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“What is the definition of ‘affordability?’ Bueno, Bonito, y Barato.”
-Listening Session 1 Participants
Research Purpose and Approach

This study illuminates the assets, strengths, issues, and challenges that exist for Hispanic and Latino renters living in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood, who comprise a significant proportion of the Neighborhood’s population. Focusing on information obtained through listening sessions, interviews, data collection, and a review of relevant local and national studies, this report reveals the roadblocks that renters of color face to understanding and exercising their rights, securing healthy and affordable housing, and accessing rental housing support services. These neighborhood-specific experiences are placed in the context of the dominant narrative around rental housing and the gradual shifts occurring in Minneapolis City government policy, neighborhood association operations, and public perception.

We find that individual neighborhood identities are still relevant to the lives of residents and collaboration between neighborhood associations is vital, particularly in guiding key policy changes that will improve the livability of rental housing in Minneapolis. The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association (PPNA) is a trusted resource for renters in need and a stage for renters’ concerns to be heard at City Hall. It has significant opportunities to grow its support to neighborhood renters and cultivate local leaders, while leading the way in promoting a new narrative about who renters are and the value they bring to Minneapolis communities.

SPECIAL THANKS

We are indebted to the 13 neighborhood residents who shared in listening sessions held in March, the 14 renters who sat for interviews in April, and the 21 community leaders from around Minneapolis who shared their insights for this project. We hope you see your experiences reflected here.
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Background

Data and Sources
Data from a variety of primary and secondary sources is used to tell the story of Powderhorn Park’s renters. Decennial Census data from 1980 through 2010 is used to place the Powderhorn Park of today in the context of its past. When available and reliable, 5-year American Community Survey Estimates are used in their place. Note that these represent averages of data collected between 2008 and 2012, and some categories are unavailable due to data suppression. Other data was generously shared by Homeline, the City of Minneapolis, and PPNA for deeper analysis of the renter context in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. These data sources, alongside information obtained through interviews with key community leaders, are cited throughout the report.
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The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood is located in south-central Minneapolis bordered by Lake Street to the north, Cedar Avenue to the east, 38th Street to the south, and Chicago Avenue to the west. Originally annexed in 1887, development of the area began in the early 1900s due to expansion of the Chicago/Lake and Cedar/Lake streetcar lines. Commercial land uses have remained focused along the bounding streets of Lake, Chicago, Cedar, and Bloomington, and the center of the neighborhood surrounding the neighborhood’s largest amenity—Powderhorn Park—is predominantly residential. First development in the area was of single-family homes, but shifted to duplexes and three-story apartment buildings in the 1920s. Starting in the 1940s, many single-family homes in the neighborhood sub-divided into duplexes and triplexes and became rentals. As of 2010, only 37 percent of units in the neighborhood were single family homes. About 53.3 percent of the neighborhood’s total 3,468 housing units were renter-occupied, and 46.7 percent were owner-occupied. At the same time, approximately 2/3 of Powderhorn Park Neighborhood residents were renters.

The number of residents in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood has been trending growth since 1970, though population decreased slightly between 2000 and 2010. Compared to the rest of Minneapolis, the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood has a large 18 to 34 year old population and a small aged population. Overall, the median age of the population is 28.9 years with considerable variation by race and ethnic group. Non-Hispanic Whites have a median age of 30.5 years, and Hispanic residents have a median of only 26.9 years. Residents that move to the Neighborhood appear to remain, as only 14 percent of residents are estimated to have moved in the year preceding the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year Estimates. This is dramatically lower than most estimates for Minneapolis. About 58 percent of the population moved into their unit in the Neighborhood between 2000 and 2009, and the other 28 percent moved prior to the year 2000. The average household size in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood is about 2.8 persons, higher than the City average of 2.2 persons. Hispanic households in the Neighborhood have an average of 4.2 persons, varying across the Neighborhood between 3.8 to 4.8. Higher average household sizes seem to be focused west of the park. Car ownership is high, as only about 14 percent of Powderhorn Park households do not own at least one vehicle (2008-2012 ACS).

As the population of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood has increased since 1980, it has also become younger.

**AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

Powderhorn: 2.6 people

Minneapolis: 2.2 people

Powderhorn Hispanics Overall: 4.2 people

Powderhorn Hispanics Interviewed: 3.1 people

(2010 Census)

Map 2: Average Household Size Among Hispanic Renters by Block Group in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood
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Race and Ethnicity in Powderhorn Park

Context and Demographics

The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood is one of the most economically and racially diverse neighborhoods in Minneapolis. In the year 2000, the Hispanic population tied with the Black and African American population as the second largest group in the Neighborhood after non-Hispanic Whites, rising to 32.2 percent of the population in 2010. This proportion is mirrored in the linguistic diversity of the Neighborhood; 29.4 percent of the population speaks a language other than English in the home. Of households that speak Spanish, 68 percent speak English less than “very well.” Among U.S. citizens living in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood, only 7.9 percent speak Spanish, implying that a dramatic portion of the Spanish-speaking population of the Neighborhood are non-citizens. About 17 percent of the Neighborhood’s population is foreign-born, but approximately 50 percent of the Hispanic population was born outside of the United States.

Educational Attainment

The over 18 population of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood has lower rates of completion of college, and higher rates of never completing high school than Minneapolis overall. The City’s population identifying as Hispanic has even higher rates of non-completion of High School and lower rates of college completion. Values at the Neighborhood level were suppressed due to insufficient data.

On average, Hispanic households compared to the overall population of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood:

> Are about 1.6 times more likely to have moved in the past year.
> Are younger than the general population.
> May have lower educational attainment.
> Are more likely to speak a language other than English.
> Are about 3 times more likely to be foreign-born.
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POVERTY RATE BY RACE, MINNEAPOLIS

POVERTY RATE

Hispanic Population

Non-Hispanic White Population

Poverty Gap: 20%

Employment, Income, and Spatial Distribution by Race

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Approx. 14%

OVERALL POVERTY RATE

24% Below Poverty

48% Income 200% or Above Poverty

21% Income 100-149% of Poverty

7% Income 150-199% of Poverty

About 70 percent of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood’s population currently works. Both the Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic populations have lower unemployment rates than the Neighborhood overall, but the Hispanic population has a greater percentage of people not in the labor force.

The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood’s median income lags about $4,000 behind the citywide median, and Powderhorn’s Hispanic population lags even further, making only a median annual income of $21,597. While Neighborhood-level data on poverty rate by race is not available, the poverty gap between Hispanics and Non-Hispanic White population in Minneapolis overall is 20 percent. Across the city, 33 percent of Hispanics live below the Federal poverty line.

Using a statistical measure of segregation is a very meaningful way to measure the distribution of people of different sub-groups within a community. The Index of Dissimilarity (also called a D-Statistic) measures the degree of integration or dis-integration of a subgroup population on a scale of 0 to 100. The closer the Index of Dissimilarity reads to 100, the greater the segregation of that population from other groups. Ultimately, dissimilarity is the percent of subgroup members that would have to move in order to achieve perfect integration in the entire region. A D-Statistic of 0 for the Hispanic population would mean that every block group of the Neighborhood would have the same proportion of Hispanics as compared to the total population. At present, about 19 percent of the Hispanic population needs to move to achieve full integration, which is considered a very low level of segregation. In contrast, an isolation Index measures the extent of isolation of a particular subgroup. Again, Hispanic households overall as well as Hispanic renter households are fairly integrated spatially across the Neighborhood (by block group measures). However, White homeowner households have a high level of geographic proximity to one another and very limited proximity to other populations, mainly due to their large number and high concentration in just a couple of the Neighborhood’s block groups.

The majority of Hispanic households in Powderhorn Park:

- Are employed.
- Make less than $35,000 annually.
- Live in unsegregated block groups.
- Experience a higher rate of poverty than White households.
Housing in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood

In general, the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood has a wide range of rental housing options including everything from single family homes up to three-bedroom apartments. Rents range from just over $500 up to around $1,200 per month, with a median monthly rent around $829—lower than the City of Minneapolis overall, and very close to the statewide median. Despite this lower-price rental market, the vacancy rate is relatively high (5.1 percent) as compared to the City (3.2 percent). Vacancy among owner-occupied units is almost non-existent—less than 1 percent in 2012. The average home in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood was built in 1914, and about two-thirds of residential properties were built between 1895 and 1933. Most of the newest residential buildings are located along main corridors at the edges of the Neighborhood (Met Council 2012).

According to a housing market report completed in 2012, residents of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood have said that older homes keep their value by matriculous maintenance, but newer homes and apartments have not maintained their value (Fagan, Larrimore, and Maretell). They discovered that where estimated market value of owner-occupied units increases, the rate of vacancies on that block decreases. An 8.73 percent change in average estimated market value can be explained by the average change in percentage of vacations on the block—or vice versa. This is supported by the spatial analysis of their report, which maps age of housing stock, vacancy and value retention by block.

While Fagan et. al. only focus on owner-occupied housing, the impact of rental and multi-family housing quality on area rents and market value has been studied nationally with similar findings (DiPasquale 2011, Glaeser 2011). Deterioration of rental housing is linked to lower rents, but when disrepair becomes extreme the negative effects are displacement of populations and neighborhood blight. According to DiPasquale, the housing crisis of the late 2000s impacted owners of rental housing as dramatically as homeowners, and managers of financially-struggling multifamily properties are more likely to forego maintenance, leading to further deterioration of the property over time. This leads to filtering down of units through the market, providing some affordable housing opportunities for lower-income households for the time being, but running the risk of losing these units due to abandonment by the property owners or revoking of rental license by the City. This raises the issue of long-term availability of affordable housing in communities like the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood, where already distressed properties are occupied by some of the community’s most vulnerable populations.

This is particularly important considering Hispanics make up a significant portion of the renter population. Using block group data from 2010, about 31 percent of all renters in Powderhorn Park are Hispanic, which represents half of the Hispanic population of the Neighborhood. Among Non-Hispanic Whites, about 34 percent rent, 55 percent own and have a mortgage, and 11 percent own their homes free and clear. Only 3 percent of Hispanic households own their homes free and clear in Powderhorn Park, suggesting that this population may face more risks to their housing.

Cost-Burden in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood is more prevalent than in Minneapolis as a whole. Over 46 percent of the Neighborhood’s population spends over 30 percent of its income on housing-related costs, including rent, heat, electricity, water, sewer, and other costs. The level of cost burden is dramatically higher for Neighborhood renters, of which nearly two out of every three is cost-burdened. One in every three homeowners in Powderhorn Park currently pays more than 30 percent of their income toward mortgage repayment. Given that eleven out of twelve of the eligible interview responses lived in cost-burdened households, further research must be done to analyze the specific racial and socioeconomic stratifications of cost-burdening.

| COST-BURDEN ESTIMATES |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                       | % of Total Pop. | Homeowners      | Renters          |
| Powderhorn             | 46.3%           | 31.1%           | 63.1%            |
| Minneapolis            | 42.3%           | 33.4%           | 51.6%            |
| Minnesota              | 29.7%           | (2012 ACS)      | (2012 ACS)       |
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HOMEline Data Analysis

HOMEline is a non-profit tenant advocacy organization working to provide free legal advice to renters living in Minnesota. The organization operates a free telephone and web-based hotline, and offers free legal forms for repair requests, privacy violations, and security deposit returns among other issues. Beyond the hotline services, HOMEline is very active in advocating for preservation of project-based section 8 subsidies, working to decrease the level of cost-burden on households due to heat and electrical costs, and instituting a “Pay or Quit” policy in Minnesota to require landlords to give at least seven days warning and opportunity to pay owed rent before filing an eviction. They were successful in efforts to push a bill into legislature in 2014 to increase the renters credit (CRP). In a recent study, HOMEline found that 80 percent of callers found their advice helpful, and about 64 percent of callers followed HOMEline’s advice (CURA Presentation, 2014). Unfortunately, according to Tenant Advocate Claire Branigan, “about 90 percent of the time, Hispanic and Latino callers don’t do what we recommend out of fear of retaliation” (Interview, 2015). “When something goes wrong,” explains Ms. Branigan, “the burden is placed on the tenant to do something about it, and it’s often just not feasible for a non-native English speaker whose legal status may be uncertain to fight a problem in court.”

REPAIRS

Request for repair assistance are by far the most common calls that HOMEline receives. According to a recent study by CURA, “callers who follow HOMEline’s advice are 37 percent more likely to have their repair issues taken care of than those who do not follow Homeline’s advice.” Populations that call in about repairs, however, are stratified by race, as detailed below.

EVICITIONS

The second most common calls pertain to evictions. Currently, Minnesota is one of only seven states that has no Good Cause Protection from evictions, also called unlawful detainers (HOMELINE, 2015). According to Eric Hauge, Tenant Organizer for HOMEline, around 20,000 evictions occur each year in the state. He estimates that 90 to 95 percent of calls received about evictions are for nonpayment of rent. However, “eviction isn’t about rent; it’s about possession of a unit” (Hauge, April 14, 2015). Often, landlords seem to file evictions in an inconsistent way, doing so only when they wish to re-possess the unit. Fortunately, almost every kind of publicly subsidized housing program has a pay or quit requirement of 10 to 30 days, but the failure of state legislation means that the most vulnerable populations—low-income households who are unqualified for subsidized housing by legal status, rental history, or criminal history—are at increased risk of landlord exploitation. In conjunction with this effort, HOMEline is working on expungement processes with renters to remove evictions from their record.

SECURITY DEPOSITS

The third most common call according to Tracey Goodrich, Tenant Organizer and Volunteer Coordinator, are with regard to security deposits. Follow-up with callers found that tenants who did nothing never received their security deposits back. Of those who sent out the form letter provided by HOMEline, 50 percent got at least some of their deposit back. And finally, only 49 percent of tenants who filed a court case got any money returned, but the amount they received was significantly higher than those who did not file (CURA, 2014).
DATA ANALYSIS
Since HOMeline began serving Minneapolis in March of 2014, they have kept detailed data on calls received, resolved cases, and demographic information. HOMeline provided PPNA and the student researcher with data from March 31st 2014 through April 1 2015 for Ward 9, which includes the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. Over the course of a year, HOMeline received 347 total calls from Ward 9 residents, 170 of which were White residents and 42 of which were Hispanic residents. The most common call overall was for repairs (17%) which was also the most common call for Hispanics (19%) and White households (18%). The second most common call overall was a tie between eviction and security deposit recovery (10% each), and third was notice to vacate (9%). Interestingly, the White population had the same two ranking second and third (15% and 9% respectively), but Hispanic callers’ third highest call was with regard to rent increases (10%), which no White residents called about over the year. Hispanic callers were more likely to call about bedbugs, deposit to hold, lease disagreements, and “other” issues. Overall, only 12 percent of callers from Ward 9 were Hispanic, which is dramatically less than the percent of the population that identifies as Hispanic. 49 percent of callers were Non-Hispanic Whites.

### Issues Experienced by Renters of Ward 9, Two largest Populations of Powderhorn Park 3/31/14-4/1/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed Bugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit to Hold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Vacate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Deposit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issues</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When data for Hispanic callers was broken down further by income, it appears that the vast majority of Hispanic HOMeline callers living in Ward 9 are from the Extremely Low Income bracket, meaning that their household makes less than 30 percent of the Area Median Income for the Metro Area. Notice to Vacate had the most calls by far, all from households with extremely low incomes. Counts of calls during this time period are charted below. Interestingly, there were only 6 calls to HOMeline from the apartments within our focus area over the past year: 2 were for rent increases, 2 were for bedbugs, 1 was to recover a security deposit, and 1 was about a supposed retaliation and privacy issue. The Community Organizer at PPNA assisted in making at least half of these calls.

### Issues Experienced by Ward 9 Hispanic Households, Organized by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Bed Bugs</th>
<th>Condemnation</th>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Deposit to Hold</th>
<th>Eviction</th>
<th>Heat</th>
<th>Leases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Lockout</th>
<th>No License</th>
<th>Notice to Vacate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Rent Increase</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
<th>Security Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key Stakeholders
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The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association (PPNA)

PPNA’s mission is “to enhance the quality of life in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood by facilitating community engagement, embracing a diversity of voices, and fostering economic and community development.” A 501(c)3 nonprofit organization, PPNA was created in 1980 to support the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood of South Minneapolis. PPNA builds capacity and connections between community members, including residents, property owners, employees and businesses, to help them work collectively to address community concerns. Advocacy and engagement between the neighborhood and important governing bodies is also a central role of PPNA’s service to area residents.

PPNA currently has two full-time paid staff members and one part-time Program Coordinator. The organization is led by a twelve person Board of Directors comprised of community members who volunteer their time. The organization relies on voluntary support and works on issues identified by those who live and work in the community. PPNA is a part of the Southside United Neighborhoods (SUN) Project, a coalition of seven neighborhood organizations that represent eleven neighborhoods. Convened in 2010 the focus of the SUN Project is to explore strategic partnership opportunities to improve operating efficiencies and ensure long-term sustainability of neighborhood initiatives. The collaboration focuses on capacity-building, renters’ rights issues, neighborhood livability concerns, park programming development, and joint policy agenda creation for neighborhood commercial corridors.

2015 Southside United Neighborhoods Project Policy Agenda items:
1. Renters’ Rights and Liveability
2. Park Programming and Equity
3. Commercial Corridors

Neighborhood organizations part of the SUN Project include:
> Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association
> Bancroft Neighborhood Association
> Bryant Neighborhood Organization
> Central Neighborhood Development Organization
> Corcoran Neighborhood Organization
> Longfellow Community Council
> Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Association

PHOTO BY NICKEY ROBARE, POWDERHORN365, YEAR 2015. MAP BY ERIN OLSON, YEAR 2015, TIGER LINE SHAPEFILE 2010.
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The Livability Agenda for Apartment Housing

Presented to the City Council Members of the 7 SUN Neighborhoods, this agenda is the culmination of 8 months of data collection in over 19 buildings with 188 engaged residents. The core action items that southside neighborhoods will prioritize based on resident input include:

1. Raise standards for livability and inspections
2. Foster energy efficiency and fair utility billing
3. Equip renters and landlords to eliminate bedbugs
4. Make housing standards and renters’ rights transparent and legible
5. Support tenant hotline and renter organizing capacity.

Each of these priority areas already has significant motion, with the Corcoran Neighborhood Organization in particular receiving local recognition for its work to decrease utility costs and take the lead on drafting and promoting the Livability Agenda. Both Lyndale and Corcoran (among other South Minneapolis Neighborhoods) have seen an increase in Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS), by which landlords pass off heat costs to tenants and sometimes with inaccurate meter readings. While this has not been an observed trend in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood, PPNA has provided support to this SUN Project initiative and helped individual residents that have faced difficulties in paying for rent or utilities find helpful resources. Multi-family housing livability standards responding to pest issues in the community have been primary areas of work in Powderhorn Park. PPNA’s Community Organizer has collaborated with local organizations to work on streamlining communication and services provided to Neighborhood residents, bringing staff from Homeline doorknocking to get acquainted with community members, hosting events at the Powderhorn Park Recreation Center, and working with CLUES to offer relevant trainings for residents.

Span of Focus

PPNA has ramped up efforts to reach the renter community—particularly Hispanic and Latino renters—over the past two years. Since January 2015, the Community Organizer at PPNA has done the following:

• Organized a successful experience-sharing session between the Minneapolis Police Department and 11 residents of a nearly 100 percent Latino multi-family building
• Worked to start the Minneapolis Renter’s Coalition
• Built landlord relationships to improve inspection and extermination procedures;
• Helped develop tenant rights visuals in multiple languages;
• Door-knocked extensively in apartments along Bloomington Avenue;
• Attended 2 Renters’ Rights Organizer Think Tank retreats facilitated by CURA to work collaboratively toward policy change;
• Worked with the Ward 9 Polic Aide, Aisha Gomez, to form a working group to promote tenant livability standards;
• Met regularly with Organizers at the Lyndale and Corcoran Neighborhood Associations, and with the Tenant Organizing Table;
• Attended city-wide policy meetings at City Hall and with the Department of Regulatory Services.

Renters’ Rights Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Addressed</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extermination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction Threat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applying Rent Voucher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to Lease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish Outreach Events

• Latino Advisory Council
• Lending Circles
• Immigration Law Sessions (1)
• Appetite for Leadership cooking classes (6)
• Artesanas Latinas (Powderhorn Art Fair Diversity Initiative)
• Latino Cultural Corridor meetings

Practices in Other Neighborhoods

• Tenant Advisory Councils to meet with City Council
• Renter Sub-Committee to Neighborhood Boards
• Group Tenant Case Coverage
• Women’s Leadership Program
• Family Game Nights in Painter Park
• Special Events – La Posada
• Walking Clubs
• Clean Energy Partnership mobilization around rental housing

Photo by Andy Smith, Powderhorn365, Year 2013
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“Be careful not to devalue other forms of knowledge, or ways of knowing.”
-Jay Bad Heart Bull, President/CEO of NACDI
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Selection of Population

Outreach to the population of Hispanic and Latino renters living in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood was focused on multi-family buildings on the four block stretch of the west side of Bloomington Avenue between 35th Street and 32nd Street. This was decided based on the following realities:

1. Block groups in this segment of the Neighborhood have larger percentages of Hispanic households (see Map 4 below).
2. About 39 percent of renters living in this area identify as Hispanic or Latino (see Map 5 below).
3. PPNA's Community Organizer, Sara Lopez, had built strong, trusting relationships with residents in this part of the neighborhood, and many residents of these buildings had expressed willingness to participate in such a study.

PPNA’s Community Organizer connected with Hispanic renters in this target area by phone call, flyers in apartment buildings, presentations at yoga classes held at the Powderhorn Recreation Center, and doorknocking. However, sampling issues within the area led to sampling a strong majority of female participants in both listening sessions and interviews. This bias is recognized in the findings.

Map 4: Percent Hispanic by Block Group in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood

Map 5: Percent of All Renter Households with a Hispanic Head of Household by Block Group in Powderhorn Park Neighborhood

MAP CREATED BY ERIN OLSON, DATA SOURCE U.S. DECENTENIAL CENSUS 2010 BY BLOCK GROUP
Methods

Data Collection

Diverse methods were utilized to capture qualitative data on renter experiences in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood and to summarize existing quantitative data surrounding the research question. Central to this research were two listening sessions held with Hispanic renters living in Powderhorn Park. In all, 13 adults and 2 minors participated in the listening sessions held in Spanish. Only two listening session participants were male. Questions for the sessions were developed collaboratively by the student researcher and staff at PPNA. These sessions informed the questions developed for individual interviews held with Hispanic renters living in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. In all, 14 interviews (3 male, 11 female) were held between April 1 and April 23rd. They were administered in the language of choice for the respondent—Spanish or English—recorded, and later translated. Finally, 21 interviews with key stakeholders identified the strengths, challenges, and opportunities of renters in the neighborhood and illuminated new policy trends in Minneapolis surrounding renter rights. A full list of interview respondents and questions asked can be found at the end of this report.

Protection of Identity

Particular care was taken in the course of this research to protect the identity of participants and reduce any level of risk they take on by participating in this study. No names or addresses were recorded for this study, and responses have been randomized. Additionally, participants were not asked about their public assistance status, rental rebate eligibility, insurance, amount of time spent in the U.S., or immigration status as these questions could cause fear and discomfort or put participants at risk of identification. Although this limits our income analysis possibilities, it was a necessary decision for the protection of Powderhorn’s residents. We also acknowledge that in questions of occupancy, it is possible that participants were not completely open about the number of people currently living in their apartments in order to protect family members not officially on a lease. This community lacks access to the safety nets that exist for the general population, making them particularly vulnerable. Only an estimated annual income, Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, and first generation immigrant self-identification were used in this report as demographic indicators. PPNA values the privacy and protection of its residents above all else, and while these findings cannot be generalized to the entire Latino population, they tell an important story of the current reality of this population of renters in our community.

Analysis

Literature, listening sessions, and interviews were assessed qualitatively, drawing out themes to be explored further in the midst of data collection. AtlasTi and Excel were used to do preliminary assessment of data, and SAS 9.3 was later used to do more complete analysis. Due to small sample sizes, statistical significance cannot be assumed. Therefore, caution is advised in making any generalizations about the populations described here. All findings should be considered feedback provided by the group of participants.

PHOTOS LEFT AND BOTTOM BY JULES WIGHT, POWDERHORN365, YEAR 2014 AND TOP RIGHT SARA LOPEZ, FORMER COMMUNITY ORGANIZER
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“If [a community member] may come into contact with his neighbor, and they with other neighbors, there will be an accumulation of social capital, which may immediately satisfy his social needs and which may bear a social potentiality sufficient to the substantial improvement of living conditions in the whole community.” (Hanifan, 1916: p. 130)

PHOTO BY GAEA DILL-D’ASCOLI, POWDERHORN365, YEAR 2014
**Listening Sessions**

Feedback from the two listening sessions held in March were valuable in learning the social, organization and communication networks of renters living on the east side of Powderhorn Park. This section summarizes the key findings from both sessions framed by the questions recorded in Appendix B. Responses from Female Participants are marked with an “F” while Male contributions are marked with an “M.” Popular answers are recorded in bold.

**WHAT PARTICIPANTS DON’T LIKE ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD**

- It is not safe to walk or bike alone because of thieves and gangs (n=11 F)
- It is very dark at night and not safe (n=11 F)
- There is no nightlife or heavy drinkers in this neighborhood (n=6 F)
- Transit connectivity is better here (n=1 M and n=2 F)
- Some break ins have occurred, particularly close to the park (n=3 F)
- People hang out by the basketball courts and cause trouble (n=7 F)
- Winter walking is too cold and icy on the sidewalks (n=5 F)
- The playground isn’t safe, there was a shooting there (n=2 F)

**WINTERTIME ACTIVITIES**

- None in the neighborhood, it is too cold (n=1 M and n=7 F)
- Sledding (n=1 M)
- Cake making at home (n=1 F)
- Go to Mall of America and walk around (n=6 F)

When the board with pictures of activities in the park was brought out, participants got very animated and identified May Day Cafe and the Aztec Dancers right away as important to the neighborhood. The movie theaters in Minneapolis were identified as too expensive. Cycling is popular, however, there have been issues with fights between different groups of youth that don’t get along. Summer activities in the park are the biggest draw to families, but kids don’t seem to come to the Recreation Center for indoor activities.

**HOW HISPANIC RENTERS PREFER TO RECEIVE INFORMATION**

- Flyers on the apartment door or slid under the door of an individual unit (All)
- Signs in the Park (All)
- Signs posted at the street corner (n=1 M and n=9 F)
- Radio Rey – Listen to El Huracan, an announcer from Mexico City who is “chatty and down to earth” (n=7 F), better than the other Spanish-speaking station
- Word of Mouth from neighbors (All)
- Mercado Central Conversations and newspapers available (n=2 M and f=7 F)
- Facebook (1 F)

**HOW HISPANIC RENTERS DO NOT WANT TO RECEIVE INFORMATION**

- Text messages or telephone (unless a personal relationship) (F)
- Television
- Internet – don’t use it (M and F)

**REASONS RESIDENTS MOVED TO POWDERHORN PARK**

- The apartment she could get here is larger than her last neighborhood
- It is calm, less noise than other neighborhoods ("tranquilo") (n=7 F)
- There is no nightlife or heavy drinkers in this neighborhood (n=6 F)
- Transit connectivity is better here (n=1 M and n=2 F)

**FAVORITE ACTIVITIES OF THE FAMILY OR HOUSEHOLD**

- Walk around the park (M and F)
- Visit family in their homes or have a BBQ (M and F)
- Play Football in the park (M)
- Run around the Lake (M)
- Swimming in the pool (F)
- Play on the playground with kids (F)
- Take walks around the neighborhood with kids (F)
- Take Zumba classes at the Park (F)
- Some women are starting to take Yoga and enjoy that too (F)
- Bicycling (F)
- Aztec Dance Class (F)
- Take kids to the pool (F)
- Play volleyball in the park (F)

**ACTIVITIES ENJOYED THE LEAST**

- National Night Out – Americans organize for this (F)
- Marathon running (F)
- Roller skating (F)
- Race biking (F)

While no participants in the listening sessions said they had participated in National Night Out, in both sessions the picture of White Americans sitting in the street for the event was pointed out as something the participants wanted to be able to do. Events in the park that require purchasing things, like the Art Fair, are attended by the interview participants as spectators only.

**HOW HISPANIC RENTERS PREFER TO RECEIVE INFORMATION**

- Flyers on the apartment door or slid under the door of an individual unit (All)
- Signs in the Park (All)
- Signs posted at the street corner (n=1 M and n=9 F)
- Radio Rey – Listen to El Huracan, an announcer from Mexico City who is “chatty and down to earth” (n=7 F), better than the other Spanish-speaking station
- Word of Mouth from neighbors (All)
- Mercado Central Conversations and newspapers available (n=2 M and f=7 F)
- Facebook (1 F)

**HOW HISPANIC RENTERS DO NOT WANT TO RECEIVE INFORMATION**

- Text messages or telephone (unless a personal relationship) (F)
- Television
- Internet – don’t use it (M and F)

**PHOTO BY ERIN OLSON, RESEARCH ASSISTANT, YEAR 2015; MAP BY MIKE HOYT, YEAR 2014**
Listening Sessions

IMPORTANT ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESSES, AND GROUPS

• Mercado Central – First place mentioned ("A lot of people go there") (n=10 F)
• Reina’s House – Second place mentioned (n=2 F)
• Matt’s – social outing for hamburgers (n=10 F)
• Stores owned by Middle Eastern people (Sam’s mentioned by name)
• Stores owned by Hispanics (not on Lake Street) (M and F)
• Landromat (F)
• Dairy Queen (F)
• Midtown Global Market – for the vegetables (F)
• La Mexicana Super Market (E Lake and Bloomington Ave) (M and F)
• Hostess Bread Outlet (closed now) (F)
• Taco Taxi (n=2 M and n=6 F)
• Los Ocampo (n=2 F)
• Theater Heart of the Beast (n=2 M and n=3 F)
• May Day Cafe (n=6 F)
• Elektra Hair Cuts (n=2 F)
• Super Mercado Morelia (n=2 F)
• Tax Services (n=1 F)
• Churches (n=1 F)

WHAT DOES PPNA DO AND WHAT SHOULD IT DO MORE OF?

• Doing well in the area of tenant rights issues
• Provides good help when needed ("bueno")
• Promotes unity
• Has culturally-competent staff
• Plans meetings we are welcome at
• Calls the City to report landlords that are not maintaining properties
• Helps renters get repairs done, especially for inspections
• They are the first ones to call when you need an inspector

Since 2012, PPNA has had a Latino Community Organizer on staff who has built a strong relationship with the neighborhood’s renters. Latino residents feel at ease engaging with PPNA and consistently identify PPNA as an important resource for pressuring landlords to do repairs and going to the City about larger renters’ rights issues. Participants of both listening sessions said that their apartment buildings are in better repair now than they were a year ago, thanks to the work of PPNA. This was a theme to later come out in the interviews as well. Before PPNA hired a Spanish-speaking Community Organizer, participants said that they believed the Neighborhood Association was only for homeowners and American citizens. The importance of this shift in awareness cannot be overstated. The most important issues that residents need help with are getting rid of bedbugs (which seem to affect the children the most) and making sure that rents stay low. Participants have seen that after they organized and met with the Police department about security issues associated with the laundry room, the landlord issued a $15 rent increase on all households. Others have felt retaliated against when they call in an inspector. Participants said that residents are “keeping the secret” that inspections are coming from PPNA and not actually of the City’s initiative. Participants in the second session also noted that they did not know about rental resources — like Homeline — before PPNA hired a Spanish speaker. They enjoy the Appetite for Leadership group, like the activities and events that PPNA does to bring people together, and are interested in starting a walking group.

PHOTO BY MONICA ROJAS, POWDERHORN365, YEAR 2013

BUSINESSES NOT FREQUENTED

• Movie Theater – Too Expensive (n=2 M and n=4 F)
• Record store
• Tattoo parlor
• Chicago Avenue businesses

Overall, participants think highly of the businesses located within the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. In general, shops and restaurants along Lake Street are seen as too expensive and sometimes not very authentic. Small corner stores on corridors close to residential areas seem to have lower prices and more personable staff. Participants mentioned that they enjoyed going to Sam’s Market and Movies on 35th because the owners are kind and talk to their children. Some Middle Eastern business owners are learning Spanish, and this is seen very positively. Those shops and restaurants where no staff speak Spanish are less appealing to the participants. In the first listening session, the most important nearby institutions were identified as:

1. Santo Rosario
2. CLUES
3. Schools (South High School, Aurora, Anderson, Hiawatha Academy)

WHERE PARTICIPANTS GO TO MEET UP WITH PEOPLE

In order of mention

• Church
• Mexican shops
• Park
• People’s apartments
• Bus
• English class
• Mercado Central
• Cooking classes
**Summary of Key Findings**

**Listening Sessions**

**IN COMPARISON TO THE LAST PLACE LIVED, PARTICIPANTS THOUGHT THIS APARTMENT WAS**

**BETTER IN:**
- Located near parks and transport (n=6 F n=1 M)
- Larger (n=2 F)
- More affordable (n=5 F)

**WORSE IN:**
- The landlord raises rents when residents organize or complain (n=6 F n=2 M)
- Not significantly cheaper (n=6 F n=1 M)
- Same problems with pests as in other neighborhoods (n=9 F n=2 M)
- Landlord isn’t consistent in policies (n=2 F)
- Security, particularly the laundry room (n=4 F)

**ISSUES IN POWDERHORN PARK APARTMENTS**

Participants were asked to explain what the most pressing issues are in their apartments, whether with regard to repairs, landlord relations, or other concerns. The biggest theme was the rampant prevalence of rats, cockroaches, and bedbugs throughout the multifamily buildings in the Neighborhood, and the participants’ perception that landlords are uninterested in taking real action to improve their condition. Some said that their apartment managers were rude or yelled at residents when they had repeated pest problems and either refused to spray, or used ineffective chemicals purchased at area businesses. One participant reported not having storm windows for three years and significant drafts and high bills in the wintertime. The landlord has been unresponsive to replacing the windows. Inconsistencies in application of the lease agreement were also raised, with one resident saying her lease allows for a dog, but the landlord has since forbidden it. Landlords are enforcing payment of rent by the 1st or 3rd of each month, even though the lease allows for payment without late penalties until the 5th. Some landlords are charging $50 per day late past the first day of the month. Other reported issues include:

- Charging for repairs to unclog a drain
- Feeling insecure and unsafe
- Homeless people sleeping by the front and rear entrances
- Teens vandalizing the property
- $15 rent hike after tenants complain
- Evictions of households who call inspectors or “ask too much”
- No garbage disposal in sink
- When tenants report problems, landlords want the tenants to fix it and pay for it themselves
- Snow shoveling doesn’t get done in a timely manner
- Repairs take a long time to get done, sometimes needing to remind the landlord multiple times
- People prop doors open when bringing in groceries or when kids play
- Copper pipes were stolen from the building

**LANDLORD RELATIONSHIPS**

Particularly troubling were participants’ reports about their relationship with their landlords. In the first listening session, one participant said that owners abuse immigrants, especially Latinos, because they think they won’t respond. There is a general belief that landlords will evict tenants that complain too much. Two out of seven participants in the second listening session said that the current manager of their building had raised her voice at them and cursed, and even made other residents cry. A good landlord relationship was defined as a landlord who would “wait patiently for the rent,” complete repairs on time, and be “kind.” These aspects were incorporated into the interview questions.

**WHO HANDLES REPAIRS IN THE HOUSEHOLD**

Whoever speaks the best English in the household, whether the husband, wife, or daughter (even as young as 6 years old) is usually the one in charge of contacting the landlord about needed repairs. There is no clear trend by head of household status or gender in either the listening sessions or interviews.

**BIGGEST RISKS TO HISPANIC AND LATINO RENTERS**

- Insecurity/Safety (n=11 F n=1 M)
- Vandalism of property (n=5 F)
- Landlords “doing things wrong” (n=5 F)

**DEFINITION OF “AFFORDABILITY”**

- “Bueno, Bonito, Barato” (Good, Pretty, Cheap) (n=13)
- A small space is fine, but it must be clean and free of pests (n=6 F)

**PHOTOS BY POWDERHORN365**

**Summary Points**

> The park is valued and utilized.
> Winter activities are limited.
> Flyers and word of mouth are effective.
> Safety is a top concern.
> Corner stores and small businesses are highly frequented and important.
> Price and social interaction guide shopping and recreation decisions.
> Pests are a serious issue.
> There is some inconsistency in management of buildings.
> Landlord relationships are strained.
**Renter Interviews**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Of the fourteen individuals interviewed, four also participated in a listening session, making for a total of 23 unique contacts for data collection. Three interviewees are male, and eleven are female. All self-identify as Hispanic (n=2), Latino or Latina (n=2), Colombian (n=1), or Mexican (n=4). Thirteen out of fourteen speak Spanish a first language, and one Zapotec. Thirteen out of fourteen primarily speak Spanish in the home, with one that lives with English-speaking roommates using English more often. Twelve identified themselves as the head of household, and on average, households were around 3 members with 2 adults and 1 child. The most common number of children was either 0 or 2. On average, two people were officially listed on the lease agreement. All but three interviewees lived in one-bedroom apartments. By defining “overcrowding” as having more than two people per bedroom in a home, the apartments of interviewees were overcrowded by about one person. It is possible, however, that interviewees underreported the number of people living in their home already knowing they were overcrowded, or because they perceive some guests as being only temporary. Most interviewees were on month-to-month leases (while this was not a question, several provided the information in discussion), and in all households, it appears that the person most skilled in English handles housing issues. There is no clear trend in who handles household finances. Among households with a man and a woman living together, it is split evenly between who identifies as head of household and who handles financial matters.

**INCOME AND COST-BURDEN MEASURES**

The vast majority of households interviewed have an extremely low income according to HUD 2015 guidelines set by household size (n=10). Forty-three percent (n=6) of the households interviewed are considered below the Federal Poverty Line. On average, interviewees are paying $686 for a one-bedroom apartment, and utility costs of just over $70 each month. The average total monthly cost—including housing and utility costs—for all households interviewed was $745. Based on income estimates provided by interviewees, households are paying an average of 54 percent of their total income toward housing. HUD recommends that a household pay no more than 30 percent of its income toward housing costs. Only two households are not cost-burdened, with one paying 26 percent and the other 30 percent of its income toward housing. The main culprit of the moderate level of cost-burdening is due to low income and rents that are set too high by that income. Utility costs do not appear to be significant contributing expenses in most cases.

Most rents for the households interviewed are set just below the Fair Market Rent (FMR) of the Twin Cities area, averaging about 8 percentage points below the FMR for a one-bedroom unit of $796. However, when looking at the affordable rent for a household based on income, households are paying an average of $233 more than they can afford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUD Income Category (n=10)</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below the Federal Poverty Line (n=6)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rent, 1-Bedroom Only</td>
<td>$686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat and Electric Costs</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Housing, All Apartment Sizes</td>
<td>$745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Burden of Total Cost to Income</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost’s Percent of FMR by Size</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rent by Income</td>
<td>$546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Difference by Affordability</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See details of data manipulation in the Appendix.*

**2015 Department of Housing and Urban Development Income Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (80%)</td>
<td>$54,700</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$20,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50%)</td>
<td>$61,900</td>
<td>$43,300</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (30%)</td>
<td>$69,280</td>
<td>$54,700</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**The Experiences of Latino Renters in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood**
LANDLORD RELATIONSHIP

Overall, when asked to rank their relationship with their landlord or manager—whomever they interact with most directly—interviewees were split evenly between negative and positive responses, with the mean and median response being “neutral.” The most common response was a “moderately positive” relationship (n=5). Overall landlord relationship seemed to have a significant impact on the positivity or negativity of the interviewees’ responses to the questions outlined below, with those feeling more negative about their landlord responding with more feelings of discomfort or disagreement with the statements.

Interviewees overall were most uncomfortable approaching their landlord regarding difficulty paying rent, with an average score of “somewhat uncomfortable” and a median and mode score of “very uncomfortable.” This was the most negative of all responses in both question sets shown below. The most felt neutral about approaching their landlord regarding a needed repair (n=4) and others were split equally on the spectrum of negative and positive responses. Responses on approaching a landlord or manager about a special accommodation or request were highly split and correlated with the response to the overall relationship with the landlord.

When asked their level of agreement with certain statements, the most negative responses were to the “does repairs quickly” question. 43 percent (n=6) said they “strongly disagreed” with the statement, and provided examples of delayed repairs. The second most negative responses were related to the personality of the landlord. Again, 43 percent (n=6) said that their landlord did not “listen to their needs and concerns” and 29 percent (n=4) strongly disagreed with the statement “my landlord is approachable and helpful”—another 21 percent (n=3) simply disagreed. Responses to “my landlord is very forgiving if I pay rent late,” “keeps the building in good repair,” and “makes fair charges for repairs” were majority negative, but averaging out at a neutral score. Most interviewees feel that their landlord makes charges that they understand, and that they generally notify them at least 24 hours in advance of needing to enter their unit. However, responses to these—and most of the questions—were mixed and varied significantly even among those who lived in the same building. The strongest feelings—both positive and negative—stemmed from the personal relationship perceived with the landlord. Some comments recorded from participants include:

- “We are ignored. The Management couldn’t be bothered with my requests.”
- “The manager is nice to me but takes long to send a handyman.”
- “They never pick up the phone and ignore voicemails.”
- “There is a language barrier that makes it hard to be understood and understand.”
- “Our relationship is good. We always pay rent early. Things get fixed.”
- “Our lease makes us pay rent in cash, and I am uncomfortable with this...we don’t get a receipt.”
- “The manager uses a translator and fixes everything for us.”
- “The landlord isn’t ethical...I have gotten a lot of strange fees that don’t make sense.”
- “The manager asks nicely for rent.”
- “The manager made somebody cry.”
REPAIRS

Eleven interviewees responded to the questions regarding the time it takes the landlord to complete a repair; the other three had never asked for a repair. The median response was 2-3 days for the repair to be completed from the time it was requested, and the average was a response of 3-4 days (if including the three responses who said the landlord “never” completed the repairs needed). It was troubling to hear about the repairs that had never been completed, as they often involved the most expensive and health-damaging situations, such as mold, pest, or water intrusion problems.

- "When I started living here the blinds were broken. I told management right away, but they have been there for 10 years, always broken."
- "Water was coming out everywhere in the bathroom from the toilet. The repair men came quickly after I called. I liked how fast they came to my apartment."
- "The landlord does repairs effectively, but only because he was forced to by the City inspector."
- "Only repairs in the laundry room seem to be done quickly."
- "The landlord does repairs every other month."
- "When I started living here the blinds were broken. I told management right away, but they have been there for 10 years, always broken."
- "The landlord does not repair anything."
- "When I moved in the blinds were broken. I told management right away, but they have been there for 10 years, always broken."
- "The landlord does not repair anything."
- "The landlord does not repair anything."
- "The landlord does not repair anything."
- "The landlord does not repair anything."

APARTMENT PERCEPTIONS

Overall, 54 percent of interviewees prefer their current apartment over their last home (n=7) or like it about the same (n=1). Among those that like their current apartment less, several had owned homes previously or lived in a better unit in the same building. Those that prefer their current apartment or consider it at least as good as the last place they lived had more “yes” responses to questions about entry door security and protection of privacy (see the chart at the bottom right). Those that think their current apartment is worse than their last home were more likely to report a problem with pests, smelling mold, graffiti, or a problem paying rent. The most common problems experienced by renters interviewed were problems paying rent (n=10), seeing mold in their unit (n=8), and having pests (n=9). The most common pests were cockroaches (n=7) and bedbugs (n=4), but also mentioned were rats (n=1), mice (n=1), and ants (n=1). Four interviewees reporting cockroaches have them “all the time,” two get them “occasionally,” and two get them “once every 1-2 months.” Mold is reported as a seasonal problem, and all but one case reported the problem as “unresolved” (one of these said the landlord painted over the mold and it came back). In the other case, mold was persistent in the unit for 3 years without the landlord’s action, but through pressure by PPNA, the landlord finally took care of the problem.

Problems with neighbors are mostly because of noise, and the two that were expressed as most negative were with non-Spanish-speaking neighbors. One interviewee reported an upstairs neighbor that “will go out into the hall and scream racist slurs.” Another said that neighbors sometimes say “crazy things, hit walls, and yell.” In general, most interviewees said that they try to have the best relationship possible with neighbors and avoid any potential issues.

Summary of Key Findings

The Experiences of Latino Renters in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood
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Renter Interviews

USES OF 311
Less than half of all interviewees knew what 311 was and identified it relatively accurately (n=6). The others learned about this service for the first time in the course of the interview. Only three interview participants have used 311 before. One had a negative experience, and the other two had mixed experiences. No participants have used the online service. Those that knew about the service found out about it from a child’s teacher at Hope Academy (n=2), the police (n=1), the radio and TV (n=1), a CLUES trainer (n=1), and from a sign in their apartment (n=1). Four that knew of the service and had either used it or seen a neighbor use it reflected negatively on the service, saying it is not used often because there is not helpful information provided when you call (n=1), landlords return to their old ways after some time (n=1), inspectors don’t always come out (n=1), and some residents are afraid of landlord retaliation (n=1). Two that knew of the service but had never used it spoke positively or neutrally of it, saying “it’s a good thing to have” and that they “don’t know” what they think of it yet.

IMPORTANT NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESSES
The most popular businesses that interviewees frequented matched those places mentioned most often in both listening sessions. Corner stores were extremely popular, with Sam’s Market being mentioned the most times. Mercado Central and May Day Cafe were the second and third most common mentions. With the exception of Mercado Central, the most popular businesses are located along Bloomington and east of the apartment buildings where participants live. Very few participants spend their money at businesses located on the west side of the park.

Social interaction is a very important factor in Hispanic renters’ choices of neighborhood businesses they frequent. Two interviewees specifically noted that two non-Latino store owners are learning Spanish, and that this makes their businesses more attractive to them as consumers. Three interviewees mentioned spacial aspects of the shopping environment as important, specifically with regard to shopping at Mexican stores. Overall, stores on Lake Street and Chicago are considered too expensive, and are generally avoided.

- “I like deals. I go where I get the cheapest price.”
- “Mercado Central is affordable, and I see people I know there.”
- “I never go to other places on Chicago because they are overpriced and don’t have good produce.”
- “Tony’s Market carries Latino things now, so we love going there.”
- “I love the Farmer’s Market because the produce is fresh and it’s nice to be outside.”
- “I don’t shop many places in the neighborhood because I look for things that are cheap. I like the dollar store.”

SHOOPING BEHAVIORS
Several participants named Cub Foods and Target as too expensive, but Cub Foods was still one of the most commonly-cited places interviewees do most of their grocery shopping. In general, Cub Foods and Aldi appear to be the most popular places to shop for general purchases, with local corner stores filling in with with bargains on key items.

Four participants specifically mentioned their children or grandchildren as motivations for their choices in shopping. Either the stores are places that their children enjoyed going to, or the stores had low prices which allowed them to do more for their children. One interviewee explained that she seeks out the best bargains in order to send money back home to grandchildren living in Mexico. An overall trend expressed by female interviewees was “shopping around” for the lowest prices, sometimes stopping at three or four different locations to finish the week’s purchases. When someone in the apartment building finds a bargain, they report back to others in the building so they can share in the savings. Affordability and finding special deals are what drive grocery shopping decisions almost exclusively, with 8 interviewees specifically mentioning price in their interviews unprompted.

- “Places in the Neighborhood aren’t affordable, I am in a tight financial situation...so I go to big grocery stores where I can get everything.”
- Sam’s Market has a very nice Arab guy. Movies on 35th has a very nice owner who talks to my kids.”

### Table: Mentions of Grocery Stores Used Most Often for Food Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Mentions in Interviews</th>
<th>Mentions Strength in LS 1</th>
<th>Mentions Strength in LS 2</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cub Foods</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Stores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Warehouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam’s Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renter Interviews

NEIGHBORHOOD PERCEPTIONS

The average number of years that interviewees have lived in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood is 5.7 years, ranging from a low of 6 months to 10 years. The median number of years lived in the neighborhood is 6.5 years. Overall, 71 percent (n=10) consider themselves “long-term residents” of the neighborhood. The four that do not have only lived in the neighborhood for 6 months, 9 months, and 2 years, and one interviewee who has lived in the Neighborhood for 6 years, but had a markedly negative experience in her current apartment and preferred her last home to a large extent. This feedback is significant, as it shows that Hispanic renters in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood not only move into the Neighborhood and stay, but typically consider themselves long-term community members invested in staying. Again, the majority of responses were positive with regard to preference of current home over last home—considering both apartment and neighborhood together—with 64 percent (n=9). Preference of actual apartment building and unit was a bit lower, at 54 percent (n=7.5). Fifty-seven percent (n=8) consider their apartment affordable for their household in relation to the quality of the apartment. This is particularly interesting, considering that 11 out of 12 households paying the full rent for their unit were cost-burdened. More research is necessary to ascertain the full extent of this definition of affordability, if it has anything to do with cost-burden, or if it is based on a knowledge of what other housing opportunities might be available on the market.

Interestingly, when the same questions are analyzed with the overall preferences of the apartments split apart into responses of “better” or “worse,” those that had a more positive view of their current apartment reflected more positively on affordability (n=6 out of 8), preference of the apartment and neighborhood home environment (n=7 out of 8), and considering themselves long-term residents (n=7 out of 8). Interviewees that prefer their current apartment over their last were more likely not to have any pest problems at all (n=4 compared to n=3 among those disliking their current apartment) or to only have issues with certain kinds of pests at a much lower rate than those disliking their apartment, namely cockroaches (n=3 compared to n=4) or bedbugs (n=1 compared to n=3). For interviewees having a mold problem, those that preferred their current apartment all reported mold only being a seasonal problem, while those that disliked their current apartment more than the last exclusively reported mold as a steady problem. Having a problem paying rent does not seem to impact interviewee’s preference of their current apartment over the last. The comments provided by interviewees are telling of their experience:

- “It seems that the manager can’t keep up with the needed repairs in the building.”
- “Everyone in the building pays different rents according to the length of their stay. We paid the same rent for 3 years, and recently it increased by $50. The gas bill also went up.”
- “One lady in the building isn’t being truthful about how many people live there. She says she has 5 people living there, but really there are 7.”
- “I have tried to move, but all the apartments around are ugly and dirty. I have never seen a cockroach, mouse or bedbug in my building, so I want to stay here.”

PHOTOS BY MONICA ROJAS (LEFT), YEAR 2013, MICHAEL FLOOD (MIDDLE) YEAR 2012, AND SADIE MCKINLEY (RIGHT), YEAR 2013, POWDERHORN365

The Experiences of Latino Renters in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood
Renter Interviews

RANKING OF APARTMENT QUALITIES
Finally, interviewees were asked to rank five different apartment aspects from least important to most important to have in a home. This was asked objectively, not as a statement on their current conditions in their apartment. The most common answer for “most important” was “secure access” to the building, far outstripping the other options provided. The lowest importance for most interviewees was “specialized amenities,” such as air conditioning, dishwashers, or garbage disposals. Cleanliness, affordability, and pests all ranked as moderately important, but interviewees currently living in an apartment with pest problems tended to rank having “no pests” as more important than those who did not.

We close this discussion of renter feedback with some translated quotes from the interview sessions. These are the views and positions of individuals, not meant to be taken as the voice of all members of the Hispanic renter community. We share these to honor their time and make sure that their important insights have been shared.

• “Affordability is being able to pay rent every month without any concern. A clean unit has no mold, is in good condition, sanitary, and has good living space. The most important amenities are laundry, heating, and air conditioning.”

• “The most important thing is security. If you are not safe in your house you always live in fear. I feel safe in this apartment—well, not that safe. Let’s say 70 percent safe. You can’t be 100 percent safe anywhere.”

• “If a place is good-looking and it is not hard to pay the rent, a lot of people consider that to be enough. Lots of people think that bedbugs and cockroaches are normal.”

• “It is important for the landlord to have a good fumigation specialist to take care of pests as needed.”

• “I am lucky because I get a rent credit since I am the building caretaker. The rent for my unit is normally $675.”

• “My apartment is like a basement. It is not clean, and it doesn’t have all the services [that it should have]. There is no air conditioning, the stove is broken, the walls are damaged, the bedroom door is broken, and the heat doesn’t work well at all.”

• “When I started living here the apartment was infested and dirty. [Strangers] always entered and almost killed someone a year ago.”

• “We got a new manager and things have gotten a lot better. Things don’t break now and the building is more secure.”

• “It is important that the front door never be propped open.”

This concludes the analysis of interviews completed with Hispanic and Latino renters of the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. In the sections that follow, we highlight two prominent case studies of best practices around renter organizing and lead into implications and recommendations for these findings.
The following case studies provide some relevant examples of how renters are organizing around livability and rights issues nationwide.

**RIGHT TO THE CITY, CHICAGO IL**
A Chicago-based non-profit founded in 2007, Right to the City (RTTC) aims to strengthen the “movement for urban justice” around housing, human rights, community development, and environmental justice. The driving philosophy of RTTC is that everyone—particularly the disenfranchised—have both a right to the city and a right to “shape it, design it, and operationalize an urban human rights agenda.” They have done important work in renters’ rights connected to livability issues, cost-burdening, gentrification, and the intersection of these issues with immigration rights. Their model of hosting Renter Nation Assemblies is a promising approach for strengthening communities’ and local governments’ response to issues of housing justice and livability. A toolkit for hosting an assembly became available on their website in April of 2015 and is a valuable guide to the SUN neighborhoods as they move forward with their renter’s rights efforts. Minneapolis is already scheduled to be part of the first national assembly, and neighborhood associations across the City should educate themselves on how they can take a leadership role in this national movement. In a sense, Right to the City has found one approach to embody Saskia Sassen’s question “whose city is it?,” which she sees arising out of opportunities for connection across (and over) space, but also an increase in conflicts over space (1996 p. 206).

**CITY LIFE / VIDA URBANA**
Based out of Boston, MA, City Life/Vida Urbana is a 40-year-old grassroots community organization that seeks racial, social and economic justice and gender equality through empowerment and fostering community leaders. They focus on four main areas of organizing: leadership development and political education, anti-displacement organizing, coalition organizing, and cultural organizing. In the 1970s, they were successful in organizing tenants living in poorly maintained buildings owned by slumlords to hold rent strikes and take owners to court. Their efforts resulted in the City of Boston passing rent control protections to slow the rising rent costs ad several property owners were convicted of burning down their own buildings. In the 1980s and 1990s, the organization was successful in creating an “Eviction Free Zone” to stave off gentrification during the condo boom and began working to collaborate with developers of affordable housing. in the 2000s, tenants’ associations were organized in 40 buildings and used a collective bargaining model to win affordability contracts, Section 8 rent subsidies, and to put a cap on rent increases. More recently, the organization has focused on assisting families affected by the foreclosure crisis and working to implement a “Just Cause” Eviction Ordinance in Boston. Getting in touch with their leadership team would be a good idea for the SUN Project or Minneapolis Renters’ Coalition group.

The values expressed on the organization’s official website illustrate the directions of their work:
- Solidarity
- Housing as a Human Right
- Self-Determinatio and Speaking One’s Truth
- Challenge Intolerance and Oppression
- Serve the People
- Linking Action to Reflection
- Long-Term Commitment to Holistic Development of Working and Poor People
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“There are examples of renters who engaged City processes like 311 and inspections to obtain better housing, but ended up losing their homes due to lease termination, eviction, or even property demolition. That is continually the story of rental housing engagement.”

-Ross Joy, Lead Organizer for Corcoran Neighborhood Organization, Interview March 2015
**Challenging the Narrative**

### Some beliefs about renting that aren’t true.  

“Renters are transient.” ........................................................................................................ (2015 Interview Data)

“An apartment is a commodity.” ............................................................................................ (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters don’t care about the neighborhood.” ................................................................. (2015 Listening Sessions)


“Renters refuse to get involved.” ............................................................................................ (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters don’t provide their input or feedback.” ............................................................... (2015 Interview Data)

“Homeownership is inherently better than renting.” .................................................... (Becky Timm, PPNA, Interview 2015)

“Most neighborhoods have a majority of homeowners.” ........................................... (Census 2010)

“The number of renters has been decreasing nationwide.” ........................................... (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters don’t shop or socialize much in their own neighborhoods.” ....................... (Elizabeth Glidden, Ward 8, Interview 2015)

“Renters cause the majority of crime and neighborhood problems.” ....................... (2015 Listening Sessions)

### What we have found to be true.  

“Renters are long-term residents.” ....................................................................................... (2015 Interview Data)

“An apartment is a home.” .................................................................................................... (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters care deeply about their neighborhood.” .......................................................... (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters are cornerstones to our blocks.” ........................................................................ (Alondra Cano, Ward 9, Interview 2015)

“Everyone gets involved if you pay attention to what they care about.” ............... (2015 Interview Data)

“Renters want to and will share, if we care enough to ask and act.”  (Sara López, PPNA, Interview 2015)

“Renting is the right choice for many people, at many life stages.” (Becky Timm, PPNA, Interview 2015)

“Most Minneapolis neighborhoods are majority renters.” (Census 2010)

“The number of renters has increased nationwide, with 43 million renters in the country as of 2014 representing 35% of all households.” (Right to the City, 2015)

“Renters contribute significantly—financially and socially—to their neighborhoods.” (Elizabeth Glidden, Ward 8, Interview 2015)

“The Minneapolis Police Department gets more serious calls to owner-occupied homes.” (Karen Notsch, MPD, Interview 2015)

At many levels of Minneapolis City government, there is a disconnect between system purpose and impacts. Regulatory and government systems have homeowners’ and property owners’ interests in mind, and not the interests of renters (Repa Mekha, Presentation, 2015). This is not for lack of individual desire to see change, it is embedded in how the systems operate. It may not seem obvious, because so often “privilege is invisible to those who have it” (Kimmel, 2008).

Despite a broad and active network of organizations working in complimentary areas, and strong social networks within Powderhorn Park’s Hispanic-occupied apartment buildings, organizations working with this population have limited linguistic and cultural competency and have limited time and resources to engage such a large population of diverse constituents (Sara Lopez, PPNA, Interview 2015). Further, the Hispanic population of Minneapolis is far from homogenous—it is diverse with varied perceptions and experiences, even with regard to rental housing within some of the same buildings. To truly honor the diversity of experience, greater capacity must be built at the neighborhood level to respond to need.

Citywide policies and processes reinforce the negative renter narrative inadvertently, not only by providing a disproportionate amount of attention to homeowner programs and benefits, but by actively painting rental housing as inhabited by transients or individuals more likely to engage in criminal activity (Paul Birnberg, HOMEline, Interview 2015). For example, there is no requirement for landlords to receive training in Fair Housing or Good Tenancy, such as the ones provided by HOMEline at a cost. Regulation of multi-family housing structures through inspections is solely focused on the Department of Regulatory Services’ engagement with property owners, not with the residents that call and report the problems. Typically, as interview participants report, residents call in a complaint to the City, who then gets in touch with the landlord directly. Sometimes an inspection results, and sometimes not. Typically, the landlord decides the date of the inspection, and the Department of Regulatory Services expects the landlord to give proper (24-hour) notice of the inspection. However, since the inspection request is coming from the City, most of the time our interviewee’s landlords are not providing notice, leading to surprise visits that disregard Tenant-Landlord Law or Right to Privacy. Additionally, no interviewees received any kind of follow-up after an inspection was completed, and some reported what they perceived as retaliation—non-renewal of lease for poor housekeeping, or a rent increase. This de-incentivizes tenants from engaging City systems, because the risks are simply too high.

Renters themselves may also contribute to the anti-renter narrative, “perpetuating the perception that homeowners have more power than they do” (from an interview with Karen Notsch, Crime Prevention Specialist, MPD, February 2015). The question then becomes why Hispanic renters are more likely to report issues to their property owners than to police or inspections, are unlikely to call 911 or 311, and excludedly focus their social networks within their own apartment buildings (Karen Notsch). Perhaps it is not a question of lack of knowledge, but instead a lack of connection to the values, needs, and sociocultural structure of their community.

Even most research on renters’ rights is top-down and contains limited community-based research. Of the community-based research that does exist, very little has been done by organizers and researchers of color. This is yet another example of how embedded the traditional attitudes about housing are, and how many communities have failed to create space at the decision-making table for all residents. Thankfully, Minneapolis has taken huge strides since the housing crisis of 2008 to start thinking in new was about housing. This section proposes an ideological shift in how rental housing is perceived: as an issue of equity.
Rewriting the Narrative

We propose a monumental change to the way in which neighborhood associations, City government, and funding organizations think about renters in our community. In Powderhorn Park, because such a large percentage of our renters are Hispanic and have a lower median household income, we also see this as an issue of social justice. **Rental housing in Minneapolis should be viewed as a home to be preserved as affordable and livable, not just a commodity to be regulated and maintained.** Although promoting livability and good maintenance may appear to achieve the same end, the culture of how we treat people and their homes is dramatically different.

Why Challenge the Narrative Now?

**This is an issue of national concern.** 43 million households (35 percent) in the country are renters. Half of these are cost-burdened, paying more than 30% of their income toward rent. One in four of cost-burdened households pay more than half of their income to housing-related costs (Right to the City Assembly Toolkit, 2015).

**The number of renters will continue to rise, as will rents.** The annual State of the Nation’s Housing Report from 2014 found that the number of renter-occupied households increased by over half a million in 2013—well above the average increase in the past two decades. Rental vacancies are at an all-time low since the year 2000, and demand for rentals is expected to increase and plateau in the next ten years. The 2014 report also finds that rents went up nationwide by about 4 percent between 2011 and 2012, outpacing inflation at 1.5 percent. At the same time, the median income for renters decreased by almost 13 percent nationwide, and new construction doesn’t begin to meet the need for affordable housing (State of the Nation’s Housing Report, 2014).

**The portrait of renters is changing.** Renter demand in the next ten years will be particularly high for three- and four-bedroom apartments, and rentals suitable for people over the age of 65. According to Daryl Carter, chairman of the National Multifamily Housing Council in a webinar releasing the 2014 State of the Nation’s Housing report, “there’s almost an unlimited demand for affordable housing.” This report reveals that while a typical renter between 2005 and 2013 was aged 35 or younger, there has been a marked increase in higher-income renters with children (2014).

**It is time for new directions.** Market solutions and layers of processes have led to speculation and weakness in inspection and landlord accountability measures. The recent housing market crash and severe shortcomings of existing policy around rental housing provide the opportunity for new models that provide greater community voice in housing matters.

**Policymakers and community leaders recognize the problem.** Not only is there widespread recognition of rising cost-burdening and violations of renters’ rights, but Minneapolis City staff have been supportive of initiatives to bring more renters to the decision-making table and keep landlords accountable. The Department of Regulatory Services is already in the process of establishing a tenant advisory council through their new Tenant Engagement Initiative, and plans to rework the quality tiering system of multi-family rental buildings. City Council Members interviewed for this report all emphasized the value of hearing about constituents’ experiences directly. A single personal statement makes a more memorable, lasting impact than a powerpoint with hard numbers for many policymakers. City Council Members are most concerned about 1) occupancy and health, and 2) instituting systems change carefully and smartly. In this case, apartment quality and livability standards might be the right “carrot” for larger-scale change.

**Leaders and community members are ready to act.** Nationally, communities are speaking out against poor management practices and cost-burden, and here in Minneapolis, the momentum toward a more equitable housing environment already exists in current leadership. Neighborhood associations will have the important task of mobilizing the renter community to connect with city leaders as an organized whole. Leading neighborhood associations and allies are starting to act on the Clean Energy Initiative to bring the positive benefits to multi-family buildings, and are getting press attention. PPNA has also been part of a broader movement to create a Renter’s Coalition citywide, leveraging shared networks and experience to not only improve conditions for renters, but make sure they are invited to the decision-making table.

**Neighborhood associations facing similar issues have strong supportive relationships.** The Southside United Neighborhoods (SUN) Project in particular is an example of how neighborhoods in an area can join together to solve shared problems. Additionally, the issues that renters face vary between neighborhoods and populations to some extent, and approaches that may be suitable in one neighborhood might not be appropriate in another. By forming strong coalitions of neighborhoods, better solutions that serve the diverse population of renters in Minneapolis can be created at the policy level.

“As long as the same people are at the decision-making table, you will keep getting the same bad solutions.”
-Repa Mekha, President, Nexus Community Partners, Presentation February 2015
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“The ideal of equal access is central to the American democratic system, holding that all people deserve equal opportunity to influence their communities and benefit from living in a strong, positive society. However, when a society is stratified with groups that experience extreme disadvantage as opposed to others with prominent advantages and privileges, the promise of equal access fails. When some are excluded or lack the skills or training to participate or engage fully in public life and planning, remedies toward historic injustices must be pursued. Equity, then, commits resources and opportunities for influence to groups that have been marginalized in order to level the playing field.”

Priorities for Renter Engagement in Powderhorn Park

The following ways forward were developed through reflection on the findings from renter interviews, listening sessions, and the thoughtful input of many community leaders. While designed for PPNA, these recommendations would be impossible for one organization to accomplish on its own. These represent the most urgent and doable of all the possibilities explored, the ways to “mobilize for power” to form a foundation for future engagement (Repa Mekha, 2015). For a complete list of the ten recommendations, see Appendix E.

1. CHANGE HOW OUTREACH AND ORGANIZING IS DONE.
   - Improve coordination of messaging sent out by PPNA, the Park, neighborhood schools, and other organizations located in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood for a clear neighborhood brand, greater cohesion of message, and improved clarity of the different entities.
   - Increase volume and diversity of print materials available.
   - Design the Community Organizer’s work plan to spend a majority of work hours outside of the office—socializing and interacting with neighbors, door knocking and delivering flyers (underdoors, on apartments, in the park).
   - Deepen relationships with Mercado Central and small corner stores and ask them to share information about neighborhood happenings.
   - Provide real, impactful leadership opportunities, continuing programs like “Appetite for Leadership” that have been highlighted as valuable.
   - Identify “apartment leaders.”
   - For large events targeting the Hispanic population, seek airtime on Radio Rey. Building a relationship with the DJ may be the best approach.
   - Be an incubator and connector to bring the important work of outside organizations into the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood.
   - Coordinate with staff at the Park, Mercado Central, CLUES, and Matt’s Bar to host PPNA events and activities and expand the sphere of influence.

2. LISTEN CLOSELY, ASK OFTEN, FOCUS ON THE CRITICAL, AND MAKE IT FUN.
   - Safety, pests, and repairs are the main issues currently raised by the population of Hispanic renters we engaged. Focus on these areas first.
   - Respect wishes to move more quickly or more slowly on issues and policy initiatives. Residents know the risks associated with their actions and should have the final control over what actions are taken with regard to their homes.
   - Find the issues that are easiest to win and organize a small group of new members to work on solving that issue. Small wins lead to higher levels of future engagement and community cohesiveness (Right to the City, 2015).

3. SUPPORT OPPORTUNITIES FOR RENTERS TO BE SEEN AND HEARD IN THE CITY—AND LEAD.
   - Organize renters the way they want to organize themselves. A renter council that meets regularly may or may not be the right fit.
   - Bring new community leaders to participate in the newly-forming citywide system of local tenant advisory councils established inform City Hall and the Department of Regulatory Services.
   - Be open to hosting neighborhood gatherings twice a year to connect renters with City Council Members and Inspectors together.
   - Advertise quarterly renter assemblies that will bring renters from across Minneapolis to the same decision-making table. The first will be in 2015.
   - Keep SUN Project and Livability Agenda priorities high and remain actively involved in collaborative efforts.
   - Consider and challenge the language to ensure that renters are acknowledged as stakeholders in a property.

4. PROMOTE A SAFER AND HEALTHIER COMMUNITY.
   - Deepen the already-positive relationships with the Minneapolis Police Department. They are a strong and trusted ally identified by participants.
   - Encourage the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to install the emergency phones and additional lighting around the park as has been requested in multiple listening sessions with both PPNA and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.

5. BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH LANDLORDS AND MANAGERS.
   - Remember that landlords may not always be averse to change. Find ways to meet on common ground with landlords and work toward goals together. For example, an exterior beautification, landscaping, or energy cost reduction program may appeal.
   - Provide landlords with information on Fair Housing Law and tools the can use to improve their tenant communications. PPNA could provide them with an Inspection Notice Form or other form letters related to common issues raised by renters, and communicate with landlords to let them know that flyers and letters were the preferred form of communication among Hispanic renter participants.
   - Encourage landlords to support the Clean Energy Initiative. It could be helpful to create handouts or a website that explains the goals of the initiative so it is better understood by a wider audience.
6. OFFER MORE ACTIVITIES THAT REFLECT WHAT COMMUNITY MEMBERS ALREADY DO AND ENJOY THE MOST.

- Practice “subversive organizing,” using community-identified activities as opportunities for fostering leadership (Ned Moore, MCNO/CURA).
- Start a women’s walking or biking group that meets weekly. This can double as an “eyes on the street” safety initiative.
- Start an adult soccer league in partnership with the park, or as an informal pickup game on weekends.
- Advocate for summer “Movies in the Park” with Spanish subtitles, or in Spanish with English subtitles. Many of the Hispanic renters who participated in this study enjoy going to see movies, but the theaters are considered too expensive.
- Hold a neighborhood bake sale. Several Hispanic renters who participated in listening sessions enjoy baking and attend the Appetite for Leadership cooking class. End a class session with a bake sale, or host a friendly cooking competition.
- Get Hispanic renters connected with the organizers of National Night Out. This was a popular idea among Listening Session participants.
Notes

Areas for Further Research

This report focuses on the experiences of just a few Hispanic and Latino renters living in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood. The insights and recommendations are limited to the small sample size and Spanish language abilities of the author. Future research is recommended around the mechanisms that cause housing discrimination in the rental market in Minneapolis, and why there are so few discrimination complaints filed against landlords (recommended by Elizabeth Glidden, Ward 8 Councilmember, Interview 2015). Similar studies have been done in Maryland, Virginia, Texas, and Georgia, finding dramatic discrimination at all levels of the housing market (National Council of La Raza, 2013; Equal Rights Center, 2010).

A deeper study of the health impacts of mold, pests, and other negative household environments would also be beneficial in pushing forward the case for modifications in the Housing Maintenance Code. Additionally, a robust analysis of the employment status of neighborhood residents and their opportunities to take paid leave or use sick time would provide a deeper understanding of the financial situation of this population of community members. In all but one of the interviews completed, interviewees did not take a single sick day off from work in the past year, despite falling ill. Children rarely stayed home sick from school either. This is a strange finding which deserves further investigation under a study addressing labor law and work environments.

The findings from analysis of Data provided by HOMEline also present some interesting directions for study around Hispanic renters’ high experience of rent increases. Rent increases were the third most common call by Ward 9 Hispanic renters to HOMEline, but they represented the only calls on this topic in the whole ward. Further research is required to determine if this is a common theme in other Minneapolis neighborhoods or not, and if it should be a priority area for future advocacy work.

An interesting area of study that arose from the renter interviews was participants’ definitions of affordability. While all but one household was cost-burdened by official standards, 57 percent of interviewees believed their apartments to be affordable for their household. More research is recommended to explore what “affordability” means to this population, and what the cost-benefit analysis is that households undergo when making their housing choices.

Finally, research on the impacts of housing instability on a household—particularly the children of a household—is recommended. According to Liz Ramsey, the principal of Risen Christ School, the negative impact that moving from one home to another or changing schools has on learning is dramatic. If the City of Minneapolis is serious about closing the education gap, attention to this phenomenon is critical.

It is the author’s personal belief that social sciences including geography and anthropology are too often written off as irrelevant and impractical. Neighborhood associations (and Minneapolis residents as a whole) would benefit from more complete understanding of the wide diversity of Hispanic and Latino(a) identities that exist in the city. Geographer Gloria Anzaldúa writes of her personal experience of “the new mestizo consciousness” from the perspective of the “I,” “we,” and “she.” This new mestizo has a “plural personality” and “operates in a pluralistic mode” (1987, p. 79). Because of influences of race, culture, origin, and language, the new mestizo may sometimes hold attitudes that seem to contradict with her behaviors, and she “learns to be an Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view” (p. 79). Anzaldúa challenges the dual thinking of Western culture, which attempts to classify people into groups and lumps many people under the category of “Hispanic” or “Latino,” and instead claims that people hold many different identities that overlap and are greater than each individual identity. PPNA Community Organizer Sara López understood this when she recommended starting the Listening Sessions with a question about the city where each participant was born. It is of vital importance that future research going forward recognize this diversity and place community members in critical roles to guide the research itself, ensuring that the right questions are asked and in the right way.
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Key Definitions

Cost-Burden is experienced by a household that spends more than 30 percent of its income toward housing costs. This is a Federally-defined measure, although actual affordability is subjective and varies by region.

Fair Market Rent (FMR) is the rent expected to be paid by residents based on area median income. It is established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a region, and is approximately “the 40th percentile of gross rentals for a typical, non-substandard rental unit occupied by recent movers in a local housing market” (HUD, 2015).

Hispanic and Latino are ethnonyms that refer collectively to the inhabitants of the United States who are of Latin American or Spanish origin (Hispanic or Latino Americans). Although both terms are often used interchangeably—as they are in this report—“Hispanic” is actually a narrower term which only refers to persons of Spanish-speaking origin or ancestry, while “Latino” is used to refer more generally to anyone of Latin American origin (including Brazilians). “Hispanic” includes persons from Spain and Spanish-speaking Latin Americans but excludes Brazilians, while “Latino” excludes persons from Spain but includes Spanish-speaking Latin Americans and Brazilians. In this report, both terms refer to Spanish-speaking Latin Americans.

Labor Force Participation is calculated as the number of people in the labor force as a percent of the civilian population over the age of 16, unless otherwise noted. Data comes from the American Community Survey's 5-year estimates (2008-2012).

Median Household Income is the median household’s aggregate inflation-adjusted income, measured to the U.S. dollar value in 2012. Data comes from the American Community Survey’s 5-year estimates (2008-2012).

Poverty is measured as the percentage of individuals or households whose income falls below the Federal Poverty Threshold. Data measuring poverty comes from either the U.S. Decennial Census or the American Community Survey’s 5-year estimates (2008-2012) and was collected at the City, Census Tract, and Neighborhood levels (using Block Groups).

Residential Mobility is defined as the percentage of individuals who changed residents within one year of the data collection date. Data on mobility comes from the American Community Survey’s 5-year estimates (2008-2012).

Vacancy is a structure or parcel that is currently unoccupied or uninhabited. It is calculated as a percent of all existing properties.
Measures of Analysis

COST-BURDEN ANALYSIS
A cost-burdened household is one that pays over 30% of its annual household income toward housing-related costs. This includes utilities, rent, mortgage payments, or similar costs. Here, measures were taken from Census data and compared to interview respondents’ estimated reports as follows:

\[ \text{Cost Burden Level} = 100 \times \left( \frac{\text{Annual housing costs}}{\text{Annual Income}} \right) \]

DISSIMILARITY INDEX
The Index of Dissimilarity (or D-statistic) measures the degree of integration or dis-integration of a subgroup population on a scale of 0 (complete integration) to 100 (complete segregation). It is the most common measure of segregation. The closer the Index of Dissimilarity reads to 100, the greater the segregation of that population from other groups. Ultimately, dissimilarity is the percent of subgroup members that would have to move in order to achieve perfect integration in the entire region. In Powderhorn Park, it would mean that every block group of the Neighborhood would need to have the same proportion of Hispanics as compared to the total population, which would be represented by a D-statistic of 0. As of 2010, about 19 percent of the Hispanic population would need to move to achieve full integration. This is considered a low level of segregation. It can be calculated with the following formula:

\[ D = 100 \times \frac{1}{2} \sum \left| \frac{P_x}{P_x} - \frac{P_y}{P_y} \right| \]

where:
- \( P_x \) = The total population of subgroup “x” in the overall geographic area
- \( P_y \) = The total population of subgroup “y” in the overall geographic area
- \( P_x \) = The total population of subgroup “x” in block group or census tract “I”
- \( P_y \) = The total population of subgroup “y” in block group or census tract “I”

ISOLATION INDEX
The Isolation Index measures to what degree subgroup members live in proximity to others of the same subgroup. It can also be expressed as the extent to which subgroup members are exposed exclusively to one another and not to other subgroups. It is also measured on a scale of 0 to 100 and interpreted on a scale of 0 to 100 and interpreted. The closer the Index of Dissimilarity reads to 100, the greater the segregation of that population from other groups. Ultimately, dissimilarity is the percent of subgroup members that would have to move in order to achieve perfect integration in the entire region. In Powderhorn Park, it would mean that every block group of the Neighborhood would need to have the same proportion of Hispanics as compared to the total population, which would be represented by a D-statistic of 0. As of 2010, about 19 percent of the Hispanic population would need to move to achieve full integration. This is considered a low level of segregation. It can be calculated with the following formula:

\[ I = 100 \times \sum \left( \frac{x_i}{X} \right) \times \left( \frac{x_i}{t_i} \right) \]

where:
- \( I \) = The isolation index for a certain subgroup of people
- \( x_i \) = The subgroup population count in the block group or census tract “I”
- \( X \) = The subgroup population of the larger geographic area being studied (the Neighborhood of Powderhorn Park)
- \( t_i \) = The total population of the block group or census tract “I”
- \( \Sigma \) = The Greek letter “sigma” for the summation (or addition) of all terms from each block group or census tract in the larger geographic area

SOCIAL CAPITAL ANALYSIS
Social Capital is a term used in Sociology to characterize the collective benefits—usually economic—gained from cooperation and support between individuals or groups. It is the value that social networks have in building capital and maintaining social cohesion. It was expounded upon by L.J. Hanifan in 1916 to refer to personal investment in a community in this way:

“If a community member] may come into contact with his neighbor, and they with other neighbors, there will be an accumulation of social capital, which may immediately satisfy his social needs and which may bear a social potentiality sufficient to the substantial improvement of living conditions in the whole community. The community as a whole will benefit by the cooperation of all its parts, while the individual will find in his associations the advantages of the help, the sympathy, and the fellowship of his neighbors.” (pp. 130-131)

In this study, qualitative data from interviews and listening sessions led to understanding of the social networks and social capital access of Hispanic and Latino renters in Powderhorn Park.
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Appendix A - Listening Session Approach

Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association Listening Session Approach

Purpose of Approach

Collect preliminary data and observations on renter knowledge, experiences, and primary concerns to inform content and wording of survey questions. Specific targeted insights include:

- Learn the social, organizational, and communication networks of renters living on the East side of Powderhorn Park.
- Learn about the leisure, work, and purchasing behaviors of the renter population to better understand wants and needs for amenities and business options.
- Learn what renters identify as the positive and negative qualities of their living environment in Powderhorn Park at macro and micro levels.
- Learn what renters identify as the most pressing housing-related issues that they face.
- Learn how renters respond to housing-related issues they have identified.
- Learn what renters perceive as risks in their community and what they think should be done about them.
- Learn the correct language to be used when interviewing Powderhorn Park renters at a later stage in the research process.

Questions for the listening sessions will be developed collaboratively by researchers at the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs and staff from the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association. It will be implemented by researcher Erin Olson, CURA, and Community Organizer Sara Lopez, PPNA.

Benefits of Listening Sessions

- **Speed**: Listening sessions require an even lower level of planning and question focusing than focus groups, so they can be performed very quickly. For the benefit they can have to the final product of a survey, the brief delay they may provide is well worth the time.

- **Simplicity**: The simple format of listening session results in qualitative feedback that is easily understood by participants and researchers, allowing for more a more focused final survey.

- **Specialization**: The discussion format of a listening session allows for depth of feedback on pre-determined topics of specialization, giving the investigator the benefit of participant feedback on these issues before the final survey is developed. Unlike focus groups, listening sessions flow with the interests of the participants more freely.

- **Selectivity**: In this particular study, renters were selected as a sub-population of Powderhorn Park for study. Their exclusive participation in these listening sessions

Olson | Listening Session Approach
allows for a more complete understanding of the particular needs of this sub-population as compared to the wider community.

- **Secrecy:** Based on the fact that only a small number of people participate in listening sessions, they can be conducted without making outsiders aware of the process, participant views, or the nature of the investigation. Participants can feel safe in their anonymity.

- **Spontaneity:** Given the open-ended nature of conversation and questioning in listening sessions, they often result in genuine and spontaneous participant feedback that reaches far beyond simple responses to questions to include verbal, physical, and relational feedback.

- **Subjectivity:** Participants are able to respond to themes in their own words, focusing on what is truly most important to them rather than sticking to specific survey questions.

- **Stimulation:** Listening session settings—when composed of people that are part of the same sub-group and get along well—are often comfortable stages for self-reflection and open sharing. Participants often provide comments far beyond what is asked and offer new, unforeseen insights and energy to a project. The investigator can also delve deeper into topics that the group appears to be most keen on and disregard topics that are not strong for conversation.

**Drawbacks of Listening Sessions**

- **Ungeneralizable:** Much like focus groups, results from listening sessions cannot be generalized to the broader public.

- **Selective Sampling:** Selectivity of population means that the sample is likely not representative of the broader community.

- **Moderating Difficulty:** It is challenging to moderate and protect the diversity of opinions in the group.

- **Structure:** In a focus group, the investigator has a greater power to direct conversation, whether to remain an open-ended study with guiding questions, or to structure the focus group more tightly to gather more specific feedback on issues of greatest interest.

- **Consultation:** Listening sessions ultimately provide a forum for the public to provide their opinions and experiences in a safe space, but it is limited to a consultation phase and has little to no direct or immediate impact on policy or practices. However, ideally information from these consultations will be used to further partner with resident groups and delegate power.
General Procedure

Timing: From 1-1.5 hours, PM (Feb 7-28)

Session 1: Cooking Class at Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association
Date and Time: Friday March 6th, 2015 10:00am

Session 2: Powderhorn Park or Mayday
Date and Time: Thursday March 5th,

Amenities: Food, Water, Childcare, book “checked” for gift card

Who:
- **Facilitator/Moderator** (1-2): Primary researcher (Erin Olson) and Community Organizer (Sara Lopez)
- **Information seekers** (2): Observe and record, but do not participate (ideally familiar to participants, but may also be the same as the facilitator and moderator if the session is also being recorded for later review)
- **Participants** (6-10): Renters in 6.5 block focus area, with same language of participation

---
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Stage-Setting:
- Comfortable, welcoming, familiar space
- Video and/or audio recording arranged (if so, receive participant permission; if video, we need to be clear on what uses are permitted and know how we will make their any individual responses unidentifiable.)
- Sheets of paper, tape, Markers, smiley face, sad face, 2 maps, 2 foam pieces

Framing:
- Welcome, thank, show around the space if first time
- Introductions of roles
- Explain process: “We are here to get to know you and learn from your opinions and experiences. Your responses will be used to help create a survey and inform future research on renter knowledge and networks in Powderhorn Park.”
- Confidentiality, obtain consent
- Explain we have 1 hour, and want to hear from everyone, long conversations can happen outside the meeting
- Have all introduce selves with a lighthearted fact
- Do scheduled activity (i.e. cooking class, or watch a short video and have them discuss their thoughts about it)
- Ask questions, easiest first
- Follow flow of conversation

Facilitator Approach:
- “Just one of the guys or girls”
- Allow yourself to show surprise, dismay, interest.
- Don’t dress up too much, don’t be too formal
- Appear relaxed and comfortable
- Avoid alienating dislikable members
- Avoid favoritism
- Avoid revealing own opinions
- Build rapport quickly
- Cover every agenda topic and issue
- Encourage spontaneous reactions
- Enjoy the company of the group
- Follow a logical agenda sequence
- Listen attentively to speakers
- Never threaten or intimidate members
- Obtain comments from quiet members
- Politely control dominant members
- Prevent undue consensus formation
- Probe to learn underlying factors
- Pursue unanticipated avenues as well
• Recognize socially desirable answers
• Recognize when a topic is exhausted
• Sense members’ moods effectively
• Show genuine interest in responses
• Successfully obtain minority opinions
• Treat sensitive issues gently
• Use self-disclosure effectively
• Use simple, conversational speech

Information Needs/Considerations:
What are the key issues or considerations in the minds of respondents? How do they think about these matters? What feelings do they have? How important are these things to them? What belief patterns, experiences, or assumptions will they bring to the response task?

Sampling Design:
How much diversity is there in their thinking on these issues? How will that variance affect sample size and reliability? Must certain groups be represented? Does this suggest a stratified sample? Can they be reached and will they respond readily?

Instrumentation:
What vocabulary did participants use when they spoke about each topic? How does this affect the wording of questions? What range or spectrum of opinions was revealed? What kind of scales does that imply? How much instruction will be needed in the survey?

Data Collection:
Can and will these people respond to a self-administered, mail questionnaire, or an online one? Will they require personal contact? Telephone? How much probing will they need? Will it be easy or difficult to build rapport? What kinds of interviewers would be best for this group?

Data Processing:
Can the range, diversity and depth of response be reflected numerically? How much verbal response will be needed, if any? What methods should be used to reveal patterns of response? How should the associations between variables be measured? How can confidentiality be maintained with absolute certainty (use of aggregate data and anonymity of any individual comments)?

Report Generation:
What report mechanisms are likely to portray survey responses from this group most effectively? Will a written report suffice? Would these information seekers respond better to an oral presentation? How much graphic material should be anticipated in the report?

Appendix
Error Considerations:

- Sampling Error
- Non-Response Error
- Measurement Error
- Coverage Error
Appendix B - Listening Session Outline
Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association / CURA – Nelson Community Based Research
Listening Session Outline
March, 2015

**Introduction (5 mins)**
- Welcome, thank, show around the space if first time
- Introduce selves
- Explain Process
- Confidentiality: Explain and sign forms
- Timing

**Ice Breaker (10 mins)**
When did you move into this neighborhood? (in years)
   a. Where did you move from? (really)

**1-A: Free Time.** (Theme 1) (15-20 mins)
   1. (Behaviors) What activities do you or your family like to do in the community?
      (unaided recall)

      a. *Take out the board with pictures of activities happening in the neighbourhood.*
      —*Photos on Activities Board—Write responses to questions here.*
Like Most | Like Least

- Which are **most important** to your community? Why?

- What activities **are missing** from the pictures?

  a. When?

  b. How Often?

  c. Where?

**1-B: Get information**

  a. When?

  b. How often?

  c. Where?
2-A: organizations, businesses, or groups you can identify? (unaided recall) (15-20 mins)

*Take out board with pictures of local businesses.—Photos on Business/Amenities
  • (Opinions) Look at these pictures. What do you think about them?

  • (Behaviors) Which looks the most like a place you would go/a place you would work?

*Take out maps with some key locations marked.—Maps
  • Using only 5 pins, mark the places where you spend the most time in any week of the year (summer and winter).
    Like Most
  
  Like Least
  
  • What businesses or institutions are important in the neighborhood? Why?
For Key Institutions (PPNA, businesses that are popular)

- You mentioned PPNA. In your own words, what is PPNA, and what do they do?
- What are your feelings about PPNA? Why do you feel this way?
- How have you interacted with people working at PPNA?

2-B: (Lifestyle) How many people from your neighborhood do you see in a given week?

a. Where do you see them? (ex: apartment, park, hallway)

b. Why do you see them? (ex: work or leisure activities)

3-A: I’m curious when each of you first came to Powderhorn Park and why. (Theme 2)
Discussion—Free-flowing to open up topic

(Needs) What is better about your new neighborhood from your last neighborhood?
c. What is worse about this neighborhood from the last place you lived?

   i. What sorts of problems exist in your neighborhood?

   ii. What do you wish your neighborhood had?

d. What is better about your current apartment from your last apartment?

e. What is worse about your current apartment from your last apartment?

   iii. What sorts of problems exist in your apartment?

   iv. What do you wish your apartment had?

   v. What does a good relationship with a landlord look like?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-B: (Lifestyle, Perceptions) Who in your household takes care of housing or repair-related issues, in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perceptions) What are the biggest risks to renters living in your neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does having an “affordable” home mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is most important in a home? Affordability? Safety? Clean (no pests)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C - Interview Instrument

Renter Interview Form
Designed by Erin Osborne, ISHA, April 2015 for PPIA

Interviewer Name: ___________________________ Date and Time: __________________
Interviewer Unique ID: _______________________

Introduction
Thank you for being willing to participate in this survey to help improve the experience of renters living in Ponderhorn Park. Your opinion and experiences are important. Today, we will be conducting an interview to learn about the experiences of renters living in the Ponderhorn Park neighborhood. I will be asking you some questions that will take about one hour to complete. For your contribution, you will receive a gift card as a thank you gift. Participation is completely voluntary, and you can choose to withdraw or not answer any questions you choose. Before we begin the questions, let’s read through the consent form. You will need to sign this before we continue.

Completion of Consent Form
*Get out the consent form and help the interviewee understand and sign it.
Consent form signed and received: Yes / No
*NOTE: Ask every question below and write a full answer. For Yes / No and other dual options, circle their response. If a question is intentionally skipped by the participant, write SKIP across the question. Attempt to ask every question in order, even if it seems that they have already answered the question previously.

(a) Screening Questions for Qualification
*If no is answered to either of the following questions, the respondent does not qualify to participate.

(A1) Do you live in a multi-family apartment building of 4 or more units? Yes / No
(A2) Do you live within the Ponderhorn Park neighborhood? (Bordered on Map) Yes / No
(A3) Has anyone else in your household participated in a survey with PPIA this month? Yes / No

Introduction
Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015

(b) Demographic Data

(Bl) How long have you lived in the Ponderhorn Park neighborhood?
Write in ___________________________

Bl) Is English your first language/mother tongue? Yes / No

Bl) What is the primary language spoken in your home?
Write in ___________________________

Bl) How do you identify your race or ethnicity?
Write in ___________________________

Bl) What is your gender?
Write in ___________________________

Bl) Are you the head of the household? Yes / No

Bl) How many people live in your household?
Write in numerical ___________________________

Bl) How many adults?
Write in numerical ___________________________

Bl) How many children or dependents?
Write in numerical ___________________________

Bl) How many people are currently on your lease?
Write in numerical ___________________________

Bl) How many bedrooms are there in your apartment?
Write in numerical ___________________________

Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015

(c) Income and Expenses

(C1) Which range does your whole household’s annual income fall under?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Check Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0–$11,670</td>
<td>(100% for HH1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,671–$15,710</td>
<td>(100% for HH2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,711–$21,510</td>
<td>(100% for HH3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,511–$27,510</td>
<td>(100% for HH4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27,511–$35,999</td>
<td>(100% for HH5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000–$45,999</td>
<td>(100% for HH6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000–$55,999</td>
<td>(100% for HH7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000–$65,000</td>
<td>(100% for HH8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000–$75,000</td>
<td>(100% for HH9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C2) Approximately how much do you currently pay for the following household-related costs PER MONTH? If you do not pay anything for that amenity, or it is covered by your landlord, write $0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Approximate Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Amenities (Gym or pool apply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Water, Garbage, Per person, Per month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Repair Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015

(d) Apartment Qualities

(Bl) How important to you are each of the following home conditions?
Rank them from most important (1) to least important (5).
*NOTE: Ask follow-up details after the respondent ranks the options.

* ________ Affordability (able to pay rent each month without any concern)
  * ________ Cleanliness (in common areas and five of interior damage/mold)
  * ________ Describe a clean apartment building

* ________ Specialized Amenities (Laundry, Garbage Disposal, Air Conditioning, or Dishwasher)
  * ________ What amenities are most important

* ________ Access to pets (cats, catio, bearded, dogs)
* ________ Secure Access

(Bl) Are there any other important apartment or home qualities that you would add?
Write in ___________________________

Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015

(e) Apartment Experience

(Bl) In your current apartment better or worse than the last apartment you lived in?
Better / Worse
Explain why: ___________________________

(Bl) Describe the floor plan of your current apartment in detail.

Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015

Bl) Answer the following questions with "yes" or "no." In your apartment building:
(a) The outside doors are always locked when closed.
Yes / No
(b) Nobody has the key to your unit except for your household.
Yes / No
(c) Your landlord always notifies you 24 hours before entering your unit.
Yes / No
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Ponderhorn Park Renter Experiences Interview - April 2015
Experience
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b. What happened? (Prompt with the further questions below, if no answer)
Write in: 

c. How do you feel about the service of 311? How much so? Why?
Write in: 

d. How many times have you ever called 311 in Minneapolis? Why?
Write in: 

e. Have you ever used the 311 online service? Yes / No
Write in: 

(G) Have you ever called your landlord for repairs? Yes / No

a. If so, how long did it take for your landlord to come and perform the repair?
Write in: 

b. Unlikely Mold Yes / No

c. The smell of mold or mildew Yes / No

d. Paying your rent or utilities Yes / No

a. If so, approximately how many times?

b. How did you resolve the situation?

i. Why? Provide any comments you may have about these questions.
Write in: 

(E) Do a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you agree with the following statements? My landlord:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Is easy to contact 1 2 3 4 5

e. Is willing to respond to my concerns 1 2 3 4 5

f. Changes a fair rent 1 2 3 4 5

g. Is very forgiving if I pay rent late 1 2 3 4 5

h. Does repairs quickly 1 2 3 4 5

i. Does repairs effectively 1 2 3 4 5

j. Keeps the apartment building in good repair 1 2 3 4 5

k. Follows the lease agreement 1 2 3 4 5

l. Notifies me 24 hours before he needs to enter 1 2 3 4 5

m. Listens to my needs and concerns 1 2 3 4 5

n. Is approachable and helpful 1 2 3 4 5

o. Speaks my language, or has a translator 1 2 3 4 5

p. Makes fair charges for repairs 1 2 3 4 5

q. Makes changes that I understand 1 2 3 4 5

i. Provide any comments you may have about these questions.
Write in: 

(G) Narrate Discussion of Renting Experience

Open-ended questions to gauge their thinking of a relevant issue.

(G.1) Has anyone in this neighborhood ever had an emergency need, or an emergency repair? Yes / No

a. What happened?

b. Who was involved?

c. How did it get resolved?

d. Hypothetical: If something broke in your apartment, how would you handle the situation?

(G.2) Have you ever called your landlord for repairs? Yes / No

a. If so, how long did it take for your landlord to come and perform the repair?
Write in: 

(b) Community Connections, Opinions, and Identity

(F.1) Answer the following questions with either “yes” or “no.”
- I consider myself a long-term resident of Powderhorn Park. Yes / No
- I prefer my current apartment to my past home. Yes / No
- I consider my current housing “affordable.” Yes / No

(c) How do you feel about approaching your landlord or manager regarding:

Very Comfortable  Very Uncomfortable

a. Difficulty paying rent on time 1 2 3 4 5

b. A repair need 1 2 3 4 5

c. A request or accommodation 1 2 3 4 5
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(I) Health and Lifestyle

(1.1) Who in your household takes care of housing or repair-related issues, in general?
Write in, ________________________________

(1.2) Who in your household takes care of finances, in general?
Write in, ________________________________

(1.3) How many days of school, on average, have each of your children missed due to illness last year (Jan 1-Dec 31 2014)?
Write in numeral __________

(1.4) How many days of work or school, on average, have adults in your household missed due to illness last year (Jan 1-Dec 31 2014)?
Write in numeral __________

(II) Neighborhood Businesses

(1.1) Where do you buy your groceries for your household? (doesn’t have to be within the neighborhood)
Write in, ________________________________

(1.2) How do you travel to buy your groceries?
Write in mode of transportation, ________________________________

(1.3) What are the three businesses in Powderhorn Park that you visit the most often each month?
Write in 1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________

Conclusion
Thank you for your participation in this interview. We appreciate your contribution. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Sara Lopez at PPHA.

Approaches to Survey Questions

Measuring Attitudes
ii. "How do you feel about the service of 311?"
iii. "How much so, on a scale of 1-5? Why?"

Measuring Decision Making
1. Information Sources. Ex: "Where did you learn about 311?" (classify as direct experience, social influence, or media effects)
   a. Impact of source. Ex: "Who did you choose to call 311?" or, hypothetically, "Why do you think some people call 311?"
   b. If they provide a list of different reasons, ask them to rank them highest to lowest.

Measuring Needs/Motives
1. Rank needs and motives on a Linear, Numeric Scale. Ex: "How important to you are each of the following home/neighborhood conditions?" (safety, cleanliness, affordability, proximity to work, proximity to school, proximity to family, landlord responsiveness to repairs, landlord kindness/approachability)
   a. Or "What are the most important aspects of a home/neighborhood? Rank them."
   b. "Rank the following personal goals in order of importance to you."

Measuring Behaviors
1. Report on how often activities are done, and why. Ex: "How often...

Measuring Lifestyle Patterns
1. Impact of negative environments.
2. Household roles and responsibilities.

Measuring Affiliations
1. Important social networks.
2. Important organizations and community groups.

Measuring Demographics
1. Who the population is.
Appendix D - Listening Session Consent Form

Universidad de Minnesota, CURA
Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association
Entrevista
Formulario de Información y Consentimiento

I. Propósito
Usted está invitado(a) a participar en una entrevista acerca de sus experiencias de las personas que se alquilan en el barrio de Powderhorn Park. Nos gustaría entender sus experiencias en el barrio y el apartamento que se alquila acá, y aprender lo que más valora en tu barrio. Nos gustaría saber cómo se obtiene información sobre las actividades en el vecindario, e como PPNA puede trabajar con usted para mejorar la comunidad.

II. Procedimientos:
Si decide tomar parte o participar en esta entrevista, vamos a hablar de:
- Lo que más le gusta de su vecindario (actividades, lugares, empresas, instalaciones)
- Lo que menos le gusta de su vecindario (actividades, lugares, empresas, instalaciones)
- Como se recibe y compartir información acerca de su comunidad
- Las experiencias de usted, su familia, y sus vecinos como inquilinos

III. Riesgos:
Es posible que el participar en este estudio le cause incomodidad cuando la persona le pregunta acerca de experiencias en el barrio y apartamentos, su relación con el propietario, o cualquier dificultad que pueden tener.
Usted podrá saltarse cualquier pregunta que no quiera contestar. Usted podrá salirse del grupo en cualquier momento. Si se siente incómodo y desea hablar con alguien, le proporcionaremos una lista de lugares a donde usted puede ir. Algunos de estos puede que sean gratis, pero puede que tenga que pagar por otros.

IV. Beneficios:
El participar en este estudio puede que no le beneficie a usted personalmente. En general, esperamos obtener información acerca de la experiencia de los inquilinos en el barrio. Recibirás un regalo de $10 por su participación.

V. Participación y retirada voluntaria:
Su participación en esta conversación que es parte de un estudio depende de usted. Usted no tiene que participar en este estudio si no lo desea. Si usted decide participar en el estudio pero cambia de opinión durante la conversación, puede retirarse en cualquier momento. También si usted lo desea puede saltarse cualquier pregunta que no quiera contestar. Usted puede dejar de participar e irse de la conversación en cualquier momento.

VI. Confidencialidad:
Mantendremos los archivos y notas de esta conversación en privados hasta donde lo permite la ley. Las personas a cargo del estudio, PPNA y CURA, tendrán acceso a la información que usted proporcione. La información también puede ser compartida con aquellas/los quienes se aseguran que el estudio se haga correctamente (Junta de Revisión Institucional del Universidad de Minnesota, la Oficina de Protección de la Investigación Humana [DHRP] y el Departamento de Salud y Servicios Humanos – Administración para Ninos, y Familias, Oficina de Servicios a la Familia y a la Juventud). Usamos un número en lugar de su nombre en los registros del estudio. La información que usted proporcione será guardada en los gabinetes de archivo y bajo llave. Las copias electrónicas de sus respuestas las mantendremos en computadoras bajo protección de contraseña y servidor de seguridad. Las páginas con su nombre y fecha de nacimiento serán destruidas. Su nombre y otros datos que la puedan señalar no aparecerán en el estudio cuando lo presentemos ni cuando se publiquen los resultados. Los resultados se resumirán y se presentarán en forma grupal. Usted no será personalmente identificada (o).

VII. Personas a contactar:
Si tiene preguntas, preocupaciones o quejas acerca este estudio, por favor comuníquese con Sara López, PPNA, número 612-722-4817.

Si piensa que ha sido dañada (o) por el estudio usted puede llamar a Becky Timm, número 612-722-4817, becky@ppna.org, si quiere hablar con alguien que no es parte del equipo del estudio. Puede hablar acerca de las preguntas, de sus preocupaciones, puede hacer aportes, obtener información o hacer sugerencias acerca del estudio. También puede llamar si siente que ha sido perjudicado en alguna forma por el estudio. Si tiene preguntas sobre sus derechos como participante de este estudio o quiere hablar con alguien que no es parte de este estudio puede contactar a Jeffery Perkey en la Oficina de Revisión Institucional, perkey002@umn.edu. Puede hablar con el acerca de preguntas, preocupaciones, o sugerencias que usted tenga.

VIII. Resumen
- Usted no tiene que estar de acuerdo ni formar parte de este estudio.
- Usted puede dejar de participar en este estudio en cualquier momento y/o por cualquier razón.
- Usted puede hacer preguntas acerca del estudio/ proyecto/ programa en cualquier momento.
- La participación en este estudio pueda que no le ayude a usted directamente.
- Recibirá un regalo por su participación.

IX. Copia del formulario de consentimiento a la participante
Usted tiene derecho a tener una copia de esta autorización para que la guarde. Es nuestra obligación entregarle una copia de la misma.

¿Está dispuesto/a a participar voluntariamente en este estudio/ esta conversación? 
Sí [ ] No [ ]

[ ] Facilitador/a Fecha
Recommendations for Renter Engagement in Powderhorn Park

The following ways forward were developed through reflection on the findings from renter interviews, listening sessions, and the thoughtful input of many community leaders. While designed for PPNA, these recommendations would be impossible for one organization to accomplish on its own. We hope that these directions will guide future discussion among all community leaders and partners that seek to improve conditions for renters in Minneapolis.

1. CHANGE HOW OUTREACH AND ORGANIZING IS DONE.
   - Improve coordination of messaging sent out by PPNA, the Park, neighborhood schools, and other institutions and organizations located in the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood for a clear neighborhood brand, greater cohesion of message, and greater clarity of the different entities.
   - Increase volume and diversity of print materials available, and design the Community Organizer’s work plan to spend a majoriy of work hours outside of the office—socializing and interacting with neighbors, door knocking and delivering flyers under doors, posted on apartment buildings, and hung in the park.
   - Deepen relationships with Mercado Central and small corner stores to have them share information about what is going on in the neighborhood by word of mouth, or distribute flyers at a cash register.
   - Seek and identify leaders among the spectrum of the neighborhood’s population, and provide real, impactful leadership opportunities.
   - Identify “apartment leaders,” who will act similarly to block leaders to organize around issues affecting residents of the building, coordinate efforts between buildings, plan events, convene groups and manage a telephone tree, and even approach the landlord if issues arise.
   - For large events targeting the Hispanic population, seek airtime on Radio Rey. Building a relationship with the DJ may be the best approach.

2. SHARE PHYSICAL SPACE MORE OFTEN TO FACILITATE SHARING OF IDEAS.
   - Be an incubator and connector to bring the important work of outside organizations into the Powderhorn Park Neighborhood.
   - Coordinate with staff at the Park, CLLIES, Corcoran Neighborhood Association, and even Matt’s Bar to host PPNA events and activities and expand the sphere of influence. When people spend time in new spaces and around new faces, they begin to think in new and creative ways.

3. LISTEN CLOSELY, ASK OFTEN, FOCUS ON THE CRITICAL, AND MAKE IT FUN.
   - Safety, pests, and repairs are the main issues currently raised by the population of Hispanic renters we engaged. Focus on these areas first.
   - Keep an “opportunity map,” or “parking lot” posted on the walls of the PPNA office (and the Park Recreation Center if possible) for ideas of what kinds of events residents want to see in the community.
   - Respect wishes to move more quickly or move more slowly on issues and policy initiatives. Residents know the risks associated with their actions and should have the final control over what actions are taken with regard to their homes.
   - Find the issues that are easiest to win and organize a small group of new members to work on solving that issue. Small wins lead to higher levels of future engagement and community cohesiveness (Right to the City, 2015).

4. GIVE RENTERS THE OPPORTUNITY BE SEEN AND HEARD IN THE CITY, AND LEAD.
   - Establishing a citywide system of local tenant advisory councils with the platform to inform City Hall and The Department of Regulatory Services.
   - Host neighborhood gatherings twice a year to connect renters with City Council Members and Inspectors.
   - Fund quarterly renter assemblies to bring renters from across Minneapolis to the same decision-making table. The first will be held in 2015.
   - Consider and challenge the language of policy to ensure that renters are acknowledged as stakeholders in a property.
   - Stay connected with City Hall, having residents themselves call and write whenever possible instead of the Community Organizer.
   - Seek new ways to strategically connect renters to opportunities to connect with City government in the ways that renters themselves identify.

5. PROMOTE A SAFER AND HEALTHIER COMMUNITY.
   - Deepen the already-positive relationships with the Minneapolis Police Department. They are a strong and trusted ally among the population engaged in this process.
   - Encourage the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to install the emergency phones and additional lighting around the Park as has been requested in multiple listening sessions with both PPNA and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.
   - Seek funding for an illuminated wayfinding campaign to simultaneously
     1) point visitors to the neighborhood toward the community’s most prized amenities,
2) create beautiful talking points for the community
3) add light to areas of the neighborhood that are particularly poorly lit and noted by residents as dangerous, and
4) have emergency alarm or phone systems available in those in proximity to the most dangerous areas.

6. BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH LANDLORDS AND MANAGERS.
   • Remember that landlords may not always be averse to change, as even small building improvements could mean increased potential rents earned, and happier renters mean more full units. Find ways to meet on common ground with landlords and work toward goals together. For example, an exterior beautification, landscaping, or energy cost reduction program may appeal.
   • Provide landlords with information on Fair Housing Law and tools the can use to improve their tenant communications. Many landlords do not attend Fair Housing workshops, and they probably only have attended the Crime Free Housing session if they have a building in the jurisdiction of the Saint Paul Police Department. PPNA can provide them with an Inspection Notice Form or other form letters for common issues and tell landlords that flyers and letters were the preferred form of communication among Hispanic renter participants.
   • Encourage landlords to support the Clean Energy Initiative. It could be helpful to create handouts or a website that explains the goals of the Initiative so it is better understood by a wider audience.

7. OFFER MORE ACTIVITIES THAT REFLECT WHAT COMMUNITY MEMBERS ALREADY DO AND ENJOY THE MOST.
   • Start a women’s walking or biking group that meets weekly. This can double as an “eyes on the street” safety initiative. Some may wish to volunteer as crossing guards for schools in the neighborhood as well.
   • Start an adult soccer league in partnership with the Park, or as an informal pickup game on weekends.
   • Advocate for summer “Movies in the Park” with Spanish subtitles, or in Spanish with English subtitles. Many of the Hispanic renters who participated in this study enjoy going to see movies, but the theaters are considered too expensive.
   • Hold a neighborhood bake sale. Several Hispanic renters who participated in listening sessions enjoy baking and attend the Appetite for Leadership cooking class. End a class session with a bake sale, or host a friendly cooking competition.
   • Get Hispanic renters connected with the organizers of National Night Out.

8. STRENGTHEN TIES AND CONNECTIONS WITH OTHER NEARBY NEIGHBORHOODS.
   • Keep SUN Project priorities high, and maintain active participation in the planning and development of initiatives that are relevant to Powderhorn Park and all of South Minneapolis.
   • Provide support to neighboring communities’ priorities and collaborate whenever possible to build an environment of sharing.
   • Identify PPNA’s priorities and key strengths (in terms of capacity, knowledge, or skill) and be proactive about taking a leadership role in at least one priority area of the SUN Project.

9. PUSH FORWARD ON NEEDED SYSTEM CHANGE MATCHING RESIDENT-EXPRESSED CONCERNS.
   • Advocate for the Housing Maintenance Code (244) to also include mold as a “sanitary standard” for all housing, including multi-family structures.
   • Work creatively with the Department of Regulatory Services and the Department of Health to create a streamlined and thorough approach to solving the bedbug problem in Minneapolis that holds landlords accountable to the expectation of maintaining a building “completely free from rodents or arthropods, from the traces of either, and from an environment conducive to the growth of either” (Housing Maintenance Code 244).
   • Work directly with the Department of Regulatory Services to move quickly on improving inspection procedures, namely providing notice of inspections, violations, and follow-up reports for all tenants requesting inspections and prioritizing renter-occupied units.

10. PUSH FOR REFORM IN IMMIGRATION POLICY.
   • The impact of legal status on levels of community engagement can be dramatic, and according to Jennifer Arnold of Lyndale Neighborhood Association and Claire Branigan of HOMEline, it cannot be understated in its impact on housing security, safety, and employment among the Hispanic population of Minneapolis. PPNA should continue to host immigration law workshops and collaborate with CLUES and other organizations doing this work.
   • Do outreach to residents, educating them on fair housing law and what landlords shouldn’t be asking residents or applicants for.
   • Host or encourage discussion groups or community cafes around the topic of immigration.

Appendix
Appendix F - HUD Income Limits and FMR for Hennepin County

FY2015 FMR Geography Summary for Hennepin County, Minnesota
Hennepin County is part of the Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA.

The Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA is made up of the following:

Anoka County, MN; Carver County, MN; Chisago County, MN; Dakota County, MN; Hennepin County, MN; Isanti County, MN; Ramsey County, MN; Scott County, MN; Sherburne County, MN; Washington County, MN; Wright County, MN; Pierce County, WI; and St. Croix County, WI.

FY2015 Fair Market Rent Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>1 Bedroom</th>
<th>2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final FY2015 FMRs</td>
<td>$641</td>
<td>$796</td>
<td>$996</td>
<td>$1,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2015 Income Limits Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>1 Person</th>
<th>2 Person</th>
<th>3 Person</th>
<th>4 Person</th>
<th>5 Person</th>
<th>6 Person</th>
<th>7 Person</th>
<th>8 Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County, MN</td>
<td>$86,600</td>
<td>$30,350</td>
<td>$34,650</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$43,300</td>
<td>$46,800</td>
<td>$50,250</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (50%) Income Limits</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$20,800</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$28,410</td>
<td>$32,570</td>
<td>$36,730</td>
<td>$40,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low (30%) Income Limits</td>
<td>$46,100</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$59,250</td>
<td>$65,800</td>
<td>$71,100</td>
<td>$76,350</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>$86,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (80%) Income Limits</td>
<td>$46,100</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$59,250</td>
<td>$65,800</td>
<td>$71,100</td>
<td>$76,350</td>
<td>$81,600</td>
<td>$86,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Underlined headings in both the FMR and IL tables link to detailed documentation concerning the calculations of the parameters listed here.
### Appendix G - Income and Cost Burden Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CaseID</th>
<th>HUD Income Category</th>
<th>Below the Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>Monthly Rent, 1 Bedroom</th>
<th>Heat and Electric Costs</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost Burden of Total Cost to Income</th>
<th>Total Cost’s Percent of FMR by Size</th>
<th>Affordable Rent by Income</th>
<th>Total Cost Difference from Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$760</td>
<td>156%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0 NA</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>$647 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1 NA</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>68% 97% 142</td>
<td>$343 432</td>
<td>231$ $88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0 NA</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>46% 85%</td>
<td>444 231$ 213$ 88$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0 NA</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>34% 92%</td>
<td>467 88$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0 NA</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA NA NA</td>
<td>$849 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-6</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1 $655</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$725 49% 91%</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>281$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-7</td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0 $655</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$725 26% 91%</td>
<td>$849</td>
<td>124$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-8</td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>0 $690</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$760 35% 95%</td>
<td>$647</td>
<td>113$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1 NA</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$730 64% 73%</td>
<td>$343</td>
<td>388$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-10</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>1 $675</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$712 62% 89%</td>
<td>$343</td>
<td>370$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>0 $735</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$805 44% 101%</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>260$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-3</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0 $745</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$850 30% 107%</td>
<td>$849</td>
<td>1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income</td>
<td>43% $686 $72 $745 $54% $92% $546 $233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 BR only  *All apt sizes  *Total cost divided by FMR for apartment size  *Average income from range selected, divided by 12, and multiplied by 30%  *On average, households are paying $233 more than what is considered affordable at 30% of their income.

F-2, F-3, M-2, and F-9 were excluded from the rent analysis because they were either caretakers and received discounted rent, or occupied units larger than 1 bedroom. F-2 and M-2 are caretaking households, so their costs were not included in any cost-burden analyses as the discount should be considered an aspect of their income.
WHAT IS AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

Officially, according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, affordable housing is a residence that costs a household no more than 30% of their annual household income. This threshold is called the “affordable rent burden.”

Why is Affordable Housing so important?

- Over 12 million U.S. households now pay more than 50% of their income toward housing (HUD 2013).
- Low-Income families who pay more than 30% of their income toward housing-related costs are cost-burdened, and may have trouble affording necessities like food, transportation, clothing, or medicine.

How are income limits for Affordable Housing calculated?

The government officially uses the Area Median Income of a designated region—usually a county or metropolitan area—to identify housing that is affordable to families in the middle or lower ends of the income scale. The median (or middle) income of that region serves as the baseline. It is not an average. There are almost 1,000 different regions nationwide with different income categories.

How does Powderhorn’s Area Median Income compare?

With a median household income of $44,979, Cleveland falls under the low income category at the national, state, county, and metro levels. This means that over half of the current residents of the neighborhood may benefit from programs that create quality affordable housing!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Low Income (80%)</th>
<th>Very Low Income (50%)</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA Metro Areas</td>
<td>$68,400</td>
<td>$54,720</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$20,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$77,400</td>
<td>$61,900</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
<td>$23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul Metro Area</td>
<td>$86,600</td>
<td>$69,280</td>
<td>$43,300</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is a Fair Market Rent?
A Fair Market Rent (FMR) is established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a region. It is the rent expected to be paid by residents based on area median income. For 2015, this is what the government says is a fair rent for Hennepin County affordable to a household making the Area Median Income in 2015.

| Studio: | $641 |
| 1 Bedroom: | $796 |
| 2 Bedroom: | $996 |
| 3 Bedroom: | $1,403 |
| 4 Bedroom: | $1,656 |

What is the Twin Cities’ Housing Affordability Index?
A Housing Affordability Index measures whether or not a household of a particular size has enough income to pay a certain level of rent or to qualify for a mortgage loan on a typical home in a region.

Government Subsidy Program Eligibility:
- **Public Housing**: 80% AMI ($69,280 or less)
- **HOME and Tax Subsidies**: 60% of AMI ($51,960 or less)
- **Housing Choice Vouchers/Section 8**: 50% AMI ($43,300)

But... “affordable for whom?”
Those “fair” market rents might seem high to some people. That’s because they are! Just because the government says that housing is “affordable” doesn’t mean that it is affordable for everyone. Affordability is set to different income thresholds, described above, to target segments of the population. Many housing programs explicitly state their income requirements to make sure that the households that really need that housing can get in. These are government regulated programs that keep rents low, and for many of these programs private or non-profit developers can opt in and receive a subsidy or tax credit that offsets the loss in income from rent. In some affordable home ownership programs (like those done for Habitat for Humanity, PPL, and other developers), construction costs are kept low through the use of volunteers and donations and homes can be sold for prices lower than if they were done traditionally.

First developed by Foell, Nygaard, Olson, and Tran of the Humphrey School of Public Affairs (2015) for the Cleveland Neighborhood Association.