

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

SHAUNA NOEL and EMMANUELLA SENAT,

Plaintiffs,

15 CV 5236 (LTS)(KHP)

- against -

CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

-----X

EXPERT REPORT OF EDWARD G. GOETZ

Qualifications

My name is Edward G. Goetz. I am professor of urban and regional planning at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs and director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota, where I teach courses on urban planning, housing policy, and related subjects at the graduate level. I received my Ph.D. in political science from Northwestern University. I have written four books on low-income housing policy and published numerous peer-reviewed articles and book chapters on the subject. I have won awards for my research from my peers in the field of urban planning and urban affairs, and from within the University of Minnesota. My *curriculum vita* is attached as Appendix A to this report.

I have not served as an expert in any legal case in the past four years. My rate of compensation for this work is \$350 per hour. My fee is not dependent upon the outcome of the case.

Introduction

In 1988 the City of New York adopted a community preference policy designed to enhance the prospects of New York City residents to secure places in subsidized housing built in their neighborhoods. The policy is designed to mitigate the displacement of lower-income residents in New York City neighborhoods and in recognition that these residents are vulnerable to being displaced. Currently, in New York City, the crisis of housing affordability makes it extremely difficult for incumbent lower-income residents to continue to afford living in their communities. The community preference policy is equally responsive to displacement pressures that arise from housing abandonment or from large-scale investments. The policy is in fact relevant in strong or weak markets, and can help address displacement as a result of private actions, public policy, or natural events. The preference policy is one of many initiatives that the City has put in place to address the affordable housing crisis.

The City of New York, through its attorneys defending the City in *Noel et al. v. City of New York, 15-CV-5236* has asked me to comment on the significance of the affordable housing crisis and of displacement as a public policy challenge, and the importance for local governments in general and New York City in particular, of having affordable housing and anti-displacement initiatives in place. Based on my personal research and the broader research on these topics, I find that a) the current housing crisis in American cities and in New York City in particular has meant a crisis of displacement for low-income families, b) despite debates among researchers, there is a consensus that displacement is occurring and that it is a problem that deserves public policy attention, c) the fear of displacement is widespread among lower-income households in New York City and other cities experiencing acute shortages of affordable housing, d) City officials, philanthropic organizations, and community based groups have recognized and mobilized to address affordable housing issues and displacement in cities across the country, e) research has documented that displacement and loss of home and community produce multiple and serious negative impacts for low-income people, f) the City of New York has created a multi-faceted affordable housing strategy that incorporates a variety of program

interventions to address the housing crisis, and g) the community preference policy is one element in that strategy that is unique in its approach to mitigating displacement among low-income households in New York City.

Concerns about the displacement of lower-income residents from neighborhoods undergoing housing price increases are real and they can be addressed by government action. It is my opinion that the community preference policy serves legitimate, non-discriminatory government interests, including preventing displacement and responding to the well-founded fear of displacement.

New York City and many of the nation's cities are in a crisis of affordable housing.

The City of New York is in the midst of a severe housing crisis. The housing crisis in New York City is manifest in an overall shortage of units, especially a shortage of units renting at the lower end of the market, an increasing lack of affordability as rents rise faster than incomes, an absolute loss of units renting for under \$1,000 per month, a decline in apartment rentals that have rent restrictions or regulations, and a high rate of displacement among residents.

The most recent findings from the New York City Housing and Vacancy Study (NYCHVS) show that the median asking rent for a vacant unit in New York City increased by 30 percent between 2014 and 2017, adjusted for inflation; incomes for renters rose by 13.7% over that time period.¹ Rising rents led to the disappearance of 87,721 apartments renting for less than \$1,000 (in constant 2017 dollars) in just three years between 2014 and 2017. According to the current income and rent guidelines for housing affordability published by the federal government, two-bedroom units must rent for \$1,045 or less to be affordable to “very low-income” households (households at 50% of the area median income).² Apartments renting for less than \$1,000, however, now make up less than one-quarter of all apartments in the city.³ Over this time period rising rents led to the loss of another 86,000 units that had rented for between \$1,000 and \$1,250, roughly the affordability level for a three-bedroom unit for very low-income households and roughly the median contract rent of rent-stabilized units in the city in 2017.⁴ The rise in rents for private, non-regulated units was nearly four times greater than increases for rent stabilized units.⁵

The American Housing Survey indicates that in 2012 there were roughly 1.1 million renter “rent-burdened” households in the City of New York (households paying more than 30% of

¹ New York City, Housing Preservation & Development. 2018. “Selected Initial Findings of the 2017 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.” February 9. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/about/2017-hvs-initial-findings.pdf>, p. 5, and table 9, page 18.

² <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hpd/renters/area-median-income.page>.

³ HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, page 23, table 14.

⁴ Affordability for a three-bedroom at 50% of AMI is \$1200 (see, <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hpd/renters/area-median-income.page>), and the median contract rent for rent-stabilized units was \$1,269 in 2017 (see HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, page 5).

⁵ HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, page 21, table 12.

their incomes on housing), and these 1.1 million accounted for more than half of all renter households in the city. More than half of the 1.1 million were “severely rent-burdened”, i.e., they pay more than 50% of their incomes on housing.⁶ These numbers were up significantly since 2000. The 2011 NYCHVS estimates that while the city has 979,000 households at the very low- or extremely low-income levels (incomes less than 50% of the area median and 30% of the area median, respectively), there were only 425,000 units with rents affordable at those incomes.⁷ “The median asking rent for a vacant unit was \$1,875 in 2017, up by 30 percent from 2014 in inflation-adjusted terms.”⁸

The demand for affordable units is extremely high in New York City. In a recent case, more than 90,000 people entered the lottery for a new affordable housing development that contained just 104 units.⁹ According to HUD estimates in 2018, there are roughly 78,000 homeless persons in New York City who are also in need of permanent affordable housing.¹⁰ The city has an overall apartment vacancy rate of 3.63%,¹¹ well below what economists consider a healthy rate (5% to 6%). The shortage of rental units has been exacerbated by the conversion of up to 13,500 units into short-term rentals serving tourists and visitors rather than residents.¹² Vacancy rates in New York City are much lower for the most affordable units on the market and for units with rent regulations attached.¹³

Contributing to the severe housing crunch in the city is the set of changes occurring in the existing stock of rent-regulated housing. The City operates the nation’s most extensive system of housing assistance, anchored by Rent Stabilization/Rent Control that covers more than one million units, and public and assisted housing that provides below market rents for lower-income households. All told, in 2017 58.1% of the rental stock in the city was rent regulated.¹⁴ But that number has been declining for some time. Figures from the New York City Rent Guidelines Board indicate that between 1994 and 2018 there has been a minimum net loss in rent-regulated units of 147,512.¹⁵ The largest cause of the decline since 2000 is units that fall out of the rent stabilization system because the rent climbs high enough to trigger “high-rent

⁶ City of New York, *Housing New York: A Five-Borough Ten-Year Plan*, p. 17.

⁷ City of New York, *Housing New York*, p. 19.

⁸ HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, p. 5.

⁹ Amy Plitt, 2018. “Essex Crossing’s First Market-Rate Rentals Debut on the Lower East Side.” *Curbed New York*, March 1. <https://ny.curbed.com/2018/3/1/17067372/lower-east-side-essex-crossing-rollins-for-rent>.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2018. “The 2018 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress: Part 1: Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness.” December.

https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/AHAR_2018--Part-1.pdf, p. 20, exhibit 1.12.

¹¹ HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, p. 2.

¹² David Wachsmuth, David Chaney, Danielle Kerrigan, Andrea Shillolo, and Robin Basalaev-Binder, 2018. *The High Cost of Short-Term Rentals in New York City*, Montreal, Canada: McGill University, <http://www.sharebetter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/High-Cost-Short-Term-Rentals.pdf>.

¹³ HPD, “Selected Initial Findings”, p. 3.

¹⁴ New York City Rent Guidelines Board, 2018. *2018 Housing Supply Report*, May 24.

<https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/rentguidelinesboard/pdf/18HSR.pdf>, p. 3.

¹⁵ New York City Rent Guidelines Board, 2018. *Changes to the Rent Stabilized Housing Stock in New York City in 2017*, May 24. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/rentguidelinesboard/pdf/changes18.pdf>, p. 9.

vacancy deregulation.”¹⁶ High-rent vacancy deregulation stipulates that units that rent above a certain amount are no longer subject to rent stabilization rules. For 2019 the threshold is \$2774.76.¹⁷ There is also evidence that developers and landlords sometimes employ a range of tactics to push out tenants of rent-regulated apartments in order to increase rents and accelerate the process of high-rent deregulation.¹⁸

Cities across the country are experiencing similar shortages of affordable housing. While these problems of housing availability and affordability are extreme in New York City, they appear in a host of other American cities as well. Rapidly escalating housing prices in Boston, Washington, and Miami along the East Coast, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles on the West Coast have brought big changes and severe housing affordability problems to those cities as well, along with considerable problems of displacement for lower-income families. The problem has reached inland cities too, including Denver, Chicago, Minneapolis, and others.

Nationally, more than eight million households have very low incomes and are paying more than one-half their income on rent or live in severely inadequate housing, both of which are more common in metropolitan areas of the country.¹⁹ The disparity between the incomes of low-wage workers and rental costs are putting millions of families in metropolitan areas across the country at risk of losing their homes.²⁰ As one commentator put it, “displacement is the problem the 21st Century must solve.”²¹

Displacement is a public policy issue of importance.

Displacement has been an issue of urban public policy concern since the 1960s. Early concerns about displacement were related to the impacts of the federal urban renewal program. The program, which funded large-scale renewal and redevelopment of declining urban neighborhoods between 1950 and 1974, was estimated to have displaced hundreds of thousands of people over its lifetime.²² Of the estimated 2,500 neighborhoods that were bulldozed by the program in cities across the country, well more than half were African-American

¹⁶ New York City Rent Guidelines Board, 2018. *Changes to the Rent Stabilized Housing Stock*, p. 15.

¹⁷ New York State Homes and Community Renewal, 2018. “Deregulation Rent and Income Thresholds.” <http://www.nyshcr.org/rent/Deregulation-Rent-Income-Threshold.pdf>, p. 1.

¹⁸ Kim Barker, 2018. “Behind New York’s Housing Crisis: Weakened Laws and Fragmented Regulation.” *New York Times*, May 20. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/05/20/nyregion/affordable-housing-nyc.html>. See, also, Housing Rights Initiative; <https://housingrightsny.org/why-housing/>.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2017. *Worst Case Housing Needs*. Report to Congress. <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Worst-Case-Housing-Needs.pdf>, p. 2.

²⁰ National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2018. *Out of Reach: The High Cost of Housing*. Washington, D.C. https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/oor/OOR_2018.pdf.

²¹ Mindy Fullilove, 2005. *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Random House, Inc., p. 5.

²² Martin C. Anderson, 1967. *The Federal Bulldozer: A Critical Analysis of Urban Renewal, 1949-1962*. New York: McGraw-Hill; Marc A. Weiss, 1985. “The Origins and Legacy of Urban Renewal.” In J. P. Mitchell, editor, *Federal Housing Policy and Programs: Past and Present*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

communities.²³ This pattern was so pronounced that the program was famously nicknamed the “Negro Removal Program”.²⁴ These impacts eventually generated a backlash of opposition from residents of renewal sites who objected to the loss of their homes and communities. During the same era, federal highway construction cut through huge swaths of urban land, displacing residents and businesses. This program, too, had a disproportionate impact on communities of color as highways were much more likely to be placed through minority neighborhoods.²⁵ The backlash against widespread displacement led to the modification of the urban renewal program to reduce the importance of demolition and to focus more on rehabilitation in the hopes of reducing displacement.²⁶ Concerns about displacement also led to modifications of highway construction plans and the cancellation of some projects.²⁷

In addition to displacement resulting from large scale public sector development and redevelopment projects, displacement was also associated with the problems of housing disinvestment and abandonment. As many American urban neighborhoods were declining in the 1960s and 1970s especially, property abandonment became common in neighborhoods experiencing the greatest decline and disinvestment.²⁸ As owners walked away from properties, tenants were forced out. The arson-for-profit epidemic of the 1970s displaced a significant number of city residents in many cities in the declining rustbelt region of the country. This practice hit New York City especially hard in the 1970s.²⁹

Displacement has resulted from a third dynamic as well; rising housing costs in dynamic urban real estate markets. Gentrification, for example, emerged as a noticeable trend in American cities in the 1970s. Definitions of gentrification vary, but typically the term is used to describe previously lower-income, distressed neighborhoods that see an influx of higher socio-economic status (more highly-educated, higher income) households, rising housing costs, and commercial changes to businesses catering to the new, higher-income residents. The operational definition

²³ Fullilove, *Root Shock*. See, also, John R. Logan and Harvey Molotch, 1987. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, page 182.

²⁴ Alexander von Hoffman, 2000. “A Study in Contradictions: The Origins and Legacy of the Housing Act of 1949.” *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (2): 299-326.

²⁵ See, e.g., Charles E. Connerly, 2002. “From Racial Zoning to Community Empowerment: The Interstate Highway System and the African American Community in Birmingham, Alabama.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22.2 (2002): 99-114; Gordon Fellman and Barbara Brandt, 1970. “A Neighborhood a Highway Would Destroy.” *Environment and Behavior* 2 (3): 281-301; George Lipsitz, 1995. “The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the ‘White’ Problem in American Studies.” *American Quarterly* 47 (3): 369-387.

²⁶ Jon C. Teaford, 2000. “Urban Renewal and its Aftermath.” *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (2): 443-465.

²⁷ Raymond A. Mohl. “Stop the Road: Freeway Revolts in American Cities.” *Journal of Urban History* 30.5 (2004): 674-706.

²⁸ George Sternlieb, Robert W. Burchell, James W. Hughes, and Franklin J. James, 1974. “Housing Abandonment in the Urban Core.” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 40 (5): 321-332.

²⁹ Peter Marcuse, 1985. “Gentrification, Abandonment, and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City.” *Washington University Journal of Urban & Contemporary Law* 28: 195; Christopher Mele, 2000. *Selling the Lower East Side: Culture, Real Estate and Resistance in New York City*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

of gentrification, i.e., how a researcher measures gentrification, varies from one researcher to the next, but there is general agreement on this stipulative definition.

Thus, while some neighborhoods were experiencing accelerated decline, arson, and abandonment in the 1970s, other areas were experiencing a limited form of private sector reinvestment that led to improvements in older housing and the arrival of younger, more highly-educated, and more economically well-off in-movers. In the 1970s gentrification was a limited phenomenon, occurring in only a few neighborhoods in a few cities.³⁰

With the rebound of American cities since the end of the 1980s, the phenomenon of reinvestment-induced displacement has come to dominate the experience of many metropolitan areas. The contemporary context of displacement is characterized by the forced movement of lower-income families from neighborhoods that are rapidly escalating in value and price due to high levels of private capital investment, and from neighborhoods that are the subject of new initiatives of large scale public sector investment. The contemporary context of displacement in cities is also influenced by the growing inequality that characterizes American urban areas, with the hollowing out of the middle class and middle class neighborhoods, and the growth of both high- and low-income groups; what has come to be known as the “dual city” phenomenon.

New York City is in many ways the paradigmatic example of these contemporary trends.³¹ Displacement during the 1970s was associated with landlord abandonment and disinvestment. When the real estate market began to revive in the 1980s, the City looked to sell the parcels of land it had obtained through the *in rem* process. As it did so, market changes produced gentrification pressures in some parts of the city, patterns that became quite pronounced during this period. The pitched battles over gentrification that took place in the late 1980s on the Lower East Side of Manhattan are testament to the salience of the issue at that time. The resistance of Lower East Side residents to the potential gentrification of their neighborhood was built on a fear of displacement. Residents of this lower-income neighborhood feared a fate that would echo the changes that had already occurred in SoHo and the West Village neighborhoods, especially when developers began to refer to portions of the Lower East Side as “East Village,” a rebranding that signaled an intent to transform the neighborhood in ways that were well-understood by residents.³²

The affordable housing crisis and rates of gentrification and displacement in New York City have accelerated since then. Renewed investment in New York City, including foreign direct investment in real estate throughout Manhattan and Brooklyn in the 1990s and 2000s, has generated swift and significant changes in the housing market, trends that continue today, and

³⁰ Bruce London and J. John Palen, 1984. “Introduction.” In J. John Palen and Bruce London, editors, *Gentrification, Displacement and Neighborhood Revitalization*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

³¹ John H. Mollenkopf and Manuel Castells, eds. 1991. *Dual City: Restructuring New York*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

³² See Janet Abu-Lughod, *From Urban Village to East Village*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers; Mele, *Selling the Lower East Side*.

that have produced growing inequality. The city is now characterized by intense socio-economic inequalities and severe housing affordability problems for low-income and middle class residents.³³

Displacement is occurring in New York City and other cities across the country.

Considerable research has confirmed that displacement of low-income families occurs.

Displacement has been the subject of significant attention by researchers for many years. The earliest research was done in the context of urban renewal and the forced displacement of lower-income residents subject to full-scale demolition and clearance projects. While some studies focused on measuring displacement and estimating its prevalence, the majority reported on the relocation efforts to move and resettle displaced households who had lost their homes in redevelopment clearance.³⁴ In 1979 the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development published a report on displacement.

The first academic studies were completed in the 1960s.³⁵ After an initial flurry of studies, academic attention to the question of displacement declined due in large part to the difficulty of measuring displacement and the lack of good data on the subject.

Most recent research on displacement has emerged from a) the extensive literature on gentrification and b) research on the impacts of public housing demolition and redevelopment. In the gentrification literature, studies have been done to document the extent of displacement, the degree of neighborhood change induced, and the characteristics and motivations of in-movers. The literature on public housing demolition has attempted to similarly document the extent of displacement, track the post-displacement movement of low-income households, and measure the impact that displacement has had on a range of individual-level social, health, and economic well-being outcomes.

Estimates of the severity of displacement vary. By its nature, the phenomenon is difficult to measure; displaced persons are hard to find. The difficulties of measuring displacement are, in fact, the source of some debate among researchers regarding the relationship between displacement in gentrification. Research published roughly 15 years ago called into question whether in fact gentrification is associated with higher rates of displacement. Vigdor³⁶ and

³³ New York City Independent Budget Office, "New York City by the Numbers," <https://ibo.nyc.ny.us/cgi-park2/2017/04/how-has-the-distribution-of-income-in-new-york-city-changed-since-2006/>.

³⁴ A list of 38 such reports is provided in Chester Hartman, 1964. "The Housing of Relocated Families." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, November: 266–86;

³⁵ See, for example, Marc Fried, 1963. "Grieving for a Lost Home." In *The Urban Condition*, ed. Leonard Duhl, 151–72. New York: Basic Books; Hartman, "The Housing of Relocated Families"; Anderson, *The Federal Bulldozer*; and, Herbert J. Gans 1962. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

³⁶ Jacob Vigdor, 2002. "Does Gentrification Harm the Poor?" *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, pp. 134–173.

Freeman and Braconi³⁷ published studies in which they found the rate of outward mobility among low-income households was actually lower in gentrifying neighborhoods than it was in comparably vulnerable areas that were not gentrifying. These authors argued, therefore, for a reassessment of the relationship between displacement and gentrification, and suggested that succession, rather than displacement was causing the demographic changes in gentrifying neighborhoods. The Freeman and Braconi study is especially relevant as it looks at New York City specifically.

Other researchers have responded to make various critiques of the Vigdor and the Freeman and Braconi research.³⁸ The criticisms are largely based on the fact that these studies use household survey data to measure displacement and critics argue that such a method may seriously underestimate the degree of displacement that takes place. Households who were displaced can, for example, 'disappear' from view if they double up and become part of another household, become homeless, or leave New York City altogether.³⁹ Administrative data produce estimates of displacement that are much larger than those derived from survey data.⁴⁰ Other limitations of the survey approach are that information is typically collected only for the previous move and respondents are sometime limited in the number of reasons-for-moving that they can list on a survey instrument. Finally, there is concern about potential selection bias in surveys such that low-income residents who remain in gentrifying neighborhoods over time and therefore have survived years of displacement pressure are likely to have "found ways to adapt and survive in an increasingly competitive housing market" that makes them unlike low-income families who have been pushed out in earlier waves of displacement.⁴¹

Moreover, some researchers have noted that different research methodologies tend to produce different conclusions about processes of neighborhood change such as gentrification and displacement. For example, Brown-Saracino argues that qualitative studies of gentrification tend to produce more critical assessments of the process than do quantitative studies.⁴²

³⁷ Lance Freeman and Frank Braconi, 2004. "Gentrification and Displacement: New York City in the 1990s." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70 (1): 39-52; Lance Freeman, 2005. "Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods." *Urban Affairs Review* 40: 463-491; Lance Freeman and Frank Braconi, 2002. "Gentrification and Displacement." *The Urban Prospect: Housing, Planning and Economic Development in New York*, 8 (1): 1-4.

³⁸ The critiques have focused on the New York City study. See, e.g., Kathe Newman and Elvin K. Wyly, 2006. "The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City." *Urban studies* 43 (1): 23-57; and, Elvin Wyly, Kathe Newman, Alex Schafran, and Elizabeth Lee, 2010. "Displacing New York." *Environment and Planning A* 42(11): 2602-2623.

³⁹ Doubling up, for example, is becoming more widespread among low-income households. The U.S. government estimates that in 2011, 21.8 million households or 18.3 percent of all households were doubled-up. See, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d. "American Housing Survey Reveals Rise in Doubled-Up Households During Recession." https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_research_012714.html, and David Johnson, 2011. "Households Doubling Up." United State Census Bureau, Census Blogs. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2011/09/households-doubling-up.html>.

⁴⁰ Wyly et al., "Displacing New York."

⁴¹ Newman and Wyly, "The Right to Stay Put, Revisited" p. 28.

⁴² Japonica Brown-Saracino, 2017. "Explicating Divided Approaches to Gentrification and Growing Income Inequality." *Annual Review of Sociology* 43: 515-539.

Qualitative approaches are able to identify and consider the variety of ways in which displacement can occur or the ways in which displacement pressures can affect households. Zuk and Chapple, for example, use a qualitative research approach and challenge both the distinction between voluntary and involuntary moves that is the basis of quantitative analyses, as well as the idea that displacement necessarily happens *after* the gentrification process has begun.⁴³

Despite the research debate about the relationship between displacement and gentrification, and different estimates of the rate of displacement, there is consensus on three important points; that displacement is occurring, that public policies should be devised to mitigate displacement, and that the tenant protections in place in New York City have helped to reduce displacement. The debate among researchers just described is not about *the fact of displacement*, rather it is about whether the rate of displacement is higher or lower in gentrifying neighborhoods. Beyond that, there is substantial agreement among researchers about displacement. Freeman and Braconi conclude that although they find the rate of displacement in gentrifying neighborhoods to be no more elevated than in non-gentrifying neighborhoods, “this does not mean that no one is being displaced.”⁴⁴ They in fact estimate the rate of displacement in New York City to be between 5.1 and 7.1 percent, a figure that translates to close to 10,000 displacements each year. Newman and Wyly re-estimate and find a higher rate but a slightly lower volume estimate of displacement in New York City.⁴⁵ Then, in a follow-up study examining more recent data, Wyly et al. estimate that the number of displaced households in New York City varies over time and rose to as high as 18,000 per year between 2002 and 2005.⁴⁶ The fact of displacement is not disputed by any of these authors. Indeed, Freeman and Braconi note that in gentrifying neighborhoods rent burdens among poor people are almost 20% higher than in other neighborhoods. Ultimately, this debate, though interesting to scholars of gentrification, makes little difference in the policy context. Both sides of the research debate agree that rent increases, conversions, and landlord pressure are producing range from nearly 10,000 to 18,000 displacements throughout the city annually. This is the first important point of agreement.

The second point of agreement is that the overall rate of displacement in the city warrants a public policy response. As noted previously, Freeman and Braconi suggest that one explanation for the lower-than-expected rate of displacement in gentrifying neighborhoods is the desire of low-income households to remain in those neighborhoods in order to experience the benefits of upgrading. This, they write, provides a rationale for anti-displacement programs. “If our speculation that many disadvantaged households would prefer to stay in their neighborhoods as they gentrify is correct, this is all the more reason to fashion housing policy to mitigate some of the pressures of displacement.”⁴⁷ Thus, Freeman and Braconi do not feel that their findings

⁴³ Miriam Zuk and Karen Chapple, 2015. *Case Studies on Gentrification and Displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Center for Community Innovation, University of California, Berkeley.

⁴⁴ Freeman and Braconi, “Gentrification and Displacement”, page 50.

⁴⁵ Newman and Wyly, “The Right to Stay Put, Revisted”, p. 30.

⁴⁶ Wyly et al., “Displacing New York”, p. 2607.

⁴⁷ Freeman and Braconi, “Gentrification and Displacement”, p 50.

constitute a rationale for abandoning anti-displacement efforts. On this point, too, they agree with their critics. Wylie et al., for example, argue that fairness dictates that after decades of disinvestment in their neighborhoods lower-income families should have the ability to remain in their communities when upgrading finally occurs.

The third point of concurrence is that researchers also agree that tenant protections put in place by the City and the State in the form of rent stabilization, public housing, and other forms of housing welfare and regulation, have been and remain key in keeping lower-income families in neighborhoods they would otherwise be unable to afford. Though these authors disagree as to how best to estimate the prevalence of displacement, they agree on the importance of public policy to limit it.⁴⁸

Local governments and research universities acknowledge the existence and importance of displacement. Many local governments are responding to the critical nature of affordable housing by creating and implementing affordable housing plans that focus on displacement. In some places these are updates of longer-standing efforts, but in other places, the commitment of municipal time and resources on affordable housing is new and a response to the contemporary housing crisis. Cities like Kansas City, Charlotte, Seattle, and Minneapolis, to name just a few, have housing affordability policies or plans.⁴⁹ Austin, TX created an anti-displacement task force in 2017 to address displacement in “a comprehensive, broad, and systematic, intentional manner.”⁵⁰ Atlanta, Georgia created an “anti-displacement tax fund” program in 2017 to help homeowners facing rapidly rising property tax bills. Alameda County, California (Oakland) has an “anti-displacement crisis intervention program.” The City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin created an anti-displacement plan in 2018.⁵¹ The City of Boston, Massachusetts created an Office of Housing Stability in 2016 to research the impacts of displacement, assist tenants in danger of displacement, and to generate new policies to prevent displacement in the city. The City of San Francisco, California has organized a “Community Stabilization Strategy” to coordinate efforts across agencies to mitigate and prevent displacement of vulnerable populations.⁵² Officials in 10 cities are participating in local collaborations that make up the national “Anti-Displacement Policy Network.” This is an

⁴⁸ Freeman and Braconi, “Gentrification and Displacement”, p. 50; Wylie et al, “Displacing New York”, p. 2603.

⁴⁹ “A Housing Policy for Kansas City – 2018”, <http://kcmo.gov/neighborhoods/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2018/08/FiveYearHousingPolicyDraft.pdf>; *Housing Charlotte: A Framework for Building and Expanding Access to Opportunity Through Housing Investments*, <https://www.charlottenc.gov/HNS/Housing/Strategy/Documents/Housing%20Charlotte%20Framework.pdf>; Dan Shafer, n.d. “Next Step in Seattle’s Affordable Housing Plan Includes 6,000 Rent-Restricted Homes” *Seattle Business*, <https://www.seattlebusinessmag.com/policy/next-step-seattles-affordable-housing-plan-includes-6000-rent-restricted-homes>; “Amended and Restated Unified Housing Policy of the City of Minneapolis (December 7, 2018)”, http://www.minneapolismn.gov/cped/housing/cped_affordable_housing_resolution.

⁵⁰ City of Austin, Texas, Resolution No. 20170817-053. <http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=282905>.

⁵¹ City of Milwaukee, 2018. “A Place in the Neighborhood.” <https://city.milwaukee.gov/ImageLibrary/Groups/cityDCD/planning/plans/AntiDisplacement/Anti-DisplacementPlan.pdf>.

⁵² <https://sf-planning.org/community-stabilization-strategy>.

initiative spearheaded by PolicyLink, a national research and action institute that has focused on gentrification, displacement, and equitable urban development since 1999.⁵³ The City of New York's affordable housing efforts and its anti-displacement plan, as is discussed below (pages 18-21) are in line with what many other cities are doing nationwide.

Universities, too, are recognizing the importance of affordable housing and displacement, and have become engaged in these issues in a number of ways. To cite just three examples, The University of Texas Community and Regional Planning Program and the School of Law collaborated on a project on displacement in Austin's gentrifying neighborhoods.⁵⁴ The University of California Berkeley, the University of California, Los Angeles, and Portland State University have created "The Urban Displacement Project." The project aims to conduct research to understand and describe the nature of gentrification and displacement, and to generate knowledge on how policy interventions and investment can mitigate problems of displacement and lead to more equitable development patterns.⁵⁵ New York University's Furman Center has issued a report on efforts to maintain diversity that highlights strategies used by local governments to address displacement of low-income households.⁵⁶

The fear of displacement is widely felt by those who live and work in American cities, including New York City.

Organizations in New York City and elsewhere are organizing in response to displacement.

This movement has been spurred by the fear of displacement in the face of extreme housing affordability problems. Some of the New York City groups have been concerned about displacement for decades. The first community plan in New York City, the Coopers Square Alternate Plan was completed in 1961 in response to a redevelopment scheme that would have displaced over 6,000 low-income residents.⁵⁷ In the 1990s, residents of the Melrose Community in the Bronx produced the "We Stay! ¡Nos Quedemos!" Plan in response to a redevelopment initiative that would have displaced low-income residents in that community. More recent community activism against displacement is focused directly on concerns

⁵³ PolicyLink, 2018. "All-In Cities Anti-Displacement Policy Network",

http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/ADPNsummary-2pgr_07-02-18.pdf.

⁵⁴ Heather Way, Elizabeth Mueller, and Jake Wegmann, 2018. *Uprooted: Residential Displacement in Austin's Gentrifying Neighborhoods and What Can Be Done About It*. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin Center for Sustainable Development, and the Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic, University of Texas School of Law.

⁵⁵ "Urban Displacement Project Executive Summary," December 2015,

http://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/urban_displacement_project_-_executive_summary.pdf.

⁵⁶ NYU Furman Center, 2016. *Gentrification Response: A Survey of Strategies to Maintain Neighborhood Economic Diversity*, New York: NYU School of Law and Wagner School of Public Service,

<http://furmancenter.org/research/publication/gentrification-responses-a-survey-of-strategies-to-maintain-neighborhood-ec>.

⁵⁷ Roberta Gold, 2014. *When Tenants Claimed the City: The Struggle for Citizenship in New York City Housing*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. See chapter 5.

stemming from development taking place as a result of rezoning. Groups in Inwood,⁵⁸ Brooklyn's East New York neighborhood,⁵⁹ and throughout other parts of the City⁶⁰ are organizing to resist displacement in their communities. The Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development (ANHD), a citywide coalition of community development organizations, created an Anti-Displacement Policy Toolkit as a resource to all groups in New York City to "help build the capacity of all those engaged in NYC's planning process with tools we can employ as part of our collective work to end displacement."⁶¹ What unites these organizations in New York City is the desire to see development without displacement, to see their low-income communities, typically communities of color, remain hospitable to lower-income residents, and to see that lower-income households who have lived in disadvantaged neighborhoods for long periods of time are able to remain in those neighborhoods once upgrading and improvement begin in earnest.

The high levels of activism in New York City's neighborhoods are evidence of the real fear of displacement that exists. Given the city's affordable housing crisis, a large number of New Yorkers consider themselves at risk for displacement. A 2016 survey by NY1-Baruch College found that "almost two-thirds of New Yorkers said they believe they're at risk of being priced out of their neighborhood in the next few years, with 65 percent calling it very or somewhat likely."⁶² This fear was most widespread among lower-income respondents, but it extended even to people earning more than \$100,000 (53% of those with incomes over \$100,000 felt it was likely that they would be price-displaced in the near future).⁶³ Research on gentrification in New York City demonstrated fear even among those who were economically insulated from displacement.⁶⁴ A 2006 survey of people who moved away from New York City found that 64% blamed high housing costs as a major concern.⁶⁵

The fear of losing home and community has triggered collaborative efforts by community based groups against displacement in cities across the country. Several national efforts have been formed to address displacement in diverse settings. For example, the "Right to the City Alliance" was formed in 2007 to address the question of displacement in American cities. The

⁵⁸ <http://amsterdamnews.com/news/2018/jul/26/inwood-organizers-rally-against-rezoning-city-hall/>; <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/not-your-typical-block-party-in-a-gentrifying-nyc-neighborhood>.

⁵⁹ <https://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/brooklyn/protests-planned-east-new-york-rezoning-plan-article-1.2598517>.

⁶⁰ <https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/city-hall/story/2015/11/community-boards-grapple-with-de-blasios-housing-plans-028174>; <https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/city-hall/story/2017/04/24/amidst-community-opposition-and-political-complications-city-hall-slows-rezonings-111440>.

⁶¹ <https://www.antidisplacementtoolkit.org/>. See also the work of Fifth Avenue Committee in Brooklyn, <http://www.fifthave.org>. *Causa Justa/Just Cause* works against displacement in Oakland, <https://cjcj.org/>.

⁶² <https://www.ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/politics/2016/02/24/city-poll--new-yorkers-worried-about-being-forced-out-of-their-homes>.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ Lance Freeman, 2011. *There Goes the 'Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

⁶⁵ Manny Fernandez, 2009. "As City Adds Housing for Poor, Market Subtracts It." *New York Times*, October 14, <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/15/nyregion/15housing.html>.

Alliance is an association of organizations and allies dedicated to analyzing and minimizing displacement of vulnerable populations in cities.⁶⁶ Reflecting the importance of the issue in New York City, there are more member organizations of this alliance in New York City than in any other U.S. city.

A second national effort in this area is the “All-In Cities Anti-Displacement Policy Network.” This is an initiative spear-headed by PolicyLink, a national research and action institute that has focused on gentrification, displacement, and equitable urban development since 1999.⁶⁷ The first cohort of the Anti-Displacement Policy Network is a group of 10 cities (Austin, TX; Boston, MA; Buffalo, NY; Denver, CO; Nashville, TN; Portland, OR; San Jose, CA; Santa Fe, NM; and the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN) who will work together over the next year on strategies to fight displacement.

Another national effort is SPARCC (the “Strong, Prosperous, and Resilient Communities Challenge”), a partnership of the Enterprise Community Foundation (a national nonprofit housing organization), the Natural Resources Defense Council, Capital for Healthy Families and Communities (a national community development financial institution also known as the Low Income Investment Fund), and the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.⁶⁸ SPARCC operates in Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, LA, Memphis, and the San Francisco Bay Area. The collaboration has identified displacement as a prominent element of its agenda, and it sponsored a national conference on displacement in December 2018. The “Grounded Solutions Network,” another nonprofit doing work on displacement, has produced a policy toolkit that deals with the problems of displacement and gentrification and the objectives of keeping residents in their homes.⁶⁹

Philanthropic foundations are supporting these national efforts. SPARCC, for example, is supported by several national foundations including the Ford Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the Kresge Foundation. The Anti-Displacement Policy Network is also supported by The Kresge Foundation, as well as by J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. Grounded Solutions is supported by Ford, Kresge, the Wells Fargo Housing Foundation, and The Heinz Endowments, among others.

Other organizations, created to pursue different or broader objectives, are also focusing on displacement. For example, the National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development and Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement, a group that has a general agenda of support to Asian and Pacific Islander communities, has also found it necessary in the past few years to focus on displacement. The group issued the *Asian American & Pacific Islander Anti*

⁶⁶ <https://righttothecity.org/>.

⁶⁷ PolicyLink *supra* note 53.

⁶⁸ <https://www.sparcchub.org/>.

⁶⁹ Robert Hickey, Zachary Murray, and Stephanie Reyes, n.d. *What About Housing? A Policy Toolkit for Inclusive Growth*, Grounded Solutions Network, <https://groundedsolutions.org/housing-policy-toolkit>.

Displacement Strategies Report in 2017.⁷⁰ Another example is the California Reinvestment Coalition which has pursued activism on the issue of the financing of displacement, and has put out an “Anti-displacement Code of Conduct” for banks and other real estate lenders to curb the investment practices that are contributing to displacement.⁷¹

There is a great deal of work being done fighting displacement at the neighborhood and city levels. Coalitions of neighborhood and community based organizations are organizing against displacement in cities from Los Angeles to Boston to Oakland to Portland, OR.⁷²

The fear of displacement among lower-income persons who know their vulnerability to market changes and redevelopment pressures is difficult to overemphasize. Protection of one’s home and community is a strong, unifying force in local politics. This desire for stability, the desire to maintain one’s community is strong even in places where middle class reformers think “community” does not exist. The best example of this is the widespread opposition to displacement staged by public housing residents all over the country from the mid-1990s through the first decade of this century.⁷³ Residents of public housing communities that had been depicted as “no-go zones” in the media, that had been written off by private sector investors and public officials, that were considered the most dysfunctional communities in America, stood up against the plans to demolish their communities. They organized themselves to make their own plans to improve their communities.⁷⁴ They attempted to alter the discourse about their communities,⁷⁵ and they mounted lawsuits to protect their communities and forestall their own displacement and forced relocation.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Lailan Huen, Michelle Kauhane, Robin Danner, and Jeff Gilbreath, n.d. *Asian American & Pacific Islander Anti-Displacement Strategies*, National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development & Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement, http://www.nationalcapacd.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/anti_displacement_strategies_report.pdf.

⁷¹ <http://calreinvest.org/campaigns/>.

⁷² In Los Angeles <http://www.cesinaction.org/IssuesActivities/RentControlAntiDisplacement.aspx>; City Life Vida Urbana is a Boston group that does anti-displacement organizing. <http://www.clvu.org>. In Portland, Oregon “Living Cully” is a local coalition of groups working on displacement issues in Portland’s Cully Neighborhood, <http://www.livingcully.org/programs/normandy/>. In Oakland a variety of groups have formed an anti-displacement network and sponsored forums and policy proposals. See, <https://www.meetup.com/People-of-Color-Sustainable-Housing-Network/events/226019382/>.

⁷³ Edward G. Goetz, 2016. “Resistance to the Transformation of Social Housing.” *Cities* 57: 1-5. See also Amy Howard, 2014. *More than Shelter: Activism and Community in San Francisco Public Housing*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; and, John Arena, 2012. *Driven from New Orleans: How Nonprofits Betray Public Housing and Promote Privatization*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

⁷⁴ Antonio Raciti, Katherine A. Lambert-Pennington, and Kenneth M. Reardon, 2016. “The Struggle for the Future of Public Housing in Memphis, Tennessee: Reflections on HUD’s Choice Neighborhoods Planning Program.” *Cities* 57 (1): 6-13.

⁷⁵ Right to the City Alliance, 2010. “We Call These Projects Home: Solving the Housing Crisis from the Ground Up.” https://righttothecity.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/We_Call_These_Projects_Home-2.pdf; and, Edward G. Goetz, 2013. “The Audacity of HOPE VI: Discourse and the Dismantling of Public Housing.” *Cities* 35: 342-348.

⁷⁶ See, e.g., Patricia A. Wright, with Richard M. Wheelock and Carol Steele, 2006. “The Case of Cabrini-Green,” in Larry Bennett, Janet L. Smith, and Patricia A. Wright (eds.) *Where Are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, chapter 6, pp. 168-184; *Henry Horner Mother’s Guild v. Chicago Housing Authority*, 824 F. Supp. 810 (N.D. Ill. 1993); and, *Edwards v. District of Columbia*, 628 F. Supp. 333 (D.D.C.

The desire to protect community among lower-income households in disadvantaged neighborhoods, moreover, is fundamentally different than what is seen in exclusive white neighborhoods. The anti-displacement efforts described in this section are not exclusionary in their objectives, they are instead driven by the desire of people with limited means to remain in their neighborhoods in order to maintain social networks and support systems and to avoid the considerable disruption of dislocation. Thus, rather than an attempt to hoard resources and deprive others access to resources, community protection in lower-income neighborhoods is a form of solidarity in the face of injustice. It is an attempt to hold on in neighborhoods that, in some cases, are receiving significant investment and improving conditions after years and years of neglect and decline.

The fear of displacement, moreover, can produce a “puzzle” in which residents of neighborhoods that have long suffered from lack of investment oppose new development. Residents of such neighborhoods see new development as both increasing displacement pressure and “also as *unwelcomeness* in which residents are excluded from new development and as a result become resistant towards it.”⁷⁷

Displacement has adverse impacts on households and individuals.

Displacement is a public policy problem for a number of reasons, but especially because of its adverse impacts on people. A great deal of research has documented a number of problematic outcomes for persons experiencing displacement. The earliest research on displacement focused on the negative mental health impacts of losing one’s home and community.⁷⁸ Public health psychiatrist Prof. Mindy Fullilove has named the phenomenon, “root shock.” Root shock, according to Fullilove, is a traumatic stress reaction to the destruction of all or part of one’s emotional ecosystem.⁷⁹ This trauma “undermines trust, increases anxiety, destabilizes relationships and destroys social, emotional, and financial resources.”⁸⁰ Other researchers conceptualize the issue slightly differently, using sociologist Anthony Giddens’ notion of “ontological security.” Ontological security refers to the sense of psychological well-being and stability that derives from continuity in one’s place in the world.⁸¹ Ontological security provides a sense of stability and order regarding the events of one’s life. Researchers have found that gentrification and displacement can interrupt that stability by introducing insecurity of housing

1985), *Concerned Tenants Association of Father Panik Village v. Pierce*, 685 F. Supp. 316 (D.C. Conn. 1988), and *Tinsley v. Kemp*, 750 f. Supp. 1001 (W.D. Mo. 1990) all on the issue of *de facto* demolition (see the discussion in Edward G. Goetz, 2013 *New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 53-60).

⁷⁷ Stephen Danley and Rasheda Weaver, 2018. “‘They’re Not Building It for Us’: Displacement Pressure, Unwelcomeness, and Protesting Neighborhood Investment.” *Societies*, 8, 74; doi:10.3390/soc8030074. Emphasis in original.

⁷⁸ Fried, “Grieving for a Lost Home.”

⁷⁹ Fullilove, *Root Shock*, page 11.

⁸⁰ Fullilove, *Root Shock*, page 14.

⁸¹ Anthony Giddens, 1991. *Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

tenure. Atkinson et al.'s study of persons displaced by gentrification, for example, uncovered "a palpable sense of fear and anxiety that [displaced households] would be dislodged a second or third time from their home,"⁸² a pattern that has been documented by research.⁸³ Loss of connection to one's home can "bring about fragmentation of routines, or relationships, and of expectations" about one's life.⁸⁴ The loss of home has also been shown to be "a significant crisis that can precipitate suicide."⁸⁵ In short, displacement can trigger strong emotional and psychological distress. As one researcher found in a study of displacement in Boston, "[T]he experience of residential relocation was a powerful source of distress even among those whose attachments to the ... area were marginal."⁸⁶

While many families choose to move to different neighborhoods and can benefit from their mobility, other families prefer to remain in neighborhoods they have come to identify with. "Place attachments reflect the behavioural, cognitive and emotional embeddedness that individuals experience" in their environments.⁸⁷ These attachments play a role in self-definition and self-image, and they can also be social in nature, helping to build community bonds and cohesion. Research has shown that such attachments are not exclusionary in nature, that they are developed even in neighborhoods that are quite diverse.⁸⁸ Studies have shown that strong attachment to place is a "characteristics feature of life" in many poor and working class communities.⁸⁹ Lower-income residents displaced from their homes and communities can suffer by sacrificing their place attachment.

Research has shown that displaced persons lose their connections to social networks and support systems. Informal systems of support are especially important for low-income people who substitute favors and reciprocal assistance for the kinds of goods and services that others purchase on the market.⁹⁰ Thus, informal exchanges of childcare, transportation, and other daily routines are not simply matters of friendship and relationships, but in fact constitute

⁸² Rowland Atkinson, Maryann Wulff, Margaret Reynolds, and Angela Spinney, 2011, *Gentrification and Displacement: The Household Impacts of Neighbourhood Change*. Final report for the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, p. 3.

⁸³ Hartman, "Housing of Relocated Families."

⁸⁴ Fried, "Grieving for a Lost Home."

⁸⁵ Katherine A. Fowler, Matthew Gladden, Kevin Vagi, Jamar Barnes, and Leroy Frazier. 2015. "Increase in Suicides Associated With Home Eviction and Foreclosure During the US Housing Crisis: Findings From 16 National Violent Death Reporting System States, 2005–2010" *American Journal of Public Health* 105(2-February): pp. 311-316. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.301945

⁸⁶ Marc Fried, 2000. "Continuities and Discontinuities of Place." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20 (3): 193-205, p. 196.

⁸⁷ Lynne C. Manzo, Rachel G. Kleit, and Dawn Couch, 2008. "'Moving Three Times is Like Having Your House on Fire Once': The Experience of Place and Impending Displacement among Public Housing Residents." *Urban Studies* 45 (9): 1855-1878, p. 1860.

⁸⁸ Robert L. Rubinstein and Patricia A. Parmelee, 1992. "Attachment to Place and the Representation of the Life Course by the Elderly," in Irwin Altman and Setha M. Low (eds.) *Place Attachment*, New York: Plenum Press, chapter 7, pp 139-164; Manzo et al., "Moving Three Times."

⁸⁹ Fried, "Continuities and Discontinuities."

⁹⁰ See, e.g., Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.

strategies of survival and getting-by for people of limited means. These reciprocal relationships are built up over time as trust and experiences are built with neighbors and acquaintances who live nearby. Displacement means the interruption of these relationships and the destruction of these critical supportive ties. The loss of social supports and relationship ties resulting from displacement is, according to Fried, “the single most potent factor in explaining the widespread sense of loss as well as the variations in post-relocation adaptation.”⁹¹

The loss of social networks and networks of support is one of the more consistent findings from the literature on public housing displacement. Studies document the loss of social ties, the isolation of youth and adults in their new neighborhoods, and the loss of access to “useful social resources.”⁹²

Most studies linking physical health and displacement have focused on displacement resulting from natural disasters, violent conflicts, or large scale economic upheavals such as the foreclosure crisis. While these studies frequently document a link, there has been little work done connecting gentrification-led displacement and health. One study has shown that gentrification was associated with higher rates of preterm birth for non-Hispanic Blacks, an effect that was absent among non-Hispanic Whites.⁹³ Another study of low-income families displaced through the federal HOPE VI public housing redevelopment program concluded that displacement was likely to imperil the health of displacees.⁹⁴

Studies have shown that displacement can lead to problematic outcomes in employment and school, reducing employment instability and forcing children to switch schools (school instability having been shown to be detrimental to achievement).⁹⁵ Forced displacement has also been shown to frequently result in homelessness.⁹⁶

⁹¹ Fried, “Continuities and Discontinuities,” p. 196.

⁹² See, e.g., Becky Petit, 2004. “Moving and Children’s Social Connections: Neighborhood Context and the Consequences of Moving for Low-income Families.” *Sociological Forum* 19 (2): 285-311; Susan Clampet-Lundquist, 2004. “Moving Over or Moving Up? Short-term Gains and Losses for Relocated HOPE VI Families.” *Cityscape: Journal of Policy Development and Research* 7 (1): 57-80; Susan Clampet-Lundquist, 2007. “No More ‘Bois Ball: The Effect of Relocation from Public Housing on Adolescents.” *Journal of Adolescent Research* 22 (3): 298-323; Rachel Kleit and Lynn Manzo, 2006. “To Move or Not to Move: Relationships to Place and Relocation Choices in HOPE VI.” *Housing Policy Debate* 17(2): 271-308; Edward G. Goetz, 2003. *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America*, Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

⁹³ Mary Huynh and A. R. Maroko, 2014. “Gentrification and Preterm Birth in New York City, 2008–2010.” *Journal of Urban Health* 91 (1): 211-220.

⁹⁴ Danya E. Keene and Arline T. Geronimus. 2011. “Weathering” HOPE VI: The Importance of Evaluating the Population Health Impact of Public Housing Demolition and Displacement.” *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 88 (3): 417-435.

⁹⁵ Russell W. Rumberger, 2003. “The Causes and Consequences of Student Mobility.” *Journal of Negro Education* 72(1): 6-21; Sheila Crowley, 2003. “The Affordable Housing Crisis: Residential Mobility of Poor Families and School Mobility of Poor Children.” *Journal of Negro Education* 72(1): 22-38.

⁹⁶ Martha R. Burt 2001. “Homeless Families, Singles, and Others: Findings from the 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients.” *Housing Policy Debate* 12(4):737–80.

While it used to be the case that displaced households would frequently move only short distances,⁹⁷ contemporary displacement is likely to force households out of cities entirely and into peripheries of urban areas.⁹⁸ There is evidence from New York City that displaced households are typically older than other poor households, “more likely to crowd into larger households and to devote greater shares of their income to housing.”⁹⁹

To the extent that displacement results in a family losing an affordable unit, then the family is deprived of the benefits that housing affordability provides. These benefits include greater school stability and performance for children and job stability for adults, health benefits for children, and reduced stress and psychological strain among adults, and of course increased economic security.¹⁰⁰

The adverse impacts on individuals and families summarized in this section are what make a community preference policy important in any circumstance that might produce displacement, whether it be the actions of landlords and developers in the housing market, or public officials pursuing other development objectives, or natural events.

New York City has a housing plan that addresses many aspects of the affordable housing crisis.

Researchers group anti-displacement policies into four categories, a) preservation of existing affordable housing, b) production of new affordable housing, c) tenant rights and protections, and d) asset-building for low-income residents.¹⁰¹ New York City’s approach to the affordable housing and displacement crisis focuses on the first three of these. In this, the City is like many other local governments that take a variety of policy approaches to minimizing displacement. This reflects a common understanding that fighting displacement and creating/preserving affordable housing requires a multi-pronged policy approach. The Austin, Texas task force on displacement, for example, recommended 10 major policy initiatives with a number of specific program recommendations under each.¹⁰² The Urban Displacement Project lists 14 separate

⁹⁷ Richard T. LeGates and Chester Hartman, 1982. “Gentrification-Caused Displacement.” *The Urban Lawyer* 14 (1): 31-55.

⁹⁸ Atkinson et al., *Gentrification and Displacement*.

⁹⁹ Wyly et al., “Displacing New York”, p. 2616.

¹⁰⁰ See the review of multiple studies documenting these benefits in Edward G. Goetz, 2018. *The One-Way Street of Integration: Fair Housing and the Pursuit of Racial Justice in American cities*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 46-47.

¹⁰¹ Mitchell Crispell, Karolina Gorska, Miriam Zuk, Karen Chapple, Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris, Silvia R. Gonzalez, and Somaya Abdelgany, 2017. “Chapter 5: Anti-Displacement Policy Analysis.” In *Developing a New Methodology for Analyzing Potential Displacement*. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/apr/past/13-310.pdf>.

¹⁰² Anti-Displacement Task Force Draft Recommendations, 2018. Austin, TX.

http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Housing/Anti-Displacement_Task_Force_Draft_Report_10.10.18.pdf.

policies in its toolkit and 30 programs in its report.¹⁰³ The Milwaukee Anti-Displacement Plan includes 19 recommendations in seven strategy areas.

New York City's *Housing New York* plan, and its update (*Housing New York 2.0*), together constitute the most ambitious municipal-level affordable housing effort that exists in the U.S. As described in three documents,¹⁰⁴ the City is pursuing a wide variety of approaches aimed at preserving existing affordable housing and creating new affordable housing with the intention of easing the housing crisis and reducing the level of housing insecurity among low- and moderate-income New Yorkers. The plan is to build or preserve 300,000 units of affordable housing between 2014 and 2026, "enough housing for the entire population of Boston, Massachusetts" as the City's plan notes.¹⁰⁵ The Plan envisions that 60% of the unit count will come from preservation and 40% from new construction. The Plan is estimated to require more than \$83 billion in combined public and private financing.¹⁰⁶

The preservation of existing affordable housing through various means is one leg of the City's housing plan. Preservation initiatives are aimed at rent regulated apartments, publicly-subsidized buildings, and privately-owned units. Extending affordability requirements in existing subsidized and regulated units is a major component of preservation efforts. The refinancing of Mitchell-Lama units and the "Year 15" program to preserve and extend the affordability of Low Income Housing Tax Credit units are examples. Loans and tax incentives to rehabilitate, operate, and maintain properties at affordable levels, and enhanced code enforcement is being pursued to ensure livability of occupied rental housing units. The City's support of Community Land Trusts to provide a model in which homeowners are shielded from the pressures of rapidly rising land costs, and the energy retrofit program designed to provide assistance to owners and owner-occupants in reducing energy costs are examples. Foreclosure prevention is another way the City is attempting to preserve affordable housing.

The construction of new affordable housing is the second leg of the plan. There is a wide range of approaches being used to create new affordable housing, from the identification and preparation of land and building sites, to the reform of zoning regulations to enhance affordability, to identifying financing for development.

Development site identification, the "Housing+" program to develop on under-utilized land, and brownfield clean-up are all being pursued to free up more sites for potential affordable housing development. The City passed "Zoning for Quality and Affordability" (ZQA) in 2016 which modifies zoning regulations to encourage greater rates of affordable housing development. ZQA reforms to facilitate greater affordable housing development include reducing parking

¹⁰³ The toolkit is at: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/policy-tools/la#section-158>. The report of anti-displacement policy is Crispell et al., "Chapter 5: Anti-Displacement Policy Analysis."

¹⁰⁴ The information in this section comes from three City of New York sources; *Housing New York*; *Housing New York 2.0*; and, *Appendix 7 – Anti-Displacement Plan* from the City of New York's 2018 Annual Action Plan.

¹⁰⁵ *Housing New York 2.0*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁶ J. David Goodman, 2018. "Despite Headwinds, de Blasio's Housing Plan Moves Forward as Costs Rise." *New York Times*, July 19. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/19/nyregion/mayor-de-blasio-housing-costs.html>.

requirements for developments in areas well-served by transit, adjusting height and setback guidelines to allow for greater density and reduce per-unit costs. Similarly, the City's Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) program, also introduced in 2016, is designed to boost the development of new permanent affordable housing. MIH and the City's voluntary inclusionary housing program, which offers more tailored density bonuses, are programs that couple private, market-rate development with the creation of new permanent affordable housing.

The City has a range of initiatives in place to assist developers in getting the financing necessary to develop new affordable housing. The City plan details City financing programs for affordable housing, the use of tax exempt bonding, the recycling of bonds, expanding the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program, the use of New Market Tax Credits, and the engagement of pension funds and philanthropic sources to increase the amount of capital going to affordable housing development.

The third leg of the City's approach is to increase tenant rights and protections. Here the City is pursuing a set of strategies that are aimed at supporting tenants in their efforts to remain in affordable units. The City has, for example, created a Tenant Harassment Task Force as a resource for tenants, and is supporting tenant awareness and tenants' rights efforts, legal assistance for residents facing the loss of their homes, mediation to help protect tenants, and emergency rental assistance for households facing the loss of housing. The City's "Partners in Preservation" program works with local neighborhood organizations "to develop tailored, comprehensive anti-displacement strategies. The goal of the initiative is to deploy all of the tools at the City's disposal to aggressively combat harassment and disrepair, protect tenants, and preserve affordability."¹⁰⁷ Relocation assistance and case management for those who have lost housing is also offered by the City.

Community Preference is a unique tool in New York City's affordable housing and anti-displacement plan. In a city where 10,000 to 18,000 displacements occur each year, a range of tools to create and preserve affordable housing is necessary to have an impact. The Community Preference policy, which is primarily applied in New Construction projects, is one part of the City's multi-dimensional approach.

The Community Preference policy is unique and important for several reasons. It differs from other approaches in the City's three-pronged strategy (preservation/new construction/tenant support) in important ways. It is the only portion of the City's *new construction* effort that directly prevents displacement. Other policy initiatives aimed at the creation of new affordable housing *may* preserve affordability for incumbent residents (either by reducing demand pressure on existing affordable units or by becoming occupied by a community resident). The Community Preference policy, however, directly preserves affordability by reserving a portion of units for income-qualified neighborhood residents. It is thus *new construction* and *direct preservation* at the same time. Unlike the City's other *housing preservation* efforts which target units, the Community Preference policy is directed towards households and ensures that

¹⁰⁷ City of New York, "Appendix 7 – Housing Displacement Plan," p. 7-2.

residents who wish to remain in their communities can do so. Finally, unlike the *tenant rights and protections* efforts that support tenants who are facing immediate displacement pressures, the Community Preference policy is not a crisis intervention but rather prevents a displacement prior to the crisis stage sparing households the considerable anxiety of fighting their displacement.

Community Preference is also unique in that it serves to mollify fear of displacement among neighborhood residents. Resistance to new housing development, even affordable housing, is strong in New York City neighborhoods because residents fear that such development will ultimately lead to their displacement. This is a dynamic that is not unique to New York City.¹⁰⁸ Community Preference, by demonstrating to neighborhood residents that the City is offering means of avoiding displacement and remaining in the community and in affordable housing, can help to reduce resistance to affordable housing development.¹⁰⁹ This allows the City to get more affordable housing built and get it built more quickly.

The City has designed a patchwork quilt of interventions that are directed at different stages of the housing process, that incentivize different actors in the process, and that apply to different obstacles that exist to solving the housing affordability problems for low- and moderate-income New Yorkers. The Community Preference policy is an important and unique element of that overall strategy.

Conclusion

“Displacement is the problem the 21st Century must solve.”¹¹⁰ The City of New York, like many cities across the country, is in the middle of a significant affordable housing crisis. In New York City the crisis is characterized by rapidly rising housing costs and an insufficient supply of lower cost housing affordable to persons with low to moderate incomes. Rising rents and home costs are forcing people out of their homes and neighborhoods. Thousands of New Yorkers are displaced every year because of the housing market in the City. The fear of displacement is reasonable for residents with limited incomes who are watching the changes taking place in the City around them. Displacement and the fear of displacement among lower-income households is taking place in cities across the country. Local governments, philanthropic organizations, University and research centers, and community-based organizations have all recognized the centrality of displacement in America’s cities by focusing their efforts on understanding and responding to the problem. While researchers may disagree about the precise estimates of the rate of displacement taking place, or its role in gentrifying neighborhoods, there is consensus that displacement is occurring and that it requires a public policy response. Displacement adversely affects individual households in numerous ways. Public policy can and should mitigate the impact of displacement and limit its scope. As part of

¹⁰⁸ See, e.g., Danley and Weaver, “They’re Not Building It for Us.”

¹⁰⁹ Benjamin Dulchin, 2016. “NIMBY, or Not? What’s Going on in New York City.” *Shelterforce*, October 6, <https://shelterforce.org/2016/10/06/nimby-or-not-whats-going-on-in-new-york-city/>.

¹¹⁰ Fullilove, *Root Shock*.

a large and multi-faceted plan to address the affordable housing crisis, the City of New York's Community Preference policy operates in ways that are distinct from the City's other programs. The Community Preference policy is the only policy the City operates that combines the direct prevention of displacement with the creation of new affordable housing, targets households rather than units, and works prior to the crisis-intervention stage. Thus, the program is aimed at addressing the fear of displacement that is so widespread among city residents by providing them with greater opportunities to remain in their communities.

The City has a legitimate government interest in preventing and minimizing the displacement that is occurring throughout the city as a result of rapidly rising housing costs and neighborhood change. Such a policy minimizes the disruption to the lives of residents who wish to remain in their communities and to benefit from the increased investment and neighborhood improvements that are occurring.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Edward Goetz". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the text "Respectfully submitted,".

Edward G. Goetz, Ph.D.
February 13, 2019
Minneapolis, MN

Appendix

CURRICULUM VITAE

EDWARD G. GOETZ

Humphrey School of Public Affairs
&
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota
301 – 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 624-8737

EDUCATION

Ph. D., Political Science, Northwestern University; 1987.
M.A., Political Science, Northwestern University; 1981.
B.A., Political Science, University of California, Riverside; 1979.

Ph. D. Dissertation: "Political Design in American Urban Politics: A Look at Community Access and State Conflict-Management."
M.A. Thesis: "The Political Economy of the Ghetto, Reconsidered."

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

2003 - present; Professor, University of Minnesota, Humphrey School of Public Affairs.
1999 - 2003; Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, Humphrey School of Public Affairs.
1993 - 1999; Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, Department of Design, Housing & Apparel.
1988 - 1993; Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota, Department of DHA.
1988 - 1990; Adjunct Faculty, Humphrey School of Public Affairs.

OTHER ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

2009 – present; Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota.
2009 – 2017; Co-Director, University of Minnesota Metropolitan Consortium.
2014 – 2017; Director, Ph.D. program, Humphrey School, University of Minnesota.
2015; Visiting Scholar, *Laboratoire Mosaïques, Université Paris Ouest-Nanterre-La Défense*, Paris, France.
2015; Visiting Professor, School of Public Policy, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.
2006 – 2013; Chair, Urban and Regional Planning and Policy Area, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.
2004 – 2007; Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

1998 – 1999, 2002 – 2009; Director of Masters of Urban and Regional Planning Program, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.
1988 – 1991, 1999 – 2002; Research Fellow, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota.
2000 – 2001; Director, Urban Studies Program, University of Minnesota.
1997; Visiting Professor; Centre for Comparative Housing Research, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK.
1995 – 1998; Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Design, Housing, & Apparel, University of Minnesota.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Member, Urban Affairs Association, 1993-present.
Chair, Governing Board, Urban Affairs Association, 2007-2009
Vice Chair, Governing Board, 2006-2007.
Member, American Planning Association, 1999-present.
Member, Editorial Board, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 2007-present.
Member, Editorial Board, *Housing Policy Debate*, 2007-present.
Member, Editorial Board, *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 2014-present.
Member, Planning Accreditation Board, 2017-present.
Member of the Planning Accreditation Board's site visitor pool. Member of site visit teams for University of Oregon, University of Illinois-Chicago, University of Maryland, Rutgers University (Chair), and Hunter College, City University of New York (Chair). 2009-present.
Member, Advisory Committee, University of Iowa Public Policy Center, 2014-present.
Member, City of St. Paul Task Force on Poverty, 2017.
Guest Editor, *Cities* 57 (2016), Special issue on "Resistance to Social Housing Transformation."
Chair, Local Host Committee, 2017 Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs Association.
External reviewer for public policy centers at City University of Hong Kong; Wayne State University; University of Iowa; University of Missouri-Saint Louis; Center for Small Towns at University of Minnesota, Morris. 2010-2014.
Member, Steering Committee, Fair Housing Equity Assessment, Twin Cities, 2012-13.
Co-director, Evaluation Team for the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities' HUD Regional Sustainability Grant, 2010-2013.
Member, Technical Review Panel, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing & Transportation Affordability Index project, 2011-2012.
Member, Advisory Council of the Children, Youth and Family Consortium, University of Minnesota. 2010-2012.
Testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Financial Services on "The Administration's proposal to revitalize severely distressed public and assisted housing: The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative." March 17, 2010. Washington, D.C.

Testimony to the U. S. House of Representatives Financial Services Committee, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, on "Academic Perspectives on Public Housing." July 29, 2009. Washington, D.C.

Member, Editorial Board, *Encyclopedia of Housing, 2nd Edition*. Sage Publications, 2010.

Chair, Local Host Committee, 2010 Annual Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

Member, Editorial Board, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 2003-2009.

Co-President of the International Conference Committee for the *City Futures 2009* Conference, Madrid, Spain.

Member, Hennepin County/City of Minneapolis Commission to End Homelessness, 2004-05.

National Science Foundation, Graduate Research Fellowship Review Committee, Panel on Political Science, Geography, and Urban Planning, 2001 - 2002.

Member, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Roundtable on "Urban Issues in the 21st Century," April 2000.

Ramsey County Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee, 1999.

Coordinator, Housing Forum, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota, 1989 - 1990, and 1998 - present.

Minnesota Fair Housing Center Task Force, Minneapolis, 1997 - 1998.

Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities, Fiscal Impact Study Liaison Group, 1998 - 2001

Twin Cities Livable Communities Task Force, 1996 - 1997.

Executive Council, Research Committee on Housing and the Built Environment, International Sociological Association, 1995 - 1999.

Executive Council of the Urban Politics section of the American Political Science Association, 1995 - 1996.

Editor, Research Committee on Housing and the Built Environment newsletter, 1994 - 97.

Planning committee for "Project Urban Europe," Second Annual Upper Great Lakes Consortium for European Studies Conference, 1996.

University of Minnesota Faculty Advisory Group for Arden Hills Arsenal Cleanup and Conversion Project, 1995.

Advisory Board of "Linking Housing and Education" research grant, Institute on Race and Poverty, University of Minnesota, and the McKnight Foundation, 1995.

Chair, North Central Research Committee 54 (Housing) of the Agricultural Experiment Station, 1993.

President, Board of Directors, Central Community Housing Trust, Minneapolis, 1992-96.

Board of Directors, Central Community Housing Trust, Minneapolis, 1989 - 1997.

Board of Directors, Open Your Heart to the Hungry and Homeless, 1992 - 1994.

Reviewer for: Columbia University Press; Cornell University Press; Fairchild Books; Georgetown University Press; Oxford University Press; Public Policy Institute of California; State University of New York Press; Temple University Press; The Policy Press (Bristol, UK); University of Georgia Press; University of Minnesota Press; University of Toronto Press; University Press of Kansas; University of Illinois Press; *Administration and Society*; *American Sociological Review*; *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*; *Antipode*; *Applied Geography*; *British Journal of Sociology*; *Cities*; *City and Community*; *Cityscape*; *Demography*; *Economic Development*

Quarterly; Environment and Planning A; Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy; Home Cultures; Housing and Society Review; Housing Policy Debate; Housing Studies; Housing Theory and Society; International Journal of Housing Policy; International Journal of Urban and Regional Research; Journal of Urban History; Journal of the American Planning Association; Journal of Housing and the Built Environment; Journal of Planning Education and Research; Journal of Planning Literature; Journal of Policy Analysis and Management; Journal of Policy History; Journal of Urban Affairs; Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly; Planning Perspectives; PLOS ONE; Policy Studies Journal; Political Research Quarterly; Publius: The Journal of Federalism; Social Inclusion; Social Problems; Social Science Quarterly; Social Services Review; State and Local Government Review; Theory, Culture & Society; Urban Affairs Review; Urban Affairs Quarterly; Urban Geography; Urban Research and Practice; Urban Studies.

CONSULTING

City of New York, NY, *Noel et al. v. City of New York*, 2018-2019.
U.S. Department of Justice, *U.S. v. City of Joliet*, and *City of Joliet v. Mid-City National Bank and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*, 2011-2013.
Shriver Center on Poverty Law, *Henry Horner Mothers Guild, et al. v Chicago Housing Authority*, 2011-2012.
Shriver Center on Poverty Law, *Concerned Residents of ABLA v. Chicago Housing Authority*, 2006.
“Housing Minnesota” campaign, Minnesota Housing Partnership and the Jobs and Affordable Housing Campaign, 2001 - 2002.
City of Maple Grove, Minnesota, 2001 - 2002.
Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute for Government, State University of New York, 2000 - 2001.
Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1997 - 1998.
Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, 1996, 1997.
The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1993 - 1994.
The Bush Foundation, 1993 and 1996.
Single Room Occupancy Housing Corporation, Los Angeles, CA, 1990.
City of Omaha, Nebraska, 1989 - 1990.

HONORS AND AWARDS

The 2011 *Journal of Urban Affairs* Best Article Award for “Where have all the towers gone? The dismantling of public housing in U.S. Cities.” *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 33(3): 267-287
The 2010-11 Distinguished Teaching Award for Outstanding Contributions to Postbaccalaureate, Graduate and Professional Education, University of Minnesota.
“Paul Davidoff Book Award” from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, 2005 for *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America*, Urban Institute Press.
Winner, Scholarly Paper Competition for “Whither Fair Share? An examination of 25 years

of regional housing in the Twin Cities,” by E. G. Goetz, Karen Chapple, and Barbara Lukermann. October 2001.

Winner, *Housing Studies* Scholarly Paper Competition for “Forced vs. Voluntary Mobility Effects.” March, 2001.

The Central Community Housing Trust Appreciation Award, 1998.

University of Minnesota, College of Human Ecology “Excellence in Research” Award, 1997.

TEACHING

(University of Minnesota unless otherwise noted)

Undergraduate Instruction

Introduction to Urban Studies

Housing and Community

College of Liberal Arts Honors Seminar, Housing Discrimination

American Government, Northwestern University

Urban Politics and Social Services, Northwestern University

Urban Field Studies, Northwestern University

Graduate Instruction

Housing Policy

Urban Spatial and Social Dynamics

Global Cities

Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies and Theories

Economic Development

Managing Urban Growth and Change

Homelessness

Housing Discrimination

Survey Research

Research Methods

Regional Equity

Integration, Housing, and Racial Justice

Ph.D. supervision

(University of Minnesota unless otherwise noted)

As advisor

Tony Damiano, Humphrey School, in progress

Rachel Fang, Department of DHA, in progress

Yi Wang, Humphrey School, in progress

Rashad Williams, Humphrey School, in progress

Gregg Colburn, “The use of markets in social policy: Welfare recipients as market participants.” Humphrey School, 2017

Tasoulla Hadjiyanni, “Housing, refugee consciousness, and the meaning of lost places: The children of Cypriot refugees.” Department of DHA, 1999

Sandra Chris Hartje, “The impact of state lead policy on affordable rental housing in

Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota from 1991 to 1995.” Department of DHA, 1998

As committee member

Molly Calhoun, School of Social Work, in progress

Yunlei Qi, Humphrey School, in progress

Chen Zhang, Humphrey School, in progress

Cael Warren, Department of Applied Economics, in progress

Stephen Wulff, Department of Sociology, in progress

Andrew Guthrie, Humphrey School, 2018

Deborah Mitchell, Department of DHA, 2018

Ela Rausch, Department of DHA, 2017

Kate Ko, Department of Applied Economics, 2016

Clément Boisseuil, Sciences Po, Paris, France, 2016

Gordon Bijen, School of Social Sciences and Psychology, Western Sydney University, 2016

Revel Sims, Department of Urban Planning, University of California at Los Angeles, 2014

Andrew Greenlee, Department of Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois, Chicago, 2012

Machiko Norita, Department of Economics, 2011

Julie Barrows, Department of Sociology, 2010

Kimberly Skobba, Department of DHA, 2008

Thadeus Shio, Department of DHA, 2007

Terry Zborowski, Department of DHA, 2007

Yeontaek Ryu, Department of Geography, 2002

Hyunjeong Lee, Department of DHA, 2002

Deborah Martin, Department of Geography, 1999

Lois Cutler, Department of DHA, 1996

Elvin Wyly, Department of Geography, 1995

Daniel Hamel, Department of Geography, 1995

Yu Zhou, Department of Geography, 1995

Kerry Kmoto, Department of Geography, 1994

PUBLICATIONS

Books

Goetz, Edward G. (2018) *The One-way Street of Integration: Fair Housing and the Pursuit of Racial Justice in American Cities*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Goetz, Edward G. (2013) *New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Goetz, Edward G. (2003) *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Goetz, Edward G. (1993). *Shelter Burden: Local Politics and Progressive Housing Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Goetz, Edward G., and Susan E. Clarke (Eds.). (1993). *The New Localism: Comparative Urban Politics in a Global Era*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Chapters in Books (since 2009)

- Goetz, E.G. (2019) “The fair housing challenge to community development.” In *Furthering Fair Housing: Promises, Protests, and Prospects for Racial Justice in America’s Neighborhoods*, edited by Justin Steil, Lawrence J. Vale, and Nicholas Kelly. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Goetz, E.G. (2019) “The Right Target for Fair Housing Advocacy.” In *The Dream Revisited: Contemporary Debates about Housing, Segregation, and Opportunity*, edited by Ingrid Ellen Gould and Justin Steil. New York: Columbia University Press
- Chapple, K., and E.G. Goetz (2016) “Spatial justice through regionalism? The inside game, the outside game, and the quest for the spatial fix in the U.S.” In *Regional Equity*, edited by Victor Rubin. New York: Routledge.
- Goetz, Edward G. (2016) “Sustainable fair housing? Reconciling the spatial goals of fair housing and sustainable development in the Obama administration.” In *Urban Policy in the Time of Obama*, edited by James Defilippis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Goetz, E.G. (2016) Public Housing. In *Guide to Urban Politics and Policy*. Edited by Christine Palus and Richardson Dilworth. Sage Publications.
- Chapple, K., and E.G. Goetz (2013) “Spatial justice through regionalism? The inside game, the outside game, and the quest for the spatial fix in the U.S.” In *Segregation et Justice Spatiale*, sous le direction de S. Fol, S. Lehman-Frisch, et M. Morange. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Paris Ouest.
- Goetz E.G. (2013) “Housing dispersal programs.” In *The affordable housing reader*, edited by J. Rosie Tighe and Elizabeth J. Mueller. London: Routledge. Pp. 337-354.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) “Public housing redevelopment and the displacement of African-Americans.” In *Reinventing Race, Reinventing Racism*, edited by John Betancur and Cedric Herring. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Goetz, E.G. (2010) Going Nowhere: Fifty Years of Displacement and Relocation from Urban Renewal to HOPE VI. In *Intractable Democracy: 50 Years of Community-Based Planning*, edited by A. Venkataraman. New York, NY: Pratt Program for Sustainable Planning and Development.
- Goetz, E.G., and K. Chapple (2010) Dispersal as Anti-Poverty Policy. In *Critical Urban Studies: New Directions*, edited by J.S. Davies and D.L. Imbroscio. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Refereed Articles (since 2009)

- Goetz, E.G., A. Damiano, and R. Williams (2019) “Racially concentrated areas of affluence: A preliminary investigation.” *Cityscape* 21 (1).
- Newman, K., and E.G. Goetz (2016) “Reclaiming neighborhood from the inside out: Regionalism, globalism, and critical community development.” *Urban Geography* 37 (5): 685-699.

- Goetz, E.G. (2016) "From breaking down barriers to breaking up communities: The spatial strategies of fair housing advocacy." *Urban Affairs Review* 51 (6): 820-842.
- Skobba, K. and E.G. Goetz (2015) "Doubling up and the erosion of social capital among very low income households." *International Journal of Housing Policy* 15 (2): 127-147.
- Goetz, E.G. (2015) "The Fair Housing Tightrope in the Obama Administration: Balancing Competing Policy Objectives of Fair Housing and Locational Efficiency in Assisted Housing." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 37 (1): 53-56.
- Skobba, K., and E. G. Goetz (2013) "Mobility decisions of very low-income households." *Cityscape* 15 (2): 155-171.
- Goetz, E.G. (2013) "Too good to be true? The variable and contingent benefits of displacement and relocation among low-income public housing residents." *Housing Studies* 28(2): 235-252.
- Goetz, E.G. (2013) "The audacity of HOPE VI: Discourse and the dismantling of public housing." *Cities* 35: 342-348.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "The transformation of public housing policy, 1985-2011" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 78 (4): 452-463.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Obsolescence and the transformation of public housing communities in the U.S." *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12 (3): 331-345.
- Chapple, Karen, and E.G. Goetz (2011) "Spatial justice through regionalism? The inside game, the outside game, and the quest for the spatial fix in the United States." *Community Development* 42 (4): 458-475.
- Goetz, E.G. (2011) "'Where have all the towers gone?' The dismantling of public housing in U.S. Cities." *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 33(3): 267-287.
- Goetz, E.G. (2011) "Gentrification in Black and White: The racial impact of public housing demolition in American cities." *Urban Studies* 48 (8): 1581-1604.
- Allen, R., and E.G. Goetz (2010) "Nativity, Ethnicity and Residential Relocation: The Experience of Hmong Refugees and African-Americans Displaced from Public Housing." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 32 (3): 321-344.
- Goetz, E.G. (2010) "Better neighborhoods, better outcomes? Explaining relocation outcomes in HOPE VI." *Cityscape* 12 (1): 5-31.
- Goetz, E.G. (2010) "Desegregation in 3D: Displacement, dispersal, and development in American public housing." *Housing Studies* 25 (2):137-158.
- Goetz, E.G., and K. Chapple (2010) "'You Gotta Move': Advancing the debate on the record of dispersal." *Housing Policy Debate* 20 (2): 1-28.

Other Professional Publications (since 2009)

- Tighe, Rosie, and E. G. Goetz (2019) Comment on "Does the likely demographics of affordable housing justify NIMBYism?" *Housing Policy Debate*.
- Goetz, E.G. (2019) Comment on "Fairest of Them All," *Housing Policy Debate*. 29 (1): 106-107.
- Goetz, E.G., B. Lewis, A. Damiano, and M. Calhoun (2018) *The Diversity of Gentrification: Multiple Forms of Gentrification in Minneapolis and St. Paul*. Minneapolis: Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota.

- Goetz, E.G. (2016) "Resistance to the Transformation of Social Housing." *Cities* 57: 1-5.
- Goetz, E.G. (2015) "Poverty Pimping the CDCs: The Search for Dispersal's Next Bogyman." *Housing Policy Debate* 25 (3): 608-618.
- Goetz, E.G. (2015) "The Right Target for Fair Housing Advocacy" in NYU-Furman Center, *The Dream Revisited*, furmancenter.org/research/iri/goetz.
- Goetz, E.G. (2015) Review of *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth?* In *Journal of Urban Affairs*.
- Goetz, E.G. (2014) "The Smokescreen of Poverty Deconcentration." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 16 (2): 139-142.
- Goetz, E.G. (2014) Review of *Five Miles Away, a World Apart: One City, Two Schools, and the Story of Education Opportunity in Modern America*. In *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 34 (3): 357-358.
- Pattillo, Mary, Larry Bennett, Edward Goetz, Sudhir Venkatesh, Leonard Rubinowitz, and Molly Metzger (2012) "The Forecast for Lathrop." Op-ed published in *Skyline*, Chicago.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Slum Clearance" *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, Volume 6, 350-354. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "HOPE VI" *Encyclopedia of Housing, Second Edition*. Pages 303-306. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Linkage" *Encyclopedia of Housing, Second Edition*. Pages 427-430. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Skobba, Kim, and E. G. Goetz, (2012) "Housing Careers" *Encyclopedia of Housing, Second Edition*. Pages 342-344. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Goetz, E.G. and M. Orfield (2011) "Up for Discussion: Regionalism and Affordable Housing" *Journal of the Institute for Community Development*.
- Goetz, E.G. (2011) Review of *Public Housing and the Legacy of Segregation* by Margery Austin Turner, Susan J. Popkin, and Lynette Rawlings, *Urban Studies*. 48 (1): 215-217.
- Goetz, E.G., Kim Skobba, and Cynthia Yuen (2011) *The Impact of Subsidized Housing on Very Low-Income Families*. Report prepared for The McKnight Foundation.
- Goetz, E.G., and Kim Skobba (2010) "Housing careers of very low-income families." *CURA Reporter*.
- Goetz, E.G. (2010) Review of *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing* by D. Bradford Hunt, *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 76 (2): 252.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) *The Harbor View Hillside HOPE VI Revitalization Evaluation*. Submitted to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of Duluth. Minneapolis, University of Minneapolis, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.
- Goetz, E.G., Kate Ko, Aaron Hagar, Hoang Ton, and Jeff Matson (2009) *The Hiawatha Line: Impacts on Land Use and Residential Housing Value*. Minneapolis, MN: Transitway Impact Research Program, University of Minnesota.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) Review of *Public Housing That Worked: New York in the Twentieth Century* by Nicholas Dagen Bloom, *Social Service Review* 83 (3): 482-485.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) Review of *Neighborhood Choices: Section 8 Housing Vouchers and Residential Mobility* by David P. Varady and Carole C. Walker, *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, Vol. 18.

Goetz, E.G. (2009) Review of *Invisible City: Poverty, Housing and New Urbanism* by John I. Gilderbloom, *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 75 (3): 375.

Goetz, E.G. (2009) Review of *The Politics of Exclusion* by Michael Danielson, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 75 (2): 264-265.

Refereed Abstracts and Conference Papers (since 2009)

Goetz, E.G., and R. Williams (2018) ““Seeking closure: The closing of Lowry Grove manufactured home park and the loss of affordable housing in an ‘opportunity neighborhood.’” Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Buffalo, NY, October 25-28.

Ma, Luyao, Zhilin Liu, and Edward G. Goetz (2018) “A Panel Data Analysis of Cross-City Variance I Affordable Housing Construction in China During 2011-2015.” Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Buffalo, NY, October 25-28.

Goetz, E.G. (2017) “Defending Glendale: Public housing tenants’ resistance to RAD conversion.” Annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Denver, CO, October 12-15.

Lewis, Brittany, Edward G. Goetz, Molly Calhoun, and Tony Damiano (2017) “Gentrification debates: Identifying gentrification and its effects in Minneapolis – St. Paul.” Annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Denver, CO, October 12-15.

Goetz, E.G. (2017). “U.S. Planning in Historical Perspective.” International Association for China Planning, Dean’s Forum. June 16.

Goetz, E.G., and Brittany Lewis (2017) “More than mobility: Race, place, and regional equity.” Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs Association, Minneapolis, MN. April 19-22.

Damiano, Anthony, and Edward G. Goetz (2017) “Static neighborhood hierarchies or a great inversion? New evidence and implications for public policy.” Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs Association, Minneapolis, MN. April 19-22.

Lewis, Brittany, Molly Calhoun, Edward G. Goetz, and Anthony Damiano (2017) “Identifying gentrification: Do quantitative indices of gentrification match resident perceptions?” Annual Conference of the Urban Affairs Association, Minneapolis, MN. April 19-22.

Goetz, E.G. (2016) “The Housing Affordability Crisis in Global Cities.” Keynote address at the Asian Pacific Network for Housing Research conference, Guangzhou, China. December 16-19.

Goetz, E.G., and Tony Damiano (2016) “Exclusionism or Levelling? Explaining Rates of Affordable Housing Production in Suburban Communities.” Annual Meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Portland, OR. November 3-6.

Goetz, E.G. (2016) “The Exclusionary City: Problems of Housing Affordability in Contemporary Urbanization.” Keynote address at International Association for China Planning, Beijing, China, July 1-3.

- Goetz, E.G. (2016) "Gated communities: The U.S. perspective." International Association for China Planning, Beijing, July 1-3.
- Goetz, E.G. (2016) "Recent developments in the Fair Housing / Community Development debate." Annual Meeting of the Urban Affairs Association, San Diego, CA. March 19-21.
- Skobba, K., and E.G. Goetz (2015) "Moving stories: Reflections on community and social ties among public housing residents awaiting relocation." Annual Meeting of the Urban Affairs Association, Miami, FL. April 8-11.
- Goetz, E.G. (2015) "Implementation cost-reduction reforms in the building of affordable housing: A Twin Cities case study." Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute, University of Denver. Denver, CO. March 13-14.
- Goetz, E.G., Tony Damiano, and Jason Hicks (2015) "Racially concentrated areas of wealth in American metropolitan areas." Conference on Spatial Foundations of Inequality; Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY. February 11-12.
- Goetz, E.G. (2014) "Social housing redevelopment in France and the U.S.: Social mix vs. access." Presented at the City Futures Conference, Paris, France. June 17-19.
- Skobba, K., and E.G. Goetz (2014) "Negotiation and adaptation in securing housing among very low-income households." Annual Meeting of the Urban Affairs Association, San Antonio, TX. March 19-22.
- Goetz, E.G. (2013) "'Opportunity neighborhoods and regional equity: What role for community development?'" Annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Dublin, Ireland, July 16-19.
- Goetz, E.G., and K. Skobba (2013) "Housing and marginality in the American City: At home and on the move in the sub-market." Plenary Session Two of International Sociological Association, Research Committee 43 on Housing and the Built Environment, annual conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 10-12.
- Goetz, E.G. (2013) "Fair housing and sustainability in Obama's first term." Urban Affairs Association, San Francisco, CA. April 3-6.
- Skobba, K., and E. G. Goetz (2013) "Why do low income families move? Exploring the differing housing careers of assisted and unassisted households." Urban Affairs Association, San Francisco, CA. April 3-6.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Fair housing and place-based policy." Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Cincinnati, OH. October 31-November 2.
- Goetz, E.G., E. Shelton, L. Starling, and L. McGinnis (2012) "Developmental Evaluation of a Multi-Sector Initiative: Evaluating Sustainability and Transit Corridors." American Evaluation Association, Minneapolis, MN. October 24-27.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Neo-liberalizing Public Housing." Conference on Housing Welfare and Public Policy, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea. September 16-18.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Fair housing overreach." Urban Affairs Association, Pittsburgh, PA. April 18-21.
- Skobba, K., E.G. Goetz, and C. Yuen (2012) "Home for a while: The use of informal housing among low-income families." Urban Affairs Association, Pittsburgh, PA. April 18-21.
- Goetz, E.G. (2012) "Fair Housing and Deconcentration of Poverty." American Association of Geographers, New York, NY. February 16-21.

- Goetz, E.G. (2011) "Race-ing to demolition: Race and the decline of public housing." Annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Salt Lake City, UT, October 13-16.
- Goetz, E.G. (2011) "Race and redevelopment." Invited presentation at Symposium on Race and Community in the U.S. and U.K., University of Illinois, Chicago. June 13-14.
- Goetz, E.G. (2011) "Public Housing Transformation in the U.S." Invited presentation at International Symposium on Social and Affordable Housing Policy and Provision, Tsinghua University, Beijing. June 7-10.
- Goetz, E.G., and K. Skobba (2010) "Why low-income people move." Homes for All Conference, Saint Paul, MN. November 8.
- Goetz, E.G. (2010) "Displacement and relocation resulting from the demolition of public housing in the U.S.: Resident experiences." Conference on Neighbourhood Restructuring and Resident Relocation, Delft, The Netherlands. November 4 and 5.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) "Where have all the towers gone? The demolition of public housing in U.S. cities." Annual meeting of the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), Washington, DC, November 5-7.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) "Disparate racial impact of public housing demolition." Annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP), Washington, DC, October 1-4.
- Goetz, E.G. (2009) "Patterns of low-income displacement: Dismantling public housing in the U.S." City Futures '09 Conference, Madrid, Spain. June 4-6.
- Goetz, E.G., Kate Ko, and Aaron Hagar (2009) "Differential impact of the Hiawatha Light Rail Line on property values in Minneapolis." Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. January 12-16.

GRANTS - FUNDED

- Fulbright. "Social Mix Policies in France." \$16,000, Sept – Dec., 2015.
- MN Challenge. "Stretching Affordable Housing Resources through Better Local Government Practices." \$70,000, May, 2014. (Funders are McKnight Foundation and Minnesota Housing Finance Agency.)
- MN Challenge. "Stretching Affordable Housing Resources through Better Local Government Practices." \$10,000, March 2014. (Funders are McKnight Foundation and Minnesota Housing Finance Agency.)
- McKnight Foundation. "Performance Indicators for Sustainable Regional Development." Co-PI with Robert Johns, Center for Transportation Studies. \$50,000. September 2009.
- McKnight Foundation. "The Impacts of Affordable Housing Provision on Family Outcomes." \$87,000. December 2008.
- McKnight Foundation. "Charles R. Krusell Fellowship Endowment." \$610,000. November, 2007.
- McKnight Foundation. "EDGE II: A proposal to develop a program of planning support to communities on the metropolitan edge." Co-PI with Tom Scott, CURA. \$399,773. November, 2007.

- Center for Transportation Studies. "Economic Impacts of Light Rail: The Hiawatha Corridor." \$104,000. August 2007.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development/Duluth Housing and Redevelopment Authority. "Evaluation of Harbor View HOPE VI Project." \$90,000. March 2003.
- Family Housing Fund. "The affordable housing legacy of the Minnesota Land Use Planning Act of 1976." \$30,000. December 2000 – January 2001.
- Bush Faculty Development Program on Excellence and Diversity. "Using GIS technology in teaching and outreach related to community revitalization." \$3,000. With David Hollister. December 1999.
- Humphrey – Extension Outreach Program, Just in Time Research Grant. "The role of subsidized housing in building resilient communities." \$2,000. December 1999.
- Greater Minnesota Housing Fund. "Evaluation of the Greater Minnesota Housing Fund." \$43,000. With Barbara Lukermann. 1998.
- Family Housing Fund. "Evaluation of the implementation of the consent decree in *Hollman v. Cisneros*." \$257,378. 1998.
- Hennepin County/Minneapolis Public Housing Authority. "Evaluation of the Hennepin County/Minneapolis Public Housing Authority Social Service Pilot Project." \$78,000. 1996.
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (St. Paul) and St. Paul Companies. "Evaluation of the St. Paul 'Houses to Homes' program." \$14,500. 1996.
- University of Minnesota Graduate School Grant-in-Aid. "Collaborative research on residential segregation." \$1,349. 1996.
- Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization, U.S. Department of Education. "The impact of subsidized housing on neighborhood revitalization." \$23,000. 1994.
- College of Human Ecology Block Grant. "Household environmental risk factors and housing rehabilitation." \$11,500. With E. Franklin, D. Guerin, B. Yust, M. Bode, W. Olson. 1993.
- Minnesota Extension Service. "Household environmental risks: Outreach and service." \$8,000. With E. Franklin, D. Guerin, B. Yust, M. Bode, W. Olson. 1993.
- Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program. "Tenant screening and anti-crime techniques." \$1,889. With G. Rasmussen, L. Brandon. 1993.
- College of Human Ecology, Block Grant Funds. "An assessment of household environmental risk factors." \$6,000. With Denise Guerin and Becky Yust. August 15, 1992.
- City of Minneapolis Community Development Agency. "Evaluation of Project Self-Sufficiency." \$22,000. With Sharon Patten. July 1990.
- Project Future, Minnesota Extension Service. "Project Future project for study of housing in Sibley County, Minnesota." \$5,000. With Earl Morris. 1990.
- University of Minnesota Graduate School Grant-in-Aid Program. "Government housing initiatives in the post-federal era." \$9,350. June 1989.
- Rochester-Olmsted County Community Housing Partnership. "Housing needs assessment and market study for Olmsted County, Minnesota." \$37,500. With Barbara Lukermann. 1989.
- City of St. Paul Housing Information Office. "Evaluation of St. Paul Better Opportunities Through Self-Sufficiency Program." \$5,000. 1989.

SELECTED COMMUNITY OUTREACH & INVITED TALKS (since 2005)

- University of California, Berkeley, “The one-way street of integration: Pursuing racial justice in American cities.” November 9, 2018.
- PACE Center for Applied Housing Research, San Francisco State University. “Housing policy & the O-word: Getting beyond the mistakes and constraints of the ‘opportunity paradigm.’” November 8, 2018.
- Minneapolis City Council, “Gentrification in Minneapolis and St. Paul.” July 11, 2018.
- Minnesota Housing Finance Agency. “The one-way street of integration.” April 26, 2018.
- Hunter College, New York. “Community development v. the spatial strategies of fair housing.” March 28, 2018.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division. “Community development v. the spatial strategies of fair housing.” March 20, 2018.
- National Low Income Housing Coalition, Annual Conference. “Recent housing policy research.” March 20, 2018.
- The Levin Forum, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH. “Opportunity Neighborhoods and the Pursuit of Racial Equity in the American Metropolis,” September 12, 2017.
- Twin Cities Housing Collaborative Institute, Coon Rapids, MN. “Gentrification in Minneapolis and St. Paul,” September 11, 2017.
- Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China. “The Global Affordability Crisis in Urban Housing.” June 21, 2017.
- Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China. “Housing Trajectories: Using ‘Housing Career’ methodology to understand mobility.” June 20, 2017.
- Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China. “‘Opportunity Mapping’: Do planners promise too much in the spatial representation of neighborhood well-being?” June 19, 2017.
- Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China. “Housing Informality and Marginality in the American City.” December 18, 2016.
- Chongqing University, Chongqing, China. “The Spatial Dynamics of Public Housing Development: Lessons from France and the U.S.” December 15, 2016.
- Science Po, Ecole Urbaine, Paris. “Integration Policy in the U.S.” December 5, 2016.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, urban planning lecture series. “The Fair Housing Challenge to Community Development.” September 20, 2016.
- Shaanxi Normal University, Xi’an, China. “Housing strategies of very low-income households in the U.S.” July 8, 2016
- Wuhan University, Wuhan, China. “Housing informality in the U.S.” July 7, 2016.
- American University, Center for Metropolitan Policy. “Choice & Burden: Community Development v. the Spatial Strategies of Fair Housing.” February 2, 2016.
- Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China. “Segregation in American cities: The concentration of white affluence in urban areas.” December 15, 2015.
- Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China “Trajectories of social housing in the West: France and the U.S. compared.” December 14, 2015.

- Université Paris-Ouest-Nanterre La Défense. Understanding social housing demolition in the United States: Race, gentrification and neoliberal housing policy.” December 8, 2015.
- University of Heidelberg, Baden-Württemberg Seminar. “Ruins of the New Deal: Dismantling Social Housing in the U.S.” November 12, 2015.
- Tsinghua University, “Trajectories of social housing: A comparative analysis of France and the United States.” June 25, 2015.
- Tsinghua University, “Residential segregation at the extremes of income and race in U.S. metropolitan areas. June 18, 2015.
- University of Washington-Tacoma, “New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy.” May 12, 2015.
- League of Women Voters, Edina, MN. “American urban inequality: Racially concentrated affluence.” May 7, 2015.
- Harvard-Lincoln Institute, Cambridge, MA. “Racially concentrated affluence in American cities.” March 29, 2015.
- University of Minnesota Department of Geography, “Breaking down barriers or breaking up communities? The spatial strategies of fair housing in the U.S.” February 27, 2015.
- University of Western Sydney. Bringing the residents back in: Studying social housing transformation. September 28, 2014.
- University of New South Wales. New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy in the U.S. September 30, 2014.
- Amherst University, Amherst, MA. Public housing transformation. October 8, 2014.
- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Speaker Series on Fair Housing, Washington, D.C. “New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice and Public Housing Policy.” November 19, 2013.
- George Washington University, Sociology Department, Washington, D.C. “New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice and Public Housing Policy.” November 18, 2013.
- University of Richmond, Richmond, VA. “Race, Economic Justice and Public Housing Policy.” November 15, 2013.
- William Mitchell Law School, St. Paul, MN. “Public Housing and *The Pruitt-Igoe Myth*.” October 22, 2013.
- Texas Southern University, Houston, TX. “Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy.” September 19, 2013.
- Black Austin Democrats, Austin, TX. “New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy.” September 18, 2013.
- The Annual History of Black Columbus Conference – Gentrification, Redevelopment and the Role of a Community Benefits Agreement. Keynote Address: “‘When they’re gone, we’re gone’: The displacement of public housing residents.” The Ohio State University Department of African American and African Studies Community Extension Center, Columbus, OH. June 1, 2013.
- College of Urban Planning and Public Administration, University of Illinois-Chicago, “New Deal Ruins: The Dismantling of Public Housing in the U.S.” April 19, 2013.
- The Graduate Center, City University of New York, “What is the future of public housing?” at Reassessing Inequality and Reimagining the 21st Century: East Harlem Focus. April 2, 2013.

- Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities, "Affordable housing investments in core areas of the metropolitan region," February 20, 2013.
- University of Minnesota, Law School, "Regarding the appropriate use of government investments to spur development," at the Symposium on "The Role of the Fair Housing Act and the Minnesota Human Rights Act in Shaping Our Communities, February 15, 2013.
- Kyung Hee University, Seoul, Korea, College of Human Ecology. "Instability and informality in the housing careers of very low-income people." September 20, 2012.
- Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities, "Challenges for the new regional development framework of the Twin Cities," March 21, 2012.
- Cornwall Center for Public Policy, "Oral Histories of Public Housing Demolition," February 20, 2012.
- Iowa State University Department of Urban Planning, "Dismantling public housing" January 20, 2012.
- Centre D'Analyse Strategique, Prime Minister's Office, Republic of France, Paris, "Place-based public policies in underprivileged neighborhoods," November 24, 2011.
- University of Memphis, School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, September 12, 2011.
- Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, Department of Human and Organizational Development, "New Deal Ruins: The dismantling of public housing in the U.S." September 9, 2011.
- William Mitchell Law School, St. Paul, MN, "Public housing transformation." April 19, 2011.
- Hubert H. Humphrey Centennial Series, University of Minnesota, "Where have all the towers gone? The dismantling of public housing in the U.S." March 7, 2011.
- Presentation to Metro Transit Board, "Property value impacts of the Hiawatha Light Rail Line." September 29, 2009.
- Presentation to Lambda Alpha, "A West Side Story: The impact of light rail on property values." September 16, 2009.
- Presentation to Center for Transportation Studies Twentieth Annual Conference on Transportation Research, Bloomington, MN. May 2009.
- Presentation to Minneapolis City Councilman Gary Schiff. "Property value impacts of the Hiawatha Light Rail Line." April 2009.
- Debate with Myron Orfield - "Resolved: Subsidized affordable housing should not be placed in racially segregated or high poverty neighborhoods." CURA Housing Forum, Minneapolis, MN. University of Minnesota. September 21, 2007.
- Presentation to faculty and students at University of Louisville School of Urban and Public Affairs on "Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the poor in urban America." April 14, 2006.
- Presentation to Louisville Housing Affordability Coalition on "Affordable housing and poverty deconcentration: Competing goals?" April 13, 2006.
- Presentation to the annual meeting of Seward Redesign on "Challenges facing neighborhood-based community development corporations." February 7, 2005.