

Mitigating Displacement of Low-Income Residents: A Practical Ideal Model for Cities

Chad L. Nolte

An Applied Research Project
(Political Science 5397)

Submitted to the Department of Political Science
Texas State University-San Marcos
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements
for the Degree of Masters of Public Administration

12/1/2011

Faculty Approval:

Dr. Hassan Tajalli

Dr. Charles Garofalo

Dr. Bill DeSoto

Abstract

Purpose. The purpose of this research is to develop a practical ideal model for large metropolitan cities to use for mitigating displacement of low-income residents, due to redevelopment. Displacement adversely affects low-income residents by breaking social ties in a neighborhood, and forcing residents to relocate; disadvantaging low-income residents.

Method. A survey, based on the findings in the literature review, was sent to city officials to gauge opinions about the model and its methods/concepts. *Results.* The results of the survey determined which methods best help mitigate the displacement of low-income residents in gentrifying areas in cities. *Conclusion.* A city can alleviate problems associated with displacement of low-income residents by following a displacement plan specific to its needs as a community.

About the Author

Chad Nolte received a Master's degree in Public Administration, with a concentration in Urban and Environmental Planning, and a Bachelor's degree in Public Administration from Texas State University. He currently works at Texas State University, and serves on the Zoning Board of Adjustments in New Braunfels, Texas. He can be reached at thenolte@swbell.net.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Settings.....	3
Chapter 3 Literature Review.....	21
Conceptual Framework.....	48
Chapter 4 Methodology	52
Operationalization Table	53
Chapter 5 Results.....	61
Table 5.1	62
Table 5.2	73
Table 5.3	75
Table 5.4	79
Table 5.5	84
Table 5.6	88
Chapter 6 Conclusion	90
Final Displacement Model 6.1	93
Bibliography	100
Appendix A	106
Question 2	106
Question 3	107
Question 8	108
Question 25	109
Question 37	110
Appendix B.....	111
Appendix C.....	114

Chapter 1

Introduction

The purpose of this research is to develop a practical ideal model ¹for cities to use when displacing low-income residents in redevelopment zones in a city. Large metropolitan cities often redevelop areas to attract younger residents. The youth migration to cities has been on the rise since the early nineties, and cities redevelop economically stressed and outdated properties to make room for an influx of youth. However, the property most likely to be redeveloped is affordable housing, on which low-income residents rely. If low-income property is redeveloped, it is unlikely low-income residents displaced due to the redevelopment could afford the newly redeveloped units. Development often leaves displaced low-income residents in search of another affordable unit; however, with fewer affordable units available, it is becoming harder for low-income residents to locate affordable housing. The lack of affordable housing has caused overcrowding, leading many low-income residents to double up on occupancy in one housing unit in order to afford the higher cost of living.

This displacement model focuses on how city leaders can redevelop an area in the city, while mitigating displacement of low-income residents. This model introduces step-by-step ideas on how a city can assist low-income residents and properly relocate or return them to an area in the city. This model helps prevent overcrowding of housing units, a lack of affordable housing, financial strain, social harm, and to improve blighted neighborhoods. The following paragraphs detail the format of this research, breaking down each chapter.

¹ For more information on practical ideal models see Shields (1998), Shields & Tajalli (2006) and O'Neill (2008).

The settings chapter provides a better understand of the complicated history involved in gentrification, resulting in the displacement of low-income residents from their homes. Next, a literature review establishes crucial steps and concepts that could potentially alleviate displacement of low-income residents. In order to gauge the proposed model's ability to achieve its goal of mitigating displacement of low-income residents, the methodology chapter includes a survey, based on some of the findings in the literature review. This survey was completed by city managers and city planners in major cities across the United States. The survey asked city managers and planners about the proposed model in order to pinpoint which aspects of the model could potentially work and which ones would not. The results chapter reviews the respondents' answers and forms conclusions about the results and what they mean. Survey responses lead to the creation of a more refined practical ideal model of displacement solutions for low-income residents. The conclusion chapter explains why new ideas from respondents' answers on the survey were added, and why certain ideas from the original displacement model were removed from the final displacement model.

The next chapter discusses the history of cities across the United States, why cities today are at a critical juncture in redeveloping neighborhoods, and why it is important not to displace low-income residents who live in the neighborhood.

Chapter 2 Settings

This chapter explores the history of downtown American. The history reveals economic downturns in large metropolitan areas across the United States, which prompted upper and middle class residents to abandon city life and migrate away from the city. What followed was a planned rebirth of cities, brought about by local municipal redevelopment, aimed at bringing back the suburbanites. Unfortunately, conflict materialized when suburbanites moved back to the city, creating a housing shortage, slowly forcing low-income residents out of their homes, and replacing low-income neighborhoods with higher income residential units.

A History of Downtowns: Sixteenth through Eighteenth Century

Downtowns arose on the banks of rivers, lakes, harbors, and major trading routes (Cooper 2004, 478). For example, London was built near the English Channel to protect and fortify the town from attack. However, beginning in the Sixteenth Century, wealthy residents began moving away from London and building rural estates to escape crowding, disease, and lower class residents (Cooper 2004, 478). This phenomenon of moving away from cities, beginning in London, set off a ripple effect, spreading across Europe and eventually found its way to America.

Eighteenth through Nineteenth Century America

Americans were aware of Europe's changing urban demographics. Instead of social classes mixed together in one city, social stratification took effect, starting with the migration of elites away from cities. As a wave of immigrants moved into American cities, upper classes began to push urban boundaries and build fashionable neighborhoods, such as Boston's Beacon

Hill, to distance themselves. Along with new, fashionable neighborhoods came the construction of libraries, clubs, churches, and parks, accessible only by the elites (Cooper 2004, 480). The elite classes worked to segregate themselves from the incoming waves of Irish immigrants, viewing them as inferior; elitist felt the low-income classes would ruin their neighborhoods. Elites moved away from downtown cities, but still visited daily because businesses and factories were located in the city.

Outward development patterns, caused by inner-city flight by the elitists' class accelerated with the development of railroads, which connected major cities. There was no longer any reason to live in the hub of a city when improved transportation brought life's necessities within reasonable distance (Cooper 2004, 480). Elites began buying land further outside of cities. Land was considerably cheaper outside of cities, but only elites possessed the financial means to transport themselves from their residence to the city, while middle and lower class residents could not (Cooper 2004, 480).

20th Century

In the early twentieth century, white blue-collar workers continued living within walking distance of factory jobs; barely making enough money to live, these workers could not afford to move (Cooper 1997, 877). However, a growing break within the middle class created an upper-middle class. This upper-middle class earned enough money to move away, while the lower-middle class could not. The invention of trolley systems also allowed more middle class residents to move away from factories and overcrowded cities (Cooper 1997, 877). The trolley shifted the way developers designed cities. Over the next decade, trollies helped develop

vibrant downtown commercial districts, flanked by industrial areas and residential neighborhoods (Cooper 1997, 878).

In 1925, even with elitists and upper-middle classes leaving cities, the population of eighteen cities reached four hundred thousand or more. Los Angeles, for example, ballooned by 609 percent during this time period (Greenblatt 2006, 567). Overcrowded cities brought accompanying problems such as diseases able to travel faster and infect people at higher rates, sanitation issues, water shortages, noise pollution, higher food and living expenses, and fire hazards from buildings built too close to one another. These dangers frightened people away, but since jobs were located within the city, workers could not afford to buy homes outside the city and associated transportation costs; however, this dilemma soon changed thanks to one man.

How the Car Changed U.S. Cities

Henry Ford, the creator and owner of Ford Motor Company, invented the automobile and replaced horse drawn carriages as the primary means of private transportation. Henry Ford built the first line of cars in the early twentieth century; however, the cars were too expensive for non-elite families. It was not until Ford's creation of the assembly line and the economic boom of the mid 1920s, the middle class could afford cars (Cooper 1997, 877). Transportation started playing a greater role in shaping American communities, more people could now live outside of a city, and still commute to work (Greenblatt 2006, 567). The car broke traditional boundaries, made way for new ideas, and led to the creation of the suburbs (Greenblatt 2006, 555).

Interstate Highways

Present Dwight D. Eisenhower first conceived of an interstate highway system while serving in the United States Military during World War II. There, Eisenhower discovered how Germany connected the country using a highway system, enabling German troops to quickly move around the country. In 1956, the Federal government created a 45,000 mile network of highways, connecting major U.S. cities (Cooper 2004, 481). Interstate highways allowed people to commute with relative ease. With this road network, massive suburbs like Levittown, a 17,000-house community, brought residents out of the city to the suburbs (Cooper 2004, 482). In the West, suburban populations went from twenty-eight million in 1960 to fifty-three million in 1990 (Cooper 1997, 878). The highway system became the catalyst for pushing development further away from cities, in what became known as urban sprawl.

The Federal Government Expedites Residents Leaving Cities

Automobiles made leaving cities for the suburb easier for Americans who could afford to buy a car, but a majority of people chose to remain in the city. Federal policies in the 1950s and 1960s facilitated the exodus from cities by offering incentives to people to move to suburbs (Cooper 2004, 481). According to Cooper, “Federal mortgage subsidies alone raised the proportion of suburban residents from thirty percent of the population in the mid 1960s to forty-five percent in the 1980s” (Cooper 1997, 877). The American dream, in which everyone would own his own home, was becoming a reality. Federal incentives, like the home mortgage tax deduction act, made the dream a reality for millions of Americans (Ellen 2007, 865). Congress helped promote living in the suburbs through the GI Bill, allowing soldiers to only buy

houses safe from devaluation. Such houses were difficult to find in the city since a spike in poverty and crime lowered housing values (Cooper 2004, 481). Restrictions by the federal lending/mortgage programs, or by the GI Bill, encouraged racial and class segregation of American communities; accentuating the widening divide between poor minorities, who lived in downtown neighborhoods, and middle class residents who now lived in the suburbs.

How Urban Sprawl Hurt Cities/Downtowns

Middle class families left for suburbs, but jobs and resources they needed remained in the city; such as gas, groceries, clothes, and services only cities could offer. Suburbs expanded away from the city and the increased distance a person drove became problematic. Businesses located in the city took notice and saw a market full of potential buyers gathered in one area. By the 1980s, downtown businesses grew tired of paying high taxes with no room to expand, and slowly businesses from cities branched out into the suburbs (Fan 2010, 2911; Greenblatt 2006, 553). Shopping centers, malls, schools, libraries, and commercial development migrated to the suburbs. Cooper states that, “over the course of several decades, local ordinances that separated residential, commercial and industrial areas have produced a seemingly endless patchwork of isolated bedroom communities where residents must drive” (2004, 472). Urban sprawl affected cities by dispersing residents and economic ventures to the suburbs, leaving a donut-like hole with little economic activity in the center but booming economic activity around the outside (Clark 1995, 2).

The Fallout of Downtowns

Once families and businesses moved to suburbs, vacancies appeared in downtown areas. Businesses realized they could demolish their downtown building to reduce property tax; which resulted in a significant reduction in taxes collected by cities (Grennblatt 2006, 567). Certain areas in the city, vacated by businesses, became harbors for criminal activity. The crack epidemic that swept through cities in the 1980s caused an increase in crime, homelessness, and death, and made people afraid of some areas in cities (Greenblatt 2006, 555).

A New Trend: Moving Back to the City

In the early 1990s, cities to turning their rough and dangerous image around by cleaning up main streets in downtown. Governments targeted violent crimes in a “clean up the streets” effort, and successfully reduced the crime rate by thirty-two percent from 1995 to 2004; while non-violent crimes were reduced by fifty-eight percent (Greenblatt 2006, 555). Once crime rates in U.S. cities dropped, people took an interest in living downtown, especially the creative class. The creative class, comprised university teachers, artists, media workers, certain business owners, and finance professionals (Peck 2005, 743). Feeding off the “back to the city” movement, movies and television shows began depicting hip, young, single adults living in urban settings; helping glamorize the urban lifestyle (Greenblatt 2006, 556). With Hollywood making cities attractive, many young adults aspired to live in a city looking for action and interaction (Greenblatt 2006, 556). Interestingly this reversal in population trends occurred at a time many residents regarded downtowns as unsuitable places to live.

Declining Federal Urban Aid Funding over the past twenty years prompted city managers and planners to brainstorm new methods to draw people back to the city (Clark 1995, 11). These methods resulted in creative projects, designed to fit people's different needs. For example, stadiums were built downtown to lure sports enthusiasts, and marketplaces were established to attract people of different cultures. These concepts required patience by city managers and residents, cities had to pass expensive bonds pass, add or alter public transportation, and work with developers on a trial and error basis for two to five years (Clark 1995, 12).

People often attribute downtown success to appearance. If buildings, streets, and residential areas are visually appealing, then the area has a promising economic future (Clark 1995, 14). However, some cities fund insurmountable budget problems, making it impossible to fund major improvement projects. As a result, businesses in the city created Business Improvement Districts (BID) to raise money for improving the area (Clark 1995, 15). The BIDs have improved areas of downtown, created new jobs, and helped bring people back to the city. With improved downtowns, localities pushed to bring in a wide range of people, including young professionals, artists, white-collar workers, and retiring baby boomers; the baby boomers representing the largest class.

The Baby Boom Decision

The Baby Boomer Generation, the seventy-eight million Americans born between 1946 and 1964, have long had a resounding effect on the housing market. The Baby Boom Generation pioneered the move from cities to suburbs; now they are having the opposite effect

by returning to cities to retire. The Baby Boom Generation is drawn to city living for a variety of reasons. First, city life does not require a vehicle for daily use. Second, with children grown and gone, huge suburban houses are no longer necessary. Third, close proximity to hospitals, medical facilities, and specialized doctors is a must for this aging population. Fourth, Baby Boomers want to be near attractions city life brings. Finally, baby Boomers want to be closer to their children, who tend to live in cities (Greenblatt 2006, 556 and Cooper 2004, 478). City planners are hoping the Baby Boom generation lives in cities, allowing housing in the suburbs to open up for growing families (Cooper 2004, 488).

Public Needs Meet Private Desires

A high priority for city planners had was to raise the tax base in areas where tax bases had stalled, namely low-income areas in cities (Jost 2005, 200). Private interests, backed by the city, “sought to raze the slums in the inner city to make way for large-scale development,” consisting of high-rise condominiums (Greenblatt 2006, 568). Condominiums attracted middle-class residents to a city by rehabilitating run-down houses (Atkinson 2004, 108). Private developers acquired properties by purchasing them from the owners. If the owners were not willing to sell, then a city would use eminent domain to condemn the land and sell it to the developer. Governments protested that eminent domain was the only way for cities to offer large tracts of land to developers to redevelop; otherwise developers would go to the suburbs instead (Jost 2005, 203).

Condemnation

The U.S. Constitution forbids government from seizing private property without just compensation; however, cities often use condemnation powers to buy property and sell it to private developers (Greenblatt 2006, 562). States have the power and authority to define, regulate, and protect private property. Power over property is divided between the states and private individuals (Malloy 2008, 12). Eminent domain is meant to be used by local municipalities, the state, or the federal government to build public infrastructures such as roads, bridges, railroads, schools, parks, and any other city projects (Greenblatt 2006, 561). However, governments have used their eminent domain powers to help private developers acquire and redevelop property. Cities argue the public benefits from this redevelopment project (Jost 2005, 199). In 2005, *Kelo v. New London*, The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a state's right to use eminent domain to take a person's property and sell it to a private developer, but only if the sale benefited the area in the form of increased tax base or job creation (Greenblatt 2006, 562). Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote the dissenting opinion stating "all private property is now vulnerable to being taken and transferred to another private owner... nothing is to prevent the state from replacing any Motel 6 with a Ritz-Carlton or any home with a shopping mall" (Greenblatt 2006, 562). From 1998 to 2002, there have been over 10,000 documented cases of eminent domain by governments to sell land to private developers (Jost 2005, 200).

Eminent domain affects every landowner in the U.S. due to broadly written laws. Critics argue that the concept violates the Fifth Amendment (Jost 2005, 199). Proponents of eminent

domain state it can be curtailed and kept in check by public vote; but critics of eminent domain argue the affected area will lose the public vote because the public is voting for the public good and not for the residents who could lose property (Jost 2005, 206). Affected landowners could challenge the of their land in court, but the data reveal a disproportionate balance strongly favoring the government (Malloy 2008, 18).

Focusing From the Suburbs to the City

Efforts have been made to redevelop U.S. cities and reduce urban sprawl by focusing on metropolitan-wide planning (Clark 1995, 3 and Clark 2007, 14). The Federal government has stepped in to protect habitats by putting easements on ranches and compensating landowners to not build on land. Some states are protecting land from suburbs by passing growth development boundary laws, stating the city can deny new sewer, utility, sanitation pick up, and school services to developers outside the designated boundary; Oregon was the first state to pass this law (Cooper 1999, 968). This approach forces developers to infill and redevelop buildings inside the boundary zone of the city. Once developers reach a point where available land is scarce, then the city will extend the boundary zone. Infilling financially helps the city by reducing costly construction on new sewer lines, utility lines, and road systems to new areas; instead the city can replace outdated infrastructure (Hosansky 1999, 734). New urbanism targets older buildings for renovation, transforming older buildings into mixed-use sites by incorporating housing, retail, and services all in one walk-able location. This idea reduces the dependency on cars by allowing residents the option of walking to places, or by providing easy access to public transportation (Cooper 2004, 473). The city of Portland, for example, utilized

the new urbanism model, producing smaller yards for less water consumption, mixed use communities, a public transit system, and bike lanes. Portland now has a thriving downtown area, while still preserving the beauty of open space around the city for outdoor activities (Cooper 1997, 869).

Problems with New Urbanism

Critics of new urbanism have acknowledged the policy has curbed outward growth by setting up zoning boundaries and giving incentives for developers to develop in the city, but argue the policy inhibits property owner's rights (Cooper 2004, 474). Cities argue the policy forces property owners to alter decisions unnecessarily. For example, a person may want to live on an acre or more of land in a four-bedroom house with a garage near a city, and commute to work every day to the city. With a boundary law, that person is forced to live in the city, with little or no yard, in a house half the size they wanted, costing more than an ideal house in the suburbs. The latest census data show the traditional suburb is still the preferred long-term housing goal for many Americans (Greenblatt 2006, 478). The counter argument is that state laws are no more intrusive than zoning laws local governments create (Cooper 2004, 474). The fear of government overreach is a concern in creating laws to curtail urban sprawl.

Lack of Affordable Housing

The cost of living is growing concern due to the widening gap between housing prices and incomes. In large metropolitan areas, median house values increased by 83.2 percent and gross rents by 45.1 percent, while the median house income only rose by 26.2 percent from

1970 to 2000 (Myers 2009, 94; Tanner 2001, 95). Residents in need of assistance face overwhelming challenges. Cities enacting laws to force developers to only build inside designated urban boundaries have caused a decrease in affordable housing in the city because it is uneconomical (Tanner 2001, 92). As more people move to cities, wealthier buyers have snatched up moderately priced housing from the trickle down supply in older neighborhoods, renovated them, and raised their value (Tanner 2001, 95). A family with one full-time minimum wage worker is unable to afford a two-bedroom apartment in the city because of wealthy buyers causing unbalance in the trickle down supply of housing; which can lead to gentrification of a neighborhood (Katel 2009, 1056).

Gentrification

The term gentrification was coined by an urban geographer name Ruth Glass in 1964. The term applies to the upper middle-class purchasing property in the deprived East End of London (Atkinson 2004, 108). Gentrification is a process whereby urban neighborhoods, occupied primarily by low-income residents, experience an influx of middle to upper-class people, known as gentrifiers, who purchase property and remodel or redevelop the building (Freeman 2009, 2080 & Hammel and Wyly 1996, 250). Gentrification involves mixing classes from different backgrounds, who live together and interact with one another in close proximity on a daily basis. A person can observe an area gentrifying because gentrification brings diversity to the area, along with significant landscape changes and reinvestment of capital into previously devalued space (Davidson 2007, 493).

Gentrification in the United States

Due to the shift of capital from cities to suburbs, starting in the 1970s, cities across the U.S. experienced economic downturn and the resulting property devaluation (Fan 2010, 2911; Ellen 2007, 847). It was not until the 1990s that people began to reinvest in cities. Investors redeveloped property and increased property value, starting the chain reaction of gentrification. Other investors took notice and began to invest in the same neighborhood until all available property had been bought and redeveloped, thus driving the property values higher for all residents in that neighborhood.

Pros of Gentrification

Proponents argue gentrification is a corrective measure, correcting the problem caused by “White Flight”; when upper and middle class residents moved to the suburbs, and eventually businesses left the cities for the suburbs as well. As the trend reverses and suburban residents move back to the city, disadvantaged neighborhoods benefit from an increased tax base due to improvements made in their neighborhood by new middle and upper class residents (Slater 2009, 300; Formoso 2010, 397). A higher tax base allows a city to pursue projects deemed too expensive in the past (Davidson 2009, 225). The presence of higher income residents correlates with neighborhood improvements such as improved schools, safety, job opportunities, retail offerings, and parks (Ellen 2007, 858; Formoso 2010, 405). Gentrification of an area increases equity to neighborhood homeowners, which provides the opportunity to access credit and provides a foundation for future investments (Formoso 2010, 406).

Cons of Gentrification

Gentrification of a neighborhood can benefit low-income residents by providing more capital through taxes for city services; however, too much gentrification in a neighborhood can harm low-income residents living in that neighborhood (Formoso 2010, 397). Middle to upper class residents moving into a gentrifying neighborhood bring a higher tax base; however, most low-income residents will never see a “trickle down” affect that brings changes to a neighborhood because low-income residents are usually pushed out of the neighborhood (Freeman 2009, 2080). In neighborhoods across the country, gentrification was too strong and resulted in a change in demographic because affluent people moved in and forced out low-income residents (Freeman 2009, 2080).

When low-income residents and higher income residents mix together in neighborhoods, higher-class residents tend to take control of the neighborhood and make decisions for the majority of the residents living there. This power shift can lead to problems, because the lower class residents feel that their voice is not equal to the voice of the higher-class residents. This inequity can lead to landmarks and historical buildings being torn down that were highly cherished by the low-income residents; higher class retail shops; replacing low-class shops and the demolition of low-income housing to make way for upper-income residents (Formoso 2010, 405 and Wasserman 2010, 75).

Property appreciation benefits home owners; however, low-income homeowners experience financial strain when their property taxes increase beyond their income. This inequity occurs when higher income residents moving in, redevelop, and increase property taxes

(Formoso 2010, 407). This type of development hurts low-income people and those living on a fixed income, such as the elderly (Newman & Wyly 2006, 49). If low-income residents do not receive tax benefits, similar to what new businesses receive from cities, the result can be high rates of foreclosures, evictions, and abandoned housing (Jerzky 2009, 423). Gentrification in one neighborhood can also have price-shadowing effects (increase in rents/property tax) in adjacent neighborhoods (Atkinson 2004, 117).

Gentrification can disrupt closely connected social networks of communities in low-income neighborhoods by shifting demographics in population from low-income to middle/upper income (Formoso 2010, 400). As price inflation of a neighborhood increases low-income residents are unable to afford increased property tax or rent, forcing them out of the area. Since most low-income residents are renters, it is difficult to find equal housing in the same price range or same area of town. Unexpected increases in housing costs also create economic hardship for low-income residents by impacting family relationships and child rearing outcomes, since parents often spend less time with children and work longer hours to be able to afford the same lifestyle (Formoso 2010, 407). Families must reduce consumption of goods and services, move to poorer housing, and/or double or triple occupancy in single family housing units (Newman and Wyly 2004, 48). If renters are paying more for the same lifestyle, then gentrification has made low-income residents worse off instead of better.

Gentrification allowed to run its course without any government regulation, likely reduces neighborhood levels of social and ethnic diversity (Walks and Maaranen 2008, 320). A study by Freeman shows that gentrified neighborhoods typically were more diverse at the start

of gentrification rather than in the end (Freeman 2009, 2097). Low-income residents tend to feel uneasy or angry when higher income residents begin moving into neighborhoods, feeling they will soon be displaced. These residents reasoning is backed by history when low-income residents were left behind in cities when “white flight” occurred, while also being blacklisted by white dominated suburban neighborhoods, who barred them from the area. Low-income residents often feel higher income residents do not want them in the neighborhood.

Displacement of Low-Income Residents

According to Freeman, “displacement is the most notable consequence of gentrification, and is generally understood as the process whereby current residents are forced to involuntarily move out of their homes because they can no longer afford to reside there” (Freeman 2005, 463). It is difficult for researchers to determine exactly how many low-income residents are displaced because it is hard to locate the former residents once they move. An estimate in the U.S. in the late 1970s and early 1980s ranged from a few hundred households to 2.5 million people per year (Atkinson 2004, 115; Kirkland 2008, 22) According to recent research, the extent of displacement is significantly under-estimated: between 8,300 and 11,600 households per year were displaced in New York City alone from 1989 to 2002 (Davidson 2009, 229).

Cities lack affordable housing for low-income residents, and the housing available is typically outdated and located in undesirable locations. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has been accused of promoting racial segregation by building public housing in minority areas, instead of spreading housing across the entire city (Clark 1995, 16

and Clark 2007, 29). A city's lack of affordable housing, coupled with a growing population, causes low-income residents to become homeless (Katel 2009, 1056). For example in Seattle, the median price for a house is about half a million dollars; meaning a person earning minimum wage could never afford a house (Dooling 2009, 622). As a result of the high cost of living, the homeless population ballooned to 8,300 people; a forty percent increase between 1999 and 2004 (Dooling 2009, 623). As urban renewal continues, abandoned buildings inhabited by the homeless, become targets for redevelopment; thus, forcing the homeless out to the streets (Wasserman 2010, 78).

Resistance to Gentrification

Low-income neighborhoods threatened by gentrification have fought it off; for example, in West Town area of Chicago, property values were rising rapidly and the demand for new development was high; however, vacant land was not available except in low-income neighborhoods. Real estate agents targeted specific blocks or buildings where low-income residents were concentrated (Kirkland 2008, 23). Real estate agents tried to convince residents to sell their homes by repeatedly calling owners, paying gang members to harass and graffiti houses, arson, city property inspections, police abuse, accusations of criminal activity, and schemes to devalue the neighborhood (Kirkland 2008, 23). The residents of the low-income neighborhood banded together and fought off the threats. In Brooklyn, a resistance movement fought racial and ethnic change for two decades, forming a nonprofit community group. This group's goals were to "develop and manage affordable housing, create employment, organize residents and workers, and combat displacement." Due to their hard work, the residents raised

more than one million dollars, which was used to rebuild abandoned properties and create displacement free zones (Kirkland 2008, 24).

Conclusion

History has shown the fall and rebirth of cities in America, from the decline brought about by Federal government incentives causing the onset of “white flight” from downtowns, to the rebirth of downtown urban areas as hip and vibrant, attracting young professionals seeking a greater social experience. This new urbanism movement brought a positive outlook to living in the city; however, it was undesirable to low-income residents threatened by gentrification. With gentrification, displacement is a constant threat to low-income residents. With the rebirth of downtown areas, cost of living rose sharply, resulting in a lack of affordable housing for low-income residents. To combat this problem, ideas and concepts regarding how to mitigate displacement must be brought forward. These ideas include affordable housing production, affordable housing retention, and asset building. A comprehensive model of how cities should handle gentrification is needed, and would help reduce displacement, secure communities, and improve the neighborhood through monitored gentrification.

Chapter 3

Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature pertaining to low-income gentrification displacement and to create a master plan to avoid displacement. Regarding contemporary redevelopment projects, major metropolitan cities must be innovative yet cautious to avoid widespread gentrification and displacement, harming low-income families. Cities must provide public services and affordable housing for low-income residents who struggle on a daily basis to pay housing related costs such as rent or property taxes. Low-income renters often face rent increases beyond an ability to pay (Kushner 1994, 70). The current affordable housing models most major cities offer typically reflect poorly designed community buildings that have out-lived planned usage. Cities originally designated these buildings for low-income families, thus entrenching patterns of racial and economic class segregation (Kushner 1994, 76). For example, the Pruitt-Lgoe Project consisted of over 2,800 units in thirty-three high-rise buildings on one piece of land in a poor neighborhood in St. Louis. In Chicago, The Robert Taylor Homes housed 27,000 people in twenty-eight identical sixteen story high-rise buildings; residents were poor, and 20,000 residents were children. Critics such as Goetz state, "Projects of this size simply overwhelm the capacity of the local infrastructure," and harm public services in the area (Goetz 2006, 142).

The absence of a master plan to build and maintain low-income housing units results in massive low-income housing projects as a means to concentrate low-income residents in certain areas of the city (Goetz 2006, 147). Another reason these low-income housing projects are so large occurs when low-income residents are displaced, due to redevelopment and/or the

onset of gentrification. Commercial demand exists for affordable residential units; however, a city has the ability to redevelop an area and boost tax revenues while reducing the displacement of low-income residents through public control of development. Cities develop can channel pressure into socially constructive outcomes. For example, gentrification onset in a neighborhood often traces back to small redevelopment projects; however, these projects can signal other investors that a neighborhood's value is on the rise. This signal can lead to massive investment in a neighborhood, thus triggering a substantial rise in property value translating to an increase in rent (Marcuse 1985, 230). A city should curtail redevelopment projects in order to prevent gentrification from taking place; resulting in preserving affordable housing units. In order for a city to be able to contain redevelopment, a city should have a master plan in place to prevent or control displacement.

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to displacement in order to create a master plan. This master plan offers cities a step by step process by which to assist low-income residents, potentially displaced due to redevelopment projects. Low-income residents are susceptible to displacement due to redevelopment in highly populated metropolitan areas. Developers purchase low-income housing and redevelop the property into higher income residential units that low-income residents cannot afford. To compound the problem, the number of affordable residential units have decreased in cities across the United States, preventing low-income residents from finding suitable alternatives (Goetz 2006, 145). To avoid compounding the displacement issue, cities should create a displacement master plan that includes various methods to mitigate the displacement of low-income residents in neighborhoods targeted for redevelopment. This chapter discusses the different aspects a city

should address when creating a displacement master plan. This plan should identify ideal properties for redevelopment, relocate displaced residents, fund low-income housing, encourage resident participation, and assess the plan's overall effectiveness.

Creation of a Master Plan

A city's master plan should contain policies addressing redevelopment in low-income neighborhoods. The plan should be readily available to the public to allow residents to research the city's future plans and how those plans could/will affect residents. Ideally, a city should create and appoint a board comprised of the mayor, the city manager, city planners, city council members and citizens. This board should seat no more than seven people (Turner 1992, 10). Prior to formulating plan policies, the city must possess a clear idea of city and residents goals and direction (Marcuse 1985, 227 and 943). Marcuse states, "A city needs to prepare a plan of their own future development and goals, with some concept of bounds and nature of the population it hopes to serve and the activities it wants to harbor" (1985, 937). Once a master plan is in place, the plan directs the city government, community development corporations, developers, and others to ensure development in the neighborhood does not lead to involuntary displacement (Mertz 2008, 66; Krumholz 1999, 84).

Once created, the city should present the master plan to the public for citizen comment and opinion. Cities commonly neglect this critical part of the planning process because officials assume public apathy. Redevelopment plans are often developed through formal negotiations behind closed doors and only revealed to the public once the deal is finalized and presented as a "take it or leave it" option (McFarlane 2007, 131). This dismissive attitude leaves many

citizens feeling marginalized by their own local governments, deliberately left out of the process.

A master plan addressing gentrification and displacement is vital to city government but crucial to low-income families being displaced. A variety of public policies exist nationwide and seem to foster and promote gentrifying areas where low-income families live (Fernandez 2005, 431). Gentrification is an accepted form of disposing of out-dated buildings and developing updated buildings that would better serve the city as a whole. However, critics want to see the cities better manage the gentrification process to achieve a more equitable and just society (Freeman 2006, 186).

A city should require a population growth plan to determine the level of the city's growth and how to prepare for anticipated growth. Population growth plan's success depends in large part on how housing plans fit together physically and quantitatively in the city's overall master plan (Marcuse 1985, 234). A growth plan shows where the city's demographic population is increasing and decreasing and where different age groups are living; whether children are living in the area; the property tax; and where businesses are located. This information gives the city a guide for development and providing public services for the future. If the beginning stages of gentrification are occurring in low-income neighborhoods, the city can apply special zoning systems, protecting low-income residents in neighborhood (Kushner 1994, 70).

What should be in a Master Plan for the City

A master plan should include a guide dealing with the amount of redevelopment permitted in low-income areas. The plan should focus on neighborhoods and the future direction of growth, community identity, and preservation (Mertz 2008, 65). This plan helps prevent inflation in the housing market, resulting in higher rent low-income residents cannot afford (Freeman 2005, 488; Marcuse 1985, 932). The plan limits how much redevelopment is permitted in one area, giving low-income residents a chance to stay in their homes (Newman and Owen 1982, 136; Marcuse 1985, 232). The plan also includes designated development sights, reducing the displacement of low-income residents, through defined zoning of permutable construction in a particular area or neighborhood. According to the plan, redeveloping in specially zoned neighborhoods, the applicant must take out a special building permit and agree to construction restrictions (Marcuse 1985, 233). Special building permits should be limited to prevent a neighborhood from gentrifying; however, permits should be granted so development is not restricted.

The city should place a minimum percentage of how many low-income units should exist. City growth management systems often fail to consider the need for affordable housing. While developers build expensive units, cities ignore affordable housing stock; resulting in a lack of affordable housing (Kushner 1994, 74). A city should not rely on the private sector to build affordable housing units for low-income residents while developers make a higher profit building higher income units compared to low-income units (Kushner 1994, 85). The HOPE IV project, part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), was created to

revitalize the worst public housing projects into mixed-income developments; however, the project has been blamed for not demanding additional affordable housing from cities (Goetz 2006, 145).

A city should list procedures pertaining to redevelopment for potential developers regarding low-income areas, with the goal of allowing a portion of low-income residents to remain in the area. The redevelopment plan should include guarantees so low-income residents will not be displaced or on the streets (Marcuse 1985, 233). A fair deal to the developers should be equally important so the city is attractive to potential businesses and residents. To achieve fairness, the city should take on the role of mediator in order to bring developers and residents living in the area to an agreement on the amount of gentrification allowed (Marcuse 1985, 231). Once a deal has been reached, the next step is to create a timeline, which will establish how long construction will last. A timeline lets the city monitor construction and track the progress, making sure everything is going according to plan. A constantly updated timeline is crucial for redevelopment projects so construction delays are recorded and communicated to affected residents. A timeline should be updated about every month.

A city should have a master plan the common person can read and comprehend, without having to hire a lawyer to decipher its meaning. A resident has the right to know what the city's future outlook is, as well as where residents fit into the plan. The next step for a city is to locate potential properties or allow developers to present plans for redevelopment.

Consideration of Properties Best Suited for Redevelopment

When considering potential properties for redevelopment, a city should examine the surrounding neighborhood to determine if the neighborhood is stable enough for such a project, without causing the onset of gentrification. To prevent gentrification, Los Angeles, for example, uses a development monitoring system database to analyze and compare the demands for infrastructure generated by existing and proposed development. The system takes into account the project, the area, the social-economic impact and other variables in rendering its assessment as to whether the proposed development will strain the city and neighborhood beyond its limits. If so, the system rejects the plan (Kushner 1994, 72). This system would be a tremendous asset for a city to use to avoid displacing low-income families. The system is effective because it takes into account the two main causes of gentrification: direct and indirect displacement.

Direct displacement results from a change in ownership or physical removal of occupants. Indirect displacement results from changing conditions that surround an area and cause increased rent or property tax to reach unaffordable levels (Mertz 2008, 23). According to Marcuse (1985, 933), "Public policy dealing with low-income housing must be designed to eliminate displacement and all of its forms," so residents will not be displaced. To avoid gentrification and displacement, public investment must be increased and concentrated towards at risk neighborhoods; relieving outside pressures and threats of gentrification (Marcus 1985, 935).

Ideal properties a city should consider for redevelopment are ranked as followed: vacant land, abandoned property, city owned property, commercial property, and residential property (single family and multi-family). The properties are ordered by the number of residents who would be affected by a redevelopment project. For example, no resident is displaced when vacant or abandoned property is redeveloped; however, many residents would be affected if single family or multi-family units are redeveloped (Marcuse 1985, 233).

If vacant lands exist, a city must use the land to build low-income units. If a city cannot obtain the vacant land, the city should negotiate with the owner(s) of the vacant land and reach a deal allowing low-income residents to live in a proposed affordable housing building.

According to Mertz, negotiations could involve:

Density bonuses that may be granted as an incentive to develop on an infill site, by allowing the developer to build at a greater density than zoning and other land use regulations would normally permit. Consequently, the cost per unit of housing is lower, and the developer may pass along savings to consumers. Additionally, if a higher density allows more units to be built, and inclusionary zoning is in effect, the developer is required to reserve a greater number of housing units for low to moderate income households. Furthermore, by combining urban infill, density bonuses, and inclusionary zoning strategies, more affordable housing units may be in close proximity to transit and employment centers (Mertz 2008, 30).

If the concept of developing vacant land is utilized, a city could increase affordable housing units, without displacing low-income residents.

Abandonment of neighborhood buildings can lead to a drastic downward spiral for a neighborhood, eventually leading to displacement of low-income residents. Abandonment occurs when investors give up on a neighborhood's long-term investment opportunities;

leaving residents at a disadvantage and not providing proper services older buildings require (Marcuse 1985, 200). This action can lead to rapid displacement of low-income residents because a city could condemn the under-maintained buildings as a health or safety hazard. To prevent this, improvements must be made to depreciated buildings by public or private funds to continue to provide low-income housing (Marcuse 1985, 339; Newman; Wyly 2006, 50). To prevent displacement, a city must prevent abandonment of residential buildings to protect the residents in the building, and protect surrounding neighborhoods from an economic downward spiral, resulting in gentrification and displacement.

City owned property is a useful resource for increasing low-income housing units. City-owned property can be used for planning goals and fostering stability while avoiding displacement (Marcuse 1985, 943). If the city does not own vacant property, a joint venture project in which the city condemns and acquires land, and a private developer builds low-income units may surface. An alternative to this plan would allow the contractor to purchase the building, with a stipulation that a certain percentage of the units be reserved for low-income residents (Mertz 2008, 31; Wilson & Wouters 2002, 2). Using these methods, a city can increase low-income units and upgrade an area without causing gentrification and displacement of low-income residents.

Redevelopment of depreciated commercial property can help stabilize and improve a neighborhood showing signs of economic downturn (Blakely 2009, 23). A city will purchase the property and then contract out or sell the land to a commercial developer. Commercial redevelopment projects often run into hidden costs when restoring old commercial buildings,

such as contamination requiring specialized methods of disposal, interior building failure, or outdated wiring. Baltimore, for example, successfully redeveloped its old harbor warehouses, dating back to the industrial revolution, and converted them into modern day commercial offices. The result enhanced the area, created jobs, broadened the tax base, and increased economic interest in the area (Levine 1987, 104). Cities should be cautious when restoring commercial buildings because they could set off a chain reaction of commercial interest in the surrounding area, causing the onset of gentrification in nearby residential neighborhoods (Blakely 2009, 29).

Redeveloping residential property is risky for a city since it leads to direct displacement while the building is being redeveloped, and can lead to permanent displacement. It is imperative cities find different types of properties, so mentioned earlier, to redevelop instead of residential units. However, cities might not have a choice because some alternatives are not financially feasible, or the city does not have those options available. For a city intending to redevelop residential areas, redeveloping single family homes instead of multi-family units is the best route, because single family units can be completed sooner than multi-family units. The city can manage a small group of people better, helping residents find alternative places to live until construction is completed; compared to dealing with thirty or more residents from a multi-family complex. A city looking to redevelop an area needs to consider properties in substandard shape, where redeveloping the building(s) would be the only way to extend building life while still allowing low-income residents to live in suitable housing. A majority of buildings only require minor maintenance or repairs in order to extend the building's life span, not redevelopment (Kenndy 1987, 497). Identifying buildings for redevelopment is only part of

the task for a city. The second part would be identifying residents who live in these buildings and determining what will happen to them once the building is redeveloped.

Identifying Residents who would be Displaced

A city should identify residents who would be displaced as a result of the city's redevelopment plan, and notify the residents. A city must realize, according to Goetz, "Forced displacement interrupts social support networks that are important to low-income families, and actually impedes their ability to experience benefits of relocation" (2006, 152). For this transition to work, a city must act quickly in relocating residents, causing minimal social harm (Formoso 2010, 400). Residents are identified by which building is to be redeveloped; however, establishing reliable communication with low-income residents can be difficult. If communication is not formed between the city and the residents, then information cannot be exchanged regarding planned construction, move out date, assistance the city might be offering, and other important information.

A city should collect demographic data on residents who will be affected by the redevelopment plan. The demographic data keep track of where the displaced residents relocated to and how they adjusted to new surroundings (Mertz 2008, 41). Using the data, the city should send surveys to displaced residents within an established timeline. For example, a city should survey displaced residents a month after moving into another housing unit to determine if the move was strenuous and if their new residence is suitable. Six months later, the city should send out a different survey to the residents asking if their new neighborhood

suits them and if they were financially harmed by the displacement. Finally, a city should survey the displaced residents a year later to determine if the move adversely affected their finances.

Creating a Timeline for Residents

A timeline benefits residents of proposed projects in a neighborhood when it comes to certain stages of construction and how it will affect them. A city should create a timeline that includes all stages of construction and what needs to be done by residents. If a city and the contractor work together, they can complete the redevelopment by phased approach, allowing some residents to remain on-site during the construction. It is not ideal for residents to listen to construction in their building, but a schedule could be created for where construction to be done while most residents are at work. This method would avoid displacing residents, save the city time and money in relocation costs, and save residents from the burden of moving (Goetz 2006, 153).

Returnability of Displaced Residents

In redevelopment of low-income neighborhoods, it is rare for all affected residents to remain in their homes. Most residents are unable to return to their original homes. A city has two options for residents living in a soon-to-be redeveloped building: move the displaced residents to another low-income area, or keep the residents in the area. Mixed use development could be a compromise for residents and owners, because it houses commercial businesses on the lower floors of the building, leaving the upper floors for residential use (Kushner 1994, 73). However, all affected residents would probably not be able to move into

the newly redeveloped building. The city should establish placement policies for residents who were unable to move into the building before a final plan is presented to the affected residents.

Relocation Solutions

If the building targeted for redevelopment is altered and the former residents are not able to return, the city should plan to relocate the displaced low-income residents. A city should identify approaches to provide housing for low-income residents in need (Marcuse 1985, 933). If a city is involved in the redevelopment process, the city has a moral obligation to tax payers who lost their home through no fault of their own, to assist to find a new residence. A city should diligently locate housing solutions for low-income residents in a timely manner to avoid last minute moving and confusion, while attempting to integrate the resident into the new community as seamlessly as possible (Sapat 2007, 9). To accomplish this, the city needs to choose between a series of plans relocate the low-income resident to another home.

Relocating low-income residents from one unit to another is difficult in major cities. An example of this type of difficulty occurs in housing shortages caused by United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD has torn down 33,000 public housing units, but replaced those units with only 7,362 units. HUD's long-term plan is to tear down 61,000, units but only replace 42,000 units. HUD states shortfall of affordable housing will be bridged by private investors. These investors would be encouraged but not required to build public housing through government incentives. Property owners are more likely to opt for higher income rental units instead of affordable housing units to receive a higher profit margin (Tanner 2001, 92).

If a city is short on low-income housing, it should plan to build new apartments and/or houses for low-income residents. The city would not build the units, but instead would persuade developers to build low-income housing by offering incentives such as reduced property taxes (Kolodney 1991, 508). The low-income housing projects should be spread out across the city to prevent a concentration of low-income residents in one area. Apartment complexes should be capped at three floors and limit occupancy capacity to one hundred residences. Building guidelines prevent over-crowding, stress on public services, and too many residents in one large building (Freeman 2000, 2080). Building houses is an expensive route compared to apartments because apartments can hold more people and are cheaper to build than individual houses. Smaller cities that do not want apartment complexes may prefer houses to encourage small town feeling.

If a city's budget does not allow construction of affordable housing units, the city should provide discounted housing units through privately owned property (Formoso 2010, 408; Sazama 2000, 575). This plan allows a city to help low-income residents with rent, while not draining the city's budget to build affordable housing. First, a city needs to find an estimated cost low-income residents currently pay for housing (rent and utilities), then search for alternative similar housing (similar size requirements and similar surroundings). Once a unit is located, the city can negotiate with the owner of the building for reduced rent. In exchange for reduced rent, the owners of the building would receive property tax breaks or other legal benefits from the city (Formoso 2010, 408; Mertz 2008, 96; Newman and Wyly 2006, 49).

If owners cannot reach a deal with the city for reduced rent in exchange for tax breaks or other legal benefits, then a city should provide rent vouchers for low-income residents to assist in paying for the new residence (Kolodney 1991, 508). Cities will unlikely find a similarly priced unit comparable to the resident's old unit. Once a suitable unit is located, a city must calculate the difference between a resident's current payments and what the new payments will be, then make up the difference. For example, if a resident's living expenses for the old unit (Unit A) was \$1,500 a month, and the living expenses in the new unit (Unit B) is \$1,700 a month, the city should reimburse that resident at least \$200 a month. Next, the city needs to determine how long it will pay the shortfall. A city should take into account the economy, job market, education level, health and age of the individual, priced index for the average rent, and taxes when calculating the length of payment. The timeline for payment could be endless, but a city must find a way for individuals to eventually afford the unit without financial assistance from the city.

If a comparable unit cannot be located due to high demand for affordable units, a city should purchase foreclosed properties for displaced low-income residents. A redevelopment project of this magnitude must plan for variables that could delay such a project, such as construction costs and the time table for completion. To address these critical variables, a city must have a plan in place ahead of time. This plan benefits a city by redeveloping a once useless building into a useful building. Foreclosed buildings for sale are sold below fair market value, meaning a city could acquire a building for a reduced market price. However, a building could be attractive enough to bring a higher market value price, leading a city to exercise its right of condemnation; but the city must be willing to match the highest offer given for the building.

If low-income residents own their homes, the city should hire a third party to appraise the building to insure the fairest market value possible. The third party appraiser should be compensated by the city since the city is acquiring the resident's property. While a fair market value is being determined, the city should survey similar properties to compare prices. If the city concludes a resident cannot obtain a similar property for the price the city will pay, the city should increase the purchase price of the house until it meets the average cost of similar housing in the area.

Methods to Fund Low-Income Housing

For a city to incorporate the previously mentioned plans, it will have to find a means to finance them. In years past, cities used general tax revenue or passed a bond, placing the cost on all of the city's residents to fund low-income housing. This method is unfair to average citizens who did not take the property from low-income residents, but are being taxed for it. Cities need new methods to finance low-income housing without burdening their taxpayers. Ideas proposed would impose a tax directly on the people responsible for displacing low-income residents by taxing or increasing the tax on luxury housing. This tax would provide additional funds towards replacing/increasing affordable housing and mitigate displacement of low-income residents (Marcuse 1985, 940).

Rent control could keep housing affordable for low-income residents without the city having to spend any tax dollars (Marcuse 1985, 339; Turner 2002, 536). Rent control policy makes it illegal for owners to redevelop affordable housing into gentrified luxury housing units (Kolodney 1991, 513). Critics of the policy, such as Chief Justice Rehnquist, point out that

setting fixed rent levels would be too difficult to calculate properly, factoring location, age of the building, quality of materials used, size, furnished/unfurnished, amenities, school districts, and surrounding area (Elorza 2007, 4 and 85; Kolodney 1991, 520). Calculating a fair rent price would be difficult, and the price would be lower than the owner desires or needs. As a result of lower rents, owners would have to reduce maintenance and other vital services to the building to offset lost revenue (Elorza 2007, 71). If owners cannot receive a high enough profit required to hold on to the property or pay the mortgage, owners might default (Elorza 2007, 73). Foreclosed or bankrupt properties could pop up around the city, causing investment interest in the city to decrease. Rent control should only be applied to blighted neighborhoods to help stabilization. Deterring development could result, but if a rent control policy is enforced, it is of little concern considering development in the area is minimal to none (Elorza 2007, 67). If developers fear rent control will extend into surrounding neighborhoods, proposed construction projects could halt (Elorza 68, 2007).

Eviction Free Zones (EFZ) requires owners go through a lengthy process in order to evict tenants. New York City, for example, uses a tax abatement policy and if an owner evicts a senior citizen, the city reduces the financial incentives for the owner. A similar policy could be enacted for low-income residents (Davidson 2009, 222). The goal of EFZ is to make evictions a difficult and expensive process for property owners, resulting in lower eviction rates and lower displacement of low-income residents. To create an EFZ, community groups, along with legal services, should band together and target an area on the verge of gentrification. These groups should then work with the tenant(s) to try to delay or prevent the eviction of low-income residents (Kolodney 1991, 508). Kolodony states, "If the target neighborhood has passed the

point where stability can be restored without complete gentrification, an eviction free zone will not work” (Kolodney 1991, 541). The zone should remain in place until all external threats of neighborhood gentrification are dissolved (Kolodney 1991, 541). Cities should avoid using this method unless they feel external pressures on a large neighborhood that warrants intervention.

A city should go to the source of the situation and tax owners who bought low-income property units but replaced them with higher income units (Sazama 2000, 575; Krumholz 1999, 89). According to Kolodney, “There is an incentive for owners in gentrifying neighborhoods to turn a profit by converting low amenity and high density rental units into high amenity and low density luxury rentals” (1991, 511). Cities must increase affordable housing stock, and to do so, a city must enact a policy requiring developers to contribute money towards a housing trust fund for low-income residents. The city would use those funds to build affordable units to replace units lost in the redevelopment (Mertz 2008, 30). The money contributed to the housing trust fund should be enough to replace half of the lost low-income housing stock.

Cities should increase property taxes on higher income units which replaced low-income units, putting the extra taxes towards a housing trust fund to build more low-income units (Marcuse 339, 1985). If business owners desire a piece of property, where a substantial profit can be made, it will not matter if the owners have to pay higher property taxes. The goal is to thin the herd regarding potential investors who want to redevelop low-income housing. If the property tax is higher in one area, the likelihood is the owner will choose a cheaper tax. This is a way for cities to raise funds for low-income housing, while protecting the low-income residents

currently living in the area. Alternatively, a city could negotiate with the owner of the building to set aside a certain percentage of total units for low-income residents (Dreier 1991, 369).

A city could implement a policy where a small sales tax is placed on businesses which replaced low-income residential units. This tax would fund low-income housing. To avoid harming a business's ability to make a profit, the sales tax should be minimal. It would take more than a decade paying into a sales tax fund before there was enough money to build replacement housing, but a city could pay the construction costs for new low-income units upfront and collect the sales tax from the businesses who replaced low-income residential units as repayment (Marcuse 1985, 339). A drawback for the city would occur if the city pays for the construction of new low-income units, but the business that replaced the old low-income residential units goes bankrupt, leaving the city with the construction bill for the new low-income units. Cities must carefully screen businesses for long-term profitability before agreeing to a deal.

A city should increase the building permit fee for projects that replace existing low-income units (Dreier 1991, 366). Depending on a city's current permit fee, a city should double or triple the permit fee. Increased building permit cost would make luxury housing more expensive, thereby slowing down construction on luxury rentals and maintaining stability of occupancy for low-income residents. The proceeds from the increased permit fee would be placed in a special fund to build low-income affordable housing (Marcuse 1985, 940).

A city should create a joint venture with the state and/or federal government to secure funds to buy and/or rent units for low-income residents. According to U.S. Census Bureau data,

the nation's poverty rate rose to 15.1 percent in 2010, up from 14.3 percent in 2009 (approximately 43.6 million), to its highest level since 1993 (Smith 2010, 1). In response to the high number of people living in poverty and the lack of affordable housing, HUD and the Bush Justice Department proposed “magnet projects,” modernizing existing public housing projects. To date, the federal tax credit program, states, and cities have been unable to generate enough funding to fully implement the program (Kushner 1994, 85). Increased government spending on anti-poverty programs is essential in order to reduce poverty and increase affordable housing stock (Billitteri 2007, 130). Funding is currently limited for affordable housing, but there is funding cities could use to upgrade or increase affordable housing stock. Cities must be proactive when appropriating funding for affordable housing, and employ a grant-writing specialist to write specialized low-income grant applications.

A city should create joint ventures with non-profit groups to obtain funding to purchase and/or rent units for low-income residents. Non-profit organizations are ideal because these groups specialize in gentrification, displacement, and affordable housing supply. Using a non-profit would allow a city to not hire specialists in those areas, resulting in the city saving money by not hiring new staff. Non-profit organizations would benefit in a joint venture with the city by receiving funding, use of city powers (such as condemnation rights, zoning changes, and city incentives), and increased presence/influence in the city. Joint ventures should only be established with trusted non-profit organizations. Cities working with a trusted non-profit organization should still monitor operations and have final authority in all matters.

If low-income housing is below demand, and public or private services cannot assist, then a city should establish a non-profit organization whose goal is to raise money towards building low-income housing. Cities should establish a fund and have final authority over the non-profit organization. The prime source of revenue for the non-profit organization should be fund raising. A non-profit organization will help pay for construction on affordable housing, community buildings, and bonding of newly located low-income residents (Mertz 2008, 79). Some non-profit organizations have “Community Land Trusts”, which acquire vacant land or buildings and preserve the property for affordable housing. A Community Land trust would also secure property in a gentrified area to stabilize rent prices and prevent displacement (Mertz 2008, 32).

Incorporating any of the mentioned aforementioned policies could benefit a city trying to increase affordable housing stock; however, it is recommended a city does not apply three or more of these policies to one property, because multiple policies would financially harm businesses and hamper the ability to produce a profit. A one-for-one replacement ratio of below market-rate housing units should be the goal of city policies for stabilizing or increasing low-income housing stock (Mertz 2008, 96).

Relocating Displaced Residents

Redevelopment planning should guarantee relocation and housing replacement for all residents who lost homes (Kushner 1994, 84; Marcuse 1985, 936). Residents unable to return home should be properly placed in residential units similar to old units. The problem for cities lies in determining the best method to address this complex and emotional process.

Cumbersome public housing buildings should be ruled out due to poor design, site planning, stress on public services, and failure rate in positively influencing and helping people escape poverty (Kushner 1994, 83). Cities must prevent displaced low-income residents from relocating to other blighted neighborhoods. Results of re-segregation could lead to unstable living conditions, rise in poverty and crime, and other long term harmful effects; trapping low-income residents in poverty (Lees & Ley 2008, 2382; Fan 2010, 2907). Cities should incorporate desegregation or de-concentration policies, spreading out low-income residents across the city instead of concentrating them in one section; resulting in the same problems (Goetz, 2006, 153; Atkinson 2004, 108).

The city should provide relocation assistance for displaced low-income residents. The average person has difficulty deciding where to move and when; sometimes taking months or years to decide. However, when low-income residents are forced to move out on short notice, they experience difficulty finding places in their price range. A city should hire a relocation service to assist low-income residents in searching for a new residence because professionals could ease the burden of moving (Goetz 2006, 149). Once residency has been located, moving can be expensive and difficult for low-income residents. Cities should provide moving services for low-income residents. Moving services are efficient, and benefit residents, the city, and developers. A designated “move out week” could be established by the city to help low-income residents move out of large buildings in a timely manner.

The master plan should have provided a location for redevelopment, an assessment on how many resident will be affected, a redevelopment timeline agreed upon by the city and the

developer, stipulate whether or not the affected residents can return home once the redevelopment is completed, a permanent residence if residents cannot return home, method to relocate displaced low-income residents, and proper compensation for low-income residents. Once this plan is completed, a city should then bring its redevelopment proposal to the affected residents.

Resident Participation

A city must approach affected residents with its redevelopment plan in the proposed neighborhood (Turner 2002, 537). According to Marcuse, “A key ingredient in any effective anti-displacement strategy is an informed and involved community” (Marcuse 1985, 941). Cities should not ignore, but seek public input in redevelopment plans from residents living in the targeted neighborhood. Failing to do so could lead to backlash, calls of corruption, racial divides, lawsuits from affected residents, heated public rallies, and other forms of aggression against a city (Kirkland 2008, 23). Following the proposed steps can alleviate backlash by angry residents.

Public Involvement in the Creation of a Master Plan

City officials should be responsible for drafting an initial displacement master plan due to the complexity involved; however, city officials should seek input from residents (Mertz 2008, 96). A “rough draft” of a master plan should be brought to residents who live in neighborhoods the city has targeted for redevelopment, so residents can examine the proposed plan. Affected residents will be able to voice opinions and concerns regarding

redevelopment and the possible onset of gentrification and displacement resulting from the redevelopment plan (Marcuse 1985, 943).

Residents living in targeted redevelopment areas must be allowed to voice opinions/concerns. To accomplish this, the city must notify residents that their area is targeted for redevelopment. The city should send out formal notices to targeted neighborhoods, so open discussions can take place between affected residents and city leaders before the master plan is finalized. Residents living in targeted neighborhoods should have the opportunity to discuss impacts of the plan with city leaders. Residents bordering neighborhoods targeted for redevelopment should be allowed to meet with planning officials regarding concerns of redevelopment (Marcuse 1985, 943). Local boards who helped create the master plan should be directly involved with these conversations, explaining to residents why their neighborhood should be redeveloped (Marcuse 1985, 234).

A city should have updated information for affected residents of targeted neighborhoods, keeping them informed about meetings, public hearings, and changes to the plan. Adequate resources should be available for meetings such as large conference rooms that fit all residents comfortably, a knowledgeable city worker solely in charge of handling resident questions, current city activity regarding the targeted neighborhood, posted dates of meetings in the targeted neighborhood and on the city's website.

Extended Time for Resident Response/Appeals

Once a city presents the master plan, residents should have ample time should to unite and devise a collective response to the city's plan. This process could take weeks or months for

residents to properly organize and counter the city's proposal. If the resident's responses include a reasonable alternative plan, stipulations, and/or conditions to the city's plan, the city should consider the proposed ideas. This process can be tedious and counterproductive at times, but it is important for a city to reasonably accommodate residents' requests (Marcuse 1985, 234). Once the residents have countered the city's proposal, the city should respond back in a timely manner. It is likely residents will make an additional counter-offer. This negotiation process between residents and city officials could take months or years to resolve, making it important for city leaders and affected residents to negotiate and resolve their conflict/concerns quickly. If the city and the affected residents fail negotiate in good faith, a third party mediator should be hired by the city to re-open or improve the dialogue; in order to help the parties reach an agreement on the disputed matter. Rushing a decision could result in communications breakdown and lawsuits against the city; a costly scenario the city should avoid.

A city should wait to implement the plan until all legal affairs have been resolved. Once all appeals processes, court rulings (if the case goes to court), and negotiations are finalized; the city should implement the master plan. A city should submit a finalized master plan to affected residents and inform them of when and how construction will take place, and how residents living in affected areas should prepare.

Implementation: Carrying Out the Agreed Upon Plan

Once a redevelopment plan has been agreed upon, the implementation of the plan should be straightforward. The city should acquire contact information from displaced residents

to make sure all residents have been relocated according to plan. A city needs to have resident's moving addresses before they move out, since it will be difficult and time consuming to locate residents later. Residents mailing information is critical to send out timelines for residents, who are allowed to return once the redevelopment is completed. The city should also send out surveys to residents regarding how the move impacted them, and what the city could have done to better assist the residents. The city should plan to send out quarterly timelines to residents for a year.

Assessments: Critical Assessment of the Project and its Impact

A city should survey affected residents for suggestions on how to better handle the displacement process in the future. It is crucial a city send out and receive surveys from the residents affected by a redevelopment plan. The reasoning for this is a city might need to add important steps or redo parts of the master plan which failed to achieve desired goals (Sullivan 2007, 586; Goetz 2006, 145). Additionally, little systematic data exist in the country regarding exactly how many people are displaced by city actions during redevelopment and displacement (Newman & Owen 1982, 136 and Koebel 1996, 7). While middle and upper class citizens who replace low-income families are accessible for research, low-income residents are not researched because of the difficulties in locating displaced low-income residents. This means the actual number of residents who are harmed during redevelopment cannot be properly measured (Kirkland 2008, 22). Wyly claimed between 8,300 and 11,600 households per year where displaced in New York City alone between 1989 and 2002; a significant under-estimation according to most experts (Davidson 2009, 229). If cities send out surveys and compile survey

responses from low-income residents who were displaced, research could be conducted so a city can plan for and better handle affected residents. Additionally, if problems occurred with the plan, the surveys would reveal this fact and prompt the specially created board for redevelopment to discuss and find solutions to fix the problem before the master plan is implemented again on another redevelopment project.

To summarize, if a city follows all or parts of this model for handling displacement, it could avoid harming low-income residents. A comprehensive master plan should include public participation and voicing of concerns in finalizing a city's plan. Willingness to negotiate faithfully and the willingness to understand both sides can reduce the displacing of low-income residents (Mertz 2008, 92). Also, significant data could be collected from low-income residents who were displaced, allowing research to be conducted regarding whether relocating low-income residents is harmful or helpful. However, the main question for cities is not whether displacement can be limited but if there is a desire by city officials and/or pressure from citizens to do so. If there is a desire to avoid displacement, local, state and federal governments have the power to accomplish this goal. However, if the desire is absent, planning will only result in inequitable displacement of low-income residents.

Table 3.1 Conceptual Framework (Practical Ideal Type)²

Descriptive Categories	Sources
<p>Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Creation of a Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The issue of displacement should be included in the master plan available to citizens. ➤ A master plan for a city should include the following aspects of displacement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should have a guide on how much re-development should be permitted in certain low-income areas. ▪ A minimum percentage of total residential units in the city should be allocated for low-income units. ▪ Should include a procedure on how to redevelop low-income areas. ▪ The master plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects. ▪ Displacement plan should address the issue of equal spread of low-income people across the city to prevent concentration. ▪ If possible, the master plan should include places for future redevelopment. ▪ Should be clear enough for the common citizen to understand. ➤ The city should consider the types of properties best suited for reinvestment, without displacing a large number of low-income residents. ➤ The ideal properties for a city to look into redevelopment are ranked as follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vacant land ▪ Abandoned property ▪ City owned property ▪ Commercial property ▪ Residential property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family • Multi-Family ➤ A certain percentage of the redeveloped area should be earmarked for the low-income residents to come back to. 	<p>(Cheyne 2009) (Marcuse 1985) (Mertz 2008) (Lees and Ley 2008) (Newman and Owen 1982) (Billitteri 2007) (Tuner 1992) (Kushner 1994) (Robertson 1995) (Krumholz 1999) (Goetz 2006) (Newman and Wyly 2006) (Kennedy 1987) (Levine 1987) (Slater 2006) (Formoso 2010) (Atkinson 2004) (Elorza 2007) (Kolodney 1991) (Freeman 2000) (Turner 2002) (Fan 2010) (Sapat 2007) (Medoft and Sklar 1994) (McFarlane 2007) (Wilson and Wouters 2002) (Sazama 2000) (Blakely 2009) (Davidson 2009) (Dreier 1991) (Kirkland 2008) (Tanner 2001)</p>

² See Shields (1998) and Shields and Tajalli (2006).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If the affected area is to be changed to the point that the original residents cannot return to the area, then the city should plan for the relocation of the displaced low-income residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should plan to build new apartment/houses for displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should plan to provide rent vouchers that would pay for low-income residents rent/increase for the difference in their rent. ▪ The city should plan to buy foreclosed properties to relocate the displaced residents. ▪ The city should plan to exceed appraised market value of a property if owned by low-income resident in order to give that resident the ability to buy a comparable house in the city on the open market. ❖ The city should come up with a plan for relocating the displaced low-income residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relocation assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should plan to provide relocation assistance to the displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should plan to provide moving equipment and workers to move the displaced low-income resident's belongings. ▪ The city should plan an orderly move out that would assist low-income residents in their move. ❖ Methods to Fund Low-Income Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The city should seek financial resources in order to fund the building of new low-income units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should charge an extra tax on developers who replaced low-income units with higher income units. ▪ The city should increase property taxes for newly developed high income properties that replaced low-income units. ▪ A small sales tax (1% - 3%) should be placed on the businesses that replaced the low-income residential 	
---	--

<p>units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There should be higher building permit fee for projects that replace existing low-income units. ▪ The city should create a joint venture with the State/Federal government to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents. ▪ The city should create a joint venture with a non-profit group to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents. ▪ A non-profit organization should be created to raise money towards building low-income units. <p>❖ Resident Participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The public should be involved in the making of a displacement master plan for the city. ➤ The city should have formal notices and open discussion between residents and city leaders before the new displacement master plan is finalized. ➤ The city should regularly update the affected residents. ➤ The city should allow ample time for the affected residents to unite and devise a response to the city's plan. Also the city should allow for an sufficient time for an appeals process. ➤ Once redevelopment areas are identified, the city should collect demographic data on the residents living in that area. ➤ The city should survey the affected residents for suggestions the city could use for assisting the would be displaced residents. ➤ The city should wait on implementing its plan until all legal affairs have been resolved (Appeals process, court rulings and agreed upon deals between the residents and city on how to handle the displaced). ➤ The city should release its finalized displacement master plan to the public. 	
<p>Implementation:</p> <p>❖ Carrying Out the Agreed Upon Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The city should take the contact information of the displaced residents for future use/studies. 	

➤ The city should regularly communicate with the displaced residents who are planning to return to the redeveloped area.	
Assessments: ❖ Critical Assessment of the Project and its Impact ➤ The city should survey the displaced residents to find out the extent to which they were affected by the re-development.	(Marcuse 1985) (Davidson 2009) (Kirkland 2008) (Sullivan 2007) (Goetz 2006) (Newman and Owen 1982) (Marcuse 1985) (Mertz 2008) (Koebel 1996)

Chapter 4

Methodology

This chapter describes the research methodology used to refine the preliminary model developed from the review of the literature. To do so, a survey questionnaire was developed based on this preliminary model. This project uses the survey results to develop an ideal displacement policy model. The survey was received by professionals working in the field of city management and planning solicits opinions on how best redevelopment planning can alleviate hardship on low-income residents.

Operationalization

Developing an ideal displacement model requires an operationalization table to create the survey questionnaire. Table 4.1 operationalizes the components of the preliminary model developed through the literature review. The table links the questions on the survey to the various components of the model. The survey asks city managers and planners of major U.S. cities to assess the model and provide feedback on how it can be improved.

Table 4.1: Operationalization Table

Gauging Type II	Survey Questions	Measurement
Planning: ❖ Creation of a Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The issue of displacement should be included in the master plan available to citizens. ➤ A master plan for a city should include the following aspects of displacement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should have a guide on how much re-development should be permitted in certain low-income areas. ▪ A minimum percentage of total residential units in the city should be allocated for low-income units. ▪ Should include a procedure on how to redevelop low-income areas. ▪ The master plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects. ▪ Displacement plan should address the issue of equal spread of low-income people across the city to prevent concentration. ▪ If possible, the master plan should include places for future redevelopment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should a city have a displacement plan included in a master plan? 2. What aspects of displacement need to be involved in a master plan? 3. Please specify 3 aspects and rank in order of their importance. 4. Should there be a limit on how much redevelopment should be allowed in a low-income area? 5. If the answer to the above is yes, then what should the limit be? 6. What percentage of a city's dwelling units should be allocated for low-income people? 7. Should there be a procedure on how to redevelop low-income areas? 8. If yes, what procedures need to be included? Please specify the 3 procedures and rank in order of their importance. 9. The master plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects. 10. Relocated low-income people should be spread out in a city. 11. The master plan should specify the location of future areas to 	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>Open-ended</p> <p>1. 2. 3.</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>_____ %</p> <p>_____ %</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>1. 2. 3.</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should be clear enough for the common citizen to understand. ➤ The city should consider the types of properties best suited for reinvestment, without displacing a large number of low-income residents. ➤ The ideal properties for a city to look into redevelopment are ranked as follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vacant land ▪ Abandoned property ▪ City owned property ▪ Commercial property ▪ Residential property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family • Multi-Family ➤ A certain percentage of the redeveloped area should be ear-marked for the low-income residents to come back to. ➤ If the affected area is to be changed to the point that the original residents cannot return to the area, then the city should plan for the relocation of the displaced low-income residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should plan to build new apartment/houses for displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should plan to provide rent vouchers that would pay for low-income residents rent/increase for the difference 	<p>be redeveloped.</p> <p>12.The displacement master plan should be clear enough for the common citizen to understand.</p> <p>13.A city should consider the number of low-income residents who will be displaced in their planning project.</p> <p>14.In your opinion, what types of properties are best suited for redevelopment, please rank in order of their importance?</p> <p>15.The master plan should specify how many displaced residents should be brought back to the area.</p> <p>16.If you agree, what percent of the new units should be ear-marked for original low-income residents?</p> <p>17.The city should address the relocation issues for the displaced low-income residents.</p> <p>18.The city should plan to build new apartment/houses for displaced low-income residents.</p> <p>19.The city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low-income residents.</p> <p>20.The city should plan to provide rent vouchers that would pay for low-income residents rent/increase for the difference in their rent.</p>	<p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>_____ %</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>
---	--	---

<p>in their rent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should plan to buy foreclosed properties to relocate the displaced residents. ▪ The city should plan to exceed appraised market value of a property if owned by low-income resident in order to give that resident the ability to buy a comparable house in the city on the open market. <p>❖ The city should come up with a plan for relocating the displaced low-income residents:</p> <p>➤ Relocation assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should plan to provide relocation assistance to the displaced low-income residents. ▪ The city should plan to provide moving equipment and workers to move the displaced low-income resident's belongings. ▪ The city should plan an orderly move out that would assist low-income residents in their move. <p>❖ Methods to Fund Low-Income Housing</p> <p>➤ The city should seek financial resources in order to fund the building of new low-income units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The city should charge an extra tax on developers who replaced low-income units with higher income units. ▪ The city should increase property taxes for newly developed high income properties that replaced low- 	<p>21. The city should plan to buy foreclosed properties to relocate the displaced residents.</p> <p>22. The city should plan to exceed appraised market value of a property if owned by low-income resident in order to give that resident the ability to buy a comparable house in the city on the open market.</p> <p>23. The city should have a plan for relocating the displaced low-income residents.</p> <p>24. The city should plan to provide relocation assistance.</p> <p>25. Please rank in order of their importance what type of relocation assistance a city should plan to provide.</p> <p>26. The city should plan to provide moving equipment and workers to move the displaced low-income resident's belongings.</p> <p>27. The city should plan an orderly move out that would assist low-income residents in their move.</p> <p>28. The city should seek financial resources in order to fund the building of new low-income units.</p> <p>29. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, a city should place additional tax on developers who replaced low-income property units with higher income units.</p> <p>30. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, the city should increase property</p>	<p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>1. 2. 3.</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>
--	--	---

<p>income units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A small sales tax (1% - 3%) should be placed on the businesses that replaced the low-income residential units. ▪ There should be higher building permit fee for projects that replace existing low-income units. ▪ The city should create a joint venture with the State/Federal government to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents. ▪ The city should create a joint venture with a non-profit group to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents. ▪ A non-profit organization should be created to raise money towards building low-income units. <p>❖ Resident Participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The public should be involved in the making of a displacement master plan for the city. ➤ The city should have formal notices and open discussion between residents and city leaders before the 	<p>taxes for newly developed high income properties that replaced low-income units.</p> <p>31. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, the city should levy additional sales taxes on businesses that replaced low-income units.</p> <p>32. In your opinion, if there is going to be an additional sales tax, what should the sales tax be?</p> <p>33. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, there should be higher building permit fee for projects that replace existing low-income units.</p> <p>34. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, the city should create a joint venture with the State/Federal government to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents.</p> <p>35. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, the city should create a joint venture with a non-profit group to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents.</p> <p>36. In order to raise funds for building new low-income units, a non-profit organization should be created to raise money towards building low-income units.</p> <p>37. In your opinion, what other ways can a city raise funds to build low-income units?</p> <p>38. The public should be involved in the making of a displacement master plan for the city.</p> <p>39. The city should have formal</p>	<p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>_____ %</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Open-Ended</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>
--	--	--

<p>new displacement master plan is finalized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The city should regularly update the affected residents. ➤ The city should allow ample time for the affected residents to unite and devise a response to the city's plan. Also the city should allow for an sufficient time for an appeals process. ➤ Once redevelopment areas are identified, the city should collect demographic data on the residents living in that area. ➤ The city should survey the affected residents for suggestions the city could use for assisting the would be displaced residents. ➤ The city should wait on implementing its plan until all legal affairs have been resolved (Appeals process, court rulings and agreed upon deals between the residents and city on how to handle the displaced). ➤ The city should release its finalized displacement master plan to the public. 	<p>notices and open discussion between residents and city leaders before the new displacement master plan is finalized.</p> <p>40.The city should regularly update the affected residents.</p> <p>41.The city should allow ample time for the affected residents to unite and devise a response to the city's plan.</p> <p>42.The city should allow for a sufficient time for an appeals process.</p> <p>43.Once areas redevelopment areas are identified, the city should collect demographic data on the residents living in that area.</p> <p>44.The city should survey the affected residents for suggestions the city could use for assisting the would be displaced residents.</p> <p>45.The city should wait on implementing its plan until all legal affairs have been resolved.</p> <p>46.The city should release its finalized displacement master plan to the public.</p>	<p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>
<p>Implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Carrying Out the Agreed Upon Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The city should take the contact information of the displaced residents for future use/studies. ➤ The city should regularly communicate with the displaced residents who are planning to return 	<p>47.The city should take the contact information of the displaced residents for future use/studies.</p> <p>48.The city should regularly communicate with the displaced residents who are planning to return to the redeveloped area.</p>	<p>Scale 1-5</p> <p>Scale 1-5</p>

to the redeveloped area.		
Assessments: ❖ Critical Assessment of the Project and its Impact ➤ The city should survey the displaced residents to find out the extent to which they were affected by the re-development.	49. The city should survey the displaced residents to find out the extent to which they were affected by the re-development.	Scale 1-5

As shown in Table 4.1, the questions on the survey vary on the measurement scale. The survey asks questions in each category, breaking down each policy for the city managers and city planners surveyed; for example, which policies should be included in the policy displacement model and which should not be included. Surveys were sent out across the United States, in multiple regions, to avoid data contamination of biased answers from a single region. Interviews were not conducted because a large sample was needed to create the final model, and surveys are better suited for reaching out to a larger audience than interviews.

Survey technique is the best method for accumulating the required amount of feedback needed for this model. Due to large amounts of feedback and complete amenity between the surveyor and the surveyee, some feedback could be weakened by city employees responding to the survey who do not meet the qualifications set forth by the guideline. For example, city managers and city planners are busy and delegate some tasks to other employees. This survey must be completed by qualified and experienced professionals; however, without asking for names or position held in the city, the data could be skewed. Another weakness in this research could be participant misinterpretation of a question(s) in the survey, causing the data to be incorrect; however, each survey question was thoroughly edited to ensure and prevent any misunderstanding from occurring. To achieve the goal of obtaining sufficient feedback, the mailing list for the survey comprised an extensive database to avoid falling short for lack of

input. To avoid this pitfall, the survey was sent out using an extensive email databases provided by Mr. Ron Holifield, founder and CEO of Government Resources, Texas State University Public Administration Alumni, and Certified Public Managers Program of Texas State University. This tactic allowed the survey to reach the minimum number of high ranking city officials across the United States.

The strengths of this survey technique are that every element in the framework has an evaluation question, leaving no method unaddressed. Forty-nine questions constitute the survey, allowing the person taking the survey to give an opinion on the entire subject matter, not just parts. Open-ended survey questions allow for creative thinking. Another reason for open-ended questions is this type of model for displacement has never been attempted, and; therefore, a sizeable amount of feedback, using open ended responses, is necessary to gain additional knowledge and apply it to this model. The strength of this survey (also its main weakness) is forty-nine questions. Some of the participants surveyed complained the instrument was too long and time consuming to complete. However, each idea/method had to be measured for accuracy, so forty-nine questions were necessary.

Risk of Survey Research

Researchers conducting surveys run the risk of the research being contaminated by people who should not be taking the survey. Another problem researchers could face is people who received the survey, but did not take the survey. A lack of response leaves their research project without outside opinions, resulting in biased conclusions. Babbie (2004, 243) points out the importance of “follow-up mailings”, which act as reminders for people to take the survey. In

this case, however, a follow up email could not be sent out to a high percentage of the city officials taking the survey due to confidentiality constraints. The name of the employees, the cities, and anyone else involved in taking the surveys was completely anonymous.

Human Subject Protection

This research project did not directly harm or affect any participant. There were zero human subjects or direct interviews in this experiment, eliminating the potential of harming of an individual or class of people. Survey questions were only sent to high ranking city officials (city managers and planners), and not to residents living in low-income areas or on any kind of government aid. The survey questions did not ask for any data or specific information that would potentially harm any particular group, race, class, or gender. Cities' and employees' information will not be identified in this research because no identifying information was asked of the respondents to this survey. The results of this survey will be presented in an aggregate form. This model or parts of it could be implemented by city officials regarding redevelopment and/or displacement. This research was approved by Texas State University's IRB Board, exemption number EXP2011T7303.

Chapter 5

Results

This chapter analyzes and discusses the results of the displacement survey responses received from city officials. The chapter is organized according to the categories presented in the conceptual framework and the operationalization tables in the previous chapters. An estimated over three hundred questionnaires were sent out, twenty-seven city officials responded to the survey. All twenty-seven respondents took the survey; however, some open ended and fill in the blank questions were not answered. The results are grouped based on the categories and sub-categories in the operationalization table. In reporting the open-ended questions, similar answers will be combined into groups, while dissimilar answers will be listed individually. The fill in the blank questions, asking respondents to write in a percentage, are reported using the range and the median. All other types of questions are broken down into ranks of highest, second highest, and so forth.

Creation of a Master Plan

The first category addresses the creation of a master plan and ideas/methods that should be involved. Table 5.1 shows questions one through fifteen, how many respondents there were, and the respondents' answers. Questions two, three, eight, and fourteen are open-ended or ranking questions, and were placed in Appendix A to show all of the respondents' responses to a particular question.

Table 5.1

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
1	27	Yes: 77.8% No: 22.2%
2	16	See Appendix
3	12	See Appendix
4	26	Yes: 42.3% No: 57.7%
5	8	32.25%
6	20	19.75%
7	26	Yes: 88.5% No: 11.5%
8	15	See Appendix
9	26	Strongly Disagree: 11.5% Disagree: 7.7% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15.4% Agree: 46.2% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
10	26	Strongly Disagree: 7.7% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 53.8% Agree: 15.4% Strongly Agree: 23.1%
11	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 3.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.7% Agree: 61.5% Strongly Agree: 26.9%
12	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.7% Agree: 38.5% Strongly Agree: 53.8%
13	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15.4% Agree: 50% Strongly Agree: 30.8%
14	21	See Appendix
15	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 11.5% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34.6% Agree: 46.2% Strongly Agree: 3.8%
16	13	32.31%

The first question asked if a city should or should not have a displacement plan. Almost seventy-eight percent of respondents felt cities should have a displacement plan in the master plan. The results are not surprising, since most surveyed felt a displacement plan would only be beneficial to a city, not harmful. In summary, more than two-thirds of the respondents felt a city should include some type of plan regarding displacement in the city's overall master plan.

What Should be Included in a Displacement Plan

For question two, an open-ended question asked respondents to indicate what elements should be incorporated into a displacement plan. Sixteen respondent's answered this question. Responses varied widely. Two respondents stating nothing should be involved, five stated there needed to be policies to assist low-income residents through some financial means, and three indicated there should be a required percentage of affordable housing for displacement situations which could arise. Other responses included giving low-income residents a temporary location, providing food and clothes, or locating them near a grocery store or school (if they have children). Surprisingly two respondents answered "none." A response which could be added to this plan was a cost versus benefit analysis. A cost benefit analysis allows a city to determine what the economic impact of a proposed redevelopment project would be and if the plan justified the displacement of current residents. To summarize, the majority of respondents felt the city needed to take action in assisting low-income residents who were displaced from their homes.

The third question asked respondents to specify and rank three items which needed to be included in a displacement plan. For all of the respondents answers, see Appendix A. The number one ranking had twelve respondents, with seven respondents stating cities need to assist displaced low-income residents to locate new housing. Ideas in line with this displacement model plans included rental compensation for residents facing an increase in rent from their old unit to their new unit, city assistance in locating affordable units, and proximity of new unit compared to the location of the previous unit within the city. Responses which

were not in this displacement plan included food, legality, accessibility, and fairness to those being displaced. The reasoning behind not having the previously mentioned ideas is no displacement plan will address food, but only housing situations. Legality is non-essential because a city does legally possess the ability to condemn property and sell it to a redeveloper. Accessibility is addressed in The Disabilities Rights, and fairness is too broad a topic to truly determine if an action is fair to all parties involved.

Ten respondents responded to the second ranking, which consisted mainly of the cost of moving low-income residents, and how those residents adjusted to the forced move and new surroundings. Respondents were primarily concerned with how residents would respond to an increase in cost and the burden of a forced move, revealing that a city should be concerned with and care about what happens to residents. Other responses for the number two ranking included transportation, clothes, and how the elderly and disabled residents would be affected. Transportation and how displaced residents get to their jobs is concerning; however, major cities have abundant public transit systems, reducing the likelihood a displaced resident will not be able to access public transportation. Clothes were too vague to draw conclusions, and disabled or elderly residents have guaranteed rights which prevent them from being adversely affected.

Eight respondents responded to the number three ranking, with each response being vastly different. The responses were: will pets be accepted in the new housing, shelter, walkability of daily needs, policies for relocation of businesses, voluntariness of those subject to displacement, and in harmony with the cultural identity of displaced areas. What was expected

because, as respondents begin to run out of ideas, creativity levels rise and unique ideas start emerging, breaking away from common answers. An answer which was not mentioned was communication between city officials and community leaders/affected residents, or a procedure on how to redevelop low-income areas.

The fourth question asked surveyors if a limit should be placed on redevelopment in low-income areas. Respondents felt placing a restriction on redeveloping would not be beneficial to a city. One could speculate that property rights was the deciding factor, property owners would not like regulations placed on them by a city, preventing them from redeveloping their own property. Additionally, regulations could potentially harm a city's economic growth because areas could not be redeveloped. A follow up question (question five) asked only of surveyors who answered yes on the previous question, asked them to state what the limit of redeveloping low-income areas should be, in the form of a percentage. The cumulative average of thirty-two percent seemed low, given that if an entire block was considered one hundred percent, less than one-third of that block could be redeveloped. Redevelopment is necessary for a city to maintain aging buildings. A problem arose from the questions of how long should development be curtailed once a limit is reached in a given area; one year, five years, or ten years. If a certain area reaches its max for allowable redevelopment within two years, then no new development should be allowed in the area for at least two years.

The sixth question asked what percentage of a city's units should be allocated for low-income residents. The result was an unexpectedly high number of almost twenty percent of city units to be allocated for displaced low-income residents. Most cities do not have more than five

percent of their units allocated for low-income residents. A reasonable answer, depending on the current economic situation, would be allocating around four to six percent of units for affordable units.

Procedure for Redeveloping

This section asked respondents if they believed cities should have procedure(s) for redeveloping low-income units. Question seven asked respondents if there should be a procedure regarding how to develop low-income areas; with respondents overwhelmingly stating yes. Interestingly, respondents did not want a limit on redevelopment in an earlier question; however, if there were a limit, they would want a procedure/guideline. Developers would want this procedure since it would affect them the most.

A follow up question (question eight) asked respondents who responded yes to the previous question, to specify and rank three procedures cities could implement when limiting redevelopment in low-income areas. According to respondents, market driven development to create new or update existing affordable units is the best way for a city to redevelop property and boost its economy, without displacing residents. The concept of vision was mentioned, and while vision is not necessarily a procedure, it does have merit because city officials should visualize where they foresee what an area will or should look like in the near future.

The second ranking consisted mainly of long range planning in transportation, community impact, and addressing displacement before residents are displaced to gauge how many affordable units will be required. An interesting answer was needs assessment, which ranked the need of each resident who was displaced. While the most at need residents receive

help first, the problem is residents who ranked lower but still require assistance might not receive assistance they need if there is a limit on how many people can be helped. Another response was addressing displacement as early as possible would help reduce residents becoming displaced. While knowing how many residents will be displaced early is key to preventing displacement, if the number of displaced residents is higher than affordable housing units, residents will be displaced due to construction of new affordable housing if there is enough money in a city's budget.

Thirteen respondents replied to the last ranking, consisting of neighborhood concerns regarding schools, housing diversity, communication of how these goals will be achieved, and funding for these projects. Three respondents, mentioning improving schools, was a surprise considering such a move would not counteract displacement or help residents who do not have children. While improving a school is a critical factor in improving an area in a city, the immediate affects would not been seen for decades; thus, this cannot be a solution for residents facing displacement. The idea of priority for displaced residents to return to the area is intriguing and would work, unless the newly redeveloped units are only for sale.

Timeline

Respondents were asked if a displacement plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects for question nine. This would give affected low-income residents plenty of notice if they were forced to move. This result was as expected, with the majority favoring a timeline for redevelopment projects. An interesting side note was more respondents

chose strongly disagree (11.5%) compared to disagree (7.7%). It would be interesting to know why almost twelve percent were so adamant against a timeline.

Location

Questions ten and eleven relate to inclusion of provisions on spread and location for the newly displaced low-income residents. Of the twenty-six respondents to the question of spreading out of low-income residents, over half (54 percent) neither agreed nor disagreed with the question, twenty-three percent strongly agreed, fifteen percent agreed, and almost eight percent strongly disagreed. The results were not surprising, considering residents do not want low-income residents concentrated in one area; however, residents typically do not want low-income residents in their neighborhood. This would explain why over half of the respondents selected neither agree nor disagree because they would not know where the displaced low-income residents might end up. Question eleven's results indicated a larger than expected outcome for agree and strongly agree, both totaling eighty-eight percent. This result reveals citizens have a right to know a city's future plans when it comes to targeted redevelopment. The likely reason for this question result being skewed could be residents want to know if their property could be a potential target.

Comprehending the Displacement Plan

Respondents were asked if a displacement plan should be clear enough for the common person to understand. The results leaned towards agreement. Respondents indicated citizens want a plan which is clear and concise, and not misleading and confusing. While the term

“common citizen” has broad meaning for many people, the results show that even with many different levels of meaning, everyone has the right to know what will occur in the neighborhood in the future.

Properties Best Suited for Reinvestment

Question thirteen asked respondents if a city should consider the number of low-income residents who will be displaced by a planning project. The results showed a majority of respondents felt a city should be concerned with the number of displaced residents. Respondents felt a city be proactive and know exactly how many residents will be displaced, instead of guessing. An additional open ended question could have asked respondents for ideas about how a city could obtain these data; for example, sending a survey out to each resident or by a city employee going door to door to gather demographic information.

A follow up question asked respondents to rank properties best suited for redevelopment. The responses for the first ranking matched this paper’s displacement model. Respondents thought vacant land or condemned property was best suited for redevelopment; affecting low-income residents the least. A surprising recommendation for redevelopment was drug houses. This idea has merit, because drug houses are often repossessed by the city and sold at auction; however, if a city were to convert a drug house into an affordable unit, a city could clean up a neighborhood while adding affordable housing to the city at the same time. Respondents mentioned subdivisions and commercial property also, but these properties are not ideal solutions. Subdivisions would require a commute for residents, since jobs would likely be in the city. It would also be hard for a low-income resident to afford a house in the suburbs,

and those residents might need additional government support. The cost of commercial land would be too expensive for a city or private developer to buy and convert to affordable units. All other suggestions in the first response ranking, except for single family units, are not viable options.

Respondents for the second ranking split between redeveloping businesses or industrial properties and vacant land. As previously stated, redeveloping commercial property into affordable homes would likely be cost prohibited. Surprisingly, one respondent stated low-income property should be redeveloped; but, unless additional affordable units were built somewhere else, this opinion would be counterproductive. A viable idea was to redevelop a school into affordable housing units. This idea has merit since schools are always expanding, especially in major metropolitan areas, and eventually outgrows its building but a school cannot expand since it is landlocked in the city, so it must relocate. The old school building could be torn down and a large mixed use facility could be built, and twenty percent or more of the units could be reserved for low-income residents.

Respondent's answers for the third ranking varied widely; however, one interesting result was to redevelop dead malls. While most malls are located around cities instead of inside cities, this idea could transform "dead property" and give a city an economic boost while providing affordable housing. Using a city's condemnation rights, a city could sell the dead mall property to a developer, with the agreement that a certain percent of the units be reserved for only low-income residents. Respondents also favored redeveloping apartments or public housing; however, unless the apartments needed renovation to bring them up to city codes, it

would not be economically feasible to redevelop these units for low-income residents. In regard to redeveloping public housing, since most cities lack enough public housing to begin with, a city would first need to add additional public housing in order to meet growing demands, instead of remodeling current buildings.

Respondent's answers to the fourth ranking were similar to previous rankings, which indicated the respondents were running out of ideas for redevelopment projects. Two respondents stated aiding businesses. This response is too vague to be helpful. One could speculate if a redevelopment project helped aid businesses, then a city would receive more tax revenue and could use to build additional affordable units.

The fifth and final rankings responses lacked creativity. One respondent stated strong neighborhoods should be redeveloped. This should be the last area a city considers redeveloping, since strong neighborhoods tend to be low in crime and economically sound. Another respondent stated park and recreation areas. While this might seem like a good idea, resident in cities usually cherish green spaces and parks. New locations would be ideal for adding affordable housing; however, there would be no need for redevelopment since nothing would be there.

Ear-Marking Redeveloped Areas for Low-Income Residents

Question fifteen asked respondents if a displacement plan should stipulate the number of low-income residents to be returned to the area after redevelopment. The results were surprising because the predicted outcome was to neither agree nor disagree or disagree as the highest response; instead the respondents agreed. The reason for anticipating a negative was

because developers do not want residents forced onto them by city laws. One could speculate that city officials would like to force private developers to take on low-income residents so the city does not have to build additional affordable units.

If respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the previous question, question seventeen asked what percent of redeveloped units should be ear-marked for low-income residents who were displaced due to that particular redevelopment. The result was an average of 32.31 percent of displaced residents should be returned to original homes. The predicted outcome was approximately twenty-five percent, so this result is a positive outcome for low-income residents displaced by redevelopment. It would be difficult for developers to accomplish this goal, forcing developers to build larger complexes to hold more units. A negative outcome could occur if a city chooses thirty-two percent as the minimum number of displaced low-income residents who must return once redevelopment is completed. This number would cut into the profit margins of private developers to the point developers may consider development in another city.

Plan for Relocating Displaced Low-Income Residents

The second category addresses displaced low-income resident will go once redevelopment begins. Table 5.2 shows questions seventeen through twenty-two, how many surveyors responded, and the respondent's answers.

Table 5.2

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
17	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.7% Agree: 65.4% Strongly Agree: 23.1%
18	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 23.1% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34.6% Agree: 30.8% Strongly Agree: 7.7%
19	26	Strongly Disagree: 7.7% Disagree: 23.1% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 26.9% Agree: 34.6% Strongly Agree: 7.7%
20	26	Strongly Disagree: 15.4% Disagree: 15.4% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34.6% Agree: 26.9% Strongly Disagree: 7.7%
21	26	Strongly Disagree: 15.4% Disagree: 30.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 26.9% Agree: 15.4% Strongly Disagree: 11.5%
22	26	Strongly Disagree: 15.4% Disagree: 34.6% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 30.8% Agree: 11.5% Strongly Disagree: 7.7%

Question seventeen asked respondents if a city should address relocation issues for low-income residents who would be displaced due to redevelopment. The results were as expected, with the majority of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing. This outcome shows that if a city is partially responsible for the displacement of residents, the city should assist in locating another residence.

Questions eighteen through twenty-two asked respondents for different ideas a city could use to help relocate displaced low-income residents. The results for question eighteen, “Should a city plan to build new apartment or houses for displaced low-income residents”, revealed respondents did not particularly like the idea, but did not dislike it either. This may be because the question asks about both houses and apartments, instead of asking a separate question for each one. Also, respondents might have felt that building new units for low-income residents was not a good investment for a city, and would rather see a private

developer take on this responsibility, or see the city buy used buildings at a less cost to house low-income residents.

Question nineteen asked respondents if a city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low-income residents who lost homes due to redevelopment. The outcome indicates a city should consider this idea, if not implement it. The respondents who choose neither agree nor disagree (26.9 percent) might have been concerned with how long a city would have to subsidize the housing, reasoning that the city could end up paying a hefty chunk of tax revenue to subsidize housing over the next decade.

Question twenty asked respondents if a city should provide rent vouchers to low-income resident to alleviate the disparity between rent from the old place and the new place. The results revealed that respondents preferred subsidized housing over rent vouchers. This could be because respondents did not want to hand out money to residents and instead would rather subsidize housing. The negative stigma associated with a city handing out money to residents might have contributed to this result.

Question twenty-one asked respondents if a city should buy foreclosed properties to redevelop in order to relocate displaced low-income residents. The results revealed half of the respondents did not favor the idea. This result was expected due to the complexity of buying foreclosed property and redeveloping it into affordable housing. This action is high risk for private investors because of the amount of specialty work involved with redeveloping a foreclosed property. Due to the high initial cost of a project like this, private investors would

not undertake a project of this magnitude just to rent the units out to low-income residents; the investors would never be able to recover the investment or make a profit.

Question twenty-two asked respondents if a city should exceed appraised market value on property owned by low-income residents, allowing them a fair chance of finding alternative property in the city. The result revealed a majority of respondents were not in favor of this idea, possibly because the idea of a city deliberately over paying for property is counterintuitive. Some of the respondents saw this as a fair way to compensate low-income residents who would lose their homes and would not be able to find a similar home for the compensation they received. In all likelihood, this idea would not be implemented often since most low-income residents do not own their own homes.

Relocation Assistance

The third category addresses helping some low-income residents move from their current home to their replacement home. Table 5.3 shows questions twenty-three through twenty-seven, how many surveyors responded, and the respondent's answers. The full responses for question twenty-five are located in Appendix A.

Table 5.3

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
23	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15.4% Agree: 61.5% Strongly Agree: 23.1%
24	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 3.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19.2% Agree: 57.7% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
25	16	See Appendix A
26	26	Strongly Disagree: 11.5% Disagree: 26.9% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19.2% Agree: 38.5% Strongly Agree: 3.8%

27	25	Strongly Disagree: 8.0% Disagree: 12.0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 20.0% Agree: 48.0% Strongly Agree: 12.0%
----	----	--

This section asked respondents if a city should provide relocation assistance for displaced low-income residents. Question twenty-three asked respondents if a city should plan to relocate displaced low-income residents. The results overwhelmingly revealed a city should have a plan for relocation. Respondents probably felt residents are being displaced, a city should have a plan in place to assist those residents. Surprisingly, nobody disagreed with this idea, meaning a city should have some form of a plan in place to relocating displaced low-income residents.

Question twenty-four asked respondents if a city should plan to provide relocation assistance for displaced low-income residents. The results revealed high support for this idea, stating it is a city's responsibility to oversee the displaced low-income resident is properly assisted with locating. It was surprising the majority was in favor of this idea, was considering most cities do not offer much, if any, relocation assistance for displaced residents.

Respondents answering question twenty-five were asked to rank what type of relocation assistance a city should offer displaced low-income residents. The first ranking was ideologically similar to this model, with relocation services mentioned the most. Relocation services was probably important to respondents because everyone realizes the burden of moving, much less having to find a new place to live with limited resources as a low-income resident would have to do. Transportation issues were mentioned twice, bringing up the valid point that if a person is moved to a different part of the city, jobs could be affected. Many

factors could contribute to difficulty in getting to work, the likeliest being a longer commute. The response “making residents whole again,” was the most valid answer of all; however, without any explanation of how to accomplish this goal, little could be taken away from this or used the displacement model.

The second ranking consisted of some type of financial advice from hired experts to displaced low-income residents. The idea is to help residents with finances in respect to trying to find a place to live within their price range. If residents were granted access this type of financial advice, the transition might be smoother. The idea of temporary housing is intriguing; however, temporary housing is not a permanent solution; thus not relevant to this model it unless a clause which stated a city would assist the displaced resident in finding permanent housing.

The third ranking revealed respondents were concerned about rent payments and would like a city to assist in rent payment for an undisclosed amount of time. Eventually a city would have to slowly reduce paying a portion of displaced residents new rent due to budget restrictions. However, a reasonable amount of time could be three to six months. Medical aid was mentioned; however it does not apply to this model. An idea which should be incorporated into this model is educational activities associated with adapting to a new environment. This assistance would help displaced residents become familiar with their new neighborhood, allowing a smoother transition. Another idea which should be incorporated into this model is holding public meetings to educate affected residents on the changes they will experience.

Question twenty-six asked respondents if a city should provide moving equipment and workers to assist in moving displaced low-income residents. The results were evenly divided, indicating the respondents held a wide range of opinions regarding a city paying for moving expenses for displaced low-income residents. The responses disagreeing could derive from respondents feeling if a city helps assist residents in finding a new location to live in; the city has fulfilled its end of the bargain and does not need to do anything else. The side agreeing could feel a city should pay for moving expenses, since it was the city that condemned the resident's property, and forced them to move.

Question twenty-seven asked respondents if a city should plan an orderly move out date, assisting low-income residents. The results were as expected. Over sixty percent agreed with the concept of having a move out day for residents. Respondents liked this idea because a move out day would be simple to execute with the assistance of local law enforcement available to block off a street for moving vehicles, and cost to the city is minimal. One might conclude that a cost to the city was a factor for respondents disagreeing with this idea.

Methods to Fund Low-Income Housing

The fourth category addresses funding affordable housing units, and the struggle for cities due construction cost and the lack of profit. Table 5.4 shows questions twenty-eight through thirty-seven, how many surveyors responded, and the respondent's answers. The full responses for question thirty-seven can be located in Appendix A.

Table 5.4

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
28	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 15.4% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.5% Agree: 46.2% Strongly Agree: 23.1%
29	26	Strongly Disagree: 7.7% Disagree: 30.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23.1% Agree: 19.2% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
30	26	Strongly Disagree: 11.5% Disagree: 34.6% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 26.9% Agree: 11.5% Strongly Agree: 15.4%
31	26	Strongly Disagree: 11.5% Disagree: 30.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23.1% Agree: 23.1% Strongly Agree: 11.5%
32	11	3%
33	25	Strongly Disagree: 4.0% Disagree: 20.0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 28.0% Agree: 32.0% Strongly Agree: 16.0%
34	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 11.5% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19.2% Agree: 46.2% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
35	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 11.5% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23.1% Agree: 42.3% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
36	24	Strongly Disagree: 4.2% Disagree: 12.5% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 45.8% Agree: 33.3% Strongly Agree: 4.2%
37	12	See Appendix A

Question twenty-eight asked respondents if a city should seek out financial resources to fund the building of affordable units. The results showed respondents want a city to seek out funding for affordable housing, instead of undertaking the task. This result was expected, because a city will usually try to obtain additional funding. A surprise came from how many respondents disagreed with idea in general (19 percent). One explanation could be the respondents wanted a city to purchase already built property instead of building new units, resulting in a city saving money. A follow up question could have asked respondents how much money a city would need to raise in order to buy or build affordable housing units. The following set of questions asks respondents opinion about methods to fund new affordable housing.

The next set of questions asked respondents how effective each method would be for raising funds to build affordable housing. Question twenty-nine asked respondents if a city should place an additional tax on developers who replaced low-income units with luxury units. The result revealed the respondents were against raising taxes, which is not surprising since no one wants higher taxes. One could assume the reason respondents choose neither agree nor disagree is because they did not know the amount of the tax increase. If the survey showed how high the tax increase would have been, more respondents probably would have taken a side.

Question thirty asked respondents if a city should increase property taxes for newly redeveloped high income properties replacing low-income housing. The results showed respondents did not want to raise property taxes on businesses who redeveloped affordable units. The reasoning behind this could be respondents feared a run-away effect, causing property taxes to rise across the city uncontrollably. Another possibility is respondents did not want property tax increases that might harm current businesses and scare away potential businesses from the city.

Additional Sales Tax

Question thirty-one asked respondents how effective an additional sales tax on businesses who redeveloped affordable housing units would be. The results indicated disagreement, partly because the question omitted the proposed sales tax increase would be. If a tax rate percentage had been given, more respondents would have agreed or disagreed.

Another reason this idea was unfavorable was the additional sales tax would have directly affected consumers and not the business, penalizing the consumer.

Question thirty-two asked respondents if there was an additional sales tax, what percentage should the sales tax be. The results indicated a three percent sales tax, which was higher than the expected prediction of 1.5 percent. An additional sales tax of three percent could be too high and put businesses at an economic disadvantage compared to other businesses offering the same product or service. The reasoning for such a high sales tax could be because respondents wanted the associated revenue to fund more affordable buildings, or respondents did not take into account such a high sales tax would be detrimental to a business. Another possibility is respondents wanted to protect low-income areas from businesses who might want to poach their land, and one way of doing so would be a high sales tax.

Building Permit Fees

Question thirty-three asked respondents on a scale of one to five, if a city should raise its building permit fee for projects which would replace existing low-income housing. The result favored of this measure, because this measure would be a direct tax on developers who redeveloped affordable housing. If there had been an exact fee on what developers would have paid, then less neither agree nor disagree would have been closer. However, an exact number was not used, because every city would have different ideas about what the increased fee should be.

Joint Ventures

Respondents were asked three questions, all dealing with a city joining or creating a joint venture with either a government entity or a private non-profit organization. Question thirty-four asked respondents if a city should have a joint venture with either the State or Federal Government to secure funds for building low-income housing. The results revealed respondents favored this idea overall. The probable reasoning behind this response is how a city would get funding for projects like these. One might conclude those who disagreed did not want funds to come directly from tax payers. A surprising result was the high percentage of neither agree nor disagree. This result could have been from respondents wanting more information regarding how much funding the city would contribute.

Question thirty-five asked respondents if a city should join forces with a non-profit organization to assist it in funding affordable units. The results were similar to question thirty-four; however, a slightly higher percentage chose neither agree nor disagree. The reasoning behind this result could be the term “non-profit group” was not sufficiently defined enough or “non-profit” needed further explanation. It is surprising more respondents did not agree because non-profit organizations often help fund low-income affordable housing projects.

Question thirty-six asked respondents if a city should create its own non-profit organization to assist in raising money to build affordable housing. The results revealed that most respondents were unsure if this idea could work. Because this idea has never been undertaken before, there would be many issues to workout, legally and procedurally. The idea did receive higher agreement than expected, with many of the respondents choosing a form of

agreeing based solely on the potential of a joint venture to low-income residents locating affordable housing and in take some funding pressures off a city's budget.

Question thirty-seven asked respondents how a city could find alternative ways to fund affordable housing units. The results revealed interesting solutions, some of which should be incorporated into this displacement model. Receiving assistance from private businesses should be added because businesses would receive a tax credit for donations, while a city would receive funding to increase affordable housing stock. The downside to this idea occurs if businesses do not donate money or cannot due to a bad economy. The same could be said for public donations. Increasing sales tax on hotels/motels is a good idea; however, some metropolitan cities currently have extremely high hotel/motel taxes. Increased hotel/motel sales taxes could have a negative economic impact on a city. Requiring developers to subsidize the cost for displaced residents is a good idea since the cost is directly placed on the developer responsible for displacing the resident. However, the cost of subsidizing a large amount of residents would be too expensive for developers. This plan would only work for developers who are displacing residents from a small complex (twenty residential units or less).

Resident Participation

The fifth category addressed a series of questions, gauging respondents' opinions regarding what a city should or should not do when communicating to citizens whose residence is targeted for redevelopment. Table 5.5 shows questions thirty-eight through forty-six, how many surveyors responded, and the respondent's answers.

Table 5.5

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
38	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 7.7% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.5% Agree: 50.0% Strongly Agree: 30.8%
39	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.7% Agree: 57.7% Strongly Agree: 34.6%
40	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3.8% Agree: 42.3% Strongly Agree: 53.8%
41	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 7.7% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.7% Agree: 53.8% Strongly Agree: 30.8%
42	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 3.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3.8% Agree: 53.8% Strongly Agree: 38.5%
43	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 3.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19.2% Agree: 57.7% Strongly Agree: 19.2%
44	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.5% Agree: 57.7% Strongly Disagree: 26.9%
45	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 15.4% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.5% Agree: 42.3% Strongly Agree: 30.8%
46	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3.8% Agree: 46.2% Strongly Agree: 50.0%

Question thirty-eight asked respondents if the public should be involved in creating a master displacement plan for a city. The results revealed respondents were overwhelmingly in favor of this idea. Respondents felt residents should have input in creating a displacement plan. The reasoning behind this response is that citizens, some directly affected by this policy, should have an opportunity to voice opinions or concerns regarding this policy and how it could affect them, other citizens, or the city as a whole. This response is probably due to respondents feeling a city should be transparent when creating policies, especially policies which would force residents to move out of their homes. The respondents who disagreed with the question probably felt city officials should solely create a displacement plan, and reveal it to citizens;

instead of working with citizens during the creation of a plan. These respondents may fear the extra step would slow down the process.

Question thirty-nine asked respondents if a city should have formal notices and open discussions between affected residents and city leaders before the displacement plan is finalized. The results revealed overwhelming support for this idea, probably in large part due to the concept of having an open communication between affected residents and city officials. Surprisingly, not one respondent chose to disagree, proving this idea is vital in any displacement plan.

Question forty asked respondents if a city should regularly update affected residents facing possible displacement regarding how the redevelopment process will occur. The results were surprising because over ninety-six percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed, giving this question the highest approval of all the questions in the survey. The predicted result for this question was around fifty percent in agreement. The reasoning behind this outcome could be respondents felt a city should keep affected residents informed because a resident's way of life could soon be drastically impacted by a redevelopment decision.

Allowing for a Response Time

Question forty-one asked respondents if a city should allow ample time for affected low-income residents of displacement to unite and devise a response to the city's plan. Results revealed respondents preferred this idea. Respondents probably felt less communication problems would arise if residents were united. Probably also wanted to allow sufficient time for

residents to fully review every page of the plan and then hold meetings to gauge neighborhood needs.

Question forty-two asked respondents if a city should allow sufficient time for an appeals process from affected low-income residents. The results revealed respondents favored this idea. Respondents probably favored this idea because a city should not rush important decisions, such as a displacement policy/procedure; with courts already backed up with large case loads, it could take years for a city and neighborhood to get a result. Another reason for this outcome could be a city does not want to make an important decision without the support of a community.

Collecting Demographic Data and Surveying Affected Residents

Question forty-three asked respondents if once redevelopment areas are identified, a city should collect demographic data on residents living in the targeted neighborhoods, helping city officials determine the exact number of low-income residents who will lose their home. The results revealed respondents were overall in favor of this idea, probably because a city would need to know how many low-income residents need assistance to find new permanent living locations. The results were somewhat surprising, considering the predicted outcome for this idea was not a high acceptance rate.

Question forty-four asked respondents whether a city should survey affected residents for suggestions in assisting displaced low-income residents. The results revealed majority support for this idea, probably because this idea is not intrusive to affected residents and burdensome for a city. Additionally, this survey will help a city by better assisting affected

residents moving from their home. An interesting outlier was almost four percent strongly disagreed, but nobody disagreed with the idea. The respondent may have felt it was a city's duty to perform this type of task.

Implementation of Displacement Plan

Question forty-five asked respondents if a city should wait to implement its displacement plan until after all legal affairs have been resolved. The results revealed respondents overwhelmingly supported this idea, because a city does not want a lawsuit halting all plans until a verdict can be reached. An interesting note was the number of respondents who choose disagree was higher than predicted. The reasoning behind this is unclear, unless respondents felt a city should press on, thinking residents will concede and not take the matter to court.

Question forty-six asked respondents whether a city should release a finalized displacement master plan to the public. The results revealed respondents strongly supported this idea, believing residents have a right to know what laws, policies, regulations, or procedures are passed by the city. The results were not surprising, considering the predicted outcome for this question was the same as the actual outcome. A follow up question to only respondents who did not choose agree or strongly disagree, would have asked why they choose their answer.

Implementation

The sixth category addressed the implementation of the displacement plan, and the assessments regarding how the plan performed in meeting its goals. Table 5.6 shows questions forty-seven through forty-nine, how many responded, and the respondent's answers.

Table 5.6

Survey Question	Number of Respondents	Results
47	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34.6% Agree: 50.0% Strongly Agree: 15.4%
48	26	Strongly Disagree: 0% Disagree: 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23.1% Agree: 53.8% Strongly Agree: 23.1%
49	26	Strongly Disagree: 3.8% Disagree: 7.7% Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.5% Agree: 50.0% Strongly Agree: 26.9%

Question forty-seven asked respondents if a city should collect contact information from residents displaced when redevelopment begins. The results revealed respondents were in favor of this; however, there was a higher than expected number of neither agree nor disagree. The respondents who were unsure might have been leery of a city taking contact information of displaced residents. Another reason could have been some respondents were having difficulty in understanding how taking contact information of displaced residents would help a city in future displacement policies.

Question forty-eight asked respondents whether a city should regularly communicate with displaced residents who plan to return to the redeveloped area after construction. The results revealed strong support for this idea, mainly because respondents felt if residents would be allowed to move back to the building once redevelopment is completed, a city should

communicate with that resident and update them on projected move in dates. An interesting side note, respondents did not vote as highly in question forty-seven as they did question forty-eight; however, in order for a city to regularly communicate with displaced residents, a city would need displaced residents' contact information.

Assessments

Question forty-nine asked respondents if a city should survey displaced residents to determine the extent to which they were affected by the displacement. The results revealed respondents were in support of this idea, believing it could help future displaced residents have a better experience. Another reason for this response could be if a displaced resident was harmed beyond a city's expectations, it would benefit a city to learn of this, find out why this happened, try to remedy the situation, and prevent this from happening in the future.

Conclusion

The results from this survey revealed the displacement model was accurate overall. Respondents favored the majority of the proposed ideas. While some results were not as strongly supported as predicted, the ideas were still supported. Ideas mentioned by respondents in the open-ended and ranking questions will be added to the final displacement model in the following chapter.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The Practical Ideal Model for Mitigating Displacement

The purpose of an ideal displacement model for low-income residents is to help city officials plan for difficulties that low-income residents face when confronted with redevelopment of residential areas. This aid is accomplished by incentives offered to owners of the housing units to help offset lost profit from renting to low-income residents instead of high end residents who would pay more. If an owner is unwilling to allow low-income residents to remain with city incentives, then the model would assist displaced low-income residents in finding new homes. Funding to assist low-income residents would come from additional taxes levied on developers who replaced affordable housing with luxury housing units. Survey responses support these ideas.

Responses to open-ended questions in the survey were valid and added to the final displacement survey. For example, a cost benefit analysis was added in the category of Creation of a Master Plan. This analysis would help a city better justify redevelopment of an area by showing citizens how the plan will provide economic funding via increased tax base for the city. Dead malls could be torn down to build a subdivision or large apartment complex, allowing displaced low-income residents to move in; however, this applies to malls located inside a city. Redeveloping affordable public housing does not generate additional units, but does provide upgrades to affordable units in need of renovation. A surprising suggestion for prime redevelopment areas was drug houses. This idea has merit since drug houses are often repossessed by the city, state, or federal government and are usually sold at auction. However,

if the drug house was converted into an affordable housing unit, a city could clean up a neighborhood while adding affordable housing.

An additional idea added to the model includes cities setting up temporary housing for displaced residents. This idea would provide furnished housing for displaced residents forced to move out of their homes, but who do not have a new residence. While in temporary housing, cities can assist displaced residents in locating a permanent housing solution. One should note that elderly and disabled low-income residents may stay longer in temporary housing, since it is difficult to accommodate some of their needs. Once a resident has moved into a permanent housing unit, a city should hold support groups and/or educational activities for displaced residents to help them adapt to their new surroundings. These activities would allow for an easier transition for a new resident into a neighborhood with which they are unfamiliar.

Respondents did not favor funding methods in the survey. Ideas such as exceeding appraised market value on property owned by low-income residents, placing an additional tax on developers who replaced low-income units with luxury units, increased property taxes for newly redeveloped high income properties which replaced low-income housing, and an additional sales tax on businesses who redeveloped affordable housing units were unpopular. The reasoning behind why these ideas were not favored by respondents appears to be people do not want higher taxes or fees. However, in order to mitigate displacement of low-income residents, certain preventative policies must be in place to avoid developments from preying on affordable housing units and converting them into luxury units.

Alternative methods to fund construction for affordable housing should involve private businesses, public donations, and an increase in sales tax from other industries. Cities should try to persuade private businesses to donate money towards building additional affordable units for displaced low-income residents. Businesses, would receive a tax credit for the donation, and the city would receive necessary funding to begin construction on affordable units. The same can be said for public donations. People who donate receive a tax credit, and cities receive necessary funding without having to raise taxes. Increasing sales tax can be difficult for a city because more taxes are unpopular with both businesses and citizens; however if sales taxes from tourism were increased, citizens and businesses would not be impacted.

A city must have procedures in place for displaced residents to attend public meetings to help assist and educate them on upcoming events (move out and relocation), and the changes they might experience when they move to a new housing unit. These meetings are important to residents because displacement can be a traumatic experience in their lives, and the city should offer a service to overcome these obstacles.

Table 6.1 Final Displacement Model

Planning:

❖ Creation of a Master Plan

- The issue of displacement should be included in the master plan available to citizens.
- A master plan for a city should include the following aspects of displacement:
 - Should have a guide on how much re-development should be permitted in certain low-income areas.
 - Cost Benefit Analysis
 - A minimum percentage of total residential units in the city should be allocated for low-income units.
 - Should include a procedure on how to redevelop low-income areas.
 - The master plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects.
 - Displacement plan should address the issue of equal spread of low-income people across the city to prevent concentration.
 - If possible, the master plan should include places for future redevelopment.
 - Should be clear enough for the common citizen to understand.
- The city should consider the types of properties best suited for reinvestment, without displacing a large number of low-income residents.
- The ideal properties for a city to look into redevelopment are ranked as follow:
 - Vacant land
 - Abandoned property
 - City owned property
 - Commercial property
 - Residential property
 - Single Family
 - Multi-Family
- A certain percentage of the redeveloped area should be ear-marked for the low-income residents to come back to.
- If the affected area is to be changed to the point that the original residents cannot return to the area, then the city should plan for the relocation of the displaced low-income residents:
 - The city should plan to build new apartment/houses for displaced low-income residents.
 - The city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low-income residents.
 - The city should plan to provide rent vouchers that would pay for low-income residents rent/increase for the difference in their rent.
 - The city should plan to buy foreclosed properties to relocate the displaced residents.
 - The city should plan to exceed appraised market value of a property if owned by low-income resident

in order to give that resident the ability to buy a comparable house in the city on the open market.

❖ The city should come up with a plan for relocating the displaced low-income residents

➤ Relocation assistance

- The city should plan to provide relocation assistance to the displaced low-income residents.
- Temporary Housing while assisting in locating permanent housing
- The city should plan to provide moving equipment and workers to move the displaced low-income resident's belongings.
- The city should plan an orderly move out that would assist low-income residents in their move.

❖ Methods to Fund Low-Income Housing

➤ The city should seek financial resources in order to fund the building of new low-income units:

- The city should charge an extra tax on developers who replaced low-income units with higher income units.
- The city should increase property taxes for newly developed high income properties that replaced low-income units.
- Private donations toward
- Increase sales tax (ideally tourism sales tax)
- A small sales tax (1% - 3%) should be placed on the businesses that replaced the low-income residential units.
- There should be higher building permit fee for projects that replace existing low-income units.
- Require developers who redevelop affordable housing to subsidize the rent of low-income residents until they can find a permanent housing solution.
- The city should create a joint venture with the State/Federal government to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents.
- The city should create a joint venture with a non-profit group to secure funds to buy/rent units for low-income residents.
- A non-profit organization should be created to raise money towards building low-income units.

❖ Resident Participation

- The public should be involved in the making of a displacement master plan for the city.
- The city should have formal notices and open discussion between residents and city leaders before the new displacement master plan is finalized.
- The city should regularly update the affected residents.

- The city should allow ample time for the affected residents to unite and devise a response to the city's plan. Also the city should allow for a sufficient time for an appeals process.
- Once redevelopment areas are identified, the city should collect demographic data on the residents living in that area.
- The city should survey the affected residents for suggestions the city could use for assisting would be displaced residents.
- The city should wait on implementing its plan until all legal affairs have been resolved (Appeals process, court rulings and agreed upon deals between the residents and city on how to handle the displaced).
- The city should release its finalized displacement master plan to the public.

Implementation:

❖ Carrying Out the Agreed Upon Plan

- The city should take the contact information of the displaced residents for future use/studies.
- Meetings for affected residents to be educated and informed on upcoming events.
- Educational activities for residents associated with adapting to a new neighborhood and new lifestyle.
- The city should regularly communicate with the displaced residents who are planning to return to the redeveloped area.

Assessments:

❖ Critical Assessment of the Project and its Impact

- The city should survey the displaced residents to find out the extent to which they were affected by the re-development.

Research Limitations

This research is limited by potential city biasness when developing a displacement master plan, with the intent of purposely displacing low-income residents in order to acquire property in a city below market value. A city acting in its own interests instead of the interests of its citizens, can manipulate displacement policies, and more easily displace low-income residents. This displacement model can prevent deceitful acts by cities, developers, and others from occurring, however, if this model is altered, a city could use a displacement model to strategically redevelop areas. For example, a city could have a "displacement plan" for low-

income residents; however, a city could word the plan in a way the common person would not be able to understand, and these citizens may not realize this plan would potentially harm low-income residents. A city could also charge a minute fee to businesses which redeveloped low-income units, which would not cover the costs to build replacement affordable units. To prevent this from happening, citizens must take on the role of watch dog, along with organizations that monitor city activity on a daily basis, to ensure the city is working for all citizens best interests.

Another limitation could occur if a city failed to enforce funding requirements on businesses that redeveloped low-income housing to help pay for affordable housing for displaced low-income residents. Failing to enforce funding for affordable housing would result in businesses displacing residents, without paying fees; leaving a city worse off. If a city enacts certain policies, it must enforce all policies for developers who replace affordable housing.

Finally, a city must invest displacement money to fund affordable housing in legitimate contractors, respected in the community. Governments tend to use the “buddy system” far too much, relying on friends instead of people who best qualified for the job. A contract system needs to be created so a city receives the best quality building for money, while being fair to all contractors. The system should also stipulate that all reputable contractors have a fair chance to submit bids to win the contract to build affordable housing units for a city. A rotation system should be used. For example, when Contractor A receives the bid, Contractor A can still put in bids for another city project, but Contractor A is docked points because they already have a

contract with the city. This systems allows every contractor a fair chance, even contractors who own smaller businesses.

Future Implications

This displacement model can be used in different ways. A city may use the entire model as a displacement policy. The drawback to using this displacement model is a city would need to pick and choose which methods best fund new affordable housing units. This model can be used as a step-by-step guide to mitigate displacement; however, the methods used to fund additional affordable housing was comprehensive. Using all of the mentioned methods to fund affordable housing would put businesses at an economic disadvantage, while discouraging potential businesses relocate to the city.

The second way to use this model is for a city to pick and choose policies. This tactic most likely the best scenario for a city, choosing methods which culturally and economically best fit the city's identity. Finally, a city could expand or alter these methods, creating ideas, which better meet a city's needs. Methods used should be determined by the need of affordable housing in the city. For example, if demand for affordable housing is high, then a city should explore other methods to increase funding for additional affordable housing. If demand is low, then a city does not need to use some methods.

Cities are unlikely to utilize this entire model for displacement of low-income residents; however, one method every city should use is gathering forwarding addresses of displaced low-income residents and surveying these residents regarding any financial hardship they encountered, stress, how they are adapting to their new social environment, living quarters

suitable compared to old ones, how many people lived in their old housing unit compared to now, ages of the people who live in the same unit, whether they have children, did the children have to switch schools due to the move, are they or anybody else living in the house receiving any government aid, as well as other relevant questions.

The reason for the survey is two-fold. The first part would study how many residents are being displaced in the city/state/country every year. The number of displaced residents could be used in countless studies, considering the closest study on the number of residents who were displaced only reached seventy-two percent of the total number of residents who were displaced. Scholars believe the remaining twenty-eight percent did not fare well compared to the others since they were never located. The second reason would allow cities to take this survey data and reevaluate each policy of the displacement plan to determine whether the policy accomplished its intended goal(s). If the policy failed to reach its desired goal, a city would realize this right away and work to alleviate the problem before plan was put in use again. With real data, city leaders could find real solutions for displacement.

The goal of this research and in creating this model was to provide cities some or all of the methods to assist displaced low-income residents find new homes. The American dream was once for everybody to own a house, without the fear of government coming in and removing people from their homes, favor of businesses. Today society allows residents to be removed from their homes in order to make way for something “better”. However, society has a moral obligation to residents losing their homes, and should protect residents of all classes from becoming displaced by creating policies to prevent displacement, assisting

residents who will be displaced in finding new homes, funding additional affordable housing, and stabilizing the resident in their neighborhood. Gentrification is a necessary evil for cities, but it does not give cities the right to condemn property at will, while displacing low-income residents, without consequence.

Bibliography

- Atkinson, Rowland. 2004. The evidence on the impact of gentrification: New lessons for the urban renaissance. *European Journal of Housing Policy* 4(1): 107-131.
- Bachelor, L. 1994. Urban economic development. *University of Toledo* 29(4): 596-616.
- Billitteri, Thomas. 2007. Domestic poverty. *CQ Researcher* 17(31): 721-744.
- Blakely, Edward J. 2009. Planning local economic development: Theory and practice. *Sage Publishing* 4: 1-446.
- Blomely, Nicholas. 2008. Enclosure, common right and the property of the poor. *Social & Legal Studies* 17: 311-331.
- Cheyne, Julian. 2009. Olympian masterplanning in London. *Planning and Theory Practice* 10(3):404-418.
- Clark, Charles S. 1995. Housing discrimination. *CQ Researcher* 5(8): 1-27.
- Clark, Charles S. 2007. Revitalizing the cities: Is regional planning the answer. *CQ Researcher* 5(38): 1-37.
- Clemmitt, Marcia. 2007. Fixing urban schools. *CQ Researcher* 17(16): 361-384.
- Clemmitt, Marcia. 2010. Income inequality. *CQ Researcher* 20(42): 989-1012.
- Cooper, Mary H. 2004. Smart growth. *CQ Researcher* 14(20): 469-492.
- Cooper, Mary H. 1999. Saving open spaces. *CQ Researcher* 9(42): 953-976.
- Cooper, Mary H. 1997. Urban sprawl in the west. *CQ Researcher* 7(37): 865-888.
- Davidson, Mark. 2009. Displacement, space and dwelling: Placing gentrification debate. *Ethics, Place and Environment* 12(2): 219-234.
- Davidson, Mark. 2007. Gentrification as global habitat: A process of class formation or corporate creation. *Royal Geographical Society* 32: 490-506.
- Dooling, Sarah. 2009. Ecological gentrification: A research agenda exploring justice in the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33(3): 621-639.
- Dreier, P. 1991. Downtown Development and Urban Reform: The politics of Boston's linkage policy. *Urban Affairs Review* 26(3): 354-375.

- Elizabeth, S. 2002. Converting pork into porcelain. *Urban Affairs Review* 38(1): 24-39.
- Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and O'Regan, Katherine. 2008. Reversal of fortunes? Lower-income urban neighborhoods in the US in the 1990s. *Urban Studies* 45: 845-869.
- Elorza, Jorge. 2007. Absentee landlords, rent control, and healthy gentrification: A policy proposal to deconcentrate the poor in urban America. *Roger Williams University School of Law*: 1-90.
- Fan, Yingling. 2010. Reexamining contemporary urbanism in the United States: Convenient mix of the old and new. *Environment and Planning* 42: 2897-2913.
- Fernandez, Isis. 2005. Let's stop cheering, and let's get practical: Reaching a balance gentrification agenda. *Georgetown Journal* 12(3): 409-432.
- Formoso, Diana, Weber, Rachel and Atkins, Marc. 2010. Gentrification and urban children's well-being: Tipping the scales from problems to promise. *Society for Community Research and Action* 46: 395-412.
- Freeman, Lance. 2009. Neighbourhood diversity, metropolitan segregation and gentrification: What are the links in the US. *Urban Studies* 46(10): 2079-2101.
- Garcia, Tommy, "Decision making model for municipal planners in the state of Texas" (2010). Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos. Paper 324.
- Glick, Jonathan. 2008. Gentrification and the racialized geography of home equity. *Urban Affairs Review* 44: 280-295.
- Goetz, Edward G. 2010. Desegregation in 3D: Displacement, dispersal and development in American public housing. *Society for Community Research and Action*: 46: 395-412.
- Goetz, Edward G. 1994. Expanding possibilities in local development policy: An examination of U.S. cities. *Political Research Quarterly* 47(1): 85-109.
- Greenblatt, Alan. 2006. Downtown renaissance. *CQ Researcher* 16(24): 553-576.
- Grau, Micah E., "Using a Model Municipal Performance Measurement System to Assess Mid-size Texas Cities' Systems" (2008). *Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos*. Paper 282.
- Hefetz, Amir. 2004. Privatization and its reverse: Explaining the dynamics of the government contracting policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14(2): 171-190.
- Hosansky, David. 1999. Traffic congestion. *Congressional Quarterly* 9(32): 729-752.

- Howell, Ryan. 2008. Throw the bum out: A discussion of the effects of historic preservation statutes on low-income households through the process of urban gentrification in old neighborhoods. *Gender, Race and Justice* 11(3): 1-12.
- Jerzky, Matthew. 2009. Gentrification's third way: An analysis of housing policy and gentrification in Providence. *Harvard Law & Policy Review* 3: 413-429.
- Jost, Kenneth. 2005. Property rights. *Congressional Quarterly* 15(9): 197-220.
- Katel, Peter. 2009. Housing the homeless. *CQ Press* 19(44): 1053-1076.
- Keating, Dennis W. 1986. Linking downtown development to broader community goals. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 52(2): 133-141.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1987. The effect of the warranty of habitability on low income housing: Milking and class violence. *Florida State University Law Review* 15: 485-519.
- Kirkland, Elizabeth. 2008. What's race got to do with it? Looking for the racial dimensions of gentrification. *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 32(2): 18-30.
- Knotts, Gibbs H., Haspel, Moshe. 2006. The impact of gentrification on voter turnout. *Social Science Quarterly* 87(1): 110-121.
- Koebel, Theodore C. 1996. Urban redevelopment, displacement and the future of the American city. *Virginia Tech* 1-32.
- Kolodney, Lawrence. 1991. Eviction free zones: The economics of legal bricolage in the fight against displacement. *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 18: 507-543.
- Krumholz, Norman. 1999. Equitable approaches to local economic development. *Policy Studies Journal* 27(1): 83-95.
- Kushner, James A. 1994. Growth management and the city. *Yale Law and Policy Review* 12(1): 68-92.
- Lees, Loretta and Ley, David. 2008. Introduction to special issue on gentrification and public policy. *Urban Studies* 45: 2379-2384.
- Leitner, Helga. 1990. Cities in pursuit of economic growth: The local state as entrepreneur. *Political Geography Quarterly* 9(2): 146-170.
- Levine, Marc L. 1987. Downtown redevelopment as an urban growth strategy: A critical appraisal of the Baltimore renaissance. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 9(2): 103-123.

- Levy, Diane K., Comey, Jennifer and Padilla, Sandra. 2006. In the face of gentrification: Case studies of local efforts to mitigate displacement. *The Urban Institute*: 1-84.
- Ley, David and Dobson, Cory. 2008. Are there limits to gentrification? The contexts of impeded gentrification in Vancouver. *Urban Studies* 45(12): 2471-2498.
- Malloy, Robin Paul and Smith, James Charles. 2008. Private property, community development, and eminent domain. *Social Science Research Network*: 1-22.
- Marcuse, Peter. 1985. Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* 28: 195-240.
- Marcuse, Peter. 1985. To control gentrification: Anti-displacement zoning and planning for stable residential districts. *Review of Law and Social Change* 13: 931-945.
- McFarlane, Audrey. 2007. Rebuilding the public-private city: regulatory taking's anti-subordination insights for eminent domain and redevelopment. *University of Baltimore School of Law* 42(97): 97-163.
- Mertz, Kaycee Elizabeth. 2008. Equitable development tools to mitigate residential displacement due to gentrification. *University of Florida*: 1-117.
- Myers, Dowell and Pitkin, John. 2009. Demographic forces and turning points in the American city, 1950-2040. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626: 91-111.
- Nechyba, Thomas J. 2004. Urban Sprawl. *American Economic Association* 18(4): 177-200.
- Newman, Kathe and Wyly, Elvin. 2006. The right to stay put, revisited: Gentrification and resistance to displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies* 43(1): 23-57.
- Newman, Sandra J. and Owen, Michael S. 1982. Residential displacement: Extent, nature, and effects. *Journal of Social Issues* 38(3): 135-148.
- O'Neill, Brian. 2008. A model assessment tool for the Incident Command System: A case study of the San Antonio Fire Department. *Applied Research Projects*, Texas State University. Paper 270. <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/arp/270>
- Orr, Marion E. 1994. Urban regimes and leadership in Detroit. *Urban Affairs Review* 30(48): 48-73.
- Paradis, Thomas W. 2000. Conceptualizing small towns as urban places. *Urban Geography* 21(1): 61-82.

- Peck, Jamie. 2005. Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(4): 740-770.
- Reese, Ellen, Deverteuil, Geoffery, and Thach, Leanne. 2010. Weak-center gentrification and the contradictions of containment: Deconcentrating poverty in downtown Los Angeles. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34(2): 310-327.
- Robertson, Kent A. 1995. Downtown redevelopment strategies in the United States. *Journal of the Planning Association* 61(4): 429-437.
- Rosentraub, Mark S. 1994. Sport and downtown development strategy if you build it, will jobs come? *Journal of Urban Affairs* 16(3): 221-239.
- Slater, Tom. 2009. Missing marcuse. *Taylor and Francis* 13(2-3): 293-311.
- Sapat, Alka, Esnard, Ann-Margaret and Levine, Joyce N. 2007. Population displacement and housing dilemmas due to catastrophic disasters. *Journal of Planning Literature* 22(3):3-15.
- Sazama, Gerald W. 2000. Lessons from the history of affordable housing cooperatives in the United States: A case study in American affordable housing policy. *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY, INC.* 59(4): 573-608.
- Shields, Patricia M. 1998. Pragmatism as philosophy of science: A tool for public administration. *Research in Public Administration* 4: 195-225. <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/polsfacp/33/>
- Shields, P. and H. Tajalli 2006. Intermediate theory: The missing link in successful student scholarship" *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 12 (3): 313-334. <http://ecommons.txstate.edu/polsfacp/39/>
- Slater, Tom. 2009. Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. *Taylor and Francis Group* 13(2 & 3): 292-311.
- Slater, Tom. 2006. The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(4): 737-757.
- Smith, Donna. 2010. Poverty rate hits 15-year high. Reuters.
- Strom, Elizabeth. 2002. Converting pork into porcelain. *Urban Affairs* 38(3): 3-21.
- Sullivan, Daniel Monroe. 2007. Reassessing gentrification: Measuring residents' opinions using survey data. *Urban Affairs Review*: 42: 583-592.
- Tanner, Jane. 2001. Affordable housing. *Congressional Quarterly* 11(5): 89-112.

- Torrens, Paul M., Nara, Atsushi. 2007. Modeling gentrification dynamics: A hybrid approach. *Computers, Environmental and Urban Systems* 31: 337-361.
- Trial, Shaina., "Assessment of patient processing in emergency departments of hospitals" (2009). Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos. Paper 311.
- Turner, Robyne S. 1992. Growth politics and downtown development. *Urban Affairs Review* 28(3): 3-21.
- Turner, Robyne S. 2002. The Politics of design and development in the postmodern downtown. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24(5): 533-548.
- Urzua, Ana Siria. 2008. Gentrification and displacement: Assessing responses in Santa Ana, California. *University of California, Irvine*: 1-36.
- Wasserman, Jason Adam and Clair, Jeffery Michael. 2010. Housing patterns of homeless people: The ecology of the street in the era of urban renewal. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 40(1): 71-101.
- Watt, Paul. 2009. Housing stock transfers, regeneration and state-led gentrification in London. *Urban Policy and Research* 27(3): 229-242.
- Weeks, Jennifer. 2009. Rapid urbanization. *CQ Press* 3(4): 91-118.
- West, Darrell M. 2003. Downtown malls as engines of economic development, community spirit, and political capital. *Economic Development Quarterly* 17(193): 193-204.
- Wyly, Elvin K. and Hammel, Daniel J. 2001. Gentrification, housing policy, and the new context of urban redevelopment. *Emerald Group Publishing Limited* 6: 211-276.
- Wyly, Elvin K. and Hammel, Daniel J. 2004. Gentrification, segregation, and discrimination in the American urban system. *Environment and Planning* 36: 1215-1241.

Appendix A

Question 2: What aspects of displacement need to be involved in a master plan?

Surveyor	Responses
1	Overall, what is the honest impact for those that will be displaced and when. Meaning some people will be immediately displaced while others will be able to stay for a period of time until increased property taxes, the lure of sale, or change in culture results in a forced move of a move of choice.
2	Where to go; - How many can the first place hold? - How many can the second place hold? etc., then - Which areas of the city go to which location? - Included should be pets; which locations will hold pets? For how long will the location hold the displaced people? Would there be a relieve location in case any of the initial places could no longer provide housing? - What about the elderly, and disabled, how will they get there, and have they brought their medications with them? - Set up of temporary schools, or existing schools, how many would they hold?
3	Food, clothing and shelter most immediately. The next step would be to move to more fixed housing until FEMA can figure what the scope of the disaster is.
4	This is difficult item to tackle. Displacement of lower income citizens with increased redevelopment can effect a city demographic. One way to handle this is with a requirement for a percentage of affordable housing. We are also building an impediment to fair housing section into the comp plan.
5	Develop policies Code enforcement coordinated with rehabilitation and housing assistance. Arrange facilities to house displaced persons. Develop policies to identify and mitigate displacement of residencies. Develop policies for relocation of impacted businesses.
6	None
7	Evacuation routes with distances clearly marked. Areas of evacuation properly labeled (for handicap and people with no means of transportation). Radio stations that will broadcast critical information. Telephone numbers where people can call to obtain information.
8	Costs vs. benefits, legal considerations, voluntariness of those subject to displacement
9	helping those who become displaced to find a place to live
10	financial implications people laws
11	I need a definition of "displacement" to answer this question. Also, what type of "master plan" are you talking about?
12	Accessibility to grocery stores, schools and transportation; affordability, cultural sensitivity.

13	None
14	very little
15	What happens to residents who are displaced - how are they financially compensated for said displacement including moving and rental costs.
16	A financing plan.

Question 3: Please specify 3 aspects and rank in order of their importance.

Surveyor	Responses
Rank 1	
1	Impact of a "forced move"
2	Where to go, and what part of the displaced city would go to which location.
3	food
4	Housing
5	Develop policies to identify and mitigate displacement of residents.
6	Evacuation routes
7	Legal considerations (is it legal to do this?)
8	assist in finding homes for the displaced
9	Laws
10	Accessibility
11	Rental compensation - if they have to pay more then what they were paying
12	Define FAIRNESS in the eyes of those being displaced.
Rank 2	
1	Impact of a "move of choice"
2	How will the elderly and disabled get there, and do they have their medications.
3	Clothes
4	Transportation
5	Arrangement of facilities to house displace people
6	Areas of evacuation properly labeled
7	Costs vs. benefits
8	finanical implications
9	Affordability
10	Moving costs
Rank 3	
1	Where will pets be accepted?
2	shelter
3	Walkability of daily needs
4	Develop policies for relocation of businesses
5	Radio stations that will broadcast critical information

6	Voluntariness of those subject to displacement
7	People
8	In harmony with the cultural identity of displaced areas

Question 8: If yes, what procedures need to be included? Please specify the 3 procedures and rank in order of their importance.

Surveyor	Responses
10	Long range planning
11	Needs Assessment
12	Master Development Plan
13	impact on level of affordability - you don't want to put too much low income housing or too much market rate housing
14	address displacement at earliest possible time
Rank 3	
1	Schools and local community centers should be brought up to code, and maintenance completed if needed.
2	School sites
3	Housing diversity
4	available funding
5	Plan for the future rather than wasting resources to achieve personal goals.
6	Neighborhood schedule or timeline
7	parks and schools for kids to play and learn
8	people
9	open communication
10	Traffic/utility relocation/watershed
11	Environmental Assessment
12	Consult reinvestment plans and incentive programs
13	priority for residents to return to the neighborhood

Question 25: Please rank in order of their importance what type of relocation assistance a city should plan to provide.

Surveyor	Responses
Rank 1	
1	Transporation
2	relocation assistance
3	This will depend on the issues
4	relocation counselors
5	Information
6	Information
7	Affordability
8	location assistance
9	Use of moving truck
10	Information on housing options
11	Down payment assistance for home buyers
12	Information regarding housing programs and assistance to any displaced resident as a result of city action
13	less than 12%
14	finding a new place
15	Vouchers
16	enough to make them "whole"
Rank 2	
1	Assistance in locating a place.
2	fair market value replacement
3	Assist in securing housing
4	Financial Advice
5	Only Temporary housing
6	School systems
7	financial assistance
8	Moving assistance
9	Monetary assistance with rent and utility deposits for renters
10	Housing and relocation assistance if the displacement is a result of city action
11	building a new place, if necessary

12	Options to get into affordable housing
Rank 3	
1	Maybe 1st month's rent.
2	Assist with moving expenses
3	Critical medical aid
4	Public transportation infrastructure
5	resource assistance
6	Education activities associated with adapting to new environment
7	Monetary or direct assistance with physical moving of residents
8	Public meetings and a public hearing process for the public to be educated on the changes and the opportunity to be a part of the decision making process if this is a city action
9	help with rent
10	cash

Question 37: In your opinion, what other ways can a city raise funds to build low-income units?

Surveyor	Responses
1	Text: send 11 to a certain number, for the assistance in building new low-income units.
2	Not really sure.
3	CDBG funds are working really well and we should fight to protect those funds. Also offer affordable housing incentives to developers.
4	Public donations
5	Sale Taxes up to a certain point.
6	Seek donations from corporations and private donors.
7	Individual effort of low-income residents
8	Increase hotel taxes, require developers to subsidize the cost of displacing residents, tax incentives for developers who create only low-income housing
9	The city should not raise funds for low income housing. The city should only offer incentives for the construction of low income housing.
10	private funds
11	If a city makes it a priority on its budget, there will be money.
12	The city should not raise funds for building low income units.

Appendix B

Survey Questions

Survey Question	Measurement
1. Should a city have a displacement plan included in their master plan?	Yes/No
2. What aspects of displacement need to be involved in a master plan?	Open ended
3. What aspects of displacement need to be involved in a master plan, please specify 3 aspects and rank in order of their importance.	Rank
4. Should there be a limit on how much redevelopment should be allowed in a low income area?	Yes/No
5. If the answer to the above is yes, then what should the limit be? Please answer in the form of a percentage.	Open ended
6. What percentage of a city's dwelling units should be allocated for low income people?	Open ended
7. Should there be a procedure on how to redevelop low income areas?	Yes/No
8. If yes, what procedures need to be included? Please specify the 3 procedures and rank in order of their importance.	Rank
9. The master plan should include a timeline for redevelopment projects.	Scale 1-5
10. Relocated low income people should be spread out in a city.	Scale 1-5
11. The master plan should specify the location of future areas to be redeveloped.	Scale 1-5
12. The displacement master plan should be clear enough for the common citizen to understand.	Scale 1-5
13. A city should consider the number of low income residents who will be displaced in their planning project.	Scale 1-5
14. In your opinion, what types of properties are best suited for redevelopment, please rank in order of their importance?	Rank
15. The master plan should specify how many displaced residents should be brought back to the area.	Scale 1-5
16. If you agree, what percent of the new units should be ear marked for original low income residents?	Open ended

17. The city should address the relocation issues for the displaced low income residents.	Scale 1-5
18. The city should plan to build new apartment/houses for displaced low income residents.	Scale 1-5
19. The city should provide subsidized housing for displaced low income residents.	Scale 1-5
20. The city should plan to provide rent vouchers that would pay for low income residents rent/increase for the difference in their rent.	Scale 1-5
21. The city should plan to buy foreclosed properties to relocate the displaced residents.	Scale 1-5
22. The city should plan to exceed appraised market value of a property if owned by low income resident in order to give that resident the ability to buy a comparable house in the city on the open market.	Scale 1-5
23. The city should have a plan for relocating the displaced low income residents.	Scale 1-5
24. The city should plan to provide relocation assistance.	Scale 1-5
25. Please rank in order of their importance what type of relocation assistance a city should plan to provide.	Rank
26. The city should plan to provide moving equipment and workers to move the displaced low income resident's belongings.	Scale 1-5
27. The city should plan an orderly move out that would assist low income residents in their move.	Scale 1-5
28. The city should seek financial resources in order to fund the building of new low income units.	Scale 1-5
29. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, a city should place additional tax on developers who replaced low income property units with higher income units.	Scale 1-5
30. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, the city should increase property taxes for newly developed high income properties that replaced low income units.	Scale 1-5
31. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, the city should levy additional sales taxes on businesses that replaced low income units.	Scale 1-5
32. In your opinion, if there is going to be an additional sales tax, what should the sales tax be? Please have you answer in the form of a percentage.	Open ended
33. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, there should be higher building permit fee for projects that replace existing low income units.	Scale 1-5
34. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, the city should create a joint venture with the State/Federal government to secure funds to buy/rent units for low income residents.	Scale 1-5

35. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, the city should create a joint venture with a nonprofit group to secure funds to buy/rent units for low income residents.	Scale 1-5
36. In order to raise funds for building new low income units, a nonprofit organization should be created to raise money towards building low income units.	Scale 1-5
37. In your opinion, what other ways can a city raise funds to build low income units?	Open ended
38. The public should be involved in the making of a displacement master plan for the city.	Scale 1-5
39. The city should have formal notices and open discussion between residents and city leaders before the new displacement master plan is finalized.	Scale 1-5
40. The city should regularly update the affected residents.	Scale 1-5
41. The city should allow ample time for the affected residents to unite and devise a response to the city's plan.	Scale 1-5
42. The city should allow for a sufficient time for an appeals process.	Scale 1-5
43. Once areas redevelopment areas are identified, the city should collect demographic data on the residents living in that area.	Scale 1-5
44. The city should survey the affected residents for suggestions the city could use for assisting the would be displaced residents.	Scale 1-5
45. The city should wait on implementing its plan until all legal affairs have been resolved.	Scale 1-5
46. The city should release its finalized displacement master plan to the public.	Scale 1-5
47. The city should take the contact information of the displaced residents for future use/studies.	Scale 1-5
48. The city should regularly communicate with the displaced residents who are planning to return to the redeveloped area.	Scale 1-5
49. The city should survey the displaced residents to find out the extent to which they were affected by the redevelopment.	Scale 1-5

Appendix C

Letter to Respondents

I am a graduate student at Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas. I am currently working on my Applied Research Project. This paper required me to create a survey to send to city employees to gauge their opinions on different concepts, ideas, and solutions to the displacement of low-income residents from their homes as a result of their neighborhood going through gentrification. The survey is not long, mainly multiple choice questions with a few fill in the blank questions. I have created a link to my survey using Survey Monkey, the link is <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/displacementsurvey>. If you decide to take this survey, neither your name, your email, neither your department, nor your city will be named or mentioned in my research paper; nor will you be asked to give any identifying information about yourself or the city you work for. This survey will be completely anonymous, even I will not be able to tell who did or did not take my survey. I am just a graduate student trying to get city official's opinion about my methods to see if my ideas would or would not work for large cities.

Thank You for Your Time,

Chad Nolte
Texas State University