

Criteria for Assessing and Comparing Anti-Displacement Policy Tools

CRITERIA	RATIONALE	OPERATIONALIZATION
Dimensions of need addressed		
<p>Vulnerable populations targeted. Which group does this tool assist the most?</p>	<p>Certain populations are especially vulnerable to displacement and likely to face difficulties finding housing they can afford once displaced.</p>	<p>Vulnerable groups targeted: Includes low-income renters, low-income homeowners, people/communities of color, low-income families with children, low-income seniors</p>
<p>Stage of gentrification targeted. At what stage is this tool most effective?</p>	<p>Since conditions and challenges vary greatly according to the development pressure a neighborhood is experiencing, it is important to match policy tools to these conditions.</p>	<p>Early-stage: For neighborhoods susceptible to gentrification or in the earlier stages of gentrifying</p> <p>Mid-stage: For neighborhoods with both significant demographic changes and housing appreciation but low or moderate residential values</p> <p>Late-stage: For neighborhoods in the later stages of gentrifying with high residential values</p>
Normative dimensions		
<p>Place-based. Does this policy tool focus on specific gentrifying neighborhoods?</p>	<p>To address change that is affecting entire vulnerable neighborhoods will require an intentional focus on those areas.</p>	<p>Yes: Designed to serve vulnerable residents of one or more gentrifying neighborhoods</p> <p>No: Not targeted to specific gentrifying neighborhoods</p>
<p>Sustainability. How long will the effects of this policy tool last?</p>	<p>To preserve cultural communities and ensure ongoing income and racial diversity in vulnerable neighborhoods, it is important to consider whether the proposed tools will have effects beyond those served initially and for how long.</p>	<p>Good: Creates an ongoing (40+ years) stock of housing for current and future residents from vulnerable groups</p> <p>Fair: Creates housing for current and future residents for < 40 years</p> <p>Poor: No plans for future residents</p>
<p>Inclusivity. How will the voices of vulnerable residents be represented?</p>	<p>To ensure that policy tools incorporate features that best serve vulnerable residents, it is important that residents have a meaningful voice in the design, governance, and ongoing monitoring of the tool.</p>	<p>Good: Includes an active role for vulnerable residents in the design, governance, and ongoing implementation of the tool</p> <p>Fair: Includes some roles for vulnerable residents</p> <p>Poor: No role for vulnerable residents</p>
Implementation dimensions		
<p>Financial resources required. What level of funding or foregone revenue will be required?</p>	<p>Successful implementation and the ability to achieve the desired scale of impact will depend on the availability of financial resources from city tax dollars or other funds and resources.</p>	<p>Low: Minimal start-up and operational costs to the city</p> <p>Medium: Moderate start-up and operational costs to the city</p> <p>High: Either high start-up costs, high operational costs, or both</p>
<p>Current capacity. How well do city and nonprofit staff and community roles match current capacity?</p>	<p>Successful implementation of policy tools requires that city and nonprofit staff and community members are able to carry out the roles envisioned for them.</p>	<p>Good: Staff and community capacity currently exist to perform the envisioned roles</p> <p>Fair: Moderate levels of capacity exist but additional capacity building required</p> <p>Poor: Skills currently lacking or capacity very limited</p>