets (e.g. Sjaastad 1962; Fields 1979; Molloy, Smith, and Wozniak 2011). Other studies, which allow for heterogeneous preferences in the valuation of local amenities and services, find that people with different preferences will use mobility to sort themselves based on their preferences for locational attributes (Mueser and Graves 1995). Glaeser, Ponzetto, and Tobio (2011) found that evidence migration to the Western U.S. can in part be explained by skilled workers' appreciation of its geographic-specific amenities. Compton and Pollak (2007) found that college graduates often marry other college graduates while living in large urban areas, indicating benefits in the marriage market may prompt migration.

Recent research in political science (Hui, forthcoming) has found that people derive utility from living among neighbors who share similar political beliefs. McDonald (2011) and Cho, Gimpel, and Hui (2013) found that Americans prefer migrating to areas where their political beliefs are more commonly held, even controlling for factors such as income and racial composition. Such evidence appears to suggest that political environment is a public good, prompting sorting like that in models where migration is prompted by differences in local public expenditures (Tiebout 1956) and sorting by race (Schelling 1971).

This paper extends the research on migration by using empirical gravity estimations and data from the American Community Survey to estimate the relationship between domestic migration and political environments of Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) from 2006-10. (We have collected data to analyze migration in the 1990s as well, but have yet to add estimations from the 1990s to this paper.) We measure each MSA's political environment via how its members in the U.S. House of Representatives are rated by three political interest groups. The three groups—the American Conservative Union, the National Taxpayers Union, and the National Right to Life Committee—are all ostensibly “conservative,” but rate Congressmen along different dimensions. While the American Conservative Union is “conservative” in a general sense, the National Taxpayers Union can be described as “fiscally conservative” or “economically conservative,” while the National Right to Life Committee can be described as “socially conservative.” To our knowledge, we are the first to use these measures in order to proxy the local political environment in a migration model.

Using these interest group ratings, each of which score Congressmen on a scale of 0 to 100, allows us to measure an MSA’s political environment along a more precise metric than a binomial “right/left” or “Republican/Democrat” identification. The use of multiple groups’ ratings allows us to examine whether different dimensions of the political spectrum—namely, fiscal conservatism and social conservatism—affect migration differently.

Our estimations, which control for region and human-capital-related demographics, show that an MSA’s conservatism—as measured by American Conservative Union score—is strongly positively associated with higher mobility, both in terms of producing more outward migration and attracting more inward migration. The relationship is weaker for college graduates, especially those without children. When we differentiate between fiscal conservatism and social conservatism, we find that fiscal conservatism is strongly positively associated with higher in-migration. More socially conservative MSAs, though, attract fewer childless college graduates. Controlling for a few amenities such as climate and local economic conditions weakens the positive correlation between fiscal conservatism and higher in-migration, whereas the negative effect of social conservatism as a “stay away” factor among childless college graduates remains robust to these controls. This latter finding is consistent with the hypothesis that agreement on social issues—about which college graduates are disproportionately less conservative—is a public good that affects migration decisions of college graduates.

We also examine migration among the 100 largest MSAs in the country separately from overall migration within the country. While findings for college graduates and households with some college are consistent between the two samples, findings for households with a high school degree or less differ substantially, especially when children are present. This suggests further research into this population is warranted.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II describes our data and their sources. Section III outlines our gravity model estimation strategy. Section IV shows our results. Section V delivers possible explanations of our results, and Section VI concludes.

II. Data

a. Political Data

In this paper, we analyze mobility decisions between Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) within the United States. Areas which are not in an MSA are identified as "Non-Metro" areas. We also separate the United States into the 50 states, so that each "Non-Metro" area is assigned to its own individual state. In other words, each state will consist of multiple MSAs and one Non-Metro area.[1] Moreover, some MSAs, like Washington DC, St. Louis, and Philadelphia, cross state lines, and in these cases we further divide MSAs by state, so that for example the Washington DC MSA has a District of Columbia component, a Maryland component, and a Virginia component. For the sake of simplicity, we refer to our state-divided MSAs and Non-Metro areas as "MSAs," unless specifically noted.

To quantify each MSA's political environment, we use Congressional ratings provided by three political interest groups: the American Conservative Union, the National Taxpayers Union, and the National Right to Life Committee. All three groups rate members of Congress on a scale of 0 to 100, with higher numbers indicating a voting record more in accordance with the interest group's political philosophy.

The American Conservative Union (ACU), founded in 1964 by William F. Buckley Jr., provides our metric of "conservatism" or "overall conservatism." According to the ACU's website *conservative.org*, it has been rating Congressmen since 1971 on "issues covering votes on taxes, wasteful government spending, cultural issues, defense and foreign policy."

[1] There are two exceptions: Washington DC and New Jersey have no Non-Metro areas.

The National Taxpayers Union (NTU), founded in 1969, provides our metric of "fiscal conservatism." Its website *ntu.org* advocates "tax relief and reform, lower and less wasteful spending, individual liberty, and free enterprise." It has measured Members of Congress on a scale of 0 to 100 since 1979.

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), founded in 1968, provides our metric of "social conservatism." Its website *nrlc.org* states that its mission is "to protect and defend the most fundamental right of humankind, the right to life of every innocent human being from the beginning of life to natural death." It is largely concerned with anti-abortion issues, but endorses anti-euthanasia legislation as well. The NRLC was used by Washington (2008) to measure Congressman's scores on women's rights issues.

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of ACU, NTU, and NRLC ratings of House of Representative members for the years 1994, 1995, 2004, and 2005.[2] The last column in Table 2 shows the share of observations where a score is either 0 or 100. Scores of 0 or 100 are entirely absent among the NTU scores, but are common among ACU and especially NRLC scores.[3] In 2005, for example, fully 24 percent of ACU scores and 59 percent of NRLC scores were either 0 or 100. The ACU and NRLC both rate Members of Congress similarly: a score will be based on *X* different votes in a given year, and a Congressman will receive $\frac{100}{X}$ points per vote cast in the preferred fashion. NTU scores consist of many more votes and a more complex weighting scheme. In 2012, for example, the NTU scored congressman based on 274 different votes, assigning each vote a weight of between 1 and 30.[4] This results in smaller standard deviations than both the ACU and NRLC.

---

[2] The NRLC did not release a rating for the year 1994, but instead released one for the 103rd Congress, which covered the years 1993-94. This paper's 1994 NRLC rating is the 1993-94 rating.

[3] The 1995 NRLC score features fewer zeros and one hundreds because it disagreed with the Republican party regarding a particular welfare reform vote. Details are present in the NRLC pamphlet "U.S. House Representatives Votes on Abortion, 1995." The lack of zeros and one hundreds among 1995 ACU scores appears driven by one particular vote in which a rule regarding funding of the National Endowment of the Arts and National Endowment of the Humanities was embedded in an Interior Appropriations bill.

[4] The NTU is proud of its complex scoring system, saying on its website, "Unlike most organizations that publish ratings, we refuse to play the 'rating game' of focusing on only a handful of congressional votes on selected issues. The NTU voting study is the fairest and most accurate guide available on congressional spending. It is a completely unbiased accounting of votes." Before 1979, the NTU rated Congressman using (according to ntu.org) "a 'key vote' system that's not directly comparable to [their] modern Rating."

From 1994 to 1995, average scores from the ACU, NTU, and NRLC all increased substantially. This reflects the House becoming more conservative after the "Republican Revolution" of the 1994 Congressional elections featured the Republicans gained 54 of the 435 seats (Armey 2006). The NTU means of 2004 and 2005 are much lower than those of 1995, even though the ACU and NRLC scores are fairly similar. This may reflect a harsher scale adopted by NTU over time.

Table 2 shows correlations between the ACU, NTU, and NRLC scores for 1994, 1995, 2004, and 2005 weighted by congressional district. The correlations between ACU and NTU score are over 0.9 in all years in the sample. In 2004 and 2005, the correlations between the ACU and NRLC were both at least 0.9, after having been under 0.9 in 1994 and 1995. The correlation between NTU and NRLC is always weaker than the correlations between those two scores and ACU score, but remains strongly positive, reaching its lowest point of 0.66 in 1995 and its highest point of 0.81 in 2005.

We assign political scores to each MSA in the dataset. The measure of an MSA's American Conservative Union score is the weighted average ACU score of the House of Representatives member for each resident *i* of MSA *m* in year *t*. That is, where *c* is *i*'s Congressman,

$$ACU_{mt} = \frac{\sum_{i \in mt} ACU_{icmt}}{\sum_{i \in mt} 1} \qquad (1)$$

NTU and NRLC scores for each MSA are created similarly. Downloads from the Missouri Census Data Center for both the 1990 and 2000 censuses are used to map Congressional Districts to MSAs. The population weights in Equation (1) are the 1990 census populations for our 1994-95 political scores and the 2000 census populations for our 2004-05 scores. Different ACU, NTU, and NRLC scores are created for different MSA/state regions when a particular MSA, such as Philadelphia or Washington DC, crosses state lines. The District of Columbia, which has no voting representation in Congress, has only one score reported in the political data we collected.[5] Since its non-voting delegate for all years in the sample,

[5] Its 1994 NRLC score was 0.

Eleanor Holmes Norton, was an African-American Democrat, its remaining scores are imputed by taking, for the relevant year, the average scores of the House of Representatives' African-American Democrats.[6]

Table 3 shows the 15 most conservative and 15 least conservative, as measured by 2005 ACU scores, of the 75 largest MSAs in the sample.[7] (These scores omit non-MSA areas and do not separate MSAs into different states.) The two most conservative MSAs in the country were both in Oklahoma, and the next four were in Ohio and/or Kentucky. The next nine include MSAs in the South (Forth Worth, Greenville, Orlando, Dallas, and Richmond), West (Salt Lake City, Orange County, Phoenix), and Midwest (Grand Rapids). The least conservative MSA in the country is San Francisco, followed by Boston and Providence. The coastal West seems especially well represented among the least conservative MSAs, with appearances by San Francisco, San Jose, Portland, Honolulu, Oakland, Los Angeles, Tacoma, and Seattle.

Table 3 also shows NTU and NRLC scores for MSAs in 2005 along with their ranks from 1 to 75, from most conservative to least conservative. The 15 MSAs with the highest (lowest) ACU scores tend to be highly-ranked (low-ranked) according to both the NTU and NRLC. There are a few outliers, though. Orange County, CA has an NRLC score that indicates it is more socially liberal than other very conservative areas, and Providence has an NRLC score that indicates that it is more socially conservative than other very liberal areas. Oakland appears to be more fiscally conservative than other very liberal areas. (Appendix Table 1 contains all 2005 scores and ranks for the 75 largest MSAs.)

Table 4 shows 2005 scores from large MSAs that transverse state lines. Cincinnati, Louisville, and Philadelphia have very similar scores across state lines. The Virginia suburbs of Washington DC are more noticeably conservative than the Maryland suburbs and, especially, DC proper.

Table 5 repeats Table 2, which showed ACU, NTU, and NRLC correlations for each Congressional District, but weighs scores by MSA instead of Congressman. In Table 5, the correlations

[6] The identities of black members of the House were found via the "Black Americans in Congress" website at *history.house.gov*.

[7] The 75 largest MSAs are all large enough to cover more than one congressional district.

between NTU and NRLC score tend to be weaker than in Table 2. The 1995 correlation between NTU and NRLC score is 0.55 instead of 0.66, for example.

b. Migration Data

Our migration data comes from the 2000 decennial census and 2006-10 versions of the American Community Survey, obtained from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-USA) published by Ruggles et al (2010). These samples draw from 5 percent of all American population and constitute the richest source of information on demographic changes of population over time including domestic migration.

The American Community Survey started in 2001 as a nationwide, continuous survey designed to provide annual demographic, housing, social, and economic data for the United States. Since 2005, each annual survey has documented one percent of the population. Starting from 2010, ACS replaced the decennial census long form by collecting long-form-type information throughout the decade rather than only once every 10 years. It covers a broad range of topics about social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics of the U.S. population including migration.[8] In 2010, the Census Bureau began releasing 5-year summary files of the ACS. In this paper we are using the 2006-10 release, which combines previously-released single-year files from 2006 through 2010. ACS 2006-10 documents a total of five percent of the population. Weighting variables are adjusted to reflect the population in 2010 and all income and dollar-amount variables are inflated to 2010 dollars.

The smallest geographic information available in these datasets is the Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA). Each PUMA consists of 100,000+ residents and its geographic boundaries are can be redefined by the Census Bureau every 10 years because of population changes. A corresponding variable, MIGPUMA, identifies the location where the respondent lived five years ago in the 2000 Census and one year ago in the ACS surveys.

[8] This is taken from U.S. Census Bureau, A Compass for Understanding and Using American Community Survey Data, 2008.

Our geography of interest for this paper is the MSA. Whereas metropolitan area is available as a separate variable in IPUMS series, previous metropolitan of residence is not. We aggregate populations of PUMAs and MIGPUMAs that lie within the geographic boundaries of MSAs to construct an origin MSA variable. Unfortunately not all PUMAs and MIGPUMAs fit into MSA areas perfectly, so our measure of MSA is expanded in some cases to include some non-metropolitan areas in a few cases.[9] Areas which are not in an MSA are defined as "Non-Metro" areas. Using migration data, we impute the size of populations for each MSA in 1995 (using the 2000 census) and in the years 2005-09 (using data from the particular wave of the ACS). Using migration data, we impute the size of populations for each MSA in 1995 (using the 2000 census) and in the years 2005-09 (using data from the particular wave of the ACS). We differentiate populations by demographic characteristics. We exclude households whose heads are younger than 18 years old or who are still in school as to prevent including moves for school reasons. We group households by head's sex (2 categories), marital status (2 categories), race (4 categories), education level (4 categories), age (4 categories), and number of children (3 categories), and generate 2*2*4*4*4*3 = 768 household categories in order to analyze how different demographic groups respond to political environment when they make migration decisions.

There are some concerns with our migration data. Population counts and demographics are determined ex-post (i.e. after migration) and might give a slightly distorted picture of migration. This is especially true for decennial census data where migration is defined by the change in location compared to five years ago. Other location amenities and local economic indicators such as median household income, median rent, percentage of population living under poverty, and unemployment rate are obtained from the same data source and subject to similar issues. Characteristics of the household head, such as education and marital status, are subject to change between when the time of migration and when survey was given. For these concerns, we also imputed a one year migration measure for 2000 by combining the

[9] The MSAs that mismatches, and therefore added populations, were Chattanooga, Corpus Christi, Davenport, Denver, Flint, Fort Collins, Miami, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Omaha, Pittsburgh, Pueblo, Salinas, Sioux Falls, Springfield, and Tulsa.

change in location from five years ago with a variable that has information on whether the individual has moved since last year. In this construction of migration, we assume that the household, within the last year, moved from the location where it lived five years ago. Note that these concerns are not as serious for the ACS data, in which MSA from one year ago is reported. We will include Census estimations using these counts in future versions of this paper. We will include estimations using these counts in future versions of this paper.

We calculate distances between MSAs using the Census Bureau's website data regarding longitude and latitude of Centers of Population by Census Tract, [10] aggregating Census tracts to MSAs, and calculating centers of population for MSAs.[11] We then use the Haversine formula (Sinnott, 1984) to calculate the distances between MSAs using longitudes and latitudes of centers of population of each MSA.

We also obtained climate data on average monthly temperatures and annual precipitation by city from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration website. [12]

The last step was matching 2004 and 2005 political data to the 2006-10 ACS migration data and the 1994 and 1995 political data to the 2000 census data.[13] In the end, we had 358 MSAs, including 49 non-metro areas and 13 MSAs that crossed multiple states,[14] between which households could migrate between 2006 and 2010.

---

[10] http://www.census.gov/geo/reference/centersofpop.html

[11] U.S. Census Bureau defines population center as "the point at which an imaginary, weightless, rigid, and flat (no elevation effects) surface representation of the 48 conterminous states and the District of Columbia (or 50 states as appropriate to the computation) would balance if weights of identical size were placed on it so that each weight represented the location of one person." We calculate the center of population latitude by $\overline{lat} = \frac{\sum \omega_i lat_i}{\omega_i}$ and longitude by $\overline{long} = \frac{\sum \omega_i long_i \cos(lat_i)}{\omega_i \cos(lat_i)}$ where lat_i is the latitude, $long_i$ is the longitude, and ω_i is the population of tract *i*.

[12] http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/

[13] Because of differences in the definitions between MSAs in different samples, certain issues arose during the match. The 2000 census data tended to have more observations of MSAs than the ACS data, so many MSAs from the 2000 census were redefined as Non-Metro areas before being affixed to the political interest group ratings. Furthermore, many MSAs in the 2000 census had small portions extending into other states. Washington, DC, for example, had part of its MSA in West Virginia and Cincinnati had part in Indiana. These small portions of MSAs were also re-defined as Non-Metro.

[14] New Jersey did not have a non-metro component. Washington DC was the only MSA to include more than two states (counting the District of Columbia as a state).

Table 6 shows rankings of the 75 largest MSAs[15] by those that featured the most and least out-migration and in-migration from 2006-10.[16] Of the MSAs with the most per capita out-migration, eight were in the South (including Washington, DC) and six were in the West.[17] Tacoma and Norfolk, which have high out-migration rates, have large military populations. Seven of the fifteen of the MSAs that produce the fewest migrants per capita are in the Northeast and seven more are in the Midwest.

Of the fifteen most attracive MSAs to domestic migrants, eleven are in the South. Twelve of the least-attractive MSAs to domestic migrants are in the Northeast and Midwest. Those that are not—Miami, Los Angeles, and Fresno—have large populations of immigrants from abroad, who tend to crowd out domestic migrants (Borjas 2006). Of particular note in Table 6 is that some MSAs, especially Washington DC, have both high in-migration and out-migration rates. At the other end of the spectrum, several MSAs, particularly the Great Lakes cities of Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Milwaukee, Rochester, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Cleveland, have low in-migration and out-migration rates.

Table 7 shows results of estimations where the dependent variable is the log total number of households that migrated between 2006-10 for each of the 768 household categories and independent variables include sex, marital status, race, age, educational attainment, and number of children of the household head. Reference groups are males, unmarried heads, whites, age 19-30, high school dropouts, and households without children. Table 7 shows results of estimations where the dependent variable is the log total number of households that migrated from 2006-10 for each of the 768 categories. Column 1 shows results when including all MSA and non-MSA areas in the dataset and Column 2 shows results when limiting the sample to movement between the 100 largest MSAs (specifically excluding non-MSA areas).[18] Female-headed households, which also tend to be single parent households, are significantly less

[15] The 2006 population is imputed by the 2010 ACS population that had migrated since 2006.
[16] Table 6 treats MSAs that cross state lines as one unit, e.g. Washington DC includes the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia components.
[17] New Orleans is presumably ranked very high because of outmigration in the wake of Hurricane Katrina (Sacerdote, forthcoming).
[18] In Table 7, a household is considered to have moved if they stayed within the same MSA but to another state. This is because, as Table 4 showed, political environment can differ across different states within the same MSA.

likely to move than male-headed households. Married households are less likely to move than unmarried-head households, but are not less likely to move between larger MSAs. Black and Hispanic households are not less likely to move than white households overall, but are significantly and substantially more likely to move between larger MSAs than white households. Older households and households with more children are significantly less likely to move. High school graduates are no more likely to move than high school dropouts, whereas households with some college are more likely to move than high school dropouts. Surprisingly, households with college graduate heads are not more likely to move than high school dropout households in the overall sample, but are significantly and substantially more likely to move between larger MSAs.

Table 8 shows results of seemingly unrelated regression equations (Zellner 1962) where the dependent variables are ACU, NTU, and NRLC scores for each MSA in 2005 and the right-hand-side variables are various demographic factors from the 2006 population. Columns 1-6 show results when including all MSAs and non-MSA regions and Columns 7-12 show results when excluding non-MSA regions. Table 8 shows that more densely populated MSAs and MSAs with larger shares of college graduates are less conservative across all dimensions. There is some evidence that MSAs with larger shares of childless households are more conservative, and those with more some-college households are less conservative. The latter is especially true when dropping non-MSA regions.[19] MSAs with larger shares of Hispanic households are less socially conservative than other MSAs. Dummies on region fixed effects show that the Northeast and West are significantly less conservative than the Midwest, the omitted category. The South has a significantly higher 2005 ACU score than the Midwest, but not significantly higher NTU or NRLC scores.

III. Estimation Strategy

[19] Limiting the estimation to the 100 largest MSAs renders many coefficients insignificant.

We estimate a gravity model (e.g. Fields 1979, Asby 2007) where migration M_{ij} from origin MSA i to destination MSA j is a function of the MSAs' respective political characteristics P_i and P_j, other characteristics X_i and X_j, and the distance D_{ij} between i and j. That is, where t is year,

$$ln(1+M_{ijt}) = \beta_1 P_{i(t-1)} + \beta_2 P_{j(t-1)} + \beta_3 X_{i(t-1)} + \beta_4 X_{j(t-1)} + \beta_5 D_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ijt}. \quad (2)$$

M_{ijt} is the number of households who moved from i to j in year t. One is added to the argument to permit identification of observations where no households moved from i to j. In all our estimations, D_{ij} is a vector consisting of a dummy representing whether i and j are in the same state, another dummy representing whether i and j are in the same Census region (Northeast, Midwest, South, or West), a quadratic control for the miles between i and j, linear controls for the respective approximate distances of i and j to the population center of the United States,[20] and interactions of each of those linear respective distances to the population center with both the linear and squared terms of the distance between i and j. These variables are included in all estimations of Equation (2) but their coefficients are not reported in this paper.

Our coefficients of interest are those on P_i and P_j. In some estimations, P_i and P_j are represented by each MSA's ACU score, which measures how conservative an MSA is. In others, we use NTU and NRLC score, which respectively show how fiscally conservative and socially conservative an MSA is. All values of P are put in z-scores at the congressional district level before being assigned to MSAs. Values of P and X for year $t-1$ are used to prevent simultaneity bias when estimating Equation (2).

In all specifications, other controls X_i and X_j include the total number of households in i and j and the household density of i and j.[21] *Ceteris paribus*, more populous MSAs should produce more migrants and could also attract more migrants (Harris and Todaro 1970). In further specifications, X_i and X_j include MSA demographic characteristics. Since, as the previous section showed, households where the

[20] For i, this is created by establishing a population-weighted distance between household h in MSA i and every other MSA in the country. Populations are weighted by populations in year $t-1$. A footnote could therefore be added to the subscript of D_{ij}.

[21] Area in the density calculations is determined by the Missouri Census Data Center's record of the previous decennial census.

head is over age 60 are significantly less likely to move than other households, we do not include them in our estimations. In other words, we restrict our sample to households with prime working age heads. Therefore, right-hand-side controls always include the logs of the share of *i* and *j* of households where the head is under age 60.

Many of our estimations of Equation (2) limit the dependent variable to population subgroups, defined across differences in education level and presence of children. In these specifications, demographic characteristics include the log shares of working-age households where the head has some college and the share that are college graduates. When M_{ij} is limited to migrants of education level *e* and presence of children *k*, demographic controls include the aforementioned education level controls, the log shares of households in *i* and *j* that have no children present, the log shares that have some college education and also have no children, and the log shares that are college graduates and also have no children.[22] We also present specifications that also include region fixed effects for both *i* and *j*.

In all cases, when estimating factors affecting migration from 2006-10, population demographic controls on the right-hand-side are based on imputations of pre-migration populations. For example, the total number of households in *i* is estimated to be the number of households for whom i = j, plus the number of households that had moved away between the previous year and the year the survey was held. Demographic data based on education level, number of children, and marital status are constructed the same way.

Since many of our dependent variables have values of 0—quite a few combinations of *i* and *j* experience no migration between them—Equation (2) is estimated via Tobit maximum likelihood, where the error term ε_{ijt} is normally distributed.

IV. Results

a. All households

[22] When the dependent variables concern migration of households with two or more children present, there are additional controls for log shares of i and j households with two or more children, log shares of the intersection of two or more children with some college, and log shares of the intersection of two or more children and college graduates.

Table 9 shows estimation results where the dependent variable is log total migration from *i* to *j*, where households are limited to those where the head is under age 60. Migration is from the period 2006-10, and political environment is measured with 2005 ACU, NTU, and NRLC scores.[23] All columns include controls for share of the population under age 60. Columns 1-4 show results when including all MSAs in the sample. Column 1 measures political environment with 2005 ACU scores, and shows that while more-conservative MSAs have high mobility in both directions, more-conservative MSAs are roughly three times more likely to attract migrants than they are to produce them. Other coefficients in Column 1 show that MSAs with larger populations have more mobility, as expected. On the other hand, less-densely populated MSAs have lower mobility in both directions.

Column 2 replaces ACU scores with NTU and NRLC scores. NTU coefficients show that fiscally conservative areas have higher mobility in both directions. NRLC coefficients, on the other hand, show that socially conservative areas have less out-migration and though they appear to attract significantly more migrants, the effect is substantially smaller than that of economic conservatism.

Columns 3-4 repeat Columns 1-2 but add fixed effects for Census regions. The region effects themselves show that the Northeast produces and attracts fewer migrants than the Midwest (the omitted region), while the South and West both produce and especially attract more migrants. Both the origin and destination ACU scores remain significantly positive when controlling for region, even though both fall by 60 percent, showing that within regions, more-conservative MSAs produce and attract more migrants. NTU origin score changes little when including region fixed effects, and the NTU destination score remains significantly positive though it falls substantially. The NRLC score of the destination MSA becomes insignificantly negative, while that of the origin MSA becomes significantly negative.

Columns 5-8 repeat Columns 1-4 but limit the sample to the 100 largest MSAs in the dataset, specifically excluding non-MSA regions. The top 100 MSAs account for 60.2% of all households, and migration between the top 100 MSAs accounts for 36.5% of all migration. ACU coefficients are similar

[23] All three political variables' 2005 scores are strongly correlated with their 2004 scores. The correlations within each congressional district are 0.94 for ACU and 0.91 for both NTU and NRLC.

to their full-sample analogs when omitting region fixed effects (Column 5), but become small and insignificant when including them (Column 7). When omitting region fixed effects, NTU and NRLC scores (Column 6) are much larger in absolute value than in the full sample. Fiscal conservatism is associated with significantly and substantially more migration, both outgoing and especially incoming, while social conservatism is associated with significantly and substantially less migration. Including region fixed effects (Column 8) weakens the NTU and NRLC scores substantially, but they remain significant. The NTU coefficients when including region fixed effects are quite similar for the full sample and for the larger-MSA sample, but the NRLC scores are more substantially negative for the limited sample. In sum, then, Table 6 shows that more-conservative MSAs produce and attract more migrants, and that fiscal conservatism rather than social conservatism is the driving force. When looking exclusively at larger MSAs and including region fixed effects, the overall effect of conservatism disappears and the positive migratory effect associated with fiscal conservatism is maintained. Social conservatism is associated with less migration, both inward and outward, when looking at only the 100 largest MSAs.

b. Education and migration

Table 10 shows estimation results when including all MSAs and non-MSA areas in the sample, but separating households by education level of the household head. Education is positively correlated with mobility (Notowidigdo 2011). Columns 1-6 show results for high school dropouts and graduates (a combined population). When omitting region fixed effects and demographic controls, high school graduates and dropouts migrate from, and especially to, more-conservative areas (Column 1). They are significantly more likely to move from MSAs that are more fiscally conservative and to MSAs that are more economically and socially conservative (Column 2). When adding demographic controls (Columns 3-4)—which in this table are log share of households in *i* and *j* that are under age 60, log share that have some college, and log share that are college graduates—the coefficients on origin and destination NTU score barely change while that on destination NRLC is cut in half but remains significant. Coefficients on demographic factors show that high school dropouts and graduates are more inclined to move between areas with fewer college graduates and some-college households. When adding region fixed effects (Columns 5-6), ACU score and NTU score of origin and destination fall but remain significant, destination NRLC score falls and becomes insignificant, and demographic controls retain their signs and significances. The evidence suggests, then, that high school dropouts and graduates are more likely to move to and from fiscally conservative areas.

Columns 7-12 show results on the population of households with some college. Results are roughly similar to those for high school households. Controlling for demographics (Columns 9-10) does not substantially change coefficients on ACU, NTU, and NRLC score. The demographic coefficients themselves show that households with some college are more likely to move to MSAs with more college graduates and, especially, more households with some college. Adding region fixed effects (Column 11-12) weakens the relationship between ACU, NTU, NRLC and migration, but all three effects remain significantly positive for destination MSA.

Columns 13-18 show results on the population of college graduates. Results are noticeably different than on the other two populations. When omitting both demographic controls and region fixed effects, origin ACU score is small and insignificant, and destination ACU is less than half as intense as it was on the high-school and some-college populations (Column 13). Also when omitting demographic controls and region fixed effects, origin NTU and destination NTU have similar coefficients to the other populations, but origin and destination NRLC score is significantly and substantially negative (Column 14).   Controlling for demographics (Columns 15-16) weakens the effect of origin and destination NTU score and fully explains the negative origin and destination NRLC coefficients.   This latter result suggests that college graduates are less likely to migrate to and from socially conservative areas primarily because such areas have relatively few college graduates. When adding region fixed effects, destination NTU is almost exactly the same as it was for households with some college, but destination NRLC is significantly negative. While college graduate households are as likely to move to fiscally conservative areas as other households, they are less likely to move to socially conservative areas.

Table 11 shows political coefficients when separating populations by education level and presence of children. All estimations in Table 10 include demographic controls and region fixed effects. Table 11 shows that households of high school dropouts or graduates (Columns 1-6) and some college (Columns 7-12) have roughly similar ACU coefficients whether a household has no children, has children, or has two or more children ("two or more children" is a subset of "has children"). Origin and destination NRLC score is never significant for these two groups, and destination NTU score is always significantly positive. Among high school households, the coefficient on destination NTU is higher for households with children, but among some-college households it is higher for households without children.

Results differ noticeably for college graduates. The coefficient on destination ACU is small and insignificantly positive for households without children, but significantly positive and large for households with children. College households without children are significantly and substantially less likely to move to areas with higher NRLC scores, while those with children are not. Those with children, and especially two or more children, appear more responsive to destination NTU than childless college-graduate households.

Tables 12-14 show whether adding controls for basic climate factors and economic indicators can explain the observed correlations between NTU score, NRLC score, and migration. Our climate controls include average January temperature, average July temperature (both also used by Glaeser and Tobio 2008), and average annual precipitation. Our economic indicators include average household income, poverty rate, and average monthly rent. The last economic indicator is used to proxy for MSA cost of living. All estimations in this section include demographic controls and region fixed effects. Tables 11, 12 and 13 respectively show results for high school graduates and dropouts, households with some college, and households that are college graduates. Each table is separated into households without children (Columns 1-3), households with children (Columns 4-6) and households with two or more children (Columns 7-9). The first column of each set of three shows results omitting climate and economic indicators, i.e. results from previously displayed estimations. The second column shows results when including climate controls, and the third when including both climate and economic controls.

For high school households (Table 12), adding climate variables explains some of the effect of origin and destination NTU scores, but both remain significantly positive for all three populations. Coefficients on climate variables themselves suggest that high school households without children move between MSAs with warmer Januarys, and those with children move between areas with hotter Julys. When adding economic variables, destination NTU is rendered insignificant for high school households without children. The appeal of fiscally conservative areas, then, exists through the economic conditions correlated with such attitudes (Ashby 2007). The coefficients on economic indicators themselves suggest that high school households move away from MSAs with higher housing costs and towards MSAs with lower average income but also lower poverty rates. For high school households with children and with two or more children, destination NTU remains significantly positive when controlling for economic factors. High school households with children, like those without children, also move from areas with higher rents and towards areas with lower wages and lower poverty rates.

Table 13 shows results for some-college households. Controlling for climate and economic indicators renders destination NTU score small and insignificant for all three populations. Some-college households are more likely to move to areas with lower incomes and lower poverty rates, but also move to MSAs with significantly higher rents. There is also evidence that some-college households without children leave more socially conservative areas, while those with two or more children leave more fiscally conservative areas, even when controlling for economic indicators.

Table 14 shows results for college graduates. For households without children, the significantly negative coefficient on destination NRLC score barely budges and the positive coefficient on destination NTU declines but remains significant when controlling for climate variables and economic indicators. There remains, then, significant evidence that college graduates without children move to more fiscally conservative areas and less socially conservative areas, even controlling for (admittedly few) economic indicators. Coefficients on economic indicators show that childless college graduates move from areas with lower rents to areas with lower incomes, lower poverty rates, and higher rents. For college graduate households with children, the positive coefficient on destination NTU is fully explained when adding controls for economic indicators, suggesting that these households move to fiscally conservative areas because they appreciate the lower poverty rates and lower rents correlated with fiscal conservatism. College graduate households with children are noticeably more responsive to lower poverty rates for destination areas than are those without children. College graduate households with two or more children retain their significantly positive destination NTU coefficient when including economic variables.

In sum, Tables 10-14 show that households of all education levels, childless and with children, are significantly more likely to move to more fiscally conservative MSAs. Controlling for simple economic indicators explains much of this correlation, especially for households with some college, but the relationship remains significant for high school graduates with children and college graduates with either no children or two or more children. High school households and households with children are also, more often than not, significantly more likely to leave fiscally conservative MSAs. Social conservatism, after controlling for demographics and region of the country, is associated with attracting significantly fewer childless college graduates. It is not significantly associated with attracting more or fewer of other kinds of migrants.

c. Migration among the largest 100 MSAs

The next set of tables reproduce Tables 10-14 but restrict the sample to the 100 largest MSAs, excluding Non-Metro areas.[24] Table 15 shows results when separating populations by education level of household head and presence of children, and when including demographic controls and region fixed effects in all estimations. Origin ACU coefficients are much less likely to be significant than in the Table 11 full sample, but destination ACU coefficients are generally similar to their values in the full sample.

---

[24] Sample eligibility is determined by total population of an MSA across all states in which it is present, but actual estimations include observations where MSA areas are separated by state. The District of Columbia, for example, does not have a population large enough to place it in the 100 largest MSAs, but the total Washington, DC MSA is itself in the largest 100 MSAs. The MSA of Washington DC is therefore included in the 100 largest MSAs, and it is separated into its District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia components.

For high school households (Columns 1-6), coefficients on NTU and NRLC differ substantially from their full-sample analogs. High school households are significantly more likely to move to areas that are more fiscally conservative and less socially conservative when restricting the sample to larger MSAs. This is especially true for households with two or more children, who also move from origin MSAs that are more fiscally conservative and less socially conservative.[25]

Some-college households (Columns 7-12) and college graduate households (Columns 13-18) have roughly similar destination NTU and NRLC coefficients compared to their full-sample results. College graduates, though, are now significantly less likely to move to socially conservative MSAs even if they have children.

Tables 16-18 respectively show results for high school households, some-college households, and college-graduate households when adding climate controls and economic indicators to the sample of the 100 largest MSAs. There are a few trends worth mentioning regarding these estimations. First, the positive relationships between destination NTU score and migration of some-college (Table 17) and college-graduate (Table 18) households are fully explained by controlling for climate and economic indicators. Second, the negative destination NRLC score for college graduates remains significant and substantial for households without children, but becomes insignificant (though largely unchanged in absolute value) for households with children. Third, the strongly positive destination NTU coefficients and strongly negative destination NRLC coefficients for high school households, especially those with children, survive the inclusion of climate and economic controls (Table 16). Indeed, NRLC score becomes more intensely negative for high school households when controlling for climate and economic indicators.

To summarize Tables 15-18, then: the migration of high school households, especially those with children, is substantially different among the largest MSAs than among the country as a whole. When moving among the largest MSAs, high school households with children are significantly more likely to

[25] Additional results (not shown) find that the effect is stronger for married high school households with children rather than unmarried high school households with children.

move to and from MSAs that are more fiscally conservative and less socially conservative. The fact that households with some college and households of college graduates are more likely to move to more fiscally conservative areas is fully explained by the inclusion of a few economic indicators. Childless college graduate households are significantly more likely to move to less socially conservative areas.

V. Interpretation of Results

Our results show fairly strong evidence that, after controlling for demographics and region, domestic migration is towards MSAs that are more fiscally conservative. This result is consistent, though it varies in intensity, for all education levels, for households with and without children, and whether looking at the country as a whole or looking exclusively at larger MSAs. In many cases, this effect is accounted for when controlling for simple weather-related and economic indicators, suggesting that fiscally conservative areas attract more migrants because of their nicer climates and better economies. One clear exception is for high school graduates and dropouts with children, whose disproportionate movement towards fiscally conservative areas is not fully explained via these basic controls.

Our results also show that social conservatism repels some types of domestic migrants. Most noticeably, all estimations reveal that college graduates without children are significantly less likely to move to more socially conservative areas. Among large MSAs, social conservatism strongly repels high school graduates and dropouts with children.

Our findings are consistent with our hypothesis that political environment is a public good that allows for Tiebout sorting. Agreement on controversial social issues, such as abortion, is a good for which people are willing to incur the costs of migration. College graduates without children, who Table 8 showed to be significantly less opposed to abortion than high school dropouts and graduates, prefer to move to areas where they are in agreement with the general political environment, even controlling for an area’s presence of college graduates.

There are other potential explanations for our findings that college graduates move to less socially conservative MSAs. Though college graduates are more familiar with birth control and therefore may be less susceptible to unwanted pregnancies (Haveman and Wolfe 1984), it is possible that they are more risk-averse towards them and therefore wish to move to socially liberal areas where such pregnancies can me more easily terminated. Although it seems likely that women would be more risk-averse to unwanted pregnancies than men, men may appreciate spillovers in the sexual marketplace associated with more easily accessed abortion. Testing this alternative hypothesis is beyond the scope of this paper.

Our findings with respect to fiscal conservatism appear less correlated with a public goods hypothesis. First, our results show that fiscal conservatism, if anything, attracts more migrants, including college graduates. This is despite Table 8 showing that larger shares of college graduates are associated with an area being less fiscally conservative. It seems unlikely that college graduates would migrate to areas to consume public goods that are not in accordance with their own economic philosophies. Furthermore, that a fair share of the positive coefficient on fiscal conservatism declines when controlling for climate and economic conditions suggests that migrants, including college graduates, are less motivated by agreement on economic issues *per se* than with the better climates of areas that tend to be fiscally conservative and the personal pecuniary benefits possibly associated with such political attitudes. This latter issue is buttressed by our findings that fiscal conservatism tends make destinations more attractive for households with more children, who have higher living costs, and therefore may be especially akin to moving for bread-and-butter related issues.

The strong differences among high-school households between the full-sample and largest-100-MSA results lead to interesting questions. For high school households what migrated from between 2006 and 2010 , only 29.3% moved between the 100 largest MSAs, compared to 46.1% of college-graduate households and 32.8% of some-college households. The intense results for high school households with children in the large-MSA sample may be driven by human capital differences between these migrants and high school migrants as a whole.

Table 19 explores this by showing simple regressions similar to those in Table 7, which showed different demographic groups' probabilities of migrating. In Table 19, the sample is limited to households with children where the head is under age 60 and is either a high school dropout or a high school graduate. Column 1 shows that, compared to white households in this population, black and

Hispanic households are significantly less likely to have changed MSAs overall. But Column 2 shows that black and Hispanic high-school households are significantly and substantially more likely to move between the 100 largest MSAs than white high-school households. Perhaps black and Hispanic households with at most a high school diploma are more ambitious than similar white families, and are more likely to both live in larger MSAs and move to other larger MSAs than similarly educated white households. Columns 3-4 repeat Columns 1-2 but include interactions between the black and Hispanic dummies and the dummy showing whether children are present. Column 3 shows that, despite having a lower overall migration rate than whites, black households in the sample are relatively more likely to move when children are present. The Column 4 coefficient is similarly large but insignificant. There is no substantial coefficient on the Hispanic*Kids interaction term. Future research can perhaps detail further how migrants between large cities differ from other migrants with the same observed education levels. Perhaps growing cities attract a polarized labor market (e.g. Autor, Katz, and Kearney 2006; Autor and Dorn 2013), leading to more low-skilled migration than mid-skilled migration.

VI. Conclusion

This paper examines whether domestic U.S. migration is correlated with political environment. We measure each MSA's political environment by examining how three conservative political interest groups measure area members of the U.S. House of Representatives. The American Conservative Union scores are used to measure an area's overall tendency towards conservatism, while the National Taxpayers Union and National Right to Life Committee scores are used to measure economic and social conservatism, respectively.

Our results show that more conservative areas both produce and attract more domestic migration, even after controlling for region. When separating populations based on the household head's education level and the presence of children, and controlling for region and demographics of MSA, we find that more fiscally conservative areas successfully attract more migrants of almost every type. More socially conservative areas tend to repel one specific type of migrant: college-educated, childless households. Controlling for a few weather-related variables weakens the effect of coefficients on fiscal conservatism, indicating that the attraction of such MSAs may be due to other amenities, such as climate, or through better local economies (which of course could be affected by local laws and institutions correlated with fiscal conservatism). The negative effect of social conservatism on attracting college graduates does not go away with these controls, suggesting that a less socially conservative environment may be *ceteris paribus* a public good for which childless college graduates are willing to migrate.

Our findings also indicate that high-school educated households that move between the 100 largest MSAs in the country differ substantially from high-school educated migrants in the nation at large. Furthermore, these migrants are more likely to be black or Hispanic. This is worthy of future research.

In future research, we plan on extending our model to examine whether domestic migration patterns from 1995-2000 and perhaps 1985-1990 were similar to those of the 2006-10 period. We also plan to examine more thoroughly the relationship between race and migration, in terms of race of migrants, racial diversity of MSA, and the relationship between the two. It is also worthy of study to examine whether certain factors may explain the relationship between a less socially conservative environment and an MSA's attraction to childless college graduates. Such migrants may be specifically affected by certain amenities correlated with less social conservatism and not social conservatism *per se*.

Furthermore, improvements to our metrics of an MSA's political environment may change our findings. We have yet, for example, to account for possible gerrymandering in our political scores or the margin by which candidates win Congressional elections. It is interesting, for example, that Austin, Texas—a city thought of as liberal[26]—has a 2005 ACU score of 70.6, putting it as the 16th most conservative of the 75 largest MSAs. Its 2004 score was only 43.8, and the large jump from 2004 to 2005 was probably related to Texas' redrawing of Congressional districts between the 2002 and 2004 Congressional elections, which favored the Republican party (McKee, Teigen, and Turgeon 2006). We

[26] Tom DeLay, former Texas congressman, called Austin's Travis County "the most liberal county in the State of Texas, indeed in the United States," in an interview on NBC's Today show in 2011. The Austin American-Statesman countered that such a claim was "more than wrong—it's ridiculous" (2011).

ran our own estimations which showed that the ACU score for the average Texan's Congressman rose 11.2 points more than the rest of the country's from 2004 to 2005.

References

Armey, Dick. (2006) "Where We Went Wrong." *The Washington Post*, October 29, p. B-1.

Asbhy, Nathan J. (2007) "Economic Freedom and Migration Flows between U.S. States." *Southern Economic Journal* 73:3, pp 677-697.

Austin American-Statesman Politifact Texas. (2011) "Tom DeLay calls Travis County, home to Austin, the most liberal county in the land." February 16. *www.politifact.com/texas*.

Autor, David H. and David Dorn. (2013) "The Growth of Low Skill Service Jobs and the Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market." *American Economic Review* 103:5, pp. 1553 – 1597.

Autor, David H., Lawrence F. Katz, and Melissa S. Kearney. (2006) "The Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market." *American Economic Review* 96:2, pp. 189-194.

Borjas, George J. (2006) "Native Internal Migration and the Labor Market Impact Of Immigration," *Journal of Human Resources* 41:2: 221-258.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam, James G. Gimpel, and Iris Hui. (2013) "Voter Migration and the Geographic Sorting of the American Electorate." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103:4, pp. 856-70.

Compton, Janice and Robert R. Pollack. (2007) "Why are Power Couples Increasingly Concentrated in Large Metropolitan Areas?" Journal of Labor Economics 25:3, pp. 475-512.

Fields, Gary S. (1979) "Place-to-Place Migration: Some New Evidence." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 61:1, pp. 21-32.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Kristina Tobio (2008) "The Rise of the Sunbelt." Southern Economic Journal, 74(3), pages 610-643.

Glaeser, Edward L., Giacomo A.M. Ponzetto, and Kristina Tobio. "Cities, Skills, and Regional Change." NBER Working Paper 16934.

Harris, John R. and Michael P. Todaro. (1970) "Migration, Unemployment, and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis." *American Economic Review* 60:1, pp. 126-42.

Haveman, Robert H. and Barbara L. Wolfe. (1984) **"**Schooling and Economic Well-Being: The Role of Nonmarket Effects." *The Journal of Human Resources* 19:3, pp. 377-407.

Hui, Iris. "Who is Your Preferred Neighbor? Partisan Residential Preferences and Neighborhood Satisfaction." Forthcoming. *American Politics Research*.

McDonald, Ian. (2011) "Migration and Sorting in the American Electorate: Evidence From the 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study." *American Politics Research* 39:3, pp. 512-533.

Molloy, Raven, Christopher L. Smith, and Abigail Wozniak. (2011) "Internal Migration in the United States." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25:3, pp. 173-96.

Mueser, Peter R. and Philip E. Graves (1995) “Examining the Role of Economic Opportunity and Amenities in Explaining Regional Redistribution.” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 37, pp.176-200.

Notowidigdo, Matthew J. (2011) “The Incidence of Local Labor Demand Shocks.” NBER Working Paper 17167.

Ruggles, Steven J, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], 2010.

Sacerdote, Bruce. “When The Saints Come Marching In: Effects Of Hurricanes Katrina And Rita On Schools, Student Performance, and Crime.” *American Economic Journal*, forthcoming.

Schelling, Thomas C. (1971) “Dynamic Models of Segregation.” *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1:2, pp. 143-186.

Sinnott, R.W. (1984) “Virtues of the Haversine,” *Sky and Telescope*, vol. 68, no. 2, p. 159.

Sjaastad, Larry A. (1962): "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration," *Journal of Political Economy*, supplement, Volume 70, Number 5, 80-93.

Tiebout, Charles M. (1956) “A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures.” *Journal of Political Economy* 64:5, pp. 416-424.

Washington, Ebonya. (2008) “Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers’ Voting on Women’s Issues.” *American Economic Review* 98:1, pp. 311-332.

Zellner, Arnold. (1962) “An Efficient Method of Estimating Seemingly Unrelated Regressions and Tests for Aggregation Bias.” Journal of the American Statistical Association, 57:298, pp. 348-68.

Table 1
ACU, NTU, and NRLC Scores by Congressional Representative
Observations = 435 per year

American Conservative Union (ACU)

	Mean	St Dev	Min	Max	ore = 0 or 100
1994	46.8	36.9	0	100	0.23
1995	52.7	36.0	0	100	0.09
2004	52.3	39.6	0	100	0.23
2005	52.2	39.6	0	100	0.24

National Taxpayers Union (NTU)

	Mean	St Dev	Min	Max	ore = 0 or 100
1994	42.7	26.8	6	92	0
1995	57.8	28.7	9	98	0
2004	38.5	26.3	6	90	0
2005	39.7	22.6	8	91	0

National Right to Life Committee

	Mean	St Dev	Min	Max	ore = 0 or 100
1994	48.9	43.9	0	100	0.68
1995	55.4	38.4	0	100	0.07
2004	55.5	43.6	0	100	0.62
2005	53.8	43.4	0	100	0.59

Table 2
ACU, NTU, and NRLC correlations by MSA
Observations = 435 (1 per Congressional District)

2004	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.94	1.00	
NRLC	0.90	0.79	1.00

1994	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.91	1.00	
NRLC	0.85	0.74	1.00

2005	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.94	1.00	
NRLC	0.91	0.81	1.00

1995	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.94	1.00	
NRLC	0.78	0.66	1.00

Table 3
Political Scores by MSA

Top 10 MSAs (of 75) by 2005 ACU Score

Rank		ACU Score	NTU Score (Rank)	NRLC Score (Rank)
1	Oklahoma City, OK	96.8	63.3 (3)	88.8 (8)
2	Tulsa, OK	96.4	60.2 (5)	98.7 (2)
3	Louisville, KY-IN	94.1	56.5 (9)	94.0 (5)
4	Cincinnati, OH-KY	90.6	61.6 (4)	90.9 (7)
5	Columbus, OH	85.2	55.0 (12)	85.4 (9)
6	Dayton-Springfield, OH	85.0	54.3 (13)	100.0 (1)
7	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	82.9	58.5 (6)	76.0 (14)
8	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	82.0	65.3 (1)	95.5 (3)
9	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	80.8	55.8 (10)	94.9 (4)
10	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	80.3	55.3 (11)	81.5 (10)
11	Orlando, FL	79.6	56.9 (8)	77.0 (12)
12	Dallas, TX	78.6	57.9 (7)	75.3 (16)
13	Orange County, CA	78.6	53.8 (14)	69.2 (24)
14	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	77.7	64.5 (2)	73.6 (19)
15	Richmond-Petersburg, VA	72.3	46.4 (23)	75.4 (15)

Bottom 15 MSAs (of 75) by 2005 ACU Score

Rank		ACU Score	NTU Score	NRLC Score
75	San Francisco, CA	1.6	12.5 (74)	0.0 (73T)
74	Boston, MA-NH	2.3	16.4 (70)	7.2 (69)
73	Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA	4.9	13.5 (73)	30.1 (55)
72	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	5.8	11.5 (75)	6.4 (70)
71	San Jose, CA	6.2	16.3 (71)	2.1 (71)
70	Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	7.4	16.7 (69)	1.6 (72)
69	New York, NY	11.0	19.4 (68)	8.4 (67)
68	Oakland, CA	11.3	31.9 (49)	7.6 (68)
67	Honolulu, HI	12.0	15.8 (72)	0.0 (73T)
66	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	12.4	19.5 (67)	9.7 (66)
65	Tacoma, WA	16.1	22.6 (65)	15.2 (64)
64	Fort Lauderdale, FL	17.9	23.1 (62)	16.8 (62)
63	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	17.9	25.8 (59)	17.8 (61)
62	Hartford, CT	18.2	23.6 (61)	0.0 (73T)
61	Baltimore, MD	18.4	22.9 (63)	12.8 (65)

Table 4
ACU, NTU, and NRLC scores in 2005

MSA	State	ACU	NTU	NRLC
Cincinnati, OH-KY	KY	88.0	55.0	100.0
Cincinnati, OH-KY	OH	91.4	63.6	88.2
Kansas City, MO-KS	MO	37.4	28.0	45.2
Kansas City, MO-KS	KS	27.0	26.9	21.6
Louisville, KY-IN	IN	92.0	60.0	100.0
Louisville, KY-IN	KY	94.7	55.5	92.4
Memphis, TN-MS	TN	42.4	30.5	40.0
Memphis, TN-MS	MS	96.0	53.0	63.6
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	PA	33.6	29.3	44.2
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	NJ	33.1	32.5	48.3
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	OR	7.0	16.5	0.0
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	WA	9.0	18.0	9.1
Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA	RI	6.1	12.5	37.5
Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA	MA	0.0	17.4	0.0
St. Louis, MO-IL	IL	56.1	33.9	96.2
St. Louis, MO-IL	MO	44.7	35.6	41.7
Washington, DC-MD-VA	DC*	10.2	15.3	5.9
Washington, DC-MD-VA	MD	19.5	21.1	13.3
Washington, DC-MD-VA	VA	46.3	40.3	62.6

* = DC's scores are the respective average 2005 scores of Black Congressional Democrats.

Table 5
ACU, NTU, and NRLC correlations by MSA
Observations = 358 in 2004 and 2005, 344 in 1994 and 1995

2004	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.93	1.00	
NRLC	0.86	0.74	1.00

1994	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.87	1.00	
NRLC	0.78	0.62	1.00

2005	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.92	1.00	
NRLC	0.90	0.78	1.00

1995	ACU	NTU	NRLC
ACU	1.00		
NTU	0.92	1.00	
NRLC	0.73	0.55	1.00

Table 6
MSAs by Migration, 200610

PANEL A
Most Created Migrants Per Capita

1	Washington, DC/MD/VA	0.072
2	New Orleans, LA	0.067
3	San Francisco, CA	0.045
4	Fort Lauderdale, FL	0.044
5	Kansas City, MO-KS	0.044
6	Honolulu, HI	0.043
7	Tacoma, WA	0.042
8	Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	0.042
9	Orlando, FL	0.041
10	Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	0.041
11	San Jose, CA	0.041
12	Orange County, CA	0.039
13	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	0.039
14	Austin, TX	0.039
15	Raleigh-Durham, NC	0.038

PANEL B
Most Attracted Migrants Per Capita

1	Washington, DC/MD/VA	0.062
2	Austin, TX	0.060
3	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	0.057
4	Tacoma, WA	0.051
5	Las Vegas, NV	0.050
6	Raleigh-Durham, NC	0.049
7	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	0.047
8	Sarasota, FL	0.045
9	Phoenix, AZ	0.044
10	Jacksonville, FL	0.044
11	Tucson, AZ	0.043
12	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Delray Beach, FL	0.042
13	San Antonio, TX	0.042
14	Fort Lauderdale, FL	0.042
15	Orlando, FL	0.041

PANEL C
Fewest Created Migrants Per Capita

75	Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA	0.017
74	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	0.019
73	Cleveland, OH	0.020
72	Philadelphia, PA/NJ	0.022
71	Milwaukee, WI	0.022
70	Detroit, MI	0.022
69	Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC	0.023
68	Monmouth-Ocean, NJ	0.023
67	Chicago-Gary-Lake, IL	0.023
66	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	0.024
65	Nassau Co, NY	0.025
64	Indianapolis, IN	0.025
63	Rochester, NY	0.025
62	Fresno, CA	0.025
61	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson SC	0.026

PANEL D
Fewest Attracted Migrants Per Capita

75	Nassau Co, NY	0.013
74	Detroit, MI	0.014
73	New York-Northeastern NJ	0.015
72	Chicago-Gary-Lake, IL	0.016
71	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	0.016
70	Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, PA	0.016
69	Cleveland, OH	0.018
68	Philadelphia, PA/NJ	0.018
67	Rochester, NY	0.018
66	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	0.019
65	Miami-Hialeah, FL	0.020
64	Providence-Fall River-Pawtucket, MA/RI	0.021
63	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	0.021
62	Fresno, CA	0.022
61	Milwaukee, WI	0.022

Table 7
Household Migration by Demographic Characteristics
Dependent Variable is Ln(Migrants)
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	All Migrants	Between 100 Largest MSAs
	1	**2**
Female	-0.070*	-0.082*
	[0.038]	[0.046]
Married	-0.137***	-0.064
	[0.038]	[0.046]
Black	0.043	0.436***
	[0.056]	[0.069]
Hispanic	-0.027	0.372***
	[0.046]	[0.065]
Other Race	0.249***	0.658***
	[0.065]	[0.084]
31 to 44 years old	-0.750***	-0.723***
	[0.036]	[0.048]
45 to 59 years old	-1.487***	-1.467***
	[0.050]	[0.059]
60 or older	-2.236***	-2.307***
	[0.067]	[0.085]
HS Graduate	-0.064	-0.020
	[0.048]	[0.063]
Some College	0.113**	0.198***
	[0.047]	[0.068]
College Graduate	0.096	0.322***
	[0.059]	[0.072]
One Child	-0.381***	-0.439***
	[0.036]	[0.049]
Two or More Children	-0.704***	-0.749***
	[0.037]	[0.046]
Ln(Group)	1.092***	1.154***
	[0.024]	[0.025]
Observations	768	768
R-squared	0.931	0.862

Table 8
Demographics and Political Environment
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	All MSAs and Non-MSAs						Dropping non-MSAs					
Dependent Variable	**ACU**	**NTU**	**NRLC**	**ACU**	**NTU**	**NRLC**	**ACU**	**NTU**	**NRLC**	**ACU**	**NTU**	**NRLC**
Ln(Households)	-0.099*	-0.133**	-0.057	-0.108**	-0.136**	-0.056	0.074	-0.015	0.135*	0.064	-0.016	0.155**
	[0.055]	[0.061]	[0.054]	[0.053]	[0.060]	[0.052]	[0.079]	[0.089]	[0.076]	[0.078]	[0.089]	[0.075]
Ln(Household Density)	-0.227***	-0.134**	-0.194***	-0.144**	-0.069	-0.145**	-0.428***	-0.272***	-0.423***	-0.316***	-0.185*	-0.369***
	[0.062]	[0.068]	[0.061]	[0.062]	[0.070]	[0.061]	[0.091]	[0.101]	[0.087]	[0.092]	[0.105]	[0.089]
Ln(Share Over 65)	-0.756*	-0.497	-0.593	-0.336	-0.211	-0.252	-0.495	-0.260	-0.307	-0.100	0.034	-0.022
	[0.428]	[0.470]	[0.419]	[0.425]	[0.479]	[0.417]	[0.460]	[0.514]	[0.443]	[0.454]	[0.520]	[0.437]
Ln(Share No Kids)	2.014	2.704*	1.148	3.444**	4.074**	1.661	1.963	2.509	1.138	3.774**	4.117**	2.112
	[1.383]	[1.522]	[1.357]	[1.494]	[1.685]	[1.465]	[1.433]	[1.600]	[1.378]	[1.535]	[1.757]	[1.478]
Ln(Share 2+ Kids)	1.088	1.462	0.421	2.841**	3.040**	1.292	0.868	1.186	0.251	2.961**	2.997**	1.476
	[1.131]	[1.244]	[1.110]	[1.251]	[1.410]	[1.226]	[1.177]	[1.314]	[1.132]	[1.295]	[1.482]	[1.246]
Ln(Share Some College)	-0.480	-0.017	-0.484	-0.805*	-0.183	-0.657	-0.942*	-0.310	-1.017**	-1.120**	-0.385	-0.980**
	[0.446]	[0.490]	[0.437]	[0.468]	[0.528]	[0.459]	[0.497]	[0.555]	[0.478]	[0.513]	[0.587]	[0.494]
Ln(Share College Grads)	-0.951***	-0.802***	-0.898***	-0.697***	-0.613**	-0.664**	-0.952***	-0.743**	-0.896***	-0.748***	-0.583*	-0.734***
	[0.272]	[0.299]	[0.267]	[0.263]	[0.296]	[0.258]	[0.302]	[0.337]	[0.290]	[0.289]	[0.331]	[0.279]
Ln(Share Black)	0.113**	0.095*	0.117**	-0.034	-0.035	-0.012	0.075	0.062	0.083	-0.090	-0.086	-0.066
	[0.051]	[0.056]	[0.050]	[0.058]	[0.065]	[0.057]	[0.056]	[0.063]	[0.054]	[0.064]	[0.074]	[0.062]
Ln(Share Hispanic)	-0.060	0.017	-0.158***	-0.077	0.011	-0.113*	-0.115*	-0.029	-0.217***	-0.121	-0.025	-0.158**
	[0.060]	[0.066]	[0.059]	[0.067]	[0.076]	[0.066]	[0.068]	[0.076]	[0.065]	[0.074]	[0.084]	[0.071]
Northeast				-0.791***	-0.589***	-0.852***				-0.742***	-0.596***	-0.736***
				[0.179]	[0.202]	[0.175]				[0.195]	[0.224]	[0.188]
South				0.294*	0.281	0.041				0.343*	0.298	0.089
				[0.176]	[0.198]	[0.172]				[0.186]	[0.213]	[0.179]
West				-0.382*	-0.363	-0.670***				-0.511**	-0.494**	-0.815***
				[0.198]	[0.223]	[0.194]				[0.220]	[0.252]	[0.212]
Constant	2.173	4.423	0.132	5.335*	7.277**	1.989	0.420	3.121	-1.652	4.163	6.352*	0.730
	[2.669]	[2.936]	[2.618]	[2.739]	[3.089]	[2.686]	[2.951]	[3.295]	[2.838]	[2.979]	[3.410]	[2.868]
Observations	358	358	358	358	358	358	309	309	309	309	309	309
R-squared	0.180	0.100	0.187	0.262	0.150	0.270	0.205	0.108	0.231	0.290	0.164	0.132

Table 9
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	All MSAs				**Largest 100 MSAs**			
Origin ACU 2005	0.100***		0.042**		0.077**		0.028	
	[0.016]		[0.017]		[0.031]		[0.032]	
Destination ACU 2005	0.291***		0.112***		0.242***		0.027	
	[0.016]		[0.017]		[0.031]		[0.032]	
Origin NTU 2005		0.123***		0.104***		0.206***		0.127**
		[0.022]		[0.022]		[0.052]		[0.054]
Origin NRLC 2005		-0.027		-0.061**		-0.163***		-0.114*
		[0.026]		[0.026]		[0.060]		[0.060]
Destination NTU 2005		0.222***		0.140***		0.488***		0.148***
		[0.022]		[0.022]		[0.052]		[0.054]
Destination NRLC 2005		0.045*		-0.027		-0.314***		-0.113*
		[0.026]		[0.026]		[0.060]		[0.061]
Ln(Origin Households)	1.977***	1.980***	1.953***	1.956***	2.003***	1.975***	1.979***	1.964***
	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.041]	[0.042]	[0.041]	[0.041]
Ln(Origin HH Density)	-0.050***	-0.060***	-0.033***	-0.040***	0.031	0.015	0.065	0.051
	[0.012]	[0.012]	[0.013]	[0.013]	[0.040]	[0.040]	[0.040]	[0.041]
Ln(Destination Households)	2.041***	2.042***	1.985***	1.988***	2.026***	1.959***	1.985***	1.969***
	[0.017]	[0.017]	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.042]	[0.042]	[0.041]	[0.041]
Ln(Destination HH Density)	-0.129***	-0.153***	-0.099***	-0.110***	-0.205***	-0.225***	-0.125***	-0.127***
	[0.012]	[0.012]	[0.013]	[0.013]	[0.040]	[0.041]	[0.041]	[0.041]
Origin Northeast			-0.177***	-0.183***			0.010	0.015
			[0.056]	[0.056]			[0.100]	[0.100]
Origin South			0.240***	0.237***			0.374***	0.349***
			[0.043]	[0.043]			[0.085]	[0.085]
Origin West			0.559***	0.543***			0.801***	0.723***
			[0.083]	[0.083]			[0.162]	[0.166]
Destination Northeast			-0.257***	-0.262***			-0.311***	-0.297***
			[0.059]	[0.059]			[0.102]	[0.102]
Destination South			1.277***	1.280***			1.346***	1.308***
			[0.043]	[0.043]			[0.085]	[0.085]
Destination West			1.433***	1.420***			1.595***	1.499***
			[0.083]	[0.083]			[0.161]	[0.164]
Ln(Origin Share Working Age)	1.854***	1.937***	1.463***	1.506***	-0.172	-0.204	-0.532	-0.519
	[0.209]	[0.208]	[0.212]	[0.211]	[0.383]	[0.381]	[0.388]	[0.387]
Ln(Destination Share Working Age)	1.173***	1.372***	0.182	0.258	0.422	0.423	-0.982**	-0.943**
	[0.205]	[0.204]	[0.206]	[0.205]	[0.381]	[0.379]	[0.383]	[0.383]
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	12432	12432	12432	12432
Pseudo R-Squared	0.181	0.181	0.187	0.187	0.140	0.142	0.152	0.152

Table 10
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	High School						**Some College**						**College Graduate**					
Origin ACU 2005	0.252***		0.190***		0.151***		0.166***		0.124***		0.061**		-0.001		0.082***		0.038	
	[0.026]		[0.027]		[0.027]		[0.024]		[0.024]		[0.025]		[0.024]		[0.024]		[0.025]	
Destination ACU 2005	0.422***		0.354***		0.212***		0.434***		0.407***		0.218***		0.190***		0.265***		0.083***	
	[0.026]		[0.027]		[0.028]		[0.024]		[0.025]		[0.025]		[0.024]		[0.025]		[0.025]	
Origin NTU 2005		0.188***		0.185***		0.158***		0.119***		0.078**		0.040		0.156***		0.093***		0.074**
		[0.036]		[0.036]		[0.036]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.033]
Origin NRLC 2005		0.045		-0.024		-0.030		0.056		0.040		0.023		-0.182***		-0.032		-0.057
		[0.041]		[0.042]		[0.042]		[0.038]		[0.038]		[0.038]		[0.038]		[0.038]		[0.038]
Destination NTU 2005		0.229***		0.229***		0.140***		0.295***		0.256***		0.135***		0.295***		0.234***		0.139***
		[0.036]		[0.036]		[0.036]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.033]		[0.034]		[0.033]		[0.033]
Destination NRLC 2005		0.175***		0.092**		0.065		0.118***		0.112***		0.075*		-0.154***		-0.017		-0.079**
		[0.042]		[0.042]		[0.042]		[0.039]		[0.039]		[0.039]		[0.039]		[0.039]		[0.039]
Ln(Origin Share Working Age)			1.665***	1.833***	1.885***	1.978***			2.225***	2.326***	2.308***	2.333***			2.038***	2.137***	1.982***	2.021***
			[0.330]	[0.328]	[0.338]	[0.337]			[0.308]	[0.307]	[0.314]	[0.313]			[0.317]	[0.314]	[0.324]	[0.322]
Ln(Destination Share Working A			1.568***	1.816***	1.235***	1.334***			1.749***	2.006***	0.994***	1.084***			2.139***	2.358***	1.197***	1.262***
			[0.329]	[0.327]	[0.331]	[0.330]			[0.303]	[0.302]	[0.304]	[0.303]			[0.307]	[0.305]	[0.308]	[0.307]
Ln(Origin Share Some College)			1.470***	1.412***	1.993***	1.920***			3.448***	3.414***	3.943***	3.915***			0.835***	0.815***	0.966***	0.942***
			[0.209]	[0.210]	[0.226]	[0.226]			[0.198]	[0.198]	[0.213]	[0.213]			[0.195]	[0.196]	[0.210]	[0.210]
Ln(Origin Share College Grad)			-0.524***	-0.576***	-0.393***	-0.432***			0.389***	0.372***	0.533***	0.529***			2.481***	2.452***	2.522***	2.497***
			[0.090]	[0.091]	[0.091]	[0.092]			[0.084]	[0.084]	[0.084]	[0.085]			[0.084]	[0.085]	[0.085]	[0.085]
Ln(Destination Share Some College)			1.961***	1.855***	2.584***	2.493***			3.229***	3.104***	3.866***	3.776***			0.956***	0.880***	1.303***	1.243***
			[0.211]	[0.211]	[0.227]	[0.228]			[0.199]	[0.199]	[0.214]	[0.215]			[0.196]	[0.196]	[0.211]	[0.212]
Ln(Destination Share College Grad)			-0.738***	-0.790***	-0.426***	-0.446***			0.469***	0.409***	0.739***	0.718***			2.349***	2.280***	2.480***	2.445***
			[0.090]	[0.090]	[0.091]	[0.091]			[0.083]	[0.084]	[0.084]	[0.084]			[0.085]	[0.085]	[0.086]	[0.086]
Region Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806
Pseudo R-Squared	0.189	0.188	0.190	0.190	0.196	0.196	0.182	0.182	0.187	0.187	0.195	0.195	0.190	0.190	0.202	0.202	0.208	0.208

Table 11
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	High School						Some College						College Graduate					
	No Children		Have Children		2+ Children		No Children		Have Children		2+ Children		No Children		Have Children		2+ Children	
Origin ACU 2005	0.151***		0.181***		0.094*		0.074**		0.136***		0.166***		0.048*		0.082*		0.107*	
	[0.035]		[0.038]		[0.048]		[0.031]		[0.037]		[0.049]		[0.029]		[0.042]		[0.056]	
Destination ACU 2005	0.198***		0.236***		0.250***		0.230***		0.244***		0.209***		0.044		0.242***		0.294***	
	[0.035]		[0.038]		[0.049]		[0.031]		[0.037]		[0.049]		[0.029]		[0.042]		[0.056]	
Origin NTU 2005		0.161***		0.179***		0.137**		0.005		0.162***		0.221***		0.058		0.170***		0.116
		[0.045]		[0.049]		[0.063]		[0.040]		[0.048]		[0.063]		[0.038]		[0.055]		[0.072]
Origin NRLC 2005		-0.033		-0.020		-0.068		0.096**		-0.058		-0.097		-0.025		-0.117*		-0.000
		[0.053]		[0.058]		[0.073]		[0.047]		[0.056]		[0.073]		[0.044]		[0.064]		[0.084]
Destination NTU 2005		0.155***		0.176***		0.209***		0.181***		0.170***		0.123**		0.177***		0.226***		0.305***
		[0.045]		[0.049]		[0.062]		[0.041]		[0.048]		[0.063]		[0.039]		[0.055]		[0.073]
Destination NRLC 2005		0.021		0.046		0.021		0.029		0.056		0.094		-0.164***		-0.012		-0.036
		[0.053]		[0.058]		[0.074]		[0.048]		[0.057]		[0.075]		[0.045]		[0.065]		[0.085]
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806
Pseudo R-Squared	0.200	0.200	0.209	0.209	0.221	0.221	0.202	0.202	0.196	0.196	0.199	0.199	0.218	0.219	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206

Table 12
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
	High School, No Children			**High School, Children**			**High School, 2+ Children**		
Origin NTU 2005	0.160***	0.150***	0.133***	0.179***	0.161***	0.136**	0.136**	0.115*	0.116*
	[0.045]	[0.045]	[0.048]	[0.049]	[0.049]	[0.053]	[0.062]	[0.063]	[0.066]
Origin NRLC 2005	-0.033	-0.034	-0.018	-0.021	-0.018	0.013	-0.069	-0.052	-0.055
	[0.053]	[0.054]	[0.056]	[0.058]	[0.059]	[0.061]	[0.073]	[0.074]	[0.076]
Destination NTU 2005	0.155***	0.100**	0.038	0.177***	0.146***	0.093*	0.209***	0.184***	0.170**
	[0.045]	[0.045]	[0.049]	[0.049]	[0.049]	[0.053]	[0.062]	[0.062]	[0.066]
Destination NRLC 2005	0.021	0.001	-0.005	0.046	0.028	0.005	0.020	-0.012	-0.057
	[0.053]	[0.054]	[0.056]	[0.058]	[0.059]	[0.061]	[0.074]	[0.075]	[0.077]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.015**	0.013**		0.002	-0.000		-0.014*	-0.016*
		[0.006]	[0.006]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.008]	[0.008]
Origin Mean July Temp		0.005	0.009		0.024**	0.029***		0.045***	0.048***
		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.010]	[0.011]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Origin Average Precipitation		0.005	0.007*		0.001	0.004		0.006	0.009
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.006]	[0.006]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.022***	0.019***		0.010	0.007		0.005	0.002
		[0.006]	[0.006]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.009]	[0.009]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.073***	0.078***		0.044***	0.047***		0.056***	0.051***
		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.011]	[0.011]		[0.014]	[0.014]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.002	0.005		-0.008*	-0.000		-0.010*	-0.004
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.006]	[0.006]
Origin Average HH Income			-0.011			-0.010			-0.021*
			[0.008]			[0.009]			[0.011]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.026			-0.026			-0.022
			[0.017]			[0.019]			[0.023]
Origin Average Rent			2.878***			4.760***			5.378***
			[1.032]			[1.110]			[1.382]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.060***			-0.066***			-0.061***
			[0.009]			[0.010]			[0.012]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.135***			-0.133***			-0.096***
			[0.018]			[0.019]			[0.024]
Destination Average Rent			1.589			0.761			-2.197
			[1.109]			[1.206]			[1.527]
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806
Pseudo R-Squared	0.200	0.202	0.203	0.209	0.210	0.211	0.221	0.222	0.223

Table 13
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Some College, No Children			**Some College, Children**			**Some College, 2+ Children**		
Origin NTU 2005	0.005	-0.008	-0.064	0.161***	0.141***	0.072	0.220***	0.209***	0.151**
	[0.040]	[0.040]	[0.043]	[0.048]	[0.048]	[0.051]	[0.062]	[0.063]	[0.066]
Origin NRLC 2005	0.096**	0.075	0.125**	-0.059	-0.071	-0.011	-0.097	-0.100	-0.056
	[0.047]	[0.048]	[0.049]	[0.056]	[0.057]	[0.059]	[0.073]	[0.074]	[0.076]
Destination NTU 2005	0.181***	0.127***	0.044	0.171***	0.124**	0.030	0.123**	0.086	0.008
	[0.041]	[0.041]	[0.044]	[0.048]	[0.048]	[0.052]	[0.063]	[0.063]	[0.067]
Destination NRLC 2005	0.029	0.000	0.021	0.056	0.027	0.048	0.094	0.042	0.053
	[0.048]	[0.049]	[0.051]	[0.057]	[0.058]	[0.060]	[0.075]	[0.075]	[0.078]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.022***	0.020***		0.012*	0.010		0.002	-0.000
		[0.006]	[0.006]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.008]	[0.008]
Origin Mean July Temp		0.001	0.009		0.022**	0.031***		0.018	0.027**
		[0.009]	[0.009]		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Origin Average Precipitation		-0.008**	-0.005		-0.004	-0.001		-0.000	0.003
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.004]	[0.005]		[0.006]	[0.006]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.030***	0.025***		0.023***	0.019***		0.021**	0.015*
		[0.006]	[0.006]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.008]	[0.009]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.053***	0.061***		0.049***	0.058***		0.057***	0.062***
		[0.008]	[0.009]		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.013***	-0.004		-0.014***	-0.005		-0.016***	-0.006
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.004]	[0.005]		[0.006]	[0.006]
Origin Average HH Income			-0.007			-0.011			-0.014
			[0.007]			[0.009]			[0.011]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.051***			-0.064***			-0.063***
			[0.016]			[0.019]			[0.024]
Origin Average Rent			3.523***			4.365***			4.031***
			[0.923]			[1.096]			[1.434]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.061***			-0.071***			-0.084***
			[0.008]			[0.010]			[0.012]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.157***			-0.174***			-0.179***
			[0.016]			[0.019]			[0.025]
Destination Average Rent			3.964***			3.670***			3.411**
			[0.966]			[1.172]			[1.538]
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806
Pseudo R-Squared	0.202	0.204	0.205	0.196	0.198	0.199	0.199	0.200	0.202

Table 14
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	College Grad, No Children			**College Grad, Children**			**College Grad, 2+ Children**		
Origin NTU 2005	0.057	0.051	0.036	0.170***	0.134**	0.136**	0.115	0.080	0.084
	[0.038]	[0.038]	[0.041]	[0.055]	[0.055]	[0.059]	[0.072]	[0.073]	[0.077]
Origin NRLC 2005	-0.025	-0.035	-0.041	-0.118*	-0.098	-0.093	-0.000	0.022	0.037
	[0.044]	[0.045]	[0.046]	[0.064]	[0.065]	[0.068]	[0.084]	[0.085]	[0.088]
Destination NTU 2005	0.177***	0.130***	0.115***	0.226***	0.186***	0.050	0.305***	0.266***	0.147*
	[0.039]	[0.039]	[0.042]	[0.055]	[0.055]	[0.059]	[0.073]	[0.074]	[0.078]
Destination NRLC 2005	-0.164***	-0.171***	-0.160***	-0.012	-0.036	0.042	-0.036	-0.063	0.000
	[0.045]	[0.046]	[0.048]	[0.065]	[0.066]	[0.068]	[0.085]	[0.086]	[0.089]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.003	0.004		-0.009	-0.010		-0.009	-0.008
		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.010]	[0.010]
Origin Mean July Temp		0.008	0.008		0.054***	0.055***		0.055***	0.056***
		[0.008]	[0.009]		[0.012]	[0.012]		[0.015]	[0.016]
Origin Average Precipitation		-0.011***	-0.011***		0.007	0.007		0.015**	0.013*
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.007]	[0.007]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.005	0.004		0.013*	0.014*		0.012	0.010
		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.007]	[0.007]		[0.010]	[0.010]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.064***	0.068***		0.050***	0.058***		0.061***	0.069***
		[0.008]	[0.008]		[0.012]	[0.012]		[0.015]	[0.015]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.005	-0.002		-0.011**	-0.010*		-0.002	0.002
		[0.004]	[0.004]		[0.005]	[0.005]		[0.007]	[0.007]
Origin Average HH Income			-0.004			0.002			0.020*
			[0.006]			[0.009]			[0.012]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.022			0.009			0.043
			[0.015]			[0.021]			[0.027]
Origin Average Rent			-1.892**			0.825			-0.202
			[0.861]			[1.200]			[1.616]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.014**			-0.003			-0.028**
			[0.007]			[0.010]			[0.013]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.035**			-0.123***			-0.163***
			[0.015]			[0.021]			[0.028]
Destination Average Rent			2.347***			-3.081**			-1.195
			[0.856]			[1.282]			[1.712]
Observations	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806	127806
Pseudo R-Squared	0.219	0.220	0.220	0.206	0.207	0.208	0.206	0.208	0.208

Table 15
Effects on 2006-10 Migration, Largest 100 MSAs
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	High School						**Some College**						**College Graduate**					
	No Children		**Have Children**		**2+ Children**		**No Children**		**Have Children**		**2+ Children**		**No Children**		**Have Children**		**2+ Children**	
Origin ACU 2005	-0.019		0.120		0.002		0.108*		0.004		0.073		0.017		0.001		0.114	
	[0.075]		[0.083]		[0.106]		[0.062]		[0.076]		[0.102]		[0.049]		[0.072]		[0.095]	
Destination ACU 2005	0.133*		0.212***		0.207**		0.185***		0.252***		0.219**		-0.055		0.126*		0.164*	
	[0.073]		[0.082]		[0.105]		[0.061]		[0.075]		[0.101]		[0.049]		[0.071]		[0.095]	
Origin NTU 2005		0.099		0.429***		0.317*		0.250**		0.103		0.257		0.075		0.350***		0.272*
		[0.122]		[0.137]		[0.174]		[0.102]		[0.127]		[0.169]		[0.081]		[0.123]		[0.161]
Origin NRLC 2005		-0.147		-0.400***		-0.383**		-0.206*		-0.124		-0.230		-0.074		-0.386***		-0.152
		[0.135]		[0.152]		[0.192]		[0.113]		[0.142]		[0.187]		[0.091]		[0.136]		[0.180]
Destination NTU 2005		0.356***		0.464***		0.604***		0.270***		0.259**		0.169		0.247***		0.309**		0.230
		[0.121]		[0.135]		[0.171]		[0.103]		[0.129]		[0.171]		[0.085]		[0.123]		[0.164]
Destination NRLC 2005		-0.295**		-0.293*		-0.453**		-0.104		-0.024		0.084		-0.380***		-0.234*		-0.106
		[0.137]		[0.153]		[0.193]		[0.117]		[0.147]		[0.194]		[0.095]		[0.138]		[0.183]
Observations	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432
Pseudo R Squared	0.142	0.142	0.148	0.149	0.156	0.157	0.147	0.147	0.143	0.143	0.140	0.141	0.185	0.186	0.154	0.155	0.151	0.151

Table 16
Effects on 2006-10 Migration, Largest 100 MSAs
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	High School, No Children			High School, Children			High School, 2+ Children		
Origin NTU 2005	0.098	0.042	0.032	0.427***	0.245*	0.233	0.316*	0.133	0.144
	[0.121]	[0.125]	[0.126]	[0.137]	[0.141]	[0.142]	[0.173]	[0.179]	[0.182]
Origin NRLC 2005	-0.148	-0.211	-0.203	-0.401***	-0.340**	-0.317**	-0.384**	-0.301	-0.280
	[0.136]	[0.141]	[0.142]	[0.152]	[0.159]	[0.160]	[0.192]	[0.201]	[0.203]
Destination NTU 2005	0.357***	0.162	0.113	0.465***	0.443***	0.395***	0.604***	0.555***	0.506***
	[0.121]	[0.125]	[0.126]	[0.135]	[0.139]	[0.139]	[0.171]	[0.176]	[0.176]
Destination NRLC 2005	-0.295**	-0.259*	-0.255*	-0.293*	-0.410***	-0.434***	-0.452**	-0.587***	-0.590***
	[0.137]	[0.143]	[0.143]	[0.152]	[0.159]	[0.159]	[0.193]	[0.200]	[0.200]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.056***	0.053***		0.045***	0.043***		0.025	0.026
		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.014]	[0.014]		[0.017]	[0.018]
Origin Mean July Temp		-0.021	-0.020		0.050**	0.049**		0.066**	0.065**
		[0.019]	[0.019]		[0.021]	[0.021]		[0.028]	[0.028]
Origin Average Precipitation		-0.007	-0.003		0.008	0.012		0.010	0.008
		[0.009]	[0.010]		[0.010]	[0.011]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.064***	0.065***		0.051***	0.044***		0.061***	0.055***
		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.014]	[0.014]		[0.018]	[0.018]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.051***	0.054***		-0.013	-0.006		-0.006	-0.000
		[0.019]	[0.019]		[0.021]	[0.022]		[0.028]	[0.028]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.011	-0.010		-0.036***	-0.027**		-0.035***	-0.027**
		[0.009]	[0.010]		[0.010]	[0.011]		[0.013]	[0.014]
Origin Average HH Income			-0.019			-0.014			0.018
			[0.021]			[0.023]			[0.030]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.052			-0.043			0.039
			[0.044]			[0.048]			[0.061]
Origin Average Rent			3.436			5.916**			5.297*
			[2.173]			[2.352]			[2.916]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.005			-0.064***			-0.051*
			[0.021]			[0.024]			[0.030]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.081*			-0.162***			-0.140**
			[0.045]			[0.050]			[0.063]
Destination Average Rent			-4.802**			0.213			-1.442
			[2.224]			[2.474]			[3.114]
Observations	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432
Pseudo R-Squared	0.142	0.146	0.147	0.149	0.152	0.153	0.157	0.159	0.160

Table 17
Effects on 2006-10 Migration, Largest 100 MSAs
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Some College, No Children			**Some College, Children**			**Some College, 2+ Children**		
Origin NTU 2005	0.249**	0.121	0.092	0.103	-0.028	-0.107	0.256	0.137	0.077
	[0.101]	[0.104]	[0.105]	[0.127]	[0.131]	[0.131]	[0.168]	[0.174]	[0.174]
Origin NRLC 2005	-0.207*	-0.208*	-0.182	-0.124	-0.072	-0.031	-0.230	-0.194	-0.156
	[0.113]	[0.117]	[0.118]	[0.142]	[0.148]	[0.148]	[0.188]	[0.196]	[0.195]
Destination NTU 2005	0.271***	0.105	0.037	0.259**	0.067	0.012	0.169	-0.047	-0.095
	[0.103]	[0.106]	[0.106]	[0.129]	[0.132]	[0.133]	[0.171]	[0.176]	[0.175]
Destination NRLC 2005	-0.104	-0.041	-0.049	-0.024	0.039	0.051	0.084	0.141	0.139
	[0.117]	[0.122]	[0.121]	[0.146]	[0.152]	[0.152]	[0.194]	[0.201]	[0.200]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.047***	0.043***		0.015	0.015		0.007	0.005
		[0.010]	[0.011]		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.017]	[0.017]
Origin Mean July Temp		0.031**	0.033**		0.062***	0.063***		0.070***	0.075***
		[0.016]	[0.016]		[0.020]	[0.020]		[0.027]	[0.027]
Origin Average Precipitation		-0.012	-0.006		-0.011	-0.005		-0.007	-0.002
		[0.008]	[0.008]		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.031***	0.023**		0.041***	0.034***		0.029*	0.020
		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.017]	[0.017]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.063***	0.068***		0.081***	0.085***		0.109***	0.113***
		[0.016]	[0.016]		[0.020]	[0.020]		[0.027]	[0.027]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.014*	-0.002		-0.015	-0.005		-0.012	-0.000
		[0.008]	[0.008]		[0.010]	[0.010]		[0.013]	[0.013]
Origin Average HH Income			-0.023			-0.022			-0.016
			[0.018]			[0.022]			[0.029]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.081**			-0.168***			-0.135**
			[0.037]			[0.046]			[0.061]
Origin Average Rent			5.111***			2.088			1.958
			[1.818]			[2.222]			[2.904]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.083***			-0.058***			-0.082***
			[0.018]			[0.022]			[0.030]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.231***			-0.166***			-0.214***
			[0.038]			[0.048]			[0.063]
Destination Average Rent			4.717**			4.226*			3.878
			[1.852]			[2.326]			[3.010]
Observations	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432
Pseudo R-Squared	0.147	0.151	0.153	0.143	0.147	0.149	0.141	0.144	0.145

Table 18
Effects on 2006-10 Migration
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	College Grad, No Children			**College Grad, Children**			**College Grad, 2+ Children**		
Origin NTU 2005	0.075	0.032	0.020	0.349***	0.231*	0.241*	0.271*	0.115	0.127
	[0.081]	[0.084]	[0.084]	[0.122]	[0.126]	[0.127]	[0.161]	[0.166]	[0.167]
Origin NRLC 2005	-0.074	-0.063	-0.053	-0.387***	-0.322**	-0.322**	-0.152	-0.022	-0.018
	[0.091]	[0.096]	[0.096]	[0.137]	[0.142]	[0.143]	[0.180]	[0.188]	[0.189]
Destination NTU 2005	0.248***	0.105	0.063	0.309**	0.175	0.091	0.230	0.061	-0.005
	[0.085]	[0.088]	[0.088]	[0.123]	[0.127]	[0.128]	[0.164]	[0.170]	[0.169]
Destination NRLC 2005	-0.379***	-0.277***	-0.265***	-0.233*	-0.221	-0.197	-0.105	-0.124	-0.107
	[0.095]	[0.100]	[0.100]	[0.138]	[0.145]	[0.144]	[0.183]	[0.191]	[0.190]
Origin Mean January Temp		0.008	0.009		0.015	0.012		0.012	0.012
		[0.008]	[0.009]		[0.012]	[0.012]		[0.016]	[0.016]
Origin Mean July Temp		0.024*	0.024*		0.047**	0.048**		0.053**	0.055**
		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.019]	[0.019]		[0.026]	[0.026]
Origin Average Precipitation		-0.010	-0.010		0.002	0.004		0.028**	0.028**
		[0.006]	[0.007]		[0.009]	[0.009]		[0.012]	[0.013]
Destination Mean January Temp		0.009	0.007		0.039***	0.043***		0.054***	0.055***
		[0.008]	[0.009]		[0.012]	[0.012]		[0.016]	[0.016]
Destination Mean July Temp		0.066***	0.068***		0.044**	0.044**		0.048*	0.053**
		[0.013]	[0.013]		[0.019]	[0.019]		[0.026]	[0.026]
Destination Average Precipitation		-0.001	0.004		-0.020**	-0.017*		-0.015	-0.009
		[0.006]	[0.007]		[0.009]	[0.010]		[0.012]	[0.013]
Origin Average HH Income			0.009			-0.015			0.007
			[0.014]			[0.020]			[0.027]
Origin Poverty Rate			-0.011			-0.013			0.023
			[0.030]			[0.044]			[0.059]
Origin Average Rent			-0.939			3.562*			2.960
			[1.466]			[2.110]			[2.795]
Destination Average HH Income			-0.021			-0.000			-0.019
			[0.014]			[0.021]			[0.028]
Destination Poverty Rate			-0.110***			-0.151***			-0.170***
			[0.030]			[0.046]			[0.062]
Destination Average Rent			0.698			-3.893*			-0.836
			[1.461]			[2.240]			[3.006]
Observations	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432	12432
Pseudo R-squared	0.186	0.188	0.188	0.155	0.158	0.159	0.151	0.154	0.155

Table 19
Household Migration by Demographic Characteristics, High School Dropouts and Graduates Only
Dependent Variable is Ln(Migrants)
Standard errors in brackets
*** = Significant at 10%; ** = Significant at 5%; *** = Significant at 1%**

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
	All	**100 Largest MSAs**	**All**	**100 Largest MSAs**
Female Head	0.014	-0.060	0.014	-0.059
	[0.032]	[0.048]	[0.031]	[0.048]
Married	-0.158***	-0.107**	-0.158***	-0.107**
	[0.032]	[0.048]	[0.032]	[0.048]
Black	-0.176***	0.205***	-0.283***	0.100
	[0.047]	[0.062]	[0.067]	[0.097]
Hispanic	-0.218***	0.230***	-0.235***	0.177**
	[0.042]	[0.050]	[0.061]	[0.079]
Other Race	-0.043	0.389***	-0.041	0.388***
	[0.063]	[0.078]	[0.064]	[0.078]
30 to 44 yrs old	-0.572***	-0.531***	-0.573***	-0.531***
	[0.037]	[0.054]	[0.037]	[0.054]
45 to 59 yrs old	-1.223***	-1.171***	-1.224***	-1.170***
	[0.048]	[0.069]	[0.049]	[0.070]
Children	-0.435***	-0.429***	-0.482***	-0.489***
	[0.031]	[0.047]	[0.042]	[0.069]
Black*Children			0.162**	0.158
			[0.078]	[0.129]
Hispanic*Children			0.026	0.080
			[0.079]	[0.102]
Ln(Group Size)	0.915***	0.969***	0.916***	0.969***
	[0.020]	[0.028]	[0.020]	[0.028]
Constant	-1.398***	-2.968***	-1.379***	-2.922***
	[0.234]	[0.305]	[0.244]	[0.321]
Observations	288	288	288	288
R-squared	0.954	0.893	0.955	0.893

Appendix Table 1
Political Scores, 2005, of Largest 75 MSAs

	ACU		NTU		NRLC		2000 population	
	Score	**Rank**	**Score**	**Rank**	**Score**	**Rank**	**Total (1000s)**	**Rank**
Akron, OH	26.7	58	20.9	66	43.5	46	695.0	75
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	29.3	56	25.8	58	70.1	23	875.6	68
Albuquerque, NM	67.6	23	42.6	32	58.0	31	712.7	73
Atlanta, GA	58.8	30	45.0	26	52.1	37	4112.2	8
Austin-San Marcos, TX	70.6	16	47.0	22	73.7	18	1249.8	47
Baltimore, MD	18.4	61	22.9	63	12.8	65	2553.0	18
Bergen-Passaic, NJ	34.3	49	30.8	52	37.9	51	1373.2	43
Birmingham, AL	68.7	20	43.4	29	70.3	22	921.1	66
Boston, MA-NH	2.3	74	16.4	70	7.2	69	3398.1	10
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	29.9	55	22.8	64	27.8	56	1170.1	52
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	67.5	24	50.6	15	70.8	21	1499.3	41
Chicago, IL	30.2	54	32.0	48	24.3	58	8272.8	3
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	90.6	4	61.6	4	90.9	7	1594.7	36
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	20.6	60	25.9	57	19.9	60	2250.9	25
Columbus, OH	85.2	5	55.0	12	85.4	9	1540.2	39
Dallas, TX	78.6	12	57.9	7	75.3	16	3519.2	9
Dayton-Springfield, OH	85.0	6	54.3	13	100.0	1	950.6	64
Denver, CO	54.9	36	45.4	25	53.2	36	2400.6	20
Detroit, MI	43.6	43	34.3	45	44.3	45	4441.6	6
Fort Lauderdale, FL	17.9	64	23.1	62	16.8	62	1623.0	34
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	82.9	7	58.5	6	76.0	14	1702.6	30
Fresno, CA	70.3	17	49.3	18	67.4	27	922.5	65
Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	80.8	9	55.8	10	94.9	4	1088.5	58
Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC	55.1	35	43.7	28	50.8	39	1251.5	46
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	82.0	8	65.3	1	95.5	3	962.4	63
Hartford, CT	18.2	62	23.6	61	0.0	73T	1183.1	51
Honolulu, HI	12.0	67	15.8	72	0.0	73T	876.2	67
Houston, TX	57.8	31	40.6	35	50.9	38	4177.6	7
Indianapolis, IN	56.0	32	43.1	30	56.0	33	1607.5	35
Jacksonville, FL	69.9	19	48.4	19	72.0	20	1100.5	56
Kansas City, MO-KS	33.3	51	27.6	56	35.8	53	1776.1	28
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	50.8	40	40.0	38	42.1	48	1408.3	42
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	12.4	66	19.5	67	9.7	66	9519.3	1
Louisville, KY-IN	94.1	3	56.5	9	94.0	5	1025.6	61
Memphis, TN-MS	47.7	41	32.7	46	42.3	47	1084.7	59
Miami, FL	68.4	21	49.3	17	76.7	13	2253.4	24
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	32.2	52	30.6	53	38.8	49	1169.6	53
Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI	53.1	37	47.5	20	55.3	34	1500.7	40
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	41.8	45	37.3	40	47.2	42	2868.8	13
Monmouth-Ocean, NJ	36.8	47	32.1	47	59.6	30	1126.2	55
Nashville, TN	39.6	46	36.6	41	38.8	50	1231.3	48
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	23.7	59	23.9	60	21.6	59	2753.9	16
New Orleans, LA	60.1	27	36.4	42	49.5	41	1337.7	44
New York, NY	11.0	69	19.4	68	8.4	67	9314.2	2
Newark, NJ	35.9	48	35.4	43	36.0	52	2033.0	26
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	68.4	22	47.1	21	74.8	17	1551.4	38
Oakland, CA	11.3	68	31.9	49	7.6	68	2392.6	22
Oklahoma City, OK	96.8	1	63.3	3	88.8	8	1083.3	60
Orange County, CA	78.6	13	53.8	14	69.2	24	2846.3	14
Orlando, FL	79.6	11	56.9	8	77.0	12	1644.6	32
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	33.5	50	30.1	54	45.2	44	5100.9	4
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	77.7	14	64.5	2	73.6	19	3251.9	12
Pittsburgh, PA	59.6	29	38.6	39	81.1	11	2358.7	23
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	7.4	70	16.7	69	1.6	72	1918.0	27
Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA	4.9	73	13.5	73	30.1	55	1188.6	49
Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	5.8	72	11.5	75	6.4	70	1187.9	50

Richmond-Petersburg, VA	72.3	15	46.4	23	75.4	15	996.5	62
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	70.2	18	45.6	24	59.7	29	3254.8	11
Rochester, NY	59.7	28	43.1	31	68.3	25	1098.2	57
Sacramento, CA	55.7	34	40.4	36	57.5	32	1628.2	33
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	80.3	10	55.3	11	81.5	10	2603.6	17
San Antonio, TX	51.1	39	31.6	50	50.8	40	1333.9	45
San Diego, CA	51.3	38	40.1	37	45.4	43	1592.4	37
San Francisco, CA	1.6	75	12.5	74	0.0	73T	2813.8	15
San Jose, CA	6.2	71	16.3	71	2.1	71	1731.2	29
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	17.9	63	25.8	59	17.8	61	1682.6	31
St. Louis, MO-IL	47.3	42	35.2	44	54.2	35	2414.6	19
Syracuse, NY	66.1	25	49.8	16	91.2	6	732.1	72
Tacoma, WA	16.1	65	22.6	65	15.2	64	700.8	74
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	65.4	26	44.3	27	67.5	26	2396.0	21
Tucson, AZ	43.3	44	42.6	33	16.6	63	843.7	69
Tulsa, OK	96.4	2	60.2	5	98.7	2	803.2	70
Ventura, CA	55.9	33	42.0	34	63.5	28	753.2	71
Washington, DC-MD-VA	30.5	53	29.1	55	34.6	54	4805.1	5
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL	29.3	57	31.0	51	24.3	57	1131.2	54