Rutgers Center on Law, Inequality & Metropolitan Equity

Displacement Risk and Gentrification: The CLiME Displacement Risk Indicators Matrix (DRIM) Methodology

A CLiME Research Brief

November 2017 By David D. Troutt Research and graphics by Cristina Garmendia

Introduction

As Newark experiences unprecedented growth potential, Newarkers express more and more anxiety about the prospects of housing displacement brought on by the processes of gentrification that have transformed urban neighborhoods across the United States. Given the recent history of other cities in its metropolitan neighborhood – New York, Hoboken and Jersey City – Newark would seem poised to attract the kind of global capital that has accelerated so much economic development among the transportation corridors that have easy access to Manhattan. With both an international airport, a port, R1 research institutions, a medical school and a rail hub at Newark Penn Station, this small, working-class city – just 24 square miles – would seem to be next in line for the arrival of a new "gentry". It has not happened yet.

However, the Center on Law, Inequality and Metropolitan Equity (CLiME) at Rutgers Law School decided to examine the potential for displacement *by any means* in this brief analysis rooted in housing and demographics. (A more comprehensive Report on Housing and Equitable Growth in Newark will follow in January 2018.) Here is a summary of our pertinent findings.

- Newark, a city with the second highest rate of renters in the country, is deep into a crisis of affordable housing. Rents are rising significantly, and incomerestricted housing is at risk.
- Traditional gentrification processes such as the wholesale transformation of neighborhoods for upscale housing development and the retail stores that cater to more expensive tastes, the proliferation of private schools, the rapid entry of at least college-educated non-Hispanic whites – have not taken significant hold in Newark – yet.
- People *are* moving to the City and locating in some of its more expensive neighborhoods.
- There is significant vulnerability to housing displacement as witnessed by incomes that cannot keep pace with asking rents, very high eviction rates and low owner-occupancy (in part a reflection of high rates of foreclosure over the past decade).

Newark elected officials care deeply about the City and its residents. They are aware of these concerns. We believe that many of the findings here can aid them and their constituents in the process of producing *just growth* – that is, economic development that is inclusive, equitable and offers shared opportunities for longtime



residents and newcomers alike. One such aid is the **Displacement Risk Indicators Matrix (DRIM)**, a data tool that can help policymakers forecast the likely impact of proposed changes. In the remainder of this Brief, we outline the DRIM methodology and how to use it while providing additional measures of displacement along the way.

The Displacement Risk Indicators Matrix (DRIM)

Purpose

The DRIM was designed as an assessment tool for policymakers, organizers, developers and the public to view the City and its five wards through select data condensed into variables that demonstrate risks associated with housing displacement. These risks are not always identified with typical gentrification. While some cities may be appropriate contexts for a gentrification index, we chose *displacement* for Newark. Using the DRIM, policymakers can measure the potential impact of contemplated policy initiatives or proposed developments.

3 Categories, 2 Time Periods, 6 Places

The ten displacement factors are divided into three conceptual categories. Each category can stand alone or be viewed in conjunction with one or both of the others. They are:

- 1. VULNERABILITY –stress indicators on households (rent burden, rent, income and poverty rate)
- 2. MARKET DYNAMICS –indicators that show *rising* rents, decreased affordability and new construction
- 3. "Gentrifier" population –indicators showing increases in the presence of wealthier, more college-educated renters

The categories are set up in three blocks of time: the present (2015), the past (2000) and the change in between (trends). The first and third blocks are probably the most useful; the second (2000) is an interesting reference point.

The City statistic is always the baseline for comparison to the individual wards, and it is represented in the white "Newark" column. The five columns that follow represent the five wards.

DATA SOURCES: All data in the DRIM and elsewhere in this Brief are derived from analyses of the U.S. Bureau of the Census American Community Survey (ACS) for 2000-2015.



_
Σ
2
e
Matrix
Indicator
Risk
placement
Dis

CLIME, Fall 2017

Color Legend Lower rick but Lower rick but

2015	Newark	Eact Ward	-	Central Ward	-	Vorth Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization Statistic	Compared to city 3	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Hgh AgH	6 Less rent-burdened	26%	Less rent-burdened	28%	Equally rent-burder	31%	More rent-burdened	95E	More rent-burdenes	37%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Moderate \$97	3 More expensive	\$1,026	Less expensive	658\$	Less expensive	\$16\$	Less expensive	606\$	More expensive	\$1,004
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low \$33,13	9 More Income	\$41,952	Less Income	\$31,162	Less Income	\$31,830	Less Income	\$15,05\$	Less Income	\$32,615
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High 29	% Less poverty	23%	More poverty	34%	less poverty	29%	More poverty	32%	More poverty	30%
Martiel Dynamics	Characterization Statistic	Compared to city 8	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$900)	Low 42	6 Less affordable	30%	Vore affordable	\$3%	Less affordable	40%	Less affordable	47%	More affordable	39%6
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$1250, FMR for 2-bed)	Low 24	% More high-rent units	28%	Less high-rent units	19%	less high-rent units	22%	Equal high-rent unit	852	More high-rent unit	26%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 2012-2016)*	Low 7	7 More occupancy pe	9.5	More occupancy per	114	Less occupancy pe	5.0	Less occupancy pe	5.2	Less occupancy pe	4.3
"Gentrifter" Population	Characterization Statistic	Compared to city 3	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low 20,05	9	3,446		3,083		4,155		4,210		5,192
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	LOW 22	6 Less owner-occupa	18%	Less owner-occupar	19%	Less owner-occupe	22%	More owner-occupe	23%	More owner-occups	26%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low 11	% More non-Hispanic	31%	Less non-Hispanic v	7%	ess non-Hispanic	8 8	Less non-Hispanic (2	Less non-Hispanic	*
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low 13	6 Less college-educat	13%	More college-educat	19%	Less college-educa	13%	Less college-educa	12%	Less college-educa	13%

	-					•						
2000	Newark		Eact Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Moderate	%EZ	Less rent-burdened	18%	Less rent-burdened	22%	More rent-burdenex	24%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdenes	26%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Low	\$586	More expensive	\$600	Less expensive	\$456	More expensive	\$614	Less expensive	\$523	Less affordable	\$619
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$27,058	More Income	\$32,464	Less income	\$23,642	More Income	\$27,429	Less Income	\$25,988	Less Income	\$27,862
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	28%	Less poverty	21%	More poverty	39%	Less poverty	26%	More poverty	30%	Less poverty	27%
Martet Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$750)	Hgh	76%	Less affordable	73%	More affordable	86%	Less affordable	71%	More affordable	78%	Less affordable	70%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying ~\$500, inflation-adjusted FMR)	Low	\$	More high-rent units	10%	Less high-rent units	5%	More high-rent unit	11%	Less high-rent units	*	More high-rent unit	11%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)*	Moderate	24.5	Less occupancy per	23.5	More occupancy per	41.0	Less occupancy pe	16.8	Less occupancy pe	9.3	Less occupancy pe	14.4
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	21,738		4,129		2,714		4,313		4,515		6,057
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	Less owner-occupar	14%	More owner-occups	23%	Less owner-occupa	21%	More owner-occups	27%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	48	More non-Hispanic	48%	Less non-Hispanic v	5%	More non-Hispanic	16%	Less non-Hispanic (1%	Less non-Hispanic	5%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	8	Less college-educat	7%	More college-educat	9%	More college-educa	10%	Less college-educa	9%	More college-educ:	11%

2000-2015 Change	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
(winerability	Characterization Sta	tistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) 	More rent-burdened	37%	Larger Increase	43%	Smaller Increase	26%	Smaller Increase	۶,	Larger Increase	43%	Larger Increase	43%
2 RENT (% change in number)	More expensive	66%	Larger Increase	71%	Larger Increase	88	Smaller Increase	5	Larger Increase	74%	Smaller Increase	828
3 INCOME (% change in number)	More Income	22%	Larger Increase	29%	Larger Increase	32%	Smaller Increase	16%	Smaller Increase	17%	Smaller Increase	17%
4 POVERTY (% change in % of households)	More poverty	3%	Larger Increase	5%	Decrease	-12%	Larger Increase	% 5	Larger Increase	£	Larger Increase	12%
dartiel Dynamics	Characterization Sta	tistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% change in % of households)	Less affordable unit	45%	Larger decrease	%65-	Smaller decrease	-38%	Smaller decrease	87 7	Smaller decrease	% 7	Equal decrease	45%
5 HIGH RENTS (% change in % of households)	More high-rent unit:	166%	Larger Increase	176%	Larger Increase	262%	Smaller Increase	100%	Larger Increase	190%	Smaller Increase	148%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (% change in number of permits)*	Less occupancy per	69%	Smaller decrease	+CO%	Larger decrease	-72%	Larger decrease	-70%	Smaller decrease	-44%	Larger decrease	-70%
Gentrifier" Population	Characterization Sta	tistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
9 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Change in number of households)		-1,652		-683		369		-158		506-		-965
s OWNER-OCCUPIED (% change in % of households)	No change	ŝ	Decrease	-19%	Increase	33%	Decrease	*	Decrease	ş	Decrease	%E-
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% change in % of population)	Less non-Hispanic (-24%	Larger decrease	%SE-	Increase	48%	Larger decrease	%C-	Increase	165%	Larger decrease	%C5-
0 BACHELORS DEGREE (% change in % of population)	More college-educa	48%	Larger Increase	87%	Larger Increase	103%	Smaller Increase	36%	Smaller Increase	36%	Smaller Increase	18%

Newark, NJ 2000-2015 CLiME Displacement Risk Indicators Matrix Newark, NJ 2000-2010

How to Read the DRIM

1. Note the baseline

In general, red indicates a variable showing higher risk of housing displacement, yellow is lower than red but still high while green represents lower risk. These risk levels are all relative to the City as a whole – the baseline – which in most cases is already pretty high. In the example below, we characterized vulnerability factors for Newark as a whole in 2000. The rate of extreme rent burden (i.e., paying more than 50% of income toward rent) is "moderate" at 23%, but for many cities that would be very high. Next, median gross rents of \$586 were low for the region (note how they rise in the "change" block and their 2015 amount). Incomes are low and poverty rates high for the City compared to other cities.

20	000	Newark	
Vı	Inerability	Characterization	Statistic
1	EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Moderate	23%
2	RENT (Median gross rent)	Low	\$586
3	INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$27,058
4	POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	28%
Ma	arket Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic
5	AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$750)	High	76%
6	HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR)	Low	9%
7	OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)*	Moderate	24.5
"G	entrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	21,738
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%
9	NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	14%
10	BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	9%



2. Compare the wards by their relation to the city-wide statistic

2	015	Newark		East Ward	
V	ulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1	EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	High	31%	Less rent-burdened	26%
2	RENT (Median gross rent)	Moderate	\$973	More expensive	\$1,026
3	INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$33,139	More income	\$41,952
4	POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	29%	Less poverty	23%
М	arket Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5	AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$900)	Low	42%	Less affordable	30%
6	HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$1250, FMR for 2-bed)	Low	24%	More high-rent units	28%
7	OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 2012-2016)*	Low	7.7	More occupancy pe	9.5
"C	Sentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	20,086		3,446
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	Less owner-occupa	18%
9	NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	11%	More non-Hispanic	31%
10	BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	13%	Less college-educat	13%



3. Compare the wards to the city-level indicators for both 2000 and 2015.

2015	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic						
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	High	31%	Less rent-burdened	26%	Less rent-burdened	28%	Equally rent-burder	31%	More rent-burdened	34%	More rent-burdene	37%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Moderate	\$973	More expensive	\$1,026	Less expensive	\$859	Less expensive	\$945	Less expensive	\$909	More expensive	\$1,004
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$33,139	More income	\$41,952	Less income	\$31,162	Less income	\$31,830	Less income	\$30,315	Less income	\$32,615
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	29%	Less poverty	23%	More poverty	34%	Less poverty	29%	More poverty	32%	More poverty	30%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic						
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$900)	Low	42%	Less affordable	30%	More affordable	53%	Less affordable	40%	Less affordable	47%	More affordable	39%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$1250, FMR for 2-bed)	Low	24%	More high-rent units	28%	Less high-rent units	19%	Less high-rent units	22%	Equal high-rent unit	24%	More high-rent unit	26%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 2012-2016)"	Low	7.7	More occupancy pe	9.5	More occupancy per	11.4	Less occupancy pe	5.0	Less occupancy pe	5.2	Less occupancy pe	4.3
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic						
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	20,086		3,446		3,083		4,155		4,210		5,192
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	Less owner-occupa	18%	Less owner-occupa	19%	Less owner-occupa	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	More owner-occup	26%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	11%	More non-Hispanic	31%	Less non-Hispanic v	7%	Less non-Hispanic	8%	Less non-Hispanic	2%	Less non-Hispanic	2%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	13%	Less college-educat	13%	More college-educat	19%	Less college-educa	13%	Less college-educa	12%	Less college-educa	13%

2(000	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vı	Inerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1	EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Moderate	23%	Less rent-burdened	18%	Less rent-burdened	22%	More rent-burdene	24%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdene	26%
2	RENT (Median gross rent)	Low	\$586	More expensive	\$600	Less expensive	\$458	More expensive	\$614	Less expensive	\$523	Less affordable	\$619
3	INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$27,058	More income	\$32,464	Less income	\$23,642	More income	\$27,429	Less income	\$25,988	Less income	\$27,862
4	POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	28%	Less poverty	21%	More poverty	39%	Less poverty	26%	More poverty	30%	Less poverty	27%
M	arket Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5	AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$750)	High	76%	Less affordable	73%	More affordable	86%	Less affordable	71%	More affordable	78%	Less affordable	70%
6	HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR)	Low	9%	More high-rent units	10%	Less high-rent units	5%	More high-rent unit	11%	Less high-rent units	8%	More high-rent unit	11%
7	OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)"	Moderate	24.5	Less occupancy per	23.5	More occupancy per	41.0	Less occupancy pe	16.8	Less occupancy pe	9.3	Less occupancy pe	14.4
' G	Sentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	21,738		4,129		2,714		4,313		4,515		6,057
8	OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	Less owner-occupat	14%	More owner-occup	23%	Less owner-occupa	21%	More owner-occup	27%
8	NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	14%	More non-Hispanic	48%	Less non-Hispanic v	5%	More non-Hispanic	16%	Less non-Hispanic	1%	Less non-Hispanic	5%
10	BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	9%	Less college-educat	7%	More college-educat	9%	More college-educ	10%	Less college-educa	9%	More college-educ	11%



4. Note CHANGE between 2000 and 2015 at the city level, which we then use to quantify ward-level changes. Finally, we can put these snapshots and trends together in one matrix...

Displacement Risk Indicator M	latriv (D	RIM)			CLIME E	all 201	7				Color Legend	
Displacement Nisk indicator in		ixini)			SEIWIE, 1		·			Higher rick	Lower risk but	Lower risk
2015	Newark		Eact Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vuinerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Stat/stic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	High	31%	Less rent-burdened	26%	Less rent-burdened	28%	Equally rent-burder	31%	More rent-burdened	34%	More rent-burdene	37%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Moderate	\$973	More expensive	\$1,026	Less expensive	\$859	Less expensive	\$945	Less expensive	\$909	More expensive	\$1,004
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$33,139	More Income	\$41,952	Less Income	\$31,162	Less Income	\$31,830	Less Income	\$30,315	Less Income	\$32,615
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	29%	Less poverty	23%	More poverty	34%	Less poverty	29%	More poverty	32%	More poverty	30%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$900)	Low	42%	Less affordable	30%	More affordable	53%	Less affordable	40%	Less affordable	47%	More affordable	39%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$1250, FMR for 2-bed)	Low	24%	More high-rent units	28%	Less high-rent units	19%	Less high-rent units	22%	Equal high-rent unit	24%	More high-rent unit	26%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 2012-2016)*	Low	7.7	More occupancy pe	9.5	More occupancy per	11.4	Less occupancy pe	5.0	Less occupancy pe	5.2	Less occupancy pe	4.3
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Stat/stic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	20,086		3,446	i i	3,083		4,155		4,210		5,192
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	Less owner-occupa	18%	Less owner-occupation	19%	Less owner-occupa	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	More owner-occup	26%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	11%	More non-Hispanic	31%	Less non-Hispanic v	7%	Less non-Hispanic	8%	Less non-Hispanic	2%	Less non-Hispanic	2%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	13%	Less college-educa	13%	More college-educat	19%	Less college-educa	13%	Less college-educa	12%	Less college-educa	13%
2000	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vuinerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Stat/stic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Moderate	23%	Less rent-burdened	18%	Less rent-burdened	22%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdene	26%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Low	\$586	More expensive	\$600	Less expensive	\$456	More expensive	\$614	Less expensive	\$523	Less affordable	\$619
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$27,058	More Income	\$32,464	Less Income	\$23,642	More Income	\$27,429	Less income	\$25,988	Less income	\$27,862
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	28%	Less poverty	21%	More poverty	39%	Less poverty	26%	More poverty	30%	Less poverty	27%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Stat/stic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$750)					Manage and and a big	000	Less affordable	71%	More affordable	78%	Less affordable	70%
	High	76%	Less affordable	73%	More anoroable	00.90						
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR)	High Low	76%	Less affordable More high-rent units	73%	Less high-rent units	5%	More high-rent unit	11%	Less high-rent units	8%	More high-rent unit	11%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR) 7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)*	High Low Moderate	76% 9% 24.5	Less affordable More high-rent units Less occupancy pe	73% 10% 23.5	Less high-rent units More occupancy per	5% 41.0	More high-rent units Less occupancy pe	11% 16.8	Less high-rent units Less occupancy pe	8% 9.3	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe	11% 14.4
HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >§900, inflation-adjusted FMR) OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)* 'Gentrifter' Population	High Low Moderate Characterization	76% 9% 24.5 Statistic	Less affordable More high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city	73% 10% 23.5 Statistic	Less high-rent units More occupancy per Compared to city	5% 41.0 Statistic	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city	11% 16.8 Statistic	Less high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city	8% 9.3 Statistic	More high-rent unit Less occupancy per Compared to city	11% 14.4 Stat/stic
KINGH RENT3 (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR) OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)* OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)* OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	High Low Moderate Characterization Low	76% 9% 24.5 Statistic 21,738	Less affordable More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city	73% 10% 23.5 Statistic 4,129	Less high-rent units More occupancy per Compared to city	5% 41.0 Statistic 2,714	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city	11% 16.8 Stat/stic 4,313	Less high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city	8% 9.3 Statistic 4,515	More high-rent unit Less occupancy per Compared to city	11% 14.4 Statistic 6,057
Filder RENTQ (% of households paying >3500, thation-adjuited FMR) 7 OCCUP-AVCY REMITG (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)* * OWRER-OCCUPIED (% households) 8 OWRER-OCCUPIED (% households) 8 OWRER-OCCUPIED (% households)	High Low Moderate Characterization Low Low	76% 9% 24.5 Statistic 21,738 22%	Less affordable More high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occupa	73% 10% 23.5 Statistic 4,129 23%	Less high-rent units More occupancy per Compared to city	5% 41.0 Statistic 2,714 14%	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occupa	11% 16.8 Statistic 4,313 23%	Less high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city Less owner-occupa	8% 9.3 Statistic 4,515 21%	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occup	11% 14.4 Statistic 6,057 27%
E HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >3500, inflation-adjuited FMR) OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1957-2011)* Committer Population OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households) OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households) S NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	High Low Moderate Characterization Low Low Low	76% 9% 24.5 Stat/stic 21,738 22% 14%	Less affordable More high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occupa More non-Hispanic	73% 10% 23.5 Statistic 4,129 23% 48%	Less high-rent units More occupancy per Compared to city Less owner-occupan Less non-Hispanic v	5% 41.0 Statistic 2,714 14% 5%	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occupa More non-Hispanic	1196 16.8 Statistic 4,313 23% 16%	Less high-rent units Less occupancy pe Compared to city Less owner-occupa Less non-Hispanic	8% 9.3 Statistic 4,515 21% 1%	More high-rent unit Less occupancy pe Compared to city More owner-occup Less non-Hispanic	11% 14.4 Statistic 6,057 27% 5%

5 Change	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
ME RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households)	More rent-burdenec	37%	Larger Increase	43%	Smaller Increase	26%	Smaller Increase	29%	Larger Increase	43%	Larger increase	43%
6 change in number)	More expensive	66%	Larger Increase	71%	Larger Increase	88%	Smaller Increase	54%	Larger Increase	74%	Smaller Increase	62%
E (% change in number)	More Income	22%	Larger Increase	29%	Larger Increase	32%	Smaller Increase	16%	Smaller Increase	17%	Smaller Increase	17%
TY (% change in % of households)	More poverty	3%	Larger Increase	5%	Decrease	-12%	Larger Increase	9%	Larger Increase	7%	Larger increase	12%
amics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
DABLE RENTS (% change in % of households)	Less affordable unit	-45%	Larger decrease	-59%	Smaller decrease	-38%	Smaller decrease	-44%	Smaller decrease	-40%	Equal decrease	-45%
ENTS (% change in % of households)	More high-rent units	166%	Larger Increase	176%	Larger Increase	262%	Smaller Increase	100%	Larger Increase	190%	Smaller Increase	148%
ANCY PERMITS (% change in number of permits)"	Less occupancy per	-69%	Smaller decrease	-60%	Larger decrease	-72%	Larger decrease	-70%	Smaller decrease	-44%	Larger decrease	-70%
Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
-OCCUPIED (Change in number of households)		-1,652		-683		369		-158		-305		-865
-OCCUPIED (% change in % of households)	No change	0%	Decrease	-19%	Increase	33%	Decrease	-5%	Decrease	-9%	Decrease	-3%
SPANIC WHITE (% change in % of population)	Less non-Hispanic (-24%	Larger decrease	-35%	Increase	48%	Larger decrease	-53%	Increase	165%	Larger decrease	-53%
LORS DEGREE (% change in % of population)	More college-educa	48%	Larger Increase	87%	Larger Increase	103%	Smaller Increase	36%	Smaller increase	36%	Smaller Increase	18%
	E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) (% change in number) (% change in number) (% change in % of households) mics ABLE RENT3 (% change in % of households) NGY PERMIT3 (% change in % of households) NGY PERMIT3 (% change in number of neureholds) NGY PERMIT3 (% change in % of nouseholds) OCCUPIED (% change in % of nouseholds) OCCUPIED (% change in % of nouseholds) OCCUPIED (% change in % of nouseholds) OCSI DEGREE (% change in % of nopulation)	Subarge Network Characterization Characterization E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) More ren4buiddees (% change in number) More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. More supensive. Characterization MORE Supensition Characterization OCCUPIED (Grange in number of households) No change MORE UPURSION Less northeaders OCCUPIED (% change in % of households) No change NOCHUPED (% change in % of households) No change ORS DEGREE (% change in % of population) Less northeaders	Change Newark E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) More rent-burdence 37% Change in number) More sepensive 26% (% change in number) More sepensive 26% (% change in number) More sepensive 26% More sepensive 26% 26% More sepensive 165% 26% OCCUPIED (% change in number of permits)* Less docupancy per -45% -45% OCCUPIED (% change in % of households) No change in 0% -1,652 OCCUPIED (% change in number of population) Less non-Hispanic i -1,652 OCCUPIED (% change in % of population) Less non-Hispanic i -24% ORS DEGREE (% change in % of population) More college-educz 45%	A Change Newark East Ward Change In Storm Statut Compared to city Compared to city E RENT BURDEN (% change In % of households) More rent-burdenee 37% Larger Increase (% change In number) More spensive 65% Larger Increase (% change In number) More spensive 22% Larger Increase (% change In number) More spensive 22% Larger Increase More spensive Compared to city More spensive 23% Larger Increase More spensive Compared to city More spensive 23% Larger Increase More Intro (% change in % of households) Less affortable unit 45% Larger decrease NCY PERMIT3 (% change in number of permits)* Less occupancy pe 45% Smaller decrease OCCUPIED (% change in number of nouseholds) Nor change 0% Compared to city OCCUPIED (% change in % of households) No change 0% Correse PAND WHTE (% change in % of population) Nor enlegenduct 45% Larger increase	A Litarge Newark East Ward Characterization Statistic Compared to city Statistic E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) More rein-buildence 37% Larger Increase 43% (shange in number) More income 22% Larger Increase 27% (% change in number) More income 23% Larger Increase 25% More proverty 3% Larger Increase 5% mics Characterization Statistic Compared to city 34 ABLE RENT3 (% change in % of households) Less affortballe unil 4-5% Larger Increase -55% NCY PERMIT3 (% change in number of permits)* Less occupancy pe 45% Statistic -55% NCY PERMIT3 (% change in number of permits)* Less occupancy pe 45% Daraler decrease 45% OCCUPIED (Change in number of households) Characterization Statistic -683 -683 OCCUPIED (K change in % of households) No change 6% Decrease -15% OCUPIED (K change in % of nouseholds) No change	A Change Newark East Ward Central Ward	A Lifarge Newark East Ward Central Ward Characterization Clastistic Compared to city Statistic Compared to city Statistic Consards in unker) More rein-buildence 37% Larger Increase 43% Binaler Increase 26% Characterization More rein-buildence 37% Larger Increase 43% Binaler Increase 26% Characterization More income 22% Larger Increase 25% Larger Increase 85% Vir & change in % of households) More income 22% Larger Increase 5% Decrease -12% More income 23% Larger Increase 5% Decrease -25% More income 34 Larger Increase 5% Barler Increase -25% Male ERENT3 (% change in % of households) Less affortballe unit 45% Larger Increase -55% NCY PERMIT3 (% change in number of permits)* Less affortballe unit 45% Larger Increase -25% NCY PERMIT3 (% change in number of permits)* Less affortballe unit </td <td>A Datage Newark East Ward Compared to city Statistic Compared to city Statist</td> <td>A Littinge Next Ward East Ward Central Ward North Ward Charge In URDEN (% change In % of households) More rein-buildenie 37% Larger Increase 43% Granzeet for dy Statistic Compared to dy Statistic Statistic Compared to dy Statistic Compared</td> <td>A Datage Newark East Ward Central Ward Outs Ward North Ward North Ward Educt Ward E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) More rein-buildene 37% Larger increase 43% Gradiestic Compared to city Statistic Compared to city Statistic</td> <td>A Datage Nearth Eact Ward Central Ward Order Revision Characterization Statistic Compared to chy Statistic Compared to chy Statistic Compared to chy Statistic C Analysis More rent-buildenie 37% Larger Increase 43% Smaller Increase 26% Smaller Increase 25% Smaller Increase 15% Smaller Increase 15%</td> <td>A Datage Nearth East Ward Central Ward North Ward Both Ward Both Ward Both Ward West Ward West Ward Compared to chy Statistic Compared to c</td>	A Datage Newark East Ward Compared to city Statistic Compared to city Statist	A Littinge Next Ward East Ward Central Ward North Ward Charge In URDEN (% change In % of households) More rein-buildenie 37% Larger Increase 43% Granzeet for dy Statistic Compared to dy Statistic Statistic Compared to dy Statistic Compared	A Datage Newark East Ward Central Ward Outs Ward North Ward North Ward Educt Ward E RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households) More rein-buildene 37% Larger increase 43% Gradiestic Compared to city Statistic Compared to city Statistic	A Datage Nearth Eact Ward Central Ward Order Revision Characterization Statistic Compared to chy Statistic Compared to chy Statistic Compared to chy Statistic C Analysis More rent-buildenie 37% Larger Increase 43% Smaller Increase 26% Smaller Increase 25% Smaller Increase 15% Smaller Increase 15%	A Datage Nearth East Ward Central Ward North Ward Both Ward Both Ward Both Ward West Ward West Ward Compared to chy Statistic Compared to c



DRIM Illustrations

Using the DRIM, one might ask basic questions about displacement risk in the City. Consider the three questions that follow.

1. Which ward is at most immediate risk of housing displacement by traditional processes of gentrification?

Probably the East Ward. First, looking at column 2 for 2015, it is the ward with the highest rents, the lowest poverty rate, highest incomes and the lowest rent burden. These vulnerability factors for 2015 put it slightly ahead of other wards as an area attractive to gentrifiers, even without knowing more about this complex ward and even without having the highest vulnerability levels (only one of four variables is red). But the question is gentrification risk, not simply displacement risk.

Moreover, the East Ward has been trending toward displacement, which may suggest that gentrifying forces are behind some of the changes. Looking at column 2 in the "Change" block, we see the East Ward is red in 7 out of 10 total displacement variables – the most of any ward. From 2000-2015, the East Ward showed some conventional signs of gentrification, such as a decrease in affordable units, an increase in high-rent units, a decrease in owner-occupancy and higher-educated residents. Its *increase* in the rate of extreme rent burden over time tied with the West Ward for the highest in the City. Additional neighborhood data on rent burden shows this from yet another perspective.



Rent-burdened Rent-burdened population by neighborhood in Newark, 2015 neighborhoods Ironbound Vailsburg Forest Hill Weequahic The Ironbound has the most Fairmont households who pay more than 50 U Clinton Hill percent of their income towards rent. **U Roseville** L Roseville West Side Vailsburg, Forest Hill, Weequahic, and L Broadway Fairmont also have significant Belmont N Broadway numbers of highly rent-burdened Lincoln Park households. Downtown L Clinton Hill Mount Pleasant Dayton, University Heights, Mount University Heights Pleasant, and Lower Clinton Hill have Dayton the least number of highly rentburdened households. Not rent burdened 🛛 🔳 Pays 30-50% of income towards rent Pays more than 50% of income towards rent

The East Ward is also the only ward with a significant population of non-Hispanic whites, whose presence is also more closely associated with traditional gentrification processes.



Race and Hispanic Status by Wards in Newark, 2015



2. Which ward is most at risk of displacement through sheer affordability?

Probably the South Ward. Looking at 2015 and 2000, it has some of the lowest rents in the City, but also very high rates of poverty and lower incomes. This has not stopped extreme rent burdens from increasing, from 24% of households in 2000 to 34% of in 2015, and an increase of 43% compared to the City as a whole. Then, looking at the "Change" block, we see the South Ward in the red in 6 out of 10 categories, the second highest in the City.

3. Why does the Central Ward exhibit such extremes?

Probably because it contains the greatest inequality of neighborhoods combined into ward-wide statistics. This makes the Central Ward very important to watch. On the one hand, its poor neighborhoods are among the poorest. On the other, it contains parts of downtown that have experienced the highest rents and investments. It is also home to many university students. Since 2000, the percentage of units charging high rents increased there by 262% (with an 88% increase in actual rents) over time and affordable units decreased by 38%--all three figures the highest in the City.

Mobility Trends Beyond the DRIM

People are moving to Newark.

- > 27,862 people moved to Newark from within Essex County in 2015.
- > 4,690 people moved to Newark from some other New Jersey county in 2015.
- ▶ 4,965 people moved to Newark from out of state in 2015.
- 2,206 people moved from Newark from abroad in 2015 in line with its status as a destination for foreign-born immigrants.

The following charts show where each group tends to settle among the City's wards and neighborhoods.





Local movers tend to move to the South, West and East Wards.



Neighborhood's Share of Local Movers, 2015

Local movers move to Ironbound, Weequahic, and Fairmont most often.

However, they move more often than expected to **Dayton**, Downtown, Fairmont, Ironbound, Lower Clinton Hill, **Lower Roseville**, Upper Clinton Hill, Weequahic, and West Side. Forest Hill attracts half the number of local movers as would be expected based on its share of the City's overall population.





Regional movers tend to move to the Central Ward.



Neighborhood's Share of Regional Movers, 2015

Regional movers move to Ironbound, Downtown, and Lower Roseville most often.

However, they move more often than expected to Dayton, **Downtown**, **Lower Roseville**, Mount Pleasant, and University Heights.

North Broadway attracts a quarter the number of regional movers as would be expected based on its share of the City's overall population.





Out-of-staters tend to move to the Central and West Wards.



Neighborhood's share of out-of-state movers, 2015

Out-of-state movers move to Downtown, Ironbound, and Vailsburg most often.

However, they move more often than expected to **Downtown**, Fairmont, Lincoln Park, Lower Roseville, Mount Pleasant, Upper Clinton Hill, Upper Roseville, and **Vailsburg**.

The Ironbound attracts half the number of out-of-state movers as would be expected based on its share of the City's overall population.



Conclusion

We hope the Displacement Risk Indicators Matrix described and illustrated here is useful in both highlighting the significance of the displacement threat currently facing many Newarkers and in forecasting the impact that particular projects or investments may have on the wards in the future.

Acknowledgements

CLiME wishes to acknowledge the continued support of the Newark Chancellor's Office and the formatting assistance of Rebecca Enright Siroky.

