EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thriving In Place: Phase One Summary

What We Heard | What We Learned | What Comes Next

We've completed Phase One of Thriving in Place to develop an anti-displacement strategy for Salt Lake City. We heard from thousands of residents and had hundreds of hours of conversation. We also dug deep into the data, documenting the extent of displacement risk and its realities.

What We Heard and Learned

The results of Phase One are a call to action. The full report details what we did, who we heard from, what they said, and what we learned from the data analysis. Here are key takeaways:

• Displacement in Salt Lake City is significant and getting worse, and is an issue of high concern in the community.
• There are no “more affordable” neighborhoods in Salt Lake City where lower income families can move once displaced. This is a particularly striking finding; something that UDP has not seen before in their work around the country.
• Salt Lake City is growing and there are not enough housing units overall, and a significant lack of affordable units for low-income families.
• Almost half of Salt Lake City’s renter households are rent burdened, spending over 30 percent of their income on housing, making them highly vulnerable when rents increase.
• Displacement affects more than half of White households in Salt Lake City and disproportionately affects households of color.
• The patterns of displacement reflect historic patterns of discrimination and segregation, with areas experiencing high displacement risk closely aligning with areas that were redlined in the past.

Dig Deeper!

Read the full Phase One Summary Report plus:

• Study UDP’s Displacement Analysis for Salt Lake City, including maps showing displacement risk around the city and region.
• Download the Community Survey Data Viewer to see how responses varied by income, Council District and more.
• Explore the details of community input from Phase One interviews, focus groups and youth workshops.
What Comes Next

Now comes Phase Two, when we work together to define our course of action. To get started, we've drafted **Guiding Principles**. These will be refined and modified through community input and engagement in the months ahead.

1. **Be pro-housing and pro-tenant.**
   - Incentivize new residential development where it will benefit the most people.
   - Discourage new development where it will do the most harm.
   - Enact policies that protect renters living in affordable homes.
   - Establish policies and programs to minimize displacement from new development.

2. **Increase housing options and choices everywhere.**
   - Create gentle infill and rental housing opportunities in every neighborhood.
   - Support new housing at all income levels.
   - Incentivize lower priced for-sale housing to provide homeownership opportunities to moderate and lower income people.
   - Make it easy and attractive to build affordable housing.

3. **Invest in equitable development.**
   - Increase spending on rental assistance and affordable housing construction and develop new funding sources to make it possible.
   - Maximize community ownership of housing through mission-driven nonprofits, coops, shared housing, public housing, and land trusts.
   - Support living wage jobs.
   - Support cultural institutions, locally owned businesses and public spaces that help communities thrive in place.

4. **Make sure the economics work.**
   - Incentivize projects that are catalytic and align with guiding principles.
   - Target incentives in the areas where new development will have the least displacement impacts and maximum benefit.
   - Ensure policies and regulations are meeting guiding principles and provide for flexibility to adjust as needed.
   - Prioritize affordability in land use policy implementation.

5. **Build an eco-system for action.**
   - Ensure ongoing communication and engagement with those who are most impacted so that they continue to inform action and are aware of the resources available to them.
   - Identify key indicators to track success and share results.
   - Create a platform for regular coordination between the City and key partners.
   - Work together to fund shared priorities.

Get Involved!

[Sign up for the newsletter](#) to keep up-to-date on the project and opportunities to participate.
GRATITUDE

Phase One was made possible by countless hours of work by many people. **Huge thanks!** to everyone who gave their time, energy and creativity to make it possible.

A very special call-out to the *University of Utah students*, working under the direction of Professors Ivis Garcia and Alessandro Rigolon. Their collective work made it possible to reach thousands of Salt Lake residents, in person. While we summarize their work here, be sure to follow the links to read their own summaries, capturing hundreds of hours of input. They also did a thorough review of current City policies and programs as well as examples from other communities. It’s impressive work!

Heartfelt thanks, too, for our *Community Liaisons and Community Working Group members, and for the many community-based organizations who opened their doors and partnered with us*. This project is committed to ensuring that those who are experiencing displacement are front and center in documenting and understanding it and then shaping the response. Our community partners are helping make that a reality.

And most importantly, sincere thanks to everyone who gave their time, responded to our questions, shared their stories, and listened to the voices of their friends, fellow students, colleagues and neighbors. We hope you find this report to be an accurate reflection of what you said and what you heard.
Thriving in Place is overseen by the Department of Community and Neighborhoods in close collaboration with the Mayor’s Office, Council and other City departments. The core city team is led by Angela Price and Susan Lundmark with support from Ruediger Matthes.

The project consultant team includes:

**Baird + Driskell Community Planning:**
- David Driskell, Project Manager
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- Alessandro Rigolon, PhD, Assistant Professor

**The Urban Displacement Project (UDP) at University of California, Berkeley:**
- Tim Thomas, PhD, Research Director
- Julia Greenberg, Research Manager

For more information, visit the project website, ThrivingInPlaceSLC.org, or write to ThrivingInPlace@slcgov.com.
WHAT IS IN THIS REPORT

Welcome! This report gives a summary of Phase One of the Thriving in Place project. It captures hundreds of hours of community conversation and input from thousands of people about housing gentrification and displacement. Follow the links (underlined orange/red text) throughout the report to read more detail.

Also, visit the project website and sign up for the Thriving in Place newsletter.

What This is About (pg. 8)
A quick intro to Thriving in Place, this report, and why this work matters.

What We Did (pg. 11)
An overview of the activities that generated the content of this report.

Who We Heard From (pg. 14)
A snapshot of the people who gave us their time and input.

What We Heard (pg. 16)
Key themes and takeaways from each of the engagement activities, with links where you can explore the data.

What We Learned (pg. 34)
Takeaways from the analysis of displacement risks in Salt Lake City and the region plus results from University of Utah’s work, with links to the detailed reports.

What Comes Next (pg. 38)
How we will connect our understanding of the problem with priorities for action, including draft guiding principles.
Section 1

WHAT THIS IS ABOUT
Thriving in Place is Salt Lake City’s community-driven process to analyze and understand gentrification and residential displacement. Through this collective work, the City and its partners will define anti-displacement strategies to address the factors that are forcing many of our friends, family members, and neighbors to leave, or to live without a home, because they can’t find housing in Salt Lake City that they can afford.

This report summarizes what we heard and learned in the first phase of the project’s work, which we called Listening and Learning. We want to reflect back to everyone who spent time with us a summary of what was said—in the community survey, focus groups, one-on-one interviews, youth workshops, and community events. We also want to share what we found out through the cutting-edge analysis conducted by our project partners at the Urban Displacement Project. This critical information—from what the analysis tells us and what we heard from the community about their perspectives and experiences—helps us to understand, more completely, the problem we are striving to solve, because it’s hard to solve a problem if you don’t agree on what the problem is.
Why This Matters

Salt Lake City is a great place to live. We are lucky to have a beautiful natural setting, a vibrant economy and a caring, creative, and diverse community. It’s a great place to raise a family, to build a career, and to grow old. But it’s increasingly a very difficult place for many who cannot find housing they can afford.

When growth pressures drive housing prices up, and incomes and housing costs get out of sync, people are displaced. They are forced to overpay for housing, move to a different neighborhood or city, double up with family and friends, or start living in their car or on the street. The impacts of displacement are profound and lasting—on the families who are displaced, and on the communities they leave behind. We lose our friends and neighbors, our coworkers, and our school-aged students. We also see increases in our unsheltered population, longer commutes, and more air pollution.

Cities thrive when all residents have access to safe, stable and affordable housing, healthy neighborhoods, and good jobs. We know we can create a city where everyone can thrive while staying in the community they love. That’s why this project is called **Thriving in Place**. It is Salt Lake City’s vision of what we will try to achieve and why this matters.
Phase One engaged people throughout the community in helping us understand and document gentrification and displacement to build a shared understanding of the problem we are working to solve.

**Guiding Our Work**

To make sure we are taking the right approach we:

- Interviewed 15 community stakeholders and leaders as a very first step in the process to get their input about key issues and shape the engagement strategy (read the summary [here](#)).
- Convened a City Steering Committee representing 16 departments and divisions (listed [here](#)) to ensure input and coordination.
- Organized a Community Working Group of over 20 stakeholders (listed [here](#)) to help direct the engagement strategy, serve as a sounding board, and provide input on the project’s work.

**Analyzing the Data**

To document the current situation using the best data possible we:

- Engaged the Urban Displacement Project to gather, analyze, model, and map data on displacement risk and trends ([see pg. 35](#)).
- Had a planning class at the University of Utah review the City’s current policies and programs related to displacement and document best practices from other places ([see pg. 37](#)).
Engaging Everyone

To reach as many people as possible we:

• Built the project website, in English and Spanish, as a platform for education and engagement.

• Launched a survey, in English and Spanish, attracting over 2000 respondents. (see pg. 17)

• Got the word out through email blasts, social media, and 4000+ multi-lingual flyers, postcards, and door hangers. Plus, we stenciled the project name and website info over 150 times on walkways around different neighborhoods.

• Presented at 14 community events or gatherings and at 13 community council meetings to let people know about the project and encourage them to participate.

Reaching the Most At-Risk

To hear from those directly impacted by displacement we:

• Hired six Community Liaisons as trusted members of their communities to talk with folks they know about their experiences.

• Held five focus groups and nearly 70 one-on-one interviews to hear people’s stories and delve into their experiences, perspectives, and ideas. (see pg. 26)

• Hosted seven youth workshops with over 200 students to hear their thoughts about changes in their neighborhoods and how to make the city a better place for everyone. (see pg. 32)
Section 3

WHO WE HEARD FROM
We heard from...

Nearly **2,500 people** whom contributed their time, input, experiences, and ideas. This involved:

- **2150 Survey Respondents**
  - 1199 Online
  - 851 Intercept (In-Person)

- **50 Focus Group Participants**
  - 5 Focus Groups
  - 2 English
  - 2 Spanish
  - 1 Bilingual

- **70 In-Depth Interviews**
  - Including with
  - Unhoused Individuals and Low-income Individuals Living in Subsidized Housing
  - People who are unsheltered
  - Latino community members
  - Immigrant community members
  - People experiencing housing instability

- **200 Students**

- **7 Youth Workshops**

- **3 Schools** (Elementary through High School)

**Explore the University of Utah’s Work from Fall 2021**

In addition to the work outlined in this report, we had a jump-start in Fall 2021 thanks to two classes at the University of Utah. Check out their work, including 21 Story Maps documenting interviews with over 400 residents and capturing valuable information about cultural assets, housing issues and neighborhood change as well as their presentation on Zoning for Equity.

**Check it out by clicking here!**
Section 4

WHAT WE HEARD
We had over a hundred hours of conversation—in one-on-one interviews, focus groups and youth workshops—in addition to having over 2,150 people respond to the survey. That’s a lot of valuable input.

We’ve worked to sort through it all, and pull out key themes and takeaways.

*In short, gentrification and displacement are issues of significant concern for people throughout the community, and are impacting many lives. There is widespread desire for more affordable housing and for ensuring that people are not displaced so that the benefits of new investment and growth can be shared by all.*

**Survey Responses**

A community survey was conducted between February and April 2022. It was available in English and Spanish. It consisted of six multiple choice questions and one open-ended question in addition to asking people to identify their neighborhood and provide basic demographic info. It could be filled out online in addition to being used for in-person interviews by University of Utah students. You can see the survey format and questions [here](#).

*Keep in mind that in most answers, people could choose more than one response, so the number of responses is often higher than the number of people who took the survey.*

**Download the Community Survey Data Viewer**

To give everyone the opportunity to explore the survey responses, we’ve built a tool you can use to see a summary of the data based on income group, race/ethnicity, renter/owner status and Council district. You can also see the full list of open-ended responses that people provided.

[Check it out by clicking here!](#)
Profile of Survey Respondents

Approximately 2,150 people took the survey, with 42 percent responding to it in-person (being interviewed by a student who then entered the data). The profile of people completing the survey was similar to the overall Salt Lake population in terms of income (figure 1), race/ethnicity (figure 2) and whether they were homeowners or renters (figure 3).

**Figure 1: Income of Survey Respondents vs Citywide Population**
**Figure 2: Race / Ethnicity of Survey Respondents vs Citywide Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Citywide (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Housing Status of Survey Respondents vs Citywide Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Status</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Citywide (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family / Friends (no rent)</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable / Unhoused / Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Concern About Gentrification and Displacement

All groups expressed high levels of concern, especially renters and lower income people.

A significant majority of survey respondents (81%), across all race and ethnicity groups, expressed moderate to very high concern about gentrification and displacement.

Those who are “very concerned” are more likely to be renters, living with family or friends without rent, facing an unstable housing situation, or unhoused, which is understandable given the direct impact of increasing rents. However, a majority of homeowners expressed that they are quite or very concerned.

A majority of respondents within each income bracket expressed a moderate to very high level of concern, with lower income households being the most concerned. The percentage of those who hold moderate to very high levels of concern reduces incrementally with each higher income bracket. For example, those earning between $15,000 and $25,000 had the most concern (90% expressed moderate to very high concern) while those earning $150,000 were less concerned (but still, 74% expressed moderate to very high concern).

Figure 4: Level of Concern About Gentrification and Displacement
Experience with Gentrification and Displacement

Most Recognize or Have Experienced Gentrification and Displacement in Their Neighborhood

Nearly all respondents (close to 95%) indicated some direct experience with the impacts of gentrification and displacement. Over half of respondents have experienced their neighborhood gentrifying or live in a neighborhood that already has gentrified, and nearly half have known someone who has already moved due to eviction or high housing costs (with 5.5% reporting having been evicted). Almost 20% said they have had to move due to rent increases, while 13% are on the verge of moving due to increased costs. Close to 40% of respondents want to buy but cannot afford a home. We know from our parallel data analysis that many of these people are renters who might otherwise be moving into lower cost for-sale “starter homes,” but instead are staying in the rental market, inadvertently putting pressure on rents because they are able to pay more than lower income households.

Figure 5: Experience with Gentrification and Displacement
Views on Gentrification and Displacement

Despite Mixed Opinions, Most Agree That No One Should Be Displaced or Excluded from the Benefits of Change

A clear majority of people expressed that the benefits of investment should be shared by all and that the City should work to ensure that people are not displaced. However, there are mixed opinions about whether gentrification makes neighborhoods worse (29%) or better (11.5%), and just over 1 in 10 expressed that “not much can be done.” Perhaps not surprisingly, lower income respondents were more likely to see gentrification negatively (about 40% of respondents with incomes less than $50,000 chose “makes things worse”) compared to higher income respondents (16% of those making over $150,000 chose “makes things worse”).

Figure 6: Views on Gentrification and Displacement
Perceptions of What Contributes to Gentrification and Displacement

People See Lack of Affordable Housing as the Main Issue

Overall, the majority of respondents (especially renters) believe gentrification and displacement are due to a lack of affordable housing and higher income people moving in. Many respondents (over 40%) also pointed to a lack of housing in general as well as new development as a cause of displacement, while a third pointed to the demolition or renovation of older buildings as a contributing factor.

Figure 7: Perception of What Contributes to Gentrification and Displacement
What Neighborhood Improvements Would You Like to See?

People Want More Affordable Housing

When asked what they would like to see improved in their neighborhoods, the most common response was housing affordability (61.5%) and more housing options (41%), with renters being particularly focused on these issues (72% and 52%, respectively). By comparison, while homeowners chose more housing affordability the most often (45%), they also expressed higher preference for diverse people and cultures (35%) and more places to eat and shop (32%) than for more housing choices (30%).

Figure 8: What Neighborhood Improvements
What Actions Would You Support?

Produce, Preserve, and Protect Are All Priorities

Overall, respondents prioritized more housing production as the top choice on actions they would support, but not far ahead of actions to protect tenants and preserve existing housing. Renters are more focused on tenant protections than homeowners (35% made it their top choice) while homeowners are more focused on housing preservation than renters (34% made it their top choice). But even then, production was the top choice for both groups (37% and 36%, respectively).

Figure 9: Ranking Actions by Priority
Focus Groups and Interviews

Five focus groups and 70 one-on-one interviews were conducted between February and April 2022. The goal of these conversations was to hear people’s stories, experiences, perspectives, and ideas about gentrification and displacement. Questions were open-ended and generally similar to those in the community survey, but less structured so that the conversation could delve into specific issues and ideas in more depth.

Most of these conversations were led by our six Community Liaisons. Some were conducted in English while others in Spanish. Participants included individuals experiencing housing insecurity and homelessness as well as service providers.

Explore What People Said in More Detail

We wrote a summary of what we heard from the focus groups on the pages that follow. But if you want to dig into the data yourself, you can view our sorting of the takeaways and themes from the different activities.

Check it out by clicking here!
Experiences of Gentrification

“I am concerned that the beauty, history, and diversity of this community will be pushed out and even erased in the name of progress.”

“Small, locally-owned businesses are being pushed out due to demolition and unaffordable rents in new businesses, and we are losing our architectural heritage in the city.”

“My daughter who is 30 can’t afford to live in my area despite a good paying job. If she loses her current rental, I don’t know where she will go.”

Weakening of the Community

The rising cost of housing is making it harder for people to thrive, with displacement causing a loss of diversity as well as individual and community-level trauma. Many have experienced or witnessed friends, family members, co-workers, and neighbors being priced out and needing to move elsewhere, namely to West Valley City, Stansbury Park, and Tooele. People described living on one’s own to be a greater challenge now, and mourned the loss of community spaces and local businesses.

“I’m close to several housing insecure or homeless people in my personal life and in my neighborhood. I live along the JRP and see people displaced from camps, only to have to build new camps elsewhere.”

“I just see a lot more harassment towards homeless. They look so down on us.”

“Rents are like $1200-1500 a month—come on—and vouchers are only good for $800 or $850. How are we supposed to get cheaper rent for a place like this? I can’t go anywhere else in Salt Lake.”

Worsening Challenges Faced by the Most Vulnerable

High housing costs are making it harder for those already experiencing housing instability and homelessness. For example, participants of the Palmer Court Focus Groups said that their housing vouchers are not sufficient to cover the high rent prices, and that those who have been evicted are having a harder time finding a place to live or are even being denied housing vouchers. They also pointed out that victims of domestic violence and people living with disabilities are particularly vulnerable. They said that as a result many are being forced to live in “condemned housing,” “slum housing,” or without housing.
Attitudes about Gentrification

Overall, people we heard from have a negative view of gentrification, explaining that it disrupts their “quality of life and community. They described feeling excluded, distrustful and powerless.

Exclusion

Some believe gentrification can be good if it benefits the community as a whole. However, they feel that is not the case when current residents are not able to access the benefits and lower income people are disproportionately affected and forced to leave.

Distrust

There’s a general distrust of the government. Some feel that there has not been enough done by the City or State to intervene and protect existing communities from being displaced. They think that those in power do not have their best interests at heart and are instead motivated by personal gains. However, there are some who think that the City and nonprofits are trying to provide as much support as they can.

Loss of Power

Some feel that newcomers contribute to the gentrification by organizing, taking power, and pushing policies that further alienate existing community members.

“It can improve communities to a point, but when housing and other resources become inaccessible to everyone but the very well off, it is a detriment.”

“Not enough benefits and resources are equitably distributed and supported across communities to prevent gentrification from happening.”

“Council needs to cater to community needs for housing not developer wants!”

“I don’t feel like I have enough power to do something because I’m a person of color.”
Perceived Causes of Gentrification

Limited Supply of Affordable Housing
Participants said there is simply not enough affordable housing available for low to moderate income people. They do not consider much of the new housing being built to be affordable nor to fit their needs. They also do not think the government has made a sufficient effort to preserve the existing supply of affordable housing or to control the cost of housing.

Newcomers Put Pressure on Housing Prices
Participants view the trend of out-of-town newcomers moving to Salt Lake City as a factor driving up housing demand and prices.

Prioritizing Growth Before Community
Some perceive gentrification to be enabled by the City through the over-prioritization of growth and economic development over the protection of current residents and preservation of the existing community.

Ignorance and Erasure
Some think that newcomers’ ignorance about the culture or history of the existing community contributes to the displacement and erasure of existing residents and cultures.

Greed and Prejudice
Some believe that the problem is caused by individuals’ greed, racism, and classism.
Resources People Turn to for Help

Relying on Community for Support
Many said that they rely on their community for support—turning to community-based or religious organizations for help. Services they have sought out include housing assistance/counseling, food pantries, career counseling, and health clinics.

Where Resources Are Lacking
Participants said that there’s a lack of support for those living with disabilities or mental health challenges. Poor case management was also identified as an issue.

Thoughts About What Can Be Done
The following list of policy suggestions was collected from participants and grouped into themes. This list is a reflection of community members’ desires, not a formal proposal. However, it will be taken into account when developing policy and program proposals during the next phase of Thrive in Place (see pg. 40). Please note that while some of these suggestions are within the City’s control, others would require intervention at the County, State, and/or Federal level (e.g. rent control, regulating short-term vacation rentals, etc.).

Grow the Housing Supply
- Evaluate current land use and consider permitting housing or converting other types of lots or buildings into housing.
- Build more middle housing (like duplexes, triplexes, and small apartment buildings).
- Promote accessory dwelling units and reduce restrictions.

Preserve Existing Affordable Housing
- Programs that support or subsidize the repair of existing affordable housing.
- Programs that monitor home sales and support the sale to existing community members.
- Expand the Community Land Trust program.
- Regulate the conversion of short-time vacation rentals from affordable housing.

“[A local community organizer] was a huge help. Huge. She fought for us. She told us everything we needed to do. She fought for our housing for a whole year.”

“The case manager is key to many of these services. So what are my thoughts about what can be done? One of them is would be to have more case managers.”
Protect Renters
• Programs that address absentee landlords and neglected properties.
• Expand tenant protection policies.
• Establish rent control policies.
• Reduce barriers for receiving rental assistance.

Expand Homeownership Opportunities
• Increase homeownership opportunities for the working class.
• Increase homeownership education and housing counseling.
• Improve tax policy and increase tax relief for lower income homeowners.

Increase Social Services
• Provide immediate, transitional assistance for those at risk of eviction and displacement or experiencing housing instability.
• Increase support for people experiencing homelessness, especially children.
• Increase the number of social workers and case managers available.
• Improve homeless shelters.
• Address drug addiction.

Focus on Workforce Development
• Improve access to better-paying jobs, especially for unsheltered people.
• Increase educational opportunities.
• Create regulations that limit large corporate chain stores and support locally owned businesses.

Improve Community Engagement
• Make public meetings more accessible, for example by scheduling them during times when more residents can participate.
• Improve representation from different community and racial/ethnic groups (e.g. Latinx, Pacific Islander, etc.) and raise the voices of leaders and organizers who can voice the concerns of their community.
Youth Workshops

Seven youth workshops with 200 student participants (elementary to high school) were hosted between February and April 2022. The goal of these workshops was to help the students understand gentrification and displacement in their neighborhoods, hear their perspectives and stories, and inspire their creativity through community visioning exercises.

Students Are Anxious about Change in Their Communities

Although “gentrification” and “displacement” were new terms for many of the students, most already recognize that these forces are at play in their communities. This is the most important takeaway from the youth workshops. They have seen the evictions and displacement of their friends, family, and neighbors. They have noticed the permanent closures of local businesses. They have observed the demolition of existing rental homes for the construction of new flats. Some even shared their personal experiences—one student said that they needed to move away from the area due to rising costs. They said that gentrification can also lead to benefits such as increased investment and public improvements, but they are anxious about the consequences of gentrification for themselves, their families, and their community.

Students Want to See Their Community Be Welcoming For Everyone

Students shared a vision for how they would like to see their community develop. They want to see Salt Lake City develop into a place that is welcoming and secure for all. They want to see investments in public amenities that benefit the community as a whole, such as shops, schools, parks, gardens, and farms. They do not want to see their family and friends be displaced. Finally, they wish to see the City do more to prioritize, protect, and preserve their existing community.

View the final slide presentation by the University of Utah’s Plan Making class

At the end of their semester, the University of Utah students who supported the community engagement presented the results of their work to the community. See the full summary, which includes more details about the youth workshops, focus groups, and interviews. Check it out by clicking here!
Section 5

WHAT WE LEARNED
In addition to what we heard through the community engagement process, we also studied gentrification and displacement data to document and understand trends in Salt Lake City and the region. Following is a short summary of what we learned, with links to more detailed reports.

**Displacement Risk Analysis**

We analyzed displacement using a cutting-edge model developed by the Urban Displacement Project at the University of California, Berkeley (a project partner). It is the most advanced model of its type, and Salt Lake is one of the first places in the country where it is being used.

The model incorporates large data sets on a number of displacement-related factors to estimate the level of displacement risk faced by renter households who are very low income (earning 50% or less of the Area Median Income, or AMI, which in Salt Lake City in 2019 was $80,196) and those who are low income (earning between 50% and 80% of AMI).

Displacement occurs when more renter households in those income categories are leaving an area than are moving in. The results of the model were used to create maps indicating which areas are experiencing probable displacement, moderate displacement or high displacement. The map also includes a layer showing where rental housing units that are affordable to different income groups exist. This helps identify “displacement pathways”—where are the more affordable areas where people can go when displaced?

---

**Read the Urban Displacement Project’s Full Report**

To give everyone the opportunity to read more about the analysis, check out UDP’s full report and explore the Displacement Risk and Affordability Maps.

[Check it out by clicking here!](#)
Key Takeaways

Here are the key takeaways from UDP’s analysis, all of which resonate with what we heard in the community input:

• **Displacement in Salt Lake City is significant and getting worse.** It is particularly high east of the Granary and south of Central Ninth and Ballpark.

• There are no “more affordable” neighborhoods in Salt Lake City where lower income families can move once displaced. This is a particularly striking finding; something that UDP has not seen before in their work around the country.

• Salt Lake City is growing and **there are not enough affordable units for low-income families.**

• Almost **half of Salt Lake City’s renter households are rent burdened** (they are spending over 30 percent of their income on housing, which—when you’re low income—does not leave much for everything else).

• **More than half of all families with children live in neighborhoods experiencing displacement risk.**

• Displacement affects **more than half of white households in Salt Lake City and disproportionately affects households of color.**

• **Latinx and Black households are particularly susceptible to displacement,** as they have median incomes that are lower than what is required to afford rent in the city.

• The **patterns of displacement reflect historic patterns of discrimination and segregation,** as many areas experiencing high displacement risk are areas that were redlined in the past.
Student Analysis of Anti-Displacement Strategies

In addition to their work supporting community engagement, students in the Plan Making course at University of Utah reviewed and categorized policies and programs being used in Salt Lake City to counter the forces of displacement. These include efforts to protect tenants, promote housing production, and preserve existing affordable housing. They also reviewed potential additional policies and programs that could be enacted or strengthened to better respond to the scale and scope of need documented through the displacement risk analysis and community input. These policy and program strategies cover topics such as increasing community ownership, creating stronger incentives, zoning changes and improved renter assistance. As Thriving in Place moves into its second phase of work, we will be building upon their work (with some refinements to address incomplete or inaccurate information) to support community conversations and help prioritize actions.

As Thriving in Place moves into its second phase of work, Crafting Collaborative Solutions, their work will provide a valuable resource for community conversations and prioritizing actions.

Read the report by the University of Utah’s Plan Making class

Read the student’s summary of engagement work they led and their analysis of current and potential anti-displacement policies and programs.

Check it out by clicking here!
Section 6

WHAT COMES NEXT
The results from Phase One, summarized in this report, help us understand the problem we are trying to solve. It positions us for making decisions about what we can and should do in response.

**Setting Expectations**

As we move into Phase Two, Crafting Collaborative Solutions, there are a few important caveats to keep in mind:

- **There are no quick and easy solutions.** The factors that drive displacement are complex, varied, and interconnected. There’s no quick fix. We will need to work together to build upon what the City and others are already doing, crafting new policies and other actions that are appropriately sequenced, assessed and calibrated for maximum impact.

- **Change is constant.** Cities and neighborhoods change over time, and many of the economic and social drivers of change are beyond our control. However, there are aspects of change that we can affect, helping to shape the future we want.

- **It will take time.** While there are near-term actions that can respond to specific issues and challenges, many policies and programs take time to put into place and even longer to have an impact. That should motivate us to act, so that those benefits can be realized sooner rather than later.

- **There will be trade-offs, and some things are off the table.** Every course of action has pros and cons, with some people benefiting more than others. Further, there are legal and regulatory structures that limit some courses of action for the City and its partners. As we evaluate options, we will focus on what’s actionable, carefully consider trade-offs, and ensure that those most impacted by the forces of displacement are prioritized.

- **We are all in this together.** We are all impacted by displacement, and addressing it will require coordinated, cross-sector action. While the City has an important role, many of the responses will need to be regional in scope and require that multiple sectors (government, nonprofits, funders, real estate, and others) have a shared understanding of the problem and a collaborative plan of action.
DRAFT Guiding Principles

To translate What He Heard and What We Learned into a policy and program proposals and a plan for collaborative action, we have developed a set of Draft Guiding Principles that will be discussed, revised, and refined in the months ahead as a Framework for Action.

As they are refined, the principles will be used to guide City policymaking for areas that are within its control as well as to guide cross-sector coordination and advocacy for area’s outside of direct City control.

1. Be pro-housing and pro-tenant.
   - Locate and incentivize new residential development where it will benefit the most people (close to opportunity).
   - Discourage new development where it will do the most harm (in areas where dense concentrations of renters already live, especially lower income renters).
   - Enact pro-tenant policies that protect renters living in affordable homes.
   - Establish policies and programs to minimize displacement from new development and support those who are displaced.

2. Increase housing options and choices everywhere.
   - Create gentle infill and rental housing opportunities in every neighborhood.
   - Support new housing at all income levels.
   - Incentivize lower priced for-sale housing to provide homeownership opportunities to moderate and lower income people.
   - Make it easy and attractive to build affordable housing.
3. **Invest in equitable development.**
   - Increase spending on rental assistance and affordable housing construction and develop new funding sources to make it possible.
   - Maximize community ownership of housing through mission-driven nonprofits, coops, shared housing, public housing, and land trusts.
   - Support living wage jobs.
   - Support cultural institutions, locally owned businesses and public spaces that help communities thrive in place.

4. **Make sure the economics work.**
   - Incentivize projects that are catalytic and align with guiding principles.
   - Target incentives in the areas where new development will have the least displacement impacts and maximum benefit.
   - Ensure policies and regulations are meeting guiding principles and provide for flexibility to adjust as needed.
   - Prioritize affordability in land use policy implementation.

5. **Build an eco-system for action.**
   - Create a platform for ongoing communication, coordination and collaboration.
   - Continue to listen to those who are most impacted.
   - Agree on roles and priorities.
   - Work together to fund shared priorities.
   - Track what matters.