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Purpose of the Housing Seminar

• Information sharing
• Reporting community needs and discuss future direction for improving housing affordability
• Not projecting real estate development plans for any jurisdiction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Overview: A Regional Affordable Housing Study of the Mid-Michigan Tri-County Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55-9:25</td>
<td>Characteristics of the Current Housing Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25-10:00</td>
<td>Issues and Solutions from Experts and Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>Q&amp;A and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:50</td>
<td>Residents‘ Opinions on Housing Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:10</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Suggestions about Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-11:30</td>
<td>Q&amp;A and Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview:
A Regional Affordable Housing Study of the Mid-Michigan Tri-County Area
“At the Mid-Michigan Program for Greater Sustainability, our goal is to spread awareness and interest about the sustainable development of our region. We are a part of a greater community of over twenty organizations working together to involve Ingham, Clinton, and Eaton counties in our effort to revitalize Michigan and guide us towards a more sustainable future.

This consortium of partners has been given a federal grant to help reach our goals and utilize the community members’ ideas through 9 primary projects that are detailed on our projects page. From an online portal for community members to share ideas to promoting a green infrastructure system, these projects are laying the foundation for other communities to follow in our footsteps in the future.” (source: http://www.midmichigansustainability.org/)
Mid-Michigan Program for Greater Sustainability

Projects

- A 5-year Comprehensive Regional Fair and Affordable Housing Plan
- A Regional Affordable Housing Study
  
  Teaming the Greater Lansing housing Coalition’s resources with the academic expertise of Michigan State University this program study is meant to identify the development of a Fair Housing and and Equity Assessment (FHEA). Using census data collected in 2000 and 2010 the team will compare the changes of the information on demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of population and households in these areas and physical and socioeconomic characteristics of existing housing stock in mid-Michigan. They will also work using expert interviews and community input on the project to create a thorough study with recommendations for the future of Mid-Michigan’s affordable housing.

  Contact information for this project: Contact Katherine Draper, Greater Lansing Housing Coalition (517) 372-5980, katherin@glhc.org
  Suk-Kyung Kim, Michigan State University at (517) 353-9367, kims@msu.edu

- Community Reinvestment Fund
- Energy Audit of Built Structures
- Build Capacity for a Regional Urban Service Management Area
- Greening Mid-Michigan - A Prioritized Green Infrastructure System
- Sustainable Design Portfolio for Michigan Avenue Corridor
- Build Capacity for Complete Streets Planning and Implementation
- Create an Online Portal
Mid-Michigan Program for Greater Sustainability
Research Target Areas- Tri-County Areas

- Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties

A Tri-County Program for Greater Sustainability: Proposed Project Areas
Housing Projects

- Project 1: Develop a 5-year Comprehensive Regional Fair & Affordable Housing Plan (led by Greater Lansing Housing Coalition)

- Project 2: Conduct a Regional Affordable Housing Study
  Purpose: Provide an accurate diagnosis of current housing and set practical achievable goals for improving housing affordability across the region
Housing Project Team

Project 1:
- Katherine Draper, Executive Director, Greater Lansing Housing Coalition
- Susan Ronk Moriarty, AICP, Community Planner/Grant Research Associate
- Jaechoon Lee, Ph.D., Research Associate

Project 2:
- Suk-Kyung Kim, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
- Research Assistants: Stephanie Space, Cecilia Escobar, Kate Calabra, Larissa Fedoroff, & Anna Breuthaupt
Overview of Project 1

Research Goals and Major Contents:

• Project 1: Develop a 5-year Comprehensive Regional Fair & Affordable Housing Plan
  – To assess fair housing conditions and complaints
  – To identify a full inventory of the housing stock in the tri-county region, the demographic trends in light of the current housing development efforts
  – To evaluate and the regulatory barriers that may impede the preservation and development of fair and affordable housing.
Project 2. Regional Affordable Housing Study
1. Introduction

There has been a need of housing market analysis in the Tri-County Region that consists of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties in Michigan due to a variety of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. These regions include the capital city of the state, an internationally and renowned state university, a community college, a number of refugees from different cultures, small villages, rural areas, and various types of middle-income communities. As a result, the resident components are diverse from state employees, college students, faculty, staff, culturally diverse refugees, and different types of low-, middle-, and high-income families.

However, there was lack of holistic approaches to diagnose demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the regions and identify housing profiles along with these features. Because these regions experienced economic turndown after automobile companies left in the 1990 but now the economy and population in these regions are growing, it is important to investigate current regional conditions in demographic, socioeconomic, and housing characteristics to envision future directions for achieving sustainable community goals.

2. Affordable Housing Need in Tri-County Regions in Michigan

According to 2010 American Community Survey, there are approximately 4.5 million housing units in Michigan. As of 2010, the Tri-County Region has 196,866 housing units comprising 4.4% of the total stock of Michigan homes.

The average homeownership rate in tri-county areas 73.2% which is slightly lower than the state average (=74.2%). The median value of owner-occupied housing units is $152,770 which is slightly higher than the state average, $144,200.

These homeownership rates and the median housing value are different among three counties. Ingham County has the lowest homeownership rate and the median housing value while Clinton County has the highest homeownership rate and the median housing value. Through conducting a regional affordable housing study, we expect to identify housing needs, envision the directions to improve housing affordability in the region, and resolve discrepancies.

Table 1. Overview of Housing in Tri-County Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Community Survey Items</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units, 2010</td>
<td>121,281</td>
<td>30,695</td>
<td>47,050</td>
<td>4,532,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership rate, 2006-10</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value of owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>$137,900</td>
<td>$167,700</td>
<td>$152,700</td>
<td>$144,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income, 2010</td>
<td>$45,808</td>
<td>$58,016</td>
<td>$54,885</td>
<td>$48,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau (2010), State & County QuickFacts
Affordable Housing

• Definition:
  • “Affordability is for a household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing.” This applies not only for low-income households.
  • “Families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care.”
  • “An estimated 12 million renter and homeowner households now pay more than 50 percent of their annual incomes for housing, and a family with one full-time worker earning the minimum wage cannot afford the local fair-market rent for a two-bedroom apartment anywhere in the United States.” (HUD, 2012)

Affordable housing need for all income levels.
Overview of Project 2

Research Goals and Major Contents:

- **Project 2: Conduct a Regional Affordable Housing Study**

  To thoroughly review census data of the 2000 and 2010, focusing on demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population and households in the Tri-County Region.

  To review comprehensive plans in the Tri-County Region to examine criteria and standards for improving housing affordability.

  To interview housing experts and urban planners.

  To identify resident needs and opinions on affordable housing in general and energy-efficient housing.

**Added Contents**

- Housing Programs and Services
- Current Housing Conditions (Site Visits)
- Median Housing Values and Examples
- Review of Comprehensive Plans
- Review of Lending Data
- Develop Visual Images of Future Housing
Project 2 Time Line

July 2012: Establishing Housing Task Force

August 21, 2012 Housing Task Force Meeting

June 2012-Marh 2013 Community and Housing Profile Analysis

October 2012-July 2013 Housing Expert and Planner Interviews
August 2013-October 2013 Report of the Planner Interviews

July 2013-April 2014 Preparation and Collection of Resident Surveys
Land Use and Zoning Regulation Reviews

May 2014 Affordable Housing Study Seminar and Report
Contribution to the Project 1

Research Outcomes for the 5-Year Regional Housing Plan Development

- Identifying Barriers and Gaps for Fair Housing Choice for the Tri-County Regions
- Providing Recommendations for the Project 1
- Providing Policy Recommendation and Program Directions, Basic Guidelines for Improving Housing Affordability
- Providing an Analysis of the Inventory of Housing Stock
- Creating a List of Barriers to Affordable Housing in the Region
- Identifying Housing Partners (with Housing Task Force)
Regional Housing Profile Summary
Table of Content

- Housing and Community Profile of the Tri-County Region
  - Population
  - Housing stock
  - Housing tenure
  - Median housing value
  - Housing affordability

- Observations of the Regional Housing Condition
Data Sources

Housing and Community Profile

(1) “2000 and 2010 Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics, Census SF1,” for analyzing general demographic and housing characteristics in 2000 and 2010,

(2) “Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000” in Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties from the Census 2000 Summary File (SF) 3, Sample Data set for analyzing more specific 2000 housing characteristics, and

(3) “Selected Housing Characteristics 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates” for analyzing more specific 2010 housing characteristics.

Figure 2.2 show data sources available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/.

These data were gathered through American Fact Finder offered by the US Census Bureau.
Demographic Profile
Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 [1]</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>103,655</td>
<td>279,320</td>
<td>447,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**In the year of 2000,**

Clinton County had a total population of 64,753 in 2000, with 49.7% of its population male and 50.3% female. Approximately 14.9% of the population was age 60 or over.

Eaton County had a total population of 103,655, with 48.6% of its population male and 51.4% female. Approximately 15.2% of the population was at least 60 years old.

Ingham County had a total population of 279,320, with 48.3% of male and 51.7% female. About 12.3% of the population was age 60 or older.
Demographic Profile

• Older Population:
Eaton County had a higher portion of older population than the other two counties, although the actual number of older adults age 60 or older was larger in Ingham County.

• Younger Population
Ingham County had a higher percentage of younger population than the other two counties, including children under the age of 9 (12.9%), teens between ages 10 and 19 (16.0%), and college-aged-population (20.5%).

• Demographic Changes
Gender ratios stayed the same, but the populations in Clinton and Eaton Counties were getting older while Ingham County still had a higher percentage of the population between the ages of 20 to 29 (20.5% in 2000 and 21.3% in 2010).
Demographics:
Changes in demographic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population 2000</th>
<th>Population 2010</th>
<th>Rate (2000-2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>303,965,272</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
<td>9,952,687</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>74,235</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton County</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,655</td>
<td>108,002</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham County</td>
<td></td>
<td>279,320</td>
<td>281,365</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWitt city</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler village</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Rapids village</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid village</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns city</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte city</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Rapids city</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>5,202</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Ledge city</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>7,810</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potterville city</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfield village</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing city</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>46,704</td>
<td>48,220</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing city</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>118,920</td>
<td>115,634</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason city</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>6,715</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge village</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webberville village</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamston</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 - Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data
2010 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates
Demographic Characteristics: Race

• Increase in non-white population
• Increase in Asian population

Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000, Census 2000 SF 1 100-Percent Data
DP-1: Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, 2010 Census SF 1
Demographic Characteristics: Educational Attainment

- Higher Educational Attainment
- Higher percentages in High School Diploma or Higher

Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
Socioeconomic Profile:
Per Capita Income & Unemployment Rate

- In the Tri-County Region, per capita income was $22,134 in 2000, increasing to approximately $25,690 in 2010.
- Clinton County had the highest per capita income in both 2000 and 2010.
- Unemployment rates:
  Year of 2000- 2.1% in Clinton County, 3.0% in Eaton County, and 3.9% in Ingham County
  Year of 2010- 6.9% in Clinton County, 8.2% in Eaton County, and 8.9% in Ingham County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Tri-County Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eaton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingham County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Per Capita Income [1]</td>
<td>21,587</td>
<td>22,168</td>
<td>22,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,134.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,689.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
### All individuals for whom poverty status is determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Level</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All income levels</td>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>Percent below poverty level</td>
<td>All income levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
<td>9,700,622</td>
<td>1,021,605</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>64,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>9,726,785</td>
<td>1,444,004</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>73,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)

Ten Major Industries

- **Clinton County**
  - Major industries in 2000: “educational, health, and social services (19.6%),” “manufacturing (16.9%),” “public administration (10.6%),” and “retail trade (10.5%).”
  - The percentage of “educational, health, and social services” increased to 23.0% in 2010 while that of manufacturing declined to 11.5% in the same year.

- **Eaton County**
  - Major industries in 2000: “educational, health, and social services (19.4%),” “manufacturing (18.2%),” “retail trade (11.6%),” and “public administration (10.4%).”
  - These percentages changed slightly in 2010. About 21.8% were in “educational, health, and social services.” The percentage for “manufacturing” declined to 15.6%, and that for “retail trade” declined to 10.8%, while the “public administration” stayed about same (10.2%).

- **Ingham County**
  - The primary industry was “educational, health, and social services (27.3%)” in 2000 which was the same in 2010.
  - The next major industries were “retail trade (10.9% in 2000 and 11.2% in 2010),” “manufacturing (10.4% in 2000 and 8.9% in 2010),” “arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services (9.4% in 2000 and 10.1% in 2010),” and “public administration (8.7% in 2000 and 7.6% in 2010).”
Summary

- Population
  - Population getting more diverse
  - Becoming more highly educated

- Socioeconomic Status
  - Increasing in per capita income
  - Small changes in major industries, but still keep higher percentages in “educational, health, and social services” and “public administration.”
  - Slight decreases in manufacturing
  - Ingham County showed an increase in “arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services”

- But,
  - Still unemployment rates are increasing
  - The percentages of Individuals for whom poverty status are increasing
General Housing Profile
20 Selected Areas in Tri-County Areas for Data Analysis

**Clinton County**
- DeWitt, Folwer, Maple Rapids, Ovid, and St, Johns

**Ingham County**
- Mason, Lansing, East Lansing, Webberville, Stockbridge, Williamston, Lansing Charter Township, & Meridian Township

**Eaton County**
- Charlotte, Eaton Rapids, Grand Ledge, Potterville, Sunfield, & Delta Charter Township
Total Housing Units

- Tri-County regions had 181,804 housing units in 2000 and 198,508 units in 2010.
- Clinton County had 24,630 housing units in 2000 and 30,423 units in 2010, experiencing 23.5% increase, which is the biggest increase among three counties.
- Eaton County had 42,118 units in 2000 and 46,767 units in 2010, experiencing 11% increase.
- Ingham County had 115,056 housing units in 2000 and 123,318 units in 2010, experiencing 5.4% increase.

Figure 1. Total Housing Units in 2000 and 2010 in Tri-County Regions
(Source: 2000 and 2010: DP-1 Profile of General Demographic Characteristics, Census SF1)
Housing Vacancy

- About 183,422 (94.8%) of the housing units were occupied, with about 5.2% vacancy in 2000, while this vacancy rate increased to 7.8% (15,604 units) in 2010.
- **Ingham County** experience more increase in housing vacancy between 2000 (5.6%) and 2010 (8.3%) than the other two counties.

![Figure 2. Housing Vacancy Rate in 2000 and 2010](Source: 2000 and 2010: DP-1 Profile of General Demographic Characteristics, Census SF1)
Homeowner and Rental Vacancy Rate – At the County Level

- Between 2000 and 2010, homeowner vacancy rates increased.
  - In Ingham County, homeowner vacancy rate increased from 1.6% to 3.6%,
  - In Clinton County, the rate increased from 1.0% to 2.0%, and
  - In Eaton County, it increased from 1.3% to 2.6%.

- The rental vacancy rate
  - Clinton County: increased from 6.9% to 7.6% (+0.7%),
  - Eaton County: the rate stayed in 5.7%, and
  - Ingham County: the rate increased from 6.3% to 7.9% (+1.6%).

- However, these characteristics looks difference depending on cities and townships.
  - We need regional AND local market analysis for understanding housing profiles.
Housing Vacancy In Clinton County

Please refer to Table 2 in your handout.

• The homeowner vacancy rate increased between 2000 and 2010 in all five areas.
• The rental vacancy rate decreased from 18.8% to 14.5% in Maple Rapids, and from 5.1% to 4.6% in Ovid, but the other areas experienced an increase in rental vacancy rate.

Housing Vacancy In Eaton County

Please refer to Table 3 in your handout.

• The homeowner vacancy rate increased slightly between 2000 and 2010 in all six areas.
• The rental vacancy rates were different among the six areas.
• The rate increased from 4.2% to 7.8% in Charlotte, and from 5.2% to 8.3% in Delta Township.
• Sunfield showed a small increase from 5.1% to 5.8%, while Grand Ledge had a larger increase from 3.7% to 8.5%.
• The rental vacancy rate in Eaton Rapids enlarged from 3.3% in 2000 to 10.9% in 2010, but the rate in Potterville shot up from 7.1% to 24.7%.
Housing Vacancy In Ingham County

Please refer to Table 4 in your handout.

• The homeowner vacancy rate increased slightly between 2000 and 2010 in these areas, except for Mason (2.4% in 2000 and 2.0% in 2010).

• The rental vacancy rate also increased in all these areas except for East Lansing, where it decreased between 2000 and 2010 (6.4% in 2000 and 6.0% in 2010).

• The rate went up from 7.2% to 10.3% in Lansing,
• from 4.3% to 10.4% in Lansing Charter Township,
• from 5.2% to 7.6% in Meridian Township,
• from 4.0% to 8.9% in Stockbridge,
• from 8.4% to 13.7% in Webberville, and
• from 3.0% to 11.5% in Williamston
Age of Housing Units

- Between 2000 and 2010, these regions built 20,583 new housing units.
  - In Clinton County, 5,656 new units,
  - in Eaton County 5,318 units, and
  - in Ingham County 9,609 units were built during this period.

- The age of housing differed among three counties.
  - Clinton County had more houses built between 2000 or later (18.6%), and in 1939 or earlier (18.5%). This region also had 16.2% of houses built between 1990 and 1999, and 15.5% built between 1970 and 1979.
  - Eaton County had more houses built between 1970 and 1979 (19.9%), on 1939 or earlier (17.3%), and between 1990 and 1999 (15.9%).
  - In Ingham County, more houses were built on 1939 or earlier (17.2%), between 1970 and 1979 (16.9%), and between 1950 and 1959 (15.2%).

- These data show Clinton County had more newer housing structures compared to the other counties.
## Housing Tenure

### Handout Pages 8 - 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING TENURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>3,785,661</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23,653</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,793,124</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>20,173</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in owner-occupied housing units (2)</td>
<td>7,465,216</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>55,965</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size of owner-occupied units</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>992,537</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in renter-occupied housing units (2)</td>
<td>2,223,339</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>7,983</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size of renter-occupied units</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING TENURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>3,872,508</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28,766</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,793,342</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>22,612</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>7,183,134</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>60,353</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size of owner-occupied units</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>1,079,166</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,471,438</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>14,349</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size of renter-occupied units</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Household Type by Housing Tenure

- **Handout Pages 14 - 22**
- **Please pay attention to the increase in “living alone- 65 years and over” in the tables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,793,124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20,173</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households</td>
<td>2,107,892</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>16,098</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>1,714,193</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>13,607</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>393,699</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple family</td>
<td>1,732,553</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>102,723</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>272,616</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households</td>
<td>685,232</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>430,585</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>307,418</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>337,610</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>201,186</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>245,151</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>181,364</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>62,267</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>377,814</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>337,610</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>114,918</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>258,460</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>992,537</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households</td>
<td>467,807</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>435,488</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>215,157</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>32,319</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple family</td>
<td>258,460</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>192,730</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>66,240</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>266,270</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>266,270</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.
### Household Type by Housing Tenure

- **Handout Pages 14 - 22**
- **Please pay attention to the increase in “living alone- 65 years and over” in the tables.**

#### Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,793,342</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22,612</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households [1]</td>
<td>2,033,245</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>17,682</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>1,582,575</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>14,076</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>450,670</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife family</td>
<td>1,641,535</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>15,296</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>119,513</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>272,197</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households [2]</td>
<td>760,097</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>470,324</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>289,773</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>349,658</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>280,866</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>80,158</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with others</td>
<td>66,792</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>410,439</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>47,749</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>192,728</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with others</td>
<td>47,749</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>1,079,166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households [1]</td>
<td>520,828</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 15 to 64 years</td>
<td>482,155</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>38,673</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>215,592</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>65,850</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>33,905</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with others</td>
<td>67,018</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>289,093</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>233,895</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>88,646</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Housing Characteristics
Based on Census 2000 and American Community Survey 2010
**Units In Housing Structure**

**1 Unit Detached Housing Rate**

Approximately 65.3% of total housing units were 1-unit detached housing (or single-family housing) in 2000 and 66.7% in 2010.

Single-family detached housing is more dominant in Clinton County – 81.7% in 2000 and 81.1% in 2010 - than in Eaton or Ingham County.

This means that Ingham County possesses more multi-unit housing stock than the other two counties.

(Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
Mobile Homes – Clinton County

The number of mobile homes was 8,934 in 2000, but it went down to 7,871. This decrease of mobile homes were observed throughout the three counties. In Clinton County, there were 2,238 mobile homes which dropped down to 2,048 in 2010.

![Mobile Home Rate Graph]

Figure 4.2 Mobile Home Rate in 2000 and 2010 in Clinton County
(Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
Eaton County

In Eaton County, there were 2,800 mobile homes in 2000 and 2,735 in 2010.

Where do they need to go??

Ingham County

In Ingham County, 3,895 mobile homes were available in 2000, but 3,088 homes were available in 2010.
The median housing values of owner-occupied units were $110,867 in 2000 and $152,767 in 2010 in Tri-County regions.

Similar increase was observed in each county.

- In **Clinton County**, the median housing value was $120,500 in 2000 and this increased to $167,700 in 2010, which was **39.2% increase**.
- In **Eaton County**, the median housing values was $113,700 in 2000 and $152,700 in 2010, which was **34.3% increase**.
- In **Ingham County**, it was $98,400 in 2000 and $137,900 in 2010, which was **40.1% increase**.

(Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
## Median Housing Value and Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Community Survey Items</th>
<th>Ingham County</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units, 2010</td>
<td>121,281</td>
<td>30,695</td>
<td>47,050</td>
<td>4,532,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership rate, 2006-10</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value of owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>$137,900</td>
<td>$167,700</td>
<td>$152,700</td>
<td>$144,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income, 2010</td>
<td>$45,808</td>
<td>$58,016</td>
<td>$54,885</td>
<td>$48,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing price/Median Income: 301.0% 289.1% 278.2% 304.0%

!!! Save you all income, don’t spend, just save the money to pay off...It will Take more than three years to pay off your housing price in Ingham County Take less than three years to pay off your housing price in Clinton and Eaton County !!!
Median Housing Values of Owner-Occupied Units – Clinton County

Is the higher median housing values because of DeWitt?

(Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
Median Housing Values – Eaton County & Ingham County

**Eaton County**
- Charlotte: $83,700 - $115,000
- Grand Ledge: $102,800 - $105,500
- Sunfield: $82,900 - $118,100

**Ingham County**
- East Lansing: $144,300 - $189,800
- Lansing: $73,500 - $102,900
- Williamston: $114,600 - $150,500
Housing Affordability Fact

: Percentage of households spending more than 30% of the household income

• **Selected Monthly Owner Costs**

Selected monthly owner costs are calculated from the sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, and condominium fees.

• **Selected Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income (SMOCPHI)**

This item is used to measure housing affordability and excessive shelter costs. For example, many government agencies define excessive as costs that exceed 30 percent of household income.

Source: http://factfinder2.census.gov/help/en/glossary/s/selected_monthly_owner_costs.htm
Housing Affordability Fact
Percentage of households spending more than 30% of the household income

Homeowners

SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)
Housing Affordability Fact

Percentage of households spending more than 30% of the household income

![Graph showing percentage of households spending more than 30% of income with mortgage for Clinton county places.]

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Clinton County General: 17.1% -> 30.9%
- DeWitt: 17.0% -> 27.6%
- Fowler: 15.8% -> 29.0%
- Maple Rapids: 24.3% -> 32.4%
- Ovid: 20.5% -> 40.7%
- St Johns: 16.2% -> 31.4%
Housing Affordability Fact

Percentage of households spending more than 30% of the household income

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Eaton County General: 17.8% -> 29.8%
- Charlotte: 18.6% -> 34.2%
- Eaton Rapids: 18.5% -> 33.9%
- Grand Ledge: 15.5% -> 29.1%
- Potterville: 14.7% -> 32.3%
- St Johns: 18.0% -> 35.9%
Housing Affordability Fact

Percentage of households spending more than 30% of the household income

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

- Ingham County General: 20.2% -> 33.3%
  - East Lansing: 18.1% -> 29.1%
  - Lansing: 21.7% -> 34.6%
  - Mason: 24.2% -> 33.5%
  - Stockbridge: 21.7% -> 44.5%
  - Webberville: 24.4% -> 35.4%
  - Williamston: 28.2% -> 30.3%
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)

SMOCAPI over 30% (Owner with Mortgage) (2010)

SMOCAPI over 30% (Owner without Mortgage) (2010)
Occupied Units Paying Rent: Median Gross Rent

Need more affordable rental units!
The rent fee is increasing. We need more rental units available to decrease median gross rent.

The most expensive area among 6 cities
East Lansing: $578 -> $769
Webberville: $588 -> $884
Vehicles Available –
Indicator to see the need of public transportation, walkable, and bikable environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>23,653</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28,321</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40,167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicles available</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vehicle available</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>12,222</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vehicles available</td>
<td>11,023</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>17,322</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more vehicles available</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7,558</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>108,593</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>108,723</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14,426</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicles available</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vehicle available</td>
<td>41,228</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>41,883</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>6,298</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vehicles available</td>
<td>41,282</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>41,104</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more vehicles available</td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16,755</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Selected Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>23653</td>
<td>28321</td>
<td>40167</td>
<td>43358</td>
<td>108593</td>
<td>108723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking complete plumbing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking complete kitchen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No telephone service available</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>7794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCCUPANTS PER ROOM

| Occupied housing units          | 23653        | 28321        | 40167      | 43358      | 108593      | 108723      |
|                                 | 100          | 100          | 100        | 100        | 100         | 100         |
| 1.00 or less                    | 23313        | 28145        | 39511      | 42946      | 105347      | 107262      |
|                                 | 98.6%        | 99.4%        | 98.4%      | 99.0%      | 97.0%       | 98.7%       |
| 1.01 to 1.50                    | 282          | 161          | 467        | 369        | 2141        | 1294        |
|                                 | 1.2%         | 0.6%         | 1.2%       | 0.9%       | 2.0%        | 1.2%        |
| 1.51 or more                    | 58           | 15           | 189        | 43         | 1105        | 167         |
|                                 | 0.2%         | 0.1%         | 0.5%       | 0.1%       | 1.0%        | 0.2%        |

(Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data & 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
Observations of Regional Housing Condition
Single-Family vs. Multi-Family Houses

- Presents geographical locations of single-family or multifamily-housing units that were currently sold or on sale in Tri-County region.
- Refers to one of the popular real estate search tool, Zillow.com

Figure 5. Search options to get single-family housing map (source: http://www.zillow.com/homes/)
Single-Family vs. Multi-Family Houses

Lansing

Single-family

Multi-family

Foreclosed single-family

East Lansing

Source: Zillow.com (April 9, 2013)
Single-Family vs. Multi-Family Houses

Mason

Single-family

Multi-family

Foreclosed single-family

Williamston

Source: Zillow.com (April 9, 2013)
Single-Family vs. Multi-Family Houses

Source: Zillow.com (April 9, 2013)

The regional offers tremendous number of single-family homes. Need more multifamily units?
Summary of Housing Features

- Increase in elderly households: living alone households
- Newer structures in Clinton County
- Outdated structures in Ingham County
- The area predominantly occupied by Single-Family Detached Houses
- Vacant housing: Owner-occupied/ Renter-occupied – need solutions for this issue.
- Not a variety of rental housing units
- If we remove mobile homes, is there any other place for them to move?
Question

I will show you house images that exist in the region. Please tell me what is your thought after you see these pictures.
Residential Units in the Region

Housing along the Grand River Avenue – Eight Stops
Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 1- Multi-family units above commercial space downtown East Lansing

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 2 - Housing on 100 block Stoddard and Spartan, East Lansing. Within this block are commercial spaces, row housing, rental single detached homes and a few owner occupied homes. Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 3- Mobile Homes Grand River and Van Atta

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 4- Downtown Williamston on Grand River

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 5- one block south, Williamston

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
Picture location 6- one block north between Williamston and Webberville

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
7 - abandoned house and two-story home near Webberville

8 - one block south of Grand River, Webberville

Images by Space & Kim (2014)
• Think about the harmony between existing residential structures and future housing developments
• We need to improve housing quality
HOUSING ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS FROM EXPERTS AND PLANNERS

INTENSIVE INTERVIEW RESULTS FROM THE TRI-COUNTY REGION

MAY 28TH 2014
SUUK-KYUNG KIM, PH.D, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

- Developed an initial interview questionnaire
- Had several meetings with the Office for the Survey Research at Michigan State University to discuss the questions and interview methods
- Finalized the interview questionnaire and submitted an application to the Institutional Review Board for Human Subject Research at MSU
- Obtained the final approval from the IRB at MSU
- Completed the interviewer training session and confirmed questionnaire contents with interviewers
- Finalized contact information for potential interview participants
- Thank you~!
  Housing Task Force Members, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, and GLHC
- Conducted telephone interviews
- Reported major findings
**TIME LINE**

**DATA COLLECTION PROCESS**

- Developed an initial interview questionnaire
- Had several meetings with the Office for the Survey Research at Michigan State University to discuss the questions and interview methods
- Finalized the interview questionnaire and submitted an application to the Institutional Review Board for Human Subject Research at MSU
- Obtained the final approval from the IRB at MSU
- Completed the interviewer training session and confirmed questionnaire contents with interviewers
- Finalized contact information for potential interview participants
- Conducted telephone interviews
- Reported major findings

**Housing Expert Interviews**

- Questionnaire: September 2012
- IRB: November 2012
- Interviewer Training: November 2012
- Contact List: December 2012 (47 samples)
- Conducting Interviews: December 2012-March 2013
- Summary of Findings: April 2013

**Planners’ Interviews**

- Questionnaire: March 2013
- IRB: May 2013
- Interviewer Training: May 2013
- Contact List: May 2013 (28 samples)
- Conducting Interviews: May 27, 2013-July 30, 2013
- Summary of Findings: October 2013
PARTICIPANTS

Expert Participants: 33
(Participation Rate: 70.2%)

- Developers
- Property managers
- Landlords
- Loan providers
- MSU faculty
- Non-profit organizations
- Non-profit organizations
- Michigan Foreclosure Task Force
- SIREN/Eaton Shelter
- Habitat for Humanity
- REALTOR®

Planner Participants: 17
(Participation Rate: 60.7%)

- Lansing, East Lansing, Webberville, Stockbridge, Williamston, Delhi Township, Leslie, Mason, Lansing Township, & Meridian Township
- St. Johns, DeWitt, & Watertown Township
- Eaton County, Potterville & Delta Charter Township
- Ingham County
- Clinton County
- Clinton Transit
LIST OF QUESTIONS

• Opinions on an adequate supply of affordable housing
• Major Concerns for Improving Housing Affordability
• Particular Groups in Need of Affordable Housing Options
• Other Housing Issues in Their Areas
• Major Obstacles to Achieving Housing Affordability
• Foreclosure
• Housing Vacancy
• Mixed-Use Development
• Public Transportation
• Walkability
• Possible Actions to Resolve Various Affordable Housing Issues
OPINIONS ON AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Housing Experts

- No, 57.6%
- Yes, 21.2%
- Hard to answer, 21.2%

Planners

No, they don’t have an adequate supply of affordable housing:

Because their jurisdictions lacked range within the housing stock.

Yes, they have an adequate supply of affordable housing:

Because their jurisdictions offered a wide variety of housing types, such as single family homes in combination with townhouses, apartments, and so on.
MAJOR CONCERNS FOR IMPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Eaton County

- Lack of affordable single-family housing units, especially for seniors
- Lack of affordable rental units and lack of landlords’ efforts
  - Need more units for homeless or domestic violence victims
  - Need more 3-4 bedroom rental units
  - Need good quality homes for the section 8 voucher program
- Lack of public transportation: connecting between houses to school or work.
- Lack of units for residents with disabilities, lands for new developments, and employment
  - Lack of accessible units for the residents with disabilities
  - Lack of land for new development
  - Good school districts and stabilized sources of income
MAJOR CONCERNS FOR IMPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Clinton County

- More concerned about the role of county in housing development
- Concerned about many rural areas
- Units accommodating residents’ housing needs

- Lack of affordable single-family housing units, especially for seniors
- Lack of affordable rental units: need to revisit multifamily housing development issue; new multifamily developments are for students not for residents in their communities.
- Lack of public transportation: Connecting between houses to school or work.
- More concerned about the county’s role in housing development
- Concerned about the connection between houses and food systems.
- More concerned about the economic depression in the area: This caused their concerns about energy-efficient housing, affordable rental housing, and community-oriented planning.
MAJOR CONCERNS FOR IMPROVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Ingham County

- Lack of available affordable housing units: low-income households, students, apartment renters, singles, seniors including baby boomers, larger families, and young families.
- Insufficient financial support and/or lack of enough credits
- Property tax causing lack of affordable housing and financial burdens
- Lack of rental units and landlords’ efforts
- Development density
- Public transportation options
- Quality of homes

• Diverse population components
• A variety of housing options to accommodate this characteristics
PARTICULAR GROUPS IN NEED OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPTIONS

When we talk about the lack of affordable housing, which groups in particular come to mind? Who seems to be having a hard time finding affordable housing in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Housing Experts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Planners</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, they have</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>Yes, they have</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a hard time</td>
<td></td>
<td>ing</td>
<td>hard a time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families lower than poverty level</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with children attending public</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (handicapped, veterans, etc)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Diversifying the Housing Stock**

Planners suggested diversifying the housing stock beyond single-family homes to cater to the needs of their populations in regards to price as well as home functionality, such as the number of bedrooms.

Planners also called for a better balance between renters and homeowners within the housing stock. Rentals and affordable housing options tend to be placed in nodes outside of the average housing stock. This segregates communities, economically and socially. Planners would prefer to present renters and residents requiring subsidy the opportunity to be integrated into the general homeowners’ housing stock.

2. **Maintaining Quality within the Housing Stock**

Planners noted that achieving affordability is especially difficult when factoring in the cost of maintenance. This creates a sacrifice between affordability and quality. The inability for upkeep was noted on behalf of homeowners, renters, and landlords.

This issue could be addressed by choosing different materials in home construction that are longer lasting, or easier to maintain integrity. Also, the issue could be addressed through programming that educates homeowners and renters on ways to maintain a home.
3. Preserving an Aging Housing Stock

In relation to maintaining quality, many of the planners reported an aging housing stock that has been difficult to keep pace with. These homes tend to be priced within the means of low-income families; however, the degree of dilapidation and cost of improvement makes long-term costs higher than usually anticipated. Planners also noted confusion and controversy regarding historic designation and proper practices in preservation of old homes.

4. Vacancy within the Housing and Commercial Stock

Planners recognized that the recession halted many construction projects and have left many developments, such as subdivisions, unfinished. For this reason, as well as a high number of foreclosures, vacancy has become an issue- although the general conditions relevant to foreclosures seemed to be improving.

Some planners suggested the same vacancy issue holds true beyond the housing market, for industrial and commercial properties.

Planners reported that the existing vacancies are making the rebound more difficult due to the poor condition of the vacant lots and structures. The effects these properties have on surrounding property values.
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE HOUSING MARKET VALUE:
ADDRESS BY HOUSING EXPERTS

- Upkeep of homes in the neighborhood
- Level of neighborhood crime
- Repair and maintenance of streets and sidewalks
- Proximity to public transportation
- Distance to commercial shopping districts
REASONS PEOPLE LEAVE OR CHOOSE THE COMMUNITIES:
ADDRESS BY HOUSING EXPERTS

Reasons people leave the current community

Reasons people choose the current community

- Lack of employment: 87.9%
- Problems with the school district: 57.6%
- High crime rate: 42.4%
- Prevalence of poverty and poor housing conditions: 42.4%
- Lack of public services: 39.4%
- Lack of affordable rentals: 39.4%
- Increase in poverty tax rate: 36.4%
- Lack of affordable housing: 36.4%
- Lack of new housing construction: 33.3%
- Other: 30.3%
- Lack of racial and/or ethnic diversity in the...: 30.3%
- Lower owner occupancy: 27.3%
- Changing racial or ethnic composition of the...: 24.2%
- Restrictive zoning that prevents diverse housing...: 18.2%

- Generally decent housing conditions: 94.8%
- Low crime rate: 72.7%
- School district: 72.7%
- Enough public services: 69.7%
- Reasonable property tax rate: 66.7%
- Good owner occupancy: 63.6%
- Good employment opportunity: 57.6%
- Enough affordable rentals: 51.5%
- Enough affordable housing: 51.5%
- Flexible zoning that encourages diverse housing types: 39.4%
- Diverse racial composition of the neighborhood: 39.4%
- Other: 30.3%
- A lot of new housing construction: 18.2%
### MAJOR OBSTACLES TO ACHIEVING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

#### Housing Experts

- **Difficulties in Finance**
  - Lack of financial sources for building or purchasing homes
  - Lack of Employment

- **Prices of homes and property taxes**

- **Lack of regional housing vision, zoning, and regulations**
  - There is no cohesive regional vision for housing
  - Zoning requirements are unclear sometimes
  - Sprawled development has been an obstacles

- **Lack of affordable rental or single-family housing units**
  - Need more rental units with enough bedrooms

- **Lack of knowledge of low-income families about their rights**
  - Knowledge of the ability to apply for Section 8 housing

- **Foreclosed units without appropriate assistance**

- **Lack of developers and investors**

#### Planners

- **Lack of Resources**
  - Many jurisdictions and/or organizations do not have the capacity in terms of dollars or human resources to make the improvements to the housing stock that they would like to see.
  - They lack of resources to conduct research that would determine how to operate under their capacity and in what ways capacity should be expanded.

- **Restrictions by Ordinances and Lack of Ordinances**
  - Many planners identified outdated ordinances as obstacles to the housing market.
  - For instance, some cities’ ordinance do not encourage the urban infill that the planners are trying to achieve.

- **State of the Economy**
  - The nature of the economic is a major obstacles- from the high foreclosure rates experiences since that market collapse to the remaining lack of employment.
Planners’ responses when asked “have you experienced an increase or decrease of foreclosures in your area in the past three years?”

- About 24% of the planners have experienced an increase in foreclosures, while 41% have experienced a decrease in foreclosures during the past three years.
- About 35% of the planners were unable to comment.

Planners’ responses when asked “Is the foreclosure related issue getting better or worse?”

- About 94% of the planners responded “better.”
- The remaining 6% were unable to comment.
Ingham County Sheriff's Deeds

By Ingham County Land Bank
Ingham Tax Foreclosures

Year

# parcels

By Ingham County Land Bank
HOUSING VACANCY: OPINIONS ON VACANT UNITS

Whether their jurisdiction makes efforts to reduce the number of vacant housing units,
- Some efforts: 41%
- No efforts being done to reduce the number of vacant housing units: 53%
- Unable to speak on the matter: 5.5%
# MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

How much do you agree with the need to develop more mixed-use buildings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing Experts</th>
<th>Planners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very strong opinions for developing more mixed-use buildings
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Instead of big mixed-use development, many housing experts indicated small-scale mixed-use developments in downtown areas.

- Utilizing current outdated buildings downtown through upgrading the facades and offering small-scale mixed-use developments that can include some affordable residential units on the 2nd or 3rd floor.
- A newly developed mixed-use building located along Grand River Avenue in East Lansing, MI, that include retails on the first floor and residential units on the 2nd floor.
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Many housing experts and planners indicated there is a lack of public transportation connecting residential areas to commercial spaces.

Their comments were categorized into three groups:

Comments Regarding CATA
Need More Transportation Options
Transportation is Not a Problem
POSSIBLE ACTIONS TAKEN BY MUNICIPALITIES
ADDRESS BY HOUSING EXPERTS

✔ Finance and Availability of Homes
  Action 1: Financial Support
  Action 2: Offering more diverse housing options, particularly more rental units or opportunities for renters

✔ Regional Housing Planning
  Action 3: Adopting a regional housing plan considering jobs and housing
  Action 4: Creating a housing authority or active city involvement
  Action 5: Code and regulation reinforcement
  Action 6: Simplifying the process for low-income families to find permanent homes
  Action 7: Provide more transportation options

✔ Education and Outreach
  Action 8: Offering more information and education opportunities
  Action 9: Giving incentives to developers
## Housing Programs and Services in the Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Website URL</th>
<th>Housing Programs and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Bath Township</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bathtownship.us/">http://www.bathtownship.us/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator">http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator">http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Stockbridge</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stockbridge.mi.us/">http://www.stockbridge.mi.us/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Webberville</td>
<td><a href="http://www.webberville.mi.us/">http://www.webberville.mi.us/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Williamston</td>
<td><a href="http://www.williamston.mi.us/">http://www.williamston.mi.us/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hard to find out information in the city’s, township’s, or county’s websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ingham county</th>
<th>Eaton County</th>
<th>Clinton County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSHDA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 212d3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSHDA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSHDA- LIHTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 212d3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 515</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created by S. Kim based on [http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator](http://www.mshda.info/housing_locator)
COMPREHENSIVE PLANS
SEARCHED BY S KIM

City of DeWitt
- Master Plan: Comprehensive Plan Development Plan
  http://www.dewittmi.org/Portals/78/PDFs/DeWittMasterPlanCCapproved101910.pdf
- Has a housing section in Chapter Four, including a “snapshot” of facts such as owner vs. renter, age of housing stock, and housing type.
- The link on DeWitt’s website is supposed to send visitors to the development plan, but is actually a link for a previous Recreation Plan. Found link thru Google URL: http://www.dewittmi.org/
- Zoning Map: http://www.dewittmi.org/Portals/78/PDFs/DeWittZoning36x46.pdf

Fowler, Maple Rapids, Ovid
- Master Plan: None on website or thru google.

St. Johns
- Master Plan: N/A
- URL: http://cityofstjohnsmi.com/
- Zoning Map:
  http://cityofstjohnsmi.com/Departments/CommunityDevelopmentZoning/ZoningOrdinance.aspx (link to zoning ordinances, no map found)
- Comments: No master plan found on website, links to planning department are primarily ordinances

Bath Charter Township
- Master Plan: 2009 Comprehensive Development Plan, two of the ten principles include housing components “Provide diverse housing types and opportunities” and “build center of concentrated mixed uses” http://www.bathtownship.us/images/pdf/Planning/Bath%20comp%20plan_final1.pdf
- URL: http://www.bathtownship.us/
COMPREHENSIVE PLANS
SEARCHED BY S KIM

Watertown Township
- Master Plan: Master Plan (Updated 2009)
  http://watertowntownship.com/Portals/0/Master%20Plan%20(Updated%20October%202009).pdf
- URL: http://watertowntownship.com/
- Comments: Incorporates strategies such as clustering new housing developments into goals and objectives. Places and emphasis on rural/farmland.

DeWitt Charter Township
- Master Plan: 2005 Comprehensive Development Plan
- Link to individual chapters:
  http://www.dewitttownship.org/OurDepartmentsServices/PlanningDepartment/ComprehensiveDevelopmentPlan.aspx
- URL: http://www.dewitttownship.org/
- Zoning Map: http://www.dewitttownship.org/Portals/10/Documents/zoningmap0507_001.pdf
- Future Land Use Map: http://www.dewitttownship.org/Portals/10/Documents/Planning%20-%20Comp%20Dev%20Plan/Map4-1_000.pdf
- Comments: Housing issue integrated throughout the plan, no direct chapter on housing

Charlotte
- Master Plan: 2008 Master Plan
  Found through Google, not Charlotte’s website
- URL: http://www.charlottemi.org/
- Zoning Map: N/A
- Comments: No maps found on website or through Google
Eaton Rapids
• Master Plan: N/A
• URL: http://www.cityofeatonrapids.com/
• Zoning Map: N/A
• Comments: master plan nor zoning map found on website or through Google

Grand Ledge
• Master Plan: N/A
• URL: http://www.grand-ledge.com/
• Zoning Map: http://www.grand-ledge.com/?page_id=807
• Comments: No master plan or map found on site or through Google

Potterville
• Master Plan: N/A
• URL: http://www.pottervillemi.org/
• Comments: No master plan found on website or through Google

Sunfield
• Master Plan: N/A
• URL: N/A
• Zoning Map: N/A
• Comments: No website for Sunfield, nor master plan/zoning map found through Google
**Delta Charter Township**
- Existing housing conditions included throughout chapter on Community Profile, including housing type, age, and values, etc.
- No explicit “goal” for housing in “goals and objectives” section
- URL: http://www.deltami.gov/
- Zoning Map: maps within plan

**Vermontville**
- Housing incorporated into community profile (“existing” conditions for time of adoptions)
- Housing not explicitly included in 7 goals/objectives
- Zoning Map: [http://www.vermontville-mi.gov/council/ordinances.htm#two](http://www.vermontville-mi.gov/council/ordinances.htm#two)
  - Link to zoning ordinances, no map on website
  - Proposed maps included in master plan (land uses)

**Lansing**
- Zoning Map (interactive): [http://gismo.lansingmi.gov/website/PropertyInfo/viewer.htm](http://gismo.lansingmi.gov/website/PropertyInfo/viewer.htm)
- Links to all maps from Comprehensive Plan: [http://www.lansingmi.gov/Plan-Maps](http://www.lansingmi.gov/Plan-Maps)
**Comprehensive Plans**

**Searches by S. Kim**

**East Lansing**
- Master Plan: 2006 Big Picture Comprehensive Plan
- Other Plans (Land Use, Transportation, Parks/Rec):
  http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/Home/Departments/PlanningBuildingDevelopment/PlanningZoning/
- URL: http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/
- Zoning Map: Maps available for download at http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/Home/Departments/PlanningBuildingDevelopment/Maps/
- Comments: No specific housing chapter in comprehensive plan, but is mentioned in planning areas sections.

**Webberville**
- Master Plan: No adopted plan found online. Found MSU Practicum Webberville Grand River Avenue Corridor Sub-Area Plan:
- URL: http://villageofwebberville.com/

**Stockbridge**
- Master Plan: Adopted 2008
  http://www.vil.stockbridge.mi.us/Portals/10/Master%20Plan%20PDF4-29-08.pdf
- URL: http://www.vil.stockbridge.mi.us/Home.aspx
- Link to other Maps and Plans: http://www.vil.stockbridge.mi.us/PlanningCommission.aspx
COMPREHENSIVE PLANS
SEARCHED BY S KIM

City of Williamston
- URL: http://www.williamston-mi.us/index.html
- Zoning Map: http://www.williamston-mi.us/zoning-map.html
- Link to other Maps: http://www.williamston-mi.us/city-maps.html
- Comments: Master plan as a designated housing chapter.

Williamstown Township
URL: http://www.williamstowntownship.com/
Zoning Map: No zoning map found

Lansing Charter Township
Master Plan: Adopted in 2010
URL: http://www.lansingtownship.org/Home.aspx
Zoning Map: Multiple zoning maps http://www.lansingtownship.org/ZoningMaps.aspx
Comments: Master plan has a designated housing chapter

Delhi Charter Township
Master Plan: http://www.delhitownship.com/CommunityDevelopment-mp.htm
URL: http://www.delhitownship.com/index.html
Zoning Map: No map available link to zoning brochure,
Comments: There is a section in the plan for key housing observations
City of Leslie
Master Plan: No master plan found on Website
URL: http://www.cityofleslie.org/index.shtm
Zoning Map: http://www.cityofleslie.org/forms/Leslie%20City%20Zoning%20Map.pdf

City of Mason
Master Plan: http://www.mason.mi.us/2014/032514%20MASTER%20PLAN%202014.pdf
URL: http://www.mason.mi.us/index.htm
Comments: No designated housing chapter in plan
FUTURE COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING PLANS ADDRESSED BY PLANNERS

“Does your city/township/county have a comprehensive housing plan for the next five years?”

• **About 29% of the planners** reported that the master plan within their city/township/county incorporates a specific housing component.

• The remaining **71% reported** that there was **not** a designated housing plan within their jurisdictions.
FUTURE COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING PLANS ADDRESSED BY PLANNERS

“What kinds of aspects would you emphasize in a comprehensive housing plan and housing assistance program to improve housing affordability in your area?”

❖ **Continue existing programs and pursue new partnerships**

• Planners already involved in housing programs noted that they would continue to execute those same services.

• Some, including planners without existing programs, mentioned bringing back past programs that are now expired. Those programs include rehabilitation, land banking, quality of life programs, community engagement programs, down payment assistance, and so on.

• Almost all the planners expressed interest in partnering with new networks as a means of targeting their individual weaknesses within their jurisdictions’ housing stock. This includes partnerships with landlords, property owners, and developers to discuss affordable options as well as more formal partnerships with organizations that can provide funding, such as MISHDA.

• Many of the planners expressed a desire to implement programs that educate renters and owners about home maintenance. This would be a tactic to keep homes affordable in terms of quality and ability to resell or rent.
“What kinds of aspects would you emphasize in a comprehensive housing plan and housing assistance program to improve housing affordability in your area?”

- **Target senior living and aging in place**
  - Implementing strategies that allow populations to age in place, meaning the housing stock can evolve with the population.
  - This will make the stock more diverse in regards to the variety of people each home can accommodate and the stock will hopefully become more accessible for seniors and handicapped through better design tactics.

- **Introduce more mixed-use properties**
  - Increasing density through mixed-use properties and downtown living trended across many planners as a way to diversify the housing stock.
  - Many hope to incorporate such tactics into future plans and those that already have indicated these practices in plans hope to see the tactics implemented while the need still exists.
  - This strategy was especially noted in the Lansing area. More mixed-use housing could increase density, integrate different socio-economic backgrounds, and provide an infrastructure for renters and buyers more interested in the urban lifestyle.
“What kinds of aspects would you emphasize in a comprehensive housing plan and housing assistance program to improve housing affordability in your area?”

- **Energy Efficiency**
  - The planners indicated a need to increase energy efficiency by making good use of subsidy resources and other available funds. From an affordability standpoint, this will increase the durability of homes and the long-term costs.
  - Energy efficiency should be considered in terms of retrofitting existing structures and also be a consideration in new construction.
POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO RESOLVE VARIOUS AFFORDABLE HOUSING ISSUES

“What are some possible actions that could be taken by the upper municipalities over your jurisdiction?”

❖ The Regional Approach, Public and Private Efforts

• Many of the planners felt a regional discussion is necessary in identifying next steps or approaches to improving housing affordability. Many have different needs and demands, and the planners felt that now is an opportunity to make future plans comprehensive across multiple municipalities.

• Look at more a regional strategy for affordable unites and not over concentrate in Lansing.

• Need a regional worldview-encouraging housing efficiency on a range of levels, working with MSHDA, potential refugee housing, senior housing. It should be regional cooperation.

• Need more regional collaboration to help each other understand the needs and services, specifically planning services.

• Need more funding to support regional efforts.
POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO RESOLVE VARIOUS AFFORDABLE HOUSING ISSUES

“What are some possible actions that could be taken by the upper municipalities over your jurisdiction?”

❖ The Municipalities and Government Roles

• There are efforts underway that include updating the comprehensive plan to understand demand and growth, or if they add units faster than the population, what areas will be abandoned.

• Encouraging banking industry to be more friendly to help individuals/new families with assistance for acquiring new affordable homes.

• It is up to elected officials.

• A lot of the programs that the state/county already have would be great to partner with

• Need more from the state for local communities to diversify housing and to make neighborhoods more walkable and connect residential with services and retails and jobs. Working with the Department of Transportation.
POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO RESOLVE VARIOUS AFFORDABLE HOUSING ISSUES

“What are some possible actions that could be taken by the upper municipalities over your jurisdiction?”

△ The Role of Funding and Capacity from the State or the Counties

• Devoting more resources to the issue, being able to participate in more programs that reflect/address our needs better (or are more flexible or can be tailored more to our specific needs) – unfortunately, most programs that come down from state/HUD are helpful, but so prescriptive it’s hard to adapt to the needs of our community, the one-size-fits-all doesn’t really fit → Need a variety of programs with different funding size.

• City’s capacity for tackling things is low, due to small staff – City of XXX is seen by residents as providing water/ sewer, roads, parks, police/fire, collecting taxes, but anything else is seen as luxury, so what needs to be done is either local municipalities working together or county working together with smaller cities and towns to take on the responsibility to provide affordable housing, assistance programs, and grant.

• They would love to do these projects, but don’t have time to administer federal or state programs. → Lack of human resources to get some funding for improving housing affordability.
Tri-County Resident Survey

Regional Affordable Housing Seminar
May 28, 2014
Presented by Suk-Kyung Kim, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
School of Planning, Design, & Construction, Michigan State University
Purpose & Contents

- To collect and analyze residents’ opinions and needs about their individual homes and regional housing conditions and to help TCRPC and Greater Lansing Housing Coalition set practical and achievable goals to improve housing affordability across the region based on the results.

Survey Questions

- Socioeconomic and Demographic information
- Current Housing Characteristics: Type, Age of Housing, Size, Story, Basement, Number of Bedrooms and Bathrooms, Tenure, Length of Residency, and so on.
- Housing Affordability: For their current residence and available regional housing stock (Units for Seniors, Residents with Disabilities, Mixed-use Development)
- Opinions on Future Development
- Transportation Mode: Walking, Biking, Passenger Cars, etc.
- Fair Housing/ Energy-Efficient Housing/ Aging-In-Place
Voluntary Participation

- Participation in this study is entirely voluntary.
  - Participants may choose not to participate, to skip any question that they do not want to answer, and they can end their participation at any time.
  - Respondents’ confidentiality and privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowed by local, state, and federal law. They were not be asked to give their name or any other information that would allow them to be identified.

- The survey took about 25-30 minutes to complete.
  - While there is no direct benefit to the respondents personally for participating, they were informed that the results of this study might provide information to improve housing affordability in the region.
Data Collection Process

1. **Developing a Resident Survey Questionnaire, Revising the Questionnaire, & Establishing the Data Collection Process**
   - July 2013 - November 2013

2. **Obtain IRB Approval for the Resident Survey**
   - November 2013

3. **Specify Survey Versions: Owners, Renters, and Students**
   - December 2013

4. **Develop an Online Survey which Includes All Versions**
   - December 2013

5. **Collect Responses from the Random Samples**
   - January 2014 - February 2014

6. **Extend the Survey to Non-Random Samples and Collect Data from On-Site Surveys**
   - March 2014 - April 2014
Sampling

Random Samples: Obtained 4,000 resident samples
- 1,000 samples from low-income category (25% of total samples): 30% of the median household.
- Sampling guidelines:
  - If we use $39,000 cut off it represents about 33% of the households in Ingham, Eaton, and Clinton Counties.
  - If we use the $19,000 cut off it is around 16% of households.
  - Also 60% of the HH are in Ingham, 16% in Clinton, and 23% Eaton. 80% of the blocks in the proposed sampling frame are from Ingham, 15% from Eaton, and 5% in Clinton.
  - Based on these assumptions, we used the $19,000 cut off.
- 3,000 samples from the other categories (75% of total samples)

Random Samples: Obtained 3,000 MSU student samples

Purposive Samples: Obtained 500 samples that include low-income renters, seniors, and college students
Survey Methods

1) **Online Survey**: sending a cover letter and providing an URL
   Residents: 361
   [https://ippsr.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3aeNE3wja89fR9b](https://ippsr.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3aeNE3wja89fR9b)
   
   Students:
   [https://ippsr.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4OBQpkBjWH4Ocvz](https://ippsr.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4OBQpkBjWH4Ocvz)

2) **Site Visits: Between March 1 and April 20, 2014**
   - Ingham County Health Department, Lansing
   - Jefferson Square Senior Apartments, Mason
   - Marsh Point Senior Apartments, Haslett
   - Edgewood Apartments, East Lansing
   - Meridian Township Senior Center, Okemos
   - Eaton County Senior Center, Eaton Rapids
   - Bellevue Apartments, Bellevue

3) **Class Visits: Between March 1 and April 30, 2014**
   10 classes at Michigan State University