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Introduction

• Community Research Institute
  – Grand Valley State University
  – Grand Rapids, Michigan

• Community Work
  – Community Level Research
  – Data Dissemination
    • Census Geographies
    • Sub City Geographies (neighborhoods, wards, etc)

• Community Profiles 2.0
  – Expansion of older version of profiles site
  – Dyer-Ives Foundation
Project Goals

• **Enhance Access to Local Neighborhood Data**
  – Expansion of Existing Housing Work
  – New Economics Data

• **Enhance Existing Tools to Support Local Community Planning**
  – Assessment of Current Conditions
  – Monitor Conditions Over Time

• **Convene Local Groups for Planning, Development and Training of Community Profiles 2.0**
Housing

- Data Sharing Agreements with Departments in Kent County and Grand Rapids
- Expansion of 15 New Indicators
  - Examples:
    - Year Built
    - Proximity to Park Access
    - Foreclosure, Blight, Nuisances
    - Building Permits
    - Vacancy
- Available for City Blocks, Neighborhoods

Economic

- Purchased New Datasets: Infogroup and Neilsen
- Expansion of 14 New Indicators
  - Examples
    - Employee Size
    - Female Owned Businesses
    - % Manufacturing, Industrial, Commercial
    - Sales and Demand
- Available for City Blocks, Neighborhoods
- Wanted to use LED data
  - Data problems intervened
The first phase of the CRI Community Profiles 2.0 aims to build upon CRI's existing work in housing and economics within the City of Grand Rapids and to further the development and use of neighborhood information and data systems in local policymaking and community building.

This tool allows you to:

- Map housing and economic patterns within a community or neighborhood
- Compare multiple neighborhoods and indicators simultaneously
- Trend information over time and across geographies
- Score neighborhoods based on multiple indicators
- Generate profile reports for your defined or customized geographic areas

CRI will continue to expand this tool into different content areas outside of housing and economics and broaden its geographic area beyond the City of Grand Rapids.

To get started click on either the housing or economic content sections.
Remember this Block
LED and Wealthy Neighborhood

With St. Mary’s Included

- Total All Jobs (LED):
  - 2002: 5,186
  - 2010: 13,398
- LED 2010
  - 37.1% Healthcare
    - St. Mary’s, Mary Free Bed
  - 15.2% Public Admin
  - 14.9% Educational Services
- Infogroup 2012: 6,599

Excluding St. Mary’s

- Total All Jobs (LED):
  - 2002: 588
  - 2010: 747
- LED 2010
  - 25.2% Healthcare
    - Cherry Street Health Cntr
  - 19.4% Food Service
  - 12.4% Information
- Infogroup 2012: 1,235
LED and Wealthy Neighborhood

With St. Mary’s Included  Excluding St. Mary’s
Problem Blocks Examples

Number of Employees

Year

Washington and State

Number of Employees

2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011
LED and Wealthy Neighborhood
2010 Inflow/Outflow
With St. Mary’s Included
Excluding St. Mary’s
LED and Wealthy Neighborhood

2010 Where Workers are Coming From

With St. Mary’s Included

Excluding St. Mary’s
LED and Wealthy Neighborhood
2010 Where Workers are Going
With St. Mary’s Included
Excluding St. Mary’s
Block Level Data for Stakeholders
Grand Rapids Blocks outside of 95% Confidence Interval

- Single Year Changes (2002-2010)
- 70 Unique Problem Blocks (Large Changes)
- 24 blocks a problem 2 or more years
- On major boundaries
Problems with Block Data

Michigan and College
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Problem Blocks Examples: Westside

Westside: Block 1

Westside: Block 2

Westside: Block 3
Community and Adverse Reaction

• Showed original LED calculations with modeling errors to focus groups
  – Didn’t believe the numbers being reported
  – Didn’t trust all other numbers being reported in tool

• Solutions important for keeping data integrity
### Change at the Neighborhood Level (2002 – 2010)

#### Belknap Lookout: (2002-2010)
- All Blocks: 10,130 to 1,799 (-82%)
- Minus Bad Blocks: 1,521 to 1,703 (12%)
- Infogroup (2012): 5,109
  - Autodie LLC: 2,500
  - UAW: 270
  - GR Spring and Stamping: 250

#### Shawmut Hills: (2002-2010)
- With Bad Blocks: 3,662 to 3,411 (-7%)
- Excluding Bad Blocks: 2,233 to 1,473 (-34%)
- Infogroup (2012): 2,399
  - Christian Rest Home: 260
  - Covenant Village: 182

#### Heritage Hill: (2002-2010)
- With Bad Blocks: 1,422 to 12,828 (802%)
- Excluding Bad Blocks: 1,337 to 1,750 (31%)
- Infogroup (2012): 4,365
  - WOTV: 200
  - Cherry Street Health: 150
  - St. Mary’s Healthcare: 150
Solution

- Clip blocks that fall outside 2 standard deviations
- Ground Truthing on Clipped Blocks (Manageable)
  - Local knowledge
  - Other sources (infogroup)
  - Detailed Geographic Maps (satellites, etc)
- Use percentages instead of totals
- Neighborhood with larger employee counts have smaller effects from errors
- Examples: % Workers: Stay, Leave, Come in
  - Wealthy Street
  - Silver Bus Line from Wyoming
Questions

Jeremy Pyne: pyneje@gvsu.edu