Segregation/Integration

Key Findings

A history of racism, segregation, and exclusion still has a negative impact on neighborhoods with high-concentrations of people of color, primarily located on the east side of the county. Increased demand and high housing prices in the Ann Arbor Area exacerbate this problem. According to the 2015 Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis:

The reality is that Washtenaw County has two distinct housing markets. One is fundamentally strong, anchored by the City of Ann Arbor, The other in the City of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township is fundamentally weak and in some respects, in abject distress.

The former has high quality of life and excellent public schools. The latter faces real challenges. The former does not have a perception problem when it comes to safety and housing equity, the latter does.

This dynamic is a function of previous segregation policies and actions. Without targeted intervention, the status quo will continue, and will advantage and reward the primarily white, middle and upper-middle class populations in the county. It will also exacerbate the lack of opportunity for communities of color, particularly on the east side of the county.
History of Segregation in the Urban County

In the early 1800s to 1900s, Ypsilanti was home to a free black population, many of which were laborers and slaves fleeing the impact of the Fugitive Slave Act. The area was also part of a broader network in Michigan and Ontario that served as a connection to Canada as part of the underground railroad. Much of this population located in the area, which is now considered the Historic South Side of Ypsilanti. After the Civil War, as the Jim Crow era began with laws codifying discrimination and segregation, separate districts for African American cultural and social organizations and businesses grew in Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor and other communities in the area.

Discriminatory Practices
Specific to housing, there are no historical red-lining maps as there are for Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia or many others. However, similar practices were in place, including limitations on where African Americans could purchase homes, the practice of using racially restrictive covenants in subdivisions to prohibit African American ownership or residence, and lending policies directing African Americans to specific communities.

Oral histories provide stories of housing discrimination and segregation instances in which people of color were denied home loans in some communities while being directed to specific African American areas in the county. For example, in response to a surge in employment for the Willow Run Bomber Plant in the 1940’s, African American and Black workers were not allowed to live in most neighborhoods, but instead were permitted to live in neighborhoods already experiencing racial segregation. The Southside of Ypsilanti (city) was one of the few nearby areas where people of color could purchase a home, and today, is known as a racially concentrated area.

Racially Restrictive Covenants
As mentioned above, deed restrictions and racially restricted covenants were often used to enforce racial segregation. Records from the Washtenaw County Register of Deeds provide examples in various parts of the county used in the 1940s. Nationally, these covenants were at the height of their use from 1926 until 1948, when the Supreme Court case, Shelley v. Kramer, determined that courts could not enforce racial covenants on real estate. These racially restrictive covenants state that no persons of any race other than the Caucasian race can use or occupy the home.


A.P. Marshal African American Oral History Archive (Ypsilanti District Library) http://history.ypsilibrary.org/
These practices had an impact on the development of the region. Looking back to census data from 1960, the areas with higher concentrations of African American Population are the Water Hill/Kerrytown neighborhoods of Ann Arbor, the South Side of Ypsilanti, including historic African American neighborhoods, and portions of Superior and Ypsilanti Township on the east side of the county.

Outside of the Ann Arbor neighborhoods, the areas showing higher African American populations in 1960 are similar today, and include one of the Racial/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) areas (Map 9).
Impact of Segregation and Exclusion

When referring to the Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index, provided by HUD, there is less racial/ethnic segregation in the the Washtenaw Urban County than in the Region (all of Washtenaw County). Urbanized areas tend to attract people for its employment opportunities, access to goods and services, public transportation, entertainment and so on. Because there is less development and more agricultural land use in rural areas, these opportunities and services are fewer, as is the population. These differences between urban and rural areas may affect the Dissimilarity Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Urban County</th>
<th>Washtenaw County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-White/White</td>
<td>39.59</td>
<td>41.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>53.61</td>
<td>55.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/White</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>27.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander/White</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>49.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< 40 = Low Segregation; 40 to 54 = Moderate Segregation; > 55 = High Segregation

Source: HUD-Provided Table 3, Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends

The Race/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index shows high segregation between Blacks and whites, as well as moderate segregation between Asian or Pacific Islanders and Whites, in both Urban County
(Jurisdiction) and Washtenaw County (Region). Segregation between non-whites and whites is moderate in the Jurisdiction, whereas segregation between non-whites and whites is high in the Region.

In the Urban County, there has been a steady increase in segregation among Blacks and whites (largest increase), Asian/Pacific Islanders and whites (second largest), and Hispanic/Latinos and whites. It is notable that although segregation has increased among Hispanic/Latinos and whites, the Dissimilarity Index indicates the segregation currently is low (less than 40). Likewise, segregation among Asian/Pacific Islanders and whites is moderate (40 to 54). Segregation among Blacks and whites is right on the border of moderate and high, and shows the highest level of segregation when comparing the other dissimilarities.

**TABLE 19_RACIAL/ETHNIC DISSIMILARITY INDEX TRENDS FROM 1990, 2000 AND 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-White/White</td>
<td>37.97</td>
<td>39.36</td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td>39.59</td>
<td>+ 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>52.30</td>
<td>53.61</td>
<td>+ 5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/White</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>+ 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander/White</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>43.66</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>+ 3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< 40 = Low Segregation; 40 to 54 = Moderate Segregation; > 55 = High Segregation

Source: HUD-Provided Table 3, Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends

A [2015 report by the Martin Prosperity Institute](https://www.martinprosperity.org) finds that the Ann Arbor MSA (Washtenaw County) is the 5th most poverty-segregated community in the nation, and 8th in the nation for overall economic segregation. Ann Arbor joins a few other university towns on this index (Ames, Iowa and New Haven, Connecticut.). The influence of the University of Michigan (U of M) and the University of Michigan Hospital on housing and transportation patterns cannot be underplayed. The impact on the housing market is documented in the [2015 Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis](https://www.oecd.org) published by the OCED. More about both reports will be discussed in the access to opportunity chapter. However, the poverty maps and areas with high African American population are strikingly similar. For instance, Map 10 shows African American populations living areas of high poverty.
Today’s maps (Map 11) mirror some of the historic racial segregation with clusterings of concentrated race and ethnicities:

- **African American and Blacks** predominantly reside in the City of Ypsilanti, Ypsilanti Township, portions of Scio Township, Pittsfield Township (especially in the Golfside and Washtenaw Ave area), and Milan/York Township area.
- **Asian and Pacific Islanders** clustered in Ann Arbor’s north end and downtown area, and in Pittsfield Township.
- **Hispanic/Latino populations** clustered in Pittsfield Township (also in the Golfside area), Ypsilanti Township, Ann Arbor, and Milan/York Township.
MAP 11_POPULATION BY RACE

MAP 12_RACIAL DOT MAP, 2010

Source: The Racial Dot Map
Another way to look at the potential segregation is to look at minority populations within given school districts. As seen on Map 13, the majority of the census tracts with higher percentages of African American students are located in the Ypsilanti Community Schools and Lincoln Consolidated Schools Districts. Neighborhood or regional segregation is playing out in school district segregation as well.

MAP 13_SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION

Source: Race by Black or African American Alone, 2015 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
As mentioned in the Demographic Summary Chapter, there are clusterings of Foreign-Born residents and LEP residents, especially in certain areas in the City of Ann Arbor and Pittsfield Township. Residents with Limited English Proficiency live in similar clusters.

MAP 14__FIVE MOST POPULOUS NATIONAL ORIGINS
Washtenaw County is unique in that it hosts two major universities, the U of M in Ann Arbor and Eastern Michigan University (EMU) in the City of Ypsilanti. While both universities draw international populations, 15% of enrolled U of M students in 2016 (6,754) were international students.

**Contributing Factors**

Each chapter discusses contributing factors that continue, worsen, or otherwise prevent resolution to the fair housing issue discussed in the chapter. These contributing factors help direct the development of goals and strategies to counter the issue.

**Community Opposition**

Community Opposition is common when there are proposals for specific developments looking to add affordable housing or when there are proposed zoning changes to add residential density. While these changes in high opportunity could help offset some of the push of lower income (often African American) households to the east side, they continue to be difficult to implement. In continuation of this vicious cycle, lower income households are then pushed out of the east side as more people relocate to the east side, potentially raising cost of living and rents throughout the east side. It is also important to note that the community opposition is not exclusive to high-opportunity markets and is in play throughout the county.
The opposition to affordable housing sometime takes the form of “green or environmental” concerns. When pressed, the conversation usually sources concerns related to safety, the increase in low-income households, and concerns about different races moving into the neighborhood.

A smaller, but persistent, way this opposition also plays out is in the location of group group housing that provides support and treatment for persons with disabilities and/or substance abuse issues.

**Displacement of residents due to economic pressures**
A few factors are at play with concerns about displacement. As frequently discussed in the 2015 Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis, high housing prices in the Ann Arbor area are pushing many households out of Ann Arbor, often to the east side of the county, specifically in Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township. The high cost of housing, due in large part to the presence and dominance of the U of M and its hospital system, impacts renters and homeowners alike.

In some cases, loss of committed affordable units has also caused displacement. Of current concern is the Cross Street Village in the City of Ypsilanti. Cross Street Village is an affordable senior living facility where the property owners have completed the 15-year mandatory affordability period, but are opting out of the 99-year extended affordability period by using the IRS Qualified Contract exemption that allows them to “list” the property for sale. Based on the calculation involved, the property is listed for sale at $12,050,000, significantly higher than its appraisal of $4 million. While the affordability period will extend 3 years, current tenants are seeing rent increases and are concerned about how long they will be able to stay. Many are already looking to relocate and are finding few affordable options.

The Ypsilanti Housing Commission’s Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion is having a positive impact on neighborhoods due to the renovation of all units, including demolition and redevelopment in some cases. These properties moved out of public ownership to a public/private partnership to allow the use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits to fund renovation and redevelopment. The total affordability period for these properties is 45 years once construction is complete.

The Ann Arbor Housing Authority is also in the middle of a full RAD conversion, but the AAHA/City of Ann Arbor are maintaining ownership of the land to control long-term affordability for those properties. The City of Ann Arbor provided a 99 year ground lease to the entity developing the property. In both cases, long-term planning will be needed to maintain affordability at either the 45 or 99 year point.

**Lack of community revitalization strategies**
The foreclosure crisis had a particularly negative impact on Ypsilanti Township. In response, the township partnered with Habitat for Humanity of Huron Valley and provided resources to launch revitalization strategies in three neighborhoods: West Willow, Gault Village, and Sugarbrook.
The partnership includes funding for acquisition and rehab of foreclosure of lower-quality houses for rehabilitation and ownership for low-income households. In addition, Habitat has provided community development support through neighborhood organization, capacity building and development, and supportive programs, including exterior cleanups, park improvements and more.

The City of Ypsilanti has created a disposition policy for vacant lots deeded to the city through tax foreclosure and has success putting them into private ownership. That policy is supported by the creation of a Neighborhood Enterprise Zone (NEZ), which uses tax abatement and encourages infill on the southside of the city.

Areas lacking any revitalization strategy include the MacArthur Boulevard area of Superior Township and the LeForge Road area, which straddles both Ypsilanti City and Township.

**Lack of private investments in specific neighborhoods**
The City of Ypsilanti has not seen any new residential housing construction (outside of rehabilitation and RAD conversion) in more than 10 years. That said, there has been great improvements through RAD conversion of Ypsilanti Housing Commission properties, and residential investments in rehabilitation of post-foreclosure properties. There are several new prospects in the planning stages, but still limited investment, particularly in the south and southeast neighborhoods.

Private investments in Ypsilanti Township increased post-recession as several subdivisions that had previously stalled, restarted development often with new ownership. Additionally, there is interest in investment along several corridors (i.e. Whittaker Road); however, the Gault Village shopping area- previously a neighborhood center with a grocery and related convenience shopping- is still in transition and is experiencing high degree of vacancy.

**Lack of public investments in specific neighborhoods, including services or amenities**
Within the City of Ypsilanti, there are a number of amenities including parks, a fairly complete sidewalk network, streetlights, community centers, and similar. Due to it’s age and funding constraints, the City of Ypsilanti has deferred maintenance on several of its amenities, such as the sidewalk network, downtown pedestrian improvements, parks, and other infrastructure.

The City of Ypsilanti eliminated recreation programming around 2004, and has reduced many maintenance services due to budget constraints over the past 15 years. However, an active community has taken over several roles including the operation and physical replacement of the Rutherford City Pool, the operation of the Senior Center, and a partnership with Washtenaw Community College that provides programming and education at Parkridge Community Center. Ongoing facility maintenance is limited to the availability of grant funding and charitable support rather than general fund. Investments in Parkridge Park and Peninsula Park (both R/ECAPs) has been minimal and focused on maintenance and replacement of existing equipment.
Ypsilanti Township has maintained its recreational programming and expanded its park and park facilities. In the case of the West Willow neighborhood, a partnership between the Township and Habitat for Humanity of Huron Valley has resulted in improvements to the neighborhood center, the addition of a pavilion as well as some park maintenance.

Superior Township has identified the need for additional facilities in and around the MacArthur Drive neighborhood. A small branch of the Ypsilanti District Library is located in the area as well as the Superior Township Community Park, but there are limited facilities to provide recreational and/or educational services to youth.

**Lack of regional cooperation**
Positive regional cooperation include the Urban County, the Continuum of Care for homelessness services, and the expansion of the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority to the Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority, now including the City of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township. While five jurisdictions have adopted the 2015 Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis, there is some tension around implementation of regional goals for the effort. In some cases that includes some communities interest in gentrification more than revitalization, and in other cases, limited investment and engagement in removing exclusionary policies.

Areas where regional cooperation could benefit are efforts involving a countywide public education district, coordinated hiring efforts from anchor institutions, and ongoing coordination on affordable housing for the urbanized area. The 2016 failure of the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Millage presents some broader regional coordination needs. The effort looks to connect 4 counties with transit services that will expand employment opportunities and improve access overall.

**Land use and zoning laws**
Single-family zoning districts make up the bulk of zoning districts in communities throughout the county. This limits the housing choices, price points and availability of housing for populations most in need. There have been efforts to limit the number of affordable units or use of housing choice vouchers through the use of Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning. In other communities, PUDs have been utilized to encourage affordable housing. In Washtenaw County, similar to the nation, lower-income populations often includes communities of color.

**Lending discrimination**
Figure 13 shows the recent history of mortgage lending in Washtenaw County as reported through Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). African Americans are denied mortgages for single family, duplex, triplex and quad buildings at a rate often 2-3 times that of whites or Asians. Hispanics are also denied at a much higher rate, than whites or Asians. The smaller number of loan originations does show more fluctuation in the information for Hispanics/Latinos.
Anecdotally, there have been numerous stories of EMU professors looking for housing that are immediately directed to the Ann Arbor Housing market by realtors and others, rather than neighborhoods with quality and affordable housing stock within walking or shorter commuting distances in the City of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township. Anecdotal reports from realtors indicate that steering occurs related to school districts, with school district boundaries serving as the modern era "redline" districts.

**Location and type of affordable housing**
As the map in the Publicly Supported Housing Analysis section shows, the City of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti township host the vast majority of committed affordable housing units for the county, creating areas of disproportionate housing needs and areas of concentrated poverty. For example, in the City of Ypsilanti, more than 95% of the committed affordable units in the city are located South of Michigan Avenue - this includes the 632 units located in the Southside R/ECAP.

**Occupancy codes and restrictions**
Most local units use the state building code to define occupancy limits. As far as the definition of a family, there is variation among jurisdictions related to the number of unrelated individuals that can live together under the definition of family. Most of the out-county townships limit this number to 1 or 2 individuals. However, state case law has broadened the definition of functional
family in a number of cases, even if local zoning ordinances haven’t been amended to reflect current case law.

Private discrimination
Through both surveys and focus groups, it was affirmed that discrimination is still an issue in particular for people of color and persons with disabilities. In the Ypsilanti Renters focus group, it was posited that one reason for this ongoing discrimination is a lack of diversity among property managers and landlords. This could minimize cultural misunderstandings that can lead to applications being denied and, in some cases, eviction.