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Introduction: Inconvenient Truth #1

Change in Households vs New Housing Units, 1990-2015, Cleveland Metro

Data source: HUD and Census Bureau, analysis by J. Ganning
The Cleveland Urbanized Area, from 2010-2018, built ~16,000 more housing units than there were new households to fill them.
Background: Inconvenient Truth #2

Non-shrinking Principal Cities of MSAs: 17.6% African American Percent of MSA: 12.7%

Shrinking Principal Cities of MSAs: 41.6%. Percent of MSA: 15.8%
Research Questions
1. Does the context of urban decline challenge job accessibility for central city residents?

2. If so, is it due to suburbanization without growth?

3. If job accessibility is declining, what’s happening to housing?
Does the context of urban decline challenge job accessibility for central city residents?

- **EPA’s Smart Location Database**: Jobs available within 45 minutes by car from any given block group.

**Modeled as a function of:**
- Total employment in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)
- % of the block group’s population that is not White Alone (Census data)
- % of workers in the block who are low wage (less than $1250/month)
- Shrinking City status: yes/no (as identified by Ganning & Tighe, 2018)
Does the context of urban decline challenge job accessibility for central city residents?

Inconvenient Truth #3: The Context of Decline Lowers Job Accessibility by 6.9%, Other Things Constant
Does this happen because of jobs move away from the core *without* regional growth?

- 182,021 block groups
- Assigned to nearest Principal City
- Principal City identified as shrinking or growing
Inconvenient Truth #4: This happens because of suburbanization without growth

City Change, Regional Change

- % Change Job Accessibility
- % Change Regional Employment

- Shrinking Cities
- Non-Shrinking Cities
2010-2015: An Even Clearer Trend

Changes in Job Accessibility, Regional Employment

- Shrinking Cities
- Non-Shrinking Cities

% Job Accessibility Change
% Regional Job Change
Inconvenient Truth 5: Musical Chairs

HYPOTHETICAL 10% OVER-BUILDING RATE

IMPACT OF CLEVELAND’S ACTUAL OVER-BUILDING RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in Long-Term Vacancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrinking Cities</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Shrinking Cities</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>202 per year $2M/year intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Shrinking Cities
Because Shrinking Cities uniquely have a Vacancy Multiplier, which means existing vacancies lead to more vacancies.

This does not happen in non-Shrinking Cities.
Conclusion

1. We massively over-build housing in the Cleveland region

2. That process appears to be racialized

3. Context of decline worsens job accessibility, other things constant

4. This appears to be caused by ongoing suburbanization without growth

5. Over-building also causes massive vacancy in the central city

6. Shrinking Cities experience a “Vacancy Multiplier” other cities don’t
Thank you!
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