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Where you live has a significant effect on your overall health. Science, media, and policy makers have all recently highlighted that zip codes are often better predictors of health than genetic codes.\textsuperscript{1,2} Despite the historic focus of health care and genetics on health outcomes, current research overwhelmingly indicates that social and environmental conditions have just as important or greater influence on overall health. People living in healthy neighborhoods that promote physical activity, have affordable housing and public transit, ensure access to healthy foods, and are free of toxins are less likely to suffer from chronic disease and are more likely to live healthier, happier lives.

Gentrification is an intensifying trend and is defined as “a reversal, reinvestment, and the in-migration of a relatively well-off, middle- and upper middle-class population”\textsuperscript{3} and the “outmigration of low-income people and people of color from their existing homes and neighborhoods due to social economic, or environmental conditions that make their neighborhoods uninhabitable or unaffordable.”\textsuperscript{4} It is threatening the ability of long-time, low-income, primarily residents of color to benefit from improvements to their neighborhood conditions. Gentrification is facilitated by new public and private investments in historically disinvested communities—including those that advance health such as transit, parks, open space, and healthy food options that have unintentionally paved the way for gentrification and then displacement. Without policies that protect and support longtime residents and communities, increasing land values and housing prices, land speculation, and new development disrupts individual and community stability and well-being as households are often forced to make choices between paying for housing and food, healthcare, transportation, child care, and other basic needs. Lower income residents in particular face pressure to seek more affordable housing, oftentimes further from their jobs and the communities they are connected to. As gentrification brings an influx of wealthier residents into neighborhoods and communities local goods—from groceries, to restaurants, to childcare—become more expensive and less accessible to longtime residents. Locally operated businesses and nonprofit organizations also face rising rents and increased insecurity despite often having served the neighborhoods in which they are located in for many years. Ultimately these pressures result in low-and middle-income residents—often people of color—getting squeezed out of neighborhoods rather than benefiting from the new development and investments that accompany gentrification.\textsuperscript{5}
In order to create healthier places and protect the health of places where investments have been made, the field of public health must ensure that the strategies used invest in place proactively prevent displacement. Preventing displacement does not mean preventing development, or hindering land use planning that promotes health. It means understanding the history and needs of the existing residents in a place, and ensuring that they can benefit from health promoting planning and development.

Rooted in its commitment to place and social determinants of health, the public health field plays a critical role in advancing place-based health strategies. For decades the field of public health has been advancing the idea that where we live matters for our health. This concept, which began with only a few determined voices, is now widely understood and accepted. It can be seen in practice through initiatives that promote a focus on land use planning that considers the ways in which health can be affected by issues such as transportation accessibility, pedestrian safety, and climate change. Efforts to address barriers to health in land use planning have responded to the real need to increase investment in place, particularly places that have experienced disinvestment and political marginalization.

Yet much more needs to be done. With the impacts from gentrification increasing in magnitude and severity, the public health field must recognize that investments such as parks, support for healthy food retail, and efforts to increase public safety may actually have the potential to disrupt and harm the very neighborhoods to be improved. Public health leaders have been a strong force in promoting policy changes to minimize and avoid the impacts of gentrification on health, however, in order to effectively achieve policy change that ensures the protection of public health for all public health leaders must engage in strategic discussions about the role of development policy in the process of gentrification and displacement, and ultimately on neighborhood and community health.

To support this effort, we present a summary of literature that draws from the linkages between displacement and public health as well as a set of considerations for the field. The review of literature focuses on the links between the impacts of gentrification and displacement and the health of communities, families, and individuals, particularly children and youth. It is not intended to be an exhaustive review of the literature but rather a way to capture increasing research—as well as longtime community experience and knowledge—that points to the negative impacts that gentrification and displacement have on individual and community health. We hope that this summary of research will help to elevate the consideration of public health in discussions about public decisions on development, and ultimately be used to advance a more inclusive approach to development. For more information, refer to the sources cited.6

Gentrification and Displacement Impacts on INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY HEALTH

Housing is one of the major factors that impacts health for individuals and families. The ability to access safe, secure, and affordable housing has a wide range of positive health impacts for adults and children.7,8 When the ability to afford quality housing is out of reach, however, both social and health outcomes are adversely affected.9
Housing instability and related financial pressure is associated with stress and anxiety in both adults and children.\textsuperscript{10,11,12,13,14} Chronic stress is associated with serious health conditions including asthma, arthritis and allergies, as well as other short and long-term physical and mental health problems.\textsuperscript{15,16} The severity and impact of exposure to stress varies depending on the stage of brain development that a person is in when they experience that stress.\textsuperscript{17}

As the process of gentrification causes property values to increase and demand for housing to accelerate, rising housing costs place a disproportionate burden on lower income residents with limited household budgets.\textsuperscript{18} This leaves individuals and families struggling to afford housing at the expense of their health.\textsuperscript{19} Spending more to afford housing leaves fewer resources for basic health-promoting necessities such as food, healthcare, transportation, education, or childcare.\textsuperscript{20}

When the cost of housing is prohibitive and residents need to stay close to jobs and family, they are often forced into overcrowded and substandard housing conditions.\textsuperscript{21,22} Overcrowding is associated with a higher risk of mortality, infectious disease, poor child development and school performance, poorer self-rated health, increased stress, noise, and fires, poor mental health, developmental delay, heart disease, and even short stature.\textsuperscript{23,24,25,26} Poor quality housing can leave residents exposed to hazards that may lead to injury, cause respiratory disease or neurological and behavioral disorders.\textsuperscript{27,28,29,30} Prohibitive housing costs often limit families in poverty or with less economic means to living in unsafe neighborhoods as well as in substandard housing units.\textsuperscript{31}

When residents are displaced they not only lose their homes, but also the investments made in jobs or business as well.\textsuperscript{32,33} Moving further from jobs, schools and other vital services can also increase transportation costs, commute times, and limit access to public transportation.\textsuperscript{34,35,36} Difficulty accessing employment can lead to the loss of jobs and income. Longer commutes contribute to stress, and reduce time spent with family or on other health promoting activities such as exercise and sleep.\textsuperscript{37,38,39,40} The process of relocating and setting up a new household is also costly, and adds further strain to limited household budgets.\textsuperscript{41,42}
Families with children are particularly at risk for eviction and homelessness which impacts health in a variety of ways. For children, homelessness can impact school performance and increase risks for physical and mental health problems as well as accidental injury and physical assault. Currently, homelessness amongst school-aged children is at an all-time high. Despite this and the exceptional burden of rising rents on families, federal rental assistance available to families with children has been on the decline, and is currently at its lowest point in more than a decade.

Those who are unable to afford stable housing are also more likely to move frequently, either to similar or lower quality housing. Young children are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of an unstable environment and family stress resulting from housing insecurity. Displacement destabilizes social networks and routines, and frequent moves leave children less likely to feel connected at home, in school, and in their neighborhoods. This type of stress and disruption can have lifelong effects on mental and behavioral health, and can lead to additional risks for chronic disease in adulthood. Displacement has also been associated with declining school performance in children, affecting educational achievement and the lifelong health benefits to which it is tied.

In order to provide for their basic needs when housing costs become a burden, family members, including parents and school age teenagers, may also take on additional jobs and work hours. Long work hours for parents and pressure on teenage children trying to balance school and work also leads to additional stress and less time for families to be together.

**Gentrification and Displacement Impacts on Community and Place**

Policies that shape land use and the built environment impact health by affecting communities’ access to resources such as transportation, employment, housing, healthy food, and open space. Revitalization initiatives that aim to address pressing community health needs such as improvements in bike and pedestrian infrastructure, access to parks, and transit-oriented development, are also hallmarks of the gentrification process that has had devastating health impacts on low-income communities of color in particular. Communities that have not historically had access to health-promoting services and amenities are typically the first to be adversely affected by gentrification and displacement, and often do not benefit from the changes to the built environment that new residents enjoy.

Having access to basic goods and services as well as health-promoting resources is associated with a longer lifespan and a lower likelihood of physical and mental illness. Those displaced by gentrification are likely to be in need of services such as community clinics, unemployment benefits, nutrition assistance programs, and homeless shelters.
This increase in demand can lead to strain on available services, leaving the needs of many displaced residents unmet. In Alameda County, for example, a survey of Public Health Department and Behavioral Health Care Services staff and contractors found that 94% had clients that have been significantly affected by the San Francisco Bay Area’s housing crisis. The survey data highlights ways in which the housing crisis is compromising many of the health gains the department’s programs have been achieving, and is contributing to serious health issues resulting from stress, poor quality housing, frequent moves, homelessness, barriers to accessing health care services, lack of continuity in school and social networks, and other routines for children.

When residents move to a new area their lack of familiarity with community resources can be a barrier to accessing health-promoting goods and services. Poorer residents in search of more affordable living conditions as gentrification intensifies are often forced from cities into suburban areas that are job-poor and lack amenities such as public transportation, social services and healthy neighborhood resources such as jobs, stores, schools, and parks.

**Commercial displacement is also a significant community health issue.** The loss of community-serving local retail can impact the availability of culturally appropriate, health-promoting goods and amenities and limit important sources of economic prosperity and potential for upward mobility for longtime residents, while supporting the advancement of more affluent, predominantly white, professional residents. These impacts further existing inequities and divide communities along racial and economic lines.

Racial disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated in areas where poverty is concentrated and segregation increases. In societies facing greater levels of inequity, public health is compromised for all people, not just those directly facing adversities.

**Gentrification and displacement also result in weakened social networks and social cohesion and the associated health benefits that they promote among residents who are rooted in an area.** Social cohesion is one of the primary factors that enables people to develop a sense of belonging in their environment and encourages positive community interactions and a general sense of safety and well-being. By helping to link people with needed resources in a community, social cohesion can also help to alleviate poverty. Without a network of trusted community to rely on, displaced people or longtime residents in gentrifying areas may feel more socially isolated, stressed, and less safe, impacting material wealth and emotional well-being.

**Gentrification and its impacts on access to housing lead to changes in the social and cultural environments that longtime residents consider home.** As areas gentrify, retail, services and political decision makers often shift their attention toward the needs of new residents, leaving those with a history in the neighborhood feeling disconnected, marginalized, and threatened. These changes are often coupled with cultural tensions and the loss of social networks, spurring longtime residents to consider relocating even if
they are not directly being displaced. Unfortunately, wealth and resources entering into gentrifying communities are often not directed into improvements for institutions that serve existing low-income residents. For example, gentrifying areas of Atlanta, New York and Chicago have seen new residents and decision-makers channel resources into new (often charter) or private schools that exclude poor residents of color, versus the existing public school systems.

Gentrification is associated with increased criminalization, particularly of poor and working class people in urban areas where there is increased surveillance and a growing population of new residents that lack understanding of cultural behaviors and norms among existing residents. Examples of this trend span from regular arrests and ticketing of street vendors in New York (and until recently Los Angeles) to stop and frisk policing in Chicago and New York, surveillance and criminalization of long time social practices such as street parades in post-Katrina New Orleans, and noise complaints on church choirs and community music events in Oakland. The adverse health impacts of criminalization for both youth and adults are well documented and include measures of physical and mental health, increased rates of substance abuse, infectious and chronic disease, and exposure to violence and injury. Incarceration also poses significant barriers to education and employment, reducing earning potential and impacting future health outcomes. These health burdens extend beyond the individual to families and communities.

Gentrification and displacement also contribute to political fragmentation and dilution of political power as formerly cohesive communities become geographically dispersed. As gentrification progresses, longtime residents who are active in neighborhood and community organizations become outnumbered by new residents, and the issues and communities that they represent may no longer be of interest to the new community. These changes can affect political control in a neighborhood as well as the political composition of the region. Newer residents often have a more limited understanding of or connection to their neighborhood context, and tend to participate less in civic affairs. Conversely, neighborhoods with more residents who have experience with a community over time are more likely to be concerned with the well-being of their community members, which can impact their motivation to engage and organize around problems, and lead to increased civic participation.

Communities directly affected by gentrification often have long histories of being displaced as a result of social and political systems that have supported segregation, redlining, urban renewal, predatory lending practices, and community disinvestment. This history of displacement has led to limited economic opportunity, an inability to accrue wealth, and reduced ability for communities to build social and political power. These conditions have adversely affected physical, mental and community health over generations. Emerging research now shows that these types of historical trauma can have physiological effects on future generations, leaving them more susceptible to the impacts of stress.
Addressing gentrification and displacement, and advancing inclusive community development, requires a holistic and intersectional approach to understanding its root causes and the policy approaches that can drive development toward health outcomes. Central to this approach is the recognition of power and the unequal power dynamics that result in inequities in individual and community health.

Over the course of a year, the California Funders Working Group on Gentrification and Displacement engaged in a discussion to develop a framework for identifying strategies for funders to build capacity, power, and leadership in communities that will stabilize neighborhoods and allow residents to take steps to determine their own development futures. The Framework titled “Power Building in Place: Framing Community Development Issues and Solutions” presents a shared analysis of gentrification, displacement and neighborhood change illustrating the pathways and policy decisions necessary to achieve inclusive and healthy communities. Shared analysis about power and neighborhood-based power building strategies provide funders with a framework for advancing a community driven development agenda that addresses neighborhood conditions as well as advances structural and transformative change. This type of power building strategy addresses systemic conditions and includes building leadership capacity and voice in the community, and prepares leaders within government to govern from an equity perspective.

The framework draws from work of Causa Justa::Just Cause and academic literature that situates neighborhood development in the structural context of interwoven systems of structural racism, capitalism, neoliberalism, and unequal power relationships that define material and political conditions for change. The Framework highlights the role neoliberal policies play in prioritizing market driven investments at the expense of human and public goods. Within a power building framework, policy approaches to advance healthy and stable communities are achieved through power building strategies that challenge existing systemic conditions, change the narrative, and implement policy that influences the drivers of neighborhood change.

The framework of public health, power, and place brings full focus on the public health impacts resulting from gentrification and displacement and the necessary role of people in place to engage in power building approaches to shift policy and change conditions in neighborhoods.
POWER BUILDING IN PLACE:
FRAMING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS

SYSTEMIC CONDITIONS
Systemic conditions define the underlying context for development, gentrification, and neighborhood change. These are mutually reinforcing and function together.

- STRUCTURAL RACISM
- CAPITALISM
- NEOLIBERALISM
- UNEQUAL POWER RELATIONS

DRIVERS OF NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE
The following drivers influence development and neighborhood change. The impact and outcomes of these drivers are ultimately a function of competing agendas, policy decisions, and power relationships.

- Long term urban disinvestment
- Market driven reinvestment
- Economic development (deindustrialization/economic restructuring)
- Housing insecurity and vulnerable housing
- Rising inequality
- Segregation/resegregation
- Land use planning for development
- Transportation and infrastructure investments
- Shifting role of government
- Demographic change
- Criminalization and legal structures/processes
- Dominant narrative that reinforces drivers of change

COMMUNITY DRIVEN
- Housing as a right and public good
- Stable communities with affordable and accessible housing, tenure and homeownership rights and protections
- Government resources, policies, and decision making that prioritizes community needs over market driven development
- Community driven development: without displacement, and development of strong neighborhood and regional infrastructure
- Community power building based on community needs, knowledge, and leadership in policy change and implementation
- Community ownership and control of development

POLICY APPROACHES
Influencing drivers of neighborhood change requires choices about public policy. Because these policy choices reflect competing values and agendas, power building strategies are necessary to win policies that shift the outcomes of drivers of neighborhood change to ensure community stabilization and longer term community driven development without displacement.

- Community Stabilization Policies that protect and support renters and low-income homeowners, e.g., rent control, anti-eviction laws, no net loss policies, condo conversion regulations, tenants’ rights, homeownership rights, small business protections/support
- Affordable Housing Preservation Policies that preserve affordable housing and take housing and land out of the speculative market; e.g., surplus land policies, land trusts, Section 8, 31 replacement, protection of affordable housing near TODs, housing finance programs, maintenance/codes enforcement
- Affordable Housing Production Policies that facilitate and expand affordable housing production e.g., inclusionary zoning, redefinition of affordability, CIDs, housing trust funds, affordability requirements in TOD, etc

MARKET DRIVEN
- Housing as an unregulated for-profit commodity
- Development for profit and speculation
- Private sector driven and government supported investments and subsidies
- Limited government role in free market; role focused on capital investment
- Reduction of and absence of rent control laws/tenant rights/homeless rights and other public protections and regulations
- Power held by elites

AGENDA
- Disinvestment / Destabilization Policies that facilitate land speculation, eviction, and market-driven housing
- Unregulated Market and Profit Driven Housing Preservation Policies that incentivize market driven housing and land speculation; projects/initiatives that prioritize market rate housing
- Unregulated Market Driven Housing Production Policies that facilitate investment in profit from the production of market rate housing

OUTCOMES
- Housing insecurity, displacement and homelessness
- Economic inequality and instability
- Decline in social networks, neighborhood, and regional infrastructure
- Role of the state focuses on facilitating market conditions for capital investments rather than providing and distributing public goods
- Cities and neighborhoods for the elite
- Concentration of wealth

AGENDA
- Community Planning and Development Policies that frame and inform community planning processes and planning efforts defined and led by community needs, community knowledge, and community leadership; e.g. planning for transit or other infrastructure investments
- Community Economic Development Policies that stabilize and support economic development that meets current needs and future development visions of residents, and provide pathways for quality and stable jobs; Policies that stabilize and support workers, small businesses, and community and nonprofit commercial uses
- Tax and Fiscal Policies for Community Stability and Development that stabilize communities and facilitate community driven development; e.g. land trusts, reducing/eliminating property taxes for long-term residents; ties for the National Housing Trust Fund, higher relocation costs for landlords
- Community Ownership Policies that support the control of housing and land through democratic structures and processes, e.g., land trusts, housing co-ops, worker-owned co-ops

OUTCOMES
- Housing security
- Economic well-being and stability
- Investment and development without displacement
- Strong social networks and neighborhood and regional infrastructure
- Vibrant and healthy neighborhoods for all
- More equal power relations
- Public sector policy and decisionmaking focused on public needs and goods
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Source: California Funders Working Group on Gentrification and Displacement; Murtha Matsuwaka, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute/ Occidental College. Updated March 2017.
To download the full version of the report, please visit sfg.org. For more information, contact Mike Molyet, Senior Program Manager of the Democratizing Development Program, at mmolyet@sfpg.org.
Building the Power of Public Health

Three fundamental principles are necessary for the public health field and health funders to consider in discussions and strategies about healthy and inclusive development.

1. **Develop health improvement strategies that stabilize communities and prevent displacement.** If not, investments in place including parks, open space, and transit, can ultimately contribute to or exacerbate the very issues that are most harmful to the health of the people and neighborhoods we are focused on supporting. This does not mean that development should be stopped, but rather that development must be planned alongside long-time community residents and implemented in a way that considers the long term benefits and impacts to existing residents.

2. **Focus on community-centered development.** This requires moving beyond theoretical discussions and “design charrettes” into meaningful forums for listening, strategies that result in power sharing, risk taking and intervention to directly address the problematic issues that we see within current planning and development practices. In order to make real, sustainable changes, systems themselves need to be transformed—by both inside and outside strategies.

3. **Put community-based powerbuilding strategies at the center of health and development.** Elevating community knowledge and power in public health strategies and place brings into focus the public health impacts that result from gentrification and displacement and the necessary role of people in place to engage in power building approaches that will shift policy and change conditions in neighborhoods. This includes a need to identify who is driving development visions and decision-making, and the strategies that influence the processes that define community and regional development choices and outcomes.

**About the Authors**

Martha Matsuoka, PhD, is an Associate Professor of urban and environmental policy. She directs the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute, an applied research and advocacy center at Occidental College focused on community-driven programs and policies to build healthy, thriving communities and achieve social, economic, and environmental justice.

Jennifer Lucky, MPH, has worked throughout the past 10 years in collaboration with local communities throughout the state of California to support policies that address the impacts of development on health and equity. Her background includes a focus on community outreach and training, environmental justice and Health Impact Assessment.

Alex Desautels is a Program Manager for Strategy Development and Dissemination. In that role, Desautels is responsible for working with key senior-level Building Healthy Communities (BHC) staff to sharpen the core elements of the BHC strategy and disseminate this strategy to key audiences and venues. Desautels also leads strategic initiatives that span multiple BHC sites, including initiatives related to displacement and gentrification, criminal justice reform, and governing for racial equity.
Endnotes

1. Iton, Anthony. TEDx San Francisco. October 6, 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0H6yte4RXx0
6. See work by Causa Justa:Just Cause (https://cjjc.org/) and the Urban Displacement Project (http://www.urbandisplacement.org) for detailed reviews of the literature as well as policy recommendations.
ENDNOTES


NOTES


109 The California Funders Working Group on Gentrification and Displacement is comprised of Amy Kenyon from the Ford Foundation, Luke Newton from Common Counsel, Nina Bohlen from Smart Growth California/Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities (TFN), Alexandra Desautels from The California Endowment, and Dennis Quirin, Yolanda Hippensteele, and Nile Malloy from the Neighborhood Funders Group.

110 The original framework was developed by Martha Matsuoka, Urban & Environmental Policy Institute at Occidental College in collaboration with the Program for Environmental and Regional Equity (PERE) at USC and presented at the California Funder Working Group convening on Gentrification and Displacement, July 20, 2015. Discussions over the past year have shaped and refined the framework into a tool for ongoing funder engagement.
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