

# Growing Pains

A study of the ebb and flow of gentrified populations in  
Seattle

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Cameron Miller

December 2019

# Table of Contents

Project Summary .....	3
Intellectual Benefits .....	3
Practical/Policy Benefits .....	3
Literature Review.....	4
Research Question.....	11
Methodology.....	11
Variable Table .....	16
Timeline.....	21
Budget.....	22
Appendix .....	23
Appendix I – Survey.....	23
Appendix II – Interview .....	28
Bibliography .....	29

## Project Summary

Seattle is currently undergoing a period of massive growth, in terms of both population and economy. This growth sees massive movement of people, which can be broadly categorized into three groups: people attracted to the city from elsewhere, people who already live here moving throughout the city, and people leaving it. This study aims to both understand the specifics of *where* people are moving to and from - where did new residents leave, which neighborhoods in Seattle are people flocking to, to which places do displaced residents relocate? - and it aims to provide reasons as to why. The former will be supported by numerical survey data and GIS analysis, the latter by further survey questions and qualitative interviews. Research participants are found via City of Seattle construction data, which maps locations where housing has been demolished.

## Intellectual Benefits

This study aims to find specific data that, due to its difficult nature to capture, has gone uncollected in Seattle. Using census data, we can see broad demographic trends for neighborhoods, we can see the numbers of people moving in and out of the county. This inductive, ideographic study aims to go a step further, directly mapping the movement of individual people and their families, and examining the people that "replace" them on the sites of their former homes, analyzing the wide variety of structural and personal factors that could lead people there. I aim to both describe these relatively obscured urban migrations, and explain them. Seeing as the subject is a fairly difficult to track down population, it seems wise to ask follow up, qualitative questions about deeper reasoning when we will already have access to this population.

## Practical/Policy Benefits

The data collected by this study offer a variety of practical implications for local/regional policy. First, the source of Seattle's growth, be it from the region, from other states, or other countries, and be it lower, middle, or upper classes, and so forth, is important to understand - each unique combination provides unique challenges. Second, this study aims to identify direct lines between areas that people migrate between (say, if someone moves from Capitol Hill in Seattle to Renton). Not only is it important for officials to know which neighborhoods are at risk for or are currently gentrifying, but officials in the regions where displaced peoples locate to could use these findings to better understand the needs of their communities. One statistic in particular I think will provide useful is commuting times, which I plan to analyze and relate to income. Commute times and methods fall at an intersection of personal happiness, environmentalism, health, labor, and housing - further research of the commute (both in this study and future studies) would better inform policy makers about the needs of their people both as individuals and as a collective.

## Literature Review

### The Paradox of Growth

Our entire modern society is organized around the concept of growth. Successes and failures are evaluated based on growth, the rate of growth, and the likelihood of continued growth - be it in land values, stock prices, profits, tax revenue, population, wages, test scores. Going off population, Seattle is the 5th largest growing city in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Anyone living in this city, or any of the others experiencing such rapid growth, are likely at least familiar with some of the concepts included in the heavy term *gentrification*. As defined by Neil Smith, gentrification is "the reinvestment of CAPITAL at the urban centre, which is designed to produce space for a more affluent class of people than currently occupies that space." (Smith, 2000: 294; emphasis in original) The reinvestment of capital is what makes the processes of gentrification initially very attractive. Capital comes into places that have been both incidentally and purposefully denied it previously (often neighborhoods that are majority people of color), and promise great returns for investors - in other words, there is great opportunity for growth. Unfortunately, this growth often comes at the expense of those already present in the given area, often either disrupting their current economic and social standing or displacing them altogether.

### Attempts at Alleviating

The solutions to displacement, as one might imagine for a problem this complex, come in a variety of flavors. I turn to Nicolas Welch (2019), who perfectly and succinctly describes the "two competing schools of thought" as to how cities can develop in a prosperous way.

"First, the economic tenet of supply and demand is an oft-cited justification for new housing. Constrain supply of any good in an environment of increasing demand and prices will continue to rise. As a result, many believe the construction of new housing is the easiest, if not only, way to maintain affordability as the population grows in the Puget Sound region. In opposition, many housing advocates counter that, despite the boom in housing development, living in Seattle is less affordable now than ever before...Long-time residents of many communities have been displaced as rents become unaffordable and their buildings are upgraded to cater to a higher-income audience (5-6)."

This debate lies between neoliberal, more classic market-based solutions, and more radical leftist based approaches, such as rent control and shared community-based ownership. Carolyn Gallaher (2017) struggles with this tension in her analysis of Washington DC's policy, the Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act (TOPA). She describes the policy as one that exists at the edge of the neoliberalism many describe as being the root cause of the housing problem. Recounting the energy she received from reading an invigorating article titled "Fuck Neoliberalism", Gallaher still somewhat begrudgingly finds usefulness in TOPA, which she describes as a flawed but still useful tool.

This tension can be seen in two similar but still different approaches in South Seattle. Rainier Beach's "Fulfilling the Promise" fits a little more into neoliberal policy, in that it focuses primarily on providing locals with the resources to be productive members of the

community and larger Seattle market (Miller, 2019). It aims to attract smaller businesses, provide education, and connect residents with food services. A little further north, the Othello Square Project aims to create 200 units on cooperatively owned land, affordable retail space, and a variety of education and services, in addition to the facilitation of small business growth in the Rainier Beach plan (ibid.).

### A New Urban Sphere

The focus of gentrification often follows Smith's definition, which specifies this phenomenon as occurring near the city core. However, I argue this definition can be expanded. The newer theory of Planetary Urbanization calls into question the previous narrative dividing "urban" and "rural" spaces, and states that given the current rate and scale of urbanization, this previous distinction is outdated (Brenner and Schmid, 2012). This is exhibited by the changing role of farmland in the United States, which is increasingly seen as a place for capital investment, in similar ways to land in the city centers. Since the 2007 market crash, investors have begun looking for new, more reliable places to store capital (Katy, 2017) - this gives them the *motivation* to buy farmland. As for the *means*, historically low interest rates, and an aging generation of farmers looking to sell their land and retire, provides investors easy access to these new opportunities. Thirty percent of American farmland is now owned by people who lease their land to the people who work it. Agricultural speculation has made it more difficult for new farmers to enter the market, making it likely that the next generation will be increasingly unlikely to own their own farms, if they decide to enter at all (ibid). This "rural gentrification" adds complexity to an already vastly complex phenomenon, and has

very obvious parallels to traditional gentrification theories, in both its causes and effects. This gives credence to the theory of planetary urbanization and its proposed breakdown of the urban and rural divide.

### A Movement of Peoples

I also argue, however, that this breakdown is at different stages in different places in the world, which can be seen through migration patterns. The common dialogue in Seattle seems to be that its people are being replaced by Californian transplants in an almost *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* style process. This is a significant departure from the growth of American cities in the past, and cities in certain parts of the world in the modern day, in which the growth of the urban sphere is based on siphoning from the rural. For example, "57 per cent to 65 per cent of China's urban population growth could be attributed to rural-to-urban migration (UN, 2018: 7)." In the more densely urbanized Latin America, however, this rural siphoning is still occurring, but accounts for little of the urban population growth (ibid.), and in the US, migration in and out of rural counties has almost come to a complete standstill (US Department of Agriculture, 2019). Each type of migration brings with it its own unique challenges, so it's important to understand the specificities.

While colloquial discourse theorizes as to the origin of Seattle's growth, there currently exists a gap in the actual data on movement in and out of the city. Nationwide and on the county level, domestic migration has largely been from the urban to the suburban, while most urban population growth from migration occurs with international migrants

(Pew Research Center, 2018). Again, this isn't the story your average Seattelite would tell you. Is this a disconnect between perception and reality, or between nationwide and local statistics? Or perhaps the "techbro" migration many lament about has a disproportionate impact compared to its population and that of international migration?

Currently we can identify areas in Seattle experiencing effects of gentrification. Statistical models using census data show broader demographic shifts, focusing on factors such as race. Examination of census data reveals larger proportions of wealthier white populations across the city in the past decade, and while people of color are becoming more likely to only be found residing in parts of South Seattle, these neighborhoods, too, are having sizable increases in the wealthy, white population (Rothschild 2019). Hess (2018) tracks these same changes along Seattle's light rail, finding areas in the urban core near rail becoming whiter, and neighborhoods along the same system towards the city outskirts/suburbs more racially diverse - although Hess mentions difficulty in isolating light rail from the other wide variety of factors. These spatial interactions - between urban and suburban, between heavily invested neighborhoods and vice versa, between near and far from the core - have a variety of important repercussions on things such as social justice, environmentalism, health, labor, and happiness.

Using similar statistical analysis, it is possible to identify areas at risk for continued gentrification (Welch 2019; Herman et al., 2017). These statistical models take into account indicators such as income, race, and development of infrastructure such as light rail, however with such a phenomenon as fluid and complex as Seattle gentrification, it



can be hard to draw definitive conclusions from these models, since “Even slight adjustments to the thresholds of a given indicator can make a neighborhood appear substantially more or less vulnerable to [gentrification] (Welch 2019).”

The demographics and distance of movement have a particular importance to environmentalism (Rice et al., 2019). Rice describes how one of the major reasons gentrified neighborhoods are initially so attractive are due to their perception as “low-carbon” neighborhoods, and attracted capital is used to continue to develop this image. These areas increasingly develop more efficient buildings, more walkable spaces, and greater access to public transit. However, Rice brings into question the environmental gains made from these upgrades. The displacement of locals into the suburbs adds additional emissions from commuting and shipping needs, and the new, wealthier residents themselves, Rice points out, actually have a shockingly large carbon footprint despite their supposed eco-awareness.

Of particular interest interests to me is actually a form of *relative* distance of these migrations exhibited by the daily commute. The commute seems to lie at the intersection of some of these factors of health and happiness that I repeatedly bring up, and seems understudied in Seattle. A study of Beijing rail commutes reveals a sort of equilibrium around the 45-minute commute (Huang et. al., 2018). Those living beyond 45 minutes from their jobs would adjust either their residence or their workplace so that the two were closer together. People closer than 45 minutes were willing to accept a longer commute in exchange for benefits such as better jobs, lower rent, or nicer housing.

While my proposed study is not equipped to prove or disprove this same exact equilibrium here in Seattle, it marks a good baseline for this integral part of the study. The length of commute has direct impacts on personal satisfaction, the methods of the commute have impacts on the environment, and this commute-equilibrium-dance has impacts on how individuals navigate through the housing and labor markets, making this an important phenomenon that captures a lot of the heart of the impacts of gentrification.

These are the kinds of specificities that cannot be addressed via current census data.

This study aims to answer much narrower questions as to: **where are people coming into the city *from*, where are people who leave their neighborhoods or Seattle going *to*, and why?** The who, where, and why of gentrification in Seattle still requires far greater understanding, which is key to monitoring the impacts of current gentrification effects and efforts in Seattle, and are important in guiding the much more comprehensive efforts that must come in the following years.

## Research Question

**Where are people coming into the city *from*, where are people who leave their neighborhoods or Seattle going *to*, and why?**

## Methodology

### Goals

The purpose of this research is to collect more in-depth data on Seattle's migration patterns, in order to better understand the cause and effects of gentrification. Currently, broader demographic data is available via the census, however, likely due to the difficult nature of capturing it, there haven't been attempts to get more specific quantitative data. This research will be comparing residents who have moved into and out of Seattle to see the differences in income and commutes. These two phenomena quickly get at a variety of factors, from happiness, to economic mobility, to environmental impact, and more.

This research will primarily be done through a short survey, which has questions pertaining to the variables provided in the table below. However, there will also be follow up interviews with volunteers in order to provide further important context around the numbers. While through this study I aim to provide widely applicable (on the city scale) quantitative data, I do so in response to currently overly broad data. In that frame, it is important that the numbers not be too far removed from the context they exist in.

### The "Who"

My population is people who have moved into, out of, and around Seattle, since 2010, which is the period in which we see a rapid uptick in income and rents (Rothschild, 2019).

This includes both renters and homeowners, and the survey makes distinctions between both. Not entirely coincidentally, this time period starts shortly before I myself arrived in Seattle. The purchase of my family's home, along with the rest of the city's boom, coincides with the wider recovery from the 2008 Recession.

The easiest way to access the target population is to do so via construction/demolition permits. The City of Seattle lists 635 sites where a place of residence has been replaced by another within the past decade (City of Seattle, 2019). While this source presents a variety of challenges, it's the only definitive and broad source that *a move of some sort* has occurred, whether it be a homeowner retiring to Florida, an apartment tenant moving down the block, or a townhouse renter retreating to the suburbs. I exclude places where a home has been replaced by a non-residence, as I wish to draw very direct comparisons. I hope the data reveals people who have recently left the city, and the people that have "replaced" them in their very same lots, in order to compare the different factors that have led them there. I also exclude the displacement of businesses - this is a very important part of gentrification, but is something that would require a very different methodology and should be examined in a future study.

The desired sample size is around 640 people. This would allow for 10 people per building (5 previous residents and 5 new residents, where possible), across 64 total buildings, across 8 neighborhoods (8 buildings per neighborhood). My target samples come from people who have moved in and out of the following neighborhoods (working North to South): Lake City, University District, South Lake Union, Capitol Hill, Central

District, International District, Colombia City, and South Park. These neighborhoods cover many different parts of the city, cover many different demographics, and exhibit many different effects of gentrification, including rising income, rents, and home values. With such a variety, I also expect to find people who are both gentrifiers and gentrified - people who were outpriced of their previous neighborhood, and now are part of the new wealthier wave pricing up their current one.

This study aims to quantify an unknown population. We can see the amount of people that move in and out of King County - on average 104,000 left the county every year in the first half of this decade, and there was a net total of 2800 population growth from domestic migration (Guy, 2018) - but this tells us little about how many are coming to *Seattle* and how many people are moving in and around the city and county itself. This makes it impossible to create a fully random and therefore representative sample (Babbie, 2013), but the methods I put forward will hopefully still provide broad enough data to be useful to others.

Of course, accessing this population will still be difficult - more so for the people who have moved *out* of the city. Recruitment will have to occur in this order: finding location of new residential development -> finding former owner of the land on this site (either through publicly available records or via inquiry to the new landowners) -> requesting access to list of previous tenants (in the case of rentals) -> contacting households -> recruiting households. Reaching a single participant could require navigating through several other entities, depending on the situation - each of which

could either lack or deny access to the information required to contact the participant. Due to these difficulties, in addition to the multi-staged simple random sampling I'm about to describe, it is also necessary to employ snowball sampling. Respondents will be asked if they are willing to refer people they know that have recently moved, with the understanding that this non-probability based sampling will further limit the wider applicability of the data collected (Babbie 2014, 512).

A list of the developments in each of the target neighborhoods will be created, and 10 buildings will be randomly selected from them. Then, provided that I gain access to both the current and previous residents, I will attempt to recruit 5 from each list. This will also vary with location - some previous lots might have only contained a household or two, for example. New residents of the building can simply have the survey dropped into their mailbox.

This methodology is very time consuming and difficult, but, if successful, would be the best way to collect the data that I'm after. The only other practical way would involve fully random sampling in different neighborhoods, which would be useful within the city, but less useful outside of it. Neighborhoods where we see some of the broader demographic shifts mentioned earlier could be targeted, but that would mean there would be a lot of important areas left out. Perhaps there's a neighborhood that a lot of displaced city dwellers are starting to move to, but so far they haven't left in large enough numbers that it's readily apparent via the census. This method would also leave out anybody that moved on a state, national, or global scale, and I hope to capture at least

some of this movement through my method. And finally, this alternative method would not allow me to draw direct comparisons between new and former residence of a specific lot.

The units of analysis and observation are households. While in many cases it is expected for these households to be individuals, an important part of this study is examining how many people are present in the home, and how they each relate to one another. The effects on families, and the need or lack thereof for roommates, are part of this examination.

### The Variables

I categorize the variables into two major categories: demographics and geography. Demographics, the respondents' *previous* geography, and their reasons for moving are their independent variables, and their current geography is the dependent. I initiate discussion of these variables in the context of the primary data collection method: the survey (See Appendix I, page 23). A list of variables follows, before their in-depth descriptions.

## Variable Table

Variable	Operationalization	Conceptualization	Independent/ Dependent/ Control
Race	Nominal	Single dimensional	I
Age	Ratio	Single dimensional	I
Household Income	Ratio	Single dimensional; Indicator of wealth; Proxy for economic mobility	I
Number of members in household	Ratio	Multi dimensional; Indicator of wealth (in relation to income)	I
Current location	Nominal (address)	Single dimensional; Indicator of migration	D
Previous location	Nominal	Multi dimensional; Indicator of migration (in relation to current location)	I
Time of move	Interval (year)	Single dimensional	
Length of time in previous home	Interval (year)	Single dimension	
Former homeownership status	Nominal	Single dimensional; indicator of wealth	I
Current homeownership status	Nominal	Single dimensional; indicator of wealth	I
Former home type	Nominal	Single dimensional;	
Current home type	Nominal	Single dimensional;	
Former home area	Nominal (urban, suburban, rural)	Multi dimensional	
Current home area	Nominal (urban, suburban, rural)	Multi dimensional	
Current commute time	Ordinal (range of minutes)	Multi-dimensional; proxy for health, happiness, interaction with environment and labor market	D
Current commute method(s)	Nominal	Multi-dimensional; proxy for health, happiness, interaction with environment and labor market	D
Satisfaction with commute	Ordinal	Multi-dimensional; proxy for health, happiness, interaction with environment and labor market	D
Reason for moving	Nominal	Multi dimensional;	I



## Demographics

Race will be questioned (See Appendix I - Page 23, Question #1) along a new format the US Census tested in 2010 (US Census Bureau Public Information Office. 2012.) in order to have a high criterion validity (Babbie 2014, 513) . While this factor on its own is already important to gentrification, I've discussed previous statistical analysis that's been done with race and income levels, so this will hopefully allow this new data to be easily connected to the wider literature.

Household income will be examined over the entire target period, 2010 to the study date. Respondents will be asked about their estimated average yearly income from 2010 to 2011, 2012 to 2013, and so on, and will be provided an exhaustive range of income brackets to select from (See Appendix I - Page 23, Question #4). This will be an attempt to find any major increases or decreases in household revenue over time, and see how it compares between the people moving in and out of and around the city. I partially use this to address claims along the lines of "a rising tide lifts all boats" - in other words, the idea that increased economic opportunity benefits everyone, even the displaced. I predict that data will show little to no benefits after their move.

By grouping incomes into two year periods, I do introduce reliability issues. Perhaps 2013 saw a large change in income, so it would be difficult to characterize the 2012-2013 period. However, this chart aims to characterize trends of income, and those should still be apparent despite any minor inaccuracies. Additionally, I think the chart being half the size due to the two year period makes the question appear slightly less long/intimidating.

Next is a question about other members of the household (See Appendix I - Page 23, Question #3). Respondents will be asked to list the ages and relations of the other members of the home (partner, sibling, parent, children, other close family member, roommate). The respondent will be asked to mark the period of time the other members have lived with them, as this could drastically change the meaning of other factors. For example, the birth of a child, a partner or family member moving in, or the need for a roommate will change both the reasons for wanting to move, and the amount of household income. It's important that an increase in working household members is not mistaken for an increase in personal wages. These relations, however, are likely things that would require further investigation in follow up interviews to understand entirely.

These questions all attempt to start to answer the *why* included in my research question.

## Geography

Respondents will be asked about their most recent previous residence (See Appendix I, page 24, Questions #5-#10), to answer the *where are they moving from* part of my research question. First, they will be asked to mark if it was within Seattle, elsewhere within King County, elsewhere within Washington, elsewhere within the United States, or from another country. If they mark that they moved from Seattle, they will be asked to confirm which neighborhood they lived in by writing it down - and this is where there's a small reliability issue, there's a little more interpretation left up to the subject. They will be asked to write the year that they moved and how long they stayed in that

home, to provide further context, and will be asked if they owned or rented. The reasons for displacement differ for these groups. Then they will be asked to mark the type of home that they lived in (house, townhome, apartment, condo, lacked permanent residence (including dorms, hotels, or none)). Finally, respondents who moved into Seattle from elsewhere will be asked to describe their former home area as rural, suburban, or urban. This will also be a little be up to interpretation and have reliability issues. I differentiate between suburban areas closer to the city, say a neighborhood like Magnolia, in Seattle, and those outside the city, to hopefully make this question a little less ambiguous.

Next comes current geography (See Appendix I, pages 24-25, Questions #11-#14), answering the remaining part of my research question, *where are they moving to*. First, for location, respondents will be asked for their current address. I desire specific location for at least one stage of the geography inquiries, so that data can be mapped in GIS software. Data points can be marked via current address and color coded based on where they lived previously. However, I stress in the survey that address will be disconnected from responses before publication, so points on the map will have to be generalized to the neighborhood/city level. Respondents will then be asked to define their home ownership, home type, and home area for their current geography just as they were their previous geography, to see how they differ.

The final geography questions relate to commute (See Appendix I, pages 25-26, Questions #15-#18). Respondents will be given a table of commute methods (personal

car, carpool, rideshare service, public transit, biking, walking) and will be asked to mark how many minutes they spend commuting via each of these methods on an average weekday commute. They will be provided a set of ranges (0 minutes, 1-5 minutes, 5-15 minutes, 15-25 minutes, 25-35 minutes, 35-45 minutes, 45-55 minutes, 55+ minutes) for each method. A 15 minute bus ride followed by a 15 minute bike ride is very different from a 30 minute personal car ride, for example, and this question aims to get at some of that nuance while still providing some leeway (I don't expect respondents to provide estimates down to the exact minute). Of course, since this is asking for an average of the entire week's commutes, there is still some nuance that can be left out - this question is not fully exhaustive. For example, I, as a student have slightly different commutes on different days of the week. If respondents feel unable to easily characterize a more complicated commute situation, they are directed to skip this question, and to briefly explain their situation (See Appendix I, page 26, Question #18).

Subjects will then be asked about their satisfaction with their commute, measured both in satisfaction in time and satisfaction in method. They will be asked to agree or disagree with statements describing these satisfactions (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). Even splitting this variable into two questions still leaves a lot of room for interpretation and a lot of lost nuance, and will definitely require deeper inquiry during follow up interviews.

Finally, returning to the *why*, the survey will contain a list of possible reasons the subject might have moved (including various economic and social factors), and will be asked to

check all that are applicable (See Appendix I, page 27 Question #19). This is obviously a point in the survey that would require the most nuance, and the listed options are not exhaustive at all. Respondents will be asked to specify the top three reasons for their move. They will also be provided a short space to write any further thoughts they have about reasons for their move, if they wish to elaborate (See Appendix, page 27, Question #20) - and this section will prompt them to reach out about a follow up interview.

### **The Interviews**

To recap what I've discussed about these interviews, subjects will be asked primarily to discuss the composition of their household, their feelings surrounding their current commute, and their reasons for their move (See Appendix II, page 28). A timeline for the project follows.

### **Timeline**

	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Goal</b>
1	November 2019	Finish literature review
2	December 2019	Complete approval
3	January 2020	Apply for ethics approval
4	February 2020	Secure funding
5	June 2020	Recruitment
6	September 2020	Data collection
7	November 2020	Data coding / analysis
8	December 2020	Complete writeup

# Budget

	GENTRIFICATION SURVEY					TOTALS
	Overall Time Frame					
	December 2019 - January 2020	February - May 2020	June - September 2020	November - December 2020		
<b>01 - Salaries</b>	2000					76,000.00
Include yours if you would be paid. Also include any research assistants you would need.	Myself	Myself + 1 Assistant	Myself + 10 Assistants	Myself + 10 Assistants		
<b>02 - Personal Service Contracts</b>						
Do you need to pay anyone for their services (e.g. Translators, Transcribers, Consultants)	0	0	0	0		
<b>03 - Other Contractual Services</b>						
Do you need to pay an outside company (e.g. for advertisements)	0	0	0	0		
<b>04 - Travel</b>						
local travel, assume 0.25 cents per mile. Include airfare and accommodation.	0	0	495	Average of 18 miles for 100 interviews	0	495.00
<b>05 - Supplies and Materials</b>						
e.g. Software, Hardware, Instruments, Postage, Office Supplies	0	0	303.75	Printing surveys and interview Qs at UW	0	303.75
<b>06 - Equipment</b>						
Hardware, Instruments, (e.g. GPS )	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>07 - Benefits</b>						
Calculate 14.2% of your salary. Otherwise consult A&S instructions	284	1136	6248	3124		10,792.00
<b>08 - Student Aid and Other Grants and Services</b>						
e.g. your tuition						11,000.00
<b>Total Direct Costs:</b>						
Amount Subject to P&A Costs: Typically this would be amounts in 01 thru 06						98,590.75
Indirect Costs (UW Overhead) : multiply Total Direct Costs by 54.5% to get total budget amount						53,731.96
<b>Total Total Amount of Budget:</b>						152,322.71
	\$					

## Appendix

### Appendix I – Survey

1. **What is your race or origin? Mark one or more boxes AND write in the specific race(s) or origin(s).**
  - a. White - Print origin(s), for example, German, Irish, Lebanese, Egyptian, and so on.
  - b. Black, African Am. - Print origin(s), for example, African American, Haitian, Nigerian, and so on.
  - c. Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin - Print origin(s), for example, Mexican, Mexican Am., Puerto Rican, Cuban, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.
  - d. American Indian or Alaska Native - Print name of enrolled or principal tribe(s), for example, Navajo, Mayan, Tlingit, and so on.
  - e. Asian - Print origin(s), for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.
  - f. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander - Print origin(s), for example, Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro, Samoan, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.
  - g. Some other race or origin - Print race(s) or origin(s).
2. **Print your age.**
3. **List the members of your household by your relation (for example, partner, parent, child, roommate, and so on), and mark their age, race (by similar guidelines to Question #1), and length of time they have lived with you (if they have lived with you longer than 10 years, write 10+).**

Relation	Race	Age	Years lived with
<i>Example: Sister</i>	Asian	21	1

4. **Fill in bubble that corresponds to your estimated average pre-tax annual household income for each two-year period.**

	2010, 2011	2012, 2013	2014, 2015	2016, 2017	2018, 2019	2020
\$0-\$20,000						
\$20,001-\$40,000						
\$40,001-\$60,000						
\$60,001-\$80,000						
\$80,001-\$100,000						
\$100,001-\$140,000						
\$140,001-\$180,000						
\$180,001-\$240,000						

\$240,001-\$500,000						
\$500,001 or greater						

*The following questions relate to your most recent previous residence - the one before where you live currently.*

- 5. Your residence was located in...**
  - a. Seattle - Print the neighborhood you lived in.
  - b. Elsewhere in King County
  - c. Elsewhere in Washington State
  - d. Elsewhere in the United States
  - e. Another country
- 6. Your place of residence was...**
  - a. Owned by you
  - b. Rented by you from a landlord
  - c. Owned by a friend or family member that allowed to you live there rent free or for below market rate
  - d. Lacked permanent residence - Print type of residence, for example, dormitories, hotels, none, and so on.
- 7. Mark the type of home you lived in.**
  - a. Apartment
  - b. House
  - c. Condo
  - d. Townhome
  - e. Other - Print type of home.
- 8. Print the number of years you lived in your previous residence.**
- 9. If you moved from somewhere outside of Seattle, mark if your residence was urban, suburban, or rural.**
  - a. Urban
  - b. Suburban (within a large city)
  - c. Suburban (outside of a large city)
  - d. Rural
  - e. Did not move from outside of Seattle.
- 10. Print the year you moved out of your previous residence.**

*The following questions relate to your current residence.*

- 11. Print your current address. This will be generalized to the neighborhood/city scale before publication to preserve your privacy.**
- 12. Your place of residence is...**
  - a. Owned by you
  - b. Rented by you from a landlord
  - c. Owned by a friend or family member that allows to you live here rent free or for below market rate
  - d. Lack permanent residence - Print type of residence, for example, dormitories, hotels, none, and so on.



**13. Mark the type of home you live in.**

- a. Apartment
- b. House
- c. Condo
- d. Townhome
- e. Other - print type of home.

**14. If you moved to somewhere outside of Seattle, mark if your residence is urban, suburban, or rural.**

- a. Urban
- b. Suburban (within a large city)
- c. Suburban (outside of a large city)
- d. Rural
- e. Did not move outside of Seattle / Just moved into Seattle.

*The following question involves your daily commute. Try to provide your answer for the average weekday to the best of your ability - however if you feel that averaging your commute is difficult or even impossible, skip to Question #18.*

**15. For each commuting method, mark the bubble that most closely corresponds to the average amount of time you spend in that commute method every day - going one way. Be sure to mark every commuting method. Mark 0 minutes if you don't use that commute method.**

	Private vehicle, taxi, or ride share app	Public bus or train	Carpool	Small personal vehicle (such as bike, skateboard, or motorized scooter or monowheel)	Walking	Ferry or Water Taxi	Private Shuttle (such as the Microsoft Bus)	Aircraft	Other
<b>0 min</b>									
<b>0-5 min</b>									
<b>5-15 min</b>									
<b>15-25 min</b>									
<b>25-35 min</b>									
<b>35-45 min</b>									
<b>45-55 min</b>									
<b>55+ min</b>									

*Mark how much you agree with the following statements.*

**16. I am satisfied with the length of my commute.**

- a. Strongly disagree
- b. Slightly disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Slightly agree
- e. Strongly agree

**17. I am satisfied with my commute, in terms of the methods I use.**

- a. Strongly disagree
- b. Slightly disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Slightly agree
- e. Strongly agree

**18. If I was not able to characterize my commute as a single average, the reason is...**

- a. I work or study from home.
- b. I am responsible for looking after the household or family members, instead of a salaried job.
- c. I undertake seasonal work where I live elsewhere during on-seasons (e.g. agriculture, oil, tourism labor)
- d. My work/study schedule is irregular.
- e. I work multiple jobs on different days that have different commutes.
- f. I work multiple jobs most days, or go to work and school most days, and have multiple commutes in a single day.
- g. My job changes location periodically.
- h. My job sends me to a different location every day.
- i. I am currently unemployed and not in education.
- j. I was able to characterize my commute as a single average.

**19. Mark any and all of the factors that caused or affected your decision to move. Put a star next to the 3 most important factors.**

- a. I could no longer afford the cost of my previous living situation.
- b. My lease was up and I decided not to renew.
- c. My lease was up and my landlord decided not to renew.
- d. I was evicted.
- e. Eminent domain was used to buy my house.
- f. I wanted to move in or out with a new roommate, partner, or family member.
- g. I wanted to move closer to friends and family.
- h. I was tired of the home I was living in previously.
- i. I was tired of the area I was living in previously.
- j. The area I live in now feels safer than the one I lived in previously.
- k. I could no longer afford the area I lived in.
- l. I lost my job.
- m. I got a new job.
- n. I wanted to search for work elsewhere, but didn't have anything lined up before leaving.
- o. My house was damaged in a natural disaster or accident.
- p. I moved to a place better suited for raising children.
- q. I was interested in pursuing a change in lifestyle (e.g. downsizing in retirement)
- r. My commute was too long.
- s. My commute now is longer than before, but still acceptable.
- t. I'm from another country, and decided to return home.

**20. If you have other reasons for or thoughts on your move, feel free to share them in the space below. If you have additional thoughts, please consider leaving your email address so we may contact you to schedule an in-person interview in the coming months in order to better understand your story. Your email address will not be associated with your response.**

## Appendix II – Interview

1. Can you discuss the people of your household? Can you explain to me how they are all related to you?
2. Can you explain to me your current daily commute?
3. How do you feel about your daily commute?
4. Can you explain the reasons for your most recent move?
5. Tell me about the place that you used to live.
6. Tell me about the place you live now.
7. Are you happy with your move?

## Bibliography

- Brenner, N., Schmid, C., 2012. Planetary Urbanization. *Urban Constellations* 11–13.
- Babbie, Earl. 2014. *The Basics of Social Research*. 6th ed. Chapman University: Wadsworth - Cengage Learning.
- City of Seattle. Building Permits [WWW Document], 2019. City of Seattle Open Data portal. URL <https://data.seattle.gov/Permitting/Building-Permits/76t5-zqzr> (accessed 11.17.19).
- Gallaher, C., 2017. Do Efforts to Mitigate Gentrification Work? Evidence from Washington DC. *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research* 28.
- Guy, G.B./ F., 2018. Fed up with Seattle? Data show where people are moving [WWW Document]. The Seattle Times. URL <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/data/fed-up-with-seattle-data-show-where-people-are-moving/> (accessed 11.17.19).
- Herman, B., Proksch, G., Berney, R., Dawkins, H., Kovacs, J., Ma, Y., Rich, J., Tan, A., 2017. Data science for urban equity: Making gentrification an accessible topic for data scientists, policymakers, and the community. arXiv:1710.02447 [cs].
- Hess, C.L., 2018. Light-Rail Investment in Seattle: Gentrification Pressures and Trends in Neighborhood Ethnoracial Composition. *Urban Affairs Review* 1078087418758959. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087418758959>
- Huang, J., Levinson, D., Wang, J., Zhou, J., Wang, Z., 2018. Tracking job and housing dynamics with smartcard data. *PNAS* 115, 12710–12715. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1815928115>
- Katy, K., 2017. Who really owns American farmland? - The New Food Economy [WWW Document]. New Food Economy. URL <https://newfoodeconomy.org/who-really-owns-american-farmland/> (accessed 10.28.19).
- Miller, L.M., 2019. Community-Based Equitable Development: Seattle’s Response to Gentrification 11. Pew Research Center’s Social & Demographic Trends Project. Demographic and economic trends in urban, suburban and rural communities, 2018. URL <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/05/22/demographic-and-economic-trends-in-urban-suburban-and-rural-communities/> (accessed 11.17.19).
- Rice, J.L., Cohen, D.A., Long, J., Jurjevich, J.R., 2019. Contradictions of the Climate-Friendly City: New Perspectives on Eco-Gentrification and Housing Justice: CONTRADICTIONS OF THE CLIMATE-FRIENDLY CITY. *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12740>
- Rothschild, S., 2019. An Exploratory Statistical Analysis of Gentrification and Neighborhood Change in Seattle. Whitman College 42.
- Smith, N., 2000. Gentrification, in: *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 294–296.
- United Nations, 2018. Sustainable cities, human mobility and international migration (No. E/CN.9/2018/1), Commission on Population and Development. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- United States Census Bureau. Fastest-Growing Cities Primarily in the South and West, 2019.
- US Census Bureau Public Information Office. 2012. “Census Bureau Releases Results From the 2010 Census Race and Hispanic Origin Alternative Questionnaire Research.” US Census Bureau. August 8, 2012. [https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010\\_census/cb12-146.html](https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010_census/cb12-146.html).
- United States Department of Agriculture. Cromartie, J., Vilorio, D., 2019. Rural Population Trends [WWW Document]. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2019/february/rural-population-trends/> (accessed 11.17.19).
- Welch, N., 2013. City for all? A geospatial approach to equity, sustainability, and gentrification in Seattle, Washington (M.A.). Tufts University, United States -- Massachusetts.