Gentrification and Unemployment in Binghampton

Neel Saxe

Rhodes College

Rhodes Institute for Regional Studies

Abstract

The goal of this research project is to understand the connection between gentrification and unemployment in Binghampton, a neighborhood in Memphis, TN. Binghampton is made up of four Census Tracts (Census Tracts 15,27,28, and 30). The relationship between gentrification and unemployment is often murky. Many argue that gentrification can increase employment opportunities by providing new jobs and improving infrastructure. On the other hand, critics claim that gentrification can create a skills mismatch, where existing residents do not have the education or skills to be hired in the changing job landscape. This complex relationship is important to be explored especially within a city like Memphis with a long history of redlining and racial economic inequality. Furthermore, the majority of research on gentrification is focused on displacement and racial transition rather than its financial impacts. It is important to view the tangible financial impacts of gentrification on original residents who have not yet been displaced, since their stories are often overlooked.

Binghampton lies between Summer Avenue and Poplar Avenue on the North and South Parkways, as well as East Parkway and Holmes Street to the east and west. Binghampton was named after William H. Bingham who was a well-regarded hotelier. According to *High Ground News*, Binghampton used to have its own newspaper, utilities, and Police Force (Bradley, 2018). In the early 1900's Binghampton, which used to be self-sustaining, became incorporated into Memphis. Binghampton has a rich history of music (Memphis Slim), transportation (Litchfield Car Works), and social change (Binghampton Civic League). Binghampton today has a divide between the East and West sides. *High Ground News* also states, “The west side of BInghampton runs from East Parkway to Collins Street, while the east side runs from Scott to Holmes Street” (Bradley, 2018). This divide is important because the East side has lower income demographics with a higher percentage of people of color [POC], while the West has a higher percentage of white residents and a higher median income. This divide, coupled with the strong degree of economic, cultural, and racial diversity is what makes Binghampton an ideal area to study.

In recent years, new developers have come to the Binghampton area and bought investment properties. Broad Avenue, a street within Census Tract 15, has developed considerably within recent years. Since 2007, the street has featured numerous shops and stores, which replaced the vacant buildings. Although positive development like the development of Broad Street has taken place, displacement has occurred with the increase in economic activity. For instance, The Hollywood Square apartments, which were once a thriving community of international citizens, were bought by a local developer who forced the removal of its residents. Additionally, Binghampton has many areas with homes worth less than $60,000 but now has new development on the market for $400,000. This dichotomy between high and low income with development and displacement made Binghampton a focus of discussions of gentrification in Memphis.

Along with development, unemployment is an issue which further exacerbates economic disparities and can often be caused by factors such as gentrification. It can have a myriad of causes but can often be traced back to legacies of racism and economic injustice. The city of Memphis has a high unemployment rate compared to the rest of the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2025), much as a result of a legacy of racial inequality. Additionally, Binghampton's position within a city like Memphis, one with a long history of racially based economic inequality, further complicates these issues. For this reason, Binghampton is a textbook example of a neighborhood on the edge of gentrification and is representative of countless other, similar neighborhoods which do not fit neatly into predetermined classifications.

It is important to understand how these changes can affect such a crucial issue like employment within a city that has and is struggling with racial economic inequality, but in order to study gentrification, it is necessary to first define it. According to Jacob L. Vigdor, a professor at Duke University, "Gentrification brings renewed population growth accompanied by an inflow of households with high educational attainment, professional jobs, and few children." (Vigdor, 2002) He reasons that outflows include displacement of "low socioeconomic status households." (Vigdor, 2002) Vigdor also states that gentrification "also implies racial transition." (Vigdor, 2002) These criteria are the basis from which this research's definition stems. It aims to track this inflow of wealthier residents, an outflow of lower income residents, and racial transition. In addition, it traces the relationship between gentrification and unemployment. In his study, Vigdor argues that gentrification could help employment opportunities by bringing more jobs to metropolitan locations and bringing higher wages. Conversely, many scholars hold the perhaps more intuitive notion that gentrification worsens unemployment. These scholars include Rachel Meltzer and Pooya Ghorbani who conclude "incumbent residents in gentrifying neighborhoods experienced significant job losses within their home census tracts. The number of local jobs, primarily in service goods-producing sectors, decreased as much as 63 percent in some tracts." (Meltzer & Ghorbani, 2017) This connection is often highly contextual and dependent on the region of study. The variety of thoughts on this connection makes it worth exploring especially within the context of a city like Memphis.

Method

For this research, it was crucial to study gentrification and unemployment separately. This is because gentrification is an issue that is made up of many factors and in order to compare it to something the extent to which it is occurring must be established. For this reason, the research is split into quantitative research into gentrification (analyzing census data changes), qualitative gentrification research (interviews with current and former Binghampton residents), and quantitative research into unemployment (analyzing census data on unemployment).

Gentrification Method

To compare gentrification over time to rates of unemployment, it is important to see the extent to which gentrification is affecting different Census Tracts in Binghampton. UC Berkeley's Urban Displacement Project (UDP) tries to estimate the effects of gentrification and displacement in an area. Initially the project worked on creating maps for San Francisco and Los Angeles, but in 2018, it partnered with the Strong, Prosperous, and Resilient Communities Challenge (SPARCC) to create maps for Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, and Memphis. The project used Zillow values and rental data to account for changes in the housing market, which were indicators not included in previous projects. However, due to the subjective nature of gentrification, it is important to define the terms that the Urban Displacement Project uses and what criteria they use to establish a rating.

The UDP uses the following criteria to define whether an area is experiencing gentrification:

A tract gentrified from 1990-2000 or 2000-2017 if the following criteria were met: 1. The tract was vulnerable to gentrification in the base year (1990 for gentrification between 1990 and 2000, or 2000 for gentrification between 2000 and 2017). Vulnerability is defined as tracts with: 2. Below regional median housing values or rents 3. Two or more of the following criteria is met: a. Above regional median percent of the population that is low-income b. Above the regional median percent of population that is non-white c. Above the regional median percent of population that rents d. Below regional median percent of the population that is college educated 4. The tract experienced an above regional median change in percent college educated population 5. The tract experienced an above regional median percent change in median income 6. The tract experienced above regional median percent change in housing values or rents (otherwise known as a “hot market”) 7. For non-urban tracts: tract experienced an above regional median loss in low-income households (absolute loss). (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.)

The map on gentrification uses Census and Zillow data from 2010-2018. Although Census data is based on estimates and the data is not updated until the current day, it still gives a good window into existing trends in the neighborhood and combines a wide swathe of data points to obtain an accurate look at displacement. The data from UDP is very thoroughly researched and its use of many different sources is effective for capturing trends within a multi-faceted issue like gentrification. For that reason, it is a good framework to help build this study of gentrification because it accounts for a broad range of factors.

The UDP map provides a color-coded scale which goes from low income/ susceptible to displacement, ongoing displacement, at risk of gentrification, early/ongoing gentrification, advanced gentrification, stable moderate/ mixed income, at risk of becoming exclusive, becoming exclusive, and Stable/ Advanced Exclusive. Additionally, for each Census Tract, it gives a section on market dynamics, demographics, and risk factors. Census Tract 15 is characterized as being low income/ susceptible to displacement. The sections on market dynamics, demographics and risk factors are displayed in Chart 1 below.

Chart 1(Census Tract 15) - UDP Analysis on Gentrification (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.)

Market Dynamics	***Demographics***	***Risk Factors***
Tract median home value: $62,100 Tract home value change from 2000 to 2017: -11% Regional median home value: $95,400 Tract median rent: $809 Regional median rent: $887 Tract rent change from 2012 to 2017: 4%	Tract population: 1,566 Tract household count: 701 Percent renter occupied: 31.7% Percent vacant homes: 25.8% Tract median income: $24,932 Percent low income hh: 69.4% Percent change in LI: 24.3%	Mostly low income: Yes Mix low income: No Rent change: No Rent gap: No Hot Market: Yes Vulnerable to gentrification: Yes Gentrified from 1990 to 2000: No Gentrified from 2000 to 2017: No

Rent gap (nearby - local): -$16.53 Regional median rent gap: $20.93	Percent POC: 88.6% Regional median POC: 74.9% Tract racial typology: Black-Latinx-White White: 11.4% Black: 75.3% Asian: 2.4% Latinx: 10.6% Other: 0.3% Percent students: 5.3% Percent college educated: 16.5% Regional median educated: 19.4%	

According to the data above Census Tract 15 has 3 out of 8 risk factors and gentrification occurred between 2000-2017. We can see from demographic information that the tract is majority people of color (POC) and 69.4 percent low income. Census Tract 27 is characterized as having advanced gentrification. Census Tract 27 includes the majority of West Binghampton, which is where there has been the biggest shifts in housing prices and new development. Additional data for Census Tract 27 is in Chart 2 below.

Chart 2 (Census Tract 27) - UDP Analysis on Gentrification (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.)

<u>Market Dynamics</u>	***<u>Demographics</u>***	***<u>Risk Factors</u>***
Tract median home value: $96,500 Tract home value change from 2000 to 2017: 13% Regional median home value: $95,400 Tract median rent: $780	Tract population: 1,996 Tract household count: 682 Percent renter occupied: 52.5% Percent vacant homes: 19.4%	Mostly low income: No Mix low income: No Rent change: No Rent gap: Yes Hot Market: Yes Vulnerable to gentrification: No

Regional median rent: $887 Tract rent change from 2012 to 2017: -5% Rent gap (nearby - local): $28.01 Regional median rent gap: $20.93	Tract median income: $40,769 Percent low income hh: 41.2% Percent change in LI: -37.9% Percent POC: 60.6% Regional median POC: 74.9% Tract racial typology: Black-White White: 39.4% Black: 47.7% Asian: 3.8% Latinx: 7.8% Other: 1.3% Percent students: 7.4% Percent college educated: 32.5% Regional median educated: 19.4%	Gentrified from 1990 to 2000: No Gentrified from 2000 to 2017: Yes

Census Tract 27 has 3 out of 8 gentrification risk factors and experienced some gentrification between 2000 to 2017. Census Tract 27 is 60.6 percent POC and 41.2 percent low income.

Census Tract 28 is characterized as being at risk of gentrification, which is in the lower third of the scale. The sections on market dynamics, demographics and risk factors are displayed in Chart 3 below.

Chart 3 (Census Tract 28) - UDP Analysis on Gentrification (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.)

Market Dynamics	***Demographics***	***Risk Factors***
Tract median home value: $65,100	Tract population: 3,092	Mostly low income: Yes Mix low income: No

Tract home value change from 2000 to 2017: -9% Regional median home value: $95,400 Tract median rent: $636 Regional median rent: $887 Tract rent change from 2012 to 2017: -7% Rent gap (nearby - local): $163.07 Regional median rent gap: $20.93	Tract household count: 1,371 Percent renter occupied: 57.5% Percent vacant homes: 14.1% Tract median income: $21,825 Percent low income hh: 70.7% Percent change in LI: -0.7% Percent POC: 83.5% Regional median POC: 74.9% Tract racial typology: Black-White White: 16.5% Black: 81.8% Asian: 0.2% Latinx: 0.8% Other: 0.6% Percent students: 3.7% Percent college educated: 15.7% Regional median educated: 19.4%	Rent change: No Rent gap: Yes Hot Market: Yes Vulnerable to gentrification: Yes Gentrified from 1990 to 2000: No Gentrified from 2000 to 2017: No

Census Tract 28 has 4 out of 8 risk factors for gentrification. It was characterized as being vulnerable to gentrification. The area is 83.5 percent POC and more specifically 81.8 percent black. Additionally, it is 70.7 percent low income.

Census Tract 30 is characterized as being low income/ susceptible to displacement which is the lowest rating on the scale. The sections on market dynamics, demographics and risk factors are displayed in Chart 4 below.

Chart 4 (Census Tract 30) - UDP Analysis on Gentrification (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.)

Market Dynamics	***Demographics***	***Risk Factors***
Tract median home value: $139,000 Tract home value change from 2000 to 2017: 4% Regional median home value: $95,400 Tract median rent: $746 Regional median rent: $887 Tract rent change from 2012 to 2017: 1% Rent gap (nearby - local): $75.87 Regional median rent gap: $20.93	Tract population: 3,315 Tract household count: 1,425 Percent renter occupied: 48.6% Percent vacant homes: 14.1% Tract median income: $24,990 Percent low income hh: 55.0% Percent change in LI: 34.5% Percent POC: 53.5% Regional median POC: 74.9% Tract racial typology: Black-White White: 46.5% Black: 51.2% Asian: 0.0% Latinx: 1.6% Other: 0.7% Percent students: 9.4% Percent college educated: 29.3% Regional median educated: 19.4%	Mostly low income: Yes Mix low income: No Rent change: No Rent gap: Yes Hot Market: Yes Vulnerable to gentrification: No Gentrified from 1990 to 2000: No Gentrified from 2000 to 2017: No

Census Tract 30 has 3 out of 8 gentrification risk factors. The Census Tract is 53.5 percent POC and more specifically 51.2 percent black. Also, the area is 55 percent low income.

The UDP was necessary to use due to its thorough analysis on Zillow housing data and rent values which is an incredibly time intensive process. The UDP provides well researched estimates which act as an excellent building block for future studies.

Although the UDP’s model of gentrification and displacement is a good framework, it has several limitations in regard to this study's research question. The first is the fact that the data ends in 2018. The effects of the pandemic on the economy and job market need to be accounted for when trying to measure this issue currently. Additionally, the UDP has a section on the limitations of their work, stating that the 5-year ACS is not completely accurate due to timing issues and the oversight of some population shifts, which is why they included their Community Suggestion Layer. The need for community input on the issue was something that needed to be addressed when tackling this research question. Due to the broad scope of the UDP’s research, it was almost impossible to get the opinions of people in every neighborhood they researched.

Another issue that the UDP stated was that “local groups in Chicago and Memphis identified several overestimations of gentrification and gentrification risk, mostly within in Black and poor neighborhoods.” (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.) They explained that this was due to the history of racial segregation and systemic income inequality which changed the ways that gentrification occurred. Oftentimes in these areas, gentrification occurs on a different timeline and does not always present itself in the same way. The last limitation that they mentioned was that their research did not account for changes in racial demographics over time. They state, “our methodology does not account for cultural displacement or different types of turnover among low-income households.” (Urban Displacement Project, n.d.) This is particularly true for the “Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement” category which should be further refined in future research to include more diverse types of low-income turnover, or by accounting for the loss of particular racial and ethnic groups. The main takeaway from this is that gentrification research needs to incorporate a racial lens and modified risk models by taking into account legacies of inequality and finer details about low-income population turnover.

While the UDP is a good building block it was necessary to get a more comprehensive look into the neighborhood's situation. To improve upon the UDP’s work in Binghampton, it was necessary to correct some of the project’s limitations. To correct for the data’s end in 2018, this research uses data from 2023 to better understand the current state of the neighborhood. Furthermore, this data is compared against 2010, 2015, 2018, and 2020 figures to capture trends over time as well as inaccuracies in data collection. In order to correct for the second issue of transparency between local perceptions and publicly available data, this research incorporates interview data from neighborhood residents, many of whom are part of community organizations. This aims to correct this discrepancy between public data and the day-to-day reality in a neighborhood. To improve upon the overestimation of gentrification in black and poor neighborhoods, this research also focused on neighborhood economic changes that were independent from the UDP’s research. To try and avoid these biases, it was important to view not only more recent changes but the context behind them. To correct the last issue of not having data on racial turnover, this research incorporated data on the change in racial demographics over time. By building on the well-researched structure of the UDP’s work, this research aims to improve upon the project's limitations and provide an even more accurate picture of gentrification in Binghampton.

The first metric to focus on was how median income has changed over time. The Census provides multiple methods to capture data changes over time. The Decennial Census and the ACS both provide estimates on population changes over time. Both surveys have different strengths, which Census.gov describes below: “While the main function of the U.S. decennial census is to provide counts of people for the purpose of congressional apportionment, the primary purpose of the American Community Survey (ACS) is to measure the changing social and economic characteristics of the U.S. population—our education, housing, jobs, and more.”(U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). For this reason, the research relied on the Decennial Census data for total change in population but the ACS for demographic changes. The changes in median income from 2013-2023 are displayed in chart 5 below.

Chart 5 (ACS - Median household income in the past 12 months - in 2023 inflation adjusted dollars)

Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
15	1	14,844	35850	21,006	141.5117219
27	1	21667	65764	44097	203.5214843
27	2	21866	56058	34192	156.3706211
28	1	38625	41094	2469	6.39223301
28	2	29625	-	-	
28	3	10451	-	-	
30	1	16676	9518	-7158	-42.92396258
30	2	30568	41619	11051	36.15218529

Due to the availability of Census data, 2013 was the earliest year that data on median income could be recovered from the ACS. However, this still provides a period of study of ten years which is often used when measuring gentrification and changes over time.

From the data above, we can see that Census Tracts 15 and 27 saw significant increases in income over time. On the other hand, Census Tracts 28 and 30 saw much smaller increases and block group 1 for Census Tract 30 declined significantly over time. This shows the divide between East and West Binghampton with West Binghampton seeing significant growth while East Binghampton stayed relatively stagnant or even declined in some block groups. To contextualize the significance of this growth, it is important to compare these changes with city and national averages. Chart 6 displays these changes below.

Chart 6 (Median household income in the past 12 months - in 2023 inflation adjusted dollars)

Area	2013	2023	change	percent change
United States	52250	77719	25469	48.74449761
Memphis.	46962	64025	17063	36.33363145

As is evident in the discrepancy between city, national, and block group data, West Binghampton experienced significant growth in median income in the 10 year period but still lags behind city and national averages. Furthermore, the unavailability of data for Census Tract 28 makes it difficult to analyze the areas change. The latest year that the ACS has median income data on both Block group's 2 and 3 for Census Tract 28 is 2018. The changes are shown below in Chart 7.

Chart 7 (Median household income in the past 12 months - in 2023 inflation adjusted dollars)

Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2018	change	percent change
28	2	29625	9231	-20394	-68.84050633
28	3	10451	9109	-1342	-12.84087647

Although the data is taken 5 years before the other metrics, this significant decline and lack of growth within 10 years further highlights the discrepancy between east and west Binghampton in regards to economic development.

The second metric that was important to observe was the change in racial statistics over time. This was analyzed using the ACS estimates from 2013-2023. The change in racial demographics is displayed in chart 8 (appendix). In the ACS data Census Tracts 15 and 27 saw significant increases in white residents, especially Block Group 1 in Census Tract 27 which saw a 44 percent increase. Block Group 1 in Census Tract 30 went from 0 to 62 white residents while the white population fell within Census Tract 28. Across nearly every Census Tract the African American population declined with a notable exception of Block Group 1 in Census Tract 27 which saw a 285 percent increase. Census Tract 27 block group 2 saw an 83 percent decline from an estimate of 1451 to 236 black residents. Furthermore, in Census Tract 27 block group 1 and Block group 1 Census Tract 30 residents falling under some other race declined sharply since 2013. In Census Tract 28 block group 1 the Asian population increased from 0 to 76 but fell 80.6 percent in Census Tract 27 block group 2. Moreover, in Census Tract 15 block group 1 the Native American population increased from 0 to 82.

In order to understand what these changes represent, it is necessary to look at the trends across Census Tracts. Besides Census Tract 28, there was an increase in white residents within every area of Binghampton. This increase was the most extreme in Census Tract 27 Block Group 1 and Census Tract 30 block group 1. Across all of West

Binghampton, there has been a steady increase in the white population. Although in Census Tract 30 block group 1 the change was significant, it is important to note that in 2013 it had an estimate of 0 which increased to 62 (a number that is still far smaller than almost every other area). For this reason, there has been an influx of white residents, but it has not been in the same raw numbers as West Binghampton tracts. Disregarding percentage and looking at raw numbers of residents alone, Census Tract 27 has seen significant triple digit increases in its white population.

The population of black residents has declined across nearly every Census Tract, with especially extreme examples being the 83 percent decrease in Census Tract 27 Block group 2 and the 49 percent decline in Census Tract 30 block group 1. In the case of Census Tract 27 block group 1, it represents a similar situation to the change in the white population for Census Tract 30 block group 1. Although there was a very significant increase which could represent large scale changes it is important to note that Census Tract 27 block group 1 increased from 64 black residents to 247, a number which is still by far the lowest of any block group. For this reason, while the influx may indicate future changes it does not provide enough evidence to imply that the area is deviating from trends in its surrounding Census Tracts. It is also important to note that in Census Tracts 15 and 28 there have been influxes of racial groups that were not there previously. Asian, Native American, and groups that fall under some other race have all increased across these tracts, often from an estimate of 0. While these populations are still small minorities in the area their arrival indicates an increase in racial diversity within the area.

The tracts within West Binghampton have seen steady increases in white residents while the population of black residents has shrunk significantly. Within Census Tract 15, there has been increases within other racial groups like Asian and Native American residents. In East Binghampton, there has been slight increases in their white population with steady decreases in their black residents. In Census Tract 28 there has been an influx of other previously unrepresented racial groups like Asians and Native Americans. These trends point to rising gentrification within west Binghampton with possible displacement within east Binghampton.

To better understand these trends, it is important to look at how the total population is changing over time. The Decennial Census specializes in capturing population changes, so it was a reliable source for this research. The chart below shows how the total population of Binghampton has changed between 2010 - 2020.

Chart 8 (Decennial Census - Total Population Data)

Total Population	Census Tract	Block Group	Population 2010	Population 2020	Change	Percent change
	15	1	874	809	-65	-7.437070938
	27	1	716	651	-65	-9.078212291
	27	2	1302	1123	-179	-13.74807988
	28	1	1635	1597	-38	-2.324159021
	28	2	777	577	-200	-25.74002574
	28	3	1350	1218	-132	-9.777777778
	30	1	911	721	-190	-20.85620198
	30	2	996	801	-195	-19.57831325

Through viewing this data, it is apparent that the total population has declined between 2010 and 2020. This indicates that displacement is occurring on a large scale within the neighborhood, a conclusion which is supported by the racial demographic changes.

One method of measuring displacement is to look at evictions, since they can indicate if residents are being forced out of areas. Although not always, an increase in evictions can indicate an increase in gentrification and displacement. The site EvictionLab publishes data on the average number of eviction fillings within an area. EvictionLab displays the data with the average filings for every month since January 1 of 2020. They also display the prepandemic averages to give context. The average amount of filings for Census Tract 15 was 7.3 while prepandemic levels were 3.3. The average amount of fillings for Census Tract 27 was 6.8 with prepandemic levels being 6.7. The average amount of filings for Census Tract 28 was 10.1 while the prepandemic level was 12.7. Finally, the average amount for Census Tract 30 was 5.24 while the prepandmeic average was 4.6. From this data it is apparent that Census Tract 28 has a higher level of evictions and Census Tract 15 had a significant increase in evictions post pandemic. The pandemic did not significantly affect the average amount of evictions in Census Tract 27 and 30.

Qualitative Research

To move beyond the limits of quantitative data, it was important to conduct interviews with current and former Binghampton residents. Three interviews were conducted; the first with a community leader who works at a housing focused community organization located in West Binghampton (Participant A). In order to protect the privacy of the interviewees, they have been given pseudonyms in this paper. Participant A stated that when she moved into Binghampton, she was struck by the racial, economic, and cultural diversity in the neighborhood. She mentioned that her children who were in middle school and high school at the time enjoyed playing soccer at the park and how close knit the community was. She mentioned that over the last 23 years there has been a decline in economic, cultural, and racial diversity in the neighborhood. She said that over time, more white, middle-class people moved to the neighborhood in conjunction with new developers. She mentioned that there were many people who moved to fix up and sell homes in order to make a profit.

Participant A also said that West Binghampton was now majority white and middle class. She stated that many of these people were not as interested in community meetings or community organizing and that they were much more isolated. She said that there was a more “white middle-class mindset,” which she described as the attitude that “I live here, this is my home, I’m going to live my life, I’ll like the people on my block, but I am not really going to worry about the big things that are happening within my neighborhood.” She said that during the onset of Covid, the residents of the Hollywood Square Apartments underwent significant displacement. She said that the apartments had been owned by a California company for years and were home to many international residents. There were community gardens and festivals and the community there was very tightly knit. A Memphis developer bought the property during Covid and, despite community resistance, evicted many of the residents. The developer updated the apartment complex and made the new building unaffordable to the previous residents. The same developer bought the Merton Avenue apartments down the street and has forced out the residents and is planning on renovating it. Participant A also stated that these were just two examples of people being forced out either by raising rent prices or new developers buying properties and telling residents they had to leave. She found that in 2018, when her community organization was founded, it had a board of fifteen residents. By 2025, seven have had to move out of the neighborhood due to rising rents. In regard to the housing markets, Participant A stated that in the last year it has been stagnant even though a number of developers have tried to flip houses. She said the future of the housing market was uncertain and that down the street from her there have been three houses (two of them for sale) that have remained empty for some time, and that no one will buy them.

In regard to employment in Binghampton, Participant A also had several insights. She said that for a long time there were several doctors that lived in the neighborhood that worked at Christ Community Clinic but that a few of them had left. She added that a number of the young people in the neighborhood were doing service work including teaching, organizing, gardening, and art. Additionally, many Hispanic people in the neighborhood did construction and cleaned houses, while a number of the men in African families worked at FedEx. She mentioned that FedEx workers had a solid income, hours, and health insurance which made the company an attractive employer for many refugee families. Participant A also said that many people worked maintenance at night so that they could help with other things during the day.
When discussing transportation, she said that one reason that Binghampton used to be a popular neighborhood was that it was on the Hollywood bus line and the Poplar bus line. She said that although it still is, the Memphis Area Transit Authority (MATA) was

stumbling and that she wasn’t sure if it was reliable anymore. There is a high volume of walking within the neighborhood, and she said that everyone who works has a car or, if they did not have a car, struggled to have a job. Participant A added that she suspected people were struggling with unemployment, but everyone she knew in the neighborhood was working. She said that several young college graduates were looking for work. However, she said that there is a food pantry in Binghampton, which is always very busy, leading to her suspicions that unemployment was an issue. She said that most of the work is not being done in the neighborhood because FedEx is far away, as are hotels that require cleaning work, and there are no close hospitals.

The study’s second interviewee, Participant B, is a 35-year-old journalist who is a current Binghampton resident. She lives between Summer and Sam Cooper, which is part of the lower portion of Census Tract 15. This is important because, while the majority of West Binghampton is made up of Census Tract 27, the upper portion of West Binghampton is Census Tract 15, an area with different economic and racial demographics. Participant B stated that she used to live on a street in Census Tract 27 for 2 years and has lived in her current home for 7. She said that over time housing in Binghampton has gotten more expensive and that during her time living there Broad Street has developed significantly. She mentioned that there has been restoration to different homes, which she noted was positive but that there were negative changes as well. Several businesses in the area do not accept cash at all, which is a problem since many Binghampton residents do not have access to debit and credit cards. She also mentioned that the apartments that have been developed on Broad Street and the ones across from Overton Park have become very expensive, noting that prices are around

$1100 to 1200 for a studio. Additionally, Participant B has access to a car and has not noticed any drop in employment where she lives.

The third interviewee, Participant C, is a neighborhood connector who lived in Binghampton from 2014-2020. During her time living there, she noticed Broad Street getting more developed and new development around Sam Cooper Boulevard. When she first moved to the neighborhood, she rented because buying a home was out of her price range. When she moved there, she said that she was entering during the renaissance of the neighborhood, but over time, many people have been pushed out of the neighborhood due to rising prices. She also mentioned how the apartment on Hollywood caused residents to be forced out of their homes and how the event displaced many families. Participant C said that the majority of Binghampton residents that have left have relocated to areas like Berclair and Nutbush or suburbs like Codova and Bartlett. She has also heard from people she knows in Binghampton that the neighborhood seems quieter now. In regard to common occupations in the area, she noted that FedEx and the construction industries were major employers. While she used to live in West Binghampton, she said that in East Binghampton issues regarding gentrification are different. The people living in East Binghampton are oftentimes older homeowners who have been in the area for generations. Concerning unemployment, she said that she has not noticed any significant changes from her time living there. She highlighted that Binghampton is a close-knit community and that efforts like the Binghampton Community Land Trust are especially effective there because of the large immigrant population. She noted that people from other countries are often more responsive to ideas about collective ownership in regard to property.

Overall, after viewing the interview data on gentrification several trends mapped on to the qualitative findings. First there appears to be a “cultural shift” in Census Tract 27 that was confirmed by both Participant A and C. This is a very common phenomenon when gentrification occurs since with an influx of new residents’ traditions and cultural values can often shift. Oftentimes a cultural shift is one intangible factor that is reported in these instances, and it confirms quantitative findings on Census Tract 27’s level of gentrification. Furthermore, increasing home and rent prices across Census Tract 27 and 15 both point to a rise in gentrification risk and the mention of new development further reinforces this line of reasoning. These findings also align with quantitative data results which imply the onset of gentrification risk factors in Census Tract 15 and active gentrification within Census Tract 27.

Gentrification Findings

After analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data on gentrification it was possible to make assumptions about the degree to which gentrification is affecting Binghampton. In Census Tract 15 there has been a decline in median home value and a slight increase in rent. The median rent is still below the regional median average and there is no rent gap. The tract has a high percentage of low income and POC residents as well as a hot market. These signs indicate that the tract is still affordable but is at risk for gentrification due to the market and surrounding areas. From 2013-2023, the ACS estimates that the median income in census tract 15 has more than doubled. Additionally, Census Tract 15 has seen a steady increase in its white population with a steady decline in black residents. It has also seen an increase in the amount of previously absent minority groups like Asian and Native American residents. The number of average evictions per month more than doubled postpandemic, rising from 3.3 to 7.3. The interview data conducted supports many of these findings, where Participant B confirmed that new development and rising housing costs were occurring. While UDP classifies Census Tract 15 as low income/ ongoing displacement it is important to note the changes in demographics and eviction statistics since 2018 where the UDP's model ends. The displacement of black residents as well as the exponential increase in evictions all point to displacement occurring. Combined with the qualitative interview data this research suggests that the Tract is ongoing displacement, which is one category higher on the UDP's displacement typology.

Census Tract 27 has experienced an increase in average home value along with a rent gap that exceeds the regional median. The median rent is below the regional median which means that it could be susceptible to new developers raising rent prices. There has been a 37.9 percent decline in low-income households which could be a strong sign of displacement. The percent college educated exceeds the regional median which could indicate an influx of college educated residents. Furthermore, the region has a hot market which could mean an increase in new development and people attempting to flip homes. Census Tract 27 has seen a sharp increase in white residents combined with a sharp decline in black residents between 2013-2023. Additionally, median income has more than doubled since 2013. Eviction averages have not changed significantly since the Pandemic, but it is important to remember that the UDP defined the area as undergoing advanced gentrification in 2018. Due to this fact, there may not be a strong surge in evictions since gentrification was already occurring. The interview data confirmed these findings since Participant A stated that several people she knew had to leave the area due to rising rent prices. Participant C further confirmed this stating that many people were forced out of the neighborhood due to new development and rising housing costs. Due to these factors the research supports that Census Tract 27 is still undergoing advanced gentrification, the same classification it was given in 2018.

In Census Tract 28 median home value has decreased since 2000 and the median rent is well below the regional median. Rent has dropped 7 percent and there is a significant rent gap. The area is majority people of color (POC) and low income. Since 2013 the population of white residents has declined somewhat while the population of black residents declined more significantly. Additionally, there has been an influx of Asian and Native American residents who were not there previously. The decline in the African American population points to ongoing displacement. Eviction data post pandemic has not changed drastically, but is still quite high, especially in comparison to the rest of the region. Median income has increased somewhat but not nearly as significantly as Block Groups 15 and 27. The UDP defined Census Tract 28 as at risk of gentrification, however this research suggests that the area is experiencing ongoing displacement. This adjustment in classification is due to several factors. There has been a drop in home and rent prices and although many black residents are being displaced there has not been an influx of white residents to the neighborhood. The percent college educated is still below the median for the region and Participant C stated that many homes in the area are still owner owned. The UDP states that one issue within their model is the overestimation of gentrification risk within predominantly black and low-income areas. This research suggests that although displacement is occurring gentrification has not started.

In Census Tract 30 home value and rent have increased subtly over time and rent is much lower than the surrounding region. The area is majority POC and low income with a higher percentage of college educated residents than surrounding tracts. Median income fell within some block groups and rose in others but there was no overwhelming growth. Since 2013, there has been some growth in the white population with a significant decline in black residents. There was a slight increase in evictions since 2020 but not a significant one. The UDP classifies Census Tract 30 as low income/ susceptible to displacement. This classification is congruent with the research although one could argue that the tract is experiencing ongoing displacement. While the African American population has declined in the area, rent prices are still lower than the regional average, and median income has not rose across all block groups. For this reason, the area could be classified as either depending on how conservative your estimate is; however, for the purpose of this research it will be classified as being low income/ susceptible to displacement.

Overall, gentrification is only affecting 1 out of 4 Census Tracts in Binghampton (Census Tract 27), however every census tract is experiencing some level of displacement which has increased in recent years. Census Tract 28's gentrification risk has been overestimated most likely due to limitations in the UDP's model. The sharp increase in displacement and economic risk factors has troubling implications for the future of Binghampton.

Unemployment

In order to understand how gentrification is affecting unemployment, it is necessary to view unemployment data from the same period. Using the unemployment data from Policy Map, a widely used mapping and data analytics survey, the unemployment rates for the chosen block groups could be retrieved. The rate describes the estimated percent of people aged 16 years or older who were unemployed, between 2019-2023 and is taken from the American Census Survey's 5-year estimates. On chart 1 below they have been color-coded based on percent unemployed, adapted from Policy Map's categorizations: Green is less than 1 percent, yellow is between 1 and 7 percent, and red is greater than 7 percent.

Chart 9 - Policy Map unemployment estimates by Block Group

Census Tract	Block Group	% Unemployed
15	1	2.1
27	1	0
27	2	15.2
28	1	5.83
28	2	35.53
28	3	28.32
30	1	26.4
30	2	2.56

These numbers however paint an incomplete picture of how unemployment is spread throughout the neighborhood. The unemployment rates derived from the Census Data are based on estimates with varying and often large margins of error. In order to better isolate the population of working age adults in the region who are unable or unwilling to find work, it was necessary to view other metrics. Code S2301 on the Census Bureau website displays employment status data at the Census Tract level. Furthermore, it breaks down this data across age groups, using estimates to arrive at figures like Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) and Employment/ Population Ratio (EPOP). While these metrics are estimates, they still provide an idea of general trends along age groups and contextualize figures like the unemployment rate. The graphs below show the labor force participation rates of the included census tracts. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics," The labor force participation rate represents the number of people in the labor force as a percentage of the civilian noninstitutional population. In other words, the participation rate is the percentage of the population that is either working or actively looking for work." (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.)

The labor force participation rate is calculated as: (Labor Force ÷ Civilian Noninstitutional Population) x 100. The graphs below in Chart 10 are color coded based off of LFPR. Red means below 30, yellow is from 30 to 70, and green is 70 and above. The expected distribution of these graphs begins in red and ends in red (because of high school aged students and retirees) with a mix of yellow and green in the middle and a higher concentration of green in the 30-40 year old range. In Census Tract 15 you can see that the trend is relatively congruent with the expected distribution. All of these graphs more or less fit into this trend with slight fluctuations, like Census Tract 15 beginning with a yellow grouping and Census Tract 27 ending with one. While many of these differences can be contextualized through factors like types of employment, pursuit of higher education, and sample size, some trends do become apparent in the data. Census Tract 28 has a lower Labor force participation rate in the “working years” (20-64), with a heavy concentration of yellow in the middle of the graph.

Chart 10 - Labor Force Participation Rate

Census Tract 15	Age range	Labor Force Participation Rate	Census Tract 27	Age range	Labor Force Participation Rate
	16 to 19 years	62.4		16 to 19 years	14.8
	20 to 24 years	94.8		20 to 24 years	83.8
	25 to 29 years	75.7		25 to 29 years	90.7
	30 to 34 years	38.1		30 to 34 years	84
	35 to 44 years	79.5		35 to 44 years	77.1
	45 to 54 years	65.4		45 to 54 years	50.8
	55 to 59 years	68.3		55 to 59 years	80.3
	60 to 64 years	92.1		60 to 64 years	57.6
	65 to 74 years	21.9		65 to 74 years	26.7
	75 years and over	0		75 years and over	42.5
Census Tract 28	Age range	Labor Force Participation Rate	Census Tract 30	Age range	Labor Force Participation Rate

	16 to 19 years	0			16 to 19 years	-
	20 to 24 years	72.1			20 to 24 years	100
	25 to 29 years	89.1			25 to 29 years	100
	30 to 34 years	69.8			30 to 34 years	88.5
	35 to 44 years	48.3			35 to 44 years	95.1
	45 to 54 years	69.3			45 to 54 years	70.5
	55 to 59 years	55.6			55 to 59 years	34.3
	60 to 64 years	50.3			60 to 64 years	15.9
	65 to 74 years	24.1			65 to 74 years	29
	75 years and over	0			75 years and over	1.8

If you are to take an average of the LFPR in the working years then you can see this disparity more clearly. While Census Tract 15, 27, and 30 are more or less equiavalent in their average 28 is significantly lower. This means that a higher rate of working age residents are not employed in Census tract 28, a fact which can be reflected in the median income of the census tracts.

Chart 11 - LFPR average in working years

Census Tract	LFPR Average In working years
15	73.41
27	74.9
28	64.92
30	72.04

Another important metric for measuring employment is the Employment/ Population rate (EPOP). According to the Economic Policy institute, EPOP "shows the number of people currently employed as a share of the total working-age population, which is the number of civilian, non-institutionalized persons, age 16 and over. This measure does not typically change dramatically from month to month, but even minor changes help identify which segments of the population are experiencing the most job loss or gain."(Economic Policy Institute, n.d.)

They further expound on the benefits, stating, "The employment-to-population ratio, because it is unaffected by voluntary changes in labor force participation, is a useful indicator of current labor market conditions. Lows in the employment-to- population ratio correspond with economic downturns. The employment-to-population ratio holds clear and discernible implications for the labor market, both among and between segments of the population." (Economic Policy Institute, n.d.). The ratio gives a broad view of employment in an area and combined with the data's age breakdown, it can give an idea of how different age groups are experiencing employment.

Chart 12 - EPOP

Census Tract 15		Employment/Population Rate		Census Tract 27		Employment/Population Rate
	16 to 19 years	0			16 to 19 years	14.8
	20 to 24 years	94.8			20 to 24 years	83.8
	25 to 29 years	51.4			25 to 29 years	71.7

	30 to 34 years	17.9		30 to 34 years	84
	35 to 44 years	77.1		35 to 44 years	77.1
	45 to 54 years	52.6		45 to 54 years	50.8
	55 to 59 years	68.3		55 to 59 years	56.4
	60 to 64 years	92.1		60 to 64 years	57.6
	65 to 74 years	21.9		65 to 74 years	26.7
	75 years and over	0		75 years and over	42.5
Census Tract 28		Employment/Population Rate	Census Tract 30		Employment/Population Rate
	16 to 19 years	0		16 to 19 years	-
	20 to 24 years	59.6		20 to 24 years	100
	25 to 29 years	72.9		25 to 29 years	100
	30 to 34 years	69.8		30 to 34 years	79.8
	35 to 44 years	41.7		35 to 44 years	87.8

	45 to 54 years	55.3			45 to 54 years	70.5
	55 to 59 years	55.6			55 to 59 years	24.3
	60 to 64 years	17.4			60 to 64 years	15.9
	65 to 74 years	24.1			65 to 74 years	29
	75 years and over	0			75 years and over	1.8

The data in Chart 3 is color coded based on the same system as LFPR. For example, in Census Tract 27 84 percent of 30 to 34 year olds are employed. With both EPOP and LFPR the data is based on estimates so the exact figures can vary significantly based on their margin of error. However, they still provide an idea of trends in different Census Tracts and when aggregated together with metrics like the unemployment rate they can give an idea about the state of employment within an area. It is also important to note both the similarities and differences between the LFPR and EPOP figures. The LFPR figures are higher or the same in all cases since it includes those looking for work but not currently employed. To get a better understanding of the differences between the two they have been laid side by side in Graph 4 with their corresponding employment rates.

Chart 13 (LFPR EPOP Comparison)

Census Tract 15		LFPR	EPOP	Unemployment
	16 to 19 years	62.4	0	100

	20 to 24 years	94.8	94.8	0
	25 to 29 years	75.7	51.4	32.1
	30 to 34 years	38.1	17.9	52.9
	35 to 44 years	79.5	77.1	3
	45 to 54 years	65.4	52.6	19.7
	55 to 59 years	68.3	68.3	0
	60 to 64 years	92.1	92.1	0
	65 to 74 years	21.9	21.9	0
	75 years +	0	0	-
				-
Census Tract 27		LFPR	EPOP	Unemployment
	16 to 19 years	14.8	14.8	0
	20 to 24 years	83.8	83.8	0
	25 to 29 years	90.7	71.7	21
	30 to 34 years	84	84	0
	35 to 44 years	77.1	77.1	0
	45 to 54 years	50.8	50.8	0
	55 to 59 years	80.3	56.4	29.8
	60 to 64 years	57.6	57.6	0
	65 to 74 years	26.7	26.7	0
	75 years +	42.5	42.5	0
Census Tract 28		LFPR	EPOP	Unemployment
	16 to 19 years	0	0	-
	20 to 24 years	72.1	59.6	17.3
	25 to 29 years	89.1	72.9	18.2
	30 to 34 years	69.8	69.8	0
	35 to 44 years	48.3	41.7	13.7
	45 to 54 years	69.3	55.3	20.2
	55 to 59 years	55.6	55.6	0

	60 to 64 years	50.3	17.4	65.4
	65 to 74 years	24.1	24.1	0
	75 years +	0	0	-
Census Tract 30		LFPR	EPOP	Unemployment
	16 to 19 years	-	-	
	20 to 24 years	100	100	0
	25 to 29 years	100	100	0
	30 to 34 years	88.5	79.8	9.8
	35 to 44 years	95.1	87.8	7.7
	45 to 54 years	70.5	70.5	0
	55 to 59 years	34.3	24.3	29.2
	60 to 64 years	15.9	15.9	0
	65 to 74 years	29	29	0
	75 years +	1.8	1.8	0

When viewing the data it is important to see where LFPR are the same and differ. In areas with an estimate of 0 percent unemployment the metrics are the same because all people who are actively looking for jobs are also employed.

Through analyzing Policy Map's unemployment rate based on block group, the Census Tract data on unemployment rates, LFPR and EPOP, specific trends became noticeable in the data. The first and most obvious trend that presented itself was the discrepancy between census Tract 28 and the rest of the neighborhood. Across all metrics, the area lagged behind other Census Tracts, especially in the working years. On the Policy Map, unemployment estimates all Block Groups within Census Tract 28 had double digit rates of unemployment even going as high as 35.53 percent. When measuring LFPR and

EPOP Census Tract 28 had a high concentration of yellow and red within the working years whereas the other census tracts were primarily green intermingled with yellow. However, it is also important to note the variance even within Census Tracts. There is a 609 percent increase in unemployment between Block Group 1 and 2 in Census Tract 28. Furthermore, in Census Tract 30, there is a 1031 percent difference between block groups 1 and 2. The unemployment data points to the high degree of economic diversity even within Census Tracts. It is important to view the data at a block group level because of trends that can be overlooked in the Census Tracts.

Additionally, in order to track changes in employment over time it is important to compare the figures from 2023 to earlier years. This gives an idea of how the neighborhoods employment opportunities are changing. The same metrics from 2015 and 2018 are displayed below besides the 2023 data in Chart 14 (Appendix). Through analyzing the data on changes over time several trends begin to present themselves. Between 2018 and 2023 Census Tract 15 has a steady increase in LFPR and a slight decrease in EPOP which can be attributed to the steep decline in 16- to 19-year-olds working. This change can be viewed as more teenagers attending higher education institutions which would decrease the amount employed. This decline however is mediated by the significant increase in employed 20–24-year-olds which would coincide with students finishing a 4 year degree and entering the workforce. The employment rates of residents 60+ also increased especially within the 60-64 age range. This trend could have positive or negative ramifications based on the interpretation. This shift could be due to an increase in the median age of the region, increased job satisfaction and a desire to keep working, or the inability to retire because of financial circumstances. When analyzing the data between 2015 and 2023, many of the same trends are present. LFPR and EPOP both increase with a concentration in 60+ years and they fall within the 16–19-year-old range but pick back up for 20–24-year-olds. Overall, between 2015, 2018, and 2023 5-year census estimates there has been a decline in 16–19-year-olds working, an increase in 60+ residents working, and overall an increase in employment over time. These facts combined with the relatively low unemployment rate for block group 1 paint a positive picture for the employment opportunities in Census Tract 15 and more specifically, block group 1 which is located within Binghampton.

In census Tract 27 between 2015 and 2023 several similar trends are present. There is a decrease in EPOP and LFPR for 16–19-year-olds and a significant increase between 20–44-year-olds. Additionally, there is a sharp increase in EPOP and LFPR for 65+ year olds. One important change to examine the difference between LFPR and EPOP for 55–59-year-olds in 2023. LFPR is 80.3 and EPOP is 56.4. This discrepancy means a high percentage of this age group is actively looking for work. While in the early 20 range, this trend might be easily explained by young adults trying to find work, this age range is firmly between working and retirement age and could be a cause for concern. While the 2015-2023 data is more or less similar to Census Tract 15 the data between 2018 and 2023 has different implications. While between 2015-2023 there was a general increase in employment outcomes these numbers fell between 2018 and 2023. Census Tract 27 has an average decline of 9.1 for LFPR and 10.14 for EPOP which is far and away the highest decline for any period in the data. Across nearly every age group with the exception of 35- to 44-year-olds both LFPR and EPOP declined. Part of the declining metrics are due to the decline in 16–19-year-olds working and the numbers for 20–24-year-olds are relatively stable. However, the decline across all age groups including 65+ residents points to recent employment issues. Furthermore, in the 25-29- and 55–59-year-old age groups the difference in LFPR and EPOP points to an increased number of people looking for work but unable to find it. While between 2015-2023 the employment trends in block group 27 are mostly positive, the recent decline in LFPR and EPOP point to recent struggles. This could be due in large part to the effects of Covid on the workforce and it is important to analyze the industry breakdown to see what job industries might be facing an employment crisis.

In Census Tract 28 from 2018-2023 the metrics reveal a fairly positive narrative. Overall, despite a decline in LFPR and EPOP for 16–19-year-olds, there has been an increase for most age groups and there has not been a steep decline except for 75+ residents. From 2015-2023 there was an overall declining pattern in the metrics between ages 16-45 with a sharp decline in the amount of 16–19-year-olds working accompanied with a similar decline in 65+ residents. Due to the variability between years and age groups EPOP and LFPR did not produce any consistent trends or patterns. Instead, it was important to evaluate how the unemployment rate changed over time.

In Census Tract 30 from 2018 to 2023 the metrics paint a positive picture of employment opportunities. Between ages 20-55 both LFPR and EPOP both increase to favorable numbers. There is a decline in 60–64-year-olds working and a slight increase in subsequent age groups but for the most part the rates remain high. From 2015-2023 LFPR and EPOP portray similarly positive trends. Employment is up across the majority of age groups with the only real decline occurring in the 55+ age category. Rates only drop to a red categorization in the 60+ age group which more or less coincides with retirement age. Likewise, to Census Tract 28 it was important to see the unemployment rate for a comprehensive breakdown on some of the trends in the neighborhood.
In order to better understand these trends, it was crucial to view unemployment data from the US Census. The unemployment rates across 2015,2018, and 2023 are displayed in Chart 15 (appendix).

Chart 15 (Unemployment Rates 2015, 2018, 2023)

Census Tract 15	Age range	2015	2018	2023
	16 to 19 years	0	0	100
	20 to 24 years	45.7	0	0
	25 to 29 years	43.2	6.7	32.1
	30 to 34 years	45	15.2	52.9
	35 to 44 years	19.4	0	3
	45 to 54 years	8.3	8.9	19.7
	55 to 59 years	0	0	0
	60 to 64 years	0	0	0
	65 to 74 years	28	0	0
	75 years +	0	-	-
Census Tract 27	Age range	2015	2018	2023

	16 to 19 years	0	35.1	0
	20 to 24 years	0	0	0
	25 to 29 years	5.4	0	21
	30 to 34 years	0	0	0
	35 to 44 years	11.8	0	0
	45 to 54 years	14	10.8	0
	55 to 59 years	0	0	29.8
	60 to 64 years	15.4	0	0
	65 to 74 years	0	0	0
	75 years +	0	0	0
Census Tract 28	Age range	2015	2018	2023
	16 to 19 years	17.8	56.3	-
	20 to 24 years	36.1	48.3	17.3
	25 to 29 years	0	0	18.2
	30 to 34 years	20.9	37.7	0
	35 to 44 years	8.2	8.3	13.7
	45 to 54 years	11.4	0	20.2
	55 to 59 years	0	20.6	0
	60 to 64 years	11.2	0	65.4
	65 to 74 years	0	0	0
	75 years +	0	0	-
Census Tract 30	Age range	2015	2018	2023
	16 to 19 years	37.5	100	-
	20 to 24 years	35.9	9.9	0
	25 to 29 years	33.8	38.3	0
	30 to 34 years	0	0	9.8
	35 to 44 years	5	8.7	7.7
	45 to 54 years	4.9	12.8	0
	55 to 59 years	0	0	29.2
	60 to 64 years	0	0	0

	65 to 74 years	0	0	0
	75 years +	0	0	0

The unemployment rates can help paint an important picture of what age groups are employed and what groups are not searching for work. In Census Tract 15 there has been a steady drop since 2015 in 65+ residents looking for work. Additionally, 30–34-year-olds and 45–54-year-olds have seen increased unemployment rates. There is a reported 100 percent unemployment for 2023 in the 16–19-year-old range but the statistic has a 46.6 margin of error. Despite this however, the rate is still a sharp increase from previous years and points to a problematic change. In Census Tract 27, unemployment is down for almost every age range except for 25-29- and 55–59-year-olds. For Census Tract 28 unemployment has increased in the 25-29, 35-44,45-54-, and 60–64-year-old range since 2015. In Census Tract 30 unemployment has fallen across almost every age group with the notable exception of 55–59-year-olds where it increased exceptionally.

In order to contextualize these trends, it is necessary to see how employment by occupation has changed over time. Below, in Graph 7, are the estimates of occupations in 2015,2018, and 2023. From the data we can see that in Census Tract 15 between 2015 and 2023 the working population as a whole increased. Transportation, warehousing, and utilities was the industry group that increased the most with a 277.3 percent increase. In Census Tract 27 the population did the reverse, falling over time since 2015. Most industries saw a decrease in workers with the notable exception of educational services, and health care and social assistance which saw a 52.5 percent increase over time. In Census Tract 28, the working population declined slightly over time with a large dip in 2018. The industries with the biggest increase in employment were construction and manufacturing with a 810 and 75 percent increase respectively. In Census Tract 30 the working population fell over time and the industries with the largest increase in workers were manufacturing and wholesale trade with a 415.8 and a 100 percent increase respectively with the biggest decline in professional, scientific, management and waste services with a decline of 57.91 percent.

With the change in EPOP, LFPR, unemployment, and occupation data over time it is possible to start exploring the connections behind these metrics and theorize what trends are occurring in Binghampton. In Census Tract 15, by looking at EPOP and LFPR the metrics reveal that there has been a decline in 16–19-year-olds working, an increase in 60+ residents working, and overall, an increase in employment over time. The unemployment breakdown reveals that there has been a decline since 2015 in 65+ unemployment and we can contend that although a higher rate of 60+ residents are working, they are struggling less to find employment. On the other hand, 30–34-year-olds and 45–54-year-olds have seen increased unemployment rates, a trend which is reflected in the decline in EPOP data. In those age ranges, there is a similar decline between 2015 in LFPR, especially for the 30–34-year-old age range. Another group that is struggling with employment is the 16–19-year-old age range. Unemployment rates were reported at 0 for 2015-2018 with a sharp uptick to 100 in 2023. This change can also be seen in the discrepancy between LFPR and EPOP which captures the individuals actively looking for work but not employed. In 2023 the Census reported an LFPR of 62.4 and an EPOP of 0. On average however, there are improving metrics since 2015 with LFPR and EPOP both increasing with notable increases in the 20-24, 35-44, and 60-64. However, it also must be noted that on average these improvements could be skewed by the increase in the 60-64 range which reported an increase in both LFPR and EPOP of 57.3. The equivalence of these numbers compared with zero percent unemployment paint an overwhelmingly positive view of the employment stability for this age range, the increase in 60+ employment is a national trend. This fact makes it important to view the other ranges in isolation so as not to overlook trends that might be obscured by this 60+ increase.

While the uptick in 20–24-year-old employment somewhat offsets the decline in the 16–19-year-old range, the decline in the 30-34- and 45–54-year-old ranges points to potential problems. One reason behind the changes is a decline in labor force participation. In the 30–34-year-old range, the difference between the 2015 LFPR and EPOP was 26.1 while the difference between the 2023 LFPR and EPOP was 20.2. For 45–54-year-olds the difference between 2015 and 2023 LFPR and EPOP was 5.9 and 12.8 respectively. The similarity between these differences reveals that rather than there being a specific decline in people being able to find work, labor force participation in general had decreased. In order to analyze why labor force participation declined, it is important to look at the most common industries in the Census Tract. Since 2015 there has been an increase in the total number of employed civilians. This is a unique feature to Census Tract 15 since 27,28, and 30 have all declined since 2015. The industry with the biggest growth was transportation, warehousing and utilities with a 277.3 percent increase. Similarly there was a significant increase in construction, especially between 2015-2018 and a 100 percent increase in manufacturing since 2023.

Education and health care services declined by 41 percent and retail and wholesale trade also lost workers over time. Overall Census Tract 15 has seen some decline in labor force participation but has positive employment opportunities on average. While unemployment has risen in a few age groups on average it has declined and the increase in workers gives a positive view of the economy in this region.

In Census Tract 27 between 2015-2023, the LFPR and EPOP data shows a general increase in employment outcomes. However, in the short-term numbers fell between 2018 and 2023. Census Tract 27 has an average decline of 9.1 for LFPR and 10.14 for EPOP which is far and away the highest decline for any period in the data. Across nearly every age group with the exception of 35- to 44-year-olds both LFPR and EPOP decreased. The fact that this decline included 65+ residents points to widespread employment issues. To see whether the decrease in LFPR and EPOP reflected a decrease in available employment or labor participation, it is important to compare the changes in the metrics. Graph 5 shows that between 2018 and 2023 LFPR is down on average 9.1 and EPOP is down 10.14. Additionally, it is important to see the difference between LFPR and EPOP within 2018 and 2023 since there is such a significant discrepancy. These differences are displayed in Graph 8 below.

Chart 17 (Differences in LFPR and EPOP)

2018 Census Tract 27				2023 Census Tract 27		
LFPR	EPOP	Difference		LFPR	EPOP	Difference
69.8	45.3	24.5		14.8	14.8	0
84.4	84.4	0		83.8	83.8	0
92.6	92.6	0		90.7	71.7	19
92.2	92.2	0		84	84	0

62.5	62.5	0	77.1	77.1	0
73.7	65.7	8	50.8	50.8	0
85.6	85.6	0	80.3	56.4	23.9
57	57	0	57.6	57.6	0
35.3	35.3	0	26.7	26.7	0
46.2	46.2	0	42.5	42.5	0

The similarity between the decreases in LFPR and EPOP show that labor force participation on average is down. Additionally, the similarity in both 2018 and 2023 between these metrics reveals that most people looking for work are able to find it. This sentiment is supported by the unemployment breakdown, where unemployment is low in most age groups with the exception of 25-29- and 55–59-year-olds.

Despite this, however, the sharp decline in labor force participation is not captured by the unemployment rate. To understand what might be causing these recent shifts, it is important to look at the most common occupations in the Census Tract. Three categories employ 52 percent of Census Tract 28. These industries are professional and scientific services, education and health care, and arts, entertainment, and food services. Additionally, between 2015 and 2023 there was a 1233.33 percent increase in finance, insurance, and real estate. Wholesale trade dropped from 44 to 0 and information dropped from 15 to 0. Similarly manufacturing and retail trade dropped significantly. Overall, in Census Tract 27 there has been a decrease in blue collar work and an increase in traditionally higher paying white-collar jobs. The decline in manufacturing, retail, and wholesale trade could account for the decline in working 16–19-year-olds since many entry level jobs in those fields do not require bachelor's degrees. Furthermore, the uptick in 20–24-year-olds could be related to an influx of educators, health care workers, realtors, and insurance professionals who may have completed a bachelor's degree and are moving or returning to the neighborhood.

In Census Tract 28 LFPR and EPOP both decline over time. Between 2015-2023 LFPR declined on average by 4.28, a result that is partially due to the steep decline in 16–19-year-olds working. EPOP declines by 6.45 over time which is relatively close to LFPR. Despite these small decreases since 2015, it's important to note that Census Tract 28 is the only Census Tract with a negative average change in LFPR or EPOP. Furthermore, while the average does not portray a large decrease, individual age groups show substantial declines. LFPR for 30–34-year-olds declined 30.2 and declined 20 for 35- to 44-year-olds. These numbers are unusually high especially over such a long period of time. Furthermore 30-44 is a time when employment is expected for most of the population since higher education is over for most and it is generally too early for retirement. For EPOP 30–34-year-olds saw a decrease of 9.3 and 35 to 44 year olds saw a decline of 21. In order to capture ongoing trends, it is important to compare drops in LFPR and drops in EPOP. Over time the decline in LFPR for 30–34-year-olds of 30.2 compared to the decline in this age range’s EPOP of 9.3 shows that over the time period labor force participation dropped significantly which often happens when people are unable to find employment for a long period of time. There is also a significant discrepancy between the metrics for 25–29-year-olds. LFPR declined 2.9 and EPOP declined 19.1. This shows that a high number of people are seeking work but unable to find it. Furthermore for 60–64-year-olds there was an increase in LFPR of 21.4 but a decline in EPOP of 8.2. This is one of the most troubling metrics since this indicates that many 60–64-year-olds are seeking out work but fewer are being employed. Although there is a national increase in 60+ employment, it is due to a variety of factors. However, in this case, the sudden increase in LFPR and its discrepancy with EPOP indicates that this drive for employment is more centered around economic need rather than the choice of many older residents to continue jobs they enjoy. Overall, the fact that employment issues are stretching across all age groups in Census Tract 28 points to very serious economic problems.

The unemployment rate data for Census Tract 28 shows that there are significant increases in unemployment for 25-29, 35-44,45-54, and 60-64. Additionally, falls in the unemployment rate can often be attributed to declines in labor force participation like for the 30–34-year-old range. This range saw increasing rates of unemployment since 2015 until eventually labor force participation dropped and along with it the unemployment rate. However, since 2018 LFPR and EPOP metrics appear to improve. Most age groups saw increases since 2018 and for the most part the discrepancy between LFPR and EPOP seemed to decline. Despite this however, rates are still down since 2015, and unemployment is still relatively high. To better contextualize these changes, it is important to view the occupation breakdown.

The occupation data paints a more hopeful picture of employment since the total number of employed people rebounded after a sharp decline between 2015-2018. This trend is visible across many different industries most notably finance, insurance, and real estate as well as education and health care. Construction, public administration, and manufacturing all saw significant growth from 2015, while wholesale trade, arts, entertainment, and recreation all markedly declined. For the latter, the effects of Covid could be a major contributor to the drop post 2018; however, it also experienced significant decline since 2015 which may indicate that the pandemic exacerbated existing problems. Overall, Census Tract 28 has experienced significant employment struggles since 2015 but has appeared to rebound slightly in recent years.

In Census Tract 30 LFPR and EPOP both increased on average between 2015-2023. Adults 55+ had some decline in both over time but there was no major discrepancy between the two metrics which indicates that most people looking for jobs were able to find them. These results were confirmed by the 2018-2023 comparison where both metrics increased on average over the time period. Unemployment dropped on average since 2015 especially for residents in their twenties. One alarming area was the increase in unemployment for 55-year-olds which was echoed by the EPOP and LFPR data. In order to understand these changes, it is important to view the occupation breakdown. Manufacturing and wholesale trade increased while finance, insurance, professional, and scientific fields all fell. This could indicate an increase in blue collar jobs and a move away from white collar work but the sample size especially for manufacturing and wholesale trade is too small to adequately make this claim. However, there does appear to be a level of economic stability in the area and the positive LFPR, EPOP, and unemployment data gives a positive picture of employment opportunities within this Census Tract.

Conclusion

In regard to the research question, gentrification does not appear to be a major driver behind shifts in unemployment rates in the majority of Binghampton since most of

Binghampton is not experiencing advanced levels of gentrification. However, within the area that is (Census Tract 27), gentrification and displacement do appear to be worsening unemployment. Census Tract 15 has had positive employment changes with increased displacement. Census Tract 27 has experienced a recent drop in labor force participation and is experiencing advanced gentrification. Census Tract 28 is undergoing displacement and has had negative employment changes that have improved somewhat in recent years. Census Tract 30 has experienced low levels of displacement and mostly positive employment opportunities.

Census Tracts 15 and 30 both are experiencing positive employment metrics and have seen some increase in displacement but are by no means fully gentrified.
In Census Tract 28, unemployment rates are on average much higher in this Census Tract and median income has declined sharply between 2013 and 2018. The Census Tract has been experiencing significant economic difficulties both pre-pandemic and post-pandemic and lags behind the other regions in terms of economic growth. The drop and rebound of employment in Census Tract 28 exist independently from changes in demographic displacement and housing costs. Census Tract 28 is experiencing widespread economic difficulties which cannot be attributed to gentrification. Census Tract 28 has seen a decline in median income and housing costs which are not indicators of gentrification. Segregation research has argued for years that investors and White households are hesitant to move into Black and Brown neighborhoods without the promise of massive restructuring (Krysan and Crowder 2017). This quote is especially relevant to Census Tract 28 since much of the speculation over gentrification

rides on the assumption that wealthier white homeowners want to buy real estate. Due to the history of segregation and racial inequality this assumption often falls short in majority POC and low-income areas.

Census Tract 27 is the only Census Tract in which gentrification appears to have worsened employment outcomes significantly. I believe that this connection can be drawn because of several reasons. The first is that there are rising home costs, median income, and an increase in displacement which together are a good indicator of gentrification. This is occurring at the same time in which labor force participation is dropping significantly. While these too by themselves could be independently caused I believe that because there has been a significant shift from blue collar to white collar jobs that this points to gentrification. Furthermore, unemployment rates are concentrated within the late 20’s and late 50’s age groups which previously had very low rates of unemployment. This implies that people are losing their jobs in areas like construction and manufacturing, which could be due to the changing job landscape and demand for certain jobs. Additionally, areas like construction and manufacturing have flourished in other tracts like Census Tract 15, which indicates that the industries themselves are not necessarily declining. This points to either a changing job landscape in Census Tract 27 or displacement of people in blue collar jobs.

During this research, one issue became apparent towards the end of the data collection. Due to the complexity of an issue like gentrification, there is a substantial need for more qualitative data. Several trends that were spoken about in interviews like increasing housing prices were not fully captured in Census data. Although Census data is largely considered to be the most accurate source for demographic information, it fails to capture issues due to inaccurate data collection and timing problems. This is why UDP includes a community response section. In general, however, a heavy exploration of qualitative data is necessary to capture many of the nuances that cannot be described in the Census. Issues like undocumented individuals not being counted in the data, displacement, and specific instances of gentrification (like new developers evicting tenets) are invisible within data sets. For this reason, to better understand these trends, a more qualitative approach might better capture the nuance of this multifaceted issue. Finally, within a city like Memphis with a strong history of segregation and racial economic inequality, gentrification studies often fail to capture future developments. UDP states in regard to issues within its Memphis study. Memphis SPARCC affiliates did not agree with this categorization, however, saying that shifts in housing price in these areas may not signal the type of change typical to gentrification in large metros like Atlanta, Chicago, and Denver. Instead, they noted that persistent racial prejudice and economic decline serve as a sort of stopgap in the process. This points to the fact that, while we attempted to be responsive to local conditions, our methodology may still cater to cities with more dynamic housing markets and growing economies. In addition, our maps may be too agnostic to the effects of persistent racial bias on gentrification and displacement pressures and processes, specifically in southern cities where hyper-racialized geographies are rooted in legacies of Jim Crow segregation. (SPARCC & Urban Displacement Project affiliates, n.d.)

The persistence of discriminatory economic and housing practices can often halt the flow of gentrification and is a necessary factor to consider. Furthermore, unless there has been massive restructuring, white homeowners often do not move into majority black and brown neighborhoods as was theorized by Krysan and Krowder. Whether or not Binghampton gentrifies in coming years is difficult to predict and cannot be accurately estimated using previously established models. The history of discrimination within the city impedes the linear progress that these models often assume. Due to this facet, gentrification metrics in a city like Memphis can only be so accurate and often reality falls short of these overestimated predictions. For future neighborhood-level research, an exhaustive quantitative approach may be more effective for analyzing future changes.

However, it must be noted that the significant rise in gentrification risk factors in Census Tract 27 and the new development in Census Tract 15 are a cause for concern in the neighborhood. The rapid onset of displacement, rising median income, and rise in job loss are all troubling factors that indicate the potential rise of gentrification in Binghampton. While community organizations have had some success, if gentrification spreads from Census Tract 27, many historic residents may be displaced in the coming years and be forced out of the neighborhood they have resided in for generations. It is crucial to not only predict these warning signs and try to halt the spread of this issue but also recognize how it is negatively affecting the employment opportunities of residents. So long as the idea that gentrification is beneficial to employment continues, there may not be the community-wide push to try and keep housing affordable. Due to the complexity of this issue, it requires significant resistance from not only the community but policymakers who may not feel motivated unless confronted with the realities of gentrification. Although many scholars argue that gentrification can improve employment, and while it often can be based on raw data, the reality is that in order for gentrification to be successful it relies on the displacement of lower-income and, often times, minority residents. Since they are forced out of the neighborhood, data like median income may increase, but this is at the expense of many historic residents who have lived in these neighborhoods for generations. It is vital that this negative correlation between gentrification and unemployment is recognized or else the rest of Binghampton may follow the path of Census Tract 27.

References

Atkinson, R. (2000). Measuring gentrification and displacement in Greater London. *Urban Studies, 37*(1), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098002339

Broad Avenue Arts District. (n.d.). *History* [Web page]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.broadavearts.com/history

Chapple, K., & Zuk, M. (2016). Forewarned. *Cityscape, 18*(3), 109–130. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26328361

Eviction Lab. (2020). *Eviction tracking system: Version 2.0 – Memphis, TN* [Data report]. Eviction Lab, Princeton University. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://evictionlab.org/eviction-tracking/memphis-tn/

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (n.d.). *Survey shows weakening conditions for economic mobility in Eighth District* [PDF]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.stlouisfed.org/-/media/project/frbstl/stlouisfed/files/pdfs/community%20development/econ%20mobility/sessions/meltzerpaper508.pdf

Hyland, S., & Maurette, K. (2010). Developing poverty reform efforts in the Memphis region: Lessons for an engaged anthropology. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development, 39*(3), 213–264. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40553707

Martin, A. (2024, May 17). *Gentrification as a housing problem*. *Works in Progress*. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://worksinprogress.co/issue/gentrification-as-a-housing-problem/

Rowland, A. (2000). Measuring gentrification and displacement in Greater London. *Urban Studies, 37*(1), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098002339

Schwirian, K. P. (1983). Models of neighborhood change. *Annual Review of Sociology, 9*, 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.000503

Shiskin, J., & Stein, R. L. (1975). Problems in measuring unemployment. *Monthly Labor Review, 98*(8), 3–10. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41841341

U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: B02001 – Race* [Data table]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2013.B02001?q=B02001&g=1500000US47157

0015001,471570027001,471570027002,471570028001,471570028002,471570028003,471570030001,471570030002,471570030003

U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: B19013 – Median Household Income* [Data table]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2013.B19013?q=B19013&g=1500000US471570015001,471570027001,471570027002,471570028001,471570028002,471570028003,471570030001,471570030002,471570030003

U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: S2301 – Employment Status* [Data table]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2015.S2301?q=S2301&g=1400000US47157001500,47157002700,47157002800,47157003000

U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). *2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: S2405 – Industry by Occupation for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over* [Data table]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2021.S2405

U.S. Census Bureau. (2025). *2022 Vintage 2022 Census Tract Population Estimates (VT_2022_040_00_PP_D1)* [Map]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/map?layer=VT_2022_040_00_PP_D1&loc=43.3751,-113.1138,z2.6270

Urban Displacement Project. (2021). *Memphis – Gentrification and displacement* [Map]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.urbandisplacement.org/maps/memphis-gentrification-and-displacement/

Vigdor, J. L., Massey, D. S., & Rivlin, A. M. (2002). Does gentrification harm the poor? [With comments]. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 133–182. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25067372

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2025, July 23). *Memphis, TN–MS–AR Economy at a Glance*. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.tn_memphis_msa.htm

Meltzer, R., & Ghorbani, P. (2017). Does gentrification increase employment opportunities in low-income neighborhoods? *Regional Science and Urban Economics, 66*, 52–73.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *Labor force participation rate*. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.bls.gov/cps/lfcharacteristics.htm#participation

Economic Policy Institute. (n.d.). *Employment-to-population ratio* [Definition]. Retrieved July 25, 2025, from https://www.epi.org/newsroom/useful_definitions/

Appendix

Chart 8 (ACS - Race)

white alone	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
	15	1	137	183	46	33.57664234
	27	1	437	632	195	44.62242563
	27	2	437	549	112	25.62929062
	28	1	495	475	-20	-4.04040404
	28	2	68	50	-18	-26.47058824
	28	3	0	0	0	
	30	1	0	62	62	
	30	2	406	431	25	6.157635468
Black or African American	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
alone	15	1	602	440	-162	-26.910299
	27	1	64	247	183	285.9375
	27	2	1451	236	-1215	-83.73535493

	28	1	1254	785	-469	-37.40031898
	28	2	600	487	-113	-18.83333333
	28	3	1240	864	-376	-30.32258065
	30	1	933	471	-462	-49.51768489
	30	2	562	435	-127	-22.59786477
American Indian Or Alaska	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
Native alone	15	1	0	82	82	
	27	1	0	0	0	
	27	2	0	0	0	
	28	1	0	0	0	
	28	2	0	0	0	
	28	3	0	0	0	
	30	1	0	0	0	
	30	2	0	0	0	
Asian Alone	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
	15	1	0	15	15	

	27	1	14	11	-3	-21.42857143
	27	2	31	6	-25	-80.64516129
	28	1	0	76	76	
	28	2	0	0	0	
	28	3	0	0	0	
	30	1	0	0	0	
	30	2	0	0	0	
Native Hawaiian and other	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
Pacific Islander alone	15	1	0	0	0	
	27	1	0	0	0	
	27	2	0	0	0	
	28	1	0	0	0	
	28	2	0	0	0	
	28	3	0	0	0	
	30	1	0	0	0	
	30	2	0	0	0	

Some other race alone	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
	15	1	0	34	34	
	27	1	17	0	-17	-100
	27	2	0	8	8	
	28	1	28	278	250	892.8571429
	28	2	0	26	26	
	28	3	0	0	0	
	30	1	0	0	0	
	30	2	14	0	-14	-100
Two or more races	Census Tract	Block Group	2013	2023	change	percent change
	15	1	17	2	-15	-88.23529412
	27	1	38	7	-31	-81.57894737
	27	2	3	41	38	1266.666667
	28	1	0	0	0	
	28	2	5	0	-5	-100
	28	3	0	0	0	

	30	1	0	0	0	
	30	2	88	0	-88	-100

Chart 14 (LFPR and EPOP Comparison 2015, 2018, 2023)

Census Tract 15	Age range	LFPR 2018	LFPR 2023	Census Tract 15	
	16 to 19 years	40.3	62.4	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	73.4	94.8	2015	49.94
	25 to 29 years	82.9	75.7	2023	59.82
	30 to 34 years	57.5	38.1	average change	9.88
	35 to 44 years	69.5	79.5		
	45 to 54 years	69.3	65.4		
	55 to 59 years	42.9	68.3		
	60 to 64 years	47.6	92.1		
	65 to 74 years	16	21.9		
	75 years +	0	0		
Census Tract 27	Age range	LFPR 2018	LFPR 2023	Census Tract 27	
	16 to 19 years	69.8	14.8	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	84.4	83.8	2015	69.93
	25 to 29 years	92.6	90.7	2023	60.83
	30 to 34 years	92.2	84	average change	-9.1
	35 to 44 years	62.5	77.1		
	45 to 54 years	73.7	50.8		
	55 to 59 years	85.6	80.3		
	60 to 64 years	57	57.6		
	65 to 74 years	35.3	26.7		
	75 years +	46.2	42.5		
Census Tract 28	Age range	LFPR 2018	LFPR 2023	Census Tract 28	

	16 to 19 years	39.3	0	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	62.2	72.1	2018	49.06
	25 to 29 years	64.7	89.1	2023	47.86
	30 to 34 years	95.1	69.8	average change	-1.2
	35 to 44 years	42.9	48.3		
	45 to 54 years	69.5	69.3		
	55 to 59 years	34.7	55.6		
	60 to 64 years	50.8	50.3		
	65 to 74 years	8.2	24.1		
	75 years +	23.2	0		
Census Tract 30	Age range	LFPR 2018	LFPR 2023	Census Tract 28	
	16 to 19 years	15	-	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	62.9	100	2018	54.64
	25 to 29 years	89.9	100	2023	59.46
	30 to 34 years	72	88.5	average change	4.82
	35 to 44 years	63.5	95.1		
	45 to 54 years	65.2	70.5		
	55 to 59 years	61.4	34.3		
	60 to 64 years	47.4	15.9		
	65 to 74 years	27.3	29		
	75 years +	2.2	1.8		

Census Tract 15	Age range	EPOP 2018	EPOP 2023	Census Tract 15	
	16 to 19 years	40.3	0	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	73.4	94.8	2018	47.9
	25 to 29 years	77.3	51.4	2023	47.61
	30 to 34 years	48.8	17.9	average change	-0.29
	35 to 44 years	69.5	77.1		
	45 to 54 years	63.2	52.6		

	55 to 59 years	42.9	68.3		
	60 to 64 years	47.6	92.1		
	65 to 74 years	16	21.9		
	75 years +	0	0		
Census Tract 27	Age range	EPOP 2018	EPOP 2023	Census Tract 27	
	16 to 19 years	45.3	14.8	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	84.4	83.8	2018	66.68
	25 to 29 years	92.6	71.7	2023	56.54
	30 to 34 years	92.2	84	average change	-10.14
	35 to 44 years	62.5	77.1		
	45 to 54 years	65.7	50.8		
	55 to 59 years	85.6	56.4		
	60 to 64 years	57	57.6		
	65 to 74 years	35.3	26.7		
	75 years +	46.2	42.5		
Census Tract 28	Age range	EPOP 2018	EPOP 2023	Census Tract 28	
	16 to 19 years	17.2	0	LFPR Average	
	20 to 24 years	32.2	59.6	2018	39.19
	25 to 29 years	64.7	72.9	2023	39.64
	30 to 34 years	59.3	69.8	average change	0.45
	35 to 44 years	39.3	41.7		
	45 to 54 years	69.5	55.3		
	55 to 59 years	27.5	55.6		
	60 to 64 years	50.8	17.4		
	65 to 74 years	8.2	24.1		
	75 years +	23.2	0		
Census Tract 30	Age range	EPOP 2018	EPOP 2023	Census Tract 30	
	16 to 19 years	0	-	LFPR Average	

	20 to 24 years	56.7	100	2018	48.59
	25 to 29 years	55.5	100	2023	56.57
	30 to 34 years	72	79.8	average change	7.98
	35 to 44 years	58	87.8		
	45 to 54 years	56.8	70.5		
	55 to 59 years	61.4	24.3		
	60 to 64 years	47.4	15.9		
	65 to 74 years	27.3	29		
	75 years +	2.2	1.8		

Census Tract 15	Age range	LFPR 2015	LFPR 2023	change	average change		Census Tract 15	Age range	EPOP 2015	EPOP 2023	change	average change
	16 to 19 years	42.3	62.4	20.1	11.08			16 to 19 years	42.3	0	-42.3	10.44
	20 to 24 years	81.8	94.8	13				20 to 24 years	44.4	94.8	50.4	

	25 to 29 years	74.7	75.7	1			25 to 29 years	42.4	51.4	9	
	30 to 34 years	58	38.1	-19.9			30 to 34 years	31.9	17.9	-14	
	35 to 44 years	50.7	79.5	28.8			35 to 44 years	40.9	77.1	36.2	
	45 to 54 years	71.5	65.4	-6.1			45 to 54 years	65.6	52.6	-13	
	55 to	52.9	68.3	15.4			55 to	52.9	68.3	15.4	

	59 years						59 years				
	60 to 64 years	34.8	92.1	57.3			60 to 64 years	34.8	92.1	57.3	
	65 to 74 years	15	21.9	6.9			65 to 74 years	10.8	21.9	11.1	
	75 years +	5.7	0	-5.7			75 years +	5.7	0	-5.7	
Census Tract 27	Age range	LFPR 2015	LFPR 2023	change	average change	Census Tract 27	Age range	EPOP 2015	EPOP 2023	change	average change
	16 to	31.7	14.8	-16.9	7.76		16 to	31.7	14.8	-16.9	6.74

	19 years						19 years				
	20 to 24 years	68.1	83.8	15.7			20 to 24 years	68.1	83.8	15.7	
	25 to 29 years	87.1	90.7	3.6			25 to 29 years	82.4	71.7	-10.7	
	30 to 34 years	66	84	18			30 to 34 years	66	84	18	
	35 to 44	63.3	77.1	13.8			35 to 44	55.9	77.1	21.2	

	years						years				
	45 to 54 years	72.2	50.8	-21.4			45 to 54 years	62.1	50.8	-11.3	
	55 to 59 years	46.4	80.3	33.9			55 to 59 years	46.4	56.4	10	
	60 to 64 years	68.4	57.6	-10.8			60 to 64 years	57.9	57.6	-0.3	
	65 to 74 years	9.8	26.7	16.9			65 to 74 years	9.8	26.7	16.9	

	75 years +	17.7	42.5	24.8			75 years +	17.7	42.5	24.8	
Census Tract 28	Age range	LFPR 2015	LFPR 2023	change	average change	Census Tract 28	Age range	EPOP 2015	EPOP 2023	change	average change
	16 to 19 years	22.6	0	-22.6	-4.28		16 to 19 years	18.6	0	-18.6	-6.45
	20 to 24 years	55.5	72.1	16.6			20 to 24 years	35.5	59.6	24.1	
	25 to 29 years	92	89.1	-2.9			25 to 29 years	92	72.9	-19.1	

	30 to 34 years	100	69.8	-30.2				30 to 34 years	79.1	69.8	-9.3	
	35 to 44 years	68.3	48.3	-20				35 to 44 years	62.7	41.7	-21	
	45 to 54 years	59.7	69.3	9.6				45 to 54 years	52.9	55.3	2.4	
	55 to 59 years	44.5	55.6	11.1				55 to 59 years	44.5	55.6	11.1	
	60 to	28.8	50.3	21.5				60 to	25.6	17.4	-8.2	

	64 years						64 years				
	65 to 74 years	36.1	24.1	-12			65 to 74 years	36.1	24.1	-12	
	75 years +	13.9	0	-13.9			75 years +	13.9	0	-13.9	
Census Tract 30	Age range	LFPR 2015	LFPR 2023	change	average	Census Tract 30	Age range	EPOP 2015	EPOP 2023	change	average change
	16 to 19 years	12.6	-		1.577777778		16 to 19 years	7.9	-		5.711111111
	20 to	70.1	100	29.9			20 to	44.9	100	55.1	

	24 years						24 years				
	25 to 29 years	90.7	100	9.3			25 to 29 years	60	100	40	
	30 to 34 years	77	88.5	11.5			30 to 34 years	77	79.8	2.8	
	35 to 44 years	69.1	95.1	26			35 to 44 years	65.6	87.8	22.2	
	45 to 54	78.1	70.5	-7.6			45 to 54	74.3	70.5	-3.8	

	years						years				
	55 to 59 years	73.2	34.3	-38.9			55 to 59 years	73.2	24.3	-48.9	
	60 to 64 years	24.2	15.9	-8.3			60 to 64 years	24.2	15.9	-8.3	
	65 to 74 years	36.6	29	-7.6			65 to 74 years	36.6	29	-7.6	
	75 years +	1.9	1.8	-0.1			75 years +	1.9	1.8	-0.1	

Chart 16 (Employment by Industry)

Census Tract 15	Industry	2015	2018	2023
1	Civilian employed population 16 years and over	476	654	667
2	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0	0	0
3	Construction	8	53	59
4	Manufacturing	16	23	32
5	Wholesale trade	12	23	3
6	Retail trade	58	57	44
7	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	44	105	166
8	Information	5	2	0
9	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	43	22	36
10	Professional, scientific, and management	35	79	58
	and waste management services			
11	Educational services, and health care and social assistance	97	141	57
12	Arts,entertainment, and recreation	93	99	107
	and accomdations and food services			
13	Other services, except public administration	21	19	79
14	Public administration	44	31	26
Census Tract 27	Industry	2015	2018	2023
1	Civilian employed population 16 years and over	955	1170	804
2	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0	0	0
3	Construction	85	95	71
4	Manufacturing	61	111	47
5	Wholesale trade	44	36	0
6	Retail trade	184	152	71
7	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	52	144	82
8	Information	15	15	0
9	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	3	9	40
10	Professional, scientific, and management	95	82	134

	and waste management services			
11	Educational services, and health care and social assistance	99	179	151
12	Arts,entertainment, and recreation	194	179	134
	and accommodations and food services			
13	Other services, except public administration	65	91	18
14	Public administration	58	77	56
Census Tract 28	Industry	2015	2018	2023
1	Civilian employed population 16 years and over	1134	834	1013
2	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0	0	0
3	Construction	10	11	91
4	Manufacturing	48	42	84
5	Wholesale trade	85	29	0
6	Retail trade	183	178	168
7	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	83	74	87
8	Information	21	23	0
9	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	25	41	58
10	Professional, scientific, and management	79	117	112
	and waste management services			
11	Educational services, and health care and social assistance	315	125	185
12	Arts,entertainment, and recreation	189	108	58
	and accomdations and food services			
13	Other services, except public administration	61	39	104
14	Public administration	35	47	66
Census Tract 30	Industry	2015	2018	2023
1	Civilian employed population 16 years and over	1414	1191	1281
2	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0	27	0
3	Construction	21	30	26
4	Manufacturing	19	22	98

5	Wholesale trade	41	45	82
6	Retail trade	104	63	128
7	Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	96	119	127
8	Information	4	0	7
9	Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	125	108	93
10	Professional, scientific, and management	297	253	125
	and waste management services			
11	Educational services, and health care and social assistance	366	379	310
12	Arts,entertainment, and recreation	234	78	192
	and accommodations and food services			
13	Other services, except public administration	63	55	49
14	Public administration	44	12	44