RACE, INEQUALITY, AND THE RESEGREGATION OF THE BAY AREA





CONTENTS

I. Introduction: Urban Affluence, Suburban Povert and Regional Resegregation	y, 4
II. The New Regional Geography of Race and Inequality	6
III. Transportation and Jobs in the New Regional Geography	13
IV. Conclusion: Toward a More Just Bay Area	15
Appendix A – Tables	16
Endnotes	19

Published by: Urban Habitat

Urban Habitat works to democratize power and advance equitable policies to create a just and connected Bay Area for low-income communities and communities of color. We confront structural inequities impacting historically disenfranchised communities by bringing a race and class lens to the forefront of transportation, land use, and housing policies.

Authored by:

Tony Roshan Samara, Urban Habitat

Research by: Amy Martin, UC Berkeley

Advisory Committee:

Dwayne Marsh, Government Alliance on Race & Equity Alex Schafran, University of Leeds Chris Schildt, PolicyLink

Urban Habitat would like to thank our generous funders:

Ford Foundation Marguerite Casey Foundation The San Francisco Foundation



RACE, INEQUALITY, AND THE RESEGREGATION OF THE BAY AREA

Inequality is redrawing the geography of the Bay Area. Low-income communities and communities of color are increasingly living at the expanding edges of our region. There they often struggle to find quality jobs and schools, decent affordable housing and public transportation, adequate social services, and environmentally safe and healthy neighborhoods. Those who do live closer to the regional core find themselves unable to afford skyrocketing rents and other necessities; many families are doubling or tripling up in homes, or facing housing instability and homelessness.

The goal of this policy brief is to map the regional transformation currently underway and its implications for low-income communities and communities of color. The brief provides data and perspectives to ongoing advocacy and organizing efforts that challenge the injustice our divided region represents and seek to create a different future for the Bay Area. In this spirit, the brief is meant to inform a framework for how we see and respond to regional inequality and the new forms of race and class segregation.¹

Among the brief's key findings, between 2000-2014:

- There was a clear and dramatic shift in Black populations from the inner to the outer region, and the region as a whole lost 22,000 Black residents over this period.
- Only 11 out of 117 places with a population over 10,000 residents saw declines in poverty.
- While poverty in Black communities increased overall, it increased most dramatically in the outer parts of the region.
- The Latino population grew overall, with outer regional areas experiencing significant growth.
- Poverty in Latino communities increased disproportionately in the outer parts of the region, but also increased substantially in some inner regional jurisdictions.

- Places with high rates of increase in poverty among Asian communities are more dispersed than those of Black and Latino populations.
- The proportion of renter-occupied units to owneroccupied increased most in the outer region.
- Distances from work increased for people living in places with the highest growth rates of poverty.
- Places with high growth rates in poverty increasingly became home to workers in lower wage industries, particularly those in health care and social assistance, retail, and accommodation and food services.

Taken together, these changes across the region are a call to action for all those committed to a more just and equitable Bay Area. Without bold, sustained, and collective mobilization, the region that emerges from this transformation will be defined by deep divisions between people and places.

I. INTRODUCTION: URBAN AFFLUENCE, SUBURBAN POVERTY, AND REGIONAL RESEGREGATION

and the second second

The Bay Area is in the midst of a great transformation. The region's economic growth continues to draw people and investment from all over the world. Much of this growth is driven by an expanding technology economy and the secondary boom this creates in related markets, from real estate to banking. San Francisco and San Jose combined account for more than 25 percent of all venture capital investment in high tech globally and the region remains a global center of real estate investment.² This level of market-led growth also translates into dramatic yearly increases in people, with over 90,000 new residents arriving between 2014-15 alone.³

While many applaud the Bay Area's impressive economic growth, primarily as measured by gross regional product, the inequality that has grown alongside it has become impossible to ignore.⁴ Decades of uneven and unequal development risk turning unprecedented prosperity into an engine for new forms of injustice for people of color, women, and immigrants. Poor planning and bad policy decisions have fueled high levels of racial and economic inequality, and pushed the region's geographic boundaries ever further outwards. Lower wage workers are displaced or excluded from the places where many of them work, forcing long, expensive commutes.⁵

Inequality in the Bay Area is driven by a racialized market economy organized around the needs of wealthier residents employed in high-wage occupations but whose quality of life is dependent upon a plentiful supply of cheap, flexible labor.⁶ Inequality also reflects the concentration of political and economic resources in affluent places and, as a consequence, the absence of policies and practices that support equitable planning.

and the second second

To better understand how inequality is reshaping the region, we analyzed data from 11 counties in the greater Bay Area, recognizing that how the region is defined is both contested and fluid. The more common concept of a nine-county Bay Area – utilized by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) – is in part the reflection of state and federal political designations designed to recognize and manage the regional nature of transportation, housing, and land-use planning and governance. While this designation remains an important framework for policy and advocacy efforts, it does not adequately capture the dynamic and expanding nature of the region.

For the purposes of this brief, the region refers to the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Joaquin,* San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus.*

*Not considered part of the MTC nine-county region.

This report refers to the inner and outer region, rather than to urban and suburban areas, to define the main geographical division of the greater Bay Area. While the growth of poverty in the outer suburbs is a central concern there are inner-regional suburbs, many of which are becoming more affluent, such as along the San Mateo peninsula. At the same time, there are also outer-regional cities, such as Vallejo and Modesto, where poverty is on the rise.

The inner region refers to urbanized areas in San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, and western Contra Costa counties that touch the lower portion of the Bay, up until San Pablo Bay. This includes the three major cities of the Bay Area and the older suburbs. The outer region extends primarily east into San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties in the Central Valley, as well as north into

Solano, Napa, and Sonoma counties. We acknowledge that these are not hard and fast distinctions, as the data presented here demonstrate, but they do capture important trends in racial and economic inequality at the regional scale.⁷

In line with national trends, poverty in the Bay Area is in the process of migrating out from the center (see Map 1). Seen in this light, the growth of working-class and low-income communities of color in the outer region is the geographic expression of the new labor market, the increasing concentration of affluence in the region's economic centers, and new forms of racial segregation.

For much of the past 10 years, attention to the negative consequences of the region's growth has focused on gentrification and the displacement of communities of color through speculative real estate investment and in-migration of wealthier residents. More recently, a relatively independent perspective has drawn attention to the disproportionate growth of poverty in suburban regions across the country.⁸ Only recently has a more fully integrated regional analysis begun to emerge, which maps the relationship between these intertwined processes.⁹ Viewed from this more holistic perspective, displacement appears as the leading edge of regional resegregation.

Viewing regional transformation through the lens of resegregation is important because the racial dimension of the new regional inequality is undeniable. Conventional definitions and measures of segregation continue to be relevant. However, these emerged from a specific historical period. As regions transform, we must also be attentive to changes in what segregation looks like, how it is implemented, and how it is lived. Our use of the term "resegregation" is not meant to suggest that older forms of segregation are simply being uprooted from inner cities and replanted in suburban soil, but that the essential feature of segregation — the unequal allocation of land, resources, and political power on the basis of race and ethnicity within a defined place — will be decisive in shaping the region of the 21st century.



II. THE NEW REGIONAL GEOGRAPHY OF RACE AND INEQUALITY

A. County-level view of populations, poverty, and resegregation

The emerging shape of regional inequality is revealed in the uneven growth of populations and poverty across the Bay Area between 2000-2014 (see Chart 1). The region's population grew overall during this period, with increases ranging from just under 4 percent in Marin County to almost 25 percent in San Joaquin County. The proportion of residents living in poverty increased in all counties, but the greatest increases occurred in Contra Costa, Solano, Stanislaus, and Sonoma counties. As a point of reference, poverty rates increased in the latter three counties at more than twice the rate of that in San Mateo County during the same period. The two most distant counties, San Joaquin and Stanislaus, also had the highest rates of population growth and, as of 2014, the highest levels of poverty.

Regional shifts in communities of color

The shift in Black and Latino populations from inner to outer regions is dramatic. Although the Bay Area experienced significant population growth overall between 2000-2014, the proportion of Black residents declined in all but two counties: Napa and San Joaquin, each of which saw small increases. At the same time, poverty in Black communities grew significantly in both inner and outer regional counties, particularly in Santa Clara, Marin, Solano, and Stanislaus (see Chart 2).









The largest increases in the proportion of Latinos relative to the total population were in Stanislaus, Napa, and San Joaquin, though Contra Costa, Solano, and Sonoma also experienced increases above the regional average (see Chart 3). San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Mateo counties experienced the lowest rates of increase of Latino population. Poverty among Latinos increased most significantly in Solano, Marin, and Sonoma counties.

Asian populations in Solano, Alameda, Santa Clara, and Napa counties increased at greater rates than the regional average (see Chart 4). Between 2000-2014, poverty among the Asian population increased at above the regional average in San Francisco, Sonoma, Napa, Solano, and Marin counties.¹⁰ Most notably, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) communities tended to experience above average increases in poverty in the counties where increases in Asian poverty overall were below average or decreased.

Rise of the renter region

One indication of long-term shifts in structural inequality in the United States is the increase in renters relative to homeowners.¹¹ The proportion of renters in the Bay Area – and particularly renters of color – is on the rise. The proportion of renter-occupied households in the region generally outpaced both the nation and the state between 2000-2014. The only county which did CHART 3: Latino Population & Poverty Changes by County, 2000-2014







not see an increase in renter households relative to homeowners over this period is San Francisco, which already has one of the highest percentages of renter households in the region but has also weathered over a decade of relentless displacement pressures (see Table 1).

The proportion of renter-occupied units to owner-occupied increased most in the outer region. Five counties clustered at the top range of increases: Solano, Stanislaus, Napa, Sonoma, and Contra Costa. These counties also suffered the most during the recent foreclosure crisis. Many working families and people of color were targeted for predatory loan products, lost their homes, and were forced to move back into the rental housing market.

TABLE 1: Changes in Units Occupied byRenters by County, 2000-2014

County	Percentage Point Change	Share of Renter Occupied Units, 2014			
Solano	4.97	39.79%			
Stanislaus	4.76	42.83%			
Napa	4.65	39.56%			
Sonoma	4.48	40.40%			
Contra Costa	4.28	34.99%			
San Joaquin	3.52	43.14%			
Santa Clara	2.89	43.05%			
San Mateo	2.17	40.73%			
Alameda	1.84	47.14%			
Marin	1.02	37.41%			
San Francisco	-1.61	63.40%			
11 county rental unit growth: 2.49					

B. The places that low-income people and people of color call home

County comparisons provide an important context, but they also risk obscuring much of the complexity of the regional shifts currently underway. Important patterns in how poverty and populations are changing occur across county lines and within counties. Hence, it is all the more important to focus in on the sub-county scale as well, and to integrate developments in suburban and urban jurisdictions outside of the traditional core or inner region into a regional analysis. These are especially vital considerations from an equity and advocacy perspective, which requires a more fine-grained understanding of local dynamics, the relationships between localities, and relationships between the local and the regional.

Of the 117 places with populations over 10,000, including aggregated unincorporated areas by county, only 11 experienced declines in poverty between 2000-2014. Seven jurisdictions experienced increases of at least twice the national average of 3.22 percent, while the top three experienced increases that were three times the national average. (See Table 1 in Appendix A for a list of the top 20 places that experienced a population increase.)

Poverty is on the rise across much of the region, but the most impacted places are found along its outer edge (see Maps 2, 3, and 4, which illustrate changes in poverty by subregion, 2000-2014). The 20 places with the greatest increases span eight counties, but are concentrated across Solano, Stanislaus, and Contra Costa. The places with the highest rates of poverty in 2014 were also disproportionately in the outer sectors of the region.







Black communities

The population shift outward from the regional center is particularly stark for Black communities (see Map 5, above). In 2000, the greatest number of Black residents lived in the inner region of the East Bay, stretching from Ashland to Vallejo. These places experienced the largest decrease in Black residents between 2000-2014. The most substantial increases in the number of Black residents occurred in places to the east, in a belt stretching north from Patterson, through central Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties and into eastern Contra Costa County, ending in Suisun City in eastern Solano County.¹²

The four largest decreases in the proportion of Black residents relative to the total population occurred in Richmond, Oakland, East Palo Alto, and Berkeley. The absolute loss of Black residents for each was 5,531 in Berkeley, 43,777 in Oakland, 12,565 in Richmond, and 2,796 in East Palo Alto. Although the proportional loss of Black residents in San Francisco was substantially lower than it was for these cities, the absolute loss was a shocking 18,417 residents. Overall, the region lost 22,000 Black residents between 2000-2014.

By contrast, the number of Black residents in Antioch nearly doubled to 18,409 residents, representing 17 percent of the overall population by 2014. In Patterson, the Black population increased from 227 to 1,307 residents, and grew proportionately from 1.8 to 6.3 percent of the total population. This pattern of large increases in population and proportion occurred in a number of places in eastern Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties. (See Table 2 in Appendix A for top 20 places with increases in Black population.)

Richmond, in western Contra Costa County, experienced the largest proportional loss of Black residents over this period while Antioch, on the County's eastern edge, saw the region's single largest increase. Trends in poverty in Black communities show a somewhat different pattern, with places experiencing the greatest increases clustered in Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa counties. Most of the places where poverty increased substantially experienced little, if any, change in population and were already struggling with high rates of poverty overall and for Black residents. Most of the places that experienced Black population increases also saw increases in the poverty rate, with some notable exceptions in the far eastern edge of the region, including Patterson, Lathrop, Dixon, and Lodi, where poverty rates declined in Black communities. (See Table 3 in Appendix A for top 20 places which experienced greatest increases in poverty in Black communities.)

Latino communities

Latino communities are growing rapidly across the Bay Area, with an overall growth of 474,000 Latino residents between 2000 and 2014. Growth was concentrated along a belt on the eastern edge of the region running north-south from the Stockton metro area in San Joaquin County, through the Modesto area, and down to Newman in Stanislaus County (see Map 6).¹³ The largest decreases occurred along the east and west sides of the Bay in San Mateo and Alameda counties, and in Santa Clara County, including absolute population losses in Daly City and Union City. (See Table 4 in Appendix A for top 20 places with increases in Latino population.)

Places where poverty increased significantly for Latinos between 2000-2014 are fairly dispersed across eight counties, with larger clusters in Contra Costa, Santa Clara, and Alameda, mirroring the clusters of growth in poverty for Black communities. There is some overlap between these and places with the highest rates of poverty for Latinos in 2014, but the latter were more prevalent in Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties. There was also an increase in poverty in Latino communities in the inner region, even as overall growth of the Latino population there was stagnant, possibly reflecting barriers to people moving in. (See Table 5 in Appendix A for top 20 places which experienced greatest increases in poverty in Latino communities.)



Asian and NHOPI communities

Asian communities continue to grow rapidly across the Bay Area, with 400,000 Asian residents moving to the region between 2000 and 2014. Unlike Black and Latino communities, much of the population growth of Asian communities is concentrated in the inner region, including Santa Clara, San Mateo, and western Alameda counties. The Asian communities in these counties are disproportionately non-Taiwanese Chinese, Vietnamese, and, in the case of Santa Clara and Alameda, Asian Indian. Communities in Alameda, San Francisco, and Santa Clara counties also have higher proportions of Korean residents, and San Mateo County has a high proportion of Filipino residents, second only to Solano County.

Many places in outer counties also saw significant increases in the proportion of Asian residents relative to the total population. San Ramon in Contra Costa County had the largest increase in the proportion of Asian residents across the Bay Area (24 percent). Lathrop (6.5 percent) and Tracy (5 percent) in San Joaquin, American Canyon (17.74 percent) in Napa, El Sobrante (7.61 percent) in Sonoma, and Fairfield (3 percent) in Solano also experienced significant growth. (See Table 6 in Appendix A for top 20 places with increases in Asian population.)

A number of Asian ethnic groups have sizable communities in the outer counties. San Joaquin, for example, is home to 76 percent of the region's Hmong population, 42 percent of the Cambodian population, and 23 percent of the Pakistani population.¹⁴

Places with high poverty rates in 2014, and places with high rates of increase in poverty between 2000-2014 among Asian communities are more dispersed than for Black and Latino populations. The places with the highest poverty rates for Asians in 2014 are concentrated in Contra Costa County, mainly in the eastern county, in Alameda, and in Stanislaus, with smaller clusters in Sonoma, Santa Clara, and San Joaquin. (See Table 7 in Appendix A for top 20 places which experienced greatest increases in poverty in Asian communities.)

Places with the largest increases in poverty between 2000-2014 are also concentrated in Contra Costa and Alameda, with additional clusters in Sonoma, Santa Clara, San Joaquin, and Solano. What this data suggests is that this distribution reflects differences in the way specific Asian populations are more likely to experience poverty, and as a result, where they are able to live.

The trends for NHOPI communities show that high rates of poverty and increases in poverty are concentrated in Alameda County and, to a lesser extent, in Contra Costa County. There is also a cluster of communities comprised of NHOPIs experiencing high and climbing rates of poverty in San Mateo County, particularly in the cities of San Mateo and East Palo Alto. The cities with the greatest increases in poverty have relatively small NHOPI communities and stretch across three counties. These are Sunnyvale (58 percent), Turlock (42 percent), and Concord (35 percent). Cities with larger NHOPI populations that also saw substantial increases include Oakland (11.25 percent), Vallejo (5.81 percent), and Stockton (2.38 percent).

Rise of the renter suburb

Places with the highest percentages of rental units are concentrated in Alameda and Santa Clara counties, with slightly smaller clusters in San Mateo and western Contra Costa. By contrast, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and eastern Contra Costa counties saw a dramatic rise in renter-occupied units between 2000-2014, particularly in the wake of the foreclosure crisis. Unincorporated areas are also heavily represented here, including the aggregated unincorporated communities of San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Marin counties. (See Table 8 in Appendix A for top 20 places which experienced greatest increase in rental units.) Places where the proportion of renter-occupied units either stagnated or decreased are heavily concentrated in jurisdictions spanning the inner regional counties of San Mateo, northern Santa Clara and eastern Alameda counties, and San Francisco.

III. TRANSPORTATION AND JOBS IN THE NEW REGIONAL GEOGRAPHY

The growth of poverty in the outer region reflects the unevenness of the labor market and economic development more generally across the Bay Area. Parallel to the shift in populations, higher wage jobs appear to be concentrating in the regional center while lower wage industries become more prevalent in the outer region.¹⁵ The cost of living, and of housing in particular, pushes workers out to find affordable homes and raises the transportation costs between home and work.

Here we present data on commutes and the jobs held by residents in the 20 places with the highest increases in poverty across the region between 2002-2014 (see Table 2). What the data suggests is that these areas are home to more and more low-wage workers and the commutes for these workers are taking up a greater proportion of their time and paychecks. (See Table 9 in Appendix A for top work destinations aggregated by places of highest poverty, 2014.) In many places, the change is most noticeable in the shift between workers who traveled less than 10 miles to work in 2002, and more than 25 miles in 2014.

In Santa Rosa, for example, 70 percent of workers in 2002 traveled less than 10 miles to work, and 14.7 percent traveled more than 25 miles. By 2014 only 53 percent traveled less than 10 miles while the number of workers commuting over 25 miles had doubled to 30 percent. This corresponds to a decrease in the proportion of Santa Rosa residents who worked in the city over the same period, from 46 to 34 percent. Across the region as a whole, this appears to be the trajectory.

To understand what jobs are available in places struggling most with increasing poverty, we look at three employment categories from the North American Industry Classification System:

- Retail Trade (Table 10 in Appendix A)
- Accommodation and Food Services (Table 11 in Appendix A)
- Health Care and Social Assistance (see Table 3, next page)

TABLE 2: Change in Commuters Traveling 25 Miles or More to Work in Top 20 Places with Highest Growth in Poverty, 2002-2014

(CC BY 2.0) by Hitch

Place	County	Percentage Point Change	2014 Share of Workers		
Suisun City	Solano	12.29	44.68%		
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	10.34	39.12%		
Antioch	Contra Costa	10.21	51.64%		
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	8.74	41.71%		
Gilroy	Santa Clara	8.64	56.54%		
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	7.93	32.30%		
Oakdale	Stanislaus	7.56	40.91%		
Dixon	Solano	7.35	40.34%		
Rohnet Park	Sonoma	6.70	40.73%		
Petaluma	Sonoma	6.32	34.06%		
Vallejo	Solano	5.13	36.01%		
Concord	Contra Costa	4.95	31.80%		
Newman	Stanislaus	4.73	48.14%		
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	Contra Costa 4.12			
Patterson	Stanislaus 4.00		54.02%		
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	3.91	17.75%		
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	3.14	16.51%		
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	2.79	38.45%		
Ceres	Stanislaus	-0.21	31.73%		
Ripon	San Joaquin	-14.37	25.30%		
11-County Average		5.29	26.75%		
Source: LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics					

Taken together, these three industries constitute a substantial proportion of occupations held by residents in the places with the highest increases in poverty, and are in keeping with the general trend regionally toward an increase in the proportion of service sector jobs, and a decrease in traditionally middle-wage jobs in industries such as manufacturing.¹⁶

The Health Care and Social Assistance category is the largest, or near-largest single employment category held by residents in places experiencing the highest rates of increasing poverty (see Table 3).¹⁷ In one striking example, Bay Point (unincorporated in Contra Costa County) saw declines in residents working in manufacturing and construction, and small increases in those working in retail and services. The percentage of residents employed in health care and social assistance over this period, however, jumped from 2 percent to 17 percent.

Ceres, in Stanislaus County, experienced decreases in residents working in both retail and services, and a doubling of those employed in health care and social assistance. Here, however, the largest sector represented is Educational Services, at 20 percent of the total. Annual median wages range from \$27,000 to \$93,000 in these industries, with teacher's aides at the low end of the scale and education administrators at the high end.

Inner regional places that experienced the largest increases in rates of poverty – Redwood City, San Jose, and, to a lesser extent, North Fair Oaks – also had substantial increases in residents from two high-wage sectors (Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; and Information), suggesting that there may be intensifying displacement pressures as high-wage earners move in to be closer to their jobs.

TABLE 3: Change in Health Care and Social Assistance Jobs in Top 20 Places with Highest Growth in Poverty, 2002-2014

Place	County	Percent Point Change	2014 Share of Jobs		
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	15.05	17.1%		
Antioch	Contra Costa	11.56	28.4%		
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	10.04	40.5%		
Ceres	Stanislaus	7.98	15.1%		
Vallejo	Solano	7.56	33.5%		
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	6.52	23.7%		
Ripon	San Joaquin	4.76	9.4%		
Suisun City	Solano	4.74	11.8%		
Rohnet Park	Sonoma	4.69	10.2%		
Newman	Stanislaus	4.32	10.7%		
Concord	Contra Costa	4.10	15.0%		
Oakdale	Stanislaus	3.25	13.1%		
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	2.78	9.9%		
Gilroy	Santa Clara	2.73	13.3%		
Patterson	Stanislaus	2.67	8.8%		
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	2.44	7.0%		
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	2.35	5.5%		
Petaluma	Sonoma	2.07	12.2%		
Dixon	Solano	1.54	4.8%		
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	-7.63	9.4%		
11-County Average		3.39	12.9%		
Source FUD Origin Destination Employment Statistics					

Source: LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics

IV. CONCLUSION: TOWARD A MORE JUST BAY AREA

The great transformation currently underway across the Bay Area raises the specter of a future defined by social, economic, and political divisions. Indeed, the dispersion of many working class communities of color out from the center — even as many others struggle to remain — poses major challenges to building power and creating change across this new geographic reality.

The challenges that confront us will look different in each place. They will vary, for example, between existing inner regional low-income communities and communities of color, and the new or expanding outer regional ones. But a framework that allows us to better understand how inequalities between places are connected can strengthen local advocacy and support integrating these local efforts into a broader regional movement.

Regional resegregation does not have to define the Bay Area of the 21st century. Planning for a just future will require organizing and advocacy that is focused on democratizing power and advancing an integrated local and regional agenda for equitable development. Our hope is that this brief is a useful starting point, and that future research will deepen and extend the initial analysis presented here so that we can continue to build a long-term vision and movement guided by a commitment to racial and economic justice.

APPENDIX A – TABLES

TABLE 1: Poverty Increase, Top 20

Place	County	Percentage Point Change	Increase in Residents in Poverty	Poverty Rate, 2014	
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	14.39	2,299	26.67%	
Newman	Stanislaus	13.27	1,844	26.35%	
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	11.09	2,430	28.32%	
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	8.85	1,342	24.23%	
Vallejo	Solano	8.23	9,821	18.31%	
Rohnert Park	Sonoma	7.48	3,096	15.48%	
Ceres	Stanislaus	7.12	4,711	20.01%	
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	6.88	721	18.38%	
Patterson	Stanislaus	6.59	2,479	18.61%	
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	6.56	5,330	18.08%	
Suisun City	Solano	6.42	2,013	12.89%	
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	6.28	2,789	10.97%	
Oakdale	Stanislaus	6.23	1,937	17.55%	
Antioch	Contra Costa	6.13	7,683	14.66%	
Gilroy	Santa Clara	5.74	3,848	16.10%	
Dixon	Solano	5.67	1,269	13.72%	
Concord	Contra Costa	5.46	7,060	13.06%	
Ripon	San Joaquin	5.33	1,046	11.57%	
Petaluma	Sonoma	4.77	3,040	10.76%	
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	4.76	10,000	13.30%	
Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014					

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 250 or more people in poverty in 2014 $\,$

TABLE 3: Poverty in Black Communities Increase, Top 20					
Place	County	Percent- age Point Change	Increase in Black Residents in Poverty	Poverty Rate Among Black Residents, 2014	
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	31.26	337	31.26%	
Pleasanton	Alameda	29.33	550	31.42%	
Mountain View	Santa Clara	28.74	25	28.74%	
San Lorenzo CDP	Alameda	27.12	391	34.27%	
Gilroy	Santa Clara	22.77	224	25.00%	
Turlock	Stanislaus	19.50	571	50.39%	
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	19.50	538	41.01%	
Fremont	Alameda	14.45	1,255	18.03%	
Redwood City	San Mateo	14.41	222	24.19%	
Vallejo	Solano	14.12	3,257	29.41%	
Concord	Contra Costa	12.37	781	22.63%	
Campbell	Santa Clara	12.02	99	17.95%	
Suisun City	Solano	10.82	741	20.14%	
San Ramon	Contra Costa	10.52	209	14.41%	
Brentwood	Contra Costa	10.48	285	10.48%	
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	10.21	529	17.34%	
Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	10.09	(140)	17.52%	
Alameda	Alameda	9.38	682	26.96%	
Newark	Alameda	9.36	214	15.54%	
Novato	Marin	9.12	140	22.35%	
San Jose	Santa Clara	9.12	2,934	19.55%	

Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 500 or more Black residents in 2014

TABLE 2: Black Po	nulation Incr	ease Top 20		
Place	County	Percentage Point Change	Increase in Black Residents	Share of Population, 2014
Antioch	Contra Costa	7.73	8,965	17.43%
Patterson	Stanislaus	4.48	1,080	6.30%
Lathrop	San Joaquin	3.73	1,085	8.50%
Oakley	Contra Costa	3.43	1,632	6.95%
Moraga	Contra Costa	2.93	480	4.11%
San Lorenzo CDP	Alameda	2.11	554	5.16%
Brentwood	Contra Costa	1.84	1,820	4.65%
Suisun City	Solano	1.70	501	20.49%
San Leandro	Alameda	1.04	1,172	10.86%
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	0.92	1,394	3.38%
Tracy	San Joaquin	0.92	2,079	6.44%
Concord	Contra Costa	0.74	770	3.99%
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	0.73	374	2.60%
Turlock	Stanislaus	0.69	644	2.20%
Pleasanton	Alameda	0.66	589	2.18%
Dixon	Solano	0.62	153	2.77%
Manteca	San Joaquin	0.61	973	3.61%
Lodi	San Joaquin	0.58	389	1.22%
Albany	Alameda	0.53	174	5.30%
Hayward	Alameda	0.48	509	11.20%

Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 500 or more Black residents in 2014

IABLE 4: Latino	Population In	crease, lo	p 20	
Place	County	Percent- age Point Change	Increase in Hispanic Residents	Share of Population, 2014
Garden Acres CDP	San Joaquin	21.79	2,854	75.36%
Ceres	Stanislaus	20.30	13,274	58.68%
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	16.87	2,933	56.21%
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	16.50	1,550	47.16%
Newman	Stanislaus	16.26	3,263	67.82%
Salida CDP	Stanislaus	15.20	2,568	47.03%
Manteca	San Joaquin	13.70	14,425	39.90%
Richmond	Contra Costa	13.46	14,756	40.59%
Ashland CDP	Alameda	12.04	3,100	45.13%
Napa	Napa	11.43	9,809	38.94%
San Lorenzo CDP	Alameda	11.22	3,056	36.58%
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	11.20	1,903	53.34%
Modesto	Stanislaus	10.95	23,910	37.18%
Oakley	Contra Costa	10.75	6,624	36.88%
Antioch	Contra Costa	10.67	13,191	34.03%
Tracy	San Joaquin	10.45	15,576	39.01%
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	10.44	21,044	30.41%
Rohnert Park	Sonoma	10.44	3,843	24.70%
San Pablo	Contra Costa	10.29	1,736	55.00%
Pinole	Contra Costa	9.00	1,459	23.59%
c c		1. 6		

Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 1,000 or more Latino residents in 2014 $\,$

TABLE 5: Poverty in Latino Communities Increase, Top 20			TABLE 7: Pove	erty in Asian (Communit	ies Increase, To	p 20		
Place	County	Percent- age Point Change	Increase in Hispanic Resi- dents in Poverty	Poverty Rate Among Hispanic Residents, 2014	Place	County	Percent- age Point Change	Increase in Asian Residents in Poverty	Poverty Rate Among Asian Res- idents, 2014
Suisun City	Solano	17.18	1,387	23.69%	Rohnert Park	Sonoma	15.94	29	25.37%
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	16.35	1,617	29.57%	Cherryland CDP	Alameda	15.38	316	19.36%
Newman	Stanislaus	13.48	1,659	33.60%	Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	9.94	1243	20.07%
Vallejo	Solano	12.91	4,707	23.25%	Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	8.98	-642	15.76%
Oakdale	Stanislaus	11.68	992	24.13%	Petaluma	Sonoma	7.15	663	14.09%
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	11.62	1,876	20.65%	Gilroy	Santa Clara	6.86	949	9.16%
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	10.11	3,903	24.91%	Manteca	San Joaquin	6.39	3561	11.11%
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	9.66	1,114	28.08%	San Leandro	Alameda	6.28	9630	10.81%
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	9.64	1,997	31.82%	Pittsburg	Contra Costa	5.99	3494	12.66%
Milpitas	Santa Clara	9.58	1,088	15.25%	Danville	Contra Costa	5.57	1313	7.95%
Petaluma	Sonoma	9.57	2,007	22.64%	Oakley	Contra Costa	5.40	2475	7.12%
Ripon	San Joaquin	9.08	499	21.58%	Antioch	Contra Costa	4.83	4265	11.52%
Emeryville	Alameda	8.88	152	23.47%	San Pablo	Contra Costa	4.78	-587	16.88%
Concord	Contra Costa	8.61	4,574	21.00%	Vallejo	Solano	4.12	1353	9.52%
Albany	Alameda	8.57	291	20.28%	Napa	Napa	3.90	456	10.07%
Lafayette	Contra Costa	8.37	236	12.40%	Alameda	Alameda	3.88	4854	13.16%
Burlingame	San Mateo	8.22	370	14.30%	Benicia	Solano	3.80	1086	6.82%
Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	7.85	2,529	15.88%	Alum Rock CDP	Santa Clara	3.43	103	14.62%
San Ramon	Contra Costa	7.82	2,042	28.08%	Hillsborough	San Mateo	3.38	332	7.42%
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	7.61	500	8.17%	Lathrop	San Joaquin	3.14	2391	7.10%
Source: Census 2000	Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014				Source: Census 20	000 & American (Community S	urvey 2010-2014	

Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 1,000 or more Latino residents in 2014

TABLE 6: Asian Population Increase, Top 20						
Place	County	Percent- age Point Change	Increase in Asian Residents	Share of Population, 2014		
San Ramon	Contra Costa	24.15	22217	40.20%		
Dublin	Alameda	20.52	12280	31.81%		
Cupertino	Santa Clara	20.25	15479	64.88%		
American Canyon	Napa	17.74	5210	34.85%		
Saratoga	Santa Clara	15.25	4679	45.05%		
Millbrae	San Mateo	15.12	3518	42.67%		
Fremont	Alameda	15.03	35366	52.04%		
Pleasanton	Alameda	13.35	10662	26.14%		
Foster City	San Mateo	12.67	4604	45.75%		
Milpitas	Santa Clara	11.95	9985	62.96%		
Palo Alto	Santa Clara	11.18	8346	29.47%		
Castro Valley CDP	Alameda	9.72	6310	24.03%		
Santa Clara	Santa Clara	9.47	14797	38.94%		
South San Francisco	San Mateo	9.25	6179	37.95%		
San Leandro	Alameda	8.89	8360	31.86%		
Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	8.88	15596	41.26%		
Union City	Alameda	8.62	6158	51.57%		
Daly City	San Mateo	7.84	4895	57.27%		
El Sobrante CDP	Sonoma	7.61	989	20.98%		
San Lorenzo CDP	Alameda	7.46	2020	23.35%		
Source: Concurs 2000 St American Community Survey 2010 2017						

Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 1,000 or more Asian residents in 2014

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 1,000 or more Asian residents in 2014

TABLE 8: Renter-Occupied Units Increase, Top 20						
Place	County	Percentage Point Change	Share of Units Occupied by Renters, 2014			
Newman	Stanislaus	17.58	45.04%			
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	14.34	49.88%			
Alum Rock CDP	Santa Clara	13.68	41.10%			
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	12.79	40.35%			
American Canyon	Napa	12.26	26.41%			
Garden Acres CDP	San Joaquin	11.70	47.32%			
Suisun City	Solano	11.61	37.97%			
Salida CDP	Stanislaus	11.48	24.50%			
Oakley	Contra Costa	10.39	25.33%			
Discovery Bay CDP	Contra Costa	10.36	20.42%			
Antioch	Contra Costa	9.93	38.97%			
Lathrop	San Joaquin	8.63	28.89%			
Tracy	San Joaquin	8.53	36.35%			
Dixon	Solano	8.31	35.45%			
Ceres	Stanislaus	7.86	41.62%			
San Bruno	San Mateo	7.42	44.38%			
Sonoma	Sonoma	7.34	45.46%			
Rohnert Park	Sonoma	7.27	48.87%			
Brentwood	Contra Costa	7.22	26.48%			
San Pablo	Contra Costa	6.63	57.56%			
Source: Census 2000 & American Community Survey 2010-2014						

Analysis limited to those places with populations of 10,000 residents or more and 1,000 or more renter occupied units in 2014. Share of units is reflective of non-vacant units only

TABLE 9: Top work destinations aggregated by places of highest poverty, 2014

County (Places of Highest Poverty)	Destination	Share of Workers		
Alameda	Oakland	15.96%		
(Cherryland CDP, San Leandro,	San Francisco	12.52%		
San Lorenzo CDP)	San Leandro	9.46%		
	San Francisco	9.02%		
Contra Costa (Antioch Bay Point CDP Pittsburg)	Pittsburg	6.10%		
(Antioch	6.07%		
	San Francisco	20.93%		
Marin (Novato, San Rafael)	San Rafael	16.55%		
(Novato	10.57%		
	Napa	26.07%		
Napa (American Canvon, Napa)	San Francisco	4.27%		
(St. Helena	2.70%		
	San Francisco	59.60%		
San Francisco (San Francisco)	Oakland	3.20%		
()	Mountain View	2.20%		
	Tracy	12.60%		
San Joaquin (Country Club CDP Ripon Tracy)	Stockton	9.32%		
	Livermore	6.72%		
San Mateo	San Francisco	18.55%		
(North Fair Oaks CDP, Pacifica,	Redwood City	8.92%		
Redwood City)	Palo Alto	6.92%		
Santa Clara (Gilroy, Morgan Hill, San Jose)	San Jose	36.71%		
	Vallejo	11.48%		
Solano (Divon Suisun City Valleio)	San Francisco	7.61%		
(Dixon, Suban city, Vallejo)	Fairfield	7.27%		
	Santa Rosa	23.51%		
Sonoma (Petaluma Rohnert Park Santa Rosa)	Petaluma	9.79%		
	San Francisco	5.55%		
	Modesto	18.58%		
Stanislaus (Ceres Newman Patterson)	Ceres	6.07%		
(,,,,,	Turlock	4.34%		
Source: LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics				

Analysis limited to top 3 places in each county with populations of 10,000	
residents or more and 250 or more people in poverty in 2014	

TABLE 10: Change in Retail Trade Jobs in Top 20 Places with Highest Growth in Poverty, 2002-2014

		2 2024		
Place	County	Percent Point Change	2014 Share of Jobs	
Dixon	Solano	12.96	20.0%	
Patterson	Stanislaus	6.72	16.2%	
Suisun City	Solano	4.34	19.6%	
Gilroy	Santa Clara	3.31	24.6%	
Ripon	San Joaquin	2.41	11.5%	
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	1.44	14.8%	
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	1.24	12.3%	
Petaluma	Sonoma	0.75	12.5%	
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	0.45	8.7%	
Rohnet Park	Sonoma	0.30	13.0%	
Antioch	Contra Costa	-0.60	19.6%	
Oakdale	Stanislaus	-1.39	11.2%	
Concord	Contra Costa	-1.81	10.8%	
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	-2.75	16.9%	
Vallejo	Solano	-3.12	11.8%	
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	-3.77	14.5%	
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	-3.84	10.0%	
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	-4.39	5.7%	
Ceres	Stanislaus	-8.95	11.5%	
Newman	Stanislaus	-15.07	10.5%	
11-County Average		-1.28	9.4%	
Source: LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics				

TABLE 11: Change in Accommodation and Food Services Jobs in Top 20 Places with Highest Growth in Poverty, 2002-2014

		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Place	County	Percent Point Change	2014 Share of Jobs
Rohnet Park	Sonoma	18.89	26.7%
Suisun City	Solano	5.89	16.6%
Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	3.51	10.4%
North Fair Oaks CDP	San Mateo	3.09	10.4%
Gilroy	Santa Clara	2.94	11.5%
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2.32	8.5%
Dixon	Solano	2.25	11.1%
Patterson	Stanislaus	2.17	12.3%
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	1.78	9.9%
Concord	Contra Costa	1.69	8.1%
Antioch	Contra Costa	1.55	9.9%
Petaluma	Sonoma	1.38	8.3%
Country Club CDP	San Joaquin	1.33	17.5%
Bay Point CDP	Contra Costa	0.83	9.4%
Oakdale	Stanislaus	0.43	8.4%
Newman	Stanislaus	0.43	3.9%
Ripon	San Joaquin	0.15	10.2%
Cherryland CDP	Alameda	-0.47	6.4%
Vallejo	Solano	-0.51	7.8%
Ceres	Stanislaus	-1.58	8.9%
11-County Average		1.29	8.2%
		2.5 (1998) (19977) (19977) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997)	

Source: LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics

ENDNOTES

- 1 Causa Justa::Just Cause, Development without Displacement: Resisting Gentrification in the Bay Area, 2013. http://cjjc.org/ publication/hudreport/
- 2 Richard Florida, "The Global Cities Where Tech Venture Capital Is Concentrated." *The Atlantic*, January 26, 2016. http://www. theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/01/global-startupcities-venture-capital/429255/; "Global Cities 2016 Report: The Future of Real Estate in the World's Leading Cities." Newmark, Grubb, Knight, and Frank. http://www.knightfrank. com/resources/global-cities/2016/all/global-cities-the-2016report.pdf
- 3 Kimberly Veklerov, "Bay Area's population grows by more than 90,000 in a year." San Francisco Chronicle, March 25, 2016. http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Bay-Area-populationgrows-by-more-than-90-000-in-7096552.php
- 4 Jessica Floum, "Bay Area economy outpaces U.S., China." San Francisco Chronicle, September 26, 2016. http://www. sfchronicle.com/business/article/Bay-Area-economyoutpaces-U-S-China-9289809.php; Joaquin Palomino, "As Bay Area economy booms, the rich get richer, study shows." San Francisco Chronicle, February 26, 2016. http://www.sfchronicle. com/bayarea/article/As-Bay-Area-economy-booms-the-richget-richer-6854937.php
- 5 Vu-Bang Nguyen and Evelyn Stivers, *Moving Silicon Valley Forward*. The Non-Profit Housing Partnership of Northern California and Urban Habitat, 2012. http://nonprofithousing. org/moving-silicon-valley-forward/
- 6 Working Partnerships USA and Silicon Valley Rising, *Tech's Invisible Workforce*, March 2016. http://www.wpusa.org/ Publication/TechsInvisibleWorkforce.pdf
- Because of large margins of error resulting from smaller sample sizes, our analysis is limited to incorporated cities and Census Designated Places (CDPs) with 10,000 residents or more according to the American Community Survey 2010-2014 estimates. While removing places with less than 10,000 residents from our dataset drops legitimately small communities, this also removes those communities that have remained small over time due to anti-growth and exclusionary measures. As a result, this analysis leaves out both those smaller places with pockets of poverty but unreliable data and pockets of exclusion. Our analyses of rates of change refer to the period 2000-2014, unless otherwise noted. Additionally, when looking at race and ethnicity, we again limit our analysis to account for large margins or error due to small sample sizes. For Black population and Black population in poverty, the analysis is limited to incorporated cities and CDPs with 500 or more Black residents according to the American Community Survey 2010-2014 estimates. For Latino and Asian populations and populations in poverty, the analysis is limited to those places with 1,000 or more Latino and Asian residents. For Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) communities the analysis is limited to places with 500 or more NHOPI residents
- 8 Elizabeth Kneebone, *The Growth and Spread of Concentrated Poverty, 2000 to 2008-2012*. Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C., 2014. https://www.brookings.edu/interactives/ the-growth-and-spread-of-concentrated-poverty-2000-to-2008-2012/Matthew Soursourian, *Suburbanization of Poverty in the Bay Area.* Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, January 2012. http://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/Suburbanization-of-Poverty-in-the-Bay-Area1.pdf

- 9 Alex Schafran, "Origins of an Urban Crisis: The Restructuring of the San Francisco Bay Area and the Geography of Foreclosure." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 37(2) 2013: 663-88. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/ doi/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01150.x/abstract PolicyLink and the Program for Environmental and Regional Equity at the University of Southern California, An Equity Profile of the San Francisco Bay Area Region. The San Francisco Foundation, 2015. http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/documents/bayarea-profile/BayAreaProfile_21April2015_Final.pdf
- 10 Broad racial and ethnic data as captured by the Census oftentimes obscures the lived experiences of many communities of color. Because of the large number and variety of people from communities grouped together by the Census as "Asian", we have disaggregated this category by subgroup to the extent feasible given the scope of the project. We recognize that a similar look at Black, Latino, Native American, and other communities of color is necessary in order to more fully understand these communities, and hope that future analyses can contribute to this important conversation in this way.
- 11 Tony Roshan Samara, *Rise of the Renter Nation: Solutions to the Housing Affordability Crisis*, Right to the City Alliance, 2014. http://righttothecity.org/cause/rise-of-the-renter-nation/
- 12 It should be noted that only six of the jurisdictions with the highest increases in the proportion of Black residents saw gains over 2 percent and only the top nine saw more than a 1 percent increase.
- 13 Seven of the 20 jurisdictions with the highest Latino growth rates are unincorporated areas, compared with only two for Black populations.
- 14 These differences in national origin within the Asian Census category are important to keep in mind when we look at poverty rates and changes in poverty rates in specific jurisdictions, where 2014 national origin data is both more difficult to obtain and less reliable because of smaller population sizes.
- 15 Metropolitan Transportation Commission Economic Prosperity Strategy: Improving Economic Opportunity for the Bay Area's Low – and Moderate-Wage Workers, 2014 http://mtc.ca.gov/toolsand-resources/digital-library/economic-prosperity-strategyimproving-economic-opportunity-bay
- 16 Jennifer Lin, The Suburbanization of Low-Wage Work in the East Bay, EBASE, June, 2016. PolicyLink and the Program for Environmental and Regional Equity at the University of Southern California, An Equity Profile of the San Francisco Bay Area Region. http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/ documents/bay-area-profile/BayAreaProfile_21April2015_ Final.pdf
- 17 Health Care and Social Assistance in particular covers a range of occupations with very different incomes. The three sub-categories, with median annual income in brackets, are: Medical and Health Services Manager (\$104,000), Licensed Practical and Licensed Vocational Nurse (\$44,000), and Home Health Aide (\$22,750). For our purposes here, we operate with the assumption that the latter two categories constitute a disproportionate share of employees in the jurisdictions under consideration.



1212 Broadway, Suite 500 Oakland CA 94612 (510) 839-9510 www.urbanhabitat.org