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Identification Model of Gentrifying Neighborhoods

- Is the neighborhood gentrifiable?
  - Yes → Did the neighborhood gentrify during the study period?
    - Yes → Gentrified
    - No → Did not gentrify
  - No → Not gentrifiable
Working Definition of Gentrification

1. Populated by low-income households
2. Neighborhood has previously experienced disinvestment
3. Influx of relatively affluent gentry
4. Increase in investment
Many Forms of Displacement

Last-Resident Displacement
- A low-income household is “involuntarily” displaced from a housing unit that they would otherwise have been able to afford.

Chain Displacement
- Multiple low-income households can be displaced from the same housing units over time at different stages of neighborhood change.

Exclusionary Displacement
- Rising housing costs prevent new low-income residents from moving in.

Cultural Displacement/Displacement Pressure
- When family, friends, local businesses are forced to leave and rents rise. This puts pressure on the family to leave as well.

Marcuse (1985)
Measuring Displacement

• Very difficult to measure

• Some studies have used individual longitudinal data to try to measure displacement, but there are issues:
  o Can only measure last-resident displacement
  o Very difficult to distinguish between “voluntary” and “involuntary” moves

• Difficult to track transient low-income populations

• Likely to be differences between responders and non-responders

• Our analysis uses qualitative methods to understand small scale patterns of neighborhood change, but will not allow us to make larger scale quantitative claims about displacement.
LOSS OF AFFORDABILITY IS EXCLUSIONARY DISPLACEMENT

Source: Author calculations, 2000 Census, 2010-2014 ACS, 2000 IPUMS, 2010-2014 IPUMS

All bolded values adjusted to 2014 dollars

Incomes for households

2000
Median Rent: $809
($575 in 2000 dollars)

Median Renter Income:
Affordable threshold:

Black or African American
$26,729 ($19,000 in 2000 dollars)
$686 ($475 in 2000 dollars)

Hispanic or Latino
$40,234 ($26,000 in 2000 dollars)
$1,006 ($715 in 2000 dollars)

White Not Hispanic or Latino
$39,390 ($26,000 in 2000 dollars)
$986 ($700 in 2000 dollars)

2014
Median Rent: $854

Median Renter Income:
Affordable threshold:

Black or African American
$14,951
$374

Hispanic or Latino
$30,491
$762

White Not Hispanic or Latino
$39,525
$988

The typical renting household can afford to rent 50% or more of the units in the neighborhood.
Quantitative Analysis

• For robustness, using three well-known gentrification indices
  • Freeman (2005) – NYC, NY
  • Ding et. al (2015) – Philadelphia, PA
  • Bates (2013) – Portland, OR

• Scale
  • Regional vs. City reference geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Neighborhoods that are defined as gentrifiable tend to match intuition about low-income neighborhoods
  • Generally more conservative            | • Captures effects of upgrading in middle-class neighborhoods as well
  • Captures roll that urban restructuring plays in process of gentrification. |
## Demographic Changes MPLS & 7C Metro 2000 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minneapolis</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>382,618</td>
<td>399,950</td>
<td>17,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bach</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Own</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pov</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Inc</td>
<td>$55,523</td>
<td>$51,480</td>
<td>-$4,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Value</td>
<td>$166,243</td>
<td>$205,300</td>
<td>$39,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Rent</td>
<td>$841</td>
<td>$869</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author calculations, 2000 Census, 2011 – 2015 American Community Survey
2015 constant $ using MSP Regional CPI
## Demographic Changes STPL & 7C Metro 2000 - 2015

### St. Paul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>287,151</td>
<td>295,043</td>
<td>7,892</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bach</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Own</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pov</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Inc</td>
<td>$56,692</td>
<td>$48,757</td>
<td>-$7,935</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Value</td>
<td>$153,523</td>
<td>$173,900</td>
<td>$20,377</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Rent</td>
<td>$826</td>
<td>$838</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>2,642,056</td>
<td>2,952,114</td>
<td>310,058</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bach</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Own</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pov</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Inc</td>
<td>$79,441</td>
<td>$68,464</td>
<td>-$10,977</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Value</td>
<td>$201,994</td>
<td>$216,026</td>
<td>$14,032</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Rent</td>
<td>$946</td>
<td>$940</td>
<td>-$6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author calculations, 2000 Census, 2011 – 2015 American Community Survey
2015 constant $ using MSP Regional CPI
CENSUS DATA LAGGING

2015 figures represent 5-year average from the American Community Survey (ACS)

2011-2015 ACS includes trough of the recession

Source: Zillow.com
COMPARISON OF GENTRIFIABILITY MEASUREMENTS IN 2000

Source: Author calculations, 2000 Census (Normalized to 2010 boundaries using Geolytics Neighborhood Change Database)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Tracts</th>
<th>GF Tracts</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consensus Gentrifiable Areas in 2000
(2 or 3 Indices Agree)

Gentrifiability by Census Tract
Meta Index
- Y
- N
- N/A
- N’hood/PD Boundaries

Source: Author Calculations, 2000 Census (normalized to 2010 boundaries using GeoLytics N’hood Change Database)
COMPARISON OF GENTRIFICATION MEASUREMENTS 2000 - 2015

Source: Author calculations, 2000 Census (Normalized to 2010 boundaries using Geolytics Neighborhood Change Database), 2011 – 2015 American Community Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>GF Tracts</th>
<th>Gentrified</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consensus Gentrified Areas 2000 - 2015
(2 or 3 Indices Agree)

Meta Index
- Gentrified
- Did Not Gentrify
- Non-Gent
- N/A

THREE OUTLIER TRACTS:

Sumner-Glenwood, site of Heritage Park redevelopment

University, site of new student housing (2010 – 2016, 27 apartment projects built near University)

Elliot Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gentrified</th>
<th>Gentrifiable (but did not gentrify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pct. Black (non-Hispanic)</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pct. Below Poverty</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median HH Income</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$42,067</td>
<td>$40,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$40,491</td>
<td>$33,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Rent</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$771</td>
<td>$752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$847</td>
<td>$790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Home Value</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$117,045</td>
<td>$148,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$162,668</td>
<td>$150,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pct. w/College Degree</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variation Across Gentrifying Tracts

**Pct. Black**
- Highland Park, 25 point increase
- Bottineau, 12 point increase
- Willard-Hay, 22 point decline
- Bryant, 33 point decline

**Pct. Poverty**
- Columbia Park, 12 point increase
- West Side, 13 point increase
- St. Anthony West, 13 point decline
- Willard-Hay, 10 point decline

**Median HH Income**
- Standish, $11,000 increase
- Frogtown, $7,000 increase
- Frogtown, $16,000 decline
- Sheridan, $9,000 decline
Variation Within Gentrifying Tracts

**Hamline-Midway**
College educated population, 25 point increase

Median Household Income, 15 point decrease

**Elliot Park**
White population, 10 point increase

Median Home Value, 66 point decrease

**Willard-Hay**
Median Home Value, 24 point increase

Home ownership rate, 11 point decrease
Arbitrariness of Census Tract Boundaries
Uniform Patterns Across Gentrifying Tracts

Increase in population with bachelors degree
• All 27 gentrifying tracts saw increase in proportion of population with bachelors degree

Increase in home values
• 25 of 27 tracts saw increases in home values
• Most Mpls gentrifying tracts saw increases between 30% and 60%
• Most St.P gentrifying tracts saw increases between 15% and 35%

Increase in rents
• 19 of 27 gentrifying tracts saw rent increases in excess of citywide rate
• Correlation between increase in renters and increase in rents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Change</th>
<th>Racial Change</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Housing Costs</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Incomes</th>
<th>Pct. Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>Decreasing Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change in Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Poverty</td>
<td>No Change in Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Rising</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFYING GENTRIFICATION: DO QUANTITATIVE INDICES OF GENTRIFICATION MATCH RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS?
CURA developed their qualitative research team to demonstrate the following:

...the value of shared meaning-making with local community members experiencing the day-to-day realities of urban restructuring.

...the importance of showing a dynamic and negotiated set of realities giving individuals the chance to share how they *feel* or *live* a reality instead of relying solely on quantitative data analysis which assumes a *fixed and measurable reality*, by aiming to *control* for anomalies or difference.

...a deeper understanding of *why* and *how* major development and investment decisions impacts people the way that it does especially considering that there is an unsaid social and psychological distancing that often takes place between those making decisions and those everyday people most affected by change as they are trying to understand what is happening to them or with them at the table.
TODAY

MAINSTREAM KNOWLEDGE

EXPERIENTIAL, CULTURAL, AND SPIRITUAL KNOWLEDGE

MORE

POLITICAL POWER

LESS

OUR VISION

EQUAL POLITICAL POWER AND LEGITIMACY

CULTURAL & SPIRITUAL KNOWLEDGE

EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

MAINSTREAM KNOWLEDGE
What is Situated Knowledge?

The debate surrounding gentrification is a nuanced one as a multitude of competing interests converge to inform how we see and experience neighborhood change.

Our qualitative research approach invited community members to embrace what their situated knowledges (i.e., experiential knowledges) tell them about what community redevelopment values are guiding the changes they are seeing around them and what impact it has had or will have on their lives.

Knowledge is subjective

Our various categories of identity (race, class, gender etc.,) influence the type of knowledge claims that we might make or feel privileged to make

The context of understanding any one event or phenomena is always shifting from our own respective realities or where we “stand” as we interact with the world, which means our positionality is relational
Our **social location** (how we individually see and experience the world and how the world engages back) is determined by the ways our various identity characteristics intersect with the social, political, and economic world a relational process.
Central Goal & Cluster Neighborhood Criteria

1. To assess whether or not our quantitative indices of gentrification match resident perception.

2. To analyze how local residents from a broad range of demographic realities (i.e., homeowner, business owner, renter, and long term residents (10+ years)) are defining, experiencing, and identifying the slow processes of a gentrifying neighborhood.

Consensus Gentrified Areas 2000 - 2015
(2 or 3 Indices Agree)

Meta Index
- Gentrified
- Did Not Gentrify
- Non-Gent
- N/A

How were these cluster areas chosen for a deeper set of residential qualitative interviews?

1. By cross analyzing both our quantitative indices and our initial interviews with local public officials and neighborhood leaders.
2. We excluded those neighborhoods that we identified from the quantitative indices that highlighted a small or partial section of a larger neighborhood not adjacent to or within a historic low-income community of color.
3. We integrated the initial interviews to help us identify neighborhoods that did not fall within the quantitatively identified areas to then determine, based on the history and demographic realities of that neighborhood, if it should be included into the larger project.

5 Gentrification Study Areas

1. Willard Hay and Harrison
2. Sheridan, St. Anthony West, St. Anthony East, and Logan Park
3. Phillips West, East Phillips, Powderhorn Park, Corcoran, Central, and Bryant
4. Frogtown/Thomas Dale
5. Hamline-Midway

Source: Maps by CURA Staff, Jan 2017
1. Used snowball sampling to recruit local residents for semi-structured one-on-one interviews.

2. Our residential stakeholders are evenly distributed among the following groups: homeowners, business owners, renters, and long-term residents.

3. Completed **58 interviews** with local residents not including the 30 initial interviews with local public officials and neighborhood leaders.
NARRATIVE COMMONALITIES
ACROSS FIVE CLUSTER NEIGHBORHOODS
Rapidly Increasing Rents & Home Values

100% of our participants identified increasing financial costs, as well as concerns over affordability, as indicative of the neighborhood change they are experiencing.
...if I look at my customers, you used to be able to get a one or two-bedroom apartment here for $850. Or a duplex. And now you're probably looking at $1600 to $2200. The average new-built condo studio is eleven. And a double is probably 22. That is absolutely insane.
Changes in Demographics by Race, Income, and Age

88% of our participants identified an increase of whiteness in their community and 53% used this synonymously with higher incomes and more professionals.

67% identified that a younger population is moving into the community.
So as much as I like to see good [white] people running around and enjoying their community, you know what I'm saying, enjoying their amenities, those amenities shouldn't just come with those people.
And the dogs are different. They went from Pit Bulls to Chihuahuas.
Displacement Fears

72% of our respondents noted a fear of physical displacement by citing the inevitability of displacement, being pushed out, priced out or the area becoming no longer affordable (individuals and business owners).
My main concern is affordable housing because if we don't have affordable housing, we're going to eventually be pushed out, all people of color, not just black people, everybody, or poor people, period.
New Commercial Businesses and Development

67% of our participants identified new businesses or business development uncharacteristic of the neighborhood as a sign of gentrification
NARRATIVE DISTINCTIONS
ACROSS FIVE CLUSTER NEIGHBORHOODS
NORTH: WILLARD/HAY AND HARRISON

1. Lack of community based ownership
2. The “new wave” of development neglects residents' voices
3. Historic designation as a tool of gentrification
A “New Wave” of Development: Belonging

“One thing that I noticed ... when having a community meeting, people will stand up and say, ‘My name is XXXXX, and I am a fourth generation Homewood resident.’ They're always citing their relationship to the community and their longevity...because these people have been living here, and been having to deal with people coming in and telling them all the time, what is the new wave. And they're asserting, ‘I've been through all these waves, and you're still not going to tell me, or I still don't appreciate this.’”
“It's gentrification because nobody gave a damn about Homewood for years and years of really trying to help it, but now that it's good, solid, old, beautiful homes that could be restored, it's close to downtown, it's right on the parkway. Beautiful space. All of a sudden, there's this interest to make it an elite neighborhood that would take it out of access to the existing people and people that live in the neighborhood...So it's forcing a rapid change of the economics, and it's going to displace people. And to me, gentrification isn't just about bringing in the gentry but it is displacing the people who have been here and been part of the community.”
1. Commodification of the arts (i.e., Art-A-Whirl, beer, and bands)

2. Creative placing making brings new types of artistic makers/businesses (i.e., brewers & tech companies)

3. The “raw” artist is unable to afford live-work space forcing many to inner and outer ring suburbs
We [the artists that fuel the creative economy] are larger than sports. We are larger than almost all other industries and our impact is in the billions of dollars because the breweries are selling the beer because the artists are there. So, what happens, as gentrification comes in and changes the fabric of a neighborhood, it also starts to drive up an economic powerhouse that services that changing dynamic.

“Now it's more like Mardi Gras than any kind of real fine arts event.” (Art-A-Whirl)
Everyone is a Maker

"I'm so narrowly focused only in the fine arts experience. So I'm only interested in that. And so I tune out a lot of the rest. But then, they got the new technologies coming at us. Like all the digital work and everything like that. So they got all this new set of tools...I was a big advocate of pluralism. The idea that everybody could be a part of it. Let's be inclusive. Now, I live in it... But I started it with my big mouth to the 70s because everybody was, "Oh, yeah, man. Anybody—if you’re painting the trees or painting on the trees, doesn't matter, right? Everything goes. So now we have no rules.”
SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS: PHILLIPS WEST, EAST PHILLIPS, POWDERHORN PARK, CORCORAN, CENTRAL, AND BRYANT

1. The fear of “uptowning”
2. New businesses do not match historic residents needs
3. Lack of resources available for “established” community driven businesses
“Now on that corner, there is a $20-a-candle store now, right across from Pillsbury House. And so, it's an interesting kind of a hipster mix. And I'm not 100% sure how I feel about it. Like, I'm a little bit concerned we're going the way of Uptown and what that means as far the people that, that's going to bring into the neighborhood that's going to shop here.”
New businesses do not match resident needs

“Blue Ox. When they first moved in trying to do something different in the neighborhood. And I tried to talk to the owner at the time of Blue Ox, to let them know things to draw the neighborhood in, the people that have been here forever. And they really didn't buy into that and they didn't last very long because of their product and the area and what people are used to and the price.”
SAINT PAUL: HAMLINE/MIDWAY

1. Fear of youth crime increasing (over-criminalization)

2. Stadium development spurs growth, fear, and a lack of engagement from those most affected

3. More expensive the closer you are to Highway 280, cheaper the closer you get to the eastside
Fear of Youth Crime Increasing

KEY QUOTES

“I think another indication that I noticed, and this is kind of cyclical in our neighborhood, but there always seems to be this uptick in concern around crime that happens in the conversations. And that has happened in the recent couple of years. There's been a lot of concern about youth congregating in our neighborhood or quality of life issues along University Avenue. And I feel like it kind of – as the neighborhood becomes more attractive to certain people, that conversation has started.”
Stadium Spurs Growth and Fear

“The conversations around kind of stadium improvement and improvement in Midway have been more diverse, but that was kind of by design of the engagement process that was happening. But it's still not representative, I think, of the folks that I actually see shopping in the neighborhood, because the people that shop there are predominantly people of color and especially black and I would say predominantly folks who are probably low-income or middle-income. And so that's not who was at the table when we were having these conversations.”
1. Tax credit housing is not affordable for local residents
2. Many households are forced to “double up” or owners become renters
3. High level of anticipation of impending businesses with the often seen “coming soon” signs
“I mean, on one hand there's a lot more development, and it's of a type—it's tax credits, affordable housing, retail on the bottom, two or three stories of what's termed affordable housing, up. The oddity of that is that—with the affordable housing is [laughter] the qualifiers are often for people who make more money than people who actually live here.”
“Double up means that it is that – so my cousin lives with my other cousin...and you're only supposed to have only one person or one family living there. He has to live there.”
COMPARING AREA MEDIAN INCOME TO FROGTOWN/THOMAS-DALE MEDIAN INCOME

In the chart, we can see the comparison of median income in different regions. The bars represent the median income for various income levels:

- **Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington (AMI):**
  - Median Income: $90,400
  - 80% Median Income: $68,000
  - 60% Median Income: $54,240
  - 50% Median Income: $45,200
  - 30% Median Income: $27,100

- **Frogtown/Thomas-Dale:**
  - Median Income: $35,299
  - 80% Median Income: $28,139
  - 60% Median Income: $21,179
  - 50% Median Income: $17,650
  - 30% Median Income: $10,590

The data is sourced from the Minneapolis-St Paul-Bloomington AMI levels and region geography - HUD, FY2017. The Frogtown/Thomas-Dale neighborhood median income is based on the American Community Survey 5-year survey 2012-2016 (retrieved from Minnesota Compass).
The qualitative analysis of study of gentrification can help us unmask the material and ideological effects of urban redevelopment not as numerical abstractions but through a very real set of social, political, and economic realities grounded in daily life.

Although our interviews show clear narrative commonalities across clusters they also highlight distinct experiential realities within and across clusters that confirm the following:

- Gentrification in Minneapolis/St. Paul does not look like what people experienced in Brooklyn, NY or Columbia Heights, Washington D.C. although they have reported similar signs.
- At the neighborhood cluster level the distinct histories of development and migration produce different signs of gentrification for our residential stakeholders

A lack of belonging and consistent sense of fear about the future is an understudied component of gentrification threatening those that are typically most vulnerable to urban redevelopment.
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VISIT GENTRIFICATION.UMN.EDU FOR MORE

@CURAUMN