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Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP)

- **Mission:**
  - conduct, support, and foster applied academic research that informs local, state, and urban policy issues
  - facilitate student learning and engagement with today’s critical local, state, and urban policy issues

- **Funding through U-M general funds**

- **Director:** Barry Rabe
Research

- Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)
- The Energy & Environmental Policy Initiative (EEPI)
  - The National Surveys on Energy & Environment (NSEE)
  - Fracking Project
Energy & Environmental Policy Initiative

Primary components:

• The National Surveys on Energy & Environment (NSEE)

• Issues in Energy and Environmental Policy (IEEP)
National Surveys on Energy & Environment

- Conducted in partnership with Muhlenberg College’s Institute of Public Opinion
- **Respondents** – general public
- **Administered** – via telephone
- **Timing** – twice per year
- **Topics** – Climate change, hydraulic fracturing, shale gas exploration, carbon taxation
The Michigan Public Policy Survey

- **Census survey** – all 1,856 counties, cities, villages, and townships
- **Respondents** – chief elected and appointed officials
- **Administered** – online and via hardcopy
- **Timing** – Spring and Fall each year
MPPS is not a typical opinion poll

- **Topics** – wide range, such as fiscal health, budget priorities, **economic development**, **intergovernmental cooperation**, privatization, employee policies, labor unions, state relations, energy, **environmental sustainability**, Great Lakes, **citizen engagement**, bankruptcy, **roads**, **public safety**, and much more.

- **70+% response rates**

- **Transparency**
  - Questionnaires online
  - Pre-run data tables online
  - Sharing of datasets with other researchers
A Sampling of Planning-relevant Questions in our Archive
Fiscal Health

• 6 years of data (2009-2015)
  
  o Compared to last year, would you say your government is less able or better able to meet its financial needs this year?

  o Thinking about the overall fiscal stress of your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road - including any future financial obligations it may have - on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction's overall fiscal stress today?

  o Has there been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year in revenue from property taxes for your jurisdiction?

  o Has there been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year in the number of tax delinquencies in your jurisdiction?

  o Has there been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year in the infrastructure needs for your jurisdiction?
Transportation Policy (’14)

• Road conditions, funding
  - Impact of road condition on economic development, tourism, ag
  - Preference for ways to raise additional revenue
  - Success of millage/special assessments

• Private roads
  - Do your policies encourage public or private roads for new development
Transportation Policy (‘14)

- Complete streets
  - Familiarity with initiative
  - Passage / implementation of CS policy
  - Impact of CS on
    - Quality of life
    - Cost-effectiveness of road spending
    - Economic development
    - Pedestrian/cyclist safety
    - Relationship with MDOT
Public transit

- Current availability of
- Satisfaction of various groups
- Factors encouraging/discouraging expansion
  - Public demand
  - Operation/maintenance costs
  - Concern over traffic congestion

- Some people think a well-functioning transit system is important to communities in a variety of ways, such as for economic development, environmental sustainability, residents' mobility, etc. Others do not. How important, if at all, do you think a well-functioning transit system is to the overall needs of your jurisdiction?
Place-making (‘13)

• Is your unit of government currently engaged in any/place making programs or projects for economic development purposes? (‘09, ‘13)

• Effectiveness for economic development purposes
  o Historic preservation
  o Mixed-use developments
  o Public transit accessibility
  o Arts & cultural amenities
  o Form-based codes
Intergovernmental cooperation (‘10)

• In the past two years, has your jurisdiction approached another unit of government about any type of formal collaborative effort(s)?

• Extent of collaboration on
  o Land use planning and/or zoning
  o Transportation
  o Economic development
  o Workforce development

• Factors encouraging/discouraging collaboration
Sustainability planning

- Does your jurisdiction engage in sustainability planning, and if so, how extensively? (‘13)

- Are environmental sustainability and the concept of "being green" important aspects of local gov. leadership? (‘10, ‘13)
Emergency managers ('12)

- P.A. 4 of 2011
  - Familiarity with
  - Effectiveness for restoring/protection fiscal health
  - Support/oppose EM power w.r.t.
    - Collective bargaining agreements
    - Sale, transfer, lease of local assets
    - Recommend consolidation
Property tax exemption (‘13)

• Types of exemptions

• Asset or liability on
  - Current/future fiscal health
  - Current/future quality of life
The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS), a program of biannual state-wide surveys of local government leaders in Michigan, was launched by the Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP) in 2009. The surveys cover a wide range of issues important to local and state governance, such as fiscal, budgetary and operational policy, fiscal health, public sector compensation, workforce development, local-state governmental relations, intergovernmental collaboration, privatization, economic development strategies and initiatives such as placemaking and economic gardening, the role of local government in environmental sustainability, energy topics such as hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”) and wind power, trust in government, views on state policymaker performance, and much more.

All MPPS questionnaires are available on this MPPS website, and pre-run data tables displaying results are available for almost all questions. Users can browse questionnaires or the pre-run data tables to find questions of interest. In addition, the search engine below allows users to search the question text across all waves of the MPPS. Results of the keyword search provide direct links to the pre-run data tables for each question.

Keyword:  

Limit search results to:  □ 2009 □ 2010 □ 2011 □ 2012 □ 2013 □ 2014
Accessing MPPS data

- Available with (IRB approval), but without FIPS

- Ability to merge your FIPS-based data (soon)

- VERY-de-identified datasets for classroom use available in Winter (Provost grant)
  - Jurisdiction type
  - Population density categories
  - Region
Collaborating with CLOSUP...
Collaboration

• CLOSUP in the Classroom
  o Anonymized datasets for classroom use
  o Guest lectures

• Suggest topics for future surveys
Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP)

Web: www.closup.umich.edu
Email: closup@umich.edu
Twitter: @closup
Slowly Improving Fiscal Health

% of jurisdictions **better or less able** to meet fiscal needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Better able</th>
<th>Less able</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spread and Easing of Fiscal Problems, by County

**Net fiscal health:**

% of local jurisdictions reporting better able to meet needs minus % reporting less able to meet needs
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**Net fiscal health:**
% of local jurisdictions reporting better able to meet needs minus % reporting less able to meet needs

**2013**
- >50% net decline
- 26-50% net decline
- 0-25% net decline
- 0-25 % net improvement
- 26-50% net improvement
- >50% net improvement
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**Net fiscal health:**
% of local jurisdictions reporting better able to meet needs minus % reporting less able to meet needs

2015
- >50% net decline
- 26-50% net decline
- 0-25% net decline
- 0-25 % net improvement
- 26-50% net improvement
- >50% net improvement