

# **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](mailto: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**

140359A

**TABLE 1: POPULATION GROWTH**

	<b>New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Athens (consolidation) in 1993</b>
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**

140359A

**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**

140359A

**TABLE 3: RACIAL EQUITY**

	<b>New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Athens (consolidation) in 1993</b>
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**

140359A

**TABLE 4: DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS**

	<b>New Gainesville (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Tallahassee (annexations) by 1990</b>	<b>New Athens (consolidation) in 1993</b>
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	Pet	Pet	Change in Pet	
		Tract	Black	Black	Black	Black
Jurisdiction	Neighborhood	Number	Population	Population	Population	Population
		in 1970	in 1970	in 1990	in 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%	



## **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.**