

HEALTHY CITY, HEALTHY REGION

Urban sprawl, elasticity, and racial opportunity

**A presentation to
Gainesville-Alachua County
Community Leadership
October 30, 1997**

by
David Rusk
4100 Cathedral Avenue, NW #610
Washington, DC 20016-3584
(202) 364-2455 (phone)
(202) 364-6936 (fax)
Email Drusk@PatriotNet.com

**Two forces have shaped
USA's urban growth patterns**

—

SPRAWL

and

RACE.

**Cities have two defenses
against urban sprawl**

**1. either capture urban sprawl
through annexation or consolidation
("elasticity")**

**2. or control sprawl through
regional growth management**

AMERICA'S BEST URBAN POLICY

	Old Gainesville no annexation since 1950	New Gainesville (annexations) as of 1990
Municipal territory (sq. mi.)	6 sq mi	35 sq mi
Population in 1950	26,861	26,861
Population in 1990	21,177	84,770
Population change	-5,684	57,909
Percentage population change	-21%	216%
Capture/Contribute Ratio	-4%	46%
Black population percentage	24%	21%
Housing segregation index	50 (?)	38
School segregation index	10 (?)	10
Family poverty pct	23%	16%
Fair Share of Poverty Index	160%	109%
Average household income	\$21,335	\$29,844
Pct metro household income	69%	97%
Total household income	\$180 million	\$954 million
Average Home Value	\$64,000	\$74,700
Municipal bond rating	Baa1 (est.)	

**A TALE OF THREE CITIES
GAINESVILLE, TALLAHASSEE, AND ATHENS GA 160776B**

TABLE 1: POPULATION GROWTH

	New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990	New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990	New Athens (consolidation) in 1993
Metro population in 1950	68,517	88,047	74,794
Metro population in 1990	204,111	233,598	156,267
Metro population change 1950-90	135,594	145,551	81,473
Pct metro population change	198%	165%	109%
Municipal area in 1950	5.5 sq mi	6.3 sq mi	9.5 sq mi
Municipal area in 1990	34.9 sq mi	63.3 sq mi	120.8 sq mi
Pct growth in area 1950-90	535%	905%	1172%
City population in 1950	26,861	27,237	28,180
City population in 1990	84,770	124,773	87,594
City population change 1950-90	57,909	97,536	59,414
Pct metro population change	216%	358%	211%
City capture/contribute percentage	43%	67%	73%

**A TALE OF THREE CITIES
GAINESVILLE, TALLAHASSEE, AND ATHENS GA 160776B**

TABLE 2: ECONOMIC GROWTH

	New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990	New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990	New Athens (consolidation) in 1993
Metro real economic growth 1950-90	199%	214%	231%
Metro real economic growth 1970-90	34%	37%	41%
Metro real economic growth 1980-90	18%	22%	16%
Metro median family income (adj.)	\$33,529	\$38,069	\$35,086
City median family income (adj.)	\$33,992	\$38,388	\$34,740
City income as pct of metro income (1990)	101%	101%	99%
City income as pct of metro income (1950)	126%	148%	132%
Metro family poverty pct in 1990 (adj.)	13.1%	10.7%	10.7%
City family poverty pct in 1990 (adj.)	14.4%	11.0%	12.6%
City fair share of poverty index in 1990	110%	102%	118%
City fair share of poverty index in 1980	101%	123%	na
City fair share of poverty index in 1970	92%	97%	na
Metro - number of poor tracts in 1970	9	8	6
Metro - number of poor tracts in 1990	7	8	8

**A TALE OF THREE CITIES
GAINESVILLE, TALLAHASSEE, AND ATHENS GA 160776B**

TABLE 3: RACIAL EQUITY

	New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990	New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990	New Athens (consolidation) in 1993
Metro black population percentage	19%	30%	19%
City black population percentage	21%	29%	26%
Housing segregation index	38	52	45
High school segregation index	10	50	na
Metro black median family income (adj.)	\$17,322	\$21,959	\$22,384
Metro black family poverty rate (adj.)	33.0%	25.5%	26.1%
Black income as pct of white income	46%	50%	52%
Pct poor white families in poor tracts	25%	10%	8%
Pct poor black families in poor tracts	48%	54%	50%

**A TALE OF THREE CITIES
GAINESVILLE, TALLAHASSEE, AND ATHENS GA 160776B**

TABLE 4: DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

	New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990	New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990	New Athens (consolidation) in 1993
Urbanized population growth (1970-90)	82%	100%	na
Urbanized land growth (1970-90)	110%	197%	na
Land-to-population growth ratio (1970-90)	1.3 to 1	2 to 1	na
Urbanized population per sq. mi. in 1990	2,062	1,752	1,677
Urbanized population growth (1980-90)	22%	31%	17%
Urbanized land growth (1980-90)	18%	29%	7%
Land-to-population growth ratio (1980-90)	0.8 to 1	1 to 1	0.4 to 1
New housing units built (1970-90)	51,256	54,848	36,167
Pct of new units built in city (1970-90)	32%	61%	54%
New households formed (1970-90)	40,143	43,806	51,256
Pct of "excess" housing (1970-90)	28%	41%	na
Real increase in metro home value (1970-90)	39%	40%	na
Real increase in city home value (1970-90)	19%	28%	na

Comprehensive Land Use Planning

Best practices: state of Oregon/ Portland region

**Approach: directly-elected regional
government (Metro) develops overall plan
with citizens, 3 counties, 24 munis;**

**plan must meet state goals;
municipalities must conform but administer
local planning and zoning decisions**

Progress: UGB in effect since 1979

**1980s: urbanized area:
+12% population, +10% land**

**1995-2040: urbanized area:
+50% population,
+8% land (maximum)**

What is Urban Growth Boundary? (Oregon-style)

1. UGB drawn for urban area

**a. must accomodate 20 years
of projected growth**

**1. clear designation of residential, commercial, industrial
land to develop**

2. specific plans for water, sewer, roads, etc

3. speedy, controversy-free, local approvals

**b. “urban growth reserve” areas
designated outside UGB for future study (years 20-50)**

2. Outside UGB,

**a. land reserved for
exclusive farm use
exclusive forest use**

recreation and wilderness lands

b. no zoning for urban development permitted

**c. no water, sewer, urban roads,
and other facilities built**

Race — the Second Factor

**Substantially segregated housing +
high black poverty rates =
high poverty neighborhoods.**

**Hard Reality:
Poor black neighborhoods
almost *never* escape poverty.**

**Why?
Successful black families move out
(as successful white families did earlier).**

**Typical formula for (semi)-successful
neighborhood revitalization**

**Strong job center (downtown, university) +
historic housing/neighborhood
(or new townhouses, condos, etc) =
regentrification**

**“Regentrification” typically results in both racial
change (to predominantly white) and total income
change (squeezing out poor).**

		TABLE A: "INSIDE GAME"			
		POOR BLACK NEIGHBORHOODS			
		DO NOT ESCAPE POVERTY			
		Census	Pct	Pct	Change in Pct.
		Tract	Black	Black	Black
Jurisdiction	Neighborhood	Number	Population	Population	Population
		in 1970	in 1970	in 1990	1970-90
GAINESVILLE	Central Business District	1	30.0%	17.7%	-12.3%
GAINESVILLE	NE/Porters/SW	2	45.7%	37.7%	-8.0%
GAINESVILLE	Duval Heights	6	75.0%	92.5%	17.5%
GAINESVILLE	Lincoln-Hawthorne	7	58.6%	75.6%	17.0%
GAINESVILLE	Southeast	8	0.9%	8.8%	7.9%
GAINESVILLE	University Neighborhood	9	1.1%	12.4%	11.3%
GAINESVILLE		15	5.3%	9.6%	4.3%
Alachua County	High Springs-Alachua	18	36.8%	17.7%	-19.1%
Alachua County	Waldo	19	29.1%	21.4%	-7.7%
Alachua County	Hawthorne	20	32.5%	20.5%	-12.0%
Alachua County	Newberry-Archer	22	30.9%	14.7%	-16.2%

		TABLE B: "INSIDE GAME"				160776B
		POOR BLACK NEIGHBORHOODS				
		DO NOT ESCAPE POVERTY				
		Census	Pct of All	Pct of All	Pct of All	Pct of All
		Tract	Families	Families	Families	Families
Jurisdiction	Neighborhood	Number	in Poverty	in Poverty	in Poverty	in Poverty
		in 1970	in 1970	in 1980	in 1990	1970-90
GAINESVILLE	Central Business District	1	23.0%	21.1%	0.0%	na
GAINESVILLE	NE/Porters/SW	2	34.7%	34.4%	35.1%	0.4%
GAINESVILLE	Duval Heights	6	30.2%	37.6%	45.7%	15.5%
GAINESVILLE	Lincoln-Hawthorne	7	28.0%	23.0%	31.6%	3.6%
GAINESVILLE	Southeast	8	6.7%	18.3%	27.1%	20.4%
GAINESVILLE	University Neighborhood	9	20.9%	35.5%	46.7%	25.8%
GAINESVILLE		15	11.9%	18.1%	22.6%	10.7%
Alachua County	High Springs-Alachua	18	21.2%	14.6%	10.6%	-10.6%
Alachua County	Waldo	19	24.3%	13.1%	15.2%	-9.1%
Alachua County	Hawthorne	20	27.4%	22.5%	15.4%	-12.0%
Alachua County	Newberry-Archer	22	21.0%	10.3%	13.2%	-7.8%

Two anti-poverty “policies”

**For poor whites (largely invisible):
mainstream in middle class neighborhoods
and middle class schools**

**For poor blacks (highly visible):
isolate in poverty neighborhoods
and poverty-impacted schools**

In Gainesville-Alachua County

- 3 out of 4 poor white families live in middle class neighborhoods**
- 1 out of 2 poor black families live in low income neighborhoods**

**In Gainesville-Alachua County
total number of
“poverty neighborhoods”
(i.e. more than 20% poverty)
dropped slightly
because of suburbanization
of poorer rural areas**

—
**nine (9) in 1970
dropped to
six (6) in 1990**

**Of these
six poverty neighborhoods,
in two
the poverty level exceeded 40%
 (“high poverty neighborhoods”)
by 1990.**

**There were no
high poverty neighborhood in 1970.**

**Successful core redevelopment
requires balancing
the “inside game”
with the “outside game.”**

**Playing the “inside game” only
never wins.**

“Inside Game” Components

- 1. strengthen concentration of high quality jobs in core locations (downtown office centers, hospitals, university campuses, etc)**
- 2. stop overloading core neighborhoods with low income housing**
- 3. improve core neighborhood facilities, services, particularly anti-crime and education (magnet schools, charter schools), amenities (special sidewalk treatments, traffic calming, etc)**
- 4. encourage higher end new housing and historic renovation**
- 5. adopt policies to assure “fair share” of low and moderate income households even in strongly regentrifying neighborhoods (e.g. public or non-profit ownership of modest percentage of housing stock)**

“Outside Game” Components

- 1. slow urban sprawl through effective growth management in order to**
 - a. preserve farmland, natural areas, and**
 - b. help redirect private investment back into core neighborhoods.**

some techniques:

- a. tighter or phased USA**
 - b. true farmland protection
(end rural sprawl)**
 - c. full cost financing of
infrastructure and services**
 - d. transferable development rights**
- 2. require “fair share” of
low- and moderate-income housing
in all new construction
throughout Urban Services Area**

Montgomery County, MD has the nation's most comprehensive, anti-poverty housing strategy.

The key has been Moderately-Priced Dwelling Unit policy (MPDU).

Adopted as county ordinance in 1973 (governs 88% of county area)

Requires any housing development of 50+ units (homes, townhouses, apartments) to be

- 85% market rate**
- 10% “affordable” (i.e. sold or rented to persons at maximum 65% of median income)**
- 5% purchased by county’s public housing authority.**

Builders get up to 22% density bonus.

**Results
after 23 years:**

1. 10,000 units of moderate income homes, townhouses, and apartments in high-cost market.

2. County housing authority owns over 1,100 scattered site individual units for “deep-subsidy” families.

a. so scattered that housing authority pays annual dues to over 150 homeowner associations in Montgomery County.

b. 2-6% assisted housing in 16 of 18 planning areas.

3. Resale values appreciated more in MPDU-developments (13%/yr) than in non-MPDU developments (10%/yr.)

**What if
MPDU policy
had been in effect
in Gainesville-Alachua County
from 1970-90?**

**From 1970-90 there were
51,256 housing units built
in Gainesville-Alachua County.**

**An MPDU-type policy
would have yielded**

- a. about 2,500 “affordable” units,
and**
- b. about 1,250 “deep-subsidy” units
primarily in
new neighborhoods.**

Advice
Gainesville's
best strategy for
poverty neighborhoods
and their residents
is to emphasize
housing strategies
to provide more scattered-site
housing choices
for poor black families
in non-poor
neighborhoods
and redevelop
poverty neighborhoods
as mixed-income
communities.