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DEFINITION OF TERMS

*Absorbing* is defined as communities where displaced residents, from gentrifying communities, relocate to after leaving the gentrifying community.

*Affordable housing* is defined as the financial cost of housing (monthly mortgage/rent expenses, annual city/county property taxes, as well as cost and availability of transportation) and the proportion to the income of the resident, allowing for utility bills, groceries, as well as availability of some discretionary money each month.

*Direct displacement* is defined as when a group succeeds another group due to a process or program.¹

*Gentrifying* is defined as a community in the process of redevelopment with increased amenities (for example sidewalks and grocery stores); new or updated construction on housing and public structures; increased home/rental costs and values. The process of redevelopment and increased in values and services are more as compared to the same community’s values and service prior to redevelopment.

*Involuntary displacement* is defined as the attrition of residents from a community where the choice was not based on solely the needs of the resident. The decision could have been made because of the effects of gentrification, including, yet not limited to increased property taxes, changes/restrictions to zoning laws/ordinances, and increases rental rates.

*Recipient* is defined as a community receiving or absorbing displaced residents from a transitioning community.

*Secondary displacement* is defined as low-income households relocating due to new development because the lower-income households can no longer afford the housing prices or property taxes.²

*Transitioning* is defined as a community in any stage (beginning, middle, or toward the end) of gentrification.

¹ Diane K. Levey, Jennifer Comey, and Sandra Padilla, “In the Face of Gentrification: Case Studies of Local Efforts to Mitigate Displacement”, *The Urban Institute Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center*, (2006).
² Ibid., 3.
Voluntary displacement is defined as population attribution based on the personal choice of the residents. Examples of voluntary displacement includes job transfer and upsizing or downsizing of residential domicile based on family needs.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gentrification by contemporary definitions is ‘the restoration and upgrading of deteriorated urban property by the middle classes, often resulting in displacement of lower-income people.’ It is a new national norm. Over the past 50 years American cities have declined as the suburbs blossomed…U.S. cities…are like donuts with a hole in the middle and the dough around the outside. Our center cities are where our poverty is concentrated. But all this is changing. A massive demographic shift has begun a great reversal as wealth returns to the inner core and poverty is pushed to the periphery. U.S. cities are beginning to conform to the pattern of most world cities, and in the process a Diaspora – an uprooting and scattering – of the poor has begun.3

While there are published documents pertaining to gentrification, this research focuses on the effects that transitioning one community has on other communities were the relocated citizens migrate to. The literature focuses on the effects of gentrification on the transitioning neighborhood while the recipient communities are not addressed. This paper intends to focus on recipient communities that receive an influx in population from displaced residents of transitioning communities.

Urban gentrification is the process of renovating neighborhoods, usually inner-city areas, to increase the property value by revitalizing the regions for wealthier constituents who may replace the existing, usually poorer, residents. Several initiatives from local governments have encouraged this change in landscape of the urban areas. These include, yet not limited to beautification, a term used to describe the exterior, physical improvements of an area; increase desire for particular neighborhoods to be viewed as vacation destinations, new businesses relocations, and conventions as well as an increase in the tax-base for such areas.

After the Great Depression, the U.S. Housing Authority created a public housing program in 1937 “[T]o raise the living standard of typical employed families of very low income who are independent and self-supporting.” Lance Freeman sites two decades after the enactment of the public housing program, the Housing Act of 1949 and Great Migration of African Americans from the South to the North, shifted the focus of public housing from a “safety valve to house black in-migrants who were barred from white neighborhoods.” Subsequently, public housing “was typically built in the least desirable sections of town,” generally within the downtown areas of the city. In recent years, this once “undesired” community inside the cities’ cores have now become the preferred areas of proponents of gentrification.

---

5 Lance Freeman, “Siting Affordable Housing: Location and Neighborhood Trends of Low Income Housing Tax Credit Developments in the 1990s”, *The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy*, (March 2004).
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
The extent of the change varies depending on the city one is surveying. The process can take years, or move quickly once altering circumstances occur, for example: Atlanta, Georgia hosting the 1996 Summer Olympics; former United States of America President William J. Clinton establishing an office in Harlem, New York after completing his term as a sitting United States President; or Hurricane Katrina affecting New Orleans, Louisiana in 2005. It is clear by surveying metropolitan Atlanta, gentrification has a huge impact on the landscaping of certain neighborhoods. Many of the neighborhoods include historically African-American residences located near economically booming downtown sections of the cities. Despite the specific agent of change, it is clear a change has come to the once “least desirable sections of town.”

There are some views stating gentrification is good for local economic growth, competitiveness, and overall beautification of the city. Local growth includes increase in local/city services such as, police, utility, and improved streets due to a boost in the tax-base based on elevated property values of the gentrified communities. In terms of competitiveness, the city must vie against other local cities for new businesses, tourist dollars, and various entertainment events. Therefore, by redeveloping the urban...
downtown areas, cities are more apt to contend with and become victorious in bringing such dollars to their cities, for example, Atlanta’s successful bid to host the 1996 Summer Olympics. Additionally, increasing the beautification of the urban areas gives a sense the city is welcoming to visitors. Proponents ultimately agree gentrification ideally offers an increase in the number of available jobs thus increasing the economic capability of the region and the ripple effect includes increase in services (emergency, utility, street/road improvements) as well as an improved educational system for children and youth.\textsuperscript{11}

Opponents of gentrification see such “improvements” to mean a relocation of long-time residents to other areas to make room for wealthier citizens. There are several other viewpoints for opposition to gentrification, including a different phenomenon of eminent domain. In this case, residents are relocated because the local government has decided to beautify the area by encouraging citizens who are capable and willing to pay more for housing, services, and taxes, to move back into the city’s downtown neighborhoods, not for a governmental need, for example the need to build another school or governmental building. Furthermore, opponents agree the historical relevance of the city will be lost if the community is renovated with citizens not familiar with the past that community endured.\textsuperscript{12} Emotional ties to a community are an additional area of concern for opponents of gentrification. Arguments concerning the historical nature of how, why, and the adversity many residents, their families, and leaders in those communities faced and conquered throughout the years may not be preserved.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} Hampton, “Studies: Gentrification a Boost for Everyone”.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
Local politics and policies surrounding gentrification are areas of debate for proponents and opponents of redevelopment. As a result, “[A]ny urban development strategy will be politicized because of the money at stake and likely displacement of the powerless (from both the neighborhood and the money game).” By Venkatesh’s statement, local politics and policies can either aid in gaining support for or in opposition to gentrification because of the optics of money and displacement of people without power and influence.

Additionally, there is a position of why city and county elected leaders would increase services to the area after gentrification for the wealthier residents, yet allowed services to diminish while the poorer residents were in the community? This viewpoint asks the question, are poorer residents allowed to live without adequate services to drive down the value of the property in order to make gentrification easier to envision?

Chernick and Reschovsky note the fiscal capacity (the ability for a local government to provide social services based on the amount of revenue the local government receives from taxpayers) “remains low in most central cities relative to their suburbs, and primarily because of concentrations of poverty, costs tend to be substantially higher.” Chernick and Reschovsky contend because the financing of social services, for example: emergency services, public utilities, public schools, and other services provided by the

---


local government, is the local and city governments’ responsibility, the tax base for these services are diminished by a higher concentration of poor compared to the tax revenue generated. Chernick and Reschovsky describe the gap between financing the services for the local government and the revenue/taxes raised by the population as need-capacity gap. By using the need-capacity gap measurement, Chernick and Reschovsky contends the explanation for the disparity in public services within the city can provide a “reasonably objective measurement of the structural fiscal problems faced by local governments." Therefore, poor/pre-gentrified residents have less public service resources provided by local leaders compared to the post-gentrified population group because of the lack of generated tax revenue by the pre-gentrified residents to support local services.

Views on both sides of gentrification have points and concerns. An issue of such emotional attachment is a difficult subject to face as well as determining the best approaches, solutions, and practices to accommodate all parties involved. History versus contemporary; poor versus wealthy; ethnic minority versus non-ethnic minority are all issues not new to society as a whole, at the same time, taken in a time where the world attempts to be more politically correct, the aforementioned concerns are, again, part of another subject of debate – gentrification and the impacts on the recipient communities.

16 Chernick and Reschovsky, 2001:3.
17 Ibid., 4.
Statement of the Problem

According to a discussion paper prepared for The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy by Maureen Kennedy and Paul Leonard on gentrification, the authors discussed neighborhood changes, including economics and steps to build a stronger community by embracing redevelopment. However, the research does not fully explain the economic and political effects on the recipient communities and those community residents displaced by transitioning communities of the displaced residents. Kennedy and Leonard discuss the effects on building a stronger, existing community as an effect of gentrification on the gentrified community; yet there is no focus on the recipient community or the financial and structural burdens these new communities face with an influx of a new population, aside expected in-migration of voluntary displacement. At the same time, not only is there an uncertainty of the number of in-migrants, there is also the uncertainty surrounding the revenue the new citizens will provide the recipient community through local and sales taxes. Therefore, the shift of the adverse fiscal capacity of the downtown community has then moved from the gentrified community to the new recipient community.

As a result, communication between the developer, elected officials, and civic/community leaders of the transitioning and potential recipient communities appears to begin to partner with each other to create a more prepared transition seems to be the missing component during the transitioning process and relocation of residents.

---

18 Expected in-migration includes voluntary attrition due to a job relocation and moving based on real estate needs of the family.
Transitioning and potential recipient communities must work together for sustainable economic growth: increase homeownership; reduced cost of housing and commuting expenses; increased access to jobs and educational improvement; encourages active citizen participation and engagement. By working together, those displaced residents could have less disruption in their everyday lives if recipient communities were prepared to house, educate, and embrace the influx of displaced residents.

There has been other research addressing gentrification within Urban Politics, including Clarence Stone’s *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*. Stone focused on the effect of urban politics in Atlanta during the beginning of the Civil Rights Movement and the affect the surge of political interest had on local governments. The current conceptual frameworks provide useful information about the area of study, however, specific information concerning the aforementioned era has not been addressed. Most of the research conducted addresses gentrification as a “whole concept” rather than impacts, i.e., the results of transitioning one area and the effect on another area. This paper’s intended focus concentrated on indicators (Housing and Urban Development (HUD) population shifts, public school budget and enrollment, and housing prices) within metropolitan Atlanta and the impact those indicators have on population shifts, housing, schools, transportation, crimes, and social services on the recipient communities.

The overall significance of this research will provide an economic reference to gentrification and the long-term economic impact to metropolitan Atlanta with direct displacement (when a group succeeds another group due to a process or program) or secondary displacement (low-income households relocate due to new development because the lower-income households can no longer afford the housing prices or taxes). This research will focus on the impacts on the recipient community, not the transitioning community.

DeKalb County, Clayton County, and City of Atlanta were chosen for this multiple case study because of the population shifts either within the City of Atlanta or the proximity to the City of Atlanta (DeKalb and Clayton counties) between 1990, 2000, and 2010, as well as the gentrification of communities within the City of Atlanta limits resulting in the displacement of residents.

Figure 1 is a map of Metropolitan Atlanta. Geographically, the City of Atlanta is located within two counties: DeKalb and Fulton counties with the largest portion of the City of Atlanta is in DeKalb County. Additionally, Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport is located in Clayton County with components of Hartsfield-Jackson spread throughout parts of unincorporated Fulton County, as well as cities of Atlanta, College Park, and Hapeville.

---

20 Levey, Comey, and Padilla, “In the Face of Gentrification”, 3.
Additionally, Clayton County was chosen because of Clayton County’s lack of public transportation infrastructure proportional to the population in need of public transportation. In March 2010, all public transportation in Clayton County was discontinued because the county could not afford to continue public transportation for the Clayton County residents. In 2014, Tanya Snyder wrote that despite Clayton County being the “most economically depressed county in the region”, where seven and a half percent of the population did not have access to a car, yet, Clayton County stopped public transportation services where those with no car, who relied on public transportation for

---

work, school, and daily errands (groceries), no longer had public transportation as a reliable source.\textsuperscript{22} Further, Snyder explained prior to 2010, Clayton County had three public transportation lines, none of which connected directly within the City of Atlanta – the only connecting line to the City of Atlanta was for a bus line to go to Hartfield-Jackson International Airport, then connect to the MARTA rail system, then into City of Atlanta limits for more public transportation options. The hardship of three lines, particularly for an individual with dependents, was overshadowed when Clayton County did not have public transportation.

Clayton County Schools also lost their Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation in 2008. Loosing accreditation influences the students’ abilities to be accepted in a college or obtaining a job because of the school system lost accreditation – not to mention, the impact of a depressed school system prior to the loss of accreditation. The anecdotal impact of little to no public transportation and loss of school system accreditation for “the most economically depressed county in the region” has an impact on workforce capabilities, individual and county economic needs, as well as, connection to the immediate neighboring communities.

DeKalb County was also selected because of not all of DeKalb County has access to public transportation – particularly South DeKalb County as compared to North DeKalb County. Additionally, inequities between North DeKalb County versus South

\textsuperscript{22} Snyder, “How Clayton Turned”.
DeKalb County continues to grow with economic, education, and housing increasing in North DeKalb County communities.²³

Figure 2 compares the 2000 to the 2010 U.S. Census Report, the population of the City of Atlanta increased 167% from 155,752 in 1990 to 416,474 in 2000 then increased another 0.8% from 416,474 in 2000 to 420,003 in 2010; DeKalb County’s population increased 219% from 208,690 in 1990 to 665,865 in 2000 then increased another 3.9% from 665,865 in 2000 to 691,893 in 2010; Clayton County’s population increased 261% from 65,523 in 1990 to 236,517 in 2000 then increased another 9.7% from 236,517 in 2000 to 259,424 in 2010.

### Population Change: Between 1990, 2000, and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Atlanta</th>
<th>DeKalb County</th>
<th>Clayton County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>420,003</td>
<td>691,893</td>
<td>259,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>416,474</td>
<td>665,865</td>
<td>236,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>155,752</td>
<td>208,690</td>
<td>65,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Population Change: Between 1990, 2000, and 2010
Source: [http://www.census.gov/](http://www.census.gov/)

The more than doubling of the overall population in City of Atlanta, Clayton County, and DeKalb County between 1990 and 2000 can be attributed to the residual

population growth following the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta. Clayton County
and DeKalb County’s doubled growth as compared to the City of Atlanta can be
attributed to lower property values and property taxes in the counties as compared to the
City of Atlanta.

Table 1 illustrates the racial totals for the City of Atlanta, DeKalb County, and
Clayton County in 1990, 2000, and 2010 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Racial Population Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^{24})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.census.gov/](http://www.census.gov/)

Table 1 provides the data to following racial demographic groups in the
municipalities for this research over three consecutive United States Census reporting

\(^{24}\) Individuals included in “Other” are self-identifiers as more than one race and/or Native Hawaiian/Pacific
Islander or Native American. These groups’ individual identifying numbers are significant as the groups
currently identified in Table 1.
period. Figures 3, 4, and 5 will detail each municipality’s racial demographic trend with the 1990, 2000, and 2010 U.S. Census data.

Figure 3 illustrates the black and white population in the City of Atlanta between 1990 and 2000 increased at a higher rate than the Latino, Asian, and Other groups.

Further, the rate of the black population decreased in the City of Atlanta between 2000 and 2010 while the rate of the white population increased between 2000 and 2010.

Figure 4 illustrates the black and white population in Clayton County between 1990 and 2000 increased at a higher rate than the Latino, Asian, and Other groups – with the black population increasing at a much higher rate than the white population.
The rate of the black population continued to increase in Clayton County between 2000 and 2010 while the rate of the white population decreased between 2000 and 2010. The Latino population increased to nearly the same population number as what the white population decreased to in 2010.

Figure 5 illustrates that while there is a continuous population growth in the Latino, Asian, and Other groups, the black and white population in DeKalb County between 1990 and 2000 increased at a higher rate than the Latino, Asian, and Other groups.
The rate of the black population, overall, increased between 2000 and 2010 while the rate of the white population decreased between 2000 and 2010.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The American Heritage College Dictionary defines gentrification as “the restoration or upgrading of deteriorated urban property especially by middle-class or affluent people, often resulting in displacement of lower-income people from their neighborhoods.” Often those lower-income people are African-Americans, Latinos, as well as other ethnic groups, who have called the “deteriorated urban property” home, in some cases for decades; because “[F]or much of the 20th century, our views on political and economic development tended to emphasize racial and ethnic divisions.”

Nelson, et al., notes “[T]he idea that minorities, especially African-Americans, but also Latinos, and Asians threaten property values was not just conventional wisdom but adopted federal and stated policy until the 1960s.”

Venkatesh’s statement can be affirmed because most of the residences in the pre-gentrified urban cities are African Americans and Latinos, yet post-gentrification, the redevelopment tends “…to ease the path of

---

mostly white-controlled real estate firms that wish to reclaim undervalued inner-city neighborhoods."27 According to Teitler, the recent phenomenon of gentrification has taken hold of developed inner cities across the country.28 Teitler attests this surge to “upwardly mobile professionals” who are “attracted to urban neighborhoods by their architecture, affordability, and proximity to work and cultural centers.”29 These professionals tend to move out of the suburbs and into the inner city to become a part of the nightlife, the arts, and shorter commute to work. Not only does this lead to displacement, the underlying issues associated with displacement such as, where can the displaced go to live and are those communities ready, willing, and able to expand public services to accommodate an influx of displaced residents?

According to Leinberger, the 1950s was the beginning of the “great suburban land rush” where the downtowns began losing residents to the suburban areas.30 Leinberger reinforced the “great suburban land rush” perspective by noting:

The desire for a suburban American Dream led to it being legally mandated and massively subsidized, essentially becoming de facto public policy. The market desire to embrace suburban living – a historically unique experiment in city building – combined with the subsidies for suburban growth, left our downtowns and surrounding neighborhoods to decline.31

Structural public policies and the tax code have been in favor of suburban homeowners. Gyourko and Sinai reported the tax code favors homeowners by allowing

27 Venkatesh, “Urban Puzzle”.
29 Ibid., 32.
31 Ibid.
homeowners to deduct property taxes and mortgage interest rates. Renters are not afforded tax deductions per the state or federal tax codes. As a result, financially, it has been beneficial for residents to relocate to the homeowner filled suburbs from the city centers, where the residents are more likely to be renters.

Brannum reinforces this view by reporting the downtown city residents did not “flee to the suburbs” in the 1980s and 1990s when the neighborhoods were facing difficult times, such as high crime rates, poverty, and lack of jobs. Those residents stayed and overcame declining living conditions, yet are, in some ways, not able to participate in the “economic rebirth and rejuvenation” of the community.

Gebhardt reveals opposing concerns between residents of the deteriorating neighborhoods and government/business community by reporting:

All the while, politicians and other community leaders pretty much wrote off their deteriorating communities – until a new group of people saw some potentially valuable real estate and began moving in. Now that the government, businesses and others are cleaning up the neighborhood, everything is going up – property taxes, rents and the cost of living in general – and very soon, the long-term residents find themselves no longer able to stay in their homes.

Gebhardt’s notion reveals the concern by existing residents that redevelopment is not centered on increasing the property value and appeal of the neighborhood for the existing residents, redevelopment is designed for those investing in these neighborhoods by buying low, and eventually selling high. The disconnection between existing residents

34 Ibid.
35 Gebhardt, “Living with the Tensions”.

viewing their property as a home rather than the business community as an investment adds conflict to an inherently complex situation. Gebhardt continues with an assertion that some “think that cleaning up a neighborhood and raising property values, even at the cost of pricing out residents who would rather not leave, is good no matter the result. They see it as progress and not a form of domestic imperialism.”

Raphael and Stoll notes the business communities’ interest is competitive advantage of the inner city”, in which poor, distressed and predominantly minority urban neighborhoods were seen as strategic areas of capital investment because of their underserved retail markets and geographic proximity to central business districts, among other factors.

The varying viewpoints of what are “good” for the residents and neighborhood causes this sensitive issue to become a controversy because there are strong opinions on both sides. Slater reaffirms this idea by citing:

Many policymakers, “business improvement” strategists, real estate agents, middle-class professionals and more conservative academics have treated gentrification as a purely positive trend, as a remedy for human, environmental and tax-base calamity of “blighted” urban neighborhoods.

Slater appears to suggest the positive discussion points of the affects gentrification has on the gentrified community can undermine the holistic reality the effects onto the displaced residents being relocated out of the community.

---

36 Gebhardt, “Living with the Tensions”.
Slater continues with this notion of varying viewpoints to include scholars. Slater details the difference between scholars who emphasize economic development and investment. These scholars focus on fiscal aspects of gentrification including responsibilities of lenders, developers, and the like. The main goal is to profit from the property.

On the other hand, there are scholars focusing on the cultural effect of redevelopment. These scholars speculate, “…the emergence and expansion of the ‘new middle classes,’ their consumption practices, the ways in which (in reaction to the perceived blandness of suburbia) they imprint their identities on neighborhoods once considered off-limits.”

Although this may appear to be an over simplification of the issue, Slater relays to the reader not only do community leaders, politicians, and citizens have strong opinions concerning gentrification, scholars also hold similarly strong views. Those opponents of gentrification may also view, as does Slater, this conflict is “…pitting the poor and the homeless against real estate developers, the police and upscale residents returning to ‘reclaim’ the inner city.” As a result, the powerless are faced with daily struggles not only to preserve their status in society, also to save their homes and the familiar.

The negative perception of gentrification is due to images of poor people being forced from their homes by the rich. Those in political office, to increase awareness and interest in a growing metropolitan area, generally add to this perception. Kennedy and

40 Ibid.
Leonard stated some mayors began to look into their cities and realize the possibility of increasing their tax base by enticing middle and upper income residents to live in their downtown communities.\textsuperscript{41} In addition to solicitation by elected officials, the pendulum shifting of real estate values in metropolitan cities can cause discomfort if stability in the real estate market value are not constant. “Metro areas don’t create enough housing when prices in the suburbs get high enough home buyers start looking at ‘undervalued’ urban housing”\textsuperscript{42} for residential living. In turn, when the property values stay constant in the suburbs, the return to the inner city is not as enticing as compared to when the property values rise in the suburban areas without an increase in amenities – resulting in the return to the city where the property values are lower while cultural amenities may be greater. Unfortunately, the insurgency of wealthier citizens to the downtown communities result in the displacement of current residents because of the inner city’s pre-gentrified low property value. With the influx of newer residents, some negative images surface that

\begin{quote}
[R]ising housing costs in gentrifying districts may ensure that poor residents who do move leave the neighborhood, rather than settle elsewhere in it. Since their places usually are taken by more affluent, better educated people, the neighborhoods character and demographics change.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

These negative images of poorer citizens being displaced by wealthier residents, economically, tend to appear as racial minorities are being replaced by non-minorities, visually. Knotts and Haspel note, this type of revalorization of neighborhoods may “lead

\textsuperscript{41} Kennedy and Leonard, “Dealing with the Change”.  
\textsuperscript{42} Hampton, “Studies: Gentrification a Boost for Everyone”.  
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
to racial tension if residents of the ethnic group displace long standing residents of another group.”

This visual change, coupled with historical racial tensions tends to create and reaffirm pessimistic viewpoints of gentrification from a demographic perspective.

The 1960s in Boston’s South End gave a picture of what gentrification can do to residents. Boston’s South End underwent a massive redevelopment covering approximately 600 acres and displacing many of the residents. Teitler cites the Director of the Boston Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Tenants Alliance Association as reporting “[P]eople were displaced on a massive scale” and the plan given by the government was deceptive. Teitler further states several “cultural and historical landmarks were replaced by parking lots and other structures” as well as new housing replaced existing residential structures. Brannum adds to Teitler’s argument regarding opposition to redevelopment is not rejecting the new residents, “it is about resisting a small, vocal group of new residents who lack respect for other residents and ‘older’ neighbors.”

It appears that the experience and actions by government officials in Boston left disturbing images of gentrification on the rest of the country. Perhaps this is due to residents in other cities envisioning themselves as the constituents of South End and reminisces on having “…raised families in their townhouses, watched their grandkids
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take their first steps in their apartments and enjoyed special memories with neighborhood friends for decades.” fade.  

As previously noted, one effect of gentrification is investment in previously underserved (fiscally, including social services) neighborhoods. Typically, the investment comes at the expense of displacing current residents to make room for newer residents. Levey and Comey described two types of displacement: direct displacement (when a group succeeds another group due to a process or program) or secondary displacement (low-income households relocate due to new development because the residents can no longer afford the housing prices or taxes). Secondary displacement is commonly used as the reference to gentrification in recent years because the investment in low-income neighborhoods raises the cost of living in community, including an increase in housing prices and property taxes. With the increase in cost of living, current low-income residents are therefore displaced out of the community because the lower income residents are now priced out of the neighborhood.

One ripple effect of secondary displacement is income segregated neighborhoods. According to Tara Watson, higher income residents gentrify existing low income inner city neighborhoods because the prices are lower to purchase therefore, the higher income residents are able to spend more to purchase upgraded fixtures and materials for their new
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home. Watson notes as an increased number of higher income residents relocate to low-income neighborhoods, the poor will continue to be displaced.

Secondary displacement can take the form of higher housing prices and changes in zoning policies. Nelson et al. notes zoning, planning, and land use controls can limit the availability of affordable housing by excluding dense housing (i.e. apartment complexes), increasing land lot sizes for new construction (including housing renovations), or banning attached/cluster homes. Nelson, et al., defined such zoning policies as “chain of exclusion”. Nelson, et al., discuss by zoning communities with restrictions on the type of housing to develop, inherently by the restrictions certain, classes of people are legally disallowed the opportunity to live in the community. For example, if the zoning provides for single-family homes and the land lots are not conducive for multi-family units, renters are either limited by quantity per Home Owner Association by-laws or legally segregated from the community because multi-family homes are restricted. As a result, the chain of exclusion policies is developed for higher-income residents, who generally are homeowners, and discouraged for low-income residents, who generally are renters.

Demographic shifts are one aspect of change associated with gentrification. Economic change is another. Gibbs-Knott and Haspel noted the redevelopment of the poorer, inner city neighborhoods has several components. These interests include
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strong economic opportunity of purchasing property in a deteriorated neighborhood; traffic congestion; desire for city living; the resurgence of community development/beautification organizations. Henderson, Kennedy and Leonard, and Smith affirm the increasing interest in once deteriorated, largely African American neighborhoods by the non-minority affluent has caused more concern by government officials to provide more efficient and effective services.\textsuperscript{53,54,55}

According to Henderson, Kennedy and Leonard, and Smith, these services, including adequate law enforcement, recreational facilities, and employment opportunities were not as prevalent with the poorer, minority community; however, once gentrification has begun, these services improve with the influx of the wealthier and non-minority residents. Kennedy and Leonard add this redevelopment tends to happen in communities with a limited housing market and in select neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{56} The limited housing market is due to several businesses and headquarters occupying space resulting in restricted residential dwelling.

Pragmatic government officials understand and encourage the inner city residential change because the state’s economic future require acceptance of social change.\textsuperscript{57} This social change is in the form of creating multi-use (retail and eateries on
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the first floor and residences above the businesses) buildings and diverse populations.\(^{58}\) As a result, from an economic standpoint, developers, government officials, and gentrifies view the redevelopment “…as a remedy for the human, environmental and tax-base calamity of ‘blighted’ urban neighborhoods.”\(^{59}\)

By displacement of labor, Bridge means poorer residents, relying on public transportation in and around the city, will have a more difficult time depending on public transportation, because in some cases, buses and trains do not have regular, if any, routes in the suburbs; therefore, limited public transportation can make it difficult to continue to earn a wage if transportation, to and from work, becomes an obstacle. In such cases, poorer residents relying on public transportation may have worked in the hotels, restaurants, and office buildings in the downtown buildings. If these residents are displaced to the suburbs, where public transportation is not as essential for the existing residents, how can the residents get to work to support themselves and their families? Raphael and Stoll wrote in 2002, “research suggests that extending public transportation into job-rich suburban corridors can enhance employment opportunities for inner-city minority populations.”\(^{60}\) If there is a lower rate of inner city residents with vehicles and these residents are displaced because of gentrification, comprehensive public transportation may be an economic service to ensure displacement does not lead to unemployment. Leinberger writes a “car-dominated metropolitan area is at a competitive
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disadvantage for economic growth.” According to Leinberger, as a result, the displaced poor are at an economic disadvantage to attempt to achieve upward economic mobility. This could suggest the economically poorer residents are shifted from one area to other areas – equating to communities of poor are relocated to make space for wealthier residents instead of government officials, communities leaders, and the business community addressing economically poor conditions, areas, and residents.

Additionally, social variance of gentrification is an important aspect of the debate. Schwirian notes as societies grow; the terrain of urban areas will change. Specifically, Schwirian writes, “[A]s societies increase in scale they increase in social differentiation; this is reflected in the increasing specialization of urban land use and in the social characteristics of the population.” As a result, the once deteriorated space becomes a different area; unlike the long-time residents’ familiarity of the neighborhood. This change, to some, is positive. On the other hand, several disagree on the positive effects of social change.

Although the intentions of “cleaning up” an urban space and the idea of restoring abandoned territory through residential means may be viewed as altruistic, it is an ongoing challenge for developers to consider what exactly causes the existing disparity and lack of diversity on a systemic level.

Furthermore, Toon expresses reversed racial transition (from majority ethnic minority to majority ethnic majority) has a greater chance of volatility because of historical racial tension along with an abrupt change in the social, economic, and
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demographic structure of the community. As a result, new residents tend to cluster together as the neighborhood begins to change, splitting a changing neighborhood by racial and economic lines. Bridge reinforces this notion by stating “one of the forces of proximate structuration is the tendency toward community or neighborhood segregation.” Bridge implies gentrification has a tendency to segregate neighborhoods by the nature of the redevelopment where newer, more expensive homes are grouped together, visually, creating a divide in the community.

Several arguments against gentrification include loss of affordable housing; displacement of the poorer residents; destruction of historical communities; economic restructuring; dismissal of historic preservation. Often this myopic view dismisses the emotional connection between residents and their neighborhood, resulting in conflict because of the perception the incoming residents do not understand the injustice as seen through the eyes of the current residents. Jones expresses this view by stating “…the conceptual scheme grows out of the experiences of non-black people and posits a level of isomorphism between their experiences and those of black people which is denied by even a cursory examination.” To avoid such conflict, government officials created policies and programs to defuse some of the tension. Such policies and programs include rent control, government subsidies, landlord-tenant understandings, eviction protection,
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zoning regulations, and the creation of community spaces. Notwithstanding, there are positive effects of gentrification. Arthur notes increased property values, reduced litter, and crime aid in the optimistic viewpoint of the redevelopment process.

Gentrification was a source of conflict before a London’s sociologist Ruth Glass coined the term in 1964. This concept has caused the displacement of people living in deteriorating conditions for decades to relocate after another decides the property in the neighborhood is “prime” for investment. Brannum expresses, “[C]ommunity revitalization and low- and moderate-income housing can coexist. But forced gentrification masks realities of race and income.”

Redevelopment including a mixed-income community is welcomed to improve schools, city services, and opportunities for growth; yet it should be collaboration, not mandate as well as become a part of the public’s psyche or else gentrification can lead to unanticipated results. Mixed-income and use communities have become the preferred planning options for transitioning communities such as in Atlanta after the 1996 Summer Olympics, in various portions of the City of Atlanta after the 1996, as well as in College Park, GA as noted in the May 2012 Atlanta Regional Commission Plan after the demolition of public housing units.
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illustrate a change in demographics and land use, while studies on recipient communities in Metropolitan Atlanta have not been available to understand the ripple effect of gentrification as a public policy. “Gentrification is no small matter, nor is it a simple one.”

Research regarding gentrification is more prevalent than research regarding recipient communities. Most of the focus of existing literature is centered around the gentrified community and not both, the gentrified community and the recipient communities for the displaced residents. In 2005, Houston, Texas an influx of nearly 240,000 increase in population because of Hurricane Katrina evacuees from New Orleans, Louisiana. Dan Vergano reported Houston’s economic, social, and education systems were tested with an increase in 7% of Houston’s population after Hurricane Katrina. Houston needed to adjust social services, public school system, build or redevelop housing, while managing an initial increase in crime immediately following displaced New Orleans’ residents relocation to Houston. As Vergano noted crime rate changes after displacement is more of a factor of the condition of the community rather than the character of the displaced population. At the same time, Richard Florida concluded the benefits of transitioning one community show “little signs of spilling over
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or trickling down to adjacent neighborhoods, particularly those with more minority residents.” As Henneberger specifically explains

“There is virtual unanimous agreement in affordable housing policy today that for low-income multifamily housing to succeed two things are needed: the resident population should be economically and racially diverse within the development and the housing itself should not be located in high crime, high unemployment, low performing school areas.”

“Success demands a coherent approach that must be effectively carried out at all levels of government, communicated in a clear manner, and embraced by a wide range of stakeholders.”
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CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: POLITICAL ECONOMY

The study of gentrification from the demographic, economic, and social is significant because the plight of citizens within the current community reveals policy revisions within local government to increase the tax-base, therefore, adding revenue within the city. The literature reveals the demographic change within the community. Prior to gentrification, the communities consisted of low-income individuals and families with shopping (grocery, retail) limitations. During and after gentrification, the neighborhood consisted of young professionals or empty-nesters, few, to no children, and with a higher income than the previous residents as well as an increase in retail and grocery stores.

The theory explored in this research is political economy because the public policy aspect of the impact of gentrification addresses the overall economic and political affects gentrification has on displaced residents’ recipient community. Political economy is how a country or the public’s household is managed or governed, considering both political and economic factors.82 In order to sufficiently explore a more holistic
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view of the effects of gentrification on a recipient community, an exploration of public policy, economics, business involvement, and community leaders’ involvement are critical aspects to be addressed as part of the political economy theory. Political economy studies the relationships between individuals and society and the state, while using tools and methods drawn from economics, political science, and sociology. As a subset of political economy, it is necessary to include various approaches used to explore gentrification since these approaches are drivers to the public policies devised by the local government officials and developers as part of redevelopment plans.

Caparosa notes the term “political economy” dates back to the eighteenth century and is used to describe “the responsibilities of the state (or statesman) with regard to the economy”. Caparosa notes the political economy debate is determining who is responsible for satisfying the specific needs (for example, housing, medical care, welfare, and education) of citizens – the citizens or the state? Caparosa argues classical theories treat the economy as a separate system from politics and family life. Caparosa defines politics as “activities, processes, and structures of government” and politics as government is defined as “organ, rules (written and unwritten), and agency”.

Further definitions explained by Caparosa for political economy involves the influences of the media, interest groups, and economic classes have on political leaders. The media, interest groups, and economic classes, while not directly part of the

---

83 George, The Science, 6.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid, 9.
87 Ibid.
government are affected by or may affect government policies, by framing positive messages encouraging gentrification without, seemingly, creating policies addressing the impact on recipient communities. With these definitions and explanations, Caparosa describes the intertwined relationship between the economy and government to explain a more comprehensive theory versus other theories with a primary focus on either the government or economy. Because political economy is the interplay between economics, law and politics, and how institutions develop in different social and economic systems, such as capitalism, socialism and communism, as well as analyzes how public policy is created and implemented, political economy is a more holistic theory exploring both, government and economy’s impact of gentrification on recipient communities.

All of the following approaches have fundamental importance to gentrification in terms of its demographic, economic, and social impacts on a community. At the same time, the following theories do not address the effects on the recipient communities, only theories explaining gentrification. This subject is diverse, complex, emotional, and affects the community on a mixture of levels, therefore, the political economy theory is an umbrella for all the below approaches to understand the holistic impact of gentrification on recipient communities.

Several methods surround redevelopment and redevelopment’s impact on communities. Some approaches are in debate with scholars due to varying viewpoints. Such methods include urban renewal; production-side; rent-gap; globalization; and need-capacity gap. These approaches explain various viewpoints of the effect / rationale,
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demographic, economic, and social issues for revitalization. These methods are vital to the gentrification debate because each one is complex and legitimizes various viewpoints of the subject. The following are some, not all, theories related specifically to gentrification.

_Urban Renewal_: Urban Renewal is the socially driven relocation of affluent baby boomers and professionals to the inner city in order to be closer to work or cultural attractions, usually located in the city. Relocating from the suburbs to the city reduces the commuting time and increases accessibility to desired amenities.\(^9^9\) Increased gasoline prices, desire for old architecture, and suburban slump motivated some middle class non-minorities to relocate to the inner city.\(^9^0\)

_Production-Side Approach_: Production Side explains gentrification as an economic need. Since more businesses relocate to the cities, near these new amenities, there are expectations of services. The flow of monies from businesses and production within the city results in better services (e.g. law enforcement, utilities, etc.) and an increase desire to redevelop the surrounding communities.

_Rent-Gap Approach_: One theory associated with the economics of gentrification is the rent-gap theory. Smith outlines that this theory is associated with the gap between “…the actual capitalized ground rent (land value) of a plot of land given its present use and the potential ground rent that might be gleaned under a ‘higher and better’ use.”\(^9^1\) Toon further adds affordable housing decreases and in some cases, for instance in Atlanta,  

\(^9^0\) Hampton, “Studies”.  
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government officials have not replaced the affordable housing for the majority of the poorer residents. Bridge agrees with the rent-gap theory and adds repercussions can include displacement of labor. This approach holds that rent, by those currently living in the community, is not compatible with the value of the land the structure resides. That is, the current residents pay lower in rent or taxes to the local government compared to what the local government could receive from wealthier residents. Therefore, gentrification is a way to balance the rent/mortgage by current residents with the updated assessed value of the land.

Globalization: Globalization theory is another economic theory with broad implications on the shaping of a community. Since the business community has become global, businesses are compelled to be in a community that reflects a global perspective. Hence, gentrification is a way to increase community development and illuminate openness to business leaders and clients around the world – the method to achieve this business vision is by displacing existing residents to make room for employees and business partners of the companies that relocated to the downtown areas.

Need-Capacity Gap: The need-capacity gap theory allows for the appreciation that because cities receive a deficient overall income because the cost of services outweigh the revenue generated. As a result, one conclusion that can be pondered is because central communities are fiscally deprived, central communities are consistently in a fiscal
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recession regardless of the overall fiscal health of the nation – it is a matter of degreed recession. “Expenditure need indicates the minimum amount of money a government must spend per resident in order to provide a standard or average level of public services for which it is responsible.”94 Because of the looming fiscal health of the central city, local officials can make decisions regarding potential revenue raised after gentrification as the catalyst for transitioning the community to maintain a fiscally sound budget and a fiscally sound city for the residents and business community.

**Research Questions**

Urban gentrification is a process of renovating deteriorating neighborhoods, usually inner-city areas, to improve the property value by revitalizing the areas for wealthier constituents who may replace the existing, usually poorer, residents. Several initiatives from local governments have encouraged this change in landscaping in the urban areas. These include, yet not limited to beautification, this is a term used to describe the exterior, physical improvements of an area; increase desire for particular areas to be viewed as vacation destinations, new businesses relocations, and conventions as well as an increase in the tax-base for such areas.95

The overall significance of this research will give an explicit timeframe and the impacts of political and public policy activities as well as those political and public policy activities’ indirect impact on the metropolitan areas of Atlanta. The political and public policy activities include: housing prices and housing availability, recipient communities’
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preparations to accept displaced residents, and the impact displacement has on
government/social services. Additionally, public policy of increase property value
(taxes) and/or strongly encouraged by the business community and politicians to relocate
in order to “better” the neighborhood displace families from transitioning communities to
recipient communities. As a result, the following are questions concerning the effects of
gentrification on the metropolitan areas of Atlanta:

1. What effects did gentrifying some Atlanta communities have on surrounding
   communities’ housing prices and availability; transportation needs; and usage of
   social services?
2. Were the recipient communities prepared to accept an influx of citizens displaced
   from Atlanta?
   a. What preparations were made?
   b. Based on the influx and preparations, what preparations were, in
      hindsight, lacking?
3. How have the recipient communities been impacted by the former cities of
   Atlanta in terms of government/social services (transportation, housing, social
   services, and education/schools)?

**Theoretical Suppositions**

Redevelopment, revitalization, or gentrification is a phenomenon occurring
throughout Metropolitan Atlanta. Although this phenomenon is greeted with mixed
emotions for proponents and opponents, one thing both sides agree upon is gentrification
is occurring and changing the faces of neighborhoods.
Opponents have several reasons for disagreeing with gentrification; one explanation is the different appeal of the neighborhood. Brannum wrote, “No neighborhood should lose its legacy and have its community spirit hijacked by those unaccustomed to and uncomfortable in an urban racial environment.” Both agree with the notion the neighborhoods change; yet the disagreement engenders the manner and dramatic differentiation between the older and newer neighborhood.

Proponents recognize gentrification as an opportunity for revitalization and redevelopment of deteriorating neighborhoods, not a dramatic negative impact as opponents claim. Proponents claim pragmatism is vital to the economic future of the community. Furthermore, opponents note the revitalization of such deteriorated areas encourages gentrification. By revalorizing these neighborhoods, economics within the areas increase due to factors including, but not limited to traffic congestion, in-town amenities, cultural attractions, and strong economic conditions.

The following suppositions demonstrate an inverse relationship occurs when comparing the gentrified communities to a recipient community – with a positive economic shift to a gentrified area and a negative economic shift to the recipient community. The gentrified areas will receive a positive economic impact with increase in tax revenue from residents and businesses along with tourist dollars. The recipient community has a negative impact because the fiscal capacity of the recipient community
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contracts with an influx in residents, increasing the cost of social services (education, fire fighters, and police, etc.), while at the same time, the amount of tax revenue diminishes.

1. People who are currently living in non-gentrified metropolitan Atlanta are more likely to pay less money for rent/mortgage than people living in a post-gentrified City of Atlanta.

2. People who live in gentrified neighborhoods are more likely to receive increased civil services than citizens living in the non-gentrified areas of metropolitan Atlanta.

3. As gentrification begins, the more likely the property value of the neighborhood will increase.

4. The non-gentrified residents’ income is more likely less than the income of transitioning residents.

5. Gentrified neighborhoods are less likely to receive government housing subsidies than non-gentrified areas of metropolitan Atlanta.

6. The stronger a neighborhood’s tax base, the less likely the neighborhood will experience gentrification.

7. The more tourist dollars a downtown area receives, the more likely the downtown residential communities will experience gentrification.

**Data Collection**

This research on recipient communities examines the demographic, economic, and social impact on metropolitan Atlanta. An examination of U.S. Census Bureau reports pertaining to the demographics and economics (for example income), business
changes within the cities’ limits, as well as internal struggles the communities face during redevelopment are examined. Records from the various cities, including general demographic information are examined to provide a clearer economic picture of the cities. Along with economics is the face of the city. The “face” of the city is the demographic impact of gentrification. (Although several authors recognize racial differences within urban areas during and after redevelopment, comparing economic and demographic information with data from the cities and Federal government provides a two-fold examination of gentrification’s impact.) Along with (residential) economics, tax base, and demographics, the social impact of gentrification is examined. Social impact includes influx of social gathering places, eateries, after-hour clubs, and amount of grocery versus convenience stores. The social aspect, may incidentally impact the tax base of the community as well as the residential tax base.

Gentrification is discussed, as seen through information in the literature review, as an issue within inner city neighborhoods from various perspectives. Proponents and opponents agree there is a change, however, an in-depth look at the surface changes, economics, demographics, and social, provide empirical data to qualify the pros and cons of the well-known “change to the inner city”. The purpose of this research is not to address the psychological effect of gentrification because that information will vary depending on the human sample.

The main purpose of this research is to examine the relationship, if any, between the transitioning community and recipient community and how a lack of partnership influences the recipient community’s economic growth and development.
Significance

This research provides a perspective on the people affected by the redevelopment instead of the economics of revitalization. While, it is important to focus and applaud the financial implications and increases the community will receive; however, the financial and structural effects on the recipient community of the displaced residents should also be examined to assist with creating effective and improved policy to address overall community and economic development rather than selective revitalization. The significance of this research is to provide an overall view of the impact of gentrification on metropolitan Atlanta.

The historical perspective of the influx and removal of displaced citizens creates a dynamic of relating to the individuals, not the money. Relating to the individuals provides the human aspect of creating and enforcing holistic policies surrounding redevelopment. Examples of holistic policy components include affordable housing in the same or similar area for some residents, transitional period, comparable relocation, and inclusion of affected citizens in the initial proposal. In addition to holistic public policies, political influence is needed to encourage enforcement of those policies. To this point, displace residents may or may not have political ties to the community leaders and politicians. It is important to note, perhaps including individuals, affected by a new policy, on the planning and implementation could produce an environment where the community could be more accepting of the change to the community. Additionally, future research questions arise from conducting this research to address a comprehensive examination.
• *Is there a formal relocation policy or strategy?*
  
  o *If there is a formal relocation policy or strategy, does the policy or strategy include identifying potential community/communities that the displaced residents may relocate to live?*
  
  o *If the policy or strategy identifies potential communities, is there a partnership created between the transitioning community and the potential recipient community to be able to structurally accommodate the displaced residents?*
    
    ▪ *How are displaced residents located?*
    
    ▪ *Where are displaced residents located?*
    
    ▪ *Do the city’s economic and development priorities promote gentrification?*
    
    ▪ *What is the relationship between the city’s neighborhood and/or inner city redevelopment priorities, through gentrification and displacement?*

Such questions and more add to the dynamic of the complexity and multi-layered issue of gentrification. Since this issue is not simple, there are no simple solutions to provide the reader, politicians, and citizens on addressing the impact gentrification has on recipient communities. However, learning from past missteps and successes as well as applying best practices may assist policymakers in making more informed decisions about overall community and economic development.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this paper is a multiple descriptive case study design of three communities in Metropolitan Atlanta. The descriptive case study design is appropriate to understand complex phenomena\textsuperscript{99} to examine the holistic and characteristics of the real-life events related to the impact of political economy on recipient communities because of gentrification. The case study design examines “contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviors cannot be manipulated”.\textsuperscript{100} The purpose of this research design is to find out and describe what happened to the recipient communities upon receiving residents from gentrified communities – that is, the effect an influx of population has on the cost to social services on the recipient community. Robert Yin states the case study techniques are aligned with the techniques used for the techniques for studying history. James P. Key notes the steps for historical techniques include “isolate the problem; collect source materials, including primary and secondary sources; evaluate source materials; formulate hypotheses; report and interpret

\textsuperscript{100} Yin, \textit{Case Study}, 11.
Findings.”¹⁰¹ Yin states case study techniques include the historical techniques along with two additional techniques: direct observation of events being studied and interviewing persons involved in the events.¹⁰² Yin further explains case study’s “unique strength [is] in its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence – documents, artifacts, interviews, observations.”¹⁰³ Case study is able to explain events in the evidentiary method to provide an insight into a phenomenon.

Limitations to case study include lack of rigor with the research procedures and allowing an unbiased interpretation of the data on behalf of the researcher “to influence the direction of the findings and conclusion.”¹⁰⁴ In order to avoid these limitations, the researcher should gather data from a variety of sources to be able to ensure the information has been neutrally researched and gathered. The researcher should also be able to accept the results of the case study regardless whether the data contradicts or affirms the researcher’s hypotheses.

When analyzing the data for this case study of the political economy of gentrification, the independent variable is the population of the studied communities between 2000 and 2010. The U.S. Census Report data regarding population shifts is important to analyze which citizens and where those citizens relocated between 2000 and 2010. The years between 2000 and 2010 are used because of the economic environment in the United States, including the economic recession in 2008.

¹⁰¹ Key, James P., Research Design in Occupational Education, Oklahoma State University, 1997.
¹⁰² Yin, Case Study, 11.
¹⁰³ Ibid.
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The dependent variables for this case study is the amount of dollars spent on social services, crime rates, housing values and occupancy rates, and education budgets. There will inevitably be adjustments in the independent and dependent variables for population shifts not related to relocation because of gentrification to neighborhoods within the City of Atlanta.

Data for this research will consist of secondary data gathered from the 2010 U.S. Census report, Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), and the receiving communities in Clayton County, DeKalb County, and the City of Atlanta, pertaining to population changes, as well as local data points regarding crime rates, residential housing values and occupancy rates, and education budgets. This data will provide a quantitative information regarding the transition of community residents from their previous communities and their relocated communities. The quantitative data will also provide perspective as to the allocated budget for social services before and after residents were relocated from their previous communities.

Primary data will consist of responses to the below interview questions. The questions have been formulated to add perspective of the quantitative information gathered through the secondary data sources. For each municipality, Clayton County, DeKalb County, and City of Atlanta, the below questions were presented for the timeframe of the year 2000 and 2010 to compare the crime rate information and impact, housing values and impact, and impact on education budget and test scores of transitioning communities to the effect on recipient communities:
1. What is the crime rate?
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the crime rate?
   b. How has the current budget been affected by the crime rate?
   c. Is the current budget adequate to address the crime rate?
      i. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address the crime rate.

2. What are the current housing values?
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the housing values?
   b. How has the current budget been affected by the housing values?
   c. How has the housing values come to be what they are for the relocated residents to be able to afford to live in the area?

3. Describe the educational budget from an administrative view.
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the education budget?
   b. How has the impact on the budget affected schools?
   c. Is the current budget adequate to address schools and educational needs?
   d. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address schools and educational needs?
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Primary Data Collection

The researcher made numerous attempts to interview representatives from City of Atlanta, DeKalb County, Clayton County, Atlanta Public Schools, and Atlanta Housing Authority. The researcher was able to explain to an initial representative the topic of this research and some general data was gathered for this research; yet, the researcher required additional aggregate data as well as responses to interview questions. Another representative with a more working knowledge of the data was either not able to assist because the researcher’s questions and data request was not aggregated in the same manner or the representative did not return the researcher’s request.

While there is data for each agency available for public use, the researcher’s requests regarding methodology, background information and explanation of the data, as well as detailed aggregate data was unavailable to the researcher.

Specifically, for Clayton County, City of Atlanta, and DeKalb County, the below questions were not responded to for this research:

1. Public Safety:
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the crime rate?
b. Is the current budget adequate to address crime due to a population shift?
   i. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address crime.

c. How has the current budget been affected by the crime rate because of a population shift?

2. Housing Values:
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the housing values?
   b. How has the current budget been affected by the housing values because of a population shift?
   c. How have the housing values come to be what they are for the relocated residents to be able to afford to live in the area?

Specifically, for Clayton County, DeKalb County, and Atlanta Public Schools, the below questions were not responded to for this research:

1. Describe the educational budget from an administrative view.
   a. What has positively or negatively impacted the education budget?
   b. How has the impact on the budget affected schools because of a population shift?
   c. Is the current budget adequate to address schools and educational needs?
      i. Explain why the current budget is or is not adequate to address schools and educational needs?

Specifically, for the Atlanta Housing Authority, the below questions were not responded to for this research:

1. Housing Voucher:
   a. Based on the vouchers Atlanta Housing Authority provides:
      i. How many residents were provided vouchers between 2000 and 2010?
      ii. Of those provided vouchers, were information provided to determine why vouchers were given?
1. For example, was it because those housing units were being repurposed based on that area being gentrified/revitalized?

2. If not, please provide context if available.

iii. Of those provided vouchers, what zip codes inside City of Atlanta limits were residents given those vouchers.

iv. Of those provided vouchers, how many of those residents used the vouchers to relocate inside City of Atlanta limits?

v. Of those provided vouchers, how many of those residents used the vouchers to relocate outside City of Atlanta limits?

vi. Of those provided vouchers, what other communities were those vouchers used to relocate residents outside City of Atlanta limits?

All the above questions for each agency have not been specifically addressed for this research. For this research to provide a holistic analysis of the effects gentrification has on other communities, it is vital to have responses to these questions from the agencies who are directly impacted by gentrification.

The researcher reviewed public documents by the Atlanta Public Schools regarding school budgets and other financial documents, yet, the Atlanta Public Schools public documents provided projected budgets rather than actual budgets. Additionally, there are public charter schools under the scope of Atlanta Public Schools, Clayton County, as well as DeKalb County schools which have access to public school monies as well as grant monies from other entities. These public charter schools’ budgets can obscure the projected and actual budgets of the Atlanta Public School, Clayton County, and DeKalb County school systems.
Additionally, the researcher requested voucher information from the Atlanta Housing Authority. The Atlanta Housing Authority did not respond to the specific questions requested by the researcher in order to obtain the aggregated data. The Atlanta Housing Authority advised the public data is neither aggregated nor does the Atlanta Housing Authority have the ability to aggregate the data to respond to the researcher’s specific questions. Further, the Atlanta Housing Authority advised the Atlanta Housing Authority does not require recordkeeping of Atlanta Housing Authority vouchers used outside of Atlanta city limits.

**Secondary Data Collection**

The Atlanta Regional Commission, a commission authorized by the Georgia State Constitution as the designated Metropolitan Area Planning and Development Commission as well as a Regional Commission. The Atlanta Regional Commission created Equity Target Area (ETA) Base maps to demonstrate the concentration of inequity in metropolitan Atlanta. The Atlanta Regional Commission created ETA Base maps to illustrate high concentrated levels of poverty and ethnic minorities, high unemployment, 60 minutes or more commuting times, 30-minute or more distance from grocery stores, 60- minutes or more transit commute to public libraries, and 60-minute or more commute to grade schools, higher education, and hospitals in metropolitan Atlanta. In essence, the below maps illustrate a spatial mismatch, the disparity

---

between where people live, work, and their economic ability to thrive, access to transportation, and racial discrimination.

Figure 6 illustrates “Very High”, “High”, and “Medium” ETAs are mostly concentrated in the southwestern part of the City of Atlanta as well as eastern parts of Fulton County, northern parts of Clayton County, and western and southern parts of DeKalb County.

Figure 6. Equitable Target Area Base Map
Source: http://atlantaregional.com/the-regional-plan
Figure 6 illustrates the highest areas where there is a need for more intervention from civic and local leaders regarding economic, education, and social services gaps as compared to areas in the northern parts of Metropolitan Atlanta.

Figure 7 illustrates accessibility to transit in Metropolitan Atlanta.

![Equitable Target Areas Transit Accessibility](image)

**Figure 7. Equitable Target Areas Transit Accessibility**


Although there is concentrated transit accessibility in the city of Atlanta limits, there is more transit accessibility on the north and eastern parts of the city, as compared to the southern and western parts immediately outside of city of Atlanta limits, including
DeKalb and Clayton counties, were equitable target areas are more present. Thusly, those not in equitable target areas disproportionally have more access to public transportation than those in equitable target areas – those in an economic need for public transportation.

Figure 8 illustrates the rate of crime in Clayton County between 2000 and 2010 based on the Uniform Crime Report’s major categories of crime.

Clayton County Crime Statistics 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Larceny</th>
<th>Vehicle Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>8736</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>8021</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td>7177</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>7373</td>
<td>2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>7618</td>
<td>2706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>7519</td>
<td>2301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>6145</td>
<td>2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>3861</td>
<td>6553</td>
<td>2053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>4927</td>
<td>7411</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>4996</td>
<td>6426</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>4981</td>
<td>6238</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Clayton County Crime Statistics 2000-2010
Source: https://gbi.georgia.gov
The crime statistics in Clayton County for murder, rape, and robbery maintained a relative steady occurrence between 2000 and 2010. Vehicle theft occurrences had its highest reported incidences in 2004, then declined through 2010. Between 2000 and 2008, burglary steadily increased, then with a sharp increased between 2007 and 2008. Between 2008 and 2010, burglary occurrences began to plateau. Larceny rates declined between 2000 and 2002; became steady between 2002 and 2005; declined between 2005 and 2006; increased between 2006 and 2008; then decrease again between 2008 and 2010. However, the specific questions regarding the effect on Clayton County’s budget or causes/correlations of crime statistics were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the crime rate?
b. How has the current budget been affected by the crime rate?
c. Is the current budget adequate to address crime?
   i. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address crime.

Figure 9 illustrates the rate of crime in City of Atlanta between 2000 and 2010 based on the Uniform Crime Report’s major categories of crime.
Figure 9. City of Atlanta Crime Statistics 2000-2010
Source: https://fbi.georgia.gov

However, the specific questions regarding the effect on City of Atlanta’s budget or causes/correlations of crime statistics were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the crime rate?

b. How has the current budget been affected by the crime rate?

c. Is the current budget adequate to address crime?

i. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address crime.

Figure 10 illustrates the rate of crime in DeKalb County between 2000 and 2010 based on the Uniform Crime Report’s major categories of crime.

DeKalb County Crime Statistics 2000-2010

![Graph of DeKalb County Crime Statistics 2000-2010](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Larceny</th>
<th>Vehicle Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>19087</td>
<td>5530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>4842</td>
<td>14775</td>
<td>5348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>5596</td>
<td>15066</td>
<td>4898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>8284</td>
<td>22362</td>
<td>7689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>12198</td>
<td>6482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>7968</td>
<td>17008</td>
<td>6986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>2469</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td>16375</td>
<td>6979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3035</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8081</td>
<td>20632</td>
<td>7241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>10881</td>
<td>22245</td>
<td>6971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>12391</td>
<td>19652</td>
<td>5005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>10523</td>
<td>19743</td>
<td>4915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. DeKalb County Crime Statistics 2000-2010

Source: [https://gbi.georgia.gov](https://gbi.georgia.gov)
The crime statistics in DeKalb County for murder, rape, and robbery maintained a relative steady occurrence between 2000 and 2010. Vehicle theft occurrences had its highest reported incidences in 2003, then declined through 2006; then began to decline in 2007 through 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, burglary and larceny occurrences fluctuated several times, unable to have consistent overall trending for law enforcement. The specific questions regarding the effect on City of Atlanta’s budget or causes/correlations of crime statistics, however, were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the crime rate?
b. How has the current budget been affected by the crime rate?
c. Is the current budget adequate to address crime?
   i. Explain how the current budget is or is not adequate to address crime.

Figure 11 addresses the questions posed to Clayton County regarding housing.

**Clayton County: Median House/Condo and Income Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>House/Condo</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$90,900</td>
<td>$42,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$78,200</td>
<td>$40,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Clayton County: Median House/Condo and Income Values
Source: www.city-data.com/city/ClaytonCounty-Georgia.html
Specifically, how have the housing values come to be what they are for the relocated residents to be able to afford to live in the area? The decline of house/condo values and median annual income for Clayton County for 2000 and 2010. The decline of house/condo values, in addition to the decline of median annual of income, demonstrates two components as to the contributing factors for Clayton County to be considered an equitable target area for the Atlanta Regional Commission. Figure 11 further demonstrates the gap between income and house/condo in 2000 was 53% compared to 48% in 2010. Although the decline in the gap between income and house/condo value is encouraging, the percentage difference remains higher than the 30% level the Atlanta Regional Commission references as an economic safe zone for citizens to be able to live and work with enough monies remaining from their take-home pay.\(^{106}\) However, the following questions were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the housing values?

b. How has the current budget been affected by the housing values?

Figure 12 addresses questions posed to the City of Atlanta regarding housing.

\(^{106}\) Atlanta Regional Commission, “Atlanta Region Plan 2040”, Atlanta Regional Commission.
Specifically, how have the housing values come to be what they are for the relocated residents to be able to afford to live in the area? The decline of house/condo values and median annual income for the City of Atlanta for 2000 and 2010. The increase of house/condo values, in addition to the decline of median annual of income, demonstrates to the contributing factors for City of Atlanta to be considered an equitable target area for the Atlanta Regional Commission. Figure 12 further demonstrates the gap between income and house/condo in 2000 was 76% compared to 77% in 2010. Although the increase in income increased 25% from 2000 and 2010, the house/condo values increased 28%. This trend suggests house/condo values increase at a rate higher than income. The income to house/condo values ratio is higher than the 30% level the Atlanta Regional Commission references as an economic safe zone for citizens to be able to live
and work with enough monies remaining from their take-home pay. However, the following questions were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the housing values?
b. How has the current budget been affected by the housing values?

Figure 13 addresses questions posed to the DeKalb County regarding housing.

DeKalb County: Median House/Condo and Income Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House/Condo</td>
<td>$133,500</td>
<td>$154,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$49,117</td>
<td>$49,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. DeKalb County: Median House/Condo and Income Values
Source: www.city-data.com/city/DeKalbCounty-Georgia.html

Specifically, Figure 13 addresses how have the housing values come to be what they are for the relocated residents to be able to afford to live in the area?

An increase of house/condo values in DeKalb County of nearly 14%, yet, an increase of 1% of annual income from 2000 to 2013. The increase of income is at a 13% rate slower than the increase in median house/condo value. This trend suggests house/condo values increase at a rate higher than income. The income to house/condo values ratio is higher than the 30% level the Atlanta Regional Commission references as

an economic safe zone for citizens to be able to live and work with enough monies remaining from their take-home pay. The following questions, however, were not addressed:

a. What has positively or negatively impacted the housing values?
b. How has the current budget been affected by the housing values?

Figures 14, 15, and 16 illustrate the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as calculated by the State of Georgia. To meet overall AYP, the school system must meet an average percentage of 95%. AYP is measured by taking the school system’s participation, attendance, and academic performance and creating an average percentage. To meet the metrics for Test Participation, 95% of students must have taken the state assessments in Reading/English Language Arts and Mathematics for school systems with 40 or more students. Academic Performance, for school systems with 40 or more students, is measured by the scoring proficiency or advanced on state assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. The State of Georgia’s Department of Education website has archived AYP schools starting at the 2006-2007 school year.

Figure 14 illustrates the average AYP for Clayton County Schools between the 2006-2007 school year through the 2010-2011 school year.

---

110 Ibid.
111 Ibid.
Per the State of Georgia’s Department of Education data, while the percentage of students taking the state assessments has been relatively consistent, students meeting State of Georgia’s education standards in the Clayton County Schools has continued to decrease.

Figure 15 illustrates the average AYP for Atlanta Public Schools between the 2006-2007 school year through the 2010-2011 school year.
Per the State of Georgia’s Department of Education data, while the percentage of students taking the state assessments has been relatively consistent, students meeting State of Georgia’s education standards in the Atlanta Public Schools has continued to decrease, with slightly half of the students in Atlanta Public County Schools meeting AYP in the 2010-2011 school year.

Figure 16 illustrates the average AYP for DeKalb County Schools between the 2006-2007 school year through the 2010-2011 school year.
Per the State of Georgia’s Department of Education data, while the percentage of students taking the state assessments has been relatively consistent, students meeting State of Georgia’s education standards in the DeKalb County Schools have continued to decrease, with more than half of the students in DeKalb County Schools not meeting AYP in the 2010-2011 school year.

Figure 17 illustrates the concentration of the black population in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.

Figure 17. Atlanta Region: Black Population (2010)
Source: http://www.neighborhoodnexus.org

Figure 17 illustrates there is a higher concentration (between 30.4%-97.7%) of the black population is generally concentrated in the southern portions of Atlanta, Fulton County and DeKalb County as well as the clear majority of Clayton County. The significance of Figure 17 is to illustrate the concentration of the black population in metropolitan Atlanta are in Equitable Target Areas (see Figure 6).

Figure 18 illustrates the concentration of the white population in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
The map illustrates there is a higher concentration (between 63.8% - 96.6%) of whites generally concentrated in the northern portion of Atlanta and counties on the outer edges of Metropolitan Atlanta. The significance of Figure 18 is to illustrate the concentration of the white population in metropolitan Atlanta is outside of Equitable Target Areas as noted in Figure 6.

Figure 19 illustrates the concentration of the Hispanic/Latino population in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
Figure 19, while illustrating a more diversity of population concentration of Hispanic/Latino population inside of Metropolitan Atlanta, shows a higher concentration of Hispanic/Latino populations in varying areas of each county, rather than the majority of the county compared to blacks and whites. The significance of Figure 19 is to illustrate the concentration of the Hispanic/Latino population in metropolitan Atlanta.

Figure 20 illustrates the median incomes in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
Figure 20 illustrates there is higher income rates are concentrated in the northern portion of Atlanta and some counties on the outer edges of Metropolitan Atlanta. The significance of Figure 20, when compared to the racial concentration maps, illustrates where there are more black and/or Hispanic/Latino populations, the lower the rates of household income are concentrated.

Figure 21 illustrates varying percentages of rental units in 2010 based on the 2010 U.S. Census Report.
The largest percentages (38%-100%) rental units are largely concentrated in the City of Atlanta, nearly all of Fulton and DeKalb counties, as well as large parts of Clayton County (although, based on previously illustrated graphs, the values of those units have decreased). Rental units include low-income multi-family units as well as higher priced multi-family units. As noted in Figures 11, 12, and 13, the median values of condo units in the City of Atlanta has increased along with the number of units inside the City of Atlanta.
Figure 22 illustrates the median home values in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.

**Atlanta Region: Median Value, Occupied Units (2010)**

Figure 22 illustrates there is a higher home values are concentrated in the northern portion of Atlanta and some counties on the outer edges of Metropolitan Atlanta. The implication of Figure 22 illustrates an increase in housing values with a relationship between higher median income rates and the concentration of white population in the northern portion of the City of Atlanta limits and Metropolitan Atlanta.

Figure 23 illustrates the recipients of food stamps in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
Figure 23. Atlanta Region: Change in Individuals Receiving Food Stamps (2007-2010)

Source: http://www.neighborhoodnexus.org/

Figure 23 illustrates there is a higher number of recipients are concentrated in the southern portion of Atlanta, with Figure 20 illustrating a higher concentration of lower income rates, and in large quantities in counties throughout Metropolitan Atlanta, specifically in Equitable Target Areas.

Figure 24 illustrates the education level, specifically Bachelor degree or higher achieved education, in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
Figure 24 illustrates there is a higher concentration of residents in the northern portion and counties of Atlanta. Figure 24 creates a broader illustration of the relationship between higher income rates, median home values, and white population composition in the northern portions of the City of Atlanta and counties in close proximity to City of Atlanta.

Figure 25 illustrates the originated financial loans in Metropolitan Atlanta in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Report.
Figure 25 illustrates there is a higher home values are concentrated in the northern portion of Atlanta and counties north of Atlanta. Figure 25 creates a broader illustration of the relationship between higher income rates, median home values, higher education, ethnic composition, as well as the availability and origination of home loans purchasing concentrated in the northern portions of the City of Atlanta. With increasing in home loans purchasing origination, areas continue to increase property value and property taxes for local government for schools and public services.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Data Analysis

Fundamentally, the question transitioning communities may have been “what’s in it for me to work with potential absorb communities?” The response to this question depends on the economic goals of the community. Perhaps, if the economic goals of Metropolitan Atlanta are for the region, as a whole, is to grow (which includes the City of Atlanta, DeKalb County, and Clayton County), attract businesses, and become a job creating region, the varying metropolitan counties and cities should begin to work with each other as a team versus autonomy. Specifically, urban economists argue

“rising incomes and declining transportation and communication costs induce individuals and businesses to move away from the city center and toward outlying areas, where land is generally less expensive.”112

This means transitioning areas, such as the City of Atlanta, are losing residents and businesses because the cost of living and existing in these transitioning areas have become too expensive. At the same time, when residents and businesses relocate outside

the transitioning areas, the communities absorbing the displaced residents and businesses must then work with their government agencies to ensure policies and procedures, infrastructure, and public services are sufficient to support the new/relocated businesses and residents.

The reactive approach of upgrading infrastructure, imposing policies and procedures, increasing public services, and other resources to improving the absorbed communities could be an expensive and piecemeal approach to economic development rather than a proactive plan with all aspects of development taken into consideration and developed holistically rather than in parts.

Analyzing all the aforementioned maps, as a whole, creates a visual correlation between higher income, home loan origination, higher education degrees, median home values, and ethnic composition are concentrated in northern portions of the City of Atlanta. Thus, the oversaturation of the northern portions of the City of Atlanta creates an opportunity to expand in the southern portions of City of Atlanta where there is a lower rate of education degrees, median home values, income rates, and home loans. These lower rates allow for the opportunity to expand gentrification growth in the southern areas of the City of Atlanta, which involuntary displaces residents currently living in the southern portions of the City of Atlanta to the counties south of the City of Atlanta, that is DeKalb County and Clayton County.

Anecdotally, displaced residents from the City of Atlanta, move to other locations within City of Atlanta limits, DeKalb County, and Clayton County because the absorb communities are ‘affordable’ compared to the transitioning areas, based on the median
home values. Yet, Penrice notes the former leader of the Atlanta Housing Authority, Renee Glover, “has championed eliminating traditional public housing units in favor of mixed-used communities.” The elimination of traditional public housing for private development of mixed-used communities removes the government oversight to ensure affordable, public housing of residents. At the same time, more detailed analysis of the needed data for this research is insufficient because of the lack of responses from the agencies responsible for the areas of concern regarding this research. Yet, the 2014 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development noted the homeless population of Atlanta at 4,203.

While the specific effects of gentrification on Metropolitan Atlanta is not clear, research has been conducted on using the phenomena of displacement based on the unexpected event of New Orleans, Louisiana’s Hurricane Katrina in 2005. According to Dan Vergano, Houston, Texas received approximately 240,000 displaced New Orleans residents, an approximate 7% increase in Houston’s population, and between 2004-2006, there was a slight increase in murder and robbery overall rates, yet no overall increase in other crime as well as suggesting a decrease in rape and aggravated assault overall rates.

John Logan noted the political participation in the 2006 New Orleans’ mayoral race was affected by the displacement of residents because of Hurricane Katrina.

---

114 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, October 2014, Retrieved at
115 Vergano, “Report: No Crime”.

Specifically, Logan noted an increase in absentee ballots, decrease in lower and middle class black voters, while an increase in upper middle class white voters. While the overall event of Hurricane Katrina had an impact on the electorate, it is unclear whether the voting participation change is related to former New Orleans’ residents changing their official addresses to another city/state, or were not informed of the availability to vote, or if there was an active voter suppression effort.

Scott Imberman, Adriana Kugler, and Bruce Sacerdote conducted research regarding the impact on the education from the influx of Hurricane Katrina displaced residents on the Houston Independent School District. According to Imberman et al., found no impact on Houston Independent School District’s achievements, classroom sizes, teacher quality, as well as dollars spent per student, with the influx of Hurricane Katrina displaced residents. Imberman et al., suggest that although there were initial adjustments to classroom sizes and social adjustments of the students, adjustments were made within a timeframe and manner to avoid long term negative effects on the students, budgets, and the school system.

While overall crime in Houston decreased and the Houston Independent School District had no impact on its functionality after the influx of Hurricane Katrina displaced residents, housing and public policy regarding housing was not managed in the same manner of inclusiveness as the school district. Specifically, Henneberger notes political

---

leaders concentrated housing opportunities in Southwest Houston, where there is a higher
crime rate, police presence, as well as concentrated poverty and low income housing as
compared to other communities in Houston.\textsuperscript{118} Henneberger notes there was “once
hopeful promises of integrating the evacuees in the city economically and socially were
replaced by an official city policy of containment and continued concentration.”\textsuperscript{119}
Thusly, by concentrating displacement, poverty, and higher need for social services in the
same area, creates an environment where cycles of poverty and despair become
normalized.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{118} Henneberger, “Houston's Fair Housing”.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
\end{footnotesize}
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research is to examine the affects gentrification has on communities that absorbed displaced residents from those transitioning communities. However, it is difficult to fully examine the effects on the absorbed communities because the data does not exist to fully track the relocation of the displaced residents and the effects on the absorbed communities in Metropolitan Atlanta. Not having the long-term aggregate data of changes in housing values and availability of low-income housing; budget and effectiveness of social services; budget and effectiveness of public schools; availability of transportation does not allow for clear and informed data to be researched and applied responsibly to effective public policy.

Although specific research questions were not responded to by Clayton County, City of Atlanta, and DeKalb County officials, the below inferences can be gathered from secondary data:

- Clayton County:
  - crime rate has fluctuated between 2000 and 2010, with noticeable increase in assaults between 2007 and 2008;
  - housing values have decreased between 2000 and 2010;
o AYP indicators have decreased between the 2006-2007 and 2010-2011 school years

- City of Atlanta:
  o crime rate has a steady decline between 2000 and 2006, with an increase between 2007-2008, and decline between 2009-2010;
  o housing values have increased between 2000 and 2010;
  o AYP indicators have decreased between the 2006-2007 and 2010-2011 school years.

- DeKalb County:
  o crime rate has fluctuated, with several cycles of increasing and decreasing between 2000 and 2010;
  o housing values have increased between 2000 and 2010;
  o AYP indicators have decreased between the 2006-2007 and 2010-2011 school years.

Varying agencies with the responsibility of collecting and disseminating data have information regarding current demographic information pertaining to race/ethnicity, income, graduation rates, and other critical figures about communities, yet, those agencies tasked with housing, transportation, public education and the like, either do not have, do not collect, or will not share the aggregate data with researchers to examine public policy as whole. Thus, current public policy is ineffective to address the specific issue of in-migration of displaced residents because of gentrification.
In addition to the aforementioned responsible agencies lacking or withholding aggregate data, public officials also have responsibility for the lack of effective data to address the issue of displaced residents into absorbed communities. It is unclear if there is a lack of concern for those displaced residents or lack of concern to address the underlying effects of gentrification on a community not directly affected by the displaced residents.

Further, absorbed community and local officials have not become proactive in their approach to receiving the displaced residents. It is unclear as to why there is a lack of proactive public policy for those receiving communities near transitioning areas. The lack of proactive or interdependency workings with government agencies demonstrates that Metropolitan Atlanta is another city where “governance of most American metropolitan areas is highly fragmented.”\textsuperscript{120} Absorbed communities should have a plan to be prepared and address the effects of an increase in residents, which may or may not have a fiscally balanced tax revenue to services used ratio. Absorbed communities should be aware of the effects on their public agencies, services, and spaces.

By not asking, addressing, and working on proactive policies regarding displaced residents into absorbed communities, government officials will continue to be ineffective when addressing the needs of those communities, thus shifting the poor instead of addressing the needs of the poor which in return addresses the needs of the entire absorbed community. This ineffective governing not only affects the displaced residents,

\textsuperscript{120} Chernick, et al., “Lost in the Balance”.}
the ineffectiveness affects current residents, government budgets, and overall functionality of the community.

The responsibility of public services relies on the local governments, even when mandated by state and federal governments. As previously noted by Vergano, crime rate changes after displacement is more of a factor of the condition of the community rather than the character of the displaced population. Therefore, proactive public policies for local governments appear to be an appropriate strategy to manage an influx of in-migration because of transitioning communities.

Recommendations

By working together, transitioning communities and recipient communities, a region could experience cooperative growth from an economic, political, and social perspective. Cooperative growth a term created for this research and is defined as transitioning areas working with communities, whose structural environment is economically obtainable for displaced residents from transitioning areas, to address and implement responsible public policy regarding communities absorbing displaced residents. Cooperative growth occurs when recipient communities and transitioning communities work together to expand the structural improvements of both communities in order to accomplish underlying goals of each community.

Structural improvements include, yet are not limited to:

- while expanding, updating, and increasing infrastructure in the transitioning communities, recipient communities should also be able to update infrastructure
(water/sewer, streets, sidewalks, and utility (electricity, gas, and internet) services) to prepare for the increase in residents;

- while decreasing the ‘low-income’ housing in transitioning communities, recipient communities should also review, update, and expect to receive residents seeking similar value of housing;

- while decreasing the ‘low-income’ housing in transitioning communities, recipient communities should review and expect an increase in families with children and the needs of those children will have on public schools and public services;

- while decreasing the ‘low-income’ housing in transitioning communities, recipient communities should review, update, and expect an increase in the use and need for public transportation for employment, school travel, and everyday needs;

- while decreasing the ‘low-income’ housing in transitioning communities, recipient communities should review, update, and expect an increase in services for police departments, fire departments, parks and recreation, as well as medical and food assistance.

Cooperative growth does not expect the same level of investment to recipient communities compared as transitioning communities. At the same time, cooperative growth does expect for some level of investment in the recipient communities from developers, government, and civic/community leaders in recipient communities, with the
understanding further investments in the surrounding communities will have a ripple effect on holistic economic development and growth for the region. Cooperative growth expects for government officials, business developers, and civic/community leaders of transitioning and recipient communities to communicate and work in partnership for the long-term, holistic economic stability of the communities. As part of communicating and working in partnership, cooperative growth expects for government agencies to keep accurate track of data along with the ability to aggregate the data in order to share data points for conducting research to address and create informed public policy.

Cooperative growth responds to the adage of “not in my back yard” to “all of the region is my back yard” and in order for property values to remain stable, businesses continue to thrive, unemployment rate in the region remains low, educational standards and achievements to increase, efficient and effective use of government funding of public services is allocated to fill the needed gaps, and the long-term functioning of the communities remain high.

Thusly, cooperative growth is a proactive policy approach to economic development and long-term growth of a region regarding recipient communities and where officials can be part of the solution to occupied blighted communities rather than responding to the negative impacts (increase in crime, decreased tax base, increase in use of public services without sufficient funding, and the like) of a disconnected community. In order for cooperative growth to be adequately measured, access to data points from varying public agencies should be made available to the public – with the ability to aggregate data in order to measure the benefits of cooperative growth.
The practice currently undertaken by the cities and counties in Metropolitan Atlanta is piecemeal instead of a holistic approach to public policy. Per the Georgia State Constitution and federal law, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with the responsibility to provide the planning needs, studies, and input on the planning and growth within Metropolitan Atlanta. However, ARC’s role is limited to recommendations without enforcement to be inclusive of the entire metropolitan area. ARC should have a forceful and legislatively impactful role with full and active support from local, regional, and state-level officials to cultivate, expand, promote, and oversee cooperate growth in Metropolitan Atlanta. As such, while ARC has varying committees to address varying issues, such as aging, transportation, workforce solutions, and education, it is unclear whether or not the committees work together to address each issue through a holistic lens versus as an individual component.

For example, when addressing educational needs, does the education committee work with the workforce solutions committee to discover gaps within education to address the workforce needs? Does the workforce solutions committee work with the transportation committee to discover new challenges or existing gaps with potential or existing employees traveling to work? If yes, how does the ARC address these gaps and challenges? Does ARC have the authority to enforce solutions to address the gaps within education and transportation for the sake of improving the skills and availability of the local workforce? If the ARC does not have the authority to enforce solutions, how effective and efficient can the Metropolitan Atlanta region be to steady economic growth
that is inclusive and inviting to residents and businesses as part of the cooperative growth theory?

As part of cooperative growth, ARC should take on an active role facilitating economic and development planning as well as tracking the movement of and potential movement of displaced persons and the ripple effect on the absorbing communities. By having a more active role, disparate impact on communities can be managed to avoid regional economic imbalance regarding education, employment, transportation, and social services. ARC should have a more influential voice negotiating and collaborating within the region to facilitate communication between transitioning and recipient communities during the planning phases to ensure the service needs and long-term benefits of both communities are expressed, planned, and acted upon to minimize economic imbalances. ARC should, legislatively, have more influence with politicians to evaluate, update, and/or change policies, holistically, to address the needs of all residents as it pertains to education, social services, and economic stability.
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