

Footloose and Fancy Free: A Field Survey of Walkable Urban Places in the Top 30 U.S. Metropolitan Areas

Christopher B. Leinberger

The post-World War II era has witnessed the nearly exclusive building of low density suburbia, here termed “drivable sub-urban” development, as the American metropolitan built environment. However, over the past 15 years, there has been a gradual shift in how Americans have created their built environment (defined as the real estate, which is generally privately owned, and the infrastructure that supports real estate, majority publicly owned), as demonstrated by the success of the many downtown revitalizations, new urbanism, and transit-oriented development. This has been the result of the re-introduction and expansion of higher density “walkable urban” places. This new trend is the focus of the recently published book, *The Option of Urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream* (Island Press, November, 2007).

This field survey attempts to identify the number and location of “regional-serving” walkable urban places in the 30 largest American metropolitan areas in the U.S, where 138 million, or 46 percent, of the US population lives. This field survey determines where these walkable urban places are most prevalent on a per capita basis, where they are generally located within the metro area, and the extent to which rail transit service is associated with walkable urban development.

The first section defines the key concepts used in the survey, providing relevant background information for those who have not read *The Option of Urbanism*. The second section outlines the methodology. The third section, which is the heart of the report, outlines the findings and conclusions of the survey.

Key Concepts

There are a number of key concepts and background information critical to understanding the rise of walkable urban places today. There is a more in-depth discussion of these terms in the book:

- **Types of Built Environment Patterns.** The built environment is generally marked by two kinds of development patterns—*drivable sub-urban* and *walkable urban*. Drivable sub-urban is very low density (floor-area-ratio of between 0.05 and 0.30), modular in nature, uses significantly more land relative to population growth and can generally only be accessed by car or truck. It is conventional suburban development. Walkable urban is:
 - at least five times as dense as drivable sub-urban (floor-area-ratio of between 0.8 and upwards to 40.0),
 - mixed-use (residential, office, retail, cultural, educational, etc.),
 - compact (regional-serving walkable urban places, as defined below, are generally between 100 and 500 acres in size),
 - generally accessible by multiple transportation means (transit, bike, car and walking), and
 - walkable for nearly every destination once in the place.

- **Functions of Walkable Urban Places.** There are two kinds of walkable urban places—*local-serving* and *regional-serving*. Local-serving places are primarily bedroom neighborhoods. They are residential in nature with limited commercial venues and instead serve everyday needs (grocery, drug store, etc.). Regional-serving places provide uses that have regional significance, such as employment, retail, medical, entertainment, cultural, higher education, etc., and generally integrates residential as well. This survey focuses only on regional-serving walkable urban places. For ease of usage, the term *walkable urban* as used in this survey means *regional-serving walkable urban places*.
- **Types of Regional Walkable Urban Places.** The book points out that five types of regional-serving walkable urban places have emerged in the country to date and these categories are used in the survey. These include:
 - Downtown—the original center city of the largest city in the metropolitan area, though many metropolitan areas are so large that one could argue that there are multiple “original” downtowns, such as the case with downtown Brooklyn and Jersey City in the New York metropolitan area.
 - Downtown Adjacent—Immediately adjacent to the original downtown or one or two transit stops away.
 - Suburban Town Center—18th or 19th century towns that have been swept up in the growth of the metropolitan area but were laid out before the advent of the car.
 - Suburban Redevelopment—failed drivable sub-urban commercial strips or regional malls that have been redeveloped into walkable urbanism.
 - Greenfield—a walkable urban place developed on a greenfield site, such as the current trend of developing *mixed-use* “lifestyle centers” (note: not retail-only lifestyle centers).
- **Critical Mass.** The walkable urban places named in this survey are at or near “critical mass”. In this survey, critical mass is defined as places where new development projects do not need significant public or private subsidies to proceed with the next new project. There are many more walkable urban places in these 30 metro areas that are not yet at critical mass but probably will be over the next decade. Examples of places that are not yet at critical mass include Mid-Wilshire in Los Angeles, Crossroads in Kansas City, Royal Oak in the Detroit metropolitan area, Columbia Heights in Washington, DC, and nearly every downtown not listed in this field survey.
- **Other Walkable Places Not Included in Survey.** There are institutions within a metropolitan area that are regional-serving and walkable by their very nature. These include medical campuses, university and college campuses, large corporate headquarters campuses, theme parks, etc. Examples include the Texas Medical Center in Houston, University of California at Santa Cruz, General Motors Tech Center in Warren, Michigan, and Disney World in Orlando. These have *not* been listed as walkable urban places in this survey unless they have connected to the area immediately around their campuses, acting as an anchor in sparking walkable urban development on adjacent property.
- **Maturity of Rail Transit System.** The definition of the extent of a metropolitan rail transit system (which includes heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail and street car) in the survey is divided into four categories, using the judgment of the author:
 - Full—The bulk of the inner suburbs and center city is served by a rail transit system, connecting many walkable urban places.
 - Partial—A significant portion of the inner suburbs and center city is served by rail transit, connecting some walkable urban places.
 - Starter—An initial transit line or two lines have been built serving a small portion of the inner suburbs and center city, connecting a few walkable urban places.
 - None—no rail transit, though there may be rail circulator systems within a walkable urban place (the Las Vegas Strip monorail, Detroit’s downtown people mover, etc.), which is not counted due to the limited geography served.

Methodology

The walkable urban places identified in this field survey are based on the experience and observations of the author, who has been active as a real estate consultant, researcher, and developer for the past 30 years. He has worked in every one of these metropolitan areas. Those observations have been supplemented by the managing directors of Robert Charles Lesser & Co, an international consulting firm, Brookings Institution scholars, public officials, real estate developers, architectural critics, downtown business improvement managers, public officials, and academics, among others. This experience has been further complemented by web-based searches.

This field survey represents only a first step at understanding the breadth of walkable urban development in the country, which requires a more rigorous, systemic review. The most important caveat which needs to be corrected in future surveys relates to the lack of a meaningful measure of the *size* of each walkable urban place. The walkable urban places in New York are among the largest in the country; for example, Midtown Manhattan has over 300 million square feet of office space, tens of thousands of residential units and hotel rooms and millions of square feet of retail; by far the largest walkable urban place in the country. Yet in the survey calculation of the number of walkable urban places per capita, Midtown Manhattan is weighed the same as Reston Town Center in Washington, DC, which probably has around 1/30th of the office, residential, hotels and retail space. Therefore, size criteria need to be incorporated into the survey in the future.

A more rigorous definition of a regional-serving walkable urban place also needs to be developed. Still unclear is the best street-by-street definition to use to demarcate walkable urban place. For example, what are the discrete boundaries of Midtown Manhattan versus Chelsea, as defined by the market?

The definition of “critical mass” needs more rigorous definition. It has always been a concept somewhat like the judicial understanding of pornography; one knows it when one sees it. This survey applied the notion that critical mass is being near or past the point in time when the next real estate development project does not need government or private gap financing to make it financially feasible. This is a good first step but requires much more rigor and standardized measures in future research.

Results of the Survey

The survey results for the 30 largest metropolitan areas are found in Table 1. The metropolitan areas are ranked according to the number of people in the metropolitan area per regional-serving walkable urban place. Thus, the metro area with the lowest number of people needed to support a walkable urban place is the most advanced in developing walkable urbanism; the equivalent of the most walkable urban places per capita. The summary tabulations are in Table 2, which ranks the 30 metro areas by their ratio of walkable urban places to total population. This divides the 30 metropolitan areas into clusters of the top 10 most walkable urban, top 15, bottom 15 and bottom 10 for comparative purposes.

The base data is re-tabulated by region (Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest and West) in Table 3.

The key survey findings are:

1. There are 157 Walkable Urban Places in the Largest 30 Metro Areas in the Country—There are regional-serving walkable urban places at or near critical mass in nearly every surveyed metro area (29 of the 30). This is significant as the best way of encouraging the development of walkable urban places is to have hometown examples to demonstrate their function and market acceptance. While comparisons over time can be only impressionistic, one can safely assume that these 30 metropolitan areas probably had very few walkable urban places 20 years ago. For example, the Denver metropolitan area did not exhibit any regional-serving walkable urban places as of 1987; downtown was an office-only place with few residents, cultural attractions, or retail while the rest of the region was basically drivable sub-urban in nature. This survey identifies five regional-serving walkable urban places in the Denver region today. Many times that number are in the planning stages due to a

comprehensive new rail transit system that is funded and in the construction planning stage, building on an existing starter system.

2. There Are an Equal Number of Walkable Urban Places in the Center Cities and the Suburbs—While there has been much attention on the revival of American downtowns over the past 10 years, the revival of suburban downtowns, the redevelopment of failed regional malls and strip centers, and the recent emergence of lifestyle centers appears to be an equally dynamic trend. Today, walkable urban places are just as likely to be found in the suburbs as in center cities.
3. The Largest Number by Type of Walkable Urban Places are Those That are Downtown Adjacent—There are more examples of downtown adjacent walkable urban place than any other type in the largest 30 metropolitan areas; 55 of 157 or 35%. It is too soon since the beginning of the walkable urban development trend to determine why this is the situation. It may be a reflection of the market appeal of this specific type of walkable urban place. For example, it may be that a downtown adjacent place can offer more housing and commercial product options than the downtown, thus appealing to broader market segments. In Midtown Manhattan, stacked flats are the predominate residential offering. Yet the downtown adjacent Lincoln Square/Upper Westside offers stacked flats *and* townhouses. Some downtown adjacent places, such as Midtown in Atlanta, also offers single family housing in addition to higher density product.
4. Washington, DC, Could be the National Model of Walkable Urban Growth—The Washington, DC, metropolitan area has the most regional-serving walkable urban places *per capita* in the country, having one for every 264,000 people, and one of each of the five types of walkable urban places. Washington also has the second highest *absolute* number of walking urban places with 20 (compared to two in 1987, Georgetown and Old Town Alexandria, both tourist dependent at the time). The Washington metro area also has at least another 10 regional-serving walkable urban places emerging that could reach critical mass over the next five to ten years. Twenty years ago, the Washington metro area only had two walkable urban places. The two major reasons for the high number of walkable urban places in Washington are (1) the success of the Metro rail system and (2) the aggressive use of “overlay zoning districts” that allow and promote walkable urbanism around Metro stations. Other reasons include the region’s strong economic growth over the past 15 years when the trend toward walkable urban development began, the high educational level of the population (the highest percentage of college graduates of all metro areas in the country according to the US Census in 2006), given the apparent, though not yet proven, propensity of the highly educated to prefer walkable urban development. It is also assisted by the large percentage of younger adults in their 20s and 30s that migrate to the region for employment opportunities and for the walkable urban lifestyle. Younger adults appear to have a higher propensity, though not proven, for walkable urbanism as well. The result is that the Washington region could be the probable model for the direction the country’s other metro areas are heading over the next generation.
5. New York Metro Area Has the Highest Number of Most Walkable Urban Places--The New York metro area, generally considered to be the most walkable urban metro area in the country, has the most discrete number of places that are walkable urban (21). However, it is ranked as the 10th most number of walkable urban places on a per capita basis. This lower ranking is due to its nearly 19 million population base (for example, compared to Washington’s 5.3 million population), resulting in one walkable urban place for every 896, 000 people (though the major caveat mentioned above in the methodology section needs to be taken into consideration). The extent and availability of drivable sub-urban development, as demonstrated by the metro area’s huge physical size stretching over four states (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut), belies its image as the leading walkable urban metro area in the country. However, the New York metro area has the largest walkable urban places *in size* as measured by any criteria. As mentioned above, Midtown Manhattan is the largest walkable urban place in the country regarding office square footage and probably many other kinds of real estate product types. For all of the walkable urbanism that Manhattan is justly known for, the bough is only 8.5 percent of the total population of the metro area.

6. Rail Transit Seems to Play a Significant Role in Catalyzing Walkable Urban Development—The relationship between rail transit and the existence of walkable urban places is very strong with 65 percent of the walkable urban places being served by rail transit service. In the top 10 metro areas for per capita walkable urban places, 80 percent (84 of 105) of these places have rail transit service. In the bottom 10 metro areas, only 14 percent (2 of 14) of the walkable urban places have rail transit service. In addition, the top 10 metro areas for per capita walkable urban places have five of the six full service rail systems and nine of the 10 have some level of rail transit service. The bottom 10 metro areas include six with no rail transit, one partial system and three starter systems. That 18 of 20 walkable urban places in Washington and 21 of 21 in New York have rail transit is rather convincing that having it is extremely beneficial for the emergence of walkable urbanism. However, rail transit is not absolutely essential for walkable urbanism to emerge since 35 percent of the walkable urban places do not have rail transit. For example, Reston Town Center, Valencia Town Center, Plano Town Center, etc., are walkable urban places identified in the survey, but do not have rail transit, relying nearly completely on car and truck transportation. However, many of the non-rail served walkable urban places in the survey (for example, Reston Town Center) have plans to be rail-served in the short-term; a condition referred to as being “transit-ready.”
7. Metro Areas with Old Rail Transit Systems Have a Greater Likelihood of Walkable Urbanism May be a Myth—Much less than half of the top 15 per capita walkable urban metro areas in the survey contain the nation’s oldest rail transit systems. Specifically, four of the top 15 are characterized by old rail transit systems, generally built in the early 20th century (Boston, Chicago,, New York, Philadelphia). However, of this top tier, one does not have rail transit (Seattle) and the remaining ten have the most recent rail transit systems, built since the 1970s. Most of the top ranked metro areas in walkable urbanism have *recent* rail transit systems (Washington, San Francisco, Denver, Portland, Pittsburgh, Miami, among others). This could indicate that a metro area with a newer rail transit system can catch up with and even pass the older rail transit metro areas in walkable urban development on a per capita basis.
8. Regional Differences Show that the Northeast and West Coast Have a Greater Prevalence of Walkable Urban Development—The Northeast and West Coast metropolitan areas, as shown in table #3, have a higher likelihood to have walkable urban places than the national average and the other three sections of the country, the Southeast, Midwest and Southwest. The Northeast has the highest likelihood; 39 percent greater propensity than the average for the surveyed metro areas. The Northeast and Midwest have a higher likelihood to have downtown and downtown adjacent places to be walkable urban than their suburbs; 57 percent of their walkable urban places are in the central city versus a national average of 50 percent, as mentioned above. The Southeast and Southwest are more likely to have suburban walkable urban places; 59 percent of these region’s walkable urban places are in the suburbs versus a national average of 50 percent. The West is at about the national average; it has 47 percent of its walkable urban places in the center city versus a national average of 50 percent. Note that this report has made some changes regarding the US Census regional boundaries; Baltimore and Washington, DC, MSAs have been considered in the Northeast region, not the Southeast region.
9. There is the Potential for the Development of Many Additional Walkable Urban Places—There is a wide range of population that currently supports each regional-serving walkable urban place in the survey in the different metropolitan areas. The top 10 metro areas have one walkable urban place per 568,000 people while the bottom 10 metro areas have one per 2,156,000 people, nearly four times the ratio. *If* the bottom 10 metropolitan areas developed as many walkable urban places on a per capita basis as the top 10 have done to date, there would be approximately 40 additional walkable urban places developed in these metro areas, probably representing tens of billions of dollars of real estate development.

10. A Tale of Two Kinds of Metropolitan Areas May be Evolving: Those Metros Benefiting from the Trend Toward Walkable Urbanism and Those Out of Position—There appears to be a wide gap between metropolitan areas that have many walkable urban places and those that have only one or two. The top 15 in the survey have 134 of the 157 walkable urban places identified; 85 percent of the total for the 30 largest metro areas, even though they are home to 68 percent of the population. The top 15 metro areas also have the preponderance of full or partial rail transit systems and thus 95 percent of the rail transit-served walkable urban places, which re-enforces the apparent connection between rail transit and walkable urbanism as discussed above. It may be possible that if action is not taken with regard to rail transit, a “have” versus “have not” gap may appear in American metropolitan areas. Additionally, those metro areas that do *not* have high level of walkable urban development nor extensive rail transit seem to fall into two categories. Many of the metropolitan areas near the bottom of the survey that have experienced some of the fastest population growth in the nation (e.g., Phoenix, Dallas-Ft. Worth, Houston) have starter transit systems and/or plans for extensive rail transit. These metro areas seem to be positioning themselves to take advantage of walkable urban demand even if they have not fully done so as of yet. It appears that these fast growth metros are emulating highly ranked walkable urban metros like Denver, Portland, and San Diego that built rail systems over the past 10–15 years. Metropolitan areas that are not seriously committed to building rail transit systems—such as Cincinnati, Detroit, and Kansas City—may not have the option of walkable urban development due to slower economic growth and weak tax base. These slow growing metropolitan areas without rail transit today may be at a competitive disadvantage regarding future economic growth. This will especially be the case if crude oil prices continue to rise as they have since 2002 (increasing nearly three fold). These metropolitan areas may have “painted themselves into a corner”, due to both rising energy costs and the market opportunity of walkable urban development.

Conclusion

The number and growth of regional-serving walkable urban places is significant in many metropolitan areas in the country and is clearly emerging in both cities and suburbs. The probable correlation between walkable urban development and rail transit, while not definitively proven by this field survey, supports the intuitive relationship between them. This field survey also points out the need to gather real estate and transit data in a different manner; distinguishing between walkable urban and drivable sub-urban places. As the research in the book, *The Option of Urbanism; Investing in a New American Dream*, points out, these two kinds of places appear to perform fundamentally differently in how they lay out on the ground and how they perform regarding market acceptance, financial performance, rental rates/sales prices, tax revenue generation, and environmental sustainability. Finally, infrastructure investment, particularly in rail transit, and revised zoning regulations should be seriously considered by metropolitan area governments that are not seeing growth in this type of development pattern.

Table 1

Rank	Metropolitan Area	Downtown	Downtown Adjacent	Suburban Town Center	Suburban Re-development	Greenfield	Place Total	Estimated Pop 2006	# of People per Place	Rail Transit Served (#) (note#1)	Rail Transit Service (% of Places)	Rail Transit System Size
1	Washington – Arlington – Alexandria (NE)	Downtown	Dupont Circle; West End; Georgetown; Adams Morgan, Capital Hill	Bethesda; Old Town Alexandria; Friendship Heights; Silver Springs; Rockville; Frederick	Ballston, Clarendon, Rosslyn, Crystal City/Pentagon City, Carlyle, Court House, Shirlington	Reston Town Center	20	5,290,400	264,520	18	90%	Full
2	Boston – Cambridge – Quincy (NE)	Downtown	Beacon Hill; Back Bay; North End; South End	Harvard Square, Kendall Square/MIT, Sommerville/Davis Square	Lowell, Wellesley, Newburyport		11	4,455,217	405,020	11	100%	Full
3	San Francisco - Oakland - San Jose (note#2) (W)	Downtown San Francisco; Oakland; Berkeley; San Jose	South of Market; Marina District; Hob Hill, Mission District	Palo Alto; Menlo Park; San Mateo, Emeryville	Walnut Creek	Santana Row	14	5,967,150	426,225	10	71%	Full
4	Denver – Aurora (SW)	Downtown	LODO	Boulder	Belmar, Cherry Creek Village		5	2,408,750	481,750	2	40%	Starter
5	Portland – Vancouver – Beaverton (W)	Downtown	Pearl District, Northwest	Lake Oswego			4	2,137,565	534,391	4	100%	Partial
6	Seattle – Tacoma – Bellevue (W)	Downtown	Bell Town; Pioneer Square	Kirkland, Redmond	University District		6	3,263,497	543,916	0	0%	None
7	Chicago – Naperville – Joliet (MW)	Loop; Magnificent Mile	Lincoln Park, Old Town, West Loop, River North, Hyde Park, South Loop, Wicker Park	Evanston; Lake Forest, Winnetka, Elgin		The Glenn	14	9,505,748	678,982	13	93%	Full
8	Miami – Fort Lauderdale – Pompano Beach - Palm Beach (note #3) (SE)		Downtown South	Miami Beach; Ft. Lauderdale; Coral Gables; West Palm Beach	Coconut Beach, Dadeland		7	5,463,857	780,551	4	57%	Partial
9	Pittsburgh (NE)	Downtown	Oakland, Southside				3	2,370,776	790,259	1	33%	Starter
10	New York – Northern New Jersey – Long Island – Stamford, Conn. (note #4) (NE)	Downtown/Wall Street, Midtown, Brooklyn/Atlantic Yards, Jersey City	Morningside Heights, Lincoln Square (Upper West Side), Museum Mile/Upper East Side, Madison Avenue/Upper East Side, SOHO, Chelsea, 34th Street, Union Square, Park Slope, Greenwich Village, Brooklyn Cultural District	White Plains; Stamford; Princeton; New Brunswick, Hoboken, Greenwich			21	18,818,536	896,121	21	100%	Full
Top 10 Subtotal		16	39	31	16	3	105	59,681,496	568,395	84	80%	
11	San Diego – Carlsbad – San Marcos (W)	Downtown	Hillcrest/Balboa Park	La Jolla			3	2,941,454	980,485	2	67%	Starter
12	Los Angeles - Long Beach - Orange County - Riverside - Bernardino (note #5) (W)	Downtown	Hollywood; West Hollywood	Pasadena, Santa Monica, Long Beach, Beverly Hills, Burbank, Glendale, Culver City	Westwood, Century City	Valencia Town Center, Costa Mesa, South Coast Town Center	15	16,976,264	1,131,751	4	27%	Partial

Table 1 –Continued

Rank	Metropolitan Area	Downtown	Downtown Adjacent	Suburban Town Center	Suburban Re-development	Greenfield	Place Total	Estimated Pop 2006	# of People per Place	Rail Transit Served (#) (note#1)	Rail Transit Service (% of Places)	Rail Transit System Size
13	Philadelphia – Camden – Wilmington (NE)	Center City	University City/U of Penn. Society Hill/Old Town	Manyunk, New Hope			5	5,826,742	1,165,348	3	60%	Full
14	Atlanta – Sandy Springs – Marietta (SE)		Midtown, Atlantic Station	Decatur	Buckhead		4	5,139,223	1,284,500	3	75%	Partial
15	Baltimore – Towson (NE)	Inner Harbor	Fells Point				2	2,658,405	1,329,203	1	50%	Partial
Top 15 Subtotal		20	47	42	19	6	134	93,222,584	695,691	97	72%	
Bottom 15 Subtotal		4	8	7	0	4	23	44,748,327	1,945,579	5	22%	
16	St. Louis (MW)		West End	Clayton			2	2,796,368	1,398,184	2	100%	Starter
17	Minneapolis – St. Paul – Bloomington (MW)	Downtown Minneapolis, Downtown St. Paul					2	3,175,041	1,587,521	1	50%	Starter
18	Detroit – Warren – Livonia – Ann Arbor (note #6) (MW)		Midtown	Birmingham, Ann Arbor			3	4,813,013	1,604,338	0	0%	None
19	Columbus (MW)		Short North				1	1,725,570	1,725,570	0	0%	None
20	Las Vegas – Paradise (W)		The Strip				1	1,777,539	1,777,539	0	0%	None
21	Houston – Sugar Land – Baytown (SW)		Montrose			Sugarland Town Center, Woodlands Town Center	3	5,539,949	1,846,650	1	33%	Starter
22	San Antonio (SW)	Riverwalk					1	1,942,217	1,942,217	0	0%	None
23	Kansas City (MW)			County Club Plaza			1	1,967,405	1,967,405	0	0%	None
24	Orlando – Kissimmee (SE)			Winter Park			1	1,984,855	1,984,855	0	0%	None
25	Dallas – Fort Worth – Arlington (SW)		Uptown			Plano Town Center, Addison Circle	3	6,003,967	2,001,322	0	0%	Starter
26	Phoenix – Mesa – Scottsdale (SW)			Tempe, 24th & Camelback			2	4,039,182	2,019,591	0	0%	None
27	Sacramento – Arden – Arcade – Roseville (W)	Downtown					1	2,067,117	2,067,117	0	0%	Starter
28	Cincinnati – Middletown (MW)		Hyde Park				1	2,104,218	2,104,218	0	0%	None
29	Cleveland – Elyria – Mentor		University Circle				1	2,114,155	2,114,155	1	100%	Partial
30	Tampa – St. Petersburg – Clearwater (SE)						0	2,697,731	2,697,731	0	0%	None
Bottom 10 Subtotal		2	4	4	0	4	14	30,460,796	2,175,771	2	14%	

Table 1 –Continued

Rank	Metropolitan Area	Downtown	Downtown Adjacent	Suburban Town Center	Suburban Re-development	Greenfield	Place Total	Estimated Pop 2006	# of People per Place	Rail Transit Served (#) (note#1)	Rail Transit Service (% of Places)	Rail Transit System Size
		24	55	49	19	10	157	137,970,911	878,795	102	65%	
	TOTAL	15%	35%	31%	12%	6%	100%					
	Note #1: American Public Transportation, www.apta.com	Note #2: Combination of San Francisco and San Jose MSAs	Note #3: Combination of Miami and Palm beach MSAs	Note #4: Combination of the New York-New Jersey-Long Island with the Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk MSA	Note #6: Combination of Detroit and Ann Arbor MSAs	Note #5: Combination of Los Angeles and Riverside MSAs						

Table 2: Tabulations of 30 Largest American Metropolitan Areas, July, 2006						
		Top 10	Top 15	Bottom 15	Bottom 10	Total
Population	#	59,681,496	93,222,584	44,748,327	30,460,796	137,970,911
	%	43%	68%	32%	22%	100%
Walkable Urban	# of Places	105	134	23	14	157
	% of Places	67%	85%	15%	9%	100%
Rail Transit Served	# that are Rail Transit served	84	97	5	2	102
	% of W-U Places	80%	72%	22%	14%	65%
	% of Total Rail Transit	82%	95%	5%	2%	100%
Rail Transit System Size	Full	50%	40%	0%	0%	20%
	Partial	20%	33%	7%	10%	20%
	Starter	20%	20%	33%	30%	27%
	None	10%	7%	60%	60%	30%

Table 3

National Rank	Metropolitan Area	Downtown	Downtown Adjacent	Suburban Town Center	Suburban Redevelopment	Greenfield	Place Total	Estimated Pop 2006	# of People per Place	Rail Transit Served (#) (note#1)	Rail Transit Service (% of Places)	Rail Transit System Size
NORTHEAST												
1	Washington – Alexandria	Downtown	Dupont Circle; West End; Georgetown; Adams Morgan; Capital Hill	Bethesda; Old Town Alexandria; Friendship Heights; Silver Springs; Rockville; Frederick	Ballston, Clarendon, Roslyn, Crystal City/Pentagon City, Carlyle, Court House, Shirlington	Reston Town Center	20	5,290,400	264,520	18	90%	Full
2	Boston – Cambridge – Quincy	Downtown	Beacon Hill; Back Bay; North End; South End	Harvard Square; Kendall Square/MIT; Somerville/Davis Square	Lowell, Wellesley, Newburyport		11	4,455,217	405,020	11	100%	Full
9	Pittsburgh	Downtown	Oakland, Southside				3	2,370,776	790,259	1	33%	Starter
10	New York – Northern New Jersey – Long Island – Stamford, Conn. (note #4)	Downtown/Wall Street, Midtown, Brooklyn/Atlantic Yards, Jersey City	Morningside Heights, Lincoln Square (Upper West Side), Museum Mile/Upper East Side, Madison Avenue/Upper East Side, SOHO, Chelsea, 34th Street, Union Square, Park Slope, Greenwich Village, Brooklyn Cultural District	White Plains; Stamford; Princeton; New Brunswick, Hoboken, Greenwich			21	18,818,536	896,121	21	100%	Full
13	Philadelphia – Camden – Wilmington	Center City	University City/University City Hill/Old Town	Manyunk, New Hope			5	5,826,742	1,165,348	3	60%	Full
15	Baltimore – Towson	Inner Harbor	Fells Point				2	2,658,405	1,329,203	1	50%	Partial
Northeast Subtotal (Note #1)		9	25	17	10	1	62	39,420,076	635,808	55	89%	
Percentage of NE/Total		15%	40%	27%	16%	2%	39%	28%	1.39	54%		
SOUTHEAST												
8	Miami – Fort Lauderdale – Pompano Beach - Palm Beach (note #3)		Downtown South	Miami Beach; Ft. Lauderdale; Coral Gables; West Palm Beach	Coconut Beach, Dadeland		7	5,463,857	780,551	4	57%	Partial
14	Atlanta – Sandy Springs – Marietta		Midtown, Atlantic Station	Decatur	Buckhead		4	5,138,223	1,284,500	3	75%	Partial
24	Orlando – Kissimmee			Winter Park			1	1,984,855	1,984,855	0	0%	None
30	Tampa – St. Petersburg – Clearwater						0	2,697,731	2,697,731	0	0%	None
Southeast Subtotal (Note #1)		0	3	6	3	0	12	15,284,666	1,273,722	7	58%	
Percentage of SE/Total		0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	8%	11%	0.72	7%		
MIDWEST												

Table 3 –Continued

7	Chicago – Naperville – Joliet	Loop; Magnificent Mile	Lincoln Park, Old Town, West Loop, River North, Hyde Park, South Loop, Wicker Park	Evanston; Lake Forest, Winnetka, Elgin	The Glenn	14	9,505,748	678,982	13	93%	Full
16	St. Louis		West End	Clayton		2	2,796,368	1,398,184	2	100%	Starter
17	Minneapolis – St. Paul – Bloomington	Downtown Minneapolis, Downtown St Paul				2	3,175,041	1,587,521	1	50%	Starter
18	Detroit – Warren – Livonia – Ann Arbor (note #6)		Midtown	Birmingham; Ann Arbor		3	4,813,013	1,604,338	0	0%	None
19	Columbus		Short North			1	1,725,570	1,725,570	0	0%	None
23	Kansas City			Country Club Plaza		1	1,967,405	1,967,405	0	0%	None
28	Cincinnati – Middletown		Hyde Park			1	2,104,218	2,104,218	0	0%	None
29	Cleveland – Elyria – Mentor		University Circle			1	2,114,155	2,114,155	1	100%	Partial
Midwest Subtotal		4	12	8	1	25	28,201,518	1,128,061	17	68%	
	Percentage of MW/Total	16%	48%	32%	4%	16%	20%	0.8	17%		
SOUTHWEST											
4	Denver – Aurora	Downtown	LODO	Boulder	Belmar, Cherry Creek Village	5	2,408,750	481,750	2	40%	Starter
21	Houston – Sugar Land – Baytown		Montrose		Sugarland Town Center, Woodlands Town Center	3	5,539,949	1,846,650	1	33%	Starter
22	San Antonio	Riverwalk				1	1,942,217	1,942,217	0	0%	None
25	Dallas – Fort Worth – Arlington		Uptown		Plano Town Center; Addison Circle	3	6,003,967	2,001,322	0	0%	Starter
26	Phoenix – Mesa – Scottsdale			Tempe; 24th & Camelback		2	4,039,182	2,019,591	0	0%	None
Southwest Subtotal		2	3	3	4	14	19,934,065	1,423,862	3	21%	
	Percentage of SW/Total	14%	21%	21%	29%	9%	22%	0.4	3%		
WEST											
3	San Francisco - Oakland - San Jose (note#2)	Downtown San Francisco; Oakland; Berkeley; San Jose	South of Market; Marina District; Hill, Mission District	Palo Alto; Menlo Park; San Mateo, Emeryville	Walnut Creek	14	5,967,150	426,225	10	71%	Full
5	Portland – Vancouver – Beaverton	Downtown	Pearl District, Northwest	Lake Oswego		4	2,137,565	534,391	4	100%	Partial

BROOKINGS

1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-2188
telephone 202.797.6000
fax 202.797.6004
web site www.brookings.edu

B | Metropolitan Policy Program
at BROOKINGS

telephone 202.797.6139
fax 202.797.2965
web site www.brookings.edu/metro