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Introduction

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

Data source: HUD and Census Bureau, analysis by J. Ganning
Introduction

Does the context of urban decline challenge job accessibility for central city residents?

If so, does this seem to happen because of the movement of jobs away from the core without regional growth?
Background

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%

Table A1: Shrinking cities as identified by Gunning and Tighe (2016).

| Gadsden, AL | Covington, KY<sup>a</sup> | Rome, NY | Lima, OH |
| Birmingham, AL | Monroe, LA | Schenectady, NY | Springfield, OH |
| Pine Bluff, AR | New Orleans, LA | Utica, NY | Dayton, OH |
| Inglewood, CA<sup>b</sup> | Holyoke, MA<sup>b</sup> | Troy, NY | Cincinnati, OH |
| Hartford, CT | Towsontown, MD | Albany, NY | Scranton, PA |
| Bridgeport, CT | Baltimore, MD | Syracuse, NY | Erie, PA |
| Macon, GA | Dandall, MD<sup>c</sup> | Rochester, NY | Wilkes-Barre, PA |
| Chicago, IL | Saginaw, MI | Niagara Falls, NY | Reading, PA |
| Berwyn, IL<sup>d</sup> | Flint, MI | Buffalo, NY | Philadelphia, PA |
| Cicero, IL<sup>e</sup> | Pontiac, MI | Binghamton, NY | Harrisburg, PA |
| Rock Island, IL | Detroit, MI | Euclid, OH<sup>f</sup> | Altoona, PA |
| Decatur, IL | Dearborn, MI | Cleveland Heights, OH<sup>g</sup> | York, PA |
| East St. Louis, IL<sup>h</sup> | Dearborn Heights, MI<sup>i</sup> | Cleveland, OH | Pittsburgh, PA |
| South Bend, IN | Lincoln Park, MI<sup>j</sup> | Lakewood, OH<sup>k</sup> | Chester, PA<sup>l</sup> |
| Gary, IN | Saint Louis, MO | Warren, OH | Providence, RI |
| Hammond, IN<sup>a</sup> | Paterson, NJ<sup>l</sup> | Toledo, OH | Galveston, TX<sup>a</sup> |
| Anderson, IN | East Orange, NJ<sup>h</sup> | Youngstown, OH | Norfolk, VA |
| Terre Haute, IN | Newark, NJ | Akron, OH | Milwaukee, WI |
| Evansville, IN | Trenton, NJ | Cantor, OH | Charleston, WV |
| Kansas City, KS | Camden, NJ | Mansfield, OH | Huntington, WV |

<sup>a</sup>Denotes cities not included in analysis.
Research Limitations

#1: We Know Too Little About Job Accessibility Via Transit

- Difficulty of estimation
- Limitations of published, public databases like the EPA’s Smart Location Database
We do not know who takes transit in any way that enables cross-sectional or national-scale research.

- In Ohio, about 95% of all Census tracts have low reliability data for Journey to Work via transit.
- In other words, we can only be confident of the percentage of workers commuting via transit in ~5% of all Ohio Census tracts.
#2: We Know Too Little About the Costs of Transportation

Just because a job exists within 45 minutes doesn’t mean everyone can afford to get to it.

Yet, there is not enough publicly-accessible data to estimate Vehicle Miles Traveled in any way that enables cross-sectional, national-scale research.
Research Approach: Question 1

Does the context of urban decline challenge job accessibility for central city residents?

349 MSAs

686 Principal Cities

54,130 block groups*
Regression: Modeling Job Accessibility

- **Sample**: Block groups within the Principal Cities of MSAs
- **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)
Results: The Context of Decline Lowers Job Accessibility by 6.9%, Other Things Constant
Results: Effects of Low Wages

Note that the effect of living in a block group with a higher proportion of low wage workers also shows a large and significant impact on job accessibility.
Research Approach: Question 2

Does urban decline challenge job accessibility because of the movement of jobs away from the core *without* regional growth?

| 182,021 block groups | Assigned to nearest Principal City | Principal City identified as shrinking or growing | Job accessibility calculated for 2005, 2010, and 2015 |
Research Approach: Question 2

\[ ACC_i = JOBS_{i, DIST=0} + \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{JOBS}{DIST/1000} \]

where:
- ACC = Job accessibility,
- \( i \) = Principal City,
- \( t \) = year (2005, 2010, or 2015),
- \( j \) = block group for which \( i \) is the closest Principal City,
- \( JOBS \) = total jobs within the block group, by place of work,
- \( DIST \) = Distance, in meters
## Results

Table 3 Median job accessibility and median total jobs from Cities’ Central Point, 2005, 2010, and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job accessibility</th>
<th>Total jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrinking Principal Cities</td>
<td>122,391</td>
<td>108,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Shrinking Principal Cities</td>
<td>81,620</td>
<td>82,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Processes experienced by shrinking cities are not merely the mirror images of those manifested in growing cities”
- George Galster, 2017
Thank you!
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