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- Has a strong focus on research and outreach based on analysis of land policy options in many contemporary issue areas.
- The ways in which we use our land and build upon it impact our quality of life, today and tomorrow.
- Focus Areas: Placemaking & Regional Prosperity, Land & Planning, Land-Based Resources, and Energy.
- Affiliated with the School of Planning, Design and Construction, with Dr. Scott Witter, Interim Director.
- Please see our website for more information: www.landpolicy.msu.edu.
**Mid-Michigan Environmental Action Council (Community Reinvestment Fund)**

- Mid-MEAC is a grassroots community organization serving Clinton, Eaton and Ingham counties.
- Founded in 1993, Mid-MEAC translates community concerns into action through volunteer programs, outreach and education.
- Focus areas: river protection, green transportation, land use and sustainability.
- Please see our website ([www.midmeac.org](http://www.midmeac.org)) for more information.
WHO IS IN THE ROOM?

Julie
Changing U.S. Demographics

Mary Beth
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: RACE/ETHNICITY UNITED STATES

U.S Decadal Growth Rates for Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1980-2010

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. *Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities*. April 2012.
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: RACE/ETHNICITY MICHIGAN

Michigan Decadal Growth Rates for Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1980-2010

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities. April 2012.
Demographic Trends: Race/Ethnicity United States

- The **Latino population will triple in size** and will account for most of the nation’s population growth from 2005 to 2050.

- The non-Hispanic white population will increase more slowly than other racial and ethnic groups. **Whites will become the minority** (47%) in 2050.

- **African Americans will be roughly the same percentage** in 2050 (13%), and **Asian Americans will almost double their percentage** (from 5% to 9%) (Pew, 2008).
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: IMMIGRANTS

MICHIGAN IMMIGRANT REALITIES

Immigrant Share of the Population, U.S. and Michigan, 1980-2010*

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California
**DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: IMMIGRANTS**

- Nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be an immigrant in 2050, compared with one in eight (12%) in 2005 (Pew, 2008).
- Many immigrants live in **sub-standard housing** because they have trouble getting landlords to take care of repairs (NYIC, 2010).
- Historically, immigrants have moved to areas where there is already an immigrant population, particularly from their home country.
2000 Percent People of Color by County

Legend:
- Less than 40% People of Color
- "Tipping Point" Counties: 40% to 50% People of Color
- Greater than 50% People of Color

Sources: 2000 Census, Census TIGER/Line, NHGIS, and ESRI.
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Demographic Trends: Race/Ethnicity Suburbs

Portrait of America: The Changing Suburbs

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities. April 2012.
Demographic Trends: Race/Ethnicity Housing Demands

- African Americans and Latinos are more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to indicate that they plan to buy a home in the next three years.
- African Americans and Latinos are also more likely to prefer city living than other racial/ethnic groups.
- Roughly seven in ten African-American families (72%) and Latinos (68%) prefer neighborhoods with a mix of houses and businesses.
- African Americans also prefer to live in communities with racial diversity; this is not the case with Latinos.
- These two groups are more likely to identify the need for more low-income housing than the general population (NAR, 2011).
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: RACE/ETHNICITY YOUTH

U.S. Change in Youth (<18) Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2000-2010

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities. April 2012.
Demographic Trends: Race/Ethnicity Generation Gap

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California
As the Baby Boom generation enters the traditional retirement age, the nation’s elderly population will more than double in size from 2005 to 2050.

The number of working-age Americans and children will grow more slowly than the elderly population (Pew, 2008).

There is a trend toward senior development in downtown areas for seniors who want convenient access to arts, shopping, museums, education, employment, technology centers, and good healthcare systems (ULI, 2011a).
Demographic Trends: Young People

- Overflowing college campuses cannot handle the demand through existing dorms, and older students prefer off-campus residences.

- However, in 10 years, the number of college-age adults will sharply decline (ULI, 2011b).

- The “Creative Class,” of young, talented individuals in the STEM fields, prefer urban living with easy access to a variety of entertainment and recreation options.
Marriage rates hit a record low in 2009-2010; they are down from 72% in 1960 to 51% today.

People are waiting until they are older to get married; the average age for first marriages has climbed to 26.5 years for brides and 28.7 years for grooms (Pew).

Younger people who are unmarried tend to prefer the convenience of dense, walkable communities (NAR, 2011).
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: INCOME LEVELS

- In 2011, 48% of Americans were considered “low income,” according to the U.S. Census Bureau definition of less than $45,000 household income, while 24% fall below the poverty line.

- The majority of low-income families (62%) spent more than one-third of their earnings on housing, surpassing a common guideline for what is considered affordable.

- Children were most likely to be poor or low-income (57%), followed by seniors over 65. By race and ethnicity, Hispanics topped the list at 73%, followed by blacks, Asians and non-Hispanic whites (Census, 2011).
**Demographic Trends: Income Levels**

- Based on a national survey, those on both ends of the socio-economic scale *(rich and poor)* prefer **Smart Growth communities**, while the middle class prefers to the suburbs *(NAR, 2011)*.

- Transportation costs make up a large percentage of household expenses for **low-income and car-dependent societies**.

- Compact development and greater transit access can help **reduce household expenditures** on transportation costs *(Benner & Pastor, 2012)*.

- Transit-oriented development, with housing along transportation corridors can be critical for providing **“affordable living”** opportunities.
Underserved & Marginalized Populations
Category II: Refinement of Tri-County Regional Growth Plan

Nine Projects:

Project 1: 5-year Comprehensive Regional Fair & Affordable Housing Plan
Project 2: Regional Affordable Housing Study
Project 3: Community Reinvestment Fund to Build Capacity
Project 4: Energy Audit Study of Built Structures
Project 5: Regional Urban Service Management Area
Project 6: Multi-faceted Green Infrastructure System
Project 7: Sustainable Corridor Design Portfolio
Project 8: Complete Streets Planning and Implementation
Project 9: Online Portal for Information Sharing & Evaluation
Traditionally underserved & Marginalized Populations – Mid-Michigan

- Clinton, Eaton & Ingham counties
  - Total Population: 464,039
  - Municipalities – 114
  - Clinton
    - 16 townships, 5 unincorporated communities, 7 villages and 4 cities
  - Eaton
    - 16 townships, 26 unincorporated communities, 5 villages and 6 cities
  - Ingham
    - 16 townships, 5 unincorporated communities, 3 villages and 5 cities
THE PROJECT

114 municipalities:
- 6–10 planning bodies per municipality
- 40 school districts (public & private) plus PTA/PTO
- 11 regional planning bodies
- 6 Health departments (community & mental)
- 54 Planning bodies in the areas of: Housing, transportation, economic development, environment, energy and education
- Neighborhood councils

> 1000 bodies, boards, committees and councils
WHO ISN’T REPRESENTED?

1. Female heads of household
2. Households at or below area median income (low income)
3. Households at or below the federal poverty limit (extremely low income)
4. LGBT individuals
5. Minorities (non-Caucasian in the tri-county area)
6. Persons age 85 and over ("oldest old")
7. Persons age 65-84 ("elderly")
8. Persons for whom English is not their first language and/or persons with limited English proficiency
9. Persons with disabilities
10. Refugees, immigrants and new citizens
11. Small business owners
12. Students (college)
13. Students (K-12)
14. Veterans
PLACEMAKING: HOUSING MARKET CHANGES

Mary Beth
WHAT IS PLACEMAKING?

“Placemaking” is defined as: . . . the development or redevelopment of a place, within a neighborhood or community, that uniquely creates a functional space with a variety of uses, that is appealing to a wide range of people and that has an identifiable character, or “sense of place.”
PLACEMAKING ELEMENTS

- Mixed-use development
- Pedestrian-orientation
- Opportunities for social activity and engagement
- Arts, cultural and other entertainment opportunities
- Alternative transportation choices
- Public/Green/open spaces
- Diverse housing choices
- Energy Efficiency
Why Placemaking is Important Now

- Our “places” are built upon the Old Economy paradigm, where uses are separated, people are auto-dependent, and infrastructure is outdated and inefficient.
- In the New Economy, the precursors to growth (e.g., talent, entrepreneurship, knowledge industries) are attracted to communities that are enhanced through placemaking.
- Michigan and the Rustbelt states have not shifted quickly enough to this new mindset to have a critical mass of these places to attract growth.
2011 National Association of Realtors

Community Preference Survey
RESULTS FROM 2011 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS STUDY

- Nearly 60% of respondents prefer to live in a neighborhood with a **mix of uses in easy walking** distance, while 40% prefer housing-only neighborhoods, where they have to drive to other amenities.

- High priorities in choosing where to live include privacy, **commute time**, high quality public schools, and **sidewalks/places to walk**.

- Respondents placed a greater priority on having **sidewalks and places to walk** (77%) than on being within walking distance of amenities (66%).
RESULTS FROM 2011 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS STUDY

- Eighty-eight percent of people said that the neighborhood where a house is located is a bigger consideration than the size of the house.

- Being within an easy walk of a grocery store was important to 75% of respondents. Other important places included pharmacy, hospital, restaurants and cultural resources.

- Americans see improving existing communities (57%) and building new developments within existing communities (32%) as much higher priorities to building new developments in the countryside (7%).
MSU-LPI Rebuilding Prosperous Places Study

Property Impact Assessment
Stakeholder Survey
Community Preference Surveys

Please note: Results from the community preference surveys are preliminary and should not be cited. Final results will be issued in early 2013.
PROPERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- Assessment of six Michigan communities and five Midwest communities to determine the economic value of property and neighborhood characteristics, as measured by home prices.
- Preliminary results show that certain features (like being within walking distance to schools, parks, restaurants, arts & cultural venues) are associated with higher property prices.
- This information can help realtors and developers to better understand what people value in their homes and neighborhoods. It can also help local and regional entities to plan for community and economic development that coincides with changing trends in the Built Environment.
**Stakeholder Survey**

- Surveyed financial institutions, local government officials and developers in Michigan (stakeholders involved in built environment decisions).
- A majority of respondents agree that placemaking is closely related to its economic well-being.
- Barriers include a general lack of financing for progressive developments that are viewed as “risky,” more expensive upfront, or outside of the traditional real estate investment categories.
- Better availability of information about the benefits of new strategies for the Built Environment, and checklists or how-to toolkits, would be conducive to progress in Michigan communities.
**Views on Placemaking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase economic activity.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve opportunities for jobs.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of life.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively affect home prices.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the sense of community belonging.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract new people to our community.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 69-76% of respondents agree that placemaking has positive economic impacts; around 20% responded neutrally on this point, while only a small percentage (around 3%) appeared to be unsure.
Please indicate how much the following statements influenced your decision to purchase your home:

- I am close to my job.
- I am able to walk/bike to many nearby places...
- I am able to do a majority of my shopping..
- The neighborhood is safe.
- Great neighbors live in the neighborhood.
- I have good access to fresh and healthy foods.
- There is a strong sense of community.
- There are many employment opportunities...
- The home is energy efficient.
- I have great access to public transportation.
- Homes in my neighborhood are affordable.
- Commuting time to job or school is short.

$n=1460$
Generally speaking, how many minutes are you willing to walk to reach a destination? (such as a restaurant, store, park, or other places you might frequently visit)

- 1-5 minutes: 6.4%
- 6-10 minutes: 20.3%
- 11-15 minutes: 29.7%
- 16-20 minutes: 24.0%
- 21-25 minutes: 6.5%
- 26-30 minutes: 7.6%
- 30 minutes or longer: 5.4%

All respondents
What are some of the places that people want in their neighborhoods (within walking distance)?
WHAT TYPE OF GROCERY SHOPPING DO YOU WANT?

- Big Box Store
- Neighborhood Grocery Store
- Convenience Store
- Specialty Market
- Farmers’ Market

Options:
- Yes
- No
Why or Why Not?

- I don’t like the traffic associated with big box stores.
- I like big box stores because they are one-stop.
- I prefer a more rural environment; I can travel to shop.
- I prefer smaller, owner-operated shops.
- I like to walk to my neighborhood grocery store.
- I view convenience stores as being unsafe.
What Type of Retail Shopping Do You Want?

 Interior Mall  Strip Mall/Plaza  Outlet Mall  Lifestyle Center  Independent Local Merchants

Yes  No

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70%
WHY OR WHY NOT?

- Being too close to the mall creates temptation for over-spending.
- Too much traffic associated with big malls.
- Too much vacancy associated with strip malls.
- I like strip malls with unique shops.
- Outlet malls are an eye sore.
- Lifestyle centers are expensive and snobby.
- Local merchant shops promote local businesses.
What Type of Restaurants Do You Want?

- Fast Food Restaurant with Drive Thru
- Suburban Sit-down Restaurant
- Sit-down Restaurant in a Strip Mall/Plaza/Mall
- Coffee Shop
- Neighborhood Sandwich Shop
- Downtown Sit-down Restaurant

[Bar chart showing preferences for different types of restaurants with percentages for 'Yes' and 'No']
Why or Why Not?

- I like the *convenience* of fast food.
- I don’t like the traffic associated with fast food.
- I don’t like restaurants in malls.
- It would be nice to be able to *walk* to a coffee shop.
- Downtown sandwich shops are *good for downtown businesses*.
- I don’t go downtown to eat.
What Type of Beverage Establishment Do You Want?

- Bar in Isolated Building
- Bar in Strip Mall/Plaza/Mall
- Downtown or Neighborhood Casual Bar
- Downtown Upscale Bar
- Downtown Nightclub with Live Music

Percentages of Yes and No responses for each option are shown in the bar chart.
Why or Why Not?

- Bars in isolated buildings use too much land.
- Isolated bars increase chances of DUI.
- Bars are not right for family neighborhoods in general; but suitable for community at large.
- Downtown/neighborhood bars are good meeting/social spaces.
- Bars are not right for newer subdivisions, but okay for older (1910-1950) neighborhoods.
- We don’t want strip clubs in our neighborhood.
What Type of Park Do You Want?

- **Suburban Park with Specific Use**: 90%
- **Suburban Park with Multiple Uses**: 80%
- **Urban Park with Specific Use**: 60%
- **Urban Park with Multiple Uses**: 50%
- **Urban Pocket Park**: 40%

[Bar chart with percentages and options for Yes and No]
Why or Why Not?

- I like the opportunity for exercise and relaxation with a single-use suburban park.
- There is no money for upkeep of suburban parks.
- We don’t need parks in the suburbs—we have backyards for open space.
- Urban parks create too much traffic.
- It would be nice to have an urban park for more events.
- Concerned about crime in urban parks.
Do You Want Arts and Culture?

![Bar chart showing the popularity of various cultural activities such as libraries, movie cinemas, performing arts centers/theaters, museums, art museums/galleries, and art fairs/festivals. The chart indicates the percentage of respondents who answered 'Yes' (orange) and 'No' (blue) to each activity.]
Why or Why Not?

- Our neighborhood is **too small** to support a library, but there is one in the community.
- It would be nice to have a movie cinema close by for **affordable** entertainment.
- Performing arts are too expensive to attend and/or maintain facility.
- Museums are **appropriate** for big cities, not for suburban/small town areas.
- Small art galleries **support local artists**.
What Type of Neighborhood Do You Like Best?

- Rural Area with Open Space
- Suburban Neighborhood with Large Lots
- Neighborhood with Small to Medium-Sized Lots
- Downtown Townhomes with Small Lots
- Mixed Use Building with Residential Above
- High Rise Building

[Bar chart showing preferences for different types of neighborhoods with percentages for Yes and No]
Why or Why Not?

- I like rural areas for the open space.
- I prefer areas that are **supported with water**.
- I grew up in the city and **want more room**.
- Suburban neighborhoods have **sense of community**.
- Smaller lots **bring down home values**.
- I like having everything **centrally located**.
- Crowding fosters **crime**.
- There are **too many rules** with condos.
- **Zoning** laws don’t allow for **mixed use housing**.
Respondents by Transect: Where Do You Currently Live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transect</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2: Rural</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3: Suburban</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4: General Urban</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5: Urban Center/Small Town</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6: Urban Core</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Non-whites appear more likely than whites to live in urban areas.
TRANSECT: IMMIGRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Transect</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Immigrant families appear to be more likely than non-immigrant families to live in more urban and suburban areas (as opposed to rural areas).
• Young people appear more likely to live in urban areas than their elders.
What is the range of your annual household income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$24,999</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$49,999</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $100,000</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Roughly 48% below 2012 low-income level ($46,100 for 4-person family).
Lower income families appear more likely to live in urban areas than the middle class and wealthy.
# Race by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Poverty</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Decent</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those in blue represent higher than average 2011 poverty and low-income rates (24% for poverty and 48% for low-income).
# My Neighborhood is Ethnically Diverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Decent</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Whites seem less likely than Black/African Americans, Asians and Latinos to indicate that their neighborhood is ethnically diverse.
- “Other” includes: Bi-racial, Hispanic, Caribbean, Jewish, Lebanese, etc.
- Hispanic row is from a separate question, since other rows more closely represent “race,” rather than “ethnicity.”
If you were able to move out of your current home, would you?

- Yes: 44%
- No: 26%
- Not sure: 20%
**If you were to move, what do you see as the main barriers to moving for you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can’t sell my house.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe more on my mortgage than the house is worth.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving costs are too high (e.g. closing costs, moving van, etc.).</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (or my spouse) can’t find a job elsewhere.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t get a loan.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t afford a house where I want to live.</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of transportation options elsewhere.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons (divorce, family, health, etc.).</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to Moving
Selected Open-Ended Answers

- I have a reverse mortgage.
- **Rents** elsewhere are higher (rent control).
- I’m disabled and need the **accessibility**.
- I’m waiting to retire.
- Not all places allow pets.
- I’m unemployed.
- I can’t **afford** it (down payment/security deposit).
- I like where I live and don’t want to move.
WHAT DOES ALL OF THIS MEAN?

- **Growing population segments**, like immigrants, non-whites and low-income families, appear to be more likely to live in urban environments, where there is, ideally, greater connectivity, mixed use and accessibility.

- Young “creative class” individuals also appear to be drawn to these areas.

- To attract and retain these segments of the population, we need to **improve their quality of life in urban environments**, especially.

- **Placemaking can** enhance walkability, transit access, connectivity, arts and culture, recreation, entertainment, services, etc.
PROS & CONS TO PLACEMAKING

- Under traditional development projects, the majority of the benefit is concentrated towards one stakeholder; with placemaking, the **benefits are often shared** (Leinberger and Kozloff, 2003).
- Placemaking creates a *sense of place* for community members, which **encourages community engagement and participation** in the development process (Wyckoff, 2010).
- Some communities harbor **NIMBY (Not in My Back Yard)** mentality toward placemaking and want to maintain traditional zoning structures that encourage socio-economic segregation and separation of housing and retail.
WORKFORCE HOUSING CONSIDERATIONS

- Placemaking encourages housing provision in densely populated urban centers in order to not only increase social equity, but secure access to resources, a viable workforce and reduce environmental degradation (Arigoni, 2001; Crowe, 2004).

- Some researchers argue that smart growth principles (which are embedded in placemaking) inevitably increase housing prices and reduce affordability (Demographia, 2008).

- Certain methods can be used to maintain housing affordability, like inclusionary zoning (Haughey, 2002) and subsidies for developers and/ or consumers (Arigoni, 2001).
PLACEMAKING PERSPECTIVES & BARRIERS

- Some placemaking elements—including **proximity to certain types of retail and green space**—are associated with higher home prices in at least three Michigan communities.

- A majority of respondents from the placemaking stakeholder groups seem to **recognize the importance of placemaking for economic development**.

- Barriers to placemaking—such as **restrictive zoning, capital access and perceptions about density**—appear to still exist in Michigan communities.

- People still have **mixed feelings** about leaving their cars and living a more walkable lifestyle.
POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- Regional visioning and community values should be taken into consideration in placemaking projects for success, engaging all populations.
- State and regional programs that educate stakeholders about placemaking and encourage public-private partnerships are needed in Michigan communities.
- State and regional programs that “de-risk” placemaking for developers and financers are more likely to get off the ground.
INCLUSIVE NEIGHBORHOODS

Both
LOCAL EXAMPLES

- The Villages: National initiative designed to foster aging in place, neighborhood stability and diversity in a community.
- Co-Housing: National effort to create a commune style living environment with homeownership, shared responsibilities and flexibility about lifestyles.
- Mixed-Use Development: Efforts to combine retail and commercial various living options (e.g., rented and owned apartments).
Kingsbury Place, Walker, MI

Affordable, Accessible Homes
Agnes Street Apartments, Detroit, MI

Affordable, Mixed-Use and Environmentally Sustainable
Genesee County Land Bank

Reuse of Blighted Property for Affordable Housing
Heron Woods, Grand Rapids, MI

Affordable, Independent Living
STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGING EVERYONE IN PLANNING

Julie
LESSONS LEARNED

- Narrative engagement techniques
- Culturally competent staff/volunteers managing project
- Trusted advisors are different from community leaders
- Avoid the “well meaning” but ill-informed philanthropists
- The RDC story
Mid-Michigan Community Reinvestment Fund

Julie
COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT FUND

- The Mid-Michigan Program for Greater Sustainability is a regional initiative designed to expand and improve the planning process for housing, transportation, green infrastructure, energy efficiency, environmental issues, economic development, education and more.

- The Community Reinvestment Fund was established to ensure that traditionally underserved and marginalized populations have the opportunity to get involved in the planning process at all levels of government.

- https://sites.google.com/site/mmpgscommunityreinvestmentfund/
ROUND 1

The details:
- Launched August 31, 2012
- 30-day application window
- Online/email only
- 1 ½ page application form
- Partnership with CADL for internet/computer access

The results:
- 23 applications
- 15 rejected on technical issue
- 1 rejected for not meeting the criteria
- 7 grants funded
THE GRANTEES: ROUND I

- Allen Neighborhood Center: Urbandale Plans Itself
- Capital Area Community Services: Parents As Leaders
- Fenner Nature Center: Regional Parks Planning
- Old Town Commercial Association: Robert Busby Memorial Park & Community Engagement Project
- Refuge Development Center: Teaching New Americans/Refugees About Planning & Engagement
- South Lansing Community Development Association: Municipal Budgeting 101
- Westside Commercial Association: Community Engagement in Placemaking
SUSTAINABLE, INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES

Mary Beth
Six Livability Principles of Sustainable Communities

1. Provide more transportation choices.
2. Promote equitable, affordable housing.
3. Enhance economic competitiveness.
4. Support existing communities.
5. Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment.
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

America’s Tomorrow:
Equity is the Superior Growth Model

[Images of various scenes and logos]

PolicyLink

Lifting Up What Works

Pere
USC Program for Environmental & Regional Equity
NO REGIONAL PROSPERITY WITHOUT EQUITY

- An analysis of 341 U.S. metros from 1990-2000 found that inequity (as measured by poverty and white/black segregation) had a negative effect on per capita income.

- Federal Reserve of Cleveland found that some unusual suspects predict failure of regional prosperity: income inequality, racial exclusion, and concentration of poverty.

- “Equity and inclusion are no longer luxuries, but imperatives for economic and social sustainability.”

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities. April 2012.
POLICIES FOR METROPOLITAN EQUITY

WORKFORCE STRATEGIES

- Need to promote clusters that have career ladders, integrating this with neighborhood-based delivery systems and learn from the local model of community benefits agreements to include local hiring and other targets in federal spending.

TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES

- A continuing need to reverse the bias toward highway spending to public transit, from infrastructure to operations. Transit-oriented development can offer real possibilities for neighborhood revitalization.

HOUSING STRATEGIES

- Provide real incentives for inclusionary zoning and acknowledge that the recovery of urban areas requires protection against displacement and gentrification.

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities. April 2012.
## Policies for Metropolitan Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset Building</strong></td>
<td>Need to consider the financial deserts that result from lack of bank services. “Bank On” programs help banks see the customer base with new data, help customers see the banks with financial literacy, and create systems of accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Communities</strong></td>
<td>Need to consider the lack of fresh food as well as environmental disparities in both exposures and opportunities. The Fresh Food Financing Initiative pioneered by The Reinvestment Fund and others is a start; park and other access is key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Improvement</strong></td>
<td>The toughest nut to crack and yet absolutely essential to retention of families in cities. There may be many different strategies but metropolitan leaders cannot stand apart from this and there are significant federal opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dr. Manuel Pastor, University of Southern California. *Looking Forward: Demographic Trends and New Opportunities for Livable Communities.* April 2012.
CONCLUSIONS

- **Equity** among different population segments (race/ethnicity, age, income) is important for creating prosperous, sustainable communities.

- **Engaging** underserved and marginalized populations in planning conversations about the future of our places is critical to achieving equity.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

To Contact Mary Beth Graebert:
lakemary@msu.edu
517-432-8800 ext. 117

To Contact Julie Powers:
jpowers155@gmail.com
517-292-3078
CITATIONS (IF NEEDED/REQUESTED)