


This article was downloaded by: [University North Carolina - Chapel Hill]

On: 29 July 2014, At: 11:56

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Journal of the American Planning Association

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjpa20>

Making Room for Manufacturing: Understanding Industrial Land Conversion in Cities

Thomas W. Lester^a, Nikhil Kaza^a & Sarah Kirk^b

^a University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

^b S. B. Freidman and Company, Chicago, Illinois

Published online: 12 Jun 2014.

To cite this article: Thomas W. Lester, Nikhil Kaza & Sarah Kirk (2013) Making Room for Manufacturing: Understanding Industrial Land Conversion in Cities, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 79:4, 295-313, DOI: [10.1080/01944363.2014.915369](https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.915369)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.915369>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Making Room for Manufacturing

Understanding Industrial Land Conversion in Cities

Thomas W. Lester, Nikhil Kaza, and Sarah Kirk

Problem, research strategy, and findings:

Planners face tension when dealing with the stock of urban industrial land: Should they enact industrial land preservation policies to protect viable manufacturers that provide good jobs even if it exacerbates the problem of affordable housing and causes cities to forgo growth in other sectors? Planners need better information on the underlying forces that lead to conversion of industrial land and an assessment of the effectiveness of preservation policies. We develop here an index of vulnerability of industrial land that is based on location factors, neighborhood dynamics, detailed industrial trends, environmental hazards, and local regulations. We show how these factors can explain the probability of the conversion of industrial land to other uses in Cook County (IL) and Mecklenburg County (NC) and describe how various industrial preservation policies are effective in limiting conversion.

Takeaway for practice: Cities can use this index to strategically plan for industries to target and sites to preserve as industrial uses. Traditional planning and regulatory tools such as industrial zone designations do reduce conversion risk, while factors such as transit accessibility increase the probability of conversion. We argue that local governments should be strategic about which manufacturing industries can be preserved at what locations using these tools. We also develop and demonstrate an open source, interactive, web-based tool that demonstrates some of the key concepts that can be replicated in other places.

Keywords: industrial land preservation, manufacturing, land use policy, economic development

The restructuring of urban economies away from manufacturing and toward services results in highly bifurcated labor markets that generate few moderate-income jobs for blue-collar workers. In addition, the growth of high technology and skilled service sector jobs in cities has generated new demand for urban living, driving up housing prices. Thus there is pressure to convert scarce urban land from industrial uses for either new housing or commercial uses. In some cities, planners have attempted to slow this transition by promoting industrial preservation policies that aim to retain a small but vital stock of blue-collar jobs in manufacturing. However, industrial preservation generates clear tradeoffs for local jurisdictions in the form of potentially forgone taxes and less space for housing. As the dual problems of labor market inequality and rising housing prices grow—especially in strong market cities like San Francisco, Portland (OR), and New York—the question of how much industrial land should be preserved will continue to vex planners. While the zoning tools for industrial preservation have been used since the late 1980s, we still know little about their effectiveness, nor much about the factors that drive conversion of industrial land in the first place.

We developed a model to predict the probability of land use change away from industrial uses. We find that industrial zone designations in plans and regulations do reduce the probability of conversion. We also offer an example of how such a model can be used to develop smart industrial preservation policies that target only the land that is most competitive for current industry needs.

Motivation and Research Questions

While the debate about industrial land preservation has waxed and waned over the past 30 years, several recent trends have put the issue back on planners' agendas. First, there is growing discussion nationally of the return of

About the authors: **Thomas W. Lester** (twlester@unc.edu) and **Nikhil Kaza** (nkaza@unc.edu) are assistant professors of city and regional planning at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. **Sarah Kirk** (sskirk@gmail.com) is an associate with S. B.

Freidman and Company in Chicago, Illinois.

Journal of the American Planning Association,
Vol. 79, No. 4, Autumn 2013
DOI 10.1080/01944363.2014.915369
© American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.

manufacturing as higher labor costs abroad, a weak dollar, and strong demand have improved the competitiveness of the United States as a production location. Indeed, manufacturing employment has grown by 729,000 jobs since the start of the recovery and exports of manufactured products have increased by 47% since 2009.¹ What is also surprising is the geographic imprint of this growth, with former Rust Belt states such as Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin taking part in this recovery along with growing states like North Carolina. While researchers continue to debate the magnitude and potential of the resurgence of U.S. manufacturing (Florida, 2013), some economic development planners are placing renewed emphasis on manufacturing and wondering if urban areas have enough available industrial land to gain from this turnaround (e.g., City of San Francisco Planning Commission, 2014).

The second trend that makes industrial land preservation a controversial issue is the increased demand for urban living. During the 1990s and 2000s, many large central cities experienced a resurgence of population and jobs based primarily on the growth of high technology and skilled service sector jobs that in turn generated a high number of entertainment and consumption-based jobs in and around industrial neighborhoods (Wyly & Hammel, 1999). The gentrification of urban neighborhoods that began in the 1980s and continued during the 2000s created pressure to convert industrial land to residential or commercial uses (Zukin, 1982).

One example from practice illustrates the tension cities face in attempting to preserve industrial land while also attempting to encourage expansion of space for growing sectors of the economy such as the high technology office. San Francisco's planning commission is currently debating a proposal to modify the strict zoning requirements for production, distribution, and repair (PDR) activities established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan in 2008. Originally, all office and retail developments were banned in core PDR districts to protect manufacturing and related enterprises from rapidly rising rents. In March of 2014, the commission considered a proposal to allow vacant and marginally occupied buildings in PDR districts to be redeveloped into properties that contained up to 66% non-PDR commercial space. This change would explicitly create an internal cross-subsidy between higher-rent office and retail spaces and lower-rent PDR space meant to house existing PDR companies. Specifically, according to the planning staff:

The need for the legislation is based on the strong growth witnessed in the PDR sector over the last few years, and the desire to see this sector continue to expand and thrive. This growth is due, in part, to the demand created by our strong technology and tourism economies, which drive

the need for services provided by businesses involved in distribution and repair. This growth is also due to the growth of our local manufacturing sector, which has increased in size over the past two years, after decades of decline. This growth has been spurred by the rise in artisanal manufacturing—a phenomenon being witnessed across the country, and which shows no signs of slowing down. The result of this growth is that PDR space is in high demand, vacancy is exceedingly low, and we are now seeing PDR companies leaving San Francisco because they cannot find space to expand. (City of San Francisco Planning Commission, 2014)

This brief example illustrates the choices that planners must balance when considering policies to protect industrial land. On the one hand, the potential for growth in manufacturing nationally is attractive. However, it is possible that cities may be at a disadvantage in attracting these relatively high-paying jobs since available industrial land has been shrinking in cities. Despite declines in manufacturing employment in North Carolina, the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce explicitly lists manufacturing as one of its targeted industries along with new economic engines such as energy and life sciences (Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, n.d.). The state of Oregon explicitly claims vested interest in discouraging conversion of prime industrial land because some of these sites have location characteristics that are not easily replicable (Industrial Conversion Study Committee & Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2004). In this case, planners seeking to make room for manufacturing might seek to enact land use policies aimed at preserving industrial land and promoting manufacturing.

On the other hand, it is important to remember that urban areas have been losing manufacturing jobs for decades and that some land may not be suitable for the specific industrial sectors that are projected to grow. As Howland's (2010) careful cost-benefit analysis shows, some cities may already have enough industrial land, so redevelopment to other uses may be highly beneficial from a fiscal point of view. Before enacting policies that preserve industrial land homogeneously, it is critical that planners better understand the factors that lead to conversion and the effectiveness of policies to preserve industrial land.

Therefore, we address the following two broad research questions. First, what factors drive the conversion of existing industrial land to other uses? Second, are industrial land preservation policies, such as restrictive zoning in industrial corridors, effective in limiting conversion? Specifically, we analyze the process of industrial land conversion at the parcel level and develop a method for planners to assess the vulnerability of existing industrial areas. We conduct our analysis

on two central urban counties: Mecklenburg County (NC) and Cook County (IL). Unlike previous studies of industrial displacement, we have developed a multifactor model that takes into account each parcel's location characteristics and neighborhood real estate dynamics as well as the regional competitiveness of manufacturing firms located within each parcel. Although our findings differ across the cases, we can conclude that real estate speculation in areas surrounding industrial land increases the risk of conversion and that industrial preservation policies, such as Chicago's Industrial Corridor (IC) program, are effective in stemming the loss of industrial land.

Background and Literature Review

The State of Urban Manufacturing

As planners weigh the potential costs and benefits of preserving industrial land, it is important to understand the current role that the manufacturing sector plays within urban economies. Despite the long-term deindustrialization of urban areas, central cities still maintain a large number of manufacturing firms and a large inventory of industrial land. Although large-scale heavy manufacturing declined significantly in the 1980s and 1990s, central cities remain competitive locations for small and midsized manufacturing companies. Mistry and Byron (2011) estimate that approximately one-third of the nation's small manufacturing establishments (fewer than 20 employees) are located in the 10 largest cities. Urban areas remain competitive locations for goods-producing firms for many of the same reasons that first brought industry to the city, including traditional location factors such as access to large markets, key transportation infrastructure, and pools of skilled labor and specialized suppliers (Alonso, 1995; Losch, 1995).

However, changes in the nature of competition in goods-producing sectors may also favor urban areas that can offer dense networks of competing and complementary firms. Research on the competitiveness of regional industrial systems (Piore & Sabel, 1984; Scott, 1988) suggests that as transportation costs fell rapidly and global markets opened in the late 20th century, firm competitiveness was increasingly dependent on flexibility. For goods-producing firms, this meant an emphasis on just-in-time (JIT) production methods, which are, in turn, reliant on access to modern transportation nodes. Thus, while globalization and falling transportation costs have freed some large manufacturing plants from central cities, location factors such as the distance to rail, multimodal depots, highway interchanges, and airports and ports—and, more important, competitive clusters of complementary

establishments—are still important factors that affect the competitiveness of land for industrial use. In addition, dense networks of small firms are also associated with greater innovation, as research indicates that knowledge spillovers play an increasingly important role in regional competitiveness (Cooke & Morgan, 1998; Saxenian, 1994).

Other scholars have emphasized the indirect role of manufacturing firms and the industrial land they occupy in enhancing the health of the overall urban economy. Chapple (in press) analyzes employment dynamics and job creation in four Bay Area cities and finds that the availability of affordable industrial space is essential in business expansions, which are a key component of overall job growth. Scholars have also pointed out that manufacturers and other users of industrial land—broadly defined as PDR—produce key goods and services that are critical inputs to other sectors of the urban economy, including the construction and commercial sectors (Chapple, in press; Howland, 2010).

Attracting and retaining manufacturing firms in cities is also attractive from the standpoint of job quality and equity. Despite recent accounts of the reshoring of manufacturing amid significant wage reductions and two-tier union contracting, manufacturing continues to offer average annual wages that are 22.9% higher than the average private sector job.² Furthermore, jobs in manufacturing typically offer such wages without requiring an advanced degree, making these jobs an attractive match for urban areas with high unemployment among lower-skilled workers. In addition, as Howland (2010) points out, there may be other important reasons for industrial preservation, including protecting healthy manufacturing firms from encroachment and preventing housing redevelopment on environmentally degraded land.

Industrial Land Conversion

Despite the factors that make urban areas attractive locations for manufacturing and planning efforts to preserve industrial land, the amount of land zoned for industrial uses continues to shrink. For example, industrial land shrank in San Francisco from 14% of total land area in 1948 to 4.5% in 2012 (Chapple, in press). Although much of this decline is understandable given the long-term sectoral decline of manufacturing, even viable industrial firms are sometimes threatened by displacement due to real estate pressures. The literature on industrial displacement dates back to the late 1980s and finds strong links between the conversion of industrial land—especially older multi-story loft buildings—and residential gentrification. Giloth and Betancur (1988) document the displacement of viable manufacturing firms in the River North area in Chicago, which is immediately adjacent to the central business

district and high-end residential communities. They highlight the role of selective rezoning of individual properties by local aldermen. Curran (2007) documents a similar process of industrial displacement caused by residential gentrification in the Williamsburg area of Brooklyn. Also, Lester and Hartley (2014) conduct a quantitative analysis of 20 large cities and find that residential gentrification plays a catalytic role in speeding up the loss of manufacturing jobs relative to nongentrifying areas. As such, we expect that land price appreciation in the neighborhoods surrounding industrial parcels, as well as the distance of each parcel from the central business district (CBD), will be key drivers of conversion (Dingle & O'Hanlon, 2009).

Planning Responses and Industrial Preservation Policy

The issue of industrial displacement has spawned a variety of planning responses to preserve industrial land. Debate over the extent to which land use policies can alter the economic structure of a given place has waxed and waned over the past several decades. Rast (1999) makes perhaps the strongest causal argument in his analysis of the anti-industry biases in Mayor Richard J. Daley's Central Area Plan of 1955, which he argues led to the displacement of thousands of viable jobs in light manufacturing in and around the Loop. Paralleling this research was a policy agenda that began in the 1980s to save healthy manufacturing firms from displacement by real estate speculation and conversion to residential or commercial uses.

The Center for Community Innovation at the University of California, Berkeley, cataloged more than 30 cities and states that have conducted industrial land use studies in recent years, suggesting that matching the supply and the demand for industrial land uses is a concern in practice.³ Some cities, such as Chicago, developed planned manufacturing districts (passed in 1988), which entirely outlawed residential conversions and sought to buffer heavier manufacturing uses from residential with large-scale commercial development (Fitzgerald & Leigh, 2002; Leigh & Hoelzel, 2012). Chicago also created a set of designated ICs in 1992 that covered a larger portion of the city. IC designation requires that a developer seeking a zoning variance for a nonindustrial use must secure approval from the plan commission instead of gaining simple aldermanic support. This is quite similar to the "industrial sanctuaries" policy adopted by the City of Portland (OR). The Bloomberg administration in New York created industrial business zones (IBZs), where residential uses are prohibited and relocation incentives for manufacturing firms are given. Hillsborough (OR) uses lot size minimums to protect large industrial sites while

creating flex zones that allow for nonindustrial uses such as call centers in industrial zones.

However, not all efforts by cities are conducive to preserving manufacturing in the city. Some of the dominant paradigms of regenerative city building such as attracting the creative class or smart growth see little need for industrial uses within cities (e.g. Bronstein, 2009; Florida, 2013). It is also unclear if these industrial preservation policies and regulations within cities are entirely beneficial and efficacious. Howland (2010) finds that there is a regulatory oversupply of parcels zoned for industrial use in Prince George's County in Maryland; in many cases, the demand does not spatially match the supply. Howland argues for a more surgical approach to identifying and targeting those areas that merit preservation as well as those that should be left to undergo their natural transformations. In some cases, these preservation policies are met with skepticism by local stakeholders aiming to reshape the waterfronts and downtowns into commercial, residential, and recreational hubs (e.g., CBRE Consulting, 2007).

Research Strategy, Methods, and Data

Based on our review of the literature on urban manufacturing, industrial displacement, and land use policies, we use the following conceptual framework to guide our empirical analysis of industrial land conversion. This framework includes five factors (parcel location characteristics, neighborhood real estate dynamics, industry trends, location-specific protection policies, and environmental hazards) that are either theoretically or empirically linked in the literature on industrial land conversion.

- *Location characteristics* includes a set of variables that capture the accessibility and spatial competitiveness of each parcel, such as the distance to various transportation infrastructure including airports, highway ramps, rail, and multimodal transfer sites (Miron, 2010). We also include a measure of the distance of each parcel from the CBD to capture a parcel's centrality vis-à-vis the region, and also because so much of the literature links industrial displacement with the expansion of downtowns for residential and commercial uses. We expect that industrial parcels with good accessibility to transportation nodes will be less likely to convert, while parcels located near the CBD are more likely. We also include the distance to the nearest transit station; the siting of these stations has accelerated the industrial displacement in the cities in favor of mixed-use commercial and residential developments nearby.
- *Neighborhood real estate dynamics* refers to the degree of land value increases in the areas surrounding each

parcel as well as subdivision activity. We expect that higher neighboring price increases, especially of residential parcels, will exacerbate the risk of conversion (Curran, 2007; Walks, 2001).

- *Establishment and industry dynamics* captures a set of variables that measures the economic competitiveness of the companies located within industrial parcels. We expect that parcels that are home to firms that operate in relatively high-growth industries nationally would be able to withstand industrial displacement. Also, manufacturing firms that are expanding and adding employment are more likely to be profitable and are likely to keep the properties in industrial use (Koritz, 1991; Troske, 1996).
- *Industrial protection policies* is an indicator of local land use policies that have been enacted to encourage industrial development in certain areas, or to slow the pace of industrial land conversion with special zoning requirements. Thus, if a parcel falls within a designated industrial zone, such as Chicago's IC or Mecklenburg's designation as a future industrial zone, we expect that that the parcel is likely to stay on as an industrial parcel (Leigh & Hoelzel, 2012).
- *Environmental hazards*, such as nearby brownfield sites or abandoned environmentally compromised parcels, are expected to dampen the risk of conversion to residential uses (Howland, 2004; McGrath, 2000).

Although all these factors have been identified separately in the literature, to our knowledge, no other study has used them together empirically at a parcel level.

Explaining Industrial Land Conversions: Empirical Analysis

In selecting our proposed cases, we took into account two distinct factors. First, we wanted to vary our cases based on their relationship to the traditional U.S. manufacturing Rust Belt. We argue that having one case within this traditional core and one case in a newly industrializing region in the southern United States would ensure that our method was valid across multiple contexts. Second, we wanted to choose regions that were large enough and diverse enough that our proposed datasets would offer sufficient sample sizes. Ultimately, we chose Mecklenburg County (NC)—which is home to Charlotte—and Cook County (IL), where Chicago is located. Both counties are at the center of their respective metropolitan regions and are home to most regional manufacturing jobs.

The primary task in both counties was to identify parcels that had been converted from industrial uses. We defined a converted parcel as one which had formerly had an industrial business, and for which current land use was not

industrial. We modeled the risk of conversion as a logit model at the parcel level. The explanatory variables include locational factors that are specific to the parcel such as distances to multimodal facilities and ports, and real estate dynamics factors that include neighborhood changes in prices for the parcel: variables that provide indicators of the health of the firm and the industry in the region. To model the effect of public policies, we included an indicator variable that specifies whether or not a parcel is in a designated industrial corridor or empowerment zone. For a more detailed discussion of individual explanatory variables, data sources, and construction steps, see the Technical Appendix.

The Extent and Geography of Conversion

The resulting datasets used for the analysis contained 6,702 and 2,698 industrial or formerly industrial parcels with fully available values for all the independent variables that we use to predict conversion for Cook and Mecklenburg counties, respectively. In the Technical Appendix, we provide a detailed description of all the variables in the dataset and visually describe their distribution for converted and nonconverted parcels separately. Correlations between independent variables are practically nonexistent in the case of Cook County and pose some concerns in the case of Mecklenburg County. We also discuss the caveats to interpretations.

Before turning to our main results, it is important to describe the context and extent of industrial land conversion in each case. As Figure 1 shows, in Mecklenburg County, approximately 3,650 acres of industrial land have been converted into nonindustrial uses since 1990. Of this area, about 30% of the land area converted to residential uses; however, more than 54% of the converted parcels converted to residential. In Mecklenburg County, 45% of the parcels that housed apparel-manufacturing firms experienced conversion. Between 1990 and 2010, the number of jobs in this sector fell by more than half. Similarly, computer and electronic equipment manufacturing also decreased by more than half, and one-third of the parcels that housed firms in that industry converted to other uses. Although chemical manufacturing increased between 1990 and 2000, the industry suffered a dramatic decline between 2000 and 2010. Nevertheless, only 24% of the parcels with those firms experienced conversion, suggesting that cleanup costs associated with these industries have an impact on conversion rates.

In Cook County, the extent of industrial conversion was much greater, given the relative size of the county. Approximately 4,750 acres of land that was previously industrial is no longer in such use. This represents 11.4% of the total stock of industrial land in Cook County in




Figure 1. Proportion of current uses of converted industrial parcels by parcel count and acreage in Mecklenburg County (NC) and Cook County (IL). Source: Authors' analysis of Mecklenburg County parcel data and National Establishment Time Series (NETS).

(Color figure available online.)

2011 (approximately 41,000 acres). A large number of these conversions were for residential use (46.2%) and accounted for 53.6% of the area. Parcels with firms in printing and fabricated metal products were more likely to convert into nonindustrial uses. These industries are consistently declining both regionally and nationally, and the statistics are consistent with the literature on industrial displacement (Gilloth & Betancur, 1988).

Along with the extent of conversion, what is also striking is the geography of conversion. In Cook County, most of the conversion is centered around areas just north of the Loop and following big transportation corridors such as I-94 and east of I-294 (i.e., in areas that are relatively affluent and in more central locations). On the other hand, conversion in Mecklenburg County is seen inside the business district (bounded by I-277) as well as in areas that are relatively far from the center. While the conversion to residential is more geographically even, construction of the new LYNX light-rail line is likely to contribute to the significant conversions into office and commercial uses along the South Boulevard corridor.

Substantive Findings

Factors Affecting the Probability of Industrial Conversion

We examine the impact of two land use and economic development policies on the probability of industrial land conversion (see the full set of results in Technical Appendix Table A-2). For Cook County, parcels located within a designated IC (City of Chicago, 2011) were significantly less likely to convert. In fact, this variable was the single most important factor in our model of conversion risk. This is a strong indicator that such industrial preservation policies are in fact effective land use tools. Because the program was enacted in 1992, we are confident in concluding that the policy is effective, as our window of conversions begins at approximately the same time (1990–2010). There were 12,368 parcels located within Chicago's industrial districts, of which only 79 were converted over the sample period (0.6%). Location inside a federal empowerment zone was also negatively associated with industrial conversion. This makes sense because empowerment zone incentives consist

mainly of employment tax credits to business owners rather than redevelopment subsidies to developers. The Chicago Empowerment Zone is located in two nonadjacent areas on the south and west sides that have not generally participated in the residential gentrification processes that are prevalent in the north and northwest sides of the city.

In Mecklenburg County, the Centers and Corridors framework was introduced in 1994 and refined and adopted in 2010 to guide the development in the region (Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department, 2010). We used the “industrial centers” designation from this framework as a proxy for where the county is targeting industrial activity. While this policy is not as strong as Chicago’s IC program, it is significantly associated with a reduction in conversion risk. This framework is responsible for aligning the subarea plans and zoning designation and changes such as the “urban industrial” designation in the zoning code. This suggests that careful land use planning can affect the probability of industrial land conversion. Of the 253 parcels in the industrial center designation in Mecklenburg County, only 13 converted into nonindustrial uses, whereas more than 3,000 parcels are not under this designation, suggesting a much larger scale of potential conversions.

In Cook County, the location factors generally behave as theory predicts. Parcels that are farther away from the CBD are less likely to convert because they become unattractive to other kinds of redevelopment. The further the parcel is from rail depots, the more likely it is to convert. A similar relationship is observed for distance to freeway ramps, although the coefficient is not significant for Mecklenburg County. For Mecklenburg, the proximity to an airport has no effect on conversion even when it is likely to increase the likelihood of commercial conversion and decrease that of residential conversion. This is partly offset by the protection of industrial land close to the airport. In Chicago, proximity to an airport seems to weakly (yet significantly) induce conversion of industrial parcels. Access to multimodal transfer points are predicted to be critical for manufacturing firms in Chicago, and we find that parcels closer to them are less likely to convert.

While the location factors generally behave as predicted by theory, two factors expected to be critical were not significant in Mecklenburg County. Interestingly, we find no statistically significant relationship between the relative performance of a parcel occupant’s industry sector nationally (i.e., the industry mix) and conversion. Likewise, neighborhood real estate values largely have no effect. It is possible that real estate dynamics may simply be different in Charlotte, which does not have a long legacy of gentrification of areas near the CBD. While distance to transit station is an important predictor of conversion in

Cook County, it is not in Mecklenburg County, despite the cluster of conversion activity near the newly developed LYNX line.

The results for Cook County are similar in some ways to those of Mecklenburg County, yet differ in key ways as well. In general, all of the five factors that we use in our conceptual model of industrial conversion risk are significant, and all but one have the impact we expected. There are several potential reasons why the models estimated for Cook County are more robust. First, since Cook County is much larger and contains a larger number of conversions, there is simply more statistical power. Second, Cook County—and Chicago in particular—is in many ways an archetypical case of industrial restructuring. The parcels that are closer to key logistical access points such as rail depots, highway interchanges, and multimodal transfer points seem to be competitive in terms of remaining industrial, while parcels closer to airports (O’Hare and Midway) are more likely to convert. Consistent with the literature and with anecdotal evidence, we find a statistically significant negative effect for the distance to the CBD, indicating that parcels located closer to downtown are more likely to convert.

In Cook County, our measures of industry and firm competitiveness are negative and significant. We find a negative and significant relationship between the net change in employment at the establishment level and conversion risk. This indicates that relatively healthy manufacturing companies that are adding jobs are able to meet potentially rising rents and withstand pressure to convert. Similarly, the impact of the industry mix is negative and significant, indicating that conversion is more common among parcels that are home to establishments in declining industries. Although the estimates were insignificant for Mecklenburg County, we interpret these findings as providing support for the argument that industrial trends are an important factor in the conversion risk calculus.

Unlike the findings for Mecklenburg County, we find that neighborhood real estate dynamics do play a role in the conversion of industrial land. Specifically, we find a positive and significant effect of nearby home price appreciation on conversion risk. This indicates that parcels located in tracts that experience a greater change in average sales price are more likely to convert. This is consistent with the scenario described in the literature on industrial displacement, whereby land owners seek zoning variances to redevelop their industrial properties as condominiums or loft properties to take advantage of rising residential land prices.

Interestingly, our findings on the impact of environmental hazards are the opposite of what theory predicts.

Specifically, we find that parcels closer to brownfield sites were *more* likely to convert. Rather than evidence of residential developers seeking out contaminated properties, we interpret this finding as indicative of the relative concentration of conversions near the CBD, which is also home to more of the older industrial properties that may contain more environmental hazards. It may very well be that this finding is driven by inadequate capture of environmental hazard by brownfield location in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency databases (which is an indication of existing redevelopment interest). There are better and more localized sources of environmental hazards, but they are difficult to obtain and cannot really be generalized to a method that can be replicated at a national scale. Other reasons for brownfield development or lack thereof, such as inadequate infrastructure, are detailed in the literature (De Sousa, 2008; Howland, 2004).

Visualizing Industrial Land Conversion Risk

One of the key outputs of this analysis is the development of an index of industrial land vulnerability. We use the predicted values that result from the regression analysis as the index since they represent the estimated probability of conversion based on the independent variables included in the regression. In Figures 2 and 3, we present the spatially aggregated index of industrial vulnerability, even though the index is calculated at a parcel level. We use an area-weighted index for block group for display purposes.

Areas closer to the higher-income neighborhoods in Charlotte have a high risk of conversion (darker colors). In general, while the probability of conversion is low for parcels in the outskirts of the county, they appear as higher-risk areas because of the small number problem and larger block group size (i.e., an artifact of choropleth maps). The geography of conversion and risk in Cook County is broadly consistent with the results of the regression analysis (Figure 3). Industrial conversions are concentrated on the north side of Chicago and in the suburban areas just north of the city. A significant number of conversions have taken place in the areas immediately surrounding the Loop area, and there are some individual parcels that remain and are under a high risk of conversion. Throughout the county, there are concentrations of higher-risk parcels around both O'Hare and Midway airports.

To demonstrate the use of this index of vulnerability, we created a prototype interactive web-based tool (available at <http://www.makingroomformanufacturing.org>) that can help planners identify vulnerable parcels. Using open source software, the website displays parcels that have been converted between 1990 and 2010 along with the vulnerability index of the current industrial parcels. The user also has the

ability to display information about specific parcel and neighborhood characteristics, including the distribution of the vulnerability index, the number of people in different occupations within a five-mile radius, and the proportion of population in different racial categories. These characteristics are chosen only for demonstration purposes.

We argue that planning tools such as the prototype demonstrated here could be a crucial tool for planners who are attempting to craft a smart industrial preservation policy that accounts for broader industrial trends as well as neighborhood and location characteristics. For example, an economic development planner can select all the parcels of a target sector and examine the conversion probability while examining the national and regional trends in the industry. A land use planner can examine the clusters of high conversion probability parcels in a neighborhood and can propose to enact preservation policies or think proactively about alternative uses in relation to other infrastructure investments and regulatory changes. A real estate developer might use the vulnerability assessment to identify parcel assemblage possibilities for different kinds of redevelopment activities. A community group might use the tool to understand the potential changes in their neighborhood based on broad economic trends as well as to identify environmental justice implications of vulnerable parcels. Because the index accounts for multiple factors, different groups can use it for different purposes in their own planning.

Conclusion

Economic developers and political leaders are excited by the potential for a manufacturing renaissance in the United States. After facing decades of declining industrial jobs and large inventories of industrial land, many cities are now at a critical juncture point. On the one hand, vacant industrial properties are an economic drag in that they do not generate revenue and may limit the potential for the type of high-density residential and commercial development that creates vibrant urban places. On the other hand, if cities do not maintain their industrial lands, they may be overlooked by manufacturing companies seeking to relocate to the United States. In addition, if cities do not maintain viable clusters of manufacturing firms and related industrial businesses, critical agglomerative forces may be eroded, further undermining the chances of manufacturing's return.

Recognizing this tension, this study is the first multifactor analysis of industrial land conversion. The purpose of this analysis is to provide a tool that can help planners better understand the trends that influence the conversion of industrial land within their jurisdictions.




Figure 2. Industrial conversion and parcel vulnerability index in Mecklenburg County.

Note: Although the vulnerability index is calculated at the parcel level, we display only the area-weighted average of the index for each census block group for visual clarity.

(Color figure available online.)




Figure 3. Industrial conversion and parcel vulnerability index in Cook County.

Note: Although the vulnerability index is calculated at the parcel level, we display only the area-weighted average of the index for each census block group for visual clarity.

(Color figure available online.)

While many of our findings are consistent across our two illustrative cases—including the importance of freight accessibility, parcel size, and proximity to the CBD—the differences between the cases suggests that the dynamics of industrial land conversion are also driven by factors that are unique to each area. For example, we found that industrial conversion in Cook County was much more sensitive to neighboring residential real estate appreciation compared with Mecklenburg County. This could indicate a fundamental difference in the nature of residential real estate markets, whereby Charlotte does not face the same pressure to gentrify inner-city neighborhoods that Chicago does. In addition, we found that national industry trends seemed to matter more for Chicago than for Charlotte. This is likely due to the fact that the overall industrial structure is different across the cases. Ultimately, this finding suggests that differential industrial trends and the historical competitive advantages of each region's industrial legacy are important for planners to consider.

Ultimately, this analysis suggests that planners need a more nuanced approach to industrial land preservation. Cities need to be strategic about their industrial land inventory and match the supply of industrial land to the strategic economic goals of the region. To do so, plans and planners have to identify strategic industries for the region, craft land use policies that take into account the needs of each industry, and look for ways to meld alternative uses together with industrial ones. Furthermore, any provisioning of public infrastructure such as multimodal facilities and transportation investments should be strategically coordinated with industry locations. To that end, our index of conversion probability would be useful in this analysis. This tool helps identify which parcels are likely to convert based on multiple factors. However, in the end, planners need to use this tool to strategically assess whether such conversions are in the best interest of the region and craft housing, commercial, and industrial land policies and plans accordingly.

Research Support

This research was supported by a grant from the What Works Collaborative, a foundation supported joint project of the Brookings Institution, the Urban Institute, NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, and the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University.

Notes

1. Total U.S. manufacturing employment grew by 729,668 from 11.3 million in January 2010 to 12.1 million in June 2013 based on data from the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Manufacturing exports grew by \$429 billion from \$918 billion in 2009 to \$1.35 trillion in 2012, according to data from the International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce (n.d.).

2. Average annual earnings per worker in manufacturing was 22.9% higher than the overall average earnings across all private sector industries (\$60,496 versus \$49,200) in 2012. Source: QCEW (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).

3. Various industrial land reports can be found at <http://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/industrial-land-report.html>

References

- Alonso, W.** (1995). Location theory. In J. Friedmann & W. Alonso (Eds.), *Regional policy: Readings in theory and applications* (pp. 35–63). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bronstein, Z.** (2009). Industry and the smart city. *Dissent*, 56(3), 27–34. doi:10.1353/dss.0.0062
- CBRE Consulting.** (2007). *Industrial vs. mixed-use zoning: Economic impact and job creation* (CCA Industrial Zone Economic Report). Los Angeles, CA: Central City Association.
- Chapple, K.** (in press). The highest and best use? Urban industrial land and job creation. *Economic Development Quarterly*.
- Charlotte Chamber of Commerce.** (n.d.). *A robust manufacturing region*. Retrieved from <http://charlottechamber.com/emerging-industry/a-robust-manufacturing-region/>
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department.** (2010). *Centers corridors and wedges*. Retrieved from <http://charmack.org/city/charlotte/planning/AreaPlanning/CentersCorridorsWedges/Pages/Home.aspx>
- City of Chicago.** (2011). *Boundaries—industrial corridors* (Data portal). Retrieved from <https://data.cityofchicago.org/Community-Economic-Development/Boundaries-Industrial-Corridors/vdsr-p25b>
- City of San Francisco Planning Commission.** (2014, March 13). *Executive summary of planning code text changes* (Document #2013.1896T). Retrieved from <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2013.1896T>
- Cooke, P., & Morgan, K.** (1998). *The associational economy: Firms, regions, and innovation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Curran, W.** (2007). “From the frying pan to the oven”: Gentrification and the experience of industrial displacement in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1427–1440. doi:10.1080/00420980701373438
- De Sousa, C.** (2008). *Brownfields redevelopment and the quest for sustainability*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Dingle, T., & O'Hanlon, S.** (2009). From manufacturing zone to lifestyle precinct: Economic restructuring and social change in inner Melbourne, 1971–2001. *Australian Economic History Review*, 49(1), 52–69. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8446.2009.00249.x
- Fitzgerald, J., & Leigh, N. G.** (2002). *Economic revitalization: Cases and strategies for cities and suburbs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Florida, R.** (2013, February 13). Sorry Mr. President, manufacturing will not save us. *Atlantic Cities*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2013/02/sorry-mr-president-manufacturing-will-not-save-us/4656/>
- Giloth, R., & Betancur, J.** (1988). Where downtown meets neighborhood: Industrial displacement in Chicago, 1978–1987. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 54(3), 279–290. doi: 10.1080/01944368808976489
- Howland, M.** (2004). The role of contamination in central city industrial decline. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–219. doi:10.1177/0891242404266013
- Howland, M.** (2010). Planning for industry in a post-industrial world. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 77(1), 39–53. doi:10.1080/01944363.2011.531233

- Industrial Conversion Study Committee & Department of Land Conservation and Development.** (2004). *Promoting prosperity: Protecting prime industrial land for job growth*. Retrieved from <http://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/presentations/industrial/OR-promote-posperity.pdf>
- Koritz, D.** (1991). Restructuring or destructuring? Deindustrialization in two industrial heartland cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 26(4), 497–511. doi:10.1177/004208169102600403
- Leigh, N. G., & Hoelzel, N. Z.** (2012). Smart growth's blind side: Sustainable cities need productive urban industrial land. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 78(1), 87–103. doi:10.1080/01944363.2011.645274
- Lester, T. W., & Hartley, D. A.** (2014). The long term employment impacts of gentrification in the 1990s. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 45, 80–89. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2014.01.003
- Losch, A.** (1995). The nature of economic regions. In J. Friedmann & W. Alonso (Eds.), *Regional policy: Readings in theory and applications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McGrath, D. T.** (2000). Urban industrial land redevelopment and contamination risk. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 47(3), 414–442. doi:10.1006/juec.1999.2147
- Miron, J. R.** (2010). *The geography of competition: Firms, prices, and localization*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Mistry, N., & Byron, J.** (2011, April 11). *The federal role in supporting urban manufacturing*. Washington, DC: What Works Collaborative, Pratt Center for Community Development, and Brookings Institution. Retrieved from http://www.areadevelopment.com/article_pdf/id61372_04_urban_manufacturing_mistry_byron.pdf
- Piore, M. J., & Sabel, C. F.** (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Rast, J.** (1999). *Remaking Chicago: The political origins of urban industrial change*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Saxenian, A.** (1994). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, A. J.** (1988). Flexible production systems and regional development: The rise of new industrial spaces in North America and western Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 12(2), 171–186. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.1988.tb00448.x
- Troske, K. R.** (1996). The dynamic adjustment process of firm entry and exit in manufacturing and finance, insurance, and real estate. *Journal of Law & Economics*, 39(2), 705–735. Retrieved from http://econpapers.repec.org/libproxy.lib.unc.edu/article/ucpjlawec/v_3a39_3ay_3a1996_3ai_3a2_3ap_3a705-35.htm
- U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration.** (n.d.). *TradeStats Express*. Retrieved from <http://tse.export.gov/TSE/>
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.** (2012). *Quarterly census of employment and wages (QCEW)*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/cew/>
- Walks, R. A.** (2001). The social ecology of the post-Fordist/global city? Economic restructuring and socio-spatial polarisation in the Toronto urban region. *Urban Studies*, 38(3), 407–447. doi:10.1080/00420980120027438
- Wyly, E. K., & Hammel, D. J.** (1999). Islands of decay in seas of renewal: Housing policy and the resurgence of gentrification. *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(4), 711–771. doi:10.1080/10511482.1999.9521348
- Zukin, S.** (1982). *Loft living: Culture and capital in urban change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

For more information, readers are referred to www.makingroomformanufacturing.org.

Measuring Conversion

To define the dependent variable in our analysis (i.e., industrial conversion at the parcel level), we combined two distinct data sources using ESRI ArcGIS software. First, we gathered parcel boundaries from the County Tax Assessor's offices in Mecklenburg and Cook counties, which comprised approximately 1.44 million records for Cook County and 0.37 million records for Mecklenburg County for years 2000, 2005, and 2010. Second, we used establishment-level data from the National Establishment Time Series (NETS), which provided information about the location and annual employment for all former and current manufacturing business establishments. The NETS database is a privately produced establishment-level longitudinal database (1990–2010) built from the Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) business credit rating service. The database is a near universe of private-sector businesses in the United States; one of its chief benefits for economic development researchers is the ability to track establishment-level births, deaths, and relocations over time at a detailed geographic scale. The NETS datasets include 35,557 and 6,339 records for Cook and Mecklenburg counties, respectively. The universe of records includes any establishment that was located within the county—alive or dead—between 1990 and 2010 and had a primary NAICS classification within the 31–33 NAICS supersector.

For each county, we geocoded all NETS records that ever had a NAICS classification with manufacturing (31–33) using the latitude and longitude listed by year from 1990 to 2010. The NETS was joined to the parcels to identify the universe of parcels with manufacturing land uses. Of these, converted parcels are identified by absence of establishment in 2010 and if the land use is nonindustrial. Based on this definition of conversion, we identified 989 parcels that converted in Mecklenburg County and 3,748 parcels that converted in Cook County.

Data Construction/Sources for Key Independent Variables

We measured location characteristics by calculating each parcel's proximity to various amenities in the county that affect the accessibility and ultimately the suitability of the land for competing uses. For each location factor, the “near” tool in ArcGIS was used to calculate the distance from each parcel to the nearest location factor. Location factors were the central business district (CBD), airports, multimodal freight transfer facilities, highway on-ramps and interchanges, transit stations, and rail facilities. For

Technical Appendix

In this appendix, we present more details about the data preparation and the full set of statistical results.

Mecklenburg County, the CBD polygon was defined as the area inside the I-277 loop in Charlotte. For Cook County, the CBD polygon was downloaded from data.cityofchicago.org. Freight facility shapefiles were accessed using the National Transportation Atlas Database 2011 from the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Public use airports, multimodal terminal facilities, railway network (nodes only), and highway on-ramps were extracted from the “U.S. Major Roads 2008” file from the ESRI Data & Maps 9.3 dataset. Specifically, we used the feature class codes A60 (Special road feature, Name = “ramp”) and A63 (Access ramp or limited access interchange). Transit station locations are from the Center for Transit Oriented Development’s TOD database of existing stations.

To capture the real estate dynamics in the neighborhoods surrounding each parcel, we attempted to assess changing property values over a 10-year period, from approximately 2000 to 2010. For Mecklenburg County, since tax assessor’s data was available, we could measure the changes in value of all parcels (not just sales) between 2001 and 2011. We calculated the change in value over this period as our primary measure of land price appreciation for all parcels within a quarter-mile buffer zone of each parcel. For Cook County, we used data from Record Information Services, a private data provider that gathered all public residential sales from 2000 through 2010 at the address level. We calculated the change in average sales price at the census tract level and applied this value to each parcel based on which tract contained the centroid of the parcel. To calculate buffers around each parcel for Cook County would have exhausted our computational power. As an additional measure of real estate activity, we identified parcels that were subdivided between 2000 and 2011 (2001 and 2011 for Mecklenburg) by comparing two sets of parcel boundary maps, because identifying information (such as parcel identification numbers) changes over time.

To assess the establishment and industry competitiveness at the parcel level, we constructed two different variables. First, we conducted a shift-share analysis for each county’s manufacturing industries relative to the United States for the broad period from 1990 to 2008 (pre-recession) using data from the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The shift-share analysis was conducted only for all four-digit NAICS industries within the manufacturing supersector. The purpose of shift-share analysis is to identify sectors that are competitive locally, accounting for broad national trends in manufacturing overall (“national shift”) and the relative performance of each industry nationally (i.e., the “industry mix”). We used the industry mix variable as a measure for the industry’s expected performance

nationally. We then matched the industry mix variable to the parcel level based on the NAICS code of the last industrial establishment listed in the NETS. While we expect parcels that are home to industries outpacing the national average to be less likely to convert, there may be some individual establishments that are growing or declining for idiosyncratic reasons. For this reason, we also calculated the net change in jobs at the establishment level.

To assess the impact of land use policies and regulations, we generated a simple dummy variable that indicates whether a parcel is included in a designated industrial area. For Cook County, we used a shapefile of the City of Chicago’s Industrial Corridors obtained from the City’s GIS portal (see <https://data.cityofchicago.org/Community-Economic-Development/Boundaries-Industrial-Corridors/vdsr-p25b>). These areas were designated beginning in 1992 and offer strong protection against speculative conversions by requiring that any zoning change obtain approval from a full vote of the Plan Commission. For Mecklenburg County, we used information obtained from the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and coded the areas where industrial development was encouraged. Thus, the variable for Mecklenburg County represents a weaker policy compared with Chicago’s Industrial Corridor program. As an additional policy variable, we also created an indicator for whether a parcel fell within one of Chicago’s Federal Empowerment Zones (none were found in Mecklenburg County).

The primary variable that proxies for our environmental hazard factor is the location of each parcel in relation to officially designated brownfield sites. Location data on brownfields was derived from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Facility Registration System. We limited our analysis to sites that were coded specifically as brownfields rather than every entry in the registry (see http://www.epa.gov/enviro/html/frs_demo/geospatial_data/geo_data_state_single.html). For descriptive statistics, see Table A-1.

Data Limitations and Caveats

Data preparation required significant effort because of changes to parcel boundaries over time and changing definitions of land uses and errors in data. While care has been taken to assure data quality, systematic but undiagnosed errors might still remain (especially with regards to geocoding, NAICS codes, etc.). Furthermore, we only consider manufacturing uses, whereas industrial land uses might include a more expansive definition of production, distribution, and repair. These ancillary uses are complementary to manufacturing, and any comprehensive examination of industrial land should include these uses. Furthermore, because of agglomerative effects and spatial spillovers, industrial parcels are also usually clustered; the spatial

Table A-1. Descriptive statistics.

Variable	Cook County		Mecklenburg County	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Distance to airport	11,226.10	5,436.40	44,014.33	18,347.70
Distance to multimodal facility	13,627.70	12,498.40	17,191.97	14,585.80
Distance to rail	3,296.10	3,413.30	8,119.09	7,076.03
Distance to highway ramp	2,877.00	2,137.80	3,239.43	2,856.88
Distance to CBD	61,568.00	39,091.10	33,261.53	22,862.26
Change in neighborhood residential price (2000–2010) ^a	-6,524.40	211,574.90	-29,294.03	125,418.40
Net employment change in industry (jobs)	-6,550.40	7,201.00	-5,342.57	13,330.75
Industry mix	0.04	0.2	0.016	0.218
Parcel size (acres)	1.4	2.3	4.038	22.17
Distance to nearest subdivided parcel	8,476.80	39,832.10	19,438.02	46,329.63
Distance to nearest transit station	6,224.40	5,295.20	26,793.74	23,909.75
Distance to nearest brownfield	7,211.10	6,501.50	3,410.38	3,413.34
<i>N</i>		6,702		2,698
Parcels in empowerment zone		4.80%		—
Parcels in industrial corridor/center		10.98%		8.33%

Notes: All distances are in feet.

a. Calculated differently for Cook and Mecklenburg counties due to data limitations. In Mecklenburg County, a quarter-mile is used as a neighborhood; in Cook County, the census tract is used as a neighborhood.

clustering is not taken into account in the statistical model.

Although this research focuses on industrial parcels that are likely to convert, we did not focus on the implications of such conversion on the socioeconomic landscape of the city. For lack of space and time, we did not exhaustively explore the environmental as well as environmental justice aspects of industrial conversion. Another caveat is the endogeneity issue that might potentially bias the importance of certain variables in predicting the vulnerability index. The methodology described here should be considered an input into deliberating what areas of the city need to be preserved as industrial land and what are the opportunity costs of such preservation.

Another potential limitation of the study is the lack of depth of the real estate processes such as parcel assembly and subdivisions included in the analyses. Large industrial sites in the central cities should be more competitive for residential and mixed-use redevelopment than assembling parcels from fragmented commercial owners. Such parcel assembly might suffer from holdout problems and make industrial parcels more appealing for redevelopment. However, our analyses suggest that size of the lot is not associated with the risk of conversion, suggesting other mitigating factors or inadequate specification of the model. All these areas are ripe for further research and can only help make our index more robust.

Statistical Analysis

Correlations between categorical variables and real variables are not statistically correct; therefore, we show the distributional similarities and differences of various explanatory variables between converted and nonconverted parcels. In Cook County, although airport distance variable has similar distribution between converted and nonconverted parcels, there is a significant difference in the distance to the CBD variable (Figure A-1). Furthermore, the transit distance is also skewed to the left (although with a long right tail) for converted parcels, suggesting that parcels closer to the transit stations are likely to convert. On the other hand, transit distance variable has roughly the same distribution between converted and nonconverted parcels in Mecklenburg County (Figure A-2). The correlation matrices suggest that multicollinearity is not a major issue in Cook county (Figure A-3), whereas there is worrisome correlation between CBD and transit distance variables mostly because the proximity of transit stations to CBD (Figure A-4). However, we included these variables in the model for cross-case comparison and because the purpose of the model is to have predictive power to construct the index rather than isolating the effect of individual variables.

Once the variables are constructed, we scaled the variables based on their standard deviation; a logit model is used to predict the risk of conversion. The results of the model are documented in Table A-2.




Figure A-1. Distributional differences of explanatory variables in Cook County based on the conversion status.

(Color figure available online.)




Figure A-2. Distributional differences in the explanatory variables based in Mecklenburg County based on the conversion status.

(Color figure available online.)




Figure A-3. Correlation matrix among explanatory variables in Cook County.

(Color figure available online.)




Figure A-4. Correlation matrix among explanatory variables in Mecklenburg County.

(Color figure available online.)

Table A-2. Full set of logistical regression model results of industrial land conversions in Mecklenburg County (NC) and Cook County (IL) 1990–2010.

	Cook County	Mecklenburg County
Location factors		
Distance to airport	−0.152*** (0.031)	0.059 (0.074)
Distance to multimodal facility	0.452*** (0.029)	0.037 (0.112)
Distance to rail	0.576*** (0.031)	0.152* (0.060)
Distance to highway ramp	0.182*** (0.030)	−0.020 (0.055)
Distance to CBD	−0.413*** (0.045)	−0.242** (0.093)
Distance to Transit station	−0.743*** (0.045)	0.136 (0.089)
Industry/firm competitiveness		
Net employment change	−0.333*** (0.032)	−0.072 (0.055)
Competitiveness of industry	−0.121*** (0.034)	−0.055 (0.058)
Neighborhood price dynamics		
Change in neighborhood residential price	0.079*** (0.026)	−0.008 (0.041)
Distance to nearest subdivision	0.079* (0.041)	−0.035 (0.044)
Environmental hazards		
Distance to brownfield	−0.105*** (0.034)	0.068 (0.060)
Policy variables		
Empowerment zone (yes)	−0.739*** (0.177)	—
Industrial corridor/center (yes)	−2.969*** (0.162)	−1.864*** (0.324)
Controls		
Parcel size	−0.016 (0.030)	0.045 (0.046)

Notes: All estimates are standardized based on the standard deviation of each variable. Standard errors are in parentheses. The number of observations (N) was 6,702 for Cook County and 2,698 for Mecklenburg County. Intercepts were negative and significant for both models but are not listed. McFadden R^2 was 0.67 for Cook County and 0.22 for Mecklenburg County.

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$.