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Background and History (Population)

Detroit Population Trends, 1890-2010

Detroit Racial Trends, 1920-2010

Reese, Sands, & Skidmore (2013)
Sand & Skidmore (2013)
Detroit 1940s and 1950s
Detroit Today
Home on East Side Detroit that recently sold for one dollar
Black Population in Region

Metro Detroit Black Population, 1960

Metro Detroit Black Population, 2010
Causes (and Effects)

- Manufacturing Decline/Global Competition
- Racial Tension
- Policies (land use, tax rates, public services, schools)
  - 40% of Street Lights Are Non-functioning
  - Highest Crime Rate Among Large Cities
  - 47 Minute Police Response Time (national average = 11 minutes)
- Corruption

### Crime Incidents and Case Clearance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Aggr. Assault</th>
<th>Simple Assault</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Larc. Theft</th>
<th>MV Theft</th>
<th>Arson</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>17,240</td>
<td>43,759</td>
<td>16,032</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>136,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>17,240</td>
<td>43,759</td>
<td>16,032</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>136,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
True deficits unrevealed by “debt restructuring”, and underfunding retiree benefits accounts
Major Revenue Sources (millions of real $)

Detroit General Fund Major Revenue Sources, FY93-FY10

Total Debt and Unfunded Liabilities = $18 billion
or $68,000 per Detroit household

Bankruptcy in Process
Broader Context—other Local Governments

- **Cities**: Fiscal Challenges in Chicago, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Oakland and Providence to name a few. Many troubled cities cite under-funded retiree compensation promises as major issue

- **Schools**: California—200 schools using capital appreciation bonds: Borrow $1 million today…no principal or interest (zero payments) for 40 years. At the end of year 40, $1 billion is due to be paid in full
Broader Context—State Governments

- Illinois—Underfunded State Retiree Benefits ($100 billion or about $21,000 per Illinois household)

- California—Underfunded Retirement Benefits ($327 billion or about $22,000 per California household)

- Novy-Marx and Rauh (2010)
Broader Context—Federal Government

- 2012 Deficit Spending ($29 cents of every $1 spent is borrowed)

- Total Debt—
  - $17 trillion
  - $148,000 per household
  - ~$242,000 per tax paying household
Broader Context—Federal Government

- **Unfunded Liabilities**
  - $125 trillion
  - $1.2 million per household
  - ~$1.8 million per tax paying household

- **Total Liability**
  - $142 trillion
  - $1.35 million per household
  - ~$2.0 million per tax paying household
Broader Context—International

Debt as Percent of GDP, 2012

Greece: 1/3 of Tax Revenue Lost to Tax Evasion
Mistaking Short-term Crises for Long-term Trends

• Detroit Fiscal Problems Accumulated over Decades
• One Interpretation: Citizens and Public Officials in Detroit Mistook a Long-run Permanent Structural Shift for Short-term Challenges
  • It might be rational to delay pension & retiree contributions, transfer short-term deficit spending into long-term bonds, & enact tax rate increases, if you think your problems are temporary and you anticipate a return to previous trends…
Detroit: Property Tax, Delinquency, & Publicly Held Parcels

- Definitions & Institutional Background
  - Taxable Value Grows at Rate of Inflation until Property Is Sold (Assessment Growth Cap Imposed in 1994)
  - State Equalized Value=1/2*Market Value
  - Tax Payment=Taxable Value*Statutory Tax Rate
  - Effective Tax Rate=Tax Payment/State Equalized Value
  - Millage Rates Vary Depending on Abatements
  - Effective Tax Rates Vary Substantially from Neighborhood to Neighborhood and from Parcel to Parcel

Hodge, Skidmore, Sands, & McMillen (2013a)
Skidmore, Sands, & Hodge (2013)
Detroit Residential SEV and TV

Dollar figures in millions
Source: City of Detroit Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports
Property Tax Delinquency and Abandonment

- Delinquency Facts and Processes
  - 48% of Parcels Are Tax Delinquent (20% delinquent for five or more years)
  - Wayne County Does Not Have the Resources to Bring Tax Foreclosure Proceedings on All Delinquent Property Owners
  - Properties with Less than $1,500-$2,000 in Back-taxes Are Ignored
  - For Properties That Are Tax Foreclosed, a Public Auction is Held
  - If a Property Is not Sold, the Property is Transferred to a Public Body such as City, State or Land Bank
Property Tax Delinquency and Abandonment

- 80% of Properties Sold at Auction Two Years ago Are Again Delinquent on Taxes

- There Is Backlog of 200,000 Tax Delinquent Properties in Wayne County (most in Detroit)

- The Number of Parcel in Public “Ownership” is Growing
Taxable and Nontaxable Properties
Central City Taxable and Nontaxable Properties
Tax Base Erosion: Abatement Zones
Tax Base Erosion:
Assessment Growth Cap

Neighborhood Average Effective Tax Rates of Owner-Occupied Residential Property

Recall that:

Tax Payment = Statutory Tax Rate * TV

Effective Tax Rate = Tax Payment / SEV
Parcel Level Effective Tax Rates
Quantile Regression Results: Effect of Assessment Growth Cap on Effective Tax Rate Densities

Hodge, Skidmore, Sands, & McMillen (2013a)

Quantile Regression Technique Allows a More Complete Evaluation of the Distributional Implications of the Assessment Growth Cap

Standard Linear Regression

$$E(y | X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_i x_i + u$$

Quantile Regression

$$Q^{(p)}(y | X) = \beta_0^{(p)} + \beta_1^{(p)} x_1 + \cdots + \beta_i^{(p)} x_i + u^{(p)}$$

$$0 < p < 1$$
Effects of Assessment Growth Cap within Different Effective Tax Rate Deciles (horizontal inequity)
Effects of Assessment Growth Cap across Different Effective Tax Rate Deciles (vertical inequity)
# Effects of Assessment Growth Cap on Efficiency (Mobility)

## Probit Home Sale Estimation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Home Sale Indicator Variable (yes=1, no=0)</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Non-Homestead</th>
<th>All Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Tax Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3810)</td>
<td>(0.2533)</td>
<td>(0.2079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0042***</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>0.0014***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0007)</td>
<td>(0.0005)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years-Owned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0236***</td>
<td>-0.0243***</td>
<td>-0.0247***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0016)</td>
<td>(0.0016)</td>
<td>(0.0011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0328***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.7860***</td>
<td>-1.5279***</td>
<td>-1.6488***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1193)</td>
<td>(0.1123)</td>
<td>(0.0822)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Effects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Obs.</td>
<td>103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R-squared</td>
<td>0.0328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marginal Effect on Probability of Sale (dy/dx)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Non-Homestead</th>
<th>All Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0004***</td>
<td>-0.00001</td>
<td>0.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00006)</td>
<td>(0.00005)</td>
<td>(0.00004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Standard errors are in parentheses and all regressions are corrected for heteroskedasticity. Asterisks denote significance at the 1% (***) 5% (**) and 10% (*) levels.
Assessment Practices

• Real Estate Market Collapse
• Are State Equalized Values Falling Fast Enough?
• Again Use Quantile Regression Techniques
• Assessment Ratio = Assessed Value/Sales Price
  • Assessed Value = 2*SEV
  • Assessment Ratio = 1 (According to State policy)
  • Actual Average Assessment Ratio ~5
  • Vertical Equity & Horizontal Equity

Hodge, Skidmore, Sands, & McMillen (2013b)
Assessment Ratio Distributions
Assessment Ratio Distributions by Sales Price Quintile
Summary…

• Assessment Growth Cap
  • Creates Horizontal & Vertical Inequity
  • Generates Market Inefficiencies (reduces mobility)
  • BUT Cap Impacts Depend on Assessment Practices…

• Assessment Practices
  • Properties Are Over Assessed (by a factor of 5 or more on average)
  • Differential Assessment Ratios within & across Property Value Groups

• Property Tax Delinquency = 48%
Tax Compliance

It isn’t just a matter of lax enforcement, though. xxxx citizens also have what social scientists call very low “tax morale.” In most places, tax-compliance rates are much higher than a calculation of risks would imply. We don’t pay our taxes just because we’re afraid of getting caught; we also feel a responsibility to contribute to the common good. But that sense of responsibility comes with conditions. We’re generally what the Swiss behavioral economist Benno Torgler calls “social taxpayers”: we’ll chip in as long as we have faith that our fellow-citizens are doing the same, and that our government is basically legitimate. Places where people feel that they have some say in how government acts, and where there are high levels of trust, tend to have high rates of tax compliance.

James Surowiecki (New Yorker, July 2011)
Detroit Delinquency by Neighborhood
What Factors Contribute to Delinquency?

- Wayne County Does Not Have the Resources Bring Tax Foreclosure Proceedings on All Delinquent Homeowners
- Properties with Less than $1,500-$2,000 in Back-taxes Are Ignored (~20% of property owners are delinquent for five years or longer)
- For Properties That Are Tax Foreclosed, a Public Auction is Held.
- If a Property Is not Sold, the Property is Transferred to a Public Body such as City, State or Land Bank
- Eighty Percent of Properties Sold Two Years Ago at Auction Are Again Delinquent on Taxes
- There Is Backlog of 200,000 Tax Delinquent Properties in Wayne County (most in Detroit)
- **The Number of Parcel in Public “Ownership” is Growing**
Factors that Determine Delinquency

Property owner first chooses whether or not to pay taxes, and if not then by how much.

Joint decision is estimated simultaneously in order to address the potential bias introduced by the property owners’ selection into delinquency. (Heckman; 1979).

Delinquency (yes/no) selection equation, which is represented by:

\[ Delinquent_i = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } P_i\alpha + X_i\beta + u_i \geq 0 \\
0 & \text{if } P_i\alpha + X_i\beta + u_i < 0 
\end{cases} \]

*Delinquent* \(_i\) indicates whether the property owner is delinquent (yes=1, no=0)

\( P_i \) is a vector of property and characteristics, and \( X_i \) is a vector of variable(s) that are excluded from the second-stage outcome equation

Variable(s) in \( X \) are used as instruments; in the estimates presented these instruments are indicators for whether the property is owned by a Detroit resident (*Detroit Resident*) and a bank owned property (*Bank Owned Property*).

The Heckman second stage outcome equation is represented by:

\[ Delinquency\ Amount_i = P_i\alpha + \epsilon_i \]
Table 1: Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-homestead</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Amount</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>694.6</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Tax Enforcement (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Response Time (minutes)</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>8.039</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>7.699</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>8.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (per 1,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Decades)</td>
<td>6.726</td>
<td>1.426</td>
<td>6.567</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>6.922</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead Property (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Tax Rate (tax payment/SEV)</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value ($1,000s)</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Owned</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>6.112</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>5.467</td>
<td>8.471</td>
<td>6.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Ratio</td>
<td>5.252</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>7.045</td>
<td>6.579</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Owner (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Owned Property (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent on Water (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Observations</td>
<td>161,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,852</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Heckman First Stage Selection Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>All Properties</th>
<th>Homestead Properties</th>
<th>Non-Homestead Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable:</strong> Delinquent (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Tax Enforcement (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.145***</td>
<td>0.156***</td>
<td>0.152***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.30)</td>
<td>(10.54)</td>
<td>(9.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Response Time (minutes)</td>
<td>0.002***</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>0.002***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.61)</td>
<td>(4.29)</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (per 1,000 square feet)</td>
<td>-0.033***</td>
<td>0.091***</td>
<td>-0.076***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.60)</td>
<td>(6.01)</td>
<td>(-8.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Decades)</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
<td>0.038***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.98)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>(9.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead Property (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>-0.436***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-50.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.50)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(15.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value (per $1,000)</td>
<td>-0.011***</td>
<td>-0.012***</td>
<td>-0.013***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-27.35)</td>
<td>(-19.75)</td>
<td>(-21.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Owned</td>
<td>-0.043***</td>
<td>-0.039***</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-59.69)</td>
<td>(-38.38)</td>
<td>(-47.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Ratio</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.47)</td>
<td>(24.92)</td>
<td>(20.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Owner (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Owned Property (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
<td>-0.872***</td>
<td>0.246***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.88)</td>
<td>(-18.74)</td>
<td>(11.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent on Water (yes=1, no=0)</td>
<td>0.492***</td>
<td>0.630***</td>
<td>0.387***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.43)</td>
<td>(54.89)</td>
<td>(35.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Observations                     | 161,523        | 80,807               | 80,716                   |
# of Censored Observations            | 75,232         | 48,288               | 26,944                   |
Psuedo R²                              | 0.113          | 0.067                | 0.076                    |

Policy Variables such as the Tax Rate and Assessment Practices Appear to Matter

Cutting the Tax Rate by a Third Reduces Delinquency by 6 Percentage Points

Cutting the Assessment Ratio by a Factor of 5 Reduces Delinquency by 5 Percentage Points
Enforcement Also Matters

- Properties with a Tax Payment of Less than $1,000 Have a 14 Percentage Point Higher Probability of Being Delinquent
Concluding Remarks & Policy Options

• Bankruptcy Proceedings Will Determine How the Pain Will be Shared

• Considerations for Altering Trajectory
  • Stabilize Budget & Improve Public Services
  • Eliminate Assessment Growth Cap (reduce inequities & inefficiencies)
  • Reduce the Millage Rate (cut rates by 33%)
  • Adjust Assessments Downward (by a factor of 5)
• Manage Excess Supply of Land
• Human and Social Capital Investment
Lessons from the Great Depression

- State and National Forests in MI, MN, & WI
  - Farmers of Marginal Lands-Abandonment and Tax Foreclosure (millions of acres)
  - County Governments Took Possession of Lands
  - Eager to Sell, Counties Found Buyers in State and Federal Governments
  - State and Federal Authorities pay PILOTs, and Manage the Land for the Good of the General Public
  - Could State and Federal Authorities Purchase Sections of Unwanted Detroit Lands?
State and Federal Government Intervention

• Purchase Blocks of Unwanted Parcels
• Immediate Infusion of $ to City Government
• PILOTs Generate Annual Revenue Payments for all Overlying Jurisdictions
• Excess Supply of Land Credibly Removed from the Market
• Land Acquired to Be Used for the Benefit of the General Public and is a Long-term Investment

_Caveat_—State and Federal Governments Face Constraints too…
Perspective: 1910 (vs. 2010)

The average life expectancy for men was 47 years. (78 years)

Only 14 percent of the homes had a bathtub (97 percent)

Only 8 percent of the homes had a telephone (97 percent)

There were only 8,000 cars and only 144 miles of paved roads (2,615,870 miles of paved roads)

The average US wage in 1910 was $5 per hour ($22 per hour) — inflation corrected comparisons.

The average US worker made about $7,000 per year ($45,000 per year) — inflation corrected comparisons

More than 95 percent of all births took place at HOME. (less than 1 percent)

About 14 percent of all adults had a high school diploma (86 percent)

Four percent of all adults had a college education (28 percent)

Most women only washed their hair once a month, and used Borax or egg yolks for shampoo.

The Five leading causes of death were (are):
  1. Pneumonia and influenza (heart disease)
  2. Tuberculosis (cancer)
  3. Diarrhea (chronic lower respiratory diseases)
  4. Heart disease (stroke)
  5. Stroke (accidents)
Geography of Government
“Entitlements”

• Implications of Promises Made…. 
  • http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/02/12/us/entitlement-map.html?ref=us
Infrastructure Quality

- Public infrastructure (e.g. transportation, water supply, sewage, etc.) is now 25 to 50 years old and in significant disrepair. According to the American Society of Engineers (for Michigan):
  - Overall Infrastructure Rating “D”
  - Drinking Water “D”
  - Transit “D”
  - Roads and Bridges “D”
  - 38% of all roads were rated to be in poor condition, and 29% of bridges were deemed to be either obsolete or deficient.
Federal Obligations

US National Debt As Percent Of GDP
US from FY 1990 to FY 2012