**Los Angeles Rental Census Data Dictionary**
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1. GEOID
   1. Census tract identification number
2. ACS\_MFRENTALS (385)
   1. The number of rentals in multi-family units in a given tract, from the 2015 5 year wave ACS Data Table B20532

Hypothesis of why this number is different:

* Only looks at 10% population. Smaller section

1. ACS\_Owners
   1. The Number of owner occupied units of all types, from the 2015 5 year wave ACS Data Table B20532
2. ACS\_SF\_Rents
   1. The number of rentals in single family and single-family attached units in a given tract, from the 2015 5 year wave ACS Data Table B20532
3. LUPAMS (555)
   1. Data from the LUPAMS office on the number of multi-family rentals registered on site (as required by the City’s proactive rental inspection program).

\*Do not use LUPAMs. Use HCIDLA instead.

1. HCIDLA (551)
   1. Data from the HCIDLA office on the number of multi-family rentals registered on site.
2. ~~LUPAMS\_RC~~
   1. ~~Data from the LUPAMS office on the number of~~ *~~rent-controlled~~* ~~multi-family rentals registered on site (as required by the City’s proactive rental inspection program).~~
3. ~~HCIDLA\_RC~~
   1. ~~Data from the HCIDLA office on the number of~~ *~~rent-controlled~~* ~~multi-family rentals registered on site.~~

Look at why HCIDLA\_RC and HCIDLA are different: Why is the number of *rent-controlled* multi-family rentals different from the number of multi-family rentals registered? Then use ACS data to support. Then compare why LUPAMS data would be different, as this is from the City’s proactive rental inspection program.

No data on the rent-controlled factor.

Compare why these differ:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ACS\_MFRENTALS (385) | HCIDLA (551) | LUPAMS (555) |
| The number of rentals in multi-family units in a given tract, from the 2015 5 year wave ACS Data Table B20532 | Data from the HCIDLA office on the number of multi-family rentals *registered on site*. | Data from the LUPAMS office on the number of multi-family rentals registered on site (as required by the City’s proactive rental inspection program). |
| Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.  0.0 231.5 **572.0** 665.7 983.2 2911.0 | Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.  0.0 293.0 **659.5** 721.0 1039.0 2913.0 | Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.  0.0 289.5 **659.5** 720.4 1038.0 3525.0 |
| Data limitations:  -Tract-level data (what does that mean?)  -5-year rolling averages  -Does not include info about the rent: How much a family of four would need to pay for rent. |  |  |
| Analyses to run:  -Could look at old and new data to see how the 5-year averages are different. What are the stable indicators? Have those numbers actually been updated? |  |  |

Steps:

1. (Working with the Palm\_LosAngelesRentalCensus.csv file): Create a filtered dataset for which there are spatial areas where there is a significant difference between the variables ACS\_MFRENTALS, HCIDLA, HCIDLA\_RC. Do summary statistics to determine the threshold of difference and come up with a ‘reasonable range’ for the upper and lower bounds.
2. Next step: Use the ROI file to examine people vs. place demographic factors to examine education and health differences based on those selected geographic regions in the filtered data set.

**Class Presentation Notes 2017-2-22**

Matt Palm, lead researcher with CAL HFA Housing Finance Agency.

<https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>

300 million people. Goal used to be 5% of population for Census data. Since expensive, transitioned to new mode. Starting 2000s, smaller samples more often, pooled into estimates that are statistically robust.

<http://www.urbandisplacement.org/map/la>

Measures gentrification for LA and the Bay Area. Data gathered on a rolling basis between 2009 and 2013; those estimates may be off because we were coming out of a recession. Mapping tools like this are being used by policymakers for housing, etc. But when data is on such a time lag, this is an issue; gentrification is already happening. In 2017, we are using data from 2009-2013 to measure changes in our neighborhoods and this is problematic. We want to understand how using richer data could change the narrative. In 2002, city pass a pro-rental inspection program in SF: all rental housing units in the city are inspected to make sure public health needs are met, this is especially important in immigrant communities—this is a census of registered housing stock. Our task is comparing that to what the census is telling us. Why this matters: rental housing is important for low-income families, temporary workers, and immigrant families.

Beurocrats make people fill out a lot of forms; that data does not always get used.

This project is an attempt to augment the American community survey with better data so that you can address problems in real time. We want to see if existing data can function as a leading indicator, so that we can take measures to invest in affordable housing, etc.

LA, Santa Cruz, Sacramento—cities with this data from landlords.

<http://interact.regionalchange.ucdavis.edu/roi/>

Regional Opportunity Index: Rental exposures to air quality issues, etc. Compare this to the census data.

The spatialized nature of social change is working against us in terms of how the census actually operates. Tip: A lot of the data you might think you need to gather might already exist, especially equity issues (US).

RESEARCH QUESTION:

[Mattdpalm@gmail.com](mailto:Mattdpalm@gmail.com) (cc Deb on emails to him). Research questions:

* **Educational data**
* Jobs access
* **Public health**, in particular, air quality exposure. Infant mortality rate.

Renters vs. non-renter and margin of error across space.

Why is the reporting more accurate in areas that have higher education, better access to public health, etc?

---Analysis of differences in education, health for each region, so based on GEOID/tract. And when a GEOID has overall lower access to housing/education this could explain why that is less accurate for that geographic region.

Does looking at census data collected by the city give a fundamentally different story than data collected by the ACS?

Users: city of LA, append to the regional opportunity index, state of California—where to target affordable housing (the problem with using ROI is that it is bringing back red lining—reproducing the inequality), UC Berkeley