

# Sustainable or Inclusive: The Tension Between HUD's Fair Housing and Sustainable Communities Programs

Sustainability Conference of American Legal Educators | May 8, 2015 Ingrid Gould Ellen, Jack Lienke, and Justin Steil





# The Partnership for Sustainable Communities





- Partnership among:
  - HUD
  - DOT
  - EPA
- Intended to:
  - Promote affordable housing;
  - Increase transportation options;
  - Protect the environment.

# The Partnership for Sustainable Communities

*Examples of Competitive Grant and Technical Assistance Programs Developed and Reviewed Jointly by the Partnership Agencies* 

Program	Year	Lead Agency	Number of Applicants	Total Funding Requested	Number Selected	Total Funding Issued
TIGER Capital Grants	2009-2013	DOT	4,605	\$112.6 billion	270	\$3.5 billion
FTA <sup>8</sup> Livability and Alternative Analysis	2010-2011	DOT	722	\$4.3 billion	165	\$494 million
Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grants	2010-2012	HUD	84	\$860 million	9	\$231.6 million
Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grants	2010-2011	HUD	416	\$674 million	74	\$165.1 million
HUD Community Challenge / TIGER Planning Grants	2010	HUD & DOT	766	\$1.3 billion <sup>9</sup>	61	\$68 million
Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program	2011	DOT	715	\$1.4 billion	65	\$56.7 million
Community Challenge Grants	2011	HUD	267	\$408 million	27	\$28.6 million
Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grants	2010-2013	HUD	314	\$75 million	56	\$16.9 million
Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grants	2010 & 2013	EPA	239	\$42.9 million	43	\$8 million
Building Blocks for Sustainable Communities	2011-2013	EPA	1,029	\$15.4 million	224	\$3.3 million
Smart Growth Implementation Assistance <sup>10</sup>	2009-2013	EPA	542	\$31.5 million	48	\$1.5 million
Greening America's Capitals	2010-2013	EPA	77	\$6.1 million	19	\$1.5 million
Partnership Brownfields Pilots	2012	EPA	25 <sup>11</sup>	\$2.5 million	5	\$0.5 million
Totals			9,801	\$121.7 billion	1,066	\$4.6 billion

## **Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing**

- The Fair Housing Act (1968)
  - "All executive departments and agencies shall administer their programs and activities relating to housing and urban development . . . in a manner affirmatively to further the purposes of this subchapter [The Fair Housing Act]." 42 U.S.C. § 3608(d).
- Proposed AFFH Rule (July 19, 2013)
  - To assist HUD program participants in "improving integrated living patterns and overcoming historic patterns of segregation, reducing racial and ethnic concentrations of poverty, . . . reducing disparities in access to key community assets based on race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or disability." Fed. Reg.78(139): 42711.

#### **Research Questions**



- How do HUD's sustainability and access to opportunity goals relate to each other on the ground?
- Where should particular types of investments be targeted to improve social equity and environmental sustainability?

# **Measuring Environmental Sustainability**

<u>Sustainability</u>		
<u>arena</u>	Indicator	Data Source
	Percent of commuters commuting to work	
Automobile	by walking + percent of commuters to work	
dependency	by public transit	U.S. Census (2000)
	Daily vehicle miles traveled per capita	FHA National Household
	(weighted average of all households)	Travel Survey (2001)
Density and		
walkability	Total population/land area (sq. mi.)	U.S. Census (2000)
	Average block size in census tract (sq. ft.)	U.S. Census (2000)

# **Measuring Access to Opportunity**

Opportunity		
<u>Arena</u>	Indicator	Data Source
	Percent of elementary school students proficient in state	State Departments of Education data
Education	reading and math tests	(2007/2008)
	Percent of elementary school students receiving free or	National Center for Education
	educed-price lunch	Statistics (2006)
Crime	Number of violent crimes per thousand people	FBI Uniform Crime Report (2008)
	Number of property crimes per thousand people	FBI Uniform Crime Report (2008)
Economic	Number of jobs at associate's degree level within five-mile	Census Zip Business Patterns (2006),
Opportunity	radius of tract	<b>BLS Occupational Training Data</b>
	Number of jobs at associate's degree level within five-mile	
	radius divided by number of people with incomes at or below	Census Zip Business Patterns (2006),
	60 percent AMI within five-mile radius	BLS Occupational Training Data
		Zip Business Patterns Data (2006 and
	Growth rate for jobs at "associates degree" level between	1998), BLS Occupational Training
	1998 and 2006 within 5-mile radius	Data
Environmental	Sum of common chemical releases (lead, nitric acid, mercury,	
Quality	etc.)	EPA Toxic Release Inventory
		EPA National Air Toxics Assessments
	Estimated total respiratory risk from air toxics	(NATA)

# **Distribution of Sustainability and Opportunity**

• <u>Seattle</u>

	<u>Low Walkability</u>	<u>High Walkability</u>
Low Opportunity	18	32
<u>High Opportunity</u>	32	18
• <u>Cleveland</u>		
	Low Walkability	<u>High Walkability</u>
Low Opportunity	15	35
High Opportunity	35	15

# Distribution of sustainability and opportunity

<u>New York</u>

	Low Walkability	<u>High Walkability</u>
Low Opportunity	11	39
<u>High Opportunity</u>	39	11
• <u>Phoenix</u>		
	Low Walkability	<u>High Walkability</u>
Low Opportunity	10	40
High Opportunity	40	10

# Seattle neighborhood quartiles by people per sq. mile

Opportunity Metrics	<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Quartile max	1,078.93	3,244.91	5,242.45	45,235.00
Percent of students proficient in state math test	0.58	0.58	0.55	0.55
Number of jobs at associate's degree level within five miles of tract divided by number of people at or below 65 percent of AMI	0.51	0.74	0.7	0.74
Number of violent crimes per 1,000 persons	3.86	4.14	3.87	3.93
Total respiratory risk in tract (NATA)	5.29	8	9.25	11.95

# NY neighborhood quartiles by people per sq. mile

Opportunity Metrics	<u>Q1</u>	<u>Q2</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q4</u>
Quartile max	7,176.07	24,726.19	50,875.00	223,600.00
Percent of students proficient in state math test	86.06	78.509	74.14	69.52
Number of jobs at associate's degree level within five miles of tract divided by number of people at or below 65 percent of AMI	0.94	0.464	0.4	0.55
Number of violent crimes per 1,000 persons	2.17	3.582	5.69	6.38
Total respiratory risk in tract (NATA)	6.42	8.848	10.5	12.32

## Percent of tracts above metro median by county

#### **Seattle**

County	Above Median Opportunity	Above Median Walkability	Above Median Opportunity and Walkability
Island	78	28	28
King	50	64	26
Kitsap	66	28	7
Pierce	10	45	1
Snohomish	71	36	13
Thurston	90	30	27

# Percent of tracts above metro median by county New York

			Above Median
	Above Median	Above Median	Opportunity and
County	Opportunity	Walkability	Walkability
Bergen	100	0	0
Bronx	1	81	0
Hudson	67	59	46
Kings	12	88	8
Nassau	96	0	0
New York	38	97	38
Passaic	80	14	1
Queens	51	52	20
Richmond	57	9	0
Rockland	76	0	0
Suffolk	95	0	0
Westchester	82	8	1

## Subsidized units and voucher holders by neighborhood

#### <u>Seattle</u>



## Subsidized units and voucher holders by neighborhood

#### New York



# Neighborhood type by race or ethnicity

#### <u>Seattle</u>



# Neighborhood type by race or ethnicity

New York



## **Preliminary conclusions**

- HUD's goals of environmental sustainability and access to opportunity exist in some tension with each other.
- The majority of tenants in subsidized housing are located in neighborhoods with high levels of walkability but limited access to opportunity.
- Project based units can be an effective tool for creating options in neighborhoods that are both environmentally sustainable and opportunity rich.
- HUD should consider the different types of interventions that can promote social equity and enhance environmental sustainability according to metro-area and neighborhood characteristics.

#### Motivation | Research question | Data and methods | Results | Conclusions

# Cleveland neighborhood quartiles by people per sq. mile

Opportunity Metrics	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Quartile Max	1518.2	3682.2	7027.8	23214.3
Percent of students proficient on state	82	76	64	49
math test				
Number of jobs at associate's degree level	2.1	1.0	0.5	0.3
within five miles of tract divided by the				
number of people at or below 65 percent				
of AMI				
Number of violent crimes per 1,000	1.20	1.90	3.14	4.86
persons				
Total respiratory risk in tract (NATA)	2.21	2.88	3.31	3.70

# Phoenix neighborhood quartiles by people per sq. mile

Opportunity Metrics	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Quartile Max	2571.6	4666.9	6707.1	27930.8
Percent of students proficient on	73	73	70	62
state math test				
Number of jobs at associate's degree	2.0	0.9	0.6	0.3
level within five miles of tract divided				
by the number of people at or below				
65 percent of AMI				
Number of violent crimes per 1,000	3.66	4.34	4.62	5.48
persons				
Total respiratory risk in tract (NATA)	3.20	4.87	5.00	7.09

# Subsidized units and voucher holders by neighborhood

#### **Cleveland**



# Subsidized units and voucher holders by neighborhood

#### **Phoenix**



# Neighborhood type by race or ethnicity

#### **Cleveland**



# Neighborhood type by race or ethnicity

#### <u>Phoenix</u>



# Increasing income segregation



Reardon, Sean and Kendra Bischoff. 2014. No Neighborhood is an Island. http://furmancenter.org/research/iri/reardonbischoff

NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy

# Increasing income segregation

Trends in Average Metropolitan Area Income Segregation, by Income Percentile, All Families,

100 Largest Metropolitan Areas, 1970-2000



Note: Left panel of figure indicates estimated average between-tract segregation (as measured by the information theory index, *H*) between families with incomes at-or-above and below each percentile of the metropolitan-wide family income distribution. Right panel shows trends for between-tract segregation at three specific percentiles. Reardon, Sean and Kendra Bischoff. 2010. Income Inequality and Income Segregation

NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy

# Increasing income segregation



Reardon, Sean and Kendra Bischoff. 2010. Income Inequality and Income Segregation

NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy

# Intergenerational economic mobility

A. Upward Mobility vs. Theil Index of Racial Segregation in CZ

B. Upward Mobility vs. Rank-Order Index of Income Segregation in CZ

