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The Michigan Public Policy Survey

• **Census survey** – all counties, cities, villages, and townships

• **Respondents** – chief elected and appointed officials

• **Administered** – online and via hardcopy

• **Timing** – Spring and Fall each year
The Michigan Public Policy Survey

- Content developed in partnership with MML and other experts

- **Topics** – wide range, such as fiscal health, budget priorities, economic development, intergovernmental cooperation, employee policies, labor unions, state relations, environmental sustainability, citizen engagement, much more.
MPPS is not a typical opinion poll

- 70+% response rates

- Transparency
  - Questionnaires online
  - Pre-run data tables online
  - Sharing of (anonymized) datasets with other researchers

- Borrow from other proven sources such as NLC and ICMA

- Quality control such as double blind coding of open-end responses, internal technical memos on data quality, etc.
What does the MPPS aim to do?

• **Improve understanding** of local government to help improve policymaking and quality of life

• **Inform local leaders** about peers across the state: challenges and responses

• **Inform state policymakers** and other stakeholders with data about local level challenges and responses not available from any other source

• **Build a longitudinal data archive** to allow tracking of fundamental changes (such as the economic transition, aging population, etc.)

• Foster **academic research and teaching** on local government issues
Presentation Outline

✓ Spring waves: fiscal and budgetary tracking data

✓ Fall waves: special topics

✓ A recent focus on Placemaking
MPPS Spring Waves:
Tracking the fiscal health of Michigan local governments
Jurisdictions’ Overall Fiscal Health

% of jurisdictions **less able to meet fiscal needs**, by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdictions’ Overall Fiscal Health

% of jurisdictions less able to meet fiscal needs, by size

Population Size:
- < 1500
- 1500-5000
- 5001-10000
- 10001-30000
- > 30000

Year:
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
Spreading Fiscal Problems

2009: less able to meet fiscal needs, by county

Jurisdictions within County

- Green: < 25%
- Yellow: 25-50%
- Red: > 50%
Spreading Fiscal Problems
2010: less able to meet fiscal needs, by county

Jurisdictions within County
- Green: < 25%
- Yellow: 25-50%
- Red: > 50%
Easing Fiscal Problems
2011: less able to meet fiscal needs, by county

Jurisdictions within County
- Green: < 25%
- Yellow: 25-50%
- Red: > 50%
Easing Fiscal Problems

2012: less able to meet fiscal needs, by county

Jurisdictions within County

- Green: < 25%
- Yellow: 25-50%
- Red: > 50%
Easing Fiscal Problems

2013: less able to meet fiscal needs, by county

Jurisdictions within County

- Green: < 25%
- Yellow: 25-50%
- Red: > 50%
MPPS Spring Waves: Tracking fiscal challenges
Declining Revenues

% of jurisdictions with declining property tax revenues

[Bar chart showing percentage of jurisdictions with declining property tax revenues by population size and year.]
Rising Costs

% of jurisdictions with rising health care costs

Population Size

- < 1500
- 1500-5000
- 5001-10000
- 10001-30000
- > 30000

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
Rising Costs

% of jurisdictions with increasing infrastructure needs
MPPS Spring Waves: Tracking local responses
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions increasing reliance on GF balance

Population Size

- < 1500
- 1500-5000
- 5001-10000
- 10001-30000
- > 30000

Years:
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions cutting staff levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-30000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions shifting health care costs to employees

![Bar chart showing the percentage of jurisdictions shifting health care costs to employees across different population sizes and years.]
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions increasing inter-gov’t cooperation

Population Size

- < 1500
- 1500-5000
- 5001-10000
- 10001-30000
- > 30000

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions **increasing debt**

![Graph showing the percentage of jurisdictions increasing debt across different population sizes from 2009 to 2013.](#)
Government Actions

% of jurisdictions cutting service levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-30000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MPPS Spring Waves: Tracking local plans for the future
Plans Going Forward

% of jurisdictions planning changes in property tax rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Increase property tax rates</th>
<th>Decrease property tax rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1500</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-5000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-30000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plans Going Forward

% of jurisdictions planning increases in intergovernmental cooperation and privatization of services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Increase Intergovernmental Cooperation</th>
<th>Increase Privatization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1500</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-5000</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-30000</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30000</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plans Going Forward
% of jurisdictions planning changes to staffing levels

- Decrease workforce hiring
- Decrease filling vacant positions
- Increase workforce layoffs

Population Size
- < 1500
- 1500-5000
- 5001-10000
- 10001-30000
- > 30000

- 6% decrease workforce hiring in < 1500
- 8% decrease workforce hiring in 1500-5000
- 6% decrease workforce hiring in 5001-10000
- 14% decrease workforce hiring in 10001-30000
- 30% decrease workforce hiring in > 30000

- 8% decrease workforce hiring in < 1500
- 6% decrease workforce hiring in 1500-5000
- 8% decrease workforce hiring in 5001-10000
- 17% decrease workforce hiring in 10001-30000
- 30% decrease workforce hiring in > 30000

- 3% decrease workforce hiring in < 1500
- 2% decrease workforce hiring in 1500-5000
- 6% decrease workforce hiring in 5001-10000
- 6% decrease workforce hiring in 10001-30000
- 13% decrease workforce hiring in > 30000
Plans Going Forward

% of jurisdictions planning changes in employee pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Increase Employee Pay</th>
<th>Decrease Employee Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,500</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-5,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-30,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plans Going Forward

% of jurisdictions planning increases in employees’ share of contributions to benefits

![Bar graph showing the percentage of jurisdictions planning increases in employees' share of contributions to benefits across different population sizes.](image)

- **Increase employees' share of health care costs**
  - < 1500: 11%
  - 1500-5000: 22%
  - 5001-10000: 27%
  - 10001-30000: 26%
  - > 30000: 37%

- **Increase employees' contribution to retirement funds**
  - < 1500: 59%
  - 1500-5000: 37%
  - 5001-10000: 28%
  - 10001-30000: 39%
  - > 30000: 77%

- **Increase retirees' share of health care costs**
  - < 1500: 30%
  - 1500-5000: 41%
  - 5001-10000: 56%
  - 10001-30000: 59%
  - > 30000: 55%
MPPS Spring Waves:
Other fiscal, labor, and operations policy
% of local officials **satisfied with negotiations** with their unions (among jurisdictions that negotiated with their labor unions), 2013

- City: 39% Very Satisfied, 43% Somewhat Satisfied
- Village: 40% Very Satisfied, 40% Somewhat Satisfied
- County: 46% Very Satisfied, 39% Somewhat Satisfied
- Township: 46% Very Satisfied, 30% Somewhat Satisfied
Concerns about PPT reform

% of local officials who distrust state government to follow through with provision of future replacement PPT funds, 2012
Evaluations of Emergency Manager Law

% of local officials who believe P.A. 4 will be effective at protecting or restoring fiscal health in jurisdictions across state, 2012

- **City**: 47% Very Effective, 16% Somewhat Effective
- **Village**: 34% Very Effective, 9% Somewhat Effective
- **County**: 46% Very Effective, 15% Somewhat Effective
- **Township**: 29% Very Effective, 8% Somewhat Effective
System of Funding Local Governments

% of local officials who believe **significant reform** is needed, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MPPS Fall Waves:
Exploring relevant, actionable topics at the local level
Intergovernmental Cooperation

% of local officials who say their jurisdictions’ IGC efforts to date have been successful, 2010
% of local officials who say they are **satisfied with levels of citizen engagement** in their jurisdictions, 2012
Detroit Bankruptcy

% of local officials who agree that Detroit’s bankruptcy filing was the right thing to do, 2013

- City: Strongly Agree 45%, Somewhat Agree 32%
- Village: Strongly Agree 26%, Somewhat Agree 28%
- County: Strongly Agree 33%, Somewhat Agree 36%
- Township: Strongly Agree 26%, Somewhat Agree 25%
MPPS and Placemaking: Partnering with MML to explore specific policy areas
Placemaking: Who does it?

% of jurisdictions that **report engaging in placemaking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placemaking: Who thinks it works?

% of local officials who believe placemaking can be effective as an economic development strategy in their jurisdictions
Future waves of the Michigan Public Policy Survey:

• Fall 2014: Infrastructure

• Other survey topics?

• How should MPPS data and reports be distributed to reach the widest audience?
The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

Web: www.closup.umich.edu
Email: closup-mpps@umich.edu
Twitter: @closup