

# **Capturing Sprawl/ Controlling Sprawl**

## **Issues and Strategies for Managing the Tri-County Region's Future Growth**

**Prepared for the  
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission  
Peoria County Commission  
Peoria, IL  
September 25, 2000**

**by  
David Rusk  
4100 Cathedral Avenue, NW #610  
Washington, DC 20016-3584  
(202) 364-2455 (phone)  
(202) 364-6936 (FAX)  
Drusk@Patriot.net**

**Two major factors have defined  
urban growth patterns  
in America's metro areas:  
SPRAWL and RACE.**

**Sprawl and race interact.  
They are linked most clearly  
thru concentration of poverty  
that drives middle-class families  
out of cities and older suburbs  
into newer suburbs.**

## **URBAN SPRAWL**

**From 1950-90  
the Peoria “urbanized area” had  
modest population growth  
*but*  
high rate of land development.**

**Urbanized population  
grew  
57%  
while  
urbanized land  
expanded  
289%.**

**Urban sprawl  
consumed land  
OVER FIVE TIMES  
faster than  
the growth of  
urbanized population.**

# **CAPTURING SPRAWL: City of Peoria's Record (1)**

**From 1950 to 1990  
region's urbanized land area  
grew from 33.2 sq. mi. to 129.1 sq. mi.**

**Through annexation  
City of Peoria  
grew from 12.9 sq. mi. to 40.9 sq. mi.**

**It "captured" 29% of newly  
urbanized land.**

**However, city's population grew only 1.4%:**

- 1. lower density of population in new areas;**
- 2. smaller household size;**
- 3. slow depopulation of older, high poverty neighborhoods**

# CAPTURING SPRAWL: City of Peoria's Record (2)

## RELATIVE SHARES OF ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE

<u>Year</u>	<u>Tazewell County</u>	<u>Woodford County</u>	<u>Peoria County</u>	<u>Peoria City</u>
<b>1966</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>1986</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>1991</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>1991</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>1999</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>34%</b>

# **CAPTURING SPRAWL: MEASURING METRO PEORIA AGAINST ITS PEERS**

**Who was like Peoria 50 years ago?**

- 1. Median family income: \$3,640 (+/- 2%)**
- 2. Metro population: 272,000 (+/- 15%)**
- 3. Minority population: 2.4% (less than 5%)**
- 4. Manufacturing jobs: 37% (25% to 56%)**

# **Peoria's Peers**

**WICHITA KS  
FORT WAYNE IN  
DAVENPORT IA (QUAD CITIES)  
EVANSVILLE IN**

**PEORIA IL**

**GRAND RAPIDS MI  
ERIE PA  
CANTON OH  
LANCASTER PA  
FLINT MI  
READING PA  
YORK PA  
SAGINAW MI  
UTICA NY**

# RACE

**Housing patterns  
remain highly segregated  
in Tri-County area.**

**Racial Segregation Index  
(100 = total segregation),**

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1990</u>
<b>Housing</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>High Schools</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>75</b>

**But while barriers based on race  
have been slowly coming down,  
barriers based on income  
have steadily been getting higher.**

**Poverty Segregation Index**  
**(100 = total segregation)**

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1990</u>
<b>Poor</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>37</b>

**JIM CROW *BY INCOME***  
**IS SLOWLY REPLACING**  
**JIM CROW *BY RACE.***

### Question:

**Why is the economic segregation index lower than the racial segregation indexes?**

### PERCENTAGE OF POOR BY RACE LIVING IN POOR NEIGHBORHOODS IN TRI-COUNTY AREA IN 1990

	<b>Total Number of Poor</b>	<b>20%+ Poverty Tracts</b>	<b>40%+ Poverty Tracts</b>
<b>White</b>	<b>27,500</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Black</b>	<b>10,600</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>43%</b>

### Answer:

**Most poor white people are not segregated, but live in middle-class communities.**

**Only poor blacks minorities are isolated in poverty-impacted ghettos and barrios.**

**THREE OUT OF FOUR  
POOR WHITES  
LIVE IN  
MIDDLE-CLASS  
NEIGHBORHOODS.**

**FOUR OUT OF FIVE  
POOR BLACKS  
LIVE IN  
POVERTY-IMPACTED  
NEIGHBORHOODS.**

# What about 1990s?

## Population (1990-97)

<b>Tazewell County</b>	<b>+3.9%</b>
<b>Woodford County</b>	<b>+6.5%</b>
<b>Peoria County</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>
<b>---Peoria City</b>	<b>-1.1%</b>

## Property Tax Base Share (1991-2000):

<b>Tazewell County</b>	<b>+0.3%</b>
<b>Woodford County</b>	<b>+1.2%</b>
<b>Peoria County</b>	<b>-1.5%</b>
<b>---Peoria City</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>

## Segregation Indices

	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>
<b>High schools (black)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Elementary schools (poor)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>

## **Part II:**

**What are the elements**

**of a strong**

**“Outside Game”**

**to match the**

**“Inside Game”?**

**Three key regional issues:**  
(inverse order of importance)

**1. fiscal disparities**

**Twin Cities Fiscal Disparities Plan**

**2. urban sprawl**  
(greater peripheral sprawl=  
greater core abandonment)

**Portland Metro growth management**

**3. mixed income housing**

**Montgomery County, Maryland**  
**“Inclusionary Zoning” Laws**

## **Twin Cities Fiscal Disparities Plan**

- 1. Mandated by Minnesota Legislature in 1971; effective in 1975**
- 2. Covers 187 cities, villages, and townships in 7 counties plus more than 100 schools districts, special districts, etc.**
- 3. Sets 1971 property tax valuation as base.**  
  
**3. Requires that 40% of *increase* in commercial and industrial property tax valuation goes into regional pool (i.e. 60% remains with local jurisdiction)**
- 4. Pool redistributed annually by formula based on population and tax capacity**

## **Results by 1998:**

- 1. Pool has grown to \$410 million (30% of region's total commercial/industrial property tax collections.**
- 2. 137 net recipients (Minneapolis, St. Paul, blue collar suburbs, rural townships).**
- 3. 49 net contributors (suburban beltway boomers like Bloomington, Eden Prairie).**
- 4. adaptable to changing dynamics — e.g. Minneapolis moved from net recipient (1971) to net contributor (1991) to net recipient again (1995) due to boom and bust of downtown office market**
- 5. 4:1 ratio between richest and poorest community; without pool, 17:1 ratio.**

## **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:  
+14% population, +11% land**

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

# **NEW JERSEY STATE PLAN AND FAIR HOUSING ACT OF 1985**

## **“The Mirage of Reform”**

### **1. State Plan**

- **Not legally binding on local governments**
  - **Not legally binding on state agencies**
- **Based on voluntary “cross acceptance”**

### **2. Fair Housing Act**

- **Only 24,000 units built or renovated in 15 years (including “under construction”)**
  - **6,400 units built in high-poverty cities thru Regional Contribution Agreements that reinforce racial/economic segregation**

**only 7% of suburban homes  
to city residents**

**Montgomery County, MD:  
Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit policy  
(i.e. “inclusionary zoning”)**

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

**Requires any larger housing development  
(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**

**To offset profit loss from 15% below-market  
sales or rentals, county provides up to 22%  
“density bonus.”  
Results (by 1999)**

**11,000 MPDU housing units  
built by private developers  
(2/3 for-sale, 1/3 rentals)**

**1,500 bought by county's  
Housing Opportunities Commission  
(scattered in 220 different neighborhoods)**

**Assisted housing = 3.4% of total housing  
1.9% to 6.1% in 14 of 18 districts**

**MPDU sales price=\$80,000 (1992-97)  
Non-MPDU sales price=\$250,000 (today)**

**No significant social problems in mixed-  
income communities**

**No negative impact whatsoever on  
Resale prices of market rate homes**

**SUMMARY**  
**MPDU-type policy (1970-96)**  
**for Northern New Jersey**

**About 680,000 housing units were built in the 25 year period.**

**Assuming only half were in new developments of sufficient size to apply inclusionary requirement, an MPDU policy would have provided**

**—about 46,000 “workforce” homes for modest income public employees and service sector workers; and**

**—about 23,000 highly scattered, homes for “welfare-to-workforce” families.**

**Those 23,000 alternative homes would have allowed lowering the poverty rate substantially in Northern New Jersey’s cities and stabilizing its older suburbs.**

## **Dilemma:**

**New Jersey's 567 cities and towns,  
in theory,  
have authority to act on  
1) regional growth management,  
2) regional revenue sharing, and  
3) regional fair share housing.**

**They won't.**

**Local governments almost never  
negotiate voluntary compacts  
on such tough issues  
in New Jersey  
or anywhere else.**

**WHERE MAJOR REFORMS  
HAVE OCCURRED,  
STATE LEGISLATURES  
(OR STATE COURTS)  
MANDATED CHANGE.**

**Central issue is *not* legal  
but political.**

**How can a sufficiently broad-based  
coalition of interests be organized  
to secure from**

**New Jersey legislature**

**“no-nonsense” reform laws addressing**

- **urban sprawl,  
(mandatory growth management law)**

- **fiscal disparities,  
(mandatory, regional revenue sharing)**

**and growing concentration of poverty  
(mandatory fair share housing law).**

## **Components of successful coalitions**

**Faith-based movements (“People Power”)**

**Labor unions (“People Power”)**

**Declining, inner suburb elected officials  
(represent swing constituencies)**

**Affordable housing advocates**

**Anti-sprawl activists (e.g. NJ Future)**

**Environmental groups**

**Public transportation advocates**

**Agricultural groups (e.g. Farm Bureau)**

**Central city officials**

**Chambers of commerce**

**“new urbanist” architects/planners**