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Mapping Displacement and Gentrification in the San Francisco Bay Area

The City’s booming jobs and housing market continuouslyawlures local and national media attention to a widespread social justice issue: rising housing costs. While gentrification is frequently discussed in official circles and media coverage, little attention is paid to the roots of displacement and gentrification, as well as the social impacts of these phenomena across the region. The recent economic downturn and the rise in displacement and gentrification will have reverberations through popular culture and political discourse. This project seeks to challenge the dominant narrative of urban displacement by exploring the multifaceted origins and impacts of these processes through case studies that offer a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the relationships between gentrification, displacement, and social justice.

Key Findings

- In 2010, 42% of San Francisco residents lived in neighborhoods with 10% or more gentrified households, including those that experienced rapid gentrification.
- Gentrification has been linked to the loss of social capital and the displacement of long-term residents.
- Case studies provide a deeper understanding of the social impacts of displacement and gentrification, highlighting the need for targeted interventions.
- The project aims to contribute to a broader conversation about the role of urban displacement in shaping social justice outcomes.

www.urbananddisplacement.org
The rise, fall, and rise of early warning systems

• Neighborhood early warning systems in the 1980s
• Uses of maps – and critique
• Gentrification and the second generation of NEWS
Surveying the landscape

- **Websites/maps exploring neighborhood issues (24):** Neighborhood development indicators, opportunity maps, racial or economic change

- **Early warning systems for neighborhood change (11):** Charlotte, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis (2), New York, Portland, St. Louis, San Francisco, Washington DC
Portland neighborhoods at risk of gentrification

Portland planners have used housing and demographic data to predict which neighborhoods are at risk of gentrification — urban revitalization that leads to mass displacement of poorer residents and ethnic minorities — and commissioned Portland State University assistant professor Lisa Bates to suggest possible policy solutions. Read more: Portland study targets neighborhoods next up for gentrification

SUSCEPTIBLE
Near gentrifying areas, but haven’t yet seen values rise or dramatic demographic changes.

EARLY, TYPE 1
Prices rising but still low. No big demographic shift yet.

EARLY, TYPE 2
Prices still low, but demographic changes signal gentrification is coming.

DYNAMIC
Prices rising, dramatic demographic change underway.

LATE
Prices up. Vulnerable populations remain, but the overall demographic picture has changed.

CONTINUED LOSS
Property values are high, and vulnerable populations have been largely priced out.

LANDING ZONES
These neighborhoods are seeing an opposite trend: Rising numbers of poor Portlanders, ethnic minorities and people with lower education levels than the citywide average.

http://projects.oregonlive.com/maps/gentrification/
Where is gentrification in Chicago?

To calculate its gentrification index, UIC researchers classified each Chicago community area by 13 socioeconomic factors. A point was added if the area was above the city average and subtracted if it was below. Change the map to see how areas compared in 2010 and how they've changed since 1970.

**2010 Socioeconomic factors**
- -13 to -7
- -6 to 0
- 0
- 1 to 6
- 7+

This map shows how community areas compared in the uic index in 2010. Scroll down to see the data UIC used to make its index.

Chicago (UIC-Voorhees Center)
http://www.voorheescenter.com/#!gentrification-index/ccmx
Invest in the Future of Baltimore
Strategic use

• Framing the conversation:
  – “We had a strategically placed piece of analysis that could help community stakeholders on our side make a point about what policy ought to be. Not a distraction, not something that came out of Washington, DC, saying ‘this is what y’all ought to do.’ Because that would have been suicidal.” (Houston)

• Target resources:
  – “It has been very, very, very useful…When you’re involved in politics, and competition for scarce resources, the more facts you can provide, the better you are. The Housing Market Indices are facts. And that speaks much louder than any political will.” (Minneapolis)
Tactical use

• Validation
  – “So for the Urban League, [it was like]: ‘See this thing we told you was happening, has happened, is real. It’s in the data.” (Portland)

• Raising awareness outside of urban core:
  – “I was able to go in and talk about the typology exercise, which highlighted that adopting tools to ensure affordable housing was a central need for places like Roosevelt. Which helps counter some of the community members who want to use those for parks and open space. [So it] brings data that shows that affordable housing is a real need here.” (Seattle)

  – “It’s like driving down the road using your rearview mirror, and all of this demographic change is in front of you. You’re going to end up in the ditch.” (Twin Cities)
Empowerment

• Empowerment:
  – “My main surprise is that when we go out to the neighborhoods that we identified as these rebound neighborhoods, that there really is a—groups on the ground that are talking about this. And it’s sort of, they find it extremely gratifying to be identified as a neighborhood that’s coming back.” (St. Louis)

• Capacity-building:
  – “We quickly realized that we needed to show people how different tools are appropriate for different stages of gentrification.” (Chicago)
Developing a New Methodology for Analyzing Potential Displacement
Funded by California Air Resources Board and MTC, March 2014-May 2016
Defining gentrification and displacement

**Gentrification**
- Process of neighborhood change characterized by new real estate investment and an influx of new residents with higher income and educational levels
- May result in displacement

**Displacement**
- When a household moves for reasons beyond their control
- Many causes – related to both disinvestment and reinvestment
- Exclusionary displacement when future generations cannot move in
## Mixed-methods approach

- Fieldwork and interviews conducted jointly with community-based organizations
- Multi-level (parcel-tract-city) database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Race, income, age, educational attainment, HH composition, employment, jobs, tenure, vacancies, crowding, housing units, housing burdened, commute mode, car ownership, rent paid, immigration status, nativity, linguistic isolation, income inequality, racial segregation, income bipolarity, % moved-in within last year (by race, education, income, tenure)</td>
<td>1990, 2000, 2010, 2009-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>Small parks (acres/1000 people) and protected areas (acres/1000 people)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Stations</td>
<td># rail stations per acre and population</td>
<td>1990, 2000, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit ridership (BART, VTA, CalTrain)</td>
<td># weekday entrances or exits</td>
<td>1992-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Building Permits</td>
<td># permits per year</td>
<td>1980-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially rent controlled units</td>
<td># of potentially rent controlled apt as percentage of total units</td>
<td>1998-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evictions (SF &amp; LA only)</td>
<td>Total, rec, youth, social services and housing/advocacy-related</td>
<td>1995, 2000, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUMS</td>
<td>Movement in/out of neighborhood (with race, income, education)</td>
<td>2011, 2010, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td># deed restricted and public housing units</td>
<td>1990, 2000, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td># of vouchers</td>
<td>2000-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETS</td>
<td># jobs, establishments, sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>% of general revenue from property taxes</td>
<td>1992-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-displacement policies</td>
<td>Production and preservation policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Low Income Households

2000: 970,272 low income households

2013: 1,064,681 low income households

- **Net gain** of 94,408 low income households
- On average tracts **gained** 60 low income households.
Loss of Naturally Affordable Housing

2000: 223,046 low income households lived in naturally affordable housing

2013: 117,149 low income households lived in naturally affordable housing

- **Loss** of 47% of naturally affordable units while
- Number of low income households grew by 10%
• > 53% of low-income households live in neighborhoods at risk of gentrification and displacement.

• ~ 50% of displacement is happening in moderate/high income neighborhoods
Displacement Early Warning

Census Tract Typology Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Income Tracts (&gt; 39% of HH are considered Low Income)</th>
<th>Moderate to High Income Tracts (&lt;39% of HH are considered Low Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not losing low income households or very early stages</td>
<td>Not losing low income households or very early stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not fall within any of the below categories</td>
<td>Does not fall within any of the below categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At risk of gentrification or displacement</td>
<td>At risk of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong market</td>
<td>- Strong market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In TOD</td>
<td>- Historic housing stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historic housing stock</td>
<td>- Losing market rate affordable units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Losing market rate affordable units</td>
<td>- Employment center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergoing displacement</td>
<td>Undergoing displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Already losing low income households, naturally</td>
<td>- Already losing low income households, naturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable units, and migration of low income</td>
<td>affordable units, and migration of low income residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residents has declined</td>
<td>- Employment center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stable or growing in size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advanced Gentrification
- Gentrified between 1990 and 2000 or between 2000 and 2013 based on:
  1) Neighborhood vulnerability
  2) Demographic change
  3) Real estate investment

Advanced Exclusion
- Very low proportion of low income households
- Very low in migration of low income households
How predictive are the models, anyway?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Gentrification</th>
<th>Census Tracts Predicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No/Low Gentrification</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/High Gentrification</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Berkeley
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
URBAN DISPLACEMENT
Do we need predictive models?

– “I did not expect that people—especially people in the city—the planning people—to view it as a predictive model...Like, how much more studying of data do you need....So from my perspective, this [should be] a wake-up call about what’s happening.”
Seek displacement remedies
- Just Cause, tenant protections
- Discrimination enforcement
- Code enforcement
- Tenant counseling
- Tenant rental assistance
- Tenant right to purchase laws
- Community organizing

Preserve and fund new affordable housing
- Project-based Section 8 preservation
- Rent control/stabilization
- Rental building acquisition
- Condo conversion restrictions
- Foreclosure prevention
- SRO regulations
- One-for-one replacement
- Mobile home park preservation
- Permit streamlining/fee reduction
- Tax exemptions
- Affordable housing tax
- Bonds for housing construction
- Demolition control
- Housing rehab programs
- Homeownership programs
- Fair housing
- Asset building/minimum wage

Stabilize neighborhoods and promote diversity
- Density bonuses/inclusionary
- Value recapture
- Impact and linkage fees
- Community benefit districts, housing overlay zones
- Zoning/density restrictions
- Station area plans
- Reduced parking requirements
- Reduced barriers to second units
- Public land disposition
- Housing trust funds
- Land acquisition funds/land trusts
- Housing elements
- Transportation investment

LAW/DEVELOPMENT
Short-term
Building by building, tenant by tenant

POLICY

PLANNING
Long-term
City/regional
New regional policy inventory
Policy Impact

• “[I use the site] to assist in writing public policy for the city I represent as a public official. It is very valuable and useful.”
• Incorporated into San Francisco’s Interim Mission Controls
• Policy inventory used to justify passing new anti-displacement policies in 5 different cities.
• Metropolitan Transportation Commission considering incorporating more stringent anti-displacement targets in its next long-range plan.
Towards Smarter – and More Inclusive? – Cities

But what if city leaders and community groups could get ahead of these changes and act early to direct neighborhood changes towards more inclusive outcomes?

-- Pettit & Greene, 2016:2
The Future of NEWS:

Two paths:

(1) - incorporate leading indicators/crowdsourced data
    - improve predictive analytics
    - make efficiency argument

(2) - or “a wake-up call”?