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ABSTRACT

The New Urban Economy is comprised of and shaped by many social, political and economic forces the dynamics of which are difficult to unpack. What is not difficult observe is that basic means of production are becoming increasingly mobile and that growth sectors in this new economy demand a college educated workforce. In order to adapt and participate in the global economy, Post-industrial cities have tried to attract stocks of human capital back to the City. And in doing so, city administrations have implemented various economic growth and redevelopment strategies that focus limited resources on urban investment projects. Nowhere is this more prevalent than in the City of Cleveland, where revitalization efforts in the city center during were hailed as a ‘renaissance’ of sorts during the 1980s and 1990s. However, despite significant capital investment, much of the city continues to struggle with poverty, unemployment, low educational attainment rates, dilapidated housing and foreclosure.

In order to evaluate the degree to which previously implemented strategies have been successful in achieving their objectives, a mixed-method analytical
strategy was employed. The overarching research strategy was to combine and synthesize insights from archival research, statistical analysis and geovisualization in order to determine whether growth and development strategies implemented by the City of Cleveland over time had improved socioeconomic conditions in the community. Despite nominal improvements in poverty and educational attainment rates, the study results suggest that tourism, amenity and re-imaging based strategies disproportionately benefit privileged populations living in and outside the City of Cleveland.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As the son of a laborer and former resident of Northeast Ohio, I am interested in the City of Cleveland’s industrial past, as well as the City’s potential to rebuild and renew its legacy as a beacon of opportunity for anyone who is willing to roll up their sleeves and work hard, regardless of occupation or socioeconomic status. At an early age I was made acutely aware of the contentious relationship, at times, between capital and labor by my father. And growing up fifty-six miles south of Cleveland, OH, my family and I made frequent visits to the City.

I remember going up to Tower City Center Mall to grab something to eat at the Hard Rock Café before walking across the street to an event at the Quicken Loans Arena (formerly known as Gund Arena). I also remember going up to Cleveland with my family the day after Thanksgiving to take part in the City’s annual WinterFest event. Here, thousands of people gathered together to kick off the holiday season with an old fashion horse-drawn carriage parade and fireworks. But, it was not until I was older that I became aware of the dense compact
neighborhoods along the freeway, with many homes either boarded up or in serious need of repair.

Although many urban centers in America confront pockets of concentrated poverty in their own community, Cleveland is an exceptional case. In 2004 and 2006, Cleveland was named the poorest City in America by the US Census Bureau (Cleveland Planning Commission\(^1\), 2006). Despite significant capital investment and restoration of Cleveland’s city center, much of the city continues to struggle with poverty, unemployment, dilapidated housing and foreclosure. Compounding the problem is an inadequate public education system that allows many students to fall through the cracks. As a result, many neighborhoods in the City of Cleveland continue to deteriorate, if they have not already been boarded up and abandoned. In order to learn what Cleveland intended to do to address these issues, the study initially reviewed Cleveland’s 2020 Citywide Plan.

Although the document asserts that the City is committed to improving the quality of life for residents living in the community, strategies that were outlined in the plan appear to suggest otherwise. In fact, this study contends that the strategies outlined in the document actually focus more attention on non-residents than on current residents. Given the social and economic ills plaguing the city, I was skeptical that the plan could achieve its overarching objective. After months of consideration, the following research question was proposed:

\(^1\) From this point forward, the Cleveland Planning Commission is abbreviated as CPC.
Will the City of Cleveland’s 2020 plan and more specifically the continued revitalization of downtown Cleveland, improve the social and economic conditions of neighborhoods in the community?

In order to formulate a reasonable answer to that question, three subsequent research questions were posed. First, how do Cleveland’s economic growth and redevelopment strategies outlined in the 2020 Citywide Plan differ from previous efforts? Second, to what degree have previous strategies been successful at achieving their desired outcome? And lastly, what do previous efforts tell us about the likely impact of the 2020 plan? To answer these questions a mixed-method approach was designed.

The first half of the study looked at previous economic growth and redevelopment strategies implemented by the City of Cleveland. Available planning documents, mayoral speeches and other reference materials were reviewed from 1949 to 2009, beginning with the City’s first general (comprehensive) plan. The quantitative component of the study examined trends in two quality of life issues facing the community, poverty and educational attainment rates. Data for both indicators was obtained for 1990 and 2000. Several choropleth maps were created to illustrate trends in the data set. A cluster mapping analysis was also employed to observe whether or not the indicators were spatially associated with one another at the census tract level.

The results of the qualitative and quantitative analyses suggest two things. First, economic growth and redevelopment strategies outlined in Cleveland’s 2020
Citywide Plan do not differ from strategies previously employed. The study found that tourism, amenity-based and re-imaging strategies were consistently planned for in varying degrees in the City of Cleveland. These strategies were intended to attract capital (both monetary and human capital) back to the City from non-residents living in the region and beyond.

Secondly, between 1990 and 2000 poverty and educational attainment rates did not significantly improve in the City of Cleveland. Therefore, this study suggests that strategies pursued by Cleveland have not been effective in improving these two quality of life indicators as of 2000. The study further suggests that given the gross inequalities observed in Cleveland, many residents are essentially not able to participate in growing sectors of the economy. Unless Cleveland makes an effort to rearticulate its local economy, the City will continue to languish in the global economy. The focus must shift from ‘attracting’ human capital to ‘generating’ this vital resource within the community. This contention is taken up in the concluding remarks and research agenda. That being said, the paper is divided into five chapters.

Chapter 1 provides the reader with a condensed summary of the project and the results gleamed from the study. In order to more fully understand why the City of Cleveland continues to struggle with high poverty and low educational attainment rates in 2009, the chapter provides a brief overview of Cleveland’s rise and fall as an major industrial center. This discussion is situated in the background section of Chapter 1. Chapter 2 provides the necessary context and impetus for this research
project by assessing the vast literature on Post-industrial cities and the three basic revitalization strategies Cleveland has pursued since 1949.

Chapter 3 explains what data and methods were used to conduct this study. A mixed-method approach was designed in order to observe whether or not previous strategies planned for and implemented by the City of Cleveland were effective at reducing poverty and raising educational attainment rates in the City. This chapter also highlights the reference materials that were reviewed, along with the processes used to generate nine choropleth maps. The maps were generated to visually observe changes in both quality of life indicators, as they relate to Cleveland and its neighboring suburbs.

In Chapter 4, the results of the qualitative and quantitative analysis are discussed around three general themes that emerge throughout the paper. The results generally show that given the post-fordist world we live in, Cleveland has become increasingly reliant on sources of revenue generated by non-residents. As a result, capital investment has been funneled into urban development projects that placate to the desires of privileged populations.

The paper concludes by synthesizing the results of the study in the context of the original research question proposed. Chapter 5 contends that Cleveland's 2020 Citywide Plan will not be able to significantly improve the quality of life for residents of the community unless the poor socioeconomic conditions in the City are specifically addressed. Going forward, the research agenda proposes that Cleveland rearticulate its local economy. To do so would require nothing less than a
comprehensive strategy to reduce systemic poverty and raise educational attainment rates in the community. At the center of this campaign should of course be education.

This study has demonstrated that there are no silver bullets to resolving the social and economic issues plaguing the City of Cleveland. Unless Cleveland changes course and starts to rejuvenate its own population from the ground up, the City will continue to exhibit quality of life conditions that are a) far below that of its neighboring suburbs and b) should not be tolerated in advanced societies, especially in the United States.

BACKGROUND

Cleveland, Ohio was founded in 1796 by Moses Cleveland at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River. Cleveland’s proximity to natural resources such as coal, iron and other raw materials, made it a natural site for manufacturing in the 19th century. With the advent of canals and railroads, the City quickly became a center for industrial activity in the Midwest. As a result, Cleveland’s industrialization attracted a substantial labor force to the community. By 1920 the City had approximately 914,000 residents, making it the 5th largest city in the United States. However, the capital investment and fortunes built up in Cleveland for more than a century quickly started to dissipate with advances in transportation systems such as the

---

2 According to THE US Census (2000), Cleveland is home to 478,403 people. Recent population projection released by the US Census show that as of 2007, Cleveland’s population decreased to 438,042. A decrease in population was also observed for the City’s five-county Metropolitan Statistical Area. As of 2008, it was estimated that Cleveland’s MSA is now the second largest MSA in Ohio (Lang, 2008).
The automobile and other advances in transportation have allowed both means of production to become increasingly mobile. The net result was a slow, but steady decline for Cleveland and other industrial cities throughout the Midwest.

This Post-Fordist transformation and its implications are discussed in more detail in the next chapter. In order to lay the ground work for that discussion, the following is an abbreviated review of Cleveland’s industry mix and how it has changed over the past 60 years\(^3\). Two data sets were combined for the following analysis\(^4\).

In 1965, nearly half of all the employment opportunities (46.1 percent) in Cuyahoga County were involved in the production of durable and non-durable goods (Table B.1). Of the 267,900 jobs that were available, almost half were confined to the City of Cleveland, specifically in the Industrial Valley\(^5\). The county’s next largest employment sector was Retail Trade. This sector accounted for 15.7 percent of labor force or 91,300 jobs. Education, Health Care and Social Services were not reported in the dataset, because their employment ratios were minimal. It was not until 1980 that these particular sectors were all reported on in this particular dataset.

\(^3\) Unfortunately due to time constraints, one time series data set could not be obtained. Therefore, partial data sets were pieced together to provide a snap shot of Cleveland’s rise and fall as a major industrial center. Data for Cuyahoga County is also provided here to supplement information specifically on the City of Cleveland. Cleveland is the largest city and seat of government in Cuyahoga County.

\(^4\) The primary data set was developed by The Center for Regional Economic Issues at the Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve University in 1987. To supplement this data with more recent demographics, information was retrieved from the 2000 US Census.

\(^5\) The Industrial Valley is home to Cleveland’s heavy industries. The Cuyahoga River runs through this area.
Between 1965 and 1985, Cuyahoga’s industrial mix changed dramatically. According to the data set Cuyahoga County lost close to 100,000 manufacturing jobs. As of 1985 only 23.9 percent of the workforce was employed in manufacturing jobs. Sectors that saw a significant increase between 1965 and 1985 included business and health care related services. In 1985 these sectors accounted for 5.7 and 8.4 percent of the workforce respectively. All together, services accounted for 24.6 percent of the labor force\(^6\). As might be expected, similar trends were also observed in the City of Cleveland.

Between 1967 and 1982, the City of Cleveland lost approximately 78,800 manufacturing jobs in the community. By 1985, this particular sector accounted for 30.3 percent of the labor force (Table B.4). While Cleveland observed a significant loss in this sector, it is important to recall that up until the 1980s Cleveland was aggressively trying to preserve what remained of its industrial base (CPC, 1976). That is why the City continued to exhibit a greater percentage of jobs in manufacturing than did Cuyahoga County in general. This decline in manufacturing was accompanied by a decrease in Retail Trade as well. By 1982, only 30,200 people remained employed in the retail industry, down 17,000 jobs from 1967. Incidentally, these declines in manufacturing and retail are consistently discussed in the planning documents and policy statements reviewed for this study. Unfortunately, Cleveland’s effort to arrest these trends was unsuccessful as evident from the above analysis.

\(^6\) Included in this statistic are Personal, Business, Health, Legal, Education and all other services classified as such.
Jumping to the year 2000, Cuyahoga County’s industrial mix had again changed (Table B.3). Instead of accounting for nearly a third of all private sectors jobs, the County’s manufacturing base employed 102,279 people or 15 percent of the labor force. Coming in a close second, not surprisingly, were healthcare and social services industries. Home to several renowned healthcare facilities, including the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospital, the industry employed 88,530 people or 13 percent of the labor force in 2000. Rounding out the top five industries in Cuyahoga County are Retail Trade at 10 percent, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate at 8 percent and Educational Services at 7 percent. Together, these five industries accounted for 53 percent the County’s total workforce.

Cleveland’s industrial mix again mirrored that of the Cuyahoga County. As of 2000, 16 percent of the workforce was employed in the production of durable and non-durable goods, accounting for 32,929 jobs (Table B.6). Meanwhile, healthcare and social services accounted for 13 percent of City’s employment opportunities. Despite having the aforementioned facilities in the City, Cleveland is home to less than one-third (30.7 percent) of the total number of employment opportunities available in the County. Rounding out Cleveland’s largest industries by sector employment is Retail Trade at 9 percent, Accommodations & Food Services at 7 percent and Finance, Insurance and Real Estate at 6 percent. Note that Cleveland’s third prominent industry is Accommodations and Food Services. Given Cleveland’s effort to increase tourism in the community, this is to be expected.
In conclusion, the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County have observed steady decline in manufacturing since the 1960s. This longtime staple of the local economy is on the cusp of being surpassed by growing employment opportunities in health care and social service related industries. Based on these new realities, the next chapter describes how and why Cleveland has pursued economic growth and redevelopment strategies focused on attracting human capital back to the community.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Over the last 60 years, the City of Cleveland pursued economic growth and redevelopment strategies to arrest trends associated with industrial decline and improve quality of life conditions in the community. Given limited resources, Cleveland focused on developing tourist activities and amenities in the community to re-brand or re-image the City, with the intent being to make the City a more attractive place for college educated people to reside\(^7\). In doing so, revitalization efforts were primarily concentrated on projects in downtown Cleveland and along the lake shore. However, the degree to which these strategies have achieved their objectives is highly questionable as referenced in the introductory chapter. To better situate these strategies in the literature, the chapter starts off with a brief

---

\(^7\) For the purpose of this study, the phrase ‘college educated people’ is used interchangeably with college educated workers, human capital and the creative class. Although each of these terms are easily differentiated from one another, they are similar in that everyone has earned at least a four year degree from a college of university.
discussion on the economic, social and spatial shifts in society as it relates to the Post-industrial city.

While the purpose for and function of the Post-industrial city going into the 21st Century is uncertain\textsuperscript{8}, there is and should be little room for disagreement with the following statement,

*Human renewal is an essential means to revitalizing the (old) industrial city; it is also the only valid reason for doing so* (Magnum and Magnum, 1986:161).

Where the presence of large stocks of physical labor was enough to sustain the industrializing countries in the beginning, the same thing does not hold true in the 21st Century. In advanced (industrialized) societies that want to remain competitive in tertiary and quaternary sectors of the economy, it is not what you do with your hands, but what you do with your mind that is of value. Therefore, a discussion of human capital and the Post-industrial city is warranted, because the former informs economic growth and redevelopment instituted by the latter.

Finally, woven through each of the revitalization strategies listed above is the assumption that if successfully implemented, cities can expect to see an increase in human capital or simply stated, an increase in the number of college educated people living in the community. Since this is a desirable outcome for reasons that will be described in a few moments, this chapter includes a more detailed account of each strategy. Each account will discuss the general objectives of each strategy and

\textsuperscript{8} Uncertainly used in this context refers to varying identities city’s hang their hats on to reassert their prominence in an increasingly interconnected and competitive global economy (Savage et al, 2003). Such identities include the Knowledge City (Ergazakis et al, 2006), Consumer City (Glaeser et al, 2001), Global/World City (Taylor and Lang, 2005) and Gateway City (Short et al, 2000).
the intended audience. An example or illustration of each is also provided. That being said let us first revisit Daniel Bell’s (1973) account of the Post-industrial city and observe how it has evolved overtime.

THE POST INDUSTRIAL CITY REVISITED:
WHAT IT MEANS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

At the height of the industrial revolution, the United States led the world in the production of manufactured goods. This revolution, perfected by Henry Ford, translated to unprecedented growth in cities across the United States that were previously just small towns situated on the confluence of a waterway or water body. This rapid growth in capital accumulation and population in particular cities like Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit and Pittsburg (to name a few), was the culmination of several factors, including the town’s location and proximity to natural resources and high transportation costs (Glaeser and Kohlhase, 2003). A city’s growth was further aided by the fact that capital investments in things such as factories and heavy machinery were fixed, meaning that once the factory went up, it could not be moved without incurring significant costs. What emerged at times was a tumultuous relationship between the primary means of production: capital and labor (Atkinson, 2004). While capitalists controlled the resources (raw materials and machinery) through which goods were produced, they did not own labor.

Through unionization, labor was able to collectively barter with employers to increase workers’ wages. In the process, a large middle class emerged in the United States, comprised of mostly unskilled workers. The middle class, in many respects,
was the mechanism by which the US grew its gross domestic product (Sassen, 2000). This was feasible, because the US was home to a well-articulated economy; an economy where a majority of the population not only produced goods and services, but had the capacity to consume the goods and services it produced (De Janvry, 1981). But that is not the whole story. The legacy of US industrialization also transformed the way people interacted with one another socially across space (Bell, 1973, Atkinson, 2004).

Socially, the industrialization of the United States impressed upon people that if you were willing to work hard, you could earn a decent living. This norm was passed down for several generations, encouraging young men and women to go into the workforce after graduating from High School, instead of furthering their education (Pred, 1981). This was the case in my own family, as my dad went to work for and retired from the Hoover Company in North Canton, Ohio working on an assembly line. I am sure at the time he could never have foreseen a day when the same opportunities afforded to him would no longer be available to his son. But, that day has come and gone.

The other and probably most visible aspect of industrialization was its impact on the landscape. Before industrialization, a majority of people were

---

9 In *The Agrarian Question and Reformation in Latin America*, Alain De Janvry (1981) contends that many third world countries in Latin America are socially and economically disarticulated, meaning they do not have the capacity to produce capital goods (such as machinery, information technologies, etc). Hence they are unable to produce and/or export any capital goods. Therefore, they are in the business of producing and exporting primary goods such as Bananas and Coffee Beans – which overtime decreased in value. That being said, in situations like these the population is socially and economically bifurcated between the rich and the poor. Although De Janvry’s discussed articulated and disarticulated economies in the context of first and third world countries, I believe the models he development in *The Agrarian Question* can be scaled back and applied to the situation currently facing many Post-industrial cities.
involved in the production of agricultural goods (outside of major urban centers like New York City). However, that quickly changed as people were drawn to work in the factories along the banks of the Monongahela in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, Ohio. Because private automobiles were not invented until the early 20th century, workers desired to live close to their place of employment. To accommodate demand, housing units were built in close proximity to one another, creating densely populated neighborhoods with small retail districts. This type of development is commonly referred to in the planning literature as Traditional Neighborhood Development (Handy et al, 2008). Although much has certainly changed, the grid street network still exists in many population centers, close to the urban core. This is particularly true of Post-industrial Midwest cities. But, what happened next was a precipitous decline in manufacturing jobs, the impacts of which communities such as Youngstown, Ohio and Detroit, Michigan are still coming to terms with (Cowie and Heathcott, 2003).

As discussed further in Chapter 4, the deindustrialization of the Cuyahoga Valley has had a dramatic impact on the quality of life for Cleveland residents. As of the most recent census (2000), nearly one third of the population lived at or below the poverty level. Making matters worse, just over 10 percent of the total population in Cleveland had earned at least a four year degree from a college or university. This reality is the culmination of several things including the deindustrialization of the Cuyahoga Valley and the City’s attempt to attract human capital back to the community. Put another way, urban change disproportionately
distributes the benefits and costs of urban change to certain demographics in a community (Bradbury, 1981 and Barnes et al 2006). And unless these realities are seriously addressed, they jeopardize the future prosperity of communities not only in Northeast Ohio, but in communities throughout the State of Ohio and Midwest (Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program, 2007 and Vey et al, 2008). Anyone from these communities and any other engaged citizens have probably already read, heard or, as in my case, personally experienced, the impacts of industrial decline.

That being said, the brief history lesson above and comments on industrial decline in the previous chapter, were purposely included to make the following statement: The Post-industrial city marks an end to the social, economic and spatial relations that for so long governed capital and labor relations in the US and abroad (Bell, 1973). With advances in transportation and telecommunication technologies, the transportation costs of doing business have been dramatically reduced. Businesses transactions’ can transpire any time at any place across the globe, and cities are becoming more flexible and adept as a result (Cortada, 2002). The net result is that labor has lost its influence and ability to collectively negotiate higher benefits and wages. To summarize, the old ways of doing business are no longer applicable.
THE POST-INDUSTRIAL CITY: DEFINED

The Post-industrial city is a term that can be used to describe the relationship between capital and labor at this junction in history, as well as the social, economic and spatial relationships observed in the City (Yeager, 2006). While capital was previously seen as being a fixed investment, it like labor has become increasingly mobile with advances in telecommunication, transportation and information technologies (Mills, 1969 and Glaeser and Kohlhase, 2003). As a result, cities that were once considered the backbone of the US economy now struggle to regain their footing in the global market place (Cowie and Heathcott, 2003; Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program, 2007). Although warning signs began to appear as early as the 1940s, Cleveland tried to resist this change by ensuring there was ample space for factory development in the city (Cleveland City Planning Commission, 1950). It was thought that if Cleveland maintained opportunities for industrial expansion and growth, Cleveland could remain a center for industrial manufacturing. This might have worked if the rules of the game had not changed, but they did. And those who did not change were left behind. But before going on to discuss the purpose and function of the Post-industrial city as it relates to its residents and suburban communities, it is important to discuss how the social, economic and spatial landscapes have changed in the Post-industrial city.

Socially, the Post-industrial city is a compilation of segregated land uses and communities, held together by a complex transportation network (Sassen 2000 and Savage et al 2003). Where someone lives and works is primarily determined by
their socioeconomic status. This spatial segregation stands in stark contrast to the industrial city, where people tended to live close to their place of employment. During the industrial revolution, people had to either walk or take public transit to get from one place to another. That changed dramatically with the advent of the automobile.

Frustrated by overcrowding, congestion and mixed-land uses, people with financial resources started to relocate further out away from the center city\(^{10}\). Although initially made possible by public transportation, the automobile substantially increased this trend toward the suburbs. In the suburbs, land-uses were separated. So, in order to get from home to work and work to home, people had to rely on an automobile. The same also held true in making trips to the grocery store and other activities. But as people left the city center, we fundamentally restructured how people interacted with one another, outside of the nuclear family (Savege et al, 2003), by constraining opportunities for interaction with our neighbors while simultaneously reinforcing the cultural values we behold.

Instead of trying to resolve the social and economic issues plaguing parts of the industrial city, people became complacent. As long as the neighborhood or community they lived in was not in decline, those issues were ‘out of sight-out of mind.’ Over time, this movement to the suburbs exposed gross inequalities in the

\(^{10}\) Although mixed-use development projects are becoming increasingly popular in the planning profession as a means to implement more sustainable development practices, proximity to businesses and industry was not considered ideal. Remember, that during deindustrialization, many stored and businesses closed up. And in doing so, residents had to deal with facilities vacated by a small business or industry. Essentially, these vacated properties became an eyesore and people with the resource to do so left that particular neighborhood or community.
Post-industrial city. This is especially evident in public education, where graduation rates are substantially lower in the inner-city schools compared to those typically observed in more affluent communities (Savage et al, 2003). All of these developments have contributed to the way in which people perceive, interact and live with one another in the Post-industrial city.

Another change in the social landscape concerns the relationship between capital and labor. Although capital has always controlled the means (resources of production) union membership is down significantly, including membership in parts of the country still engaged in the production of durable goods such as the auto industry.11 While unions were at one time the mediator between capital and labor, they are perceived by industries as cumbersome and too expensive to deal with. To reduce costs and increase profits, many jobs that require unskilled labor have went overseas, exploiting cheap labor abroad to the determinant of older industrial cities in the United States.

Economically, a large unskilled labor force is no longer attractive to businesses engaged in the creation and dissemination of knowledge, information and technology in an increasingly global market place. Rather, companies require a highly skilled and well educated workforce to compete in the knowledge economy (Atkinson, 2004). According to Esping-Anderson (1992) this division in labor has

---

11 Between 1995 and 1980, union membership in the United States fell from 39.2 percent to 23.6 percent. At the time this was the lowest rate of union membership in the country (Dickens and Leonard, 1985). In contrast, the union membership rate stood at 12.4 percent according to the US Bureau of Labor Statics in 2008. It should be further notated that union membership is largely associated with government workers; 26.8 percent of government workers are unionized (Greenhouse, 2009). According to the Bureau of Labor Statics only 11.4 percent of people working in manufacturing belong to a union (Greenhouse, 2009).
seriously eroded the traditional class structure. While a job in the steel mill or on an assembly line used to be a ticket to the middle class, that is a distant memory now. With more and more manufacturing jobs going overseas and the economic uncertainty here at home, the middle class has started to contract in terms of overall wealth, and more generally this population is increasingly unstable in terms of financial security (Wells and Logan, 2008). This is in spite of the emergence of what some have called the ‘new middle class’ or ‘creative class’ (Ley, 1996; Florida, 2002 and Gospodini, 2006). The bottom line is that unskilled labor is considered to be no longer viable in the 21st Century, at least in advanced (industrialized) countries where participation in the information and knowledge economy is highly regarded. Therefore, a college education is all but required to earn a decent wage and move up the proverbial social and economic ladder. Because Cleveland and the surrounding area’s economy were heavily oriented to manufacturing, stocks of human capital were not readily present in the community. As a result, businesses in growing sectors of the economy located elsewhere —to places that exhibited more human capital.

_Spatially,_ the Post-industrial city looks much different than its predecessor. In contrast to dense neighborhood development serviced by public transportation, the Post-industrial city is less dense and more spatially spread out (Savage et al, 2003). And since World War II, economic activity in general has been moving out of the city center and into suburban communities as well (Gurwitz and Kingsley, 12

12 According to Esping-Anderson (1992) the middle class is becoming increasingly bifurcated as some continue to gain wealth, while the vast majority of people’s incomes remain stagnant or decline.
This trend is fueled in part by people’s desire to live in a pristine environment, void of the social and economic issues often found in more urban areas. Making this exodus possible was and continues to be the automobile. Although this suburban-oriented development is dominant in the United States, spikes in the cost of gasoline have exposed how this unsustainable, cyclical development pattern (Goodman 2008). In the future Cole (2008) contends that development projects in the suburbs will incorporate a variety of land-uses so as to reduce transportation costs and make more attractive urban living in the suburbs.

Over the years, decentralization had a devastating impact on the landscape with freeways and superhighways cutting through mostly poor urban neighborhoods to connect suburban residents to the center city (which remains one of the major employment centers in most metropolitan areas). During the 1960s highways and other redevelopment projects were perceived to be good projects for a community, because they cleared ‘blighted’ neighborhoods and gave developers an opportunity to redevelop areas. Projects like the Erie View Tower (a forty-story tall office tower in downtown Cleveland) and Inner-belt Highway were all part of Cleveland’s urban renewal efforts. But, despite these changes in the Post-industrial city, many communities remain uncertain with regard to their identity and future prosperity.

---

13 Land assembly remains a barrier to large rehabilitation or redevelopment projects (CPC, 2006).
A REORIENTATION TO THE NEEDS OF BUSINESS AND HUMAN CAPITAL

For the better part of the 20th Century, major industrial centers took for granted their strong economic base by not diversifying their local/regional economies. Had cities like Cleveland and Detroit developed and invested in new specialized industries during the ‘good years,’ their fall from grace may not have been so prolonged (Simon, 2004). One of the reasons why Pittsburg is perceived to be doing better economically is that it started to make difficult structural adjustments to its economy long before other industrial cities did (Streitfield, 2009). Now Pittsburg is starting to realize the fruits of that investment.

It is increasingly apparent that the US manufacturing industry is nothing more than a relic of the past. Therefore, cities are no longer vying to become the next major producer of manufactured goods. Instead, communities are pining to be recognized as the next knowledge, high-tech, premier health-care service provider, gateway, and cultural city of tomorrow. It is important to note, however, that implementing strategies to replicate already well-established and specialized industries in a community, such as San Jose’s Silicon Valley, are generally not feasible (Wolman et al, 1994 and Fogarty, 1999).

Knowledge cities are commonly characterized as having clusters of innovation and technology. Silicon Valley and Seattle, Washington are two examples that come to mind. According to the US Census, between 2005 and 2007, it was estimated that 27 percent of Seattle’s population (25 years of age and older) had earned at least a Bachelor’s Degree or higher. Comparatively, only 12.5 percent of
the residents living in Cleveland had achieved the same level of educational attainment. While the literature is vast with respect to knowledge cities and the other subject areas just mentioned, successful cities in the 21st Century share at least two common denominators; human capital and a good quality of life – the later being more difficult to define.

_HUMAN CAPITAL AND QUALITY OF LIFE MATTER_

Human capital in a community is vital to the high-tech and information-based industries in the knowledge economy today (Mathur, 1999 and Florida, 2002). And more generally, continued human capital investment is necessary to retain a technologically advanced society (Shultz, 1961). Florida (2006) therefore asserts that if a community has an ample supply and clustering of talent, then those cities are more likely to be successful participants in the knowledge economy (Gottlieb and Fogarty, 2003). This should come as no surprise, for the same principles held true during the industrial revolution. The major difference this time is that labor (human capital) is more mobile and more preoccupied with quality of life issues than were industrial workers (Florida, 2002). However, there is still an ongoing debate in the literature as to how cities should go about attracting and/or developing human capital in their own communities (Shultz, 1961; Magnum and Magnum 1986, Kotkin, 1999; Florida, 2002; Adamson et al, 2004 and Reese and Stands, 2004). However, most are in agreement that quality of life issues do matter
in terms of where people live and ultimately find employment (Glaeser et al 2001, Florida 2005).  

While Florida (2005) advocates for policies and strategies that cater to the needs of the ‘creative class’ (another term used to describe human capital coined by Richard Florida), others are not so sure. According to Lamore et al (2006), place-based or people-based strategies are no longer viable as separate strategies. Instead they must be incorporated into one another given the limited financial resources of many old industrial cities. Unfortunately, many communities that find themselves in a precarious situation (financially) are in the business of trying to attract rather than developing their own stocks of human capital, Cleveland being one of them.

This approach to economic growth and revitalization is especially eminent in the planning documents and policy statements in the City of Cleveland – going as far back as 1950. Why? Because developing human capital from the bottom-up, in one’s own community, is a long-term strategy (Simon 1997, Mathur, 1999). While the payoff is not immediate, employing such strategies lays the groundwork for future prosperity. According to Simon (1997), communities that had and/or developed large stocks of human capital were more likely to have increasing opportunities for employment between 1940 and 1986. However, as the literature

14 In Chapter 4, quality of life issues will be discussed at greater length with respect to each of the redevelopment strategies planned and/or implemented by Cleveland.

15 In a panel discussion on the future of suburbia at the American Planning Association’s National Conference in 2008, Dr. John Archer discussed how the City of Minneapolis’ decision to strategically improve educational attainment rates has resulted in sustained economic growth. Reducing concentrated poverty and improving educational attainment rates is paramount not only to the City of Cleveland, but the region as a whole (Weissbourd, 2006).
points out, educated workers tend to be more mobile and therefore drawn to communities that exhibit the amenities and life-style they find suitable (Florida, 2000). Hence, it is important to not only educate people in the community, but retain them as well. Therefore, a balanced approach to economic growth and redevelopment is warranted. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in the City of Cleveland, as redevelopment efforts have primarily been focused on building up ‘islands of renewal’ in a ‘sea of decay.’

APPROACHES TO ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REVITALIZATION: THREE STRATEGIES

After reviewing several planning documents, mayoral addresses and other archival data, it is clear that Cleveland has engaged in three primary economic growth and redevelopment strategies over the last 50 years. They include increasing tourist activities, developing amenities and re-imaging the city. Because the objectives and audience associated with each strategy are usually focused on non-residents (Straus and Lord, 2001), Cleveland has been actively courting young professionals and members of the creative class.

TOURISM

Underlying a tourist-based approach to urban and economic renewal is the assertion that a local population is no longer able to provide for itself the public services required to keep the community functioning (Pratt, 2008). For older
industrial cities, this reality is directly attributed to deindustrialization (Xie, 2005). Therefore, additional revenues streams are needed to offset the balance of payments with respect to municipal services.

To accomplish this, cities like Cleveland and private investors have sunk billions of dollars over the years into entertainment venues and sport complexes, so as to in effect ‘cash in’ on the wealth of former Clevelanders now living just outside the city proper (Pratt, 2008) and to reenergize the urban economy (Wilson and Wouters, 2003). The logic goes that if a city is able to attract a large audience to frequent sporting events, concerts, plays and other cultural amenities on a regular basis, that will translate into additional monies being spent on hotel accommodations, food services etc.

The other justification for supporting urban development projects like the Rock N’ Roll Hall of fame and the redevelopment of Cleveland’s waterfront is jobs. According to the CPC (1998), revitalization of the City’s waterfront could result in up to 150,000 new jobs being generated in the community. While some of these jobs would likely be involved in tertiary and quaternary sectors of the economy (i.e. a new marketing firm locates in downtown Cleveland because of the improved amenities), it is probable that a vast majority of employment opportunities would stem from the service sector industries. As Xie (2005) rightly points out, employment opportunities in this sector are not able to replace the jobs lost in manufacturing in terms of wages and the tax revenues generated from these jobs.
Furthermore, Hopers (2002) contends that highly publicized ‘spin-off’ effects from industrial heritage tourism may in fact be inflated.

While the above generally describes how tourist activities are conceptualized and for whom they are intended, heritage tourism is an increasingly popular way to capitalize on a city’s industrial past. Edwards and Llurdes (1996) define industrial heritage tourism as “the development of tourist activities and industries on man-made sites, buildings and landscapes that originated with industrial processes of earlier periods.” Popular entertainments districts such as the Flats and now the vibrant Warehouse District exemplify this strategy, because each project was conceived in buildings and in parts of the Cleveland previously used for industrial purposes\textsuperscript{16}. However, the redevelopment project currently being proposed for the site is not in keeping with the definition of industrial heritage tourism\textsuperscript{17}. Instead, it should be considered a high-end amenity – another strategy Cleveland has pursued to improve its image and ultimately attract human capital back to the city center.

To recap, tourist activities are designed to attract people to the City in order to spend their disposable income. In the processes, it is believed City’s like Cleveland can improve their image and attract additional investment, especially downtown (Hopers, 2002). The other reality is that tourism activities are meant to

\textsuperscript{16} It should be noted that much of the Flats District on the east bank of the Cuyahoga River has been demolished. During the 1990s, the area saw a steady decline. There are currently plans to redevelop the east bank of the Flats into a high-end mixed-use development by Scott Wolestein, CEO of Developers Diversified.

\textsuperscript{17} Xie (2005) contends that heritage tourism is only successful when a project is able to evoke a ‘novel and nostalgic experience’. Therefore, heritage tourism projects are not easily replicated and should be unique to a particular place.
supplement revenue short falls in municipal budgets. In doing so, the community is settling on a short-term rather than long-term approach to economic growth and revitalization, one that is susceptible to changes in the economy and may not even work

AMENITIES

An amenity driven approach to economic growth was made famous by Richard Florida. In his book *The Rise of the Creative Class*, Florida (2002) explains how a new middle class has emerged in the knowledge (creative) economy. Florida refers to this group of people as the ‘creative class.’ Although much emphasis is given on the role artists and musicians play in the development of cultural amenities and creative industries, Florida (2005) also classify engineers, scientists and nurses as part of the creative class.

Florida’s underlying thesis is that vibrant and culturally rich cities that participate in the knowledge economy have a significant number of people from the creative class, living and working in the community. If a Post-industrial city is to have any success in attracting this population to its community, then the city must develop natural, historic and endogenous amenities (Brueckner et al, 1999). To better understand how and why this strategy is implemented, let us look at it from two vantage points.

First, as previously discussed, the relationship between capital and labor appears to be more fluid. Therefore, instead of trying to attract large businesses and
corporate offices, communities are vying for the opportunity to attract young professionals and members of the creative class by developing amenities they find desirable (Florida, 2005, Clark et al, 2002). “The important local amenities are no longer schools, churches and neighborhood associations, as in the urban mosaic of the old Chicago School. A residential population of young professionals with more education and fewer children created a social profile geared toward recreation and consumption patterns” (Clark et al, 2002). Therefore, quality of life issues matter to this population.

Secondly, the strategy recognizes that in the US and in many advanced countries, we are living in a consumer driven society. Furthermore, the commodification of culture has impacted what actually gets produced in the marketplace (Scott, 1997 and Glaeser et al, 2001). For example, lifestyle or traditional neighborhood centers, have become an increasingly popular way to recreate the urban environment to attract human capital back to the city. In Cleveland’s Citywide Plan for 2020, the plan lays out in great detail how each neighborhood center (sixteen in all) should be redeveloped to accommodate a variety of income levels and housing units.

While amenity-based strategies have been instituted by policy makers in municipalities (large and small) across the country, their necessity and success in attracting human capital is highly questionable. As Reese and Sands (2008)

---

18 “When a region has few cards to play, cultural (amenity) strategies respond to the quality of life argument that people and investors flow to areas with the best amenities. But cultural strategies do not reveres the hierarchies of place that lead to competition for distinctive segments of capital and labor –
contend, there is not enough research to demonstrate whether or not amenity-based strategies have been successful at attracting human capital and subsequently the growing industries to communities. Furthermore, Reese and Sands (2008) suggests that recreational (nature trails, bike baths) and cultural amenities popularized by Florida as a necessity in the Post-industrial city, may in fact be a natural phenomenon in a community where businesses in the information and knowledge economy are already present. In essence, Reese and Sands (2008) are ‘posing cumbersome question of which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Meanwhile, Scott (2007) fundamentally disagrees with the premise of pursuing amenity-based strategies, because they do not address the socioeconomic forces that continue to oppress the underclass in society (Carmon, 1990). Also, amenity-based strategies favor one segment of the population over the other. This favoritism, according to Scott (2007) can increase instability in a community and thereby further restrict capital investment and economic activity.

RE-IMAGING APPROACH

Once an image is bestowed on a community, it is difficult to change. Take for example the City of Cleveland. After Dennis Kucinich, then Mayor of Cleveland, allowed the city to default on its loans in 1979, the media characterized the community as “the mistake on the lake”. Although the City’s image has improved

_____________________
competitions that is often perceived in terms of images. Indeed, cultural strategies suggest the utter absence of new industrial strategies for growth, i.e. the lack of local strategies that have any chance of success in attracting traditional productive activity” (Zukin, 1997).
since then, the negative social and economic ills still haunt Cleveland. For example, in 2004 and again in 2006, the US Census identified Cleveland as the poorest big city in America. When these headlines and images are disseminated through local and national media outlets, it corroborates the negative stereotype area residents and non-residents may perceive. And not surprisingly, the later is more intractable and therefore are typically the target audience in media campaigns to re-image the city (Avraham, 2004). That being said, it is important to note that some cities are unfairly covered in the media as well.

According to Avraham (2004) there are several factors that contribute to how a community is covered, especially in the national media. They include such things as the city’s location and demographic profile. Additional considerations include the city’s social and political environment. One of the reasons why Cleveland received so much negative attention from the media during Kucinich’s term in office is because he publicly fought the city’s power company. Although the situation was confined to Cleveland, the city ended up defaulting on its loan payments, the first time that has happened to a major US city since the Great Depression (Martin, 1987). Not having lived in Cleveland during this period of time, one can only imagine the nightly news reports.

To rehabilitate or completely re-brand a community’s image, cities often focus on ‘megaprojects.’ This is especially true for Post-industrial cities still reeling from the effects industrial decline. For the cities of Cleveland and Detroit, this has meant significant capital investment in projects such as sport stadia and
Improving aesthetics and overall attractiveness of a place is also meant to re-image the city, especially in specific neighborhoods and corridors (Lovering, 2007 and Trueman et al, 2007). This may result in more amenities and recreational opportunities, particularly if the strategy’s objective is to attract human capital and members of the creative class to the community (Short et al, 2000; Avraham, 2004 and Miles, 2005). But, there is little evidence to suggest that these strategies have in fact improved the quality of life for local residents or been able to change the negative connotation associated with many ‘rust-belt’ communities (Carmon, 1999).

Neil (1995) claims that a campaign to re-image a city, without first properly addressing and/or resolving the problem for which their image is derived, is nothing more than a superficial attempt to gloss over the issues facing that community. Detroit’s effort to re-image the city despite the community’s glaring socioeconomic problems was equated to putting lipstick on a gorilla (Neill, 1995). Unless the problems are addressed head on they will continued to fester and occasionally bubble over, thereby reinforcing the negative image associated with that community.

CONCLUSION

Tourism, amenities and re-imaging are all types of economic growth and revitalization strategies Cleveland has pursued for the last five decades. How these strategies were either planned for and/or implemented will be articulated in the
next chapter. But before going ahead it is important to keep three considerations in mind.

First, the three strategies mentioned above are not mutually exclusive. In fact, many Post-industrial Cities have planned for or implemented a combination of one another. It is also fair to point out that the list (tourism, amenities and re-imaging) is not an exhaustive inventory of revitalization strategies at a city’s disposal. However, these particular strategies were relevant to this project, as they have been continuously implemented in Cleveland since the 1950s. However, as pointed out in the literature review and later in Chapter 4, the effectiveness of such strategies is questionable. Please recall that this study wanted to examine whether or not the City’s new general plan would be effective at improving quality of life conditions in the community by reducing poverty and improving educational attainment rates.

Second, while each of the strategies discussed here are approached somewhat differently, their objectives are similar. Cities that have and/or will implement these strategies in the future do so in order to make the community more attractive to people with a college education. In order to compete in the knowledge economy requires nothing less than a well educated labor force. Cities whose residents have not achieved at least a bachelor’s degree and who are plagued by high rates poverty are behind the eight ball. To address this, cities like Cleveland have engaged in an all out effort to attract human capital to the city. In doing so, elected officials and capitalists alike have come to the conclusion that wealth generation is no longer
possible in the city limits (Pratt, 2008). By strategically investing capital in projects aimed a particular group of people (those with the talent and financial resources to produce and consume goods and services) cities are in effect declaring they have given up on improving the social and economic well being for those with little or no choices in society. This leads us to the third consideration that tourism, amenities and re-imaging strategies may actually reinforce inequality and disarticulation in a community (Marcuse, 1993).

While the notion of disarticulated or ‘dual’ economies each have their own body of research (Kempen, 1994 and Hudson, 2007), both recognize the presence of a growing ‘underclass’ in many urban centers (Dangschat, 1994; Berg and Braun, 1999) that are not able to fully participate in the Post-industrial city. For Cleveland, the underclass is primarily confined to racially segregated neighborhoods, where people fortunate enough to be employed, typically work in the service sector and earn a low (minimum) wage. Not considering other extenuating circumstances, a majority of these long-time residents are not able to attend the ball games downtown and go out afterward to celebrate their favorite teams’ victory, because they lack the financial resources to do so. But is it not ironic that these individual’s property, sales and income taxes over the years, has helped finance many of the revitalization strategies the City of Cleveland has implemented?

Finally, there is always the possibility that the strategies described above will not achieve their objectives. What then should communities do? Although this question is not specifically addressed by this project, the last chapter will provide
some concluding remarks and possible research/recommendations on what communities should consider doing going forward. Underlying this discussion is the premise that people have a ‘right to the city’ (Harvey, 2008), meaning individuals should have the capacity to live out the life they find most fulfilling. This paper contends that this right to the City, as Harvey articulates, is 1) only possible when people have access to a first rate education and 2) when work, no matter where or what, is regarded as a positive contribution to society and rewarded as such. At the center of this discussion is the rearticulating of Post-industrial economies, especially in Cleveland (Kotkin, 1999). These two statements are expanded upon in the final chapter.
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODS

INTRODUCTION

As was evident in the previous chapter, the Post-industrial city must confront a variety of challenging issues stemming from deindustrialization. Among them include systemic poverty and low educational attainment rates. As previously stated by Scott (2007) and others, this situation is not conducive to capital investment or economic activity. Hence, the future prosperity of Post-industrial cities like Cleveland will very much depend on the economic growth and redevelopment strategies it pursues in the 21st Century. Unfortunately, the industrial legacy of many post-industrial cities leaves them at a comparative disadvantage with respect to attracting the necessary labor or businesses associated with growing sectors of the economy. In order to regain a foothold in the information and knowledge-based global economy, communities are actively seeking to attract stocks of human capital back to the City. Cleveland is one of those cities.
In 2007 portions of Cleveland’s 2020 Citywide Plan were adopted by its city council. Proposed land use changes, as well as policy and development opportunities were approved. Going through the document that is only made available online (CPC, 2006), two things became quickly apparent: (1) the City appears to be generally interested in improving the quality of life conditions of residents in the community, especially those who have little choice in where they live; and (2) the City desires very much to attract greater stocks of human capital to the community. According to the general plan, these two objectives can best be achieved by increasing tourist opportunities, improving amenities in the community and more broadly re-imagining (re-imaging) what Cleveland and the region could become in the future. However, in reading the document I am not convinced the plan will achieve its overarching objectives, to any significant degree, as long as the existing population remains essentially disconnected from the local economy and urban investment tends to disproportionately benefit non-residents.

First, I am genuinely interested in communities that work on behalf of their residents, particularly those residents who are often considered down and out in society. And second, given the City’s historical focus on downtown revitalization efforts, Cleveland continues to struggle with concentrated poverty and the lack of human capital with respect to other major US Cities. Of the 70 most populated cities in America, only three other communities had lower rates of educational attainment
(bachelor’s degree or higher) than Cleveland in 2006\textsuperscript{19}. Therefore, to gauge whether or not the 2020 Plan will be successful, I proposed the following research question:

\textit{Will the City of Cleveland’s 2020 plan and more specifically the continued revitalization of downtown Cleveland, improve the social and economic conditions of neighborhoods in the community?} Before going onto discuss how the study was structured, it is incumbent upon me to first explain why.

\textbf{MIXED-METHODS ANALYTICAL STRATEGY}

To understand the course of action a community intends to pursue and the justification for it, planning documents and policy manuals can provide us with useful insight. This is especially true if public input from various stakeholders is sought out and incorporated into the planning process. However, I am cognizant of the perception held by those outside the planning profession who are skeptical of such documents. In order to address this audience’s concern and substantiate the information obtained from planning documents, other archival data is needed such as policy manuals and public policy statements made by public officials.

The overarching research strategy was to combine and synthesize insights from archival research and statistical analysis and geovisualization in order to determine whether growth and development strategies implemented by the City of Cleveland over time had improved socioeconomic conditions in the community. To

observe whether or not there was an improvement, two variables were identified: poverty and educational attainment. Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology, several maps were created visualizing changes in the two variables between 1990 and 2000. And using Local Moran’s I to perform a cluster mapping analysis, several maps were created depicting how these two variables are spatially associated with one another across the study area.

By visualizing socioeconomic conditions in Cleveland, the maps demonstrate how realities on the ground have and continue to inform policy making decisions in the City of Cleveland. For example, the qualitative component of this study asserts that Cleveland has pursued economic growth and redevelopment strategies that try to attract human capital and/or discretionary spending back to the City. To understand the impetus for these strategies and gauge their success, several maps were generated in the quantitative analysis. The maps clearly demonstrate that the City of Cleveland exhibits a considerably high rate of poverty and low rate of educational attainment with respect to other communities in Cuyahoga County and Cleveland’s MSA. Hence, Cleveland has pursued policies that attempt to reduce such trends in the community.

Although this approach does not allow for any definitive conclusions to be made (as is typically the case when modeling simulations and performing statistical analysis\textsuperscript{20}), taken together the qualitative and quantitative components of this study

\textsuperscript{20} In 1981 Bradbury published \textit{Future for a Declining City: Simulations for the Cleveland Area}. The book simulates future conditions in the City of Cleveland based on the implementation of five different development strategies for 1980, 1985 and 1990. A job stimulus, housing rehabilitation, transit
show how reality and policy both inform and shape each other. By comparing the information obtained from both analyses, this study is able to formulate a persuasive argument as to whether or not the City’s 2020 Plan will be able to achieve its stated overall objective, which is to improve the community’s quality of life. The rest of this chapter will now describe, in more detail, the qualitative and quantitative data used in the study.

**QUALITATIVE DATA**

Archival data was obtained from a variety of sources at the Cleveland Public Library, Public Administration Library, located at Cleveland’s City Hall. The Public Administration Library is the resource for all public documents and reports. Because most of the archive is considered reference material, documents had to be reviewed at the library. Therefore, I spent a week in City Hall during the month of March, 2009 visiting the library each day from 8:30pm to 4:30pm.

From March 23-27, 2009, I reviewed planning documents, annual reports, mayoral speeches and several other resources. In combing through these documents I was interested in policy statements and strategies as they relate to economic growth and redevelopment. Hence, information on public utilities tended to be glossed over. Over the course of a week 23 pages of (single spaced) notes improvement, fiscal equalization and suburban growth control were among the five strategies. Models for each strategy were developed, including what Bradbury identified as an “All-Out Revitalization Strategy,” comprised of all five strategies. According to Bradbury, an All-Out Revitalization Strategy improved several variables in the model, more than any other strategy alone. Although Bradbury’s study has nothing to do with the mixed-method approach just described, it is useful in demonstrating the strengths and limitations of my own research design.
were compiled. These notes are compiled and included in the Appendix for review. What follows then is a brief synopsis of the archival research obtained for this study, organized based on the type of material reviewed.

GENERAL (COMPREHENSIVE) PLANS:

In accordance with Section 76-2 of Cleveland’s City Chart, the CPC shall have the power and duty to develop a general plan for the community to guide future growth and development. The plan may also take into consideration areas outside the City as long as the Commission believes such areas are relevant to the City of Cleveland. Cleveland’s first general plan was adopted by the Planning Commission in 1949. Cleveland today... tomorrow: the general plan of Cleveland identified the City as a major business and employment center in the region with enough land area to grow.

According to the plan, one-fifth of the City of Cleveland remained void of any development. This presented as an opportunity to preserve adequate space for the construction of new factories. However, the general plan also took note of the social and economic ills now facing the community, including poor living conditions on the eastside of Cleveland. The plan also foreshadowed that Cleveland may experience population loss from 1950 to 1980, but that the City should remain a center for industrial, business and retail establishments. At this time the lakefront was seen as

21 With respect to the general plan, Cleveland’s City Charter never specified how often it must be updated.
the vital component of the City’s redevelopment efforts. Unfortunately, this plan was not updated for almost 40 years.

In 1991 Mayor Michael White’s Administration published *Civic Vision 2000*. What made this document unique is that a special plan was created for downtown, *Cleveland Civic Vision, 2000: Downtown*. *Civic Vision* was only the second time Cleveland had engaged in comprehensive planning efforts. Under Mayor White, the plan was again updated in 1998.

In order to ensure Cleveland would be a 21st Century City, *Civic Vision 2000 and Beyond* called for the continued revitalization of downtown Cleveland and the City’s waterfront. Critical components to the plan included; ‘thriving retail and residential neighborhoods, diverse and attractive entertainment options, high-quality cultural and educational institutions, attractive user-friendly open spaces and park systems, healthy convention and visitor industries, competitive business conditions and supportive governing structures’ (CPC, 1998). The plan further noted that in the absence of attracting new residents to the community, hotel development should be pursued as an alternative investment to get people back downtown.

The comprehensive plan was updated a third time in July 2006. Although much of the planning for the document transpired under the discretion of then Mayor Jane Campebell (2002-2006), portions of the document were not officially adopted until Mayor Frank Jackson took office in 2007.

---

22 *Civic Vision, 2000: Downtown* was published in 1989, two years before the general plan was completed.
Connecting Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan is a comprehensive effort to ‘connect’ all the best attributes Cleveland has to offer, including its neighborhoods, downtown and waterfront. According to the plan, “the ultimate measure of a City’s greatness is the quality of life it offers to its citizens.” Because I whole heartedly believe economic growth and redevelopment strategies should be focused on improving quality of life issues in a community, the previous statement partially informed my research question and methodology. But, as a student of history, I am concerned that Cleveland will not be able to achieve such high expectations given the City’s past dealings and its current growth/redevelopment strategies.

POLICY PLANNING AND ANNUAL REPORTS

In order to account for the 40 years gap between the first and second comprehensive plans, I looked at several planning-policy documents. One of them was a Policy Planning Report by Cleveland’s Planning Commission in 1975. In this particular document, the Commission was interested in equity planning. The Commission recognized that poverty was a systemic issue in Cleveland that needed to be dealt with, in order to address other concerns such as household income and inadequate housing conditions in the community. This assessment was complimented by two annual reports by the Commission. Both reports recognized that conditions in Cleveland continued to deteriorate (CPC, 1972 and 1976).
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/CITYWIDE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Every five years, the CPC is to complete a Capital Improvement Program report. The report is supposed to prioritize the capital expenditures for every city department for a period of five years. The reports list projects and monies to be spent by each department. Since this study is primarily concerned with the revitalization of Cleveland, the Departments of Public Properties and Community Development were of particular interest.\(^{23}\)

The Department of Public Properties was responsible for all new and maintenance projects concerning City owned property. At the time that included recreation and park facilities, as well as the stadium and public auditorium. On the other hand, the Community Development Department was responsible for overseeing the City's urban renewal efforts.

Capital Improvement Programs for the following time intervals were reviewed for this study: 1971-1976, 1974-1979, 1976-1981 and 1981-1986. Starting in 1985, the Commission referred to these reports as Citywide Development Programs. And because a new comprehensive plan for the City was not released until 1991, these reports were reviewed for the following time intervals as well: 1985-1990 and 1990-1994.

\(^{23}\) In 2009, the Departmental Public Properties name sake no longer exists. Departmental responsibilities are now assumed to have been incorporated into another department(s).
MAYORAL COMMENTS/SPEECHES

The creation of the post-industrial city is a political and at times contentious issue (Yeager, 2006). To build a new stadium or concert venue often requires public investment to leverage private resources. Therefore, what is prioritized in a planning document or policy manual may not materialize, if the capital investment and financial resources are not available.

To better gauge the political pulse of the City and evaluate the strategies being pursued in the City of Cleveland, State of the City Addresses from 1990 to 2009 were reviewed. Unfortunately, this did not become a tradition for Cleveland Mayors until Mayor Michael White took office in 1990. Therefore, I was only able to review the current and two previous administrations.

Michael White took office in 1990 and was re-elected in 1994. This was only the second time in Cleveland’s 250 year history that an African American had served in such a capacity. Mayor White was preceded by Jane Campbell who only served one term as Mayor of Cleveland. In 2005, Campbell lost her bid for re-election to then City Councilman Frank Jackson. Jackson is currently serving his first time as Mayor and will be up for re-election in 2010. In addition to the State of the City Address, each Mayor’s inaugural address was reviewed between 1990 and 2009.

CLEVELAND TOMORROW

Cleveland Tomorrow was a non-profit organization developed at the behest of Mayor George Voinovich (1980-1990) to incorporate the business community
into Cleveland’s revitalization efforts. The organization was comprised of Chief Executive Officers from Cleveland’s most prominent businesses. In 1981 and 1988, Cleveland Tomorrow released two reports concerning Cleveland’s economic future. In each instance, Cleveland’s public schools, deteriorated housing and declining neighborhoods were considered to be detractors for new investment in the community.

The group further pointed out that Cleveland was disadvantaged by a lack of skilled labor (human capital) in the community and by its seemingly in-ability to attract funding for research and development at its higher-education institutions. Each report contained several recommendations to arrest and reverse declining trends in the City. Cleveland Tomorrow is now part of the Greater Cleveland Partnership, which is an active organization in Cleveland and the region.

**QUANTITATIVE DATA**

To evaluate whether or not the development strategies planned for and implemented by the City of Cleveland significantly improved the quality of life for Cleveland residents, two socioeconomic indicators were examined in this study: poverty and educational attainment\(^24\). While the data for these indicators is available from the US Census for 1990 and 2000, the data was obtained from NEO CANDO, a website maintained by Case Western Reserve University’s Mandel School.

---

\(^{24}\) A similar study was conducted by Wolman et al (1993) to evaluate whether or not proclaimed urban success stories (revitalization efforts) had improved several indicators of well-being, one of those being the poverty rate.
of Applied Social Sciences. NEO CANDO maintains a variety of social and economic indicator data for the City of Cleveland and Northeast Ohio that is readily available and neatly packaged into different scales of analysis.

To observe both local and regional changes in poverty and educational attainment, data was collected on each of the counties that make up Cleveland’s Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) for 1990 and 2000. These counties include Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina County. The following briefly explains each data set and its use in the study\textsuperscript{25}. Descriptive classification statistics for each data set are also provided in Table B.8.

The poverty rate is a data set calculated by multiplying the total number of persons below poverty by 100, and then dividing that (normalizing it) by the population for whom poverty status was determined. The result is a measure of the “percent poor” in a given area. This data set was directly involved in the project’s spatial analysis, which will be discussed in more detail in the Analysis section of the paper. In 1990, families that earned an income of $12,575 or less were considered poor. That income threshold increased in 2000 to $16,895.

The educational attainment rate is a data set that reports on the number and percent of the population (25 years of age and older) who have obtained at least a four year degree. Persons who have obtained a Master or Professional Degree are therefore included in this data set. The data was used to observe where college educated people reside with respect to Cleveland, Cuyahoga County and Cleveland’s

\textsuperscript{25} Source: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development, MSASS, Case Western Reserve University. Accessed March, 2009; www.neocando.case.edu
Recall from the literature review that an educated workforce is vital in the new urban economy. And for businesses that compete in growing sectors of this new economy, educated workers must be prevalent in a community for them to locate in a particular city. Since Cleveland is interested in competing in growing sectors of the economy, it has pursued strategies that try to attract human capital to the community. Therefore, the educational attainment rate should be understood as a measure of the City’s success. The data set also provided population data for persons 25 years of age and older. This information was used to observe trends in population growth between Cleveland and Cuyahoga County between 1990 and 2000.

With regard to the above data sets, there may be potential issues with how the data was collected and obtained. Permanent residents are required by law to complete a survey asking them to provide the US government with demographic information each decennial census. While certain segments of the population were asked to complete the long form, a vast majority of US citizens completed what is called the short form. The short form does not ask respondents to answer the same level of detailed questions that appear on the long form 26. Therefore, the US Census must extrapolate the data obtained from the long-forms through a complicated series of calculations. Thus, there may be some potential issues with the data sets. Other potential issues that may arise concern how the data was collected and formatted through NEO CANDO.

26 Source: Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development, MSASS, Case Western Reserve University. Accessed Mar. 2009; www.neocando.case.edu
As has been previously mentioned, NEO CANDO is a site that collects and stores US Census Data in a format that is easily accessible by users in a variety of formats. Since the data sets were not directly obtained from the US Census, there might have been some issues as to how the data was organized and formatted. This is acknowledged upfront on NEO CANDO’s website. Users are encouraged to report issues with data that cannot be observed using American FactFinder.

The other data sets obtained for this analysis include TIGER/Line and polygon shapefiles for the five counties located in Cleveland’s MSA in 1990 and 2000. They include census tract and roadway shapefiles. The shapefiles were downloaded from ESRI27, a leader in GIS and Mapping Software, as a free service for users of ArcGIS.

DATA PROCESSING

To expand the conversation beyond a theoretical debate, the research project examined spatial trends in poverty and educational attainment for the City of Cleveland in the context of its five county MSA, particularly Cuyahoga County. This was done to evaluate whether Cleveland’s economic growth and redevelopment efforts had been successful in improving the City’s quality of life. Together, both the qualitative and quantitative analysis were able to answer the original research questions proposed. The following briefly outlines the processes used to evaluate the two data sets.

With regard to the poverty rate data set, the field calculator was used to calculate the percentage change in persons considered to be poor, between 1990 and 2000. While the data set obtained from NEO CANDO had both the poverty rate and number of people considered to be poor indexed in one file, changes in the poverty rate were calculated. The same procedure was applied to the educational attainment dataset to produce fields that reported the change in educational attainment rates, as well as a field displaying the percentage change in population between 1990 and 2000. In addition to using this data management tool, a cluster and outlier analysis was conducted using local Moran’s I.

Local Moran’s I represents a class of local indicators of spatial analysis (LISA) in the ArcGIS Toolbox (Anselin, 1995). The function operates from the premise that data is not spatially associated. In effect this serves as the null hypothesis. To determine whether or not data is spatially associated, the function weights/compares a particular data point (in this case a census tract) with that of its surrounding neighbors using inverse distance. Using the inverse weighted distance, the function was told to weigh/compare data points in close proximity to each other more heavily than data points further away from each other, thereby localizing the sphere of influence on a particular data point. A weighted distance matrix was not used in either spatial analysis.

---

28 In this function, inverse distance refers to the spatial relationship among data and the extent to which each data influences one another.
29 Since a roadway network was not necessary for this spatial analysis, the Euclidean Distance method was selected to measure the straight-line distance between data points.
When local Moran’s I was executed using ArcGIS version 9.3, four additional fields were generated in the data tables. The first set of field values was the LMIndex (inverse weighted distance). This index showed whether a census tract is surrounded by other tracts with similar values. If the value is positive, then it indicates that a particular census tract is located in a cluster of census tracts with similar data. If the value is negative, this means that the census tract is not part of the cluster and therefore not spatially associated with other nearby census tracts. However, this measure alone does not provide the confidence needed to be sure the data is or is not spatially associated. For certainty, the study examined the next two additional fields, LMiZScore and LMiPValue.

Values in the Z-Score field are understood to be standard deviations from the mean of a particular data set. A positive Z-Score in this analysis suggests that a census tract is spatially associated with another census tract. The higher the value, the more spatially related a census tract is to its neighbor. A Z-Score value that is negative or close to zero, indicates there is little spatial association between a census tract and its surrounding neighbors. Meanwhile, the MiPValue is a measure of probability or significance.

For this particular analysis, the P-value indicates whether or not the Z-Score is statistically significant so as to reject the randomization null hypothesis. Generally speaking, a large Z-Score and low P-value is indicative of a spatially significant pattern that cannot be explained by a random sample. The last field (COType) identifies which type of cluster may be observed from the cluster mapping
analysis. For example, if a census tract was surrounded by statistically significant tracts that observed high poverty rates, the census tract would have a value of HH or High-High COtype. If low rates of poverty among census tracts were spatially associated, the tract would have a value of LL or Low-Low COtype.

DATA OUTPUT

Using the data management and statistical spatial tools just described, a total of nine maps were created for this project. The following describes the input, output and operations involved in making the maps.

The first four set of maps that were created looked at poverty rates in the Cleveland MSA for 1990 and 2000 as well as educational attainment rates. Since five counties were a part of this analysis, a common classification had to be created. Since Cuyahoga County had the greatest range of values in both data sets, one classification scheme was developed and applied to the other four counties. The resulting maps had a common classification for all five counties, which made it ideal for analyzing spatial trends. A diverging color classification was used to better visualize the stark differences in poverty observed in Cleveland's MSA.

The next three maps generated used the field calculator to compute the change in percent with respect to each of the data sets, including population data for persons 25 years of age and older. One classification scheme for Cuyahoga County
was created, including a diverging color scheme for better visualization. Parcels located in the City of Cleveland are highlighted in each of these three maps.

The final two maps were generated using a series of spatial techniques in GIS. Both maps were created to observe whether or not census tracts in Cuyahoga County were spatially associated based on either quality of life indicator. A cluster and outlier analysis was successfully executed for each data set for 2000. Although maps were generated with data from 1990, after comparing both set of maps I found them to be very similar. Therefore, only the maps generated using 2000 data are included in the following analysis.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

In order to explain how and why tourist, amenity-based and re-imaging strategies were implemented in the City of Cleveland, it is important to first understand what planners and elected officials perceived to be Cleveland’s strengths and weaknesses. As previously mentioned in the last chapter, Cleveland has struggled to adapt to and find its niche in the global economy, because it lacks the human capital necessary to attract these gross sectors to the community. Poor quality of life conditions have also contributed to the precarious situation the City now finds itself in. Before planning professionals begin to develop a plan for a community of which they have no prior knowledge, some variation of a Strengths, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat Analysis (SWOT) is typically completed. Conducting such an analysis is useful in long range planning efforts (Glaister and Falshaw, 1999). A SWOT analysis provides planners with a basic understanding of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in a community. Information gained from this analysis is then used by planners to draft specific goals, objectives
and actions steps in a comprehensive planning document provided there has been adequate public input. Therefore, the first part of this chapter will explore reoccurring themes that emerged from planning documents and policy statements reviewed for this study. A SWOT Analysis framework is used to organize the discussion.

The second part of this chapter demonstrates why Cleveland pursued strategies that primarily served the social and spatial interests of non-residents living in the MSA. Since almost a third of Cleveland’s population was impoverished and even less had earned a college degree in 2000, non-residents (many of which use to live in the City, but moved out) were a potential source of revenue. In order to offset the poor tax base, Cleveland sought to recapture lost revenues through discretionary spending on tourist activities and amenities people living in the suburbs would enjoy. In making such urban investments downtown and along the lakefront, the City also intended to lure some former Clevelanders back to the City along with young professionals and other members of the creative class. Although Cleveland aggressively cracked down on crime under Mayor White (1990-2000) and advocated for better housing that was affordable for the sake of improving the social and economic conditions of local residents (CPC, 1950, 1976 and 1985), most of the strategies pursued by Cleveland were intended to attract people with a higher socioeconomic status to live, work and play in the community. While this study does not contest the fact that people do work and play in the City of Cleveland, it does suggest that if given the choice, people tend to live elsewhere.
The third part of this chapter speaks to the qualitative component of the study. Specifically, the section demonstrates that while poverty and educational attainment did improve between 1990 and 2000, such modest improvements were isolated to a select number of census tracts, compared to the gains observed in outlying parts of Cuyahoga County and the MSA. The study further examines if the poverty and educational attainment rates are spatially associated among census tracts in Cuyahoga County. This was accomplished by performing a cluster mapping analysis using Local Moran’s I. From the qualitative analysis, the study is able to demonstrate that Cleveland has in fact been able to reduce poverty and increase the number of college educated people living in the community\textsuperscript{30}, but only in very specific parts of the City. The analysis further demonstrates that by in large college educated workers (age 25 years and older with at least a Bachelor’s Degree) are choosing to live outside the City limits. Each of the nine maps are interpreted in more detail.

**QUALITATIVE DATA RESULTS**

In order to determine whether or not Cleveland’s new general plan for 2020 would significantly improve local resident’s quality of life, the research project posed three subsequent questions; (1) do the strategies outlined in the Citywide

\textsuperscript{30} Depending on how the data is visualized in GIS, different assumptions can be made. But, in terms of the raw numbers, human capital has increased slightly at the same time poverty has in decreased. It is important to point out that such trends were confined to just a few census tracts.
2020 Plan differ previous efforts, (2) if so, to what degree have these strategies achieved their desired outcome and (3) what do previous planning efforts tell us about the likely impact of the 2020 Citywide Plan? The qualitative analysis that follows seeks to answer that first question. The section begins by identifying what Cleveland believed to be its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats from the reference materials. The SWOT analysis is immediately followed by a discussion on tourism, amenity and re-imaging based strategies Cleveland implemented over the past 60 years. This was done to observe how the strategies evolved with time. The study contends that although the target audience has shifted at times, the basic premise underlying each of these strategies (as discussed in the literature) are still very much prevalent in Cleveland today.

The second part of this chapter will address the second research question, by discussing changes in poverty and educational attainment rates. Several maps were generated to facilitate that discussion. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion on how and why Cleveland pursued the growth and redevelopment strategies it did, using the results of this study. This analysis will subsequently inform that third research question posed in the introductory chapter.

**CLEVELAND’S SWOT**

**STRENGTHS**

One of Cleveland’s greatest strengths has and will continue to be its geographic location in the Midwest and the Great Lakes. Centrally located between
Chicago and New York City (approximately 400 miles in either direction), Cleveland is connected to both cities by an extensive network of highways. Although many of these highway projects were completed between 1950 and 1970, Cleveland is considered one of the least congested big cities in the United States\textsuperscript{31}. With an extensive roadway network, international airport and rail/freight services, Cleveland is considered an ideal place to locate logistic centers (CPC, 2006).

Making business ventures in Cleveland and Northeast Ohio more attractive is Cleveland’s Metropolitan Statistical (MSA). Home to nearly 3 million people, the MSA provides Cleveland with the critical mass necessary to support many of the tourists, entertainment and recreational activities available in the community (CPC, 2006). For example, Cleveland would not be home to three professional franchises if it did not have the population base to support each team. Therefore, Cleveland’s MSA is considered to be an enduring strength for the community.

Another asset is Cleveland’s downtown. Although no longer considered necessarily a retail shopping destination, Cleveland remains the major cultural, entertainment and employment center in the region (CPC, 1950 and Cleveland Tomorrow, 1988). Cleveland’s downtown is complimented by its other great strength– the waterfront. Historically, Cleveland has been well served by the Cuyahoga River and Lake Erie. Together these two water bodies provided Cleveland with the necessary water resources to produce and export manufactured goods.

\textsuperscript{31} Out of the 39 largest metro areas in the US, Cleveland was the 5\textsuperscript{th} least congested city in 2007 based on a roadway congestion index created by the Texas Transportation Institute (Schrank and Lomax, 2007).
Today, the river and lakefront are seen as natural amenities in the community; amenities that should be protected and further enhanced\textsuperscript{32}.

WEAKNESSES

Poverty, dilapidated housing and blighted neighborhoods are familiar issues in the City of Cleveland. Unfortunately, these social and economic ailments have been festering in the community for going on a half a century, according to the reference materials. For example, in 1995 Cleveland’s Workable Program – which focused on eliminating slums in the community, identified 17 blighted neighborhoods in the City of Cleveland. Today, many of those same communities, including the neighborhood of Hough, remain challenging parts of the City.

Another weakness identified throughout the reference material was the lack of retail districts in the City of Cleveland. (Filion et al, 2004) Out of the 62 most frequented retail districts in the metropolitan area, Cleveland was home to just 6 as of 1991 (CPC, 1991). According to the CPC (2006) it is estimated that Cleveland residents spend nearly $1 billion on discretionary purchases outside the community annually. Compounding matters is Cleveland’s inability to generate enough taxes to support the municipal services it provides. This is a result of Cleveland’s poor and unsustainable tax base.

\textsuperscript{32} In 2005, the Council of Great Lake Governors (and Premiers) signed the \textit{Great Lakes –St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resource Compact}. The compact is meant to prohibit the diversion of water resources in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River Basin to other parts of the US and Canada. \textit{Source: Council of Great Lakes Governors. Accessed April, 2008; http://www.cglg.org/projects/water/CompactConsent.asp.}
As wealth and jobs left the City over a period time, the City’s income tax and property base declined. This has been aggravated by the poor quality of life exhibited in many Cleveland neighborhoods. As a result, Cleveland’s municipal coffers are no longer solvent and therefore Cleveland must use what limited resources it has to do two things: (1) leverage private capital investment and (2) develop other revenue streams for the community. The danger here, which the CPC all but explicitly stated in the Citywide 2020 Plan, is that projects and priorities (the public agenda if you will) are not determined by elected officials or City staff, but by the capitalists living in and outside the community. This has serious implications on how the City approaches economic development and redevelopment strategies going forward. Unfortunately, there are many more issues I could discuss here such as aging infrastructure and safety, but I believe Cleveland’s systemic weaknesses/challenges are symptomatic of an increasingly disarticulated economy in the region.

Many of Cleveland’s residents do not have the skills or education to participate in growing sectors of the economy, such as information technology or knowledge production. Aggravating the situation is the state of Cleveland’s Metropolitan School District. In 1996, the City of Cleveland assumed control of the school district, allowing then Mayor Michael White to appoint the City’s School Board\(^{33}\). Since taking over the district, the district has raised graduate rates among

---

\(^{33}\) Mayor White sought control of the school district, because the school was not addressing the needs of students and their families. And since the school board was an elected body, White claimed that the board focused on ‘political games’ rather than improving the education system for young people. To
its High School seniors to 61.9 percent in 2007\textsuperscript{34}. Therefore, the adversity Cleveland confronts may not necessarily extend from deindustrialization, but rather from the idea that Cleveland residents are socially and economically disconnected from the rest of the metropolitan area. The implications of this disarticulated economy are discussed in the last Chapter.

OPPORTUNITIES

Facing seemingly insurmountable challenges, the City of Cleveland has identified several opportunities for economic growth and revitalization since 1950. The most prominent of these has been the redevelopment of Cleveland’s waterfront with Lake Erie. Based on the reference materials reviewed for this study, Lake Erie and its waterfront is an underutilized natural amenity in the community (CPC, 1998). Issues of land use and accessibility along the lake shore are consistently sighted as barriers to fully realizing the utility of this amenity\textsuperscript{35}.

Cleveland’s national and world-renowned healthcare facilities and higher education institutions present the community with additional opportunities. Home to the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, Case Western Reserve University and several other public and private institutions of higher learning, Cleveland is at the


\textsuperscript{35} The primary barriers include old industrial complexes along the lake shore, as well Lake Shore Drive. Lake Shore Drive is an expressway that parallels the Lake Erie coastline. The expressway (Interstate 90) was the first major highway project to be completed in the City of Cleveland (CPC, 1950).
cutting edge of research and innovation. However, the knowledge generated at these institutions has not spilled over into the private sector, because the connections necessary between these entities are either missing or not robust enough (Fogarty, 1999). Additionally, these connection or ‘links’ are not easily replicated (Fogarty, 1999).

Despite the negative impacts associated with deindustrialization, the City of Cleveland has a unique opportunity to spark interests in segments of the population now growing up in the information age and knowledge dominated economy. Why? Because there is a certain ambiance associated with the historical legacy of cities, especially the industrial city. As was briefly pointed out in the literature, heritage tourism is increasingly perceived as a way for old industrial cities to attract visitors to a community who are interested in the country’s historic, industrial legacy (Edwards and Llurdes, 1996). Visitors are interested in the historical buildings (architecture), dense landscape and above all the sense of place one can experience. Therefore, it should be no surprise that the reference materials suggest that Cleveland use its industrial legacy to develop an ‘authentic’ sense of place that attracts not only tourists, but the creative class as well (CPC, 1991).

Another opportunity or prospect for future revitalization efforts extend from the fact that much of the property in Cleveland is either listed below market value. This is attributed to the residents living in the community and the poor socioeconomic conditions exhibited there. That being said, because property is relatively inexpensive compared to the suburbs, prospects for future revitalization
efforts are real. For example, along Chester Avenue in Cleveland (another thoroughfare running from downtown Cleveland to University Circle) new large homes dot the landscape in what would otherwise be blighted communities. With a weak housing market and financial incentives from the City of Cleveland, some people have been encouraged to invest and live in the City. However, working against new investment and keeping property valuation low is the Cleveland Metropolitan School District.

Despite being taken over by the City of Cleveland, the school district continues to struggle with academic achievement and graduation rates. However, the school has laid out a comprehensive plan to increase its graduation rate to 75 percent by the year 2012\textsuperscript{36}. Should a private investor move in and restore what tracts of land and housing stock can be saved or build new multi-income housing developments, in the long-run this entrepreneurial activity will be quite beneficial for the developer as well as the community.

Lastly, regional cooperation on a host of issues is another opportunity for the City of Cleveland and the Metropolitan Area. In 1950, the City’s general plan expected that Cleveland would be the major employer in the community and therefore an asset to the region. However, this dynamic has shifted to a certain extent. Although downtown Cleveland remains the single largest employment center in the region, it is becoming increasingly apparent that both the City and its suburbs need one another going forward in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century (Voith, 1998). This is

evident by the Northeast Ohio Mayors and City Managers Association and a new tax revenue sharing study currently underway. The revenue sharing study is being conducted by Advanced Northeast Ohio, a consortium made up of 80 partners across 16 counties in the region. In addition to the revenue study, the City of Cleveland is working with the organization to see how the region can coordinate economic incentives and redevelopment efforts to make the region more competitive for business and capital investment (Jackson, 2007).

THREATS

One of the greatest threats facing the City of Cleveland is its lack of human capital. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of college educated workers increased by approximately 3.4 percent from 8.0 to 11.4 percent respectively. This stands in stark contrast to the rest of Cuyahoga County, where 25.2 percent of the population had at least a bachelor’s degree as of the 2000 Census. This is significant, because it implies that despite Cleveland’s efforts to revitalize the center city, college educated workers continue to locate in the suburbs – the implications of which will be discussed later in this chapter and in Chapter 5.

Another disturbing issue facing the City of Cleveland is that it lacks an adequate housing market, meaning there is no demand to revitalize or build new housing (CPC, 2006). This is further exasperated by the fact that Cleveland residents do not possess the financial resources necessary to keep up their own homes (CPC, 1991). In 1989 it was estimated that approximately 40 percent of the
population lived at or below poverty. Unfortunately that statistic did not change all that much. In 2000, the US Census found that approximately 26.4 percent of people lived at or below the poverty line. This statistic is more than double that of Cuyahoga County’s reported poverty rate of 13.3 percent. Inadequate income was identified as the primary cause for Cleveland’s depleted housing stock (CPC, 1975). Making matters worse is the negative image associated with the City’s school district and issues of safety.

While safety was not a primary issue in this study, it certainly does contribute to how people perceive a place (Bell et al, 2001: 346). As a native resident of Cleveland, Mayor White was deeply concerned for the safety of all Clevelanders. For much of his administration he devoted a significant amount of time, energy and financial resources to reducing the level of violence and crime in the community. The other impetus of course was to ensure prospective residents they would be safe living in Cleveland neighborhoods.37

Although not nearly as prominent in the reference materials as those already discussed above, additional threats arise from issues of land assembly and brownfields (White, 1994 and CPC, 2006). During the City’s urban renewal program in the 1960s, land parcels were often assembled to make way for large redevelopment projects, such as the City’s Inner-Belt Highway downtown. Other projects did not transpire however, because it was difficult to assemble the land

37 Since taking office in 1990, Mayor Michael White reported that crimes in the City of Cleveland fell by 17 percent as of 1997. He also reported that his administration deployed 224 more police officers to patrol area neighborhoods (White, 1997).
parcels needed to develop new housing projects. (White, 1997 and CPC, 2006).

Even more challenging than assembling land parcels for redevelop, is making sure they are not contaminated. Because of Cleveland’s industrial past, it is estimated that there are 350 Brownfield sites in the community\(^{38}\). With limited funding available from a variety of initiatives at the state and local level, the successful mitigation of environmentally hazardous materials on these sites is timely and costly, further discouraging their development.

**GROWTH AND REDEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES:
A LOOK BACK OVER THE PAST 60 YEARS**

One of the challenges that had to be overcome in this study was deciding which reference materials to review. Since I was interested in economic growth and redevelopment strategies embraced by the City of Cleveland over the past 60 years, there were a number of resources I could have used, including old newspaper clippings. But, given time constraints this was not a realistic option. What turned out to be more pragmatic and of interest to me was reviewing old planning documents and policy statements made by elected officials in the form of Mayoral speeches.

As stated in Chapter 3, Cleveland has developed and or updated its comprehensive planning documents four times, three of which have occurred in the last 20 years. Since there was a significant gap between when the first general plan

was completed and when the comprehensive plan was updated in 1991, additional information was collected from several sources, including annual reports and capital improvement plan reports. The results of that study are presented here.

The results discuss how tourism, amenity and re-imaging strategies were implemented and evolved over time. Therefore, the following information is also presented (as much as possible) in chronological order. Please keep in mind that none of the strategies discussed below are mutually exclusive and that many of them were meant to address Cleveland’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

AMENITY-BASED STRATEGIES

Cleveland’s amenity-based strategies, beginning in 1950, primarily focused on the City’s downtown and waterfront. According to the City’s first general plan, the downtown was becoming increasingly unattractive to residents, because of crowding and congestion issues (Cleveland Urban Redevelopment Agency, 1955). Those with the financial resources to leave moved out of the City, leaving behind their homes and the businesses they once frequented. In doing so, many retailers downtown and throughout the City closed up shop. The results were vacant or abandoned buildings in a dense mix of land uses, which further contributed to the
City’s overall decline. To turn things around the City employed a number of amenity-based strategies over the years, a few of which are articulated below.

Over the years, Cleveland devoted a significant amount of energy and resource to construct sport and entertainment venues. In 1971, the City authorized a commission to study whether or not a new Municipal Stadium Complex should be built or if the existing facility could be renovated (CPC, 1972). Although I did not follow up on the commission’s recommendation, it is fair to assume that the study did not recommend a new facility be constructed. Instead, a significant amount of monetary resources were set aside to rehabilitate the existing structure. For example, in 1971 capital improvements to the Municipal Stadium and Auditorium (now part of the Cleveland Convention Center) were budgeted for $6,375,000 or roughly half of the entire budget set aside for the Division of Recreation. By 1974, the Capital Improvement Plan projected improvements for the next five years to total approximately $6,860,000 (CPC, 1974). Investments in sporting venues continued over the next 25 years, as is evident by the three new facilities in downtown Cleveland; Progressive Field, Quicken Loans Arena and Cleveland Browns Stadium. Although these facilities did not materialize until the 1990s,

---

39 The Broken Windows Theory partially explains why conditions in the City of Cleveland and many industrial cities declined rapidly after having experienced such intense growth and densification during the industrial revolution. The theory remains relevant in the planning literature today.

40 To put that in context, the Division of Recreation was part of the Department of Public Properties. The Department was responsible for maintaining existing property owned by the City of Cleveland. In 1971, the Department’s entire budget was $23,202,545.
planning for public improvements for the Gateway Project\textsuperscript{41} emerged as early as 1976 (CPC, 1996).

All together the Gateway Project cost $462 million to construct (Delaney and Eckstein, 2003), while the new Cleveland Browns Stadium is estimated to have cost more than $290 million alone\textsuperscript{42}. However, new stadia were not the extent of the Cleveland’s redevelopment efforts. Between 1980 and 1987 downtown Cleveland saw approximately $81.2 billion in capital investment (CPC, 1989). These projects are listed in Table B.7. That being said, amenity-based redevelopment efforts started to extend beyond downtown and into many Cleveland neighborhoods. The purpose of course being to make Cleveland’s neighborhoods as attractive as those found in suburban communities (CPC, 1991).

Efforts included beautifying streetscapes (White, 1990), rehabilitating old retail districts\textsuperscript{43} (White, 1990 and CPC, 2006) and providing residents with more leisure activities in the City (CPC, 1991 and 2006) such as recreational facilities and bike paths. By 1998 the Warehouse District, East Downtown, Gateway Area, Near Westside and the Flats were all identified as having the greatest potential to attract residents back to the community (CPC, 1998). A discussion about quality of life issues, which is paramount to the creative class thesis articulated by Richard Florida (2002 and 2005), did not truly emerge in the reference materials until 2006.

\textsuperscript{41}The Gateway Project refers to the baseball and basketball arena built adjacent to one another. When both facilities were completed, including an above ground parking facility, they area was referred to as the Gateway District. Cleveland Browns Stadium was not part of the Gateway Project. 
\textsuperscript{42}Source: Accessed May 1, 2009. www.clevelandbrowns.com/tickets/stadium/
\textsuperscript{43}To commemorate the approaching millennia, Mayor White (1999) invested $5 million to improve the City’s West-Side Market. The Market was considered an exemplary shopping district in the City of Cleveland, the type of district the City would like to replicate throughout the community (White 1991).
Soon after taking office in 2002, Mayor Jane Campbell set out to update Cleveland’s general plan. The final product, Connecting Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan, was not completed until 2006. As is obvious from the title, the planning document essentially laid out a roadmap for how Cleveland should proceed in the future with respect to implementing economic growth and redevelopment strategies. Recognizing the importance of knowledgeable workers in growing sectors of the economy, the Citywide Plan generally suggested that Cleveland focus its efforts on those projects that will improve the City’s quality of life. Quality of life issues identified in the Citywide Plan included, but were not limited to: improving lakefront accessibility to residents and visitors, developing vibrant neighborhoods – complete with neighborhood centers designed to meet the daily needs of the people living there, embracing all forms of diversity – not just tolerating it and fostering more opportunities for the arts and culture (CPC, 2006). If Cleveland is serious and committed to improving the area’s quality of life, it is believed the City will mitigate if not arrest the ‘brain drain’ phenomenon and become a center for ‘brain gain’ in the region (Campbell, 2003). According to the literature review, increased stocks of human capital invariably translate into increased employment opportunities in information and knowledge-based industries, which in effect can create additional positive externalities in the community.
Tourism-based redevelopment strategies emerged from the City’s need to generate revenue to pay for the municipal services it provided to local residents and businesses alike. Currently, the tax base is not sufficient to maintain the City’s level of services. The City has tried to offset this balance of payments through new economic development tourism engines in the community. Some of the more iconic projects include the Rock N’ Roll Hall of Fame, Great Lakes Science Center, Tower City Mall, Playhouse Square and the Gateway Project44.

The general idea is that if big projects can lure people back to the city for a baseball game or concert, people are more likely to patronize nearby bars, restaurants and retail establishments. As the 2020 Citywide Plan states, economic activity should be geared toward attracting businesses and visitors to the City of Cleveland (CPC 2006). The following underscores the City’s commitment to tourism.

Although Cleveland is committed to attracting new residents to live, work and play in downtown Cleveland, the City is also realistic. According to the CPC (1998) the ‘next best thing’ to a permanent resident is a non-resident who stays in hotel accommodations downtown. While the visitor may only be in town for just a few days, that visitor is likely to shop at some of the downtown businesses that necessitate a critical mass of people (foot traffic) to stay in businesses. As a result between 1990 and 2000, seven new hotels opened in downtown Cleveland, adding

44 It was projected that the Gateway Project alone would average 2.3 million visitors each year (White, 1992).
approximately 4,500 rooms to the existing inventory (White, 2000). Not only do these hotel facilities give people more opportunities to stay downtown, but it also makes the City more attractive for conventions as well\(^\text{45}\). To illustrate this point, let’s consider the new Cleveland Convention Center and Medical Mart that is currently being proposed for downtown Cleveland, another tourism-based strategy the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County has embraced.

Cuyahoga County Commissioners in January 2009 endorsed the location of a new Medical Mart and Convention Center be built on the site of the existing Cleveland Convention Center, to attract more regional and national conferences to downtown Cleveland. It is believed that between a new Medical Mart, expanded and rehabilitated convention center and the world renowned Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland could become a premier destination for health and medical related conferences. This in turn could bolster the City’s image (Gratton et al, 2005) as a leader in healthcare related services and hopefully attract additional investment from healthcare industries in the future. However, the new Medical Mart and convention center is not a done deal. Although County Commissioners, the City of Cleveland and a number of stakeholders are on board with the project, some in-fighting has occurred among developers vying to build the facility. The disagreement is where a new convention facility should be located.

\(^\text{45}\) One of the reasons the City of Columbus does not attract more national conventions is because it lacks the number of ‘full-service’ hotel accommodations. That is why the City supports a new publicly financed full-service hotel across from the convention center (Rose, 2009).
Forest City Enterprises, a large real estate firm headquartered in Cleveland, fought the County Commissioners’ decision to rehabilitate the existing facility. The reason; Forest City owns Tower City Center, a mixed use development complete with office space, retail, restaurants, movie theater and connecting hotel. Forest City’s proposal for a new convention center and Medical Mart is to be situated along the Cuyahoga River, directly across from Tower City.

According to Forest City, there are ‘100 million’ reasons why the new complex should be located next to Tower City. The 100 million reasons is a clever reference to the amount of money tax payers could save according to Forest City. In fact, in my most recent visit to Cleveland, large information boards were placed strategically throughout Tower City, encouraging local residents to voice their concerns to County Commissioners. However, I believe this strategy to be nothing more than a ploy to sway public opinion, so that Forest City could profit from convention goers patronizing restaurants and retail establishments at Tower City.

Forest City’s effort to relocate the convention center underscores the importance of tourism-based projects in the City of Cleveland and their potential to generate economic activity in the community. Since then, the dispute has been settled. The new Medical Mart will be constructed adjacent to the existing convention center which will also undergo complete renovation (Guillen, 2009).

---

46 See www.riverfrontcc.net to learn more about Forest City’s campaign and objections to a new Medical Mart and Convention Center on the existing convention center site.
47 Forest City also claims that there are currently no restaurants or retail district close to the existing convention center. Tower City is also the main terminal for Cleveland’s Rapid Public Transit System (RTA). One RTA (light rail) line directly connects Cleveland Hopkins’ International Airport to downtown Cleveland and Tower City Center.
In addition to being a commercial shipping lane and source of freshwater, Lake Erie has always been a tourist destination and natural amenity for the City of Cleveland. This is evident by the small parks that developed along the waterfront, including Edgewater Park. The City of Cleveland purchased the property for Edgewater Park in 1894. The park continues to provide residents and visitors alike with convenient access to the waterfront as well as many recreational amenities. Since then, Cleveland has continued to redevelop the lakefront, making it a more attractive and dare I say profitable tourist destination. For example, in 1998 the CPC proposed that an aquarium, retail village, convention center and multimodal transit station be constructed in the vicinity of where the Cleveland Browns Stadium is now located. In anticipation of a small, mixed-use facility developing adjacent to the stadium, Cleveland port facilities were relocated. A new port facility along with many additional recreational amenities, are planned for in the City’s Waterfront District Plan.

RE-IMAGING BASED STRATEGIES

One of the issues Cleveland continues to struggle with today is its negative connotation with residents and non-residents alike. This perception has been propagated, in part, by events on the ground such as the Cuyahoga River catching

---

49 The Waterfront District Plan was adopted by the CPC in 2004. More information about Cleveland’s ongoing efforts to revitalize the lakefront can be found by visiting the following website: www.planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/lakefront/cpc.html
fire in 1969. To overcome this negative perception, Cleveland engaged in an all out campaign to re-image the City, especially downtown. Some of those efforts have already been discussed in the context of tourism and amenity-based strategies. What I hope to do here, is highlight some more of nuanced strategies employed to re-image the City.

In 1991 the CPC suggested that the City consider installing noise barriers along major freeways, particularly along sections of the roadway network that passed through densely populated neighborhoods. The justification was twofold. First, the sound barriers were suppose to minimize the sound associated with automobiles speeding to and from the city center. Far more revealing, however, was the second justification, which said that the noise barriers should be erected to “improve views for motorists” (CPC, 1991). If the City’s true motive was to improve the living conditions of residents living close to the freeway, why would this language have been included in the planning document? What is far more likely is that this second justification was the real impetus for installing noise barriers, because the City was committed to improving its image and attracting people back to downtown Cleveland and more desirable parts of the community.

Another way Cleveland has and continues to redefine its self is, by trumpeting the success of its downtown revitalization efforts. For example, in a speech before City Hall in 1989 Mayor Voinovich proclaimed that Cleveland was coming back with vengeance. He trumpeted the fact that over $3 billion in private capital had been reinvested in the City. He was also quick to site some of the new
Nicknames bestowed on the community including 'Streaking Star of the Midwest,' 'The Comeback City' and 'The Renaissance City.' He further noted that during his tenure Cleveland had been recognized three times as an 'All-American City.' Mayor White (1993) dared Clevelanders to believe Cleveland could become the next 'International City.' And more recently, Mayor Jackson (2007) has engaged in a campaign to make Cleveland a 'City of Choice' for residents of all income groups. However, the use of such language by the current and previous Mayors of Cleveland is disingenuous. It is disingenuous because the language implies that if certain growth and development strategies are implemented, everyone’s boats will rise, when in effect the City is most concerned with attracting knowledge workers to live in the community. And again the impetus for having knowledge works in the community is to make the City a more attractive and competitive place to do business in growing sectors of the global economy. So, while Mayor Jackson may aspire to make Cleveland a 'City of Choice' for all residents, the emphasis is on privileged populations. The strategies outlined in the most recent comprehensive plan reflect that assertion.

QUANTITATIVE DATA RESULTS

As stated in this chapter an in previous chapters, it is important that planners understand the underlying mechanisms (forces) that produce the conditions they

---

50 In this instance the use of the word ‘boats’ refers to the socioeconomic conditions of Clevelanders.
observe on the ground. The maps presented here to exactly that, by visualizing the existing social and economic conditions in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. The maps also allow us to evaluate whether or not the strategies just described have been effective in reducing poverty and improving educational attainment during the 1990s, the following maps and tables were generated. The results of this quantitative analysis show that despite Cleveland's efforts, the City has not been successful at significantly reducing poverty and that rates of educational attainment remain low in the City compared to the surrounding suburbs. Therefore, the results appear to suggest that Cleveland should consider pursuing new strategies to close these gaps between its self and the suburbs. However, this will be discussed in greater detail in the last chapter.

THE POVERTY GAP

The set of poverty maps generated for this study were designed to compare and contrast the poverty rates observed in the City of Cleveland and its Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) between 1990 and 2000. Before discussing the overall trends observed in the poverty rate data set, a brief synopsis for each of the four maps is provided here.

In 1990, the City of Cleveland exhibited considerably high rates of poverty compared to its MSA (Map A.1). A majority of census tracts in Cleveland were found to have a poverty rate in excess of 31 percent, meaning that nearly one-third of Cleveland's residents earned less than $12,575 a year. Rates were even higher in
areas east and southeast of downtown Cleveland, where over half the population lived at or below the poverty line. Poverty rates observed in the City stand in stark contrast to those observed in the greater metropolitan area. On average, suburban communities and outlying areas observed poverty rates below 5 percent, the exception being the cities of Elyria and Lorain, west of Cleveland. Unlike the suburbs, Elyria and Lorain are older and more urbanized communities. Unfortunately, the situation in Cleveland did not change much between 1990 and 2000.

In 2000, Cleveland continued to exhibit higher rates of poverty than its suburban counterparts (Map A.2). However, it is important to note that while extreme rates of poverty did contract in some parts of the city, other census tracts actually saw an increase in poverty, including tracts in and outside of Cleveland. The decrease in poverty was primarily confined to tracts between downtown Cleveland and University Circle – along major arterials like Euclid Avenue (Map A.2). These observations in Cleveland were accompanied by a general decrease in poverty rates throughout the MSA, especially in the more outlying (rural) areas. That being said, higher poverty rates persist in the communities of Elyria and Lorain. While all three maps appear to suggest a general decline in poverty rates across the metro area, such a conclusion would be presumptuous without first considering the extent to which the poverty rate changed. To drill down a little

---

51 In 1990, 45 census tracts in the City of Cleveland had a poverty rate in excess of 51 percent. By 2000 this number had declined to 22 census tracts. Further note that while there was a definite decline, a majority of the census tracts still observed a poverty rate between 31 and 50 percent.
further, the change in poverty rate was calculated for the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County.

Between 1990 and 2000, on average the City of Cleveland exhibited the greatest decrease in poverty rates with respect to other suburban communities in Cuyahoga County. On average, census tracts in Cleveland observed a 4.29 percent decrease in poverty, with some tracts observing more significant decreases (Map A.3). But, poverty rates also increased in 29 census tracts in the City of Cleveland Map A.3. In these tracts, poverty rates increased between 6 to 28 percent. Census tracts that observed similar increases in poverty outside of Cleveland were either adjacent or in close proximity to the City’s corporate limits. But, on average tracts outside the City of Cleveland (in Cuyahoga County) saw an overall increase of 1.12 percent in the poverty rate. This trend, albeit small, is somewhat disturbing and will be addressed in more detail in the last chapter.

The final map produced in this set of maps, was created by employing Local Moran’s I to measure the inverse distance between neighboring census tracts as it relates to low and high rates of poverty observed in the Cuyahoga County. Looking at Map A.4 it is clear that high rates of poverty tend to be clustered in inner city Cleveland, while lower rates of poverty (0 to 5 percent) are primarily observed in suburban communities.

According to the Poverty Rate Cluster Analysis for 2000, census tracts in around downtown Cleveland are spatially associated with one another with respect to their poverty rates. In essence the map suggest that there is a stark contrast
between the rich and poor in Cuyahoga County, and that people living in poverty are more likely to be concentrated in Cleveland. In fact the relationship between the high rates of poverty observed in Cleveland are more definitive than the lower rates of poverty exhibited in the suburbs, the implications of which pose a serious challenge to Cleveland’s future growth and prosperity.

**THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT GAP**

The next sets of maps generated for this study looked at where college educated workers lived in the greater Cleveland area between 1990 and 2000. Recall that Cleveland was very much interested in attracting human capital back to the City and in doing so pursued growth and redevelopment strategies that focused on tourism and amenities. The maps that follow, therefore, look at the degree to which Cleveland has been successful in attracting this particular cohort. Generally, the results show that while certain parts of Cleveland saw a slight increase in the number of college educated workers living in the community between 1990 and 2000, significant gains were confined to census tracts close to the city center.

The first map that was produced looked at the educational attainments rates of the City of Cleveland in the context of its MSA for 1990. With the exception of 5 census tracts in Cleveland, Map A.5 shows that college educated workers tended to reside in suburban communities. Of the five tracts in Cleveland that observed educational attainment rates in excess of 36 percent, two were in downtown Cleveland while the other three were close to University Circle. Unfortunately, these
tracts were the exception. On average only 7 percent of the population in each census tract was college educated. This explains why the reference materials consistently mentioned the need to improve educational attainment rates in the community (Cleveland Tomorrow, 1988; White, 1994 and Jackson, 2006).

By 2000, the number of college-educated people living in the City of Cleveland had increased (Map A.6). On average, 11 percent of the population in each census tract now had earned a college education, representing about a 4 percent increase from 1990. Nine tracts now had populations where over 36 percent of the labor force was college educated. Such gains fail in comparison to the percentage of college educated workers living in suburban communities throughout the MSA. Furthermore, with the exception of 14 tracts located outside of the City, Cleveland is the only place that observed educational attainment rates between 0 to 5 percent. This indicates that college educated workers still prefer to live in the suburbs than in the City of Cleveland.

Between 1990 and 2000, the percent of college educated workers living in the City of Cleveland increased on average by 3.1 percent for each census tract. Had the analysis been expanded to include all the census tracts in the MSA, I am confident the results would have shown a much higher increase in educational attainment rate in the MSA. However, I was most intrigued by the variability among census tracts in and around downtown Cleveland in Map A.7. Of the 15 census tracts identified, 8 tracts saw (on average) a 15.4 percent increase in the presence of college educated people, while seven did not. Of those tracts that did not see an
increase, the percentage of college educated people actually decreased (on average) by 7.1 percent. Increases in tracts 1071 and 1033 can be attributed to neighborhood revitalization efforts, especially in the Warehouse District and the Flats (west of the Cuyahoga River). But, the decreases observed are more challenging to explain given the scale and scope of this project. However, based on the two indicators discussed here, decreases in the percent of college educated workers living downtown may be attributed to the increased poverty rates observed in some of these tracts.

The final map produced in this series of maps employed Local Moran’s I to create a cluster analysis map. The map was created in order to observe whether or not there was any spatial association between educational attainment rates in the Cuyahoga County and the City of Cleveland. The result was Map A.8.

Map A.8 demonstrates two things. First, census tracts that observed high rates of educational attainment (in excess of 36 percent) were more likely to be in close proximity to each other. This is particularly evident in suburban communities just east of University Circle. Here, the calculated Z-score was in excess of 5.2 with a P-Value less than 0.10. This indicates that those census tracts are spatially related to one another. This is also the case west of downtown Cleveland along the lake shore. Although similar Z-Scores and P-Values were observed in portions of inner-city Cleveland, when interpreted the analysis reaffirms that much of Cleveland is void of an educated workforce. The lower Z-score values and high P-Values observed in Cuyahoga County indicate that the percentage of college educated
workers in a particular census tract vary, which reflects what one might observe if this same analysis was conducted using a random sample.

**THE POPULATION GAP**

As stated in the Introductory Chapter, Cleveland has and continues to see a significant decline in population. This is again reiterated in the Map A.9, whereby the majority of census tracts in the City saw a decrease in population between 1990 and 2000. The exception being 19 tracts that observed a population increase in excess of 10 percent. Overall, population growth has occurred outside the City limits in Cuyahoga County. This analysis was not expanded to Cleveland’s MSA due to time constraints. But, if one extrapolates from the trends observed in Map A.9, and the subsequent maps on poverty and educational attainment already produced, it is highly likely we would observe positive growth rates in the rest of the MSA, especially in those tracts where the percentage of college educated workers increased between 1990 and 2000.

It is important to point out that this indicator, population change, was not included in project’s original design. It was added later to compliment the qualitative and quantitative data analysis already conducted in order to further explain some of the trends observed in the City of Cleveland and the surrounding suburbs.
ANALYSIS

To provide some structure to the following discussion, the analysis section is organized around three topics or themes, each building on the previous one(s). The first topic area examines why Cleveland is ill equipped to compete in growing sectors of the economy. The next topic area evaluates the effectiveness of Cleveland’s urban investment strategies to date. The section concludes by discussing the urban-suburban relationship in the Greater Cleveland Area.

THE NEW WORLD VIEW

As previously stated in the literature review, the purpose and function of the Post-industrial city is very much a contentious issue\textsuperscript{52}. This is especially true given the Post-Fordist world we live in today, where the exchange information and knowledge creation are the primary mechanisms by which the global economy is directed. Therefore, heavy industries are no longer perceived to be an engine for economic growth in more advanced countries. And instead of trying to stay ahead of the curve, Cleveland tried to ensure the longevity of its industrial base.

Planning documents and policy statements revealed that the City tried to hang on to its industrial base too long, in part because much of the population (and indeed the City itself) relied on blue collar jobs for their social and economic well-

\textsuperscript{52} With respect to Cleveland’s city center, Burgess et al (1998) posed the same question after reviewing the City’s Civic Vision \textit{2000 and Beyond} planning document: “Is downtown to be a home for the city’s residents, to be a heart of the region, or to be a lure for conventioneers and visitors.” The implications of pursuing anyone of these objectives are serious.
being. Unfortunately, this left Cleveland vulnerable to changes in the global economy, which continues to adversely impact the community (Kodras, 1997).

Deindustrialization for example, was partially the result of capital and labor becoming more fluid with improved transportation in the United States and other industrialized countries. Some of these negative impacts were observed in the maps and tables generated above. For instance, one of the reasons Cleveland continues to struggle financially is due to its poor tax base. Although poverty rates for census tracts in Cleveland did decline on average slightly, they still remain relatively high compared to areas just outside the City limit. As a result, vibrant retail districts that use to dot the landscape are now abandoned or in serious need of rehabilitation. Compounding the issue is the lack of educational attainment in the community.

According to the data, by 2000 only 11 percent of the population in each census tract had earned at least a four year degree from a college or university. Lack of human capital has frustrated Cleveland’s efforts to become a major bioscience or health services center, despite having such assets as the Cleveland Clinic. Not having the population necessary to fill jobs in these industries has in effect held the city back. The lack of human capital also means that employment opportunities are more likely to be in low wage service sector jobs. The exception being perhaps, those individuals still employed in what remains of Cleveland’s industrial base. However, this too has serious implications on the community.

As Mayor Campbell rightly pointed out in her State of the City speech in 2004, Cleveland is ‘at the bottom of the list when it comes to middle and upper
income households.’ And as a result, the City has not been able to support itself financially for some time. Making matters worse is the fact that between 1990 and 2000 Cleveland’s population declined and poverty rates increased in many census tracts. While some political pundits and government agencies have referred to the global financial crisis in 2008 as the ‘perfect storm,’ I would contend that the situation plaguing Cleveland is not only a perfect storm, but one that is unrelenting.

**URBAN INVESTMENT**

Confronted by an increasingly global economy where the old ways of doing business are no longer viable, and a deteriorating urban core, Cleveland has responded in two ways. As stated previously the City tried to at first hunker down and hold on to its industrial base. Such efforts were recorded in the reference materials as late as the mid 1970s (CPC, 1974 and 1976). However, these efforts appeared to almost vanish from the vernacular in planning documents and policy statements from the 1980s onward.

Recognizing that Cleveland needed to change course, the City started to invest in urban development projects that would improve the overall image of the community. To re-image the City after 40 years of decay, Cleveland focused on developing tourist activities and amenities downtown and along the lakefront. Initially, efforts to revitalize downtown were two fold; first, they were meant to reassure Cleveland’s corporate community that the City was a good place to do business and second, redevelopment strategies were intended to entice
Clevelanders (now living in the suburbs) to come back and frequent some of the local attractions. This priority could not have been more explicit than in the following excerpt from Cleveland’s Citywide Development Program (1985):

*Office towers rising on Downtown’s skyline have signaled the growth of Cleveland’s corporate community and the increase need for legal, financial and business support services. A strong regional demand for retail specialty stores, restaurants, personal services and entertainment facilities continues to exist even though neighborhood commercial areas have been declining. Cleveland already has responded to these demands with the commercial development in the Flats district, with the Playhouse Square theater restoration and with the new Cleveland Play House in Doan Center.*

Although Cleveland continues to focus on tourist and amenity-based strategies, the target audience started to shift in the early 2000s.

As the quantitative analysis pointed out, between 1990 and 2000 the number of college educated workers in a particular census tract only increased by 3.1 percent on average. By 2000, the average rate of educational attainment in a given tract was 11 percent. Such rates are below those observed in the surrounding suburbs. Instead of trying to build new ballparks and facilities, the City started to focus on trying to attract and develop a knowledgeable workforce in the City of Cleveland (Campbell, 2004). To do this Mayor Campbell brought together Cleveland’s colleges and universities, as well as the private sector. The impetus
here was to drive innovation in the private sector through Cleveland’s research institutions.

More recently, the City has focused on reconnecting neighborhoods to the waterfront via bike paths and improving public transportation along Euclid Avenue, between downtown Cleveland and University Circle. There are also plans to rehabilitate 16 retail district or ‘town centers’ to revitalize some of Cleveland’s neighborhoods. Should these town centers materialize, they would be nothing more than ‘islands of renewal in a sea of despair.’ The degree to which these efforts will be successful in achieving their objective is highly questionable, because the local population cannot support high-quality retail in their community unless that population is dispersed and replaced by higher wage earners. Although this strategy of displacement is not explicitly stated in reference materials, decreases in population and poverty east of downtown Cleveland appear to suggest otherwise.

**URBAN-SUBURBAN RELATIONSHIP**

One of the most alarming results that emerged from this study was the notion that Cleveland residents are, for the most part, socially and economically disconnected from the surrounding area. This was evident from the cluster analysis maps generated using poverty and educational attainment rate data for 2000 (see Maps A.8 and A.9). In both instances, high rates of poverty and low levels of educational attainment grip the City of Cleveland, while the opposite held true for the suburbs.
Despite significant investments downtown since 1980, Cleveland has not been able to substantially reduce systemic poverty or raise educational attainment rates among its population. As a result, the City of Cleveland has not been solvent for some time. To address this concern, it appears that Cleveland deliberately pursued strategies that attracted discretionary spending back to the community and in a sense, has become fixated on that source of income. Efforts to build a new Medical Mart and Convention Center at the Burnham Mall in downtown Cleveland and plans to rehabilitate the waterfront are a testament to that growing dependency.

Furthermore, the cluster analysis maps underscore the functional relationship between Cleveland and its suburbs. While privileged persons living in the suburbs take advantage of the amenities only a large city can provide (finance), they do not have to necessarily concern themselves with the ills facing the community. Rapid transit trains and the network of highways available in the study area facilitate this movement of people between downtown Cleveland and suburbs. As previously stated, noise barriers were not solely erected along highways to reduce the noise pollution generated from automobile traffic, but to shield suburbanites from having to see the social and economic ills that plague the community residents living along those very highways.

Because of the gross inequalities observed across space in Maps A.8 and A.9, Cleveland is pursuing a more regional approach to economic growth and development (Jackson 2006, CPC 2007) in order to leverage regional assets and
share the benefits of regional growth. Since taking office in 2006, Mayor Jackson has brought together elected officials in nearby communities to develop the Mayor & Managers Association of Cuyahoga County with the purpose being to work in tandem to attract, rather than compete for, jobs and investment. Cleveland is also one of the 80 partners across 16 counties in Northeast Ohio, working together to attract businesses and talent to the area. Although Cleveland has always considered itself to be part of a larger region (CPC 1950), this is the first time the City has genuinely reached to other communities to develop a regional approach to economic growth and development. Efforts to revitalize the lakefront and attract talent to the community are now discussed in a regional context so as to leverage regional assets (Berg and Braun, 1999).

While I certainly applaud Cleveland’s change of heart in recent years, the strategies Cleveland has put forward in the Citywide 2020 Plan still capitulate to the needs and desires of the creative class, at the expense (figuratively and literally) of residents still living in the community (Marcuse, 2005). One reason for this may be that people over the age of 25, by in large, still prefer living in the suburbs. However, they value the cultural and recreational amenities Cleveland has to offer. For some it may be the best of both worlds, urban-suburban living. And if so, what does that imply about the function and purpose of the Post-industrial city? And with that, I have come full circle.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH AGENDA

The urban environment is comprised of and shaped by many social, political and economic forces in society (Marcuse, 2005), the dynamics of which are difficult to unpack, especially in an increasingly global economy. Unfortunately, Cleveland’s experience with these underlying forces has been protracted and devastating in terms of the local economy and the City’s urban population. This was particularly evident in the quantitative analysis, where high poverty and low educational attainment rates were spatially concentrated in and around Cleveland’s urban core. However, this need not be the case indefinitely.

Like our current President Barak Obama, I am confident Cleveland and other post-industrial cities can turn themselves around, if community leaders and staff are committed to implementing the right combination of strategies to get the job done. Getting the job done in part, requires planners and elected officials to acknowledge the underlying social and economic conditions Cleveland residents struggle with and why they continue to persist. That being said, efforts thus far have not met their intended objectives, those being a significant reduction in poverty rates and
the increased presence of a college educated labor force – just to name a few. And based on the results of this study, I am less confident Cleveland’s 2020 Citywide Plan will dramatically change these quality of life indicators, because the plans continue to capitulate to privileged populations living in and outside of the City. So, to answer the overarching research question initially posed by this study, the answer is no: the City of Cleveland’s 2020 plan and more specifically the continued revitalization of downtown Cleveland, will not improve the social and economic conditions of neighborhoods in the community.

To explain why I believe Cleveland’s new general plan will not meet its stated objectives (based on the results of this study), it is important to first recall the three fundamental questions imbedded in this question. First, how do Cleveland’s economic growth and redevelopment strategies outlined in the 2020 Citywide Plan differ from previous efforts? Second, to what degree have previous strategies been successful at achieving their desired outcome? And lastly, what do previous efforts tell us about the likely impact of the 2020 plan? Let’s start with the first question.

Since completing and adopting its first general plan in 1950, Cleveland has been squarely focused on revitalization efforts downtown and along the City’s waterfront. These two features were considered definite assets in the community. As the study showed, Cleveland’s economic growth and redevelopment efforts were driven in part by the City’s perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).
Instead of adapting to the new relationships being forged between the basic means of production (capital and labor), Cleveland made a strategic blunder in trying to hold on to its industrial base. Cleveland’s efforts included preserving and even purchasing land for industries wanting to expand their operations (CPC 1950 and 1976). However, by the 1970s reference materials ceased to mention such strategies.

For the first time Cleveland started to recognize that it was not going to be a major industrial center anymore and decided to change course. In doing so, Cleveland pursued strategies aimed at bolstering tourism and amenities in the community. This was done to make the city more attractive to college educated workers and recapture the revenue lost by former Cleveland residents moving out to the suburbs. Efforts primarily focused on the downtown and lakefront, but some projects and programs did focus on neighborhood rehabilitation. Although the impetus for such strategies has shifted from being primarily focused on the business community to meeting the needs of young professionals and college educated workers – the two are really synonymous with one another.

The qualitative component of this study suggests that the growth and redevelopment efforts outlined in the 2020 Citywide Plan are similar to urban investment strategies followed in years past. Therefore the Citywide Plan continues to employ tourism, amenity-based and re-imaging strategies in the community. The only caveat is that Cleveland has started to discuss these efforts in a more regional context. Regionalism is a term that started to appear in more recent planning
documents and policy statements. This is especially true of Cleveland’s current Mayor, Frank Jackson. So, if Cleveland’s new general plan does not differ much from previous strategies, has tourism, amenity and re-imaging based strategies worked to improve the socioeconomic conditions of Clevelanders? That is a matter of perspective.

While it is true that the poverty rate decreased on average by 4.3 percent in each of the census tracts, the study showed that Cleveland already exhibited significantly higher rates of poverty than its surrounding neighbors. The study also showed that in 29 census tracts, poverty rates actually increased between 6 and 28 percent. Based on the objectives stated in many of the planning documents and policy statements, the nominal decrease in poverty observed between 1990 and 2000 is not comparative to the amount of public and private capital invested in projects downtown. Just because the City built new sporting venues, entertainment districts and skyscrapers, the projects did not necessarily translate to an improved quality of life for City residents.

The other aspect of this analysis looked at educational attainment rates observed in the City between 1990 and 2000. The analysis showed that Cleveland did see on average a 3.1 percent increase in the number of college educated workers living in each census tract. However, that rate of increase was again small. Suburban communities already observed much higher rates of educational attainment than the City of Cleveland.
Based on the qualitative analysis tourism, amenity and re-imaging strategies were meant to attract college educated people back to the community. As it turns out, this cohort still prefers to live in the suburbs. This idea was again reinforced when the study looked at changes in population growth. By in large, the most significant population growth occurred outside of the City. This is quite evident in Map A.9. Knowing all that, let’s return the initial question posed by this study. Will the 2020 Citywide Plan improve the quality of life conditions in the City of Cleveland for residents living in the community... this study suggests that it will not. One of the justifications for this contention is that many Clevelanders are not connected to the local and global economy.

Residents fortunate enough to have a job are more likely to have low wage service sectors jobs. While the income earned from these employment opportunities may far exceed wages earned in developing countries, the United States is a country whose competitive advantage is in the information, high-tech and knowledge economy. Since a disproportionate amount of Cleveland residents are not able to participate in these growing sectors of the economy, it is reasonable to assert that a substantial amount of the population is disconnected from the local economy\textsuperscript{53}. Recall that on average, only 11 percent of the population in a given census tract was college educated; meaning that they had earned at least a four year degree. Staggering statistics like these have several implications.

\textsuperscript{53} Research should also focus on how labor is perceived, value and rewarded by society.
As the study demonstrated, Cleveland has become more reliant on growth and redevelopment strategies that attract capital back to the City. The local tax base is no longer sufficient to support the level of services Cleveland provides. To offset this balance of payments, Cleveland has and continues to rely on revenues generated from discretionary spending by people living outside the community. Taking a step back for a moment, it is not difficult to abstract how Alain De Janvry’s theory of articulated and disarticulated economies applies to Cleveland’s situation.

The second reason the 2020 Citywide Plan will not achieve its objectives, is because the plan essentially recycles growth and redevelopment strategies already employed previously. As the study demonstrated, Cleveland’s plans to redevelop the lakefront, create new bike paths and build a new convention center downtown are more of the same. But, in all fairness the target audience has shifted. While the City claims that it wants to improve the living conditions in Cleveland so that residents of various incomes find it attractive, words like ‘talent’ and regionalism that are bantered about in the plan and in policy statements suggest otherwise.

As this study has demonstrated, significant investment in revitalization projects in downtown Cleveland and along the lakefront, have not been successful at improving the quality of life indicators examined here. Should many of the economic growth and redevelopment strategies outlined in Cleveland’s newest Citywide Plan be implemented, this study contends that the poor quality of life conditions exhibited by nearly one third of the population in Cleveland will continue to persist. And if that is indeed the case, concentrated poverty and low educational
attainment rates will continue to plague Cleveland as demonstrated by the cluster analysis maps produced for both indicators. In fact, between 1990 and 2000, the clustering of high rates of educational attainment and low poverty rates actually increased slightly in suburban communities in Cuyahoga County. Therefore, the study suggests that if the 2000 Citywide Plan is implemented, it will disproportionally benefit privileged populations and reinforce existing growth and development patterns in the suburbs, hence answering the third subsequent research questions.

One of the reasons I decided to use Cleveland as a case study, is because it exhibits a disproportionate amount of poverty, not to mention one of the lowest rates of educational attainment for a City its size. In order to make Cleveland a ‘City of Choice,’ as Cleveland’s current Mayor (Frank Jackson) suggests, Cleveland must redouble its efforts to reduce poverty and improve educational attainment rates. Although the reference materials reviewed for this study consistently stressed the importance of a well educated citizenry living in the community, economic growth and redevelopment strategies thus far (including the 2020 Citywide Plan) are still chiefly focused on importing that population instead of generating it from the bottom up. As long as Cleveland tolerates systemic poverty and poor educational attainment rates among its own residents, this study supports the assertion that Cleveland will continue to struggle with the negative aspects of its industrial legacy (Weissbourd, 2006).
RESEARCH AGENDA

To make more informative the results of this study, future research should incorporate data from the 2010 US Census. Had the data been available for this research project, the time series would have been doubled, allowing more trends in the data sets to be observed. While the results of this study insinuate that neither indicator was likely to improve unless growth and redevelopment focused more on Clevelanders rather than non-residents, updating the study with this new data would go a long way in affirming or negating that hypothesis. Admittedly, it was frustrating not having the data available, especially since the research project transpired between 2008 and 2009. That said, the study suggests two other areas of research be pursued going forward, those being the rearticulating of disarticulated economies and the evolving relationship between urban and suburban communities.

As the study demonstrated, tourism, amenity and re-imaging strategies employed by the City of Cleveland have not significantly improved the socioeconomic conditions for residents living in the community. Should this study be updated in the future with data from the 2010 census, in all likelihood this hypothesis will be reaffirmed. However, that does not mean gross inequalities will suddenly vanish from the community. Therefore, future research should consider exploring how disarticulated economies can be rearticulated in an urban context so as to minimize the socioeconomic ailments plaguing cities, in order to make the City a more viable place for everyone in the community (Scott, 2007 and Harvey,
While there are examples of less developed countries successfully rearticulating their economy, including Botswana and South Korea, I am not aware of any examples at a local level or how to measure whether when a community is or is not socially and economically articulated. Education is likely to take center stage in that body of research.

The other area of research that warrants further exploration is the relationship between the urban and suburban. As the study revealed, Cleveland has become increasingly reliant on discretionary spending dollars generated from tourist activities and amenities in the community. Based on the data analysis, this revenue stream is supplied by people living in nearby suburbs and the greater metropolitan area. So, what would happen if Cleveland’s suburban communities turned their attention elsewhere, meaning they started to invest in amenities typically found in urban core? Would Cleveland continue to function? Could the City survive based on its current tax base? Although this study cannot specifically answer those questions – it does suggest that without the suburbs, Cleveland (especially the urban core) could deteriorate further.

But, let’s suppose the question is turned around on its head. Would suburban communities continue to function and enjoy the quality of life they have come to value if Cleveland ceased to exist? Could the first ring suburbs survive? Would the second ring suburbs continue to grow? In asking such rhetorical

---

54 Rearticulating the local economy would start minimize the self-aggravating cycle of decline Cleveland and its residents continue to endure (Bradbury et al, 1980).
questions, my intent is to highlight how important urban and suburban communities are to one another. And in doing so, challenge the bodies of research to explain the dynamic relationship between the urban core and suburbia in a social, economic and spatial context.

While this study recognizes the importance of tourism, amenities and re-imaging based strategies, strategies like these should be balanced by efforts to lift up the least in a community. As the literature review rightly pointed out, such efforts must include improving educational attainment rates among inner-city residents. This can be partially accomplished by improving the public education system in those communities. Instead of importing talent from nearby suburban communities and beyond, Post-industrial cities should engage in planning efforts that rejuvenate their community from the bottom up, giving residents the ‘right’ to pursue the quality of life they so desire (Harvey, 2008). Fundamentally rearticulating the local economies of Post-industrial cities would not only reduce the gross inequalities observed in cities like Cleveland, but potentially arrest and reverse unsustainable development practices that continue to facilitate urban sprawl.

Understanding the multiplicative forces that shape communities is paramount to actively charting a course for future development. I sincerely hope

---

55 In a post-fordist, post-modern world urban land use models developed by Burgess, Hoyt and others do not capture the social, economic and spatial relationships between cities like Cleveland and its suburbs.

56 In addition to improve the education systems, a comprehensive plan should be developed to address the other social and economic issues that distract students from excelling in school.
the results of this study impressed upon you some of the same questions articulated here. Going forward, I hope elected officials and City Planners alike will rebalance their planning efforts so as to dramatically improve the quality of life conditions people face in Cleveland and in other Post-industrial cities.
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APPENDIX A: MAPS FROM QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS
Map A.1. Poverty Rate in 1990
Map A.2. Poverty Rate in 2000
Map A.3. Change in Poverty Rate 1990 to 2000
Map A.4. Poverty Rate Cluster Analysis
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APPENDIX B. TABLES
### Table B.1. Historical Sector Employment for Cuyahoga County, OH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing (durable and non-durable goods)</strong></td>
<td>267,900</td>
<td>262,300</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>223,600</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities</strong></td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wholesale Trade</strong></td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>52,600</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Trade</strong></td>
<td>91,300</td>
<td>108,200</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</strong></td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Services</strong></td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Services</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>60,400</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Services</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Services</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Services</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services</strong></td>
<td>126,100</td>
<td>152,300</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>177,300</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Service Producing Industries</strong></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>467,000</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*not available*

Source: Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University (1987)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>25,982</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Durable and non-durable goods)</td>
<td>127,403</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation *</td>
<td>28,194</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Public Utilities*</td>
<td>16,786</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>34,007</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>100,857</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>45,563</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Repair Services</td>
<td>30,240</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>15,656</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and Recreation Services</td>
<td>8,017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>68,236</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>49,542</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>48,206</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>24,331</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: US Census (1990)*

Table B.2. Sector Employment for Cuyahoga County, OH in 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2000 Employed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>28,952</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Durable and non-durable goods)</td>
<td>102,279</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing *</td>
<td>26,555</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities *</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information *</td>
<td>17,821</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>24,570</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>68,699</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>54,773</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Science and Technical *</td>
<td>40,296</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Companies and Enterprises *</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Support and Waste Management</td>
<td>23,289</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Services *</td>
<td>88,530</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>49,032</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation *</td>
<td>10,483</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomodation and Food Services *</td>
<td>38,313</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>28,090</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>26,857</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delineates new sector employment classifications based on the North America Industry Classification Systems (NAICS) established in 1997. Previously industries were classified by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes.


Table B.3. Sector Employment for Cuyahoga County, OH in 2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (durable and non-durable goods)</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>101,400</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communication and Public Utilities</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>58,300</td>
<td>66,200</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University (1987)

Table B.4. Historical Sector Employment for Cleveland, OH in 1976, 1980 and 1984
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Durable and non-durable goods)</td>
<td>42,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation *</td>
<td>9,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Public Utilities</td>
<td>4,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>8,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>28,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>10,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Repaurir Services</td>
<td>9,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and Recreation Services</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>19,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>12,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>11,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>8,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census (1990)

Table B.5. Sector Employment for Cleveland, OH in 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Durable and non-durable goods)</td>
<td>32,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing *</td>
<td>9,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities *</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information *</td>
<td>4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>5,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>17,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>12,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Science and Technical *</td>
<td>6,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Companies and Enterprises *</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Support and Waste Management</td>
<td>8,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Services *</td>
<td>10,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>27,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation *</td>
<td>2,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomodation and Food Services *</td>
<td>13,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>8,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>9,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delineates new sector employment classifications based on the North America Industry Classification Systems (NAICS) established in 1997. Previously industries were classified by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes.


Table B.6. Sector Employment for Cleveland, OH in 2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Completed</th>
<th>$ Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grove Port Condominiums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Condominiums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nautica (Phase 1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Convention Center</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Point</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Bell</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Cleveland Center</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Center</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Federal Savings</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Square</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Company</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP/America Building</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Center</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statler Office Tower</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle Building</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playhouse Square Theaters</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playhouse Square Garage</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NorthCoast Harbor</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt Block (Phase 1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Building</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat Factory</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Point Garage</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Underway</th>
<th>$ Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nautica Center (Phase II)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt Block (Phase II)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Block</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stouffer's Tower City Plaza</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Tower Renovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower City Center</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higbee Company</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP/America Parking Garage</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Building Renovation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Point II Office Tower</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society Center</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance at Playhouse Square</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.7. Urban Investment Projects in Cleveland, 1980 to 1987
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990 Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990 Educational Attainment Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Educational Attainment Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina County</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same count for the City of Cleveland and each County.


Table B.8. Descriptive Statistics for Poverty and Educational Attainment Data Sets
Making Cleveland a City of Choice: A Strategy for Development and Revitalization in Cleveland
Connecting Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan
Cleveland City Planning Commission
July 2006

• How should a city measure its greatness? Plan suggests that "the ultimate measure of a city's greatness is the quality of life it offers to its citizens."

• Generally, plan is focused on making a Cleveland a "city of choice and of choices as it relates to housing, services, development, education, entertainment and culture and more. It's about giving EVERYONE in the community an opportunity to make their own choices (critical objective)."

• Plan states up front that revitalization strategies and recommendations are contingent on funding sources – so the comprehensive plan should serve as a blueprint for managing the city’s scare resources (Personal comment: with scare resources, what get’s priority – who benefits most of activities are implemented and which recommendations are likely to be implemented first).

• Challenges facing the city of Cleveland in the 21st century include: the knowledge-based economy, shifting population demographics and the quality of public education. “Place-based strategies” must be coupled with “people-based” plans.

• Underlying premise of plan – great cities are places of connection between people, places and opportunities.

• Connections like the ones mentioned above are only made available through the resources of a large metropolitan area.

• Identified Strengths:
  o Metropolitan population (16th largest in the US)
  o Downtown population, grew by 1/3 from 1990 to 200
  o Medical Innovation from the Medical Institutions
  o Higher Education Institutions
  o Information technology – “ultra-broadband” network
  o Water
  o Waterfronts
  o Location and Accessibility – ranked first in Midwest and fourth in nation as a location for logistics management – largely attributed to the area’s highway system (2004).
  o Neighborhood Institutions – community development corporations
  o Philanthropic Support – Cleveland Foundation is a model (oldest in US, second largest community foundation)
• Challenges (as identified by the Brookings Institution in 2000, according to the US Census) – Cleveland was part of study that included 22 other US cities (find more information):
  o Income ranked third lowers in 1990s, despite growth in median income
  o Poverty rate declined in 1990s, but ranked third highest out of 23 targeted cities according to the 200 US Census. Cleveland has second highest black and Hispanic poverty rates according to Brookings analysis.
  o Education – 5th lowest out of 200 largest cities for obtaining a bachelor’s degree
  o Immigration – very low
  o College students – second smallest student population in 23 cities
  o Economically Dependent Population – 70 children and seniors are being supported by every 1000 of Cleveland’s working –age adults.
  o Households and families – large single-parent family population.
  o Segregation
  o Jobs in Manufacturing – still very much dependent on sector compared to other communities (twice the percentage of people work in the manufacturing industry)
  o Job Location – commutes in Cleveland Metropolitan area beginning and end in the suburbs (Personal comment: this is certainly a problem – may be addressed in redevelopment strategies by making the CITY more attractive) – only four other cities did worse.

• The Vision:
  o Biomedical and information technology leader
  o Advanced manufacturing
  o Goods jobs for all residents (through education and training) – (Personal Comment; but what king of jobs)
  o Safe, family friendly neighborhoods that have excellent services
  o Achievements in public education renewal
  o Accessible lakefront and riverfront
  o Vibrant urban neighborhoods
  o Diversity is not only tolerated by embraced
  o Arts and culture – world-renowned institutions
  o Healthy living and sustainable development (walkable communities with an abundance of recreation opportunities for all Clevelanders, regardless of age or income).

• Guiding Principles:
  o Connections
  o Assets
  o Opportunity “re-imagining” Cleveland to turn challenges into opportunities
• Place
  • Choice for residents of all income levels
• Diversity
  • Sustainability – healthy and viable community
• Neighborhood based plan focuses on 36 communities, grouped into 6 districts in the community.
• Implementation – city staffers recognize that many plans produce little results and therefore collect dust. City will need to be leader in a regional cooperative effort.
  • Marketing – attracting new residents and businesses without financial incentives
  • Neighborhood Connections via bike paths, etc
  • Zoning – update current regulations to incorporate mixed-use development projects
  • Capital Improvements
  • Incentive Programs – to make City more attractive and sustainable
  • Funding Sources – creative partnerships will between public and private sectors will be critical
  • Community Engagement

• Goals and Policies:
• 1. Housing: Provide new and renovated housing that meets the needs and preferences of Cleveland of all incomes, ages and life styles.
  • Obstacles include weak private sector market for rehabilitated housing and assembling large parcels for housing redevelopment projects.
  • Decent and Affordable Housing is a top priority in plan.
  • Example – Arbor Park Village low-income housing development in Central Neighborhood.
• 2. Retail: Provide Cleveland residents with a broad range of high quality, conveniently located retail shopping opportunities.
  • Studies conducted by City show that over $1 billion is spent outside the city by Cleveland residents, 1/3 of that going to retail.
  • One issue identified – “absence of big draw retail anchors and unattractive streetscapes
  • Land assembly is also a major concern for large-scale redevelopment projects
  • (Personal Comment; where is the language about choice and affordable shopping destinations?)
  • Policies include focusing on the rehabilitation of old neighborhood shopping districts, as well as infill development. Plans also “taps” into hidden markets and creates regional retail destinations.
• 3. Economic Development: Increase economic prosperity through job creation and improved access to jobs and business ownership by all segments of the Cleveland Community.
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Plan acknowledges education and job creation are inextricably linked – therefore Cleveland must focus on attracting and retaining persons who can participate in the knowledge economy. Because these workers are usually mobile, Cleveland is encouraged to create an environment that is conducive to their needs/desires.

Other policies include rebuilding the public education system, job training, arts and culture and regionalism (regional economic development strategies that “capitalize on the combined assets of the central city and the larger northeast Ohio region. Personal Comment; shows relationship between suburbs and city center). Another strategy is that of land assemble for redevelopment projects.

4. Recreation & Open Space: Provide high-quality recreation opportunities and facilities that meet the needs of Clevelanders of all ages, ability levels, incomes and interests.

Plan looks at connecting assets in community to natural beauty that is Cleveland and the Cuyahoga River Valley. Bikeways, recreations facilities, community gardens and diverse programming is critical to this redevelopment strategy.

5. Community Services: Connect communities and their institutions in a manner that natures the physical, mental and spiritual life of all residents.

Quality of life is not just about housing, but city services.

Plans include; utilizing schools as center for community education and connecting educational opportunities to other organizations in the community, provide Clevelanders with options as to where their children attend school and ensure healthcare facilities are widely available/accessible to all of Cleveland’s neighborhoods.


7. Transportation & Infrastructure: Provide a variety of transportation options that serve residents of all income Cleveland that promote economic development while protecting the quality of life in neighborhoods.

Plan outlines policies to encourage transit-oriented development, as well as connecting central city neighborhoods to outlying areas were jobs may be accessible.

8. Arts and Culture: Enrich the lives of Clevelanders and strengthen economic vitality by establishing Cleveland as a world-class center for the arts.

Policies include supporting the arts market to attract creative people and entrepreneurs

9. Sustainability: Endure the long-term environmental, economic and social viability of Cleveland and its region.

Policies encourage brownfield redevelopment, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development and the development of “full-life cycle neighborhoods.
10. Preservation: Foster preservation of historically and architecturally significant buildings and districts in the City of Cleveland.

- Policies include reuse/infill development, preservation of community character, create sense of ambiance.
- **Economic Base** – Policies and Strategies (only a few strategies are highlighted here – there are many more)
  - Advanced manufacturing: capitalize on Cleveland’s strengths in medicine, energy and other industries for which it has a comparative advantage (i.e. consumer products, manufactured goods).
  - Healthcare Commerce – Medical and Educational Institutions unite to grow businesses in the community
  - **Center of the Center: Strengthen the city whose business environment, residential and environmental amenities, and tourism attractions are center to a strong region. Make downtown Cleveland the premier work-residential center in the region.** This includes a new convention center, infill development b/w successful nodes in downtown (first –five strategy) and connecting strengths (including broadband). Also, better market Cleveland to US and abroad
  - Learning – Align city resources with needs to residents and demands of the employer marketplace. Investment in people for the long-term (improve skills for employment prospects). Continue to attract already educated workforce to grow labor pool.
  - Regionalism

- Quality of Life: Grow opportunities for people to earn and spend money in Cleveland by creating new jobs, increasing median incomes and strengthening downtown, patient health care and arts & culture destination spending. The target audience for economic base actions is business and visitors; for communities of choice and quality of life, it is individuals.

- Building Residential Communities of Choice – policies aimed as sustainable neighborhood development
  - Re-branding and creating demand are two critical areas of focus
  - Study identified citywide neighborhood typology by assessing market conditions; five categories identified (regional choice, stable, transitional, fragile, distressed). Only three census tracts were identified as a regional choice, and they were areas that unique retail opportunities (i.e. Ohio City – Westside Market).

- Education and Community Services: here education is a top priority
- The rest of the document identifies the strengths, challenges and vision for each of the 36 neighborhoods in each of the City’s 6 districts (available online).

**City of Cleveland 2008 Mayor’s Annual Report to the Citizens of Cleveland**
March 2009
Mayor, Frank G. Jackson
(Purpose – inform residents of work done and strategies implemented since 2006)

**City Planning Report:**

**Critical Objectives:**
- Implement the Connecting Cleveland 2002 Citywide Plan
- Facilitate Development that capitalized on completion of the Euclid Corridor Project
- Extend the Towpath Trail and its connections to Cleveland’s neighborhoods
- Update the Zoning Code and Zoning Map
- Advance implementation of Cleveland’s Waterfront District Plan
- Make the design review process more efficient, more effective and more user-friendly

**New Initiatives for 2009:**
- Historic Coast Guard Station
- Partner with the Port Authority – redevelopment of lakefront from Criver to E9th Street – new recreational assets
- Re-tenanting storefronts on the downtown segment of Euclid Avenue
- West Shoreway
- Towpath Trail to the Flats

**Achievements:**
- Euclid Corridor Project contributed to the development of several projects
  - See copied page

**Community Development Report:**
- See copied pages

**Economic Development Report:**
- See copied pages

**Cleveland Metropolitan School District**
- Graduation rate increased:
  - 05-06: 55%
  - 06-07: 61.9%
  - 07-08: have not been released yet

**Civic Vision 2000 and Beyond**

*Volume I: An Overview*

*August, 1998*

Steering Committee met for 15 months to develop Civic Vision

- Joseph Gorman, Chairman of Civic Vision 2000, Cleveland Tomorrow and Chairman of the Board &CEO of TWR Inc equated the redevelopment of Cleveland’s downtown and Lake Front to that of an improved quality of life for all Clevelanders and the region. Civic Vision 2000 was part of a much larger
effort to revitalize downtown Cleveland under the direction of then Mayor Michael White.

- Plan identified Cleveland’s Lake Front as a major asset for the community.
- “People, we agreed, are key in terms of transforming downtown into what we all want: an economically vibrant, alluring and safe community.” – Excerpt from Gorman’s letter
- B/c of what experts (who were they)said about downtown revitalization, the plan focuses on building restaurant and entertainments areas, quality retail and many housing options. The plan also discusses the importance of natural water attractions, superior visitor and sports facilities and special parks.
- First use of term “America’s 21st Century City.”
- Report identified 5 major initiatives:
  - Dramatically change our Lakefront
  - Develop a new and competitive downtown Convention Center
  - Restore and beautify Euclid Ave (from public square to CSU, then to University Circle)
  - At least double downtown residents to 21,000 people.
- Reports notes that successful downtown revitalizations have depended on the revitalization of the community’s natural water feature, in this case Lake Erie.
- Objective is to create a year-round destination place on Cleveland’s prime lakefront property. Investments include a new aquarium, retail village and convention center/multi-transit station. (the idea is to create a synergy between the lakefront and revitalization efforts already taking place in downtown Cleveland. Connect downtown t the waterfront. This plan has been updated by Cleveland Planning Commission Lake Front Plan (available online).
- While Cleveland’s downtown revitalization (to date) has been hailed as a renaissance of sorts, it will not be truly complete until the Euclid corridor in downtown Cleveland is restored to its prior grandeur.
- Opportunities for residential development include: The Warehouse District, East Downtown, Gateway Area, Near West Side and Flats, Lakefront and CSU. Planning document states that until recently, most people who lived downtown were low-to moderate income residents. (So, is plan saying that redevelopment should focus on higher wage-earners? Is this the level of success? Said that in 10 years, 21,000 people could be living downtown? Did this happen?)
- Other assets (mutual dependencies) include University Circle, CLE Airport (key to business and tourism), downtown schools and better neighborhoods.

Civic Vision 2000 and Beyond
Volume II: Plan Detail
1998

- In 1978, things hit rock bottom when City defaulted on municipal debt.
• By 1997, $3 million had been invested in downtown redevelopment to stop the precipitous decline.
• High profile projects included the Gateway, Tower City Center, Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, Great Lakes Science Center and Key Tower
• Result of redevelop strategies has restored confidence in Cleveland’s future – and it has “ignited” the local economy.
• Surveys conducted showed that Greater Clevelander’s “have a much better attitude toward the region in general and downtown in particular.
• Critical Components of the vision include:
  o Thriving retail centers and residential neighborhoods
  o Diverse and attractive entertainment options
  o High-quality cultural and education institutions
  o Attractive and user-friendly open spaces and park systems
  o Healthy convention and visitor industries
  o Growing, competitive business conditions
  o Supportive governing structures
• Hotel development seen as “next best thing” to permanent residents
• Residential development will likely attract renters and non-family households to downtown. However, the challenge is financing residential development downtown. Areas to focus development include: the Warehouse District, Playhouse Square and Euclid Avenue
• Lake front redevelopment plans similar to that of Chicago, with retail and attractions at the heart of redevelopment.
• Four stage development plan outlined – result; create up to 150,000 new jobs, attracting millions more people to visit downtown Cleveland and hopefully create conditions where people find downtown a desirable place to live.

**Cleveland Civic Vision 2000 Citywide Plan**
Cleveland City Planning Commission
1991

• According to Mayor Michael White, the City of Cleveland started to turn around in the 1980s, with the redevelopment of downtown.
• See copied list of past trends, current challenges, current opportunities and recommendations.
• To ensure Cleveland’s future in the 21st century is brighter than today, strategies must address several issues, including employment, education, community relations, public safety, housing, retail development and recreation.
• Document sets tone for development through the 1990s until 2000.
• Draws stark contrast from when last Citywide Plan was created in 1949. In 1949, half of all jobs were in manufacturing, the city’s population was nearly 914,000 and the streets were lined with retail shops. As a result, the plan from 1949 is not longer viable.
• Plan acknowledges that although Cleveland will be smaller in 2000, the city's worth is not dependent on size, but on resident's quality of life.

• See copied list of goals and policies for Citywide Plan

Development History/Context:

• Plan builds upon natural and historic assets unique to Cleveland for the purpose of revitalization.

• The Flats was once the economic and transportation hub of Cleveland

• Residential development was restricted primarily in East Cleveland, b/c of its elevations. Rail lines were building through the Cuyahoga valley b/c of the gently sloping hills – much easier to build. That is why significant residential development is clustered on the east side of Cleveland.

• As Cleveland became built out at the end of WWII, Clevelanders began to relocate outside of the city for new residential development.

• Cleveland’s small geographic size, along with advancements in transportation, made it easy for people to live outside, but work in the community.

• In 1989, approximately 40% were described as living in poverty. The suburban poverty rate was just 7%. Low income population and school district’s image was identified as issues contributed to population declined and as barriers to redevelopment.

• Households with families began to move out of the city b/w 1960 and 1985.

• Change in age/demographic structure is troubling (pg. 21)

• General Comment by me:
  o Most of the issues and challenges identified by Cleveland’s Planning Commission in the 1980s, is still exhibited in the most recent Civic Vision and Citywide Plans. For example, losses in population and retail continue to be major issues for the city. And strangely enough, some of the same policies are being implemented (such as street beautification projects). However, Cleveland continues to suffer from of the same ills, ills that revitalization projects were supposed to slow/reverse if implemented.
    ▪ Infill development and mixed-use development projects were terms being batted about in the late 1980s, but have only recently gained attention in the planning literature.
  o Creation of Town Centers (another buzz word) is also used in the Cleveland Civic Vision Plan for 2000.

• One major obstacle identified was the loss of manufacturing jobs and the obsolete buildings they leave behind. Old buildings and contaminated land make redevelopment projects not economically viable. Plus, switch from rail to truck mode of transportation has made industrial areas even less attractive for redevelopment. New light industries are locating along major freeways. Jennings Freeway was developed, in part, to improve access to Cuyahoga’s industrial valley. The same goes for the developed of I-490 downtown.

• Upon review of the various strategies, it seems as if officials (at the time – late 1980s) wanted to first, stop the bleeding (loss of population and
business/revenue going to the suburbs) and then try to address the issues (i.e., image, public education system) after the fact.

- Also, one of the transportation policies included erecting sound barriers to improve motorists commute in the City.
- It was estimated that the City lost nearly $350 million in retail spending to the suburbs. Of the 62 shopping centers at the time, only 6 were located in Cleveland’s city limits. Bottom line, retail spending was leaving the area to new facilities outside the City – coincided with trends in suburban development.
- One of the major challenges that were identified: current population and income levels in Cleveland are insufficient to support the existing supply of retail space in many city neighborhoods.
- Bright spot: historic architecture, centralized locations and proximity to ethnic populations are qualities which can be exploited to create distinctive ‘specialty’ shopping districts in many Cleveland neighborhoods; and the continuing revitalization of downtown Cleveland can be used to generated ‘spin-off’ retail development in nearby neighborhoods.

**Cleveland Civic Vision, 2000: Downtown Plan**
Cleveland Planning Commission
1989

- See downtown revitalization strategies and plan copies
- With regard to the downtown revitalization plan, Cleveland’s return seemed all but eminent given the number of completed and proposed projects at the end of 1980s. While some of the proposed projects came to fruition (Society Tower, Gateway, Tower City Center, etc), many projects did not. However, between 1908 and 1999, 22 major building projects were created for nearly 5 million square feet of new office space. It was also during this time that the Flats were rebuild and the Playhouse Square District was revitalized (three theaters – State, Palace, Ohio).
- There was little mention, though of new residential living downtown, although two complexes were built.

**Cleveland Public Library: City Hall**
March 24, 2009

**Cleveland today... tomorrow: the general plan of Cleveland**
Cleveland City Planning Commission
December, 1950
Adopted by Planning Commission in May, 1949
Reprinted by Brookhaven Press, 2004
Plan identifies issues associated with industrial decline and suburbanization (in the late 1940s) as a cancer in the human body. Document is an action plan for 30 years – where Cleveland should be in 1980.

Objective was to make Cleveland a “better community.” This is defined as creating a livable city where people can work and easily move about.

Saw current land patterns shaping future development (i.e. where industries are located).

In 1950, 1/5 of the land in Cleveland’s municipal boundary was vacant.

CBD should remain primary business/retail center. Development of highways should allow motorists easy access to downtown and other business centers/places of employment. Neighborhood centers are also identified as being important.

Plan states that City should ensure adequate space for factory development.

Acknowledges that Cleveland may lose population by 1980, but that continued development in the City (industry) is important to the metropolitan area.

Poor living conditions (housing stock) identified in areas south of Lake Erie between downtown and 93rd Street, with southern boundary being Harvard Ave.

City decided to keep apartments confined to redevelopable areas (areas in trouble). New housing developments in the new portions of the city were not permitted to have row housing or apartments.

Affordable housing and good places to live, with employment opportunities is vital to city’s long-term future according to the plan.

Identified troubled areas, sought development of multi-family housing to replace old dilapidated housing. Preserve new single-family residential neighborhoods.

Touts urban redevelopment as a strategy to clear slums and sell vacant land for redevelopment.

Lakefront redevelopment seen as the most prominent part of redevelopment plan. Burke Lakefront Airport seen as a true asset for Cleveland and the MSA.

Context: Cleveland is the center of a much larger region, therefore development strategies must be regional (i.e. freeways, transit, etc).

See copied map

For the City of Cleveland, Ohio: A Workable Program
Cleveland, Urban Redevelopment Agency
Approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, June 1955

Conducts neighborhood analysis and identified 14 communities in need of funding from Urban Renewal Program.

Document confirms that congestion, overcrowding, mixed-land uses (a subsequent vacancies of retail/business/housing) were big concerns in those communities identified as needing some assistance from the urban renewal program. At this time, however, communities are mostly in habited by white people.
Comprehensive Planning to Eliminate Slums: A Workable Program
Cleveland, Urban Redevelopment Agency
Approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, June 1959

- The revitalization of downtown Cleveland has been a primary concern for city officials for a long time now (since the 1949 Plan).
- Document identified ongoing work in blighted areas, some of which are identified from the first workable plan. States that w/respect to the Hough area, plans may not of the scale and scope at which they can be funded.

Cleveland Policy Planning Report
Vol: 1, 1975
City Planning Commission

- See list of copied objectives and goals.
- Policy Reports meant to be a collection/catalog of objectives, policies and action programs that tackle the serious issues facing Cleveland. One underlying goal for all of the proposed recommendations is the following: In the context of limited resources, the Cleveland City Planning Commission will give priority attention to the tasks of promoting a wider range of choices for those and individuals and groups who have few, if any, choices. Give the disparities in income and power between residents of the City of Cleveland and those of the surrounding region, this goal, in part, simply reflects our responsibility and commitment to serve the people of the City.
- **Overarching goal is this:** Equity requires that locally-responsible government institutions give priority attention to the goal of promoting a wider range of choices for those Cleveland residents who have few, if any choices.
  - When commission was suppose to evaluate a potential proposal, they were supposed to ask themselves two questions 1) Who pays? And 2) who benefits?
- Commission is not beholden to one set of ideas, but must adapt to conditions on the ground. Therefore a constant reassessment of policies must be done to evaluate whether or not strategies are effective.
- Objectives and Policies:
  - Inadequate income, not supply of housing, is not the basis for the housing problem in Cleveland. It was once that adequate housing was not available, so new homes were built in blighted areas.
  - Objectives and policies focus on the issue of poverty – it is interwoven through many issues facing Cleveland.
Annual Report
Cleveland Planning Commission
1972-1976

- Analysis beings in 1960
- Plan’s generally states what Commission did each year, including the plans it reviewed.

1972:
- Planning Commission was aware of rapid deterioration of housing stock and the systemic poverty that gripped the city. The Commission was also focused on new transportation projects (including new roadways and intersection upgrades). A municipal stadium sports complex study was also conducted by the Commission at this time.

1976:
- Commission recognized that population and employment shifts to the “southern rim” have had an adverse impact on the City of Cleveland – contributing to the decline in commercial and industrial activity in the region. To that end, “the City Planning Commission’s major activities are designed to formulate, evaluate, and encourage policies which address the physical, fiscal, and social problems associated with these changes.”
- Several issues were identified:
  - Tax delinquent properties
  - Poor quality of housing stock
  - Level of municipal services
- To the first and second problems, the Commission recommended that the better use its power to take over tax delinquent properties. It also acknowledged that Cleveland’s housing stock continued to deteriorate b/c the people living in the community cannot afford to keep them up. The commission proposed implementing a ‘reinvestment task force’ that would assist staff better distribute CDBG to area residents. Also suggested a Housing Assistance plan be developed in coordination with the Section 8 rental housing assistance program
- Back then, high foreclosure rates were already an issue.
- Commercial activity declined b/w 1947 and 1972 by 47.7 percent.
- Commission worked with public agencies to preserve City’s industrial base
  - City studied whether or not new industrial parks would be feasible
    - Worked with companies to expand their operations in Cleveland. In exchange for city-owned land next to their establishments (Epic Steel and Jones and Laughlin Corporation). In exchange, the city would receive additional land or other facilities
• Idea was to increase tax base to provide residents with better municipal services.

City of Cleveland, Capital Improvement Program: 1972-1977
City Planning Commission

June, 1971-1976:
• Capital Improvement Program for 6 year period is to be completed annual by the Planning Commission. The CIP Report is a compilation of project and forecasts regarding City projects and their financing. CIP is meant to guide the development of an annual budget for the City of Cleveland each year. Projects are ranked by necessity and capital investment figures (approximations) are also included.
• All municipal departments are required to submit their reports to the Planning Commission for review and to be published in the CIP Report.
• In this report, the Planning Commission expressed concerns in the city’s investments in capital projects that required additional maintenance/expenditures (that were not being recouped by the projects themselves.
• Department of Public Properties: One such capital project was the for the municipal stadium and auditorium, both of which required significant improvements. Commission recommended that either the improvements be made at a cost to the City (tax payers) or that the property be sold to another entity for investment/management. If neither option was chosen, lack of improvements would prove devastation for municipal stadium and its operation. From 72-77, it was estimated that improvements made to the Stadium and Auditorium would cost $6,375,000. This was the largest single expenditure, beside the Division of Recreation (13,665,000) in the Department of Public Properties Budget ($23,202,545).
• Department of Community Development was responsible for the City’s renewal program. Projects were expected to total $37,343,000 in capital investment, of which $12,943,000 would be financed by the City. Report was frank that department encounter difficulties in executing renewal program/activity w/regard to “site acquisition and site disposition. Funds from urban renewal bonds are not sufficient to complete all site improvements needed for specific projects. Department requests that other departments finance their respective contributions to redevelopment projects (such as water and sewer, street paving, landscaping, etc).
• Department of Human Resources and Economic Development
  o Division of Economic development is charged with retaining existing businesses and attracting new industries to the City of Cleveland. Projects are to create new jobs for Cleveland residents and expand the City’s income and property tax bases. Two major projects included
improvements to the Flat’s Industrial as well as Agrico Industrial Park
(newly planned industrial park. The other project was the Longmead
Industrial Park (also newly planned industrial park). Total budget for the
Economic Development Division is $5,225,500 of which the City will
finance $3,658,000.

1974-1979:
• Department of Public Properties: Stadium and Auditorium Division budget
increased to $6,860,000. All projects listed as urgent, except for three (there
were 18 total projects)
• Deterioration of housing again recognized as major problem for the City. Home
Improvement Loan “Back Up” Fund proposed – would assist homeowners with
upkeep if they were turned down by the bank, etc. $5,000,000 fund proposed –
classified as urgent. Would assist ’High-Risk’ homeowners. Total community
development budget $6,681,118 of which Department will finance $5,446,119.
• Within the Department of Human Resources and Economic Development,
Division of ManPower Development proposed the creation of multi-service
centers (which were listed as desirable – 3rd lowest ranking). These projects
were to financed by another entity than the City. Most of the Economic
Development projects focused on industrial development and expansion. The
exception being the “Model Cities Economic Development Compact (MESBIC).
Program was to create a minority enterprise small business investment
corporation to help rebuild neighborhoods in the city. This was listed as urgent
with total budget of $750,000 (not to be financed by the City).

1976-1981:
• Gateway Project first appears – public improvement projects for redevelopment
of site classified as urgent. Total projected investment $5,974,838.50. Most of
the funding, however, came from the Economic Development Agency (EDA) and
the NORCOM.

1981-1986:
• Investment in public facilities is seen as a way to attract private capital to the
city

Citywide Development Program (1985-1990)
Cleveland Planning Commission

• Office towers rising on Downtown’s skyline have signaled the growth of Cleveland’s
 corporate community and the increase need for legal, financial and business
 support services. A strong regional demand for retail specialty stores, restaurants,
 personal services and entertainment facilities continues to exist even though
 neighborhood commercial areas have been declining. Cleveland already has
 responded to these demands with the commercial development in the Flats district,
with the Playhouse Square theater restoration and with the new Cleveland Play House in Doan Center.

- Documents recognized Cleveland’s strengths in new service jobs, medicine and educational institutions. There is a general feeling that while manufactured goods remain important to the Cleveland economy, new service industries warrant attention.
- To drive business and attract growth the following goals were outlined:
  - Improve basic services for economic vitality and resident’s welfare
  - Stabilize existing jobs base – facilitate economic growth wherever possible (this is certainly an issue – chasing after development is never good)
  - Stimulate physical revitalization and redevelopment of blighted/deteriorated areas
  - Provide assistance to unemployed and disadvantaged to obtain meaningful employment.
- To achieve goals, program outlined:
  - Financial assistance
  - Business assistance
  - Industrial site development
  - Public Improvement Projects
  - Enterprise Zone Program – East Side

- Plan also identifies neighborhood commercial development as an important part of neighborhood revitalization. Plan states that small business owners are having a difficult time adapting to smaller population with lower incomes. The plans proposed financial assistance, storefront renovations and commercial area site improvements.
- In 1985, 75% of the city’s housing stocks (240,000 units) were over 40 years old. Since 1960, the City lost 43,000 units. Goals of plan include: restoring confidence to local homeowners as well as investors and financial institutions to ensure long term stability. The other goal was to make affordable housing more widely available.

Citywide Development Program (1990-1994)
Cleveland Planning Commission

- Again, economic development downtown is seen as essential to the revitalization of Cleveland.
- Document also acknowledges that vitality of Cleveland is connected to the health/well-being of its neighborhoods.
- To reverse decline document supports “strategies for replacing the population (lost) and increasing neighborhood investment
Document suggests that capital improvements and beautification projects are needed in commercial neighborhood centers to make shopping more attractive. (Does this make sense if the neighborhood is already in decline and local residents cannot afford to dine, buy things there? Why are we restoring storefronts and adding street trees to a place that obviously has not business taking place and is in distress?)

Mayoral Comments/Speeches:

Voinovich, Thursday 4-27-89, Cleveland City Hall (red room)
- Nick names of Cleveland during the 80’s: Streaking Star of the Midwest, The Come Back City, The Renaissance City, and The City of the 80s.
- During tenure, Cleveland saw an economic boom downtown w/ $3 billion dollars in private capital investment.
- Names “All-American City” three times
- Attracted $150 million in federal urban development action gran funds.

White, January 1st 1990: A Vision for A New Decade (Inaugural Remarks)
- Cleveland referred to as a ‘legacy of promise.’
- Mission of courage to rescue Cleveland from poverty and from the city becoming a place for the rich and the poor (the extremes).
- White says that he will tackle homelessness and the City’s public education systems, among other things.
- Greatest resource in Cleveland, its people (especially the young). That is why education must be a priority. Announced new Mayoral Initiative for Educational Excellence. Resource of City, school district and neighborhoods were to partner to build a better school system. While referred to this as a moral responsibility.
- Future of Cleveland depends on changes to school district.
- White says “we do not accept that the Cleveland must be a two-tier community with a sparkling downtown surrounded by vacant stores and whitewashed windows.

White, State of The City Address m 1-18-1991:
- White wanted to aggressively market Cleveland neighborhoods to a broad audience so people will want to move back to city.
- Safety was a big issue. Increased neighborhood patrols (48% of police force). From 1990 to 1991, there was a 14% increase.
- Established Young Gang Unit in 10/1990 to investigate juvenile crime/gangs.
- Neighborhood revitalization, another primary concern – work with neighborhood organizations
- Code enforcement units were also established – helping ensure properties were up to code (deploying more persons to do inspections).
• To encourage new construction in neighborhoods, city expanded residential tax abatement program from 7 to 10 years for large developments.
• New Neighborhood Development Bond Program – pull of money to stimulate new housing development.
• Joblessness is a major issue that underlies many of the challenges Cleveland faces (gangs, homelessness, etc). Therefore emphasis on creating jobs.
• Leverage city resources to initiate economic development.
• Gateway project seen as a ‘magnet’ for other kinds of economic development activity.
• Rock N’ Roll Hall of Fame, catalyst for waterfront redevelopment. National-International Tourist Destination.
• Assisting small businesses is paramount (New small business office created in ED)
• The City’s Industrial Parks are nearly full – only 29 acres are vacant. ED aggressively marketed developable parcels. The result 325 new jobs created in Cleveland’s Industrial Park.
• City to get more involved in International Trade and Development with creation of a new task force.
• Despite everything mentioned above, EDUCATION remains the key to our survival.
  o Held Educational Summit (One Day in 1990 and Forums were held on a weekly basis)

White, State of the City Address 1-31-1992
• Building 16 new housing projects (550 homes)
• Increasing funds for rehabilitation and construction by 300 and 400 percent respectively.
• Created first housing trust fund $2.5 million.
• Greatest challenge now – Safety in neighborhoods
• Cleveland’s heart is where our homes are
• Acknowledge that while downtown is much better, neighborhoods are still deteriorating – need attention.
• Cleveland Tomorrow and Neighborhood Progress Inc.
  o Corporate and philanthropic funding for neighborhood redevelopment
• Cleaning up neighborhoods through code enforcement, rehab of homes and new home construction (w/out the red tape)
• Gateway project is not a stadium project, but an economic development project. Projected that 2.3 million people will visit the Gateway each year and patronize local stores, etc.
• Rock Hall is expected to bring 700,000 people to the City.
• Combined, projects will create 43,000 jobs and 3.5 billion dollars in new commerce and investment.
• Waterfront development remains important
• Mayor touts new leadership at Cleveland Public Schools, says it’s a new era for engagement and rebuilding the system.

White, State of the City Address 1-22-1993
• Safety still a concern
• Gateway is being completed
• Play House Square – new hotel (Wydam)
• Rock N’ Roll Hall of Fame
• Science and Tech Museum
• Warehouse District enjoying building boom (largest in almost 10 years)
• Mayor supports these projects b/c of jobs!
• “We can be the world’s next international city” – we need a broad vision
• New housing and rehabilitations give people sense of home – focus of redevelopment efforts in city neighborhoods.
• As a result of neighborhood investment, there has been a 600% increase in the new homes being built since 1989.
• Trying to get private investment from Society and National Banks to revitalize old neighborhoods $275 million.
• Race relations still an important issue

White, State of the City Address 1-22-1994
• Education remains key to Cleveland’s revival
• Crime has gone down by 8.3 percent
• Micro Loan Lending Program for small business development
• Introduces four broad initiatives, in addition to the original five set out during first term of administration:
  o Protecting our citizens for today
  o Investing for Cleveland’s tomorrow
  o Governmental reform and competitiveness
  o Political Reform.
• The root of Cleveland’s problems, according to the Mayor and his interactions with citizens of Cleveland is JOBS!
• Administrations wants to create job opportunities
• Wants to create Neighborhood Development Investment Fund ($40 million). Funding will come from payments from Cleveland Public Power (Ohio Supreme Court overturned original decision and ruled in favor of Cleveland Electric Illumination Company… the result will be a transfer of funds back to the City of Cleveland.
• Funds from the Neighborhoods Investment Fund could be used to fund projects such as new industrial and technology parks, remediate brownfields, pursue biomedical and electronic commerce technology and create new retail centers in the neighborhoods.
• Launches a new initiative called Cleveland Competes – improve quality of life, city services, etc.
  o More focus on government organization and mentality – think as if you were a business – operate as if you were a business.
• Sponsor legislation protecting people from discrimination based on color, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, ethnic origin, etc.

Cleveland Public Library: City Hall
March 26, 2009

White, State of the City Address 1-2-1995
• “It is easy to tell if a city is working. Just look at it. It is a living, minute by minute report card of our effort. Not only does a city’s state tell us where we are, and how we are doing—it clearly reveals our destiny.”
• Safety, public education and neighborhoods remain a top priority
• In 1994, the city marked the third year that the city built more new homes than tore down existing homes – compared this to the Berlin wall coming down.
• White disagrees with statement that “as goes downtown, so goes the city.” Instead, he believes the neighborhoods are the most important part of the community.
• Designated one of eight national empowerment zones by President Clinton, received $90 million in federal assistance to redevelopment neighborhoods.
• Since White took office, the administration has secured $1.6 billion in funding (outside local government) for neighborhood redevelopment.

White, State of the City Address 1-2-1996
• “We can with three World Series… we can build ten new hotels, we can bring back three NFL teams… but, if we don’t fix the Cleveland Public School System and give these children a better chance at life, this town has no future.”
  o Schools need reform, strategic road map to turn things around.
    Educational summit must be restructures to be a time to debate and take action. Citizens of Cleveland must also be engaged. Improve safety in the schools. Schools need new levy. Create alliances/partnerships with other schools. State board must get more involved. Who and how the district should be governed. We need patience.

White, State of the City Address 2-7-1997
• Since 1990, crime went down 17 percent
• 224 more officers are in the field
• In a CSU study, 40 percent of families buying homes in Cleveland were from the suburbs. 2,300 new homes have been built in the city.
• For every dollar invested downtown, nine dollars are invested in our neighborhoods.
• According to the 1995 Poverty Indicator, 41.8 percent of Cleveland’s population lives in poverty.
• Key to creating more jobs, providing businesses with clean land to expand.
• Initiated Land Assemble Development Strategy (LADS) to reclaim/clean-up old industrial cities.
• (NOTE – CLEVELAND TOOK CONTROL OVER PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT – STATE AUTHORIZED TAKE OVER). Mayor appoints board and hires Chief Executive

White, State of the City Address 2-13-1998
• Jobs for residents equated to better neighborhoods.
• As Cleveland prepares for new Millennia, we must focus on becoming a livable city that not only attracts tourists, but residents.

White, State of the City Address 2-10-1999
• Cleveland Hopkin’s expansion a major issue – need new runway
• Working with City of Brook Park to resolve issue
• Flow of out migration from the City has slowed to lowest level in 30 years
• Investment of $5 million dollars for west-side market – gift to next millennium to improve the west-side market area.

White, State of the City Address 2000
• 1st in the country for new home construction (1999)
• Opened 7th hotel in 10 years, now have over 4,500 hotel rooms
• Cleveland Municipal School District (appointed)
• $113 million of public investment for neighborhood redevelopment. $25 million for downtown development (what is left out is the private investment sunk into these project
• Saving of 14,000 jobs, creation of 7,000 jobs
• Neighborhoods First program (started in 1999) doing a lot to revitalize neighborhoods. Improve quality of life on par with that of the suburbs.

Campbell, State of the City Address, 4-24-2002
• City is pursuing bioenterprises, with the assistance of major medical institutions in the city.
• Airport expansion continues (as big as the Gateway and Browns Stadium combined)
• Partnerships with local colleges - create knowledgeable workforce
• Working with school district on master plan to renovate and replace existing schools.
• Kicked off Connect Cleveland – Update of Citywide Plan last done in the 1980s

Campbell, State of the City Address, 2-20-2003
• In 2002, the City grew by 3 percent in population
• Sysco Foods relocated to Cleveland its headquarters. $30 million payroll, 600 jobs, $50 million new building on the Westside, largest company to come to Cleveland in 35 years.
• New Convention Center being studied
• Schools, safety
• City Planning Commission sees quality of life issues essential to realizing a “brain gain.” Better amenities
• New initiative “Cleveland 500,000+” Strategic Action Partnership for 2010
  o Strong, Smart, Safe
  o Sustaining efforts and new initiatives identified for each of the initiatives.

Campbell, State of the City Address, 2-19-2004
• Working with Cleveland State and the Home Builders Association, lakefront redevelopment would be beneficial for the City of Cleveland b/c:
  o Cleveland is at the bottom of the list when it comes to middle-and upper-income households,
  o Only 22 percent of Cleveland’s households have an income of $50,000 or more, compared to 47% in Cuyahoga’s suburban communities
  o In the past two years, 425 homes in Cleveland sold for $150k or more. The suburbs in Cuyahoga County had more than 9,000 such homes sales for 20 times that of Cleveland. And the adjacent counties sold an additional 9,000 homes.
  o Our housing stock is severely deficient for homes priced at $150k and up.
• Lakefront development is seen as way to attract higher wage earners to live in the city.
• Downtown development is a priority and this administration will tackle it head on.
  o Taxes generated downtown are the lifeline for City services (account for approximately 40 percent of all income tax collection. Downtown or neighborhoods is a false choice – we must do both better.
• Fact: nearly 50 percent of our total income tax revenues is generated along the Euclid Corridor between downtown Cleveland and the University Circle Area, home to our most affluent businesses, our universities, hospitals and research centers... Imagine the possibilities for growth on this knowledge corridor with 27,500 students learning and growing.
• Convention facilities again on the radar.
• Health care industry identified as foundation for Cleveland's economy – 40,000 jobs.
• Cleveland Clinic to build new Heart Center on Euclid
• See copied notes from speech about REGIONALISM

Campbell, State of the City Address, 2-18-2005
• More than 6,600 jobs created
• Unemployment fell from 14 percent to 11.6 percent (2004 to 2005)
• Income taxes increased (best measure of financial well-being of Clevelanders.
• In 2001, graduate rates were at 28 percent; they have increase to over 50 percent in 2005.
• Lakefront Plan developed, first in 50 years.
• Considering the allowance of a casino gambling in the city – wants to get referendum on state constitution to allow chartered cities to make their own decisions about gaming facilities.
• Creation of the Charter One Global Enterprise Center
  o Focus on creating/developing new businesses (including technology) and implement retention/attraction programs and help international companies locate in northeast Ohio.
• Ends comments by committing herself to a better Cleveland and Greater Cleveland.

Jackson, State of the City Address 2-23-2006
• New focus – regional economic and cooperation (one of many listed that were part of previous administrations)
• WE must take a regional approach to economic development, education and quality of life. Guiding principles that must be agreed on include:
  o Industrial and commercial real estate tax abatements that are capped on an agreed upon percentage or an elimination of property tax abatements.
  o A ban on the use of income tax abatements
  o Standardized low-interest loans and grants
  o A formula when a business form one to another, that the new host city shared 50% of the income tax from that business with a former host city.
• Education another big priority
• Cost of inequity in education in the region is too great

Jackson, State of the City Address 3-1-2007
• Taking on leadership role in making the City and Region places of choice
• Creation of an Industrial – Commercial Land Bank to clean up old industrial sites for redevelopment.
• Initiative to provide citywide Wi-Fi access
• Developed regional incentive packages and revenue sharing agreements to attraction national and international business
• Mayor & Managers Association of Cuyahoga County
• Airport expansion and upgrades continue
• Education a priority
  o Education will lead us to a stronger economy, stronger neighborhoods and better quality of life, not only in Cleveland, but also in the region.
• Formation of the Education Cooperative
Jackson, State of the City Address 2-28-2008

- University Hospital plans $750 project that of which 80% of total funds will be spend on materials and labor produced in the community
  - 20% of construction crew must be locals of Cleveland
  - Hire graduate from the Max Hayes High School construction trade program
- Investment shows confidence in Cleveland’s future
- Transportation network is making Cleveland a transportation hub – gateway to the Midwest
- $1.5 billion investment over 5 years to be invested in neighborhood revitalization
- Cleveland Municipal School District moved up in ranking “Continuous Improvement”

Jackson, State of the City Address 2009

- Cleveland home to SME Union (small business organization in the EU). Its headquarters will now be in Cleveland – creating a primary contact for Ohio companies to European markets.
- Build wind energy capacity
- Education is a regional issues
  - Regional sources of funding
  - Regional procurement and collective bargaining agreements
  - Regional performance standards/regional curriculums
- New Corporate Partner, Cleveland-PNC launched Grow Up Great
- Focuses on science, math and arts for preschool students.

Cleveland Tomorrow: - A Strategy for Economic Vitality
The Cleveland Tomorrow Committee, 1981

Primary Causes – Decline of Anchor Industries
- High unit labor costs
- Increased foreign competition
- Low growth of capital investment (result of the first two)

Limited Growth in Emerging Industries b/c
- Uneven technology/knowledge base
  - Cleveland not good at getting R&D Funds, outside of the University environment
  - Cleveland was not participating in up and coming industries in terms of R&D
  - Week entrepreneurial environment
  - Mixed labor situation – not enough technicians in emerging industries

Causes of decline and limited growth
• Fiscally unstable local government
• Disorganized and unfocused economic development
• Disastrous School System
• Weak political ‘clout’ in Columbus and Washington

Actions to Improve Cleveland’s Position

• Assist Anchor Industries
  o Industrial Competitiveness Project – new medium in which labor and management can engage one another (conflict negotiation/resolutions process)
  o Productivity Center

• Foster Growth Industries
  o Cleveland Research Institute – collaboration b/w universities and industries
  o Cleveland Entrepreneurial Services – consulting office that utilizes community resources (assist new ventures get off the ground, given little experience or resources)
  o Cleveland See Capital Fun – since new ventures are often risk and require venture capital, fund could be a source of funding
  o Together all three programs would be more effective and getting Cleveland involved in new emerging industries

• Committee suggests that Cleveland CEOs form new organization to implement and oversee programs – funding would come from the companies of participating CEOs.

Cleveland Tomorrow: Building On A New Foundation
Cleveland Tomorrow, 1988

• Upon recommendation from last report in 1981, Cleveland Tomorrow organization was created.

• New report finds service sector growth in Cleveland area was slower than the national average. Between 1974 and 1985, service sector grew nationally by 45 percent. Cleveland only experiences a 22 percent growth rate in this area. Reason, manufacturing and service sector in Cleveland are intertwined. Since manufacturing sector contracted, service sector increase more slowly.

• “Cities with strong education environments generally have better business-academic ties, healthier economies and better images.

• Cleveland’s image is also uneven – definite factor in attracting/creating new business opportunities in Cleveland area
  o Factors that make up image include: economy, housing, cultural and recreational facilities, social stress, health care and education

• Actions to be taken include:
  o Accelerate support for business development
  o Provide government support
  o Enhance the environment for people
Strengthen Cleveland’s image with strategic marketing plan that addressed/focuses on housing, economy, recreation, culture, sports and education

Cleveland Public Library: City Hall
March 27, 2009

Future for a Declining City: Simulations for the Cleveland Area
Katherin L. Bardbury
Anthony Downs
Kenneth A. Small

• Given the social science research on the decline of older industrial cities, researchers are aware of the factors that impact growth and decline. To assist communities like Cleveland its MSA turn the tide, the study looks at base line trends (if nothing is done) and compares that to different policies scenarios (that if implemented) might change alter the base trends. This is done to have qualitative comparison b/w different scenarios.
  o Base case scenarios based on 1997 data and projections made for 1980, 1985 and 1990
  o Researchers estimate impacts of policy scenarios with the base case, if implemented.

• See list of variables (copied) – variables are limited b/c of study and desire to focus on more detail analysis of proposed variables.

• All-Out Revitalization Strategy is the culmination of the five individually packaged strategies to improve Cleveland’s current economic and social status. These strategies include a job stimulus, housing rehabilitation, transit improvement, fiscal equalization and suburban growth control packages. Implemented all at once, these strategies could slow Cleveland’s out-migrations rates and retain more jobs in the city. It is important to note that since the suburbs (combined) are larger than the City of Cleveland and b/c growth will continue in those areas – an comprehensive revitalization plan would not adversely impact suburban communities. It could only help the City of Cleveland stem losses and potentially turn the page.

• It is important to note that each of these strategies impact the other – so collectively, they will have more of an impact (develop synergies) that would likely not exist.

• One of the focuses of course of this plan would be the rehabilitation and construction of new homes in the City of Cleveland that would attract middle-income persons back to the community. However, b/c most of the vacant or rehabilitated land is on the east side, this will certainly be difficult if not
impossible. The east side is home to the most impoverished parts of the community. For middle-income residents to move back into these area would require the relocation of many low-income people (which is what happened during the city’s urban renewal program).

- See copied notes for recommendations

**The Cleveland Metropolitan Economy**

Aaron S Gurwitz, G. Thomas Kingsley
March 1982
Prepared for the Cleveland Foundation
The Rand Corporation, 1982

- See copied excerpts from book concerning the structure of Cleveland’s economy as it relates to the central city and overall area
- Notes from Chapter IV: Metropolitan Cleveland as an Environment for Economic Activity
  - Despite shifts nominal shifts in employment to sunbelt location, Cleveland and the Midwest remain economic heartland of the US. Continued and rapid shifts would have to persist for this to change
  - Cleveland has definite advantages in energy and water
  - Volumes in Library are greater than any of the other seven cities in the study
    - Cities include: Atlanta, Baltimore, Denver, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Sand Diego and Seattle.
  - Firms locate to make a profit
  - On average, workers who produce durable goods earn higher wages b/c of unionization, etc.

**Cleveland’s Path to Regional Economic Advantage**

Weatherhead School of Management: Case Western Reserve University
1999

See copied articles:
- Can older Industrial States Repeat the Success of Silicon Valley and Route 128?
- The Importance of Training and Retaining Smart People

**Industrial Activity in Cleveland**

Robert Sadowski and Ziona Austrian
December 31, 2002
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs
Center for Economic Development
Cleveland State University
Cleveland Economic Analysis and Projections
The Center for Regional Economic Issues
Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
May 1, 1987

Economic Development Policy and Public Economic Development Incentives
1990

- See pages for information on incentives that existed in 1990 for economic development
- Note, quality of life was an issue in the report – said that environmental, historic preservation, housing, local areas that require special emphasis and culture/social benefits should be taken into consideration.

REI Review
November 1984

Also possible see chapters in Cleveland, A Concise History (1796-1996), Carol Poh Miller and Robert Wheeler