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Outline: Why are we here?

1. Amenity Growth—basic conceptual ideas.
   - Define amenities
     - Man-made
     - Natural

2. Basic evidence of amenities and local economies
   - Amenities are capitalized into wages and housing prices
   - They affect population/job growth.

3. Future trends in Amenity-Led Growth
Amenities—Conceptual Issues

Brief for those who are not familiar with the issue

• What are amenities?
  • Natural amenities: climate, water, landscape, mountains, clean environment. My focus today.
  • Man-made amenities:
    • Facilitate natural amenities such as boat ramps or ski resorts (Deller et. al. 2001; Kim et al. 2005)
    • Urban amenities such as cultural venues, recreation, urban milieu. (Glaeser et al., 2001; Adamson et al., 2004; Florida, 2004)
Conceptual Issues

- Motivating question is ‘Jobs vs People’ led growth.
  - Partridge and Rickman *J. of Urban Econ.* (2003)
  - Roughly, just under 50% jobs and just over 50% people. Amenities are important!
- The basic research on amenities dates to Graves and Linneman (1979) and Roback (1982).
  - Amenities are normal goods → rising incomes over time are increasing demand for amenities.
  - Amenities are capitalized into higher housing costs and lower wages as people crowd into high-amenity areas
  - Amenities also lead to faster population growth
Basic Empirical Evidence
• Capitalized into wages and housing costs
  – Gabriel et al. (2003, p. 632) found the range of quality of life effect, (1989$) or about double for 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Max—1989$</th>
<th>Min—1989$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating Degree Days (5,091)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$15,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling Degree Days (1,215)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$7,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed (9.36 mph)</td>
<td>-$1,450</td>
<td>-$2,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast (1=state on coast)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Water (2.7% of land)</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$3,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime (475 per 100k)</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality (0.12 pts per mil)</td>
<td>-$812</td>
<td>-$7,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Empirical Evidence—cont.

- Gabriel & Rosenthal (2004, p.440) \textit{RESTAT}
  - For 37 metro areas, examine Quality of Life and Business Environment. Find an inverse association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,990</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-603</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-8,589</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-7,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-2,796</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-1,789</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-1,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Empirical Evidence—cont.

• Schmidt and Courant (2006, p. 939, 942) note that people would take a 4% pay cut to live 100 miles nearer to a ‘nice place’ such as a national park, seashore, landmark.
  – Omaha is farthest from nice place and Oxnard-Ventura CA is almost the closest. Their results suggest Omaha has 20% higher wages to compensate for this disadvantage (*cet. par.*).
Population and Amenities

- Rappaport (2007) finds climate may be most important amenity beginning even in the 1920s (before AC and central heating), suggesting income effect.
  - Climate, topography, landscape, water area
  - McGranahan (2007, p. 234) finds:
    - If typical rural Iowa county was 50% forest, 25% cropland vs actual 5% forest, 75% cropland, it would have had 7% more net migration in the 1990s vs 1% on avg. (cet. par.)
    - If it had 7% water area (like Sawyer County WI) vs actual 2% water area, it would have had 1% more net in-migration.
Population and Amenities

- Deller et al. (2001) finds that developed recreational facilities, including for water and winter recreation are associated with both faster rural population and rural job growth.
  - A key point of Deller et al. and Kim et al. (2005) is that natural amenities are necessary, but not sufficient for growth. A location needs developed facilities to really experience growth.
- Evidence suggests smaller amenity effects in other countries (for Canada, see Ferguson et al., 2007 and for W. Europe, see Cheshire and Magrini, 2006).
1950-2007 Population Growth

• 1950-2000 period growth dominated by the Sunbelt and places with warm weather.
• 2000-2007 note the shift to cooler areas with lakes and woods: e.g., Northern MI, MN, WI; Northern Rockies, Ozarks, South central Appalachia.
• Note the growth in northern MI, MN, and WI
1950-2000 Population Growth

U.S. average over 1950-2000 = 84.80%
Some Direct Effects of Amenities

• The next slide shows the predicted impacts of some variables on 1950-2000 population growth—see Partridge et al. (2008) *J. of Econ. Geography*.

• The slide shows the effect of climate between Detroit and Orlando and for other natural amenities to give a sense of the importance of these variables.
### Table 1: Difference in population growth over 1950-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables/Samples</th>
<th>Non-metro</th>
<th>Small metro</th>
<th>Large metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean pop growth % (std. dev.)</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>122.47</td>
<td>138.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(122.93)</td>
<td>(271.64)</td>
<td>(257.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan temp (diff Detroit – Orlando)</td>
<td>-135.58</td>
<td>-768.63</td>
<td>-731.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July temp (diff Detroit – Orlando)</td>
<td>94.87</td>
<td>323.93</td>
<td>255.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July humidity (diff Detroit – Orlando)</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>215.23</td>
<td>162.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine hours (diff Detroit–Orlando)</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>-257.88</td>
<td>-248.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent water area (1 std. dev.)</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes (within 50 kms)</td>
<td>-45.19</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>52.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Ocean (within 50 kms)</td>
<td>56.09</td>
<td>205.85</td>
<td>133.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ocean (within 50 kms)</td>
<td>-28.28</td>
<td>-162.18</td>
<td>-177.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typography (most mtn. to coast plain)</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity rank (diff between Detroit (3) and Orlando (5) on a 1-7 amenity scale)</td>
<td>-69.74</td>
<td>-153.05</td>
<td>-143.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Boldface** indicates significant at 10% level. The difference between Detroit and Orlando uses their actual values. “1 std dev.” represents a one-standard deviation change in the variable. The models were re-estimated with USDA ERS amenity rank replacing all 9 individual climate/amenity variables to calculate the amenity rank effects (available online at ERS). The amenity scale is 1=lowest; 7=highest.
Heterogeneity Impacts

• Partridge et al. (2008) finds great regional variation in how amenities affect growth.
  • They use a GWR to find these effects.
• For example, high amenities tend to interact with higher initial shares of college graduates to produce even faster growth.
• Next two slides illustrate diverse effects of January temp, %Water Area, typography on nonmetropolitan 1990-2004 population growth.
Nonmetro Employment Change 1990-2004

1a: Variations in the Coeff. of January Temperature

Note: 2003 MA boundary definitions used
Nonmetro Employment Change 1990-2004

1b: Variations in the Coeff. of % Water Area

Note: 2003 MA boundary definitions used
Nonmetro Employment Change 1990-2004

1c: Variations in the Coeff. of Typography

Note: 2003 MA boundary definitions used
1990s Growth in Winnipeg/Twin Cities Region

2001-2006 Population Growth in S. Ontario: 
With 100 km rings around Large CMAs

Source: Statistics Canada—2006 CCS Boundaries
Future Trends

- Two main trends.
- 1. At the macro level, amenity migration may be slowing (my unpublished work) and McGranahan (2007).
  - Warm areas or spectacular settings are now ‘crowded’ and high housing costs deter new migrants. So, while rising incomes support amenity migration, congestion and high costs do not.
- 2. North areas with lakes and woods are now benefiting more from amenity growth. These areas are more ‘virgin’ and they have lower housing costs.
Future Trends—cont.

• Climate change—and mitigating adjustments to climate change—imply that the Great Lakes regions will further benefit from trend 2.
  – Cooler summers and more water may reverse Sunbelt migration.
  – Access to water may help certain industries such as food processing: not just recreation
  – Great Lakes Compact is an example of a policy change that may facilitate this process.
Conclusion

• Amenities cause higher land costs, lower wages and faster population growth.
  • Income growth supports the ‘purchase’ of Quality of Life
• The influence has been remarkable growth in the American Sunbelt.
• Amenity growth may be changing over time to favor areas with lakes and woods. This favors the Great Lakes states.
• Climate change may further boost growth in the Great Lakes region through reversal of Sunbelt migration.
Thank you
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