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Introduction

The Downtown Oakland Specific Plan began in 2015 with a series of community meetings where the majority of comments centered on issues of affordability, gentrification and displacement. Moreover, the Specific Plan presentations left many with the perception that the outcomes could negatively affect historically marginalized communities of color. In response to these concerns, the City of Oakland Department of Planning and Building hired an equity consultant, and with the city’s Department of Race and Equity, designed a process to consolidate racial equity into the Specific Plan as an essential component of the plan’s development policies, programs, and projects. The intention of this effort is to ensure that the plan addresses disparity throughout its recommendations to enhance the economic, cultural and environmental quality of Downtown Oakland.

The documentation of racial disparities, and identification of indicators that will measure the plan’s progress toward equity is the first step in an approach to centering racial equity in the Specific Plan.

This disparity analysis is part of a larger equity impact assessment that is underway for the Specific Plan. The equity impact assessment involves identifying and engaging a broader and more representative segment of stakeholders; documenting racial inequities; and examining equity impacts of potential specific plan policies, programs, and projects; as well as identifying complementary strategies to enhance positive impacts or reduce negative impacts of specific plan recommendations.

The equity impact assessment will help to ensure that the Specific Plan policies related to transportation, economics, housing, urban design and arts and culture will address equity. Thus, each topic within the Specific Plan will include an equity component as an implicit component of its assessments and recommendations.

Oakland’s Commitment to Equity

Like cities across the U.S., Oakland has been shaped by institutional and structural racism. Past government policies and practices have contributed to the creation of significant racial disparities. In legislation authored by councilmember Desley Brooks, Oakland established the Department of Race and Equity in 2015 to “systematically address these pervasive and persistent issues in our government, greater community and City” (City Council proposal to establish the DRE, 1/27/15). The Department is tasked with integrating, on a city-wide basis, the principle of ensuring that Oakland is a “fair and just” city, by eliminating systemic inequities caused by past and current decisions, systems of power and privilege, and policies. The initiating ordinance directs staff to implement practices that will allow the City to make progress in the elimination of inequities and mitigate unavoidable negative community impacts to fairness and opportunity.

The utilization of an equity tool (the racial equity impact assessment) for the downtown plan is one of the first applications of addressing racial equity in a City-led community process. It is imperative that the City works side by side with the community, other city departments and government institutions,
businesses, artists and other stakeholders to undo the legacy of racism and to create an Oakland where equity is realized.

Report Outline

The following racial disparity analysis has been completed to inform the Specific Plan process. This analysis begins with an account of the history of inequity in Oakland; and documents racial disparities related to the four major Specific Plan topic areas, including: (1) housing, jobs and economic opportunity; (2) built environment, health and sustainability, (3) streets, connectivity and mobility; and (4) arts & culture. For each of these topic areas, the analysis in this report presents a desired future outcome, as well as equity indicators that establish the baseline conditions that the plan’s policies, programs and projects must address. These equity indicators will be used in future analysis to help imbed equity in the Specific Plan recommendations.

Purpose of Report

- Augment existing conditions data to deepen understanding of Oakland’s community composition, racial disparities and needs so that the Specific Plan strategies are grounded in a clear understanding of existing inequities;

- Provide information about access-to-opportunity and quality-of-life outcomes, including the provision and utilization of health, educational and other social services; fit between the education and training attainment of Oakland residents and growing sectors of the economy, wage gaps; transit dependency; housing cost burden; under- and unemployment, and rates of youth disconnectedness, among others.

- Use equity data to inform the policy decisions in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP).

- Understand current conditions in downtown Oakland to develop draft technical policies and draft plans to consider for inclusion in the DOSP.
Historical Perspective on Downtown’s Racial Inequities

A. Historical Context

This section provides an overview of Oakland’s history of racial discrimination in jobs, housing and transportation and infrastructure. Like many other cities across the country, the spatial segregation and isolation from opportunities for wealth accrual and social mobility that have resulted from this history have had ongoing racial effects in current development processes. The following historical overview is presented according to key moments in Oakland history.

Prior to being incorporated as a city, Oakland and the Bay Area were the ancestral land of the Shuumi/Ohlone, whose descendants still inhabit the Bay Area. In 1869, the Pacific Transcontinental Railroad established its West Coast terminal in West Oakland. Soon thereafter, many black workers found work with the Pullman Palace Car Company, which had a policy of only hiring black men as porters. While this policy was restrictive and racist, it encouraged hundreds of black families to relocate to West Oakland from the South. Black workers often resided in company-owned rooming houses, but also in the inexpensive housing that West Oakland offered. First recruited to work in California gold mines and then forced out in the 1870s, Chinese workers relocated to cities including Oakland and remained mostly segregated during the first half of the 20th Century. In the 1880s, Oakland Chinatown covered a dozen blocks when Chinese immigration was restricted by the U.S.’ Chinese Exclusion laws, and re-enforced forty years later by the Walter-McCarran Act. The concentration of the Chinese population in a small area of Oakland’s downtown was enforced by a segregated school system (until 1947), California’s Alien Land Law (that prohibited Asian immigrants from owning land or property until 1949) and enforceable covenants against the Chinese (among others) that prevented them from living in other Oakland neighborhoods. Many Latinos have been in Oakland for generations, dating back to the original Spanish land grants, while others are more recent immigrants. Latinos have also been segregated, concentrated in the area southeast of Lake Merritt and the Fruitvale district.

The growth of the rail and shipping industries in Oakland, as well as the growth of manufacturing industries that supported the nation’s efforts in World War II led to more job opportunities for black communities. Motivated by better economic conditions, and escaping oppressive social conditions enforced by a legacy of racism and inequality, as well as Jim Crow policies in the South, led to the great

1 “Race, Space and Struggles for Mobility: Transportation Impacts on African Americans in Oakland and the East Bay,” A. Golub, Marcantonio & Sanchez., 2013, p 704.
6 Web: http://oakland-chinatown.info/chinatown-history/
8 Web: http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1009&context=studentawards
migration of black communities to places like Oakland,9 and particularly to West Oakland, where the black community had created a strong cultural and economic enclave.10 This financial stability led to a growing black presence in Oakland, which spawned a political and economic backlash in the form of restrictive covenants11. In the 1910s and 1920s, ordinances requiring segregated housing and mortgage red-lining began a period of lawful segregation in Oakland. Federal housing programs of the 1930s and 1940s funded housing projects with restrictive covenants and occupancy criteria that maintained segregation in publicly funded housing. Until 1963, the Oakland Tribune ran “white only” real estate listings.12

Struggles over segregation in jobs and unions continued throughout the 1950s. The construction of BART and the freeways were set to provide the largest number of jobs in the area since the New Deal in the 1930s. Groups fought for quotas for minority workers, job training, union integration and funding for relocated households. BART eventually instituted an affirmative action hiring program in 1967.13

Urban renewal programs of the 1950s set the stage for “white flight” a term used to describe white society fleeing to suburbs, where they excluded blacks from employment, housing, and educational opportunities. A common component of post-war urban renewal was transportation infrastructure such as highways and mass transit systems. East Bay freeways and BART, designed and constructed during this period, produced many of the typical aspects of neighborhood displacement and blight, with many of these impacts in black and Chinese neighborhoods. As the suburbs of southern Alameda County and neighboring Contra Costa County were able to leverage new transportation facilities with cheap land and expanding tax bases, white residents could secure housing in these places through federally subsidized mortgage loans while accessing employment opportunities in urban areas, using the federally subsidized highways and, eventually, the BART system.14

The civil rights and environmental movements of the 1950s and 1960s altered the rules for urban planning and ended outright support for segregation.15 Oakland saw the growth of black youth activism beginning in 1965-1970. Young black activists helped establish anti-poverty centers (to support the federal War on Poverty), where local youth could seek job placement, legal assistance and other services. These centers helped establish a strong political infrastructure of small grassroots organizations. It was within this context that Bobby Seal and Huey Newton formed the Black Panther

11 Ibid, 37.
12 “Race, Space and Struggles for Mobility: Transportation Impacts on African Americans in Oakland and the East Bay,” A. Golub, Marcantonio & Sanchez., 2013, p 706-707.
13 “Race, Space and Struggles for Mobility: Transportation Impacts on African Americans in Oakland and the East Bay,” A. Golub, Marcantonio & Sanchez., 2013, p. 708.
14 Ibid., 709-710.
15 Ibid., 713.
Party for Self Defense as one of the various approaches that emerged nationally to advance the Civil Rights Movement.\(^{16}\)

By the 1980s, Oakland’s political and economic scene had dramatically changed for black youth. As a result of “white flight” and of a changing economic climate, black youth were left with few opportunities for viable employment. Unemployment, poor investments in education and the concentration of poverty left the community exposed to the crack cocaine epidemic, which afflicted Oakland, as it did many parts of urban America. The streets got progressively more dangerous as crime rose in correlation with the influx of drugs to Oakland. This presence of violence in Oakland fostered a culture of isolation among youth, families and communities. The threat of violence slowly eroded the networks, communities and institutions that youth relied on traditionally. As far back as The War on Drugs—established in 1971 under the Nixon administration, targeting black communities that had been ravaged by a lack of employment opportunities and other community destabilization—led to mass incarceration that took a toll in Oakland communities.\(^{17}\) Punitive policing practices also served to repress youth activism.\(^{18}\)

The housing market crash and foreclosure crisis of 2007-2011 marked another moment in Oakland’s history, forcing population shifts. The subprime mortgage market collapse in 2007 hit Oakland particularly hard with over 35,000 homes lost between 2007 and 2012. These foreclosures were concentrated in Oakland’s lower-income flatlands neighborhoods that had been targeted by predatory lenders. Many of these families (predominantly people of color) moved to far-off suburbs requiring them to commute long distances to their jobs in the inner Bay Area.\(^{19}\) Investors (mostly from outside of Oakland) acquired almost half of foreclosed properties turning huge profits following the housing market recovery.\(^{20}\)

It is against this historical backdrop that we turn to evaluate contemporary racial disparities. Analysis that draws on the “Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT)” report prepared by the equity team for the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan shows that significant disparities exist today in income, education, and health, among others. The SWOT report included data points to deepen the understanding of the Oakland community composition, racial disparities and needs, many of which have been used for this analysis. This analysis also draws on Policy Link’s Equity Atlas that provides a comprehensive data resource to track, measure and make the case for inclusive growth. Additional data sources are also cited throughout the analysis below, which begins with an assessment of the demographic trends in downtown Oakland.


\(^{19}\) According to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, commute times increased 9% from 2016 to 2015 and per-commuter congested delay increased by 64% since 2000 (web: [http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov/time-spent-congestion](http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov/time-spent-congestion)). Additionally, real state resource webpage, Trulia, places Oakland as the 7\(^{th}\) metro area with the longest commute times (web: [https://www.trulia.com/blog/trends/renter-owner-commute](https://www.trulia.com/blog/trends/renter-owner-commute)).

Figure 1. Greater Downtown Oakland

Source: Oakland Planning Dept.
Notes: Greater downtown Oakland for this report is described as census tracts 4013 (29.5%), 4026 (57.4%), 4027 (41.7%), 4028, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4033, 4034, 9832.
B. Current Demographic Trends

The racial and ethnic composition of greater downtown Oakland is diverse; however, dramatic demographic shifts continue to take place. Between 1990 and 2015, the African-American population in the greater downtown fell from 27.6% to 20.1%, mirroring a more pronounced decline of African Americans citywide. The greater downtown also saw a decrease in the white population from 32.3% to 25.8%, and a slight increase in the share of the Hispanic/Latino of 2.1%, and an 8% increase in the share of the Asian population, which also reflects citywide trends.

Figure 2. Race and Ethnicity Change (1990-2015)

At 60% single person households, greater downtown has a much larger share of this demographic than Oakland does as a whole. The distribution of household types in the downtown has remained relatively steady since 1990 with a slight decline in families with children from 13% to 9%.

Figure 3. Distribution of Household Type (1990-2013)

The greater downtown has higher proportions of younger adults and seniors compared to Oakland as a whole. Approximately 39% of residents are between 25 and 44 years old, compared to 33% in Oakland. Nearly 20% of residents in Greater Downtown are seniors age 65 years and older, compared with 11.5% citywide. Overall, the median age in the Greater Downtown area is 42 years, compared with 36 in Oakland as a whole. Median age for the greater downtown remained relatively constant between 2000 and 2013.
Figure 4. Median Age (2000-2015)

Median Age in Greater Downtown vs Oakland (2000-2015)


Pockets of linguistic isolation exist in the greater downtown, primarily of Asian or Pacific Islander languages of between 0.5-2.2% of the total population.

Figure 5. Areas of Spanish & Asian Pacific Islanders Who Speak No English (2015)

Source: US American Community Survey 5-year Estimates 2015, City of Oakland.
Note: high margin of error.
Framework for Identifying and Documenting Racial Inequities

The city has utilized a Results Based Accountability (RBA) framework to analyze the contemporary racial disparities in downtown. RBA is a tool designed to reveal a relationship between results, indicators and activities. This tool includes a series of questions that will help move the downtown specific plan forward in a disciplined way that is structured to achieve equitable results. The initial questions included in an RBA analysis are:

1) What is the proposal? (description of the policy, program or action)
2) What is the desired future condition? (racially equitable future condition)
3) What does the data tell us? (racial disparity indicators)

The Downtown Plan disparity analysis will combine data about demographics, economic conditions and the built environment, and begins with a brief description of what the plan could accomplish for topics the downtown specific plan process has identified to date, including:

- Housing, Jobs and Economic Opportunity
- Built Environment, Health & Sustainability
- Arts & Culture
- Streets, Connectivity & Mobility

It then presents a desired future condition for these topics. Racial disparity indicators are introduced for each topic along with a brief explanation of why the indicator matters. These indicators will be vetted by the community at upcoming public engagement activities to ensure the city has identified the most relevant metrics of equity.
HOUSING, JOBS AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
A. Housing and Affordability

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

The Downtown Oakland Specific Plan will use as a starting point the recently completed strategy, *Oakland at Home*, to develop an affordable housing toolkit. The Plan could recommend including a zoning framework and policy context that addresses potential existing barriers to housing, and could help to facilitate the development of new housing types with a variety of unit sizes to accommodate families, as well as other non-traditional configurations.

Table 1. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Housing and Affordability in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Affordability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown is home to a vibrant blend of cultures, household types and income groups.</td>
<td>• Housing cost burden by race/ethnicity (owners) Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longstanding residents and families have abundant housing options with ample disposable</td>
<td>• Housing cost burden by race/ethnicity (renters) Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income leftover after paying housing and transportation costs. Formerly homeless</td>
<td>• Owners vs renters by race (citywide vs downtown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals have safe, secure housing and support services. Innovative housing types</td>
<td>Displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exist to meet the demand for housing offering a high quality of life.</td>
<td>• Homeless count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Displacement index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Housing Supply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SRO inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Housing Cost Burden by Owners vs Renters and Race and Ethnicity, City of Oakland (2014)

Details: Is housing affordable for all? In 2014, white owner households had the lowest housing burden at 31.6% and black households had the highest housing burden at 48.4%. A larger disparity exists between white and black renter households, for whom the burden is 40.3% and 63.4%, respectively.

Why it matters: According to the PEW “A decade after the housing bust upended the lives of millions of Americans, more U.S. households are headed by renters than at any point since at least 1965. In Oakland, Certain demographic groups – such as young adults, nonwhites and the lesser educated – have historically been more likely to rent than others, and rental rates have increased among these groups
over the past decade. However, rental rates have also increased among some groups that have traditionally been less likely to rent, including whites and middle-aged adults.”

Housing is usually the single largest expense for households, and far too many pay too much for housing, particularly low-income families and households of color. High housing costs squeeze household budgets, leaving few resources to pay for other expenses, save for emergencies, or make long-term investments.

**Figure 7. Owner vs Renter by Race (2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Greater Downtown</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black alone</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nh White</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** US American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, 2011-2015.

**Details:** The overwhelming majority of black residents are renters in downtown at 92.1%, followed by all other races, also at relatively high levels in downtown. This is contrasted with higher rates of

---

homeownership for these groups citywide, though the white population maintains the highest level of homeownership citywide at 50.5% followed by the Asian, black and Latino populations at 40.0%, 33.1% and 30.8%, respectively.

Why it matters: Homeownership can be a critical pathway to economic security and mobility, helping lower-income people build an asset that can be used to pay for education or other productive investments. But people of color have faced major barriers to accessing sustainable homeownership. In addition to more historic discrimination, communities of color were disproportionately targeted by predatory lenders and negatively impacted by the recent foreclosure crisis, contributing to the rising racial wealth gap.

Figure 8. Total Number of Homeless Population Enumerated During the Point-in-Time Count, City of Oakland (2015-2017)

Figure 9. Percent of Homeless Population with Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity, City of Oakland (2017)
Details: During a 2017 point-in-time survey in Oakland, a total of 2,761 individuals were experiencing homelessness which represented a 26% increase from 2015. Oakland’s homeless population represented nearly half (49%) of the total number of persons enumerated in Alameda County during the 2017 Point in Time count. Of individuals experiencing homelessness, more than two-thirds (68%) identified as black or African American, despite black or African American constituting only 26% of the population.

Why it matters: Homelessness is up by 26% since 2015. Thousands of people experience homelessness in Oakland, most of whom identify as black or African American. Seventy one percent of homeless individuals surveyed in Oakland became homeless after the age of 25 and of respondents age 51 or older, 40% reported they had first experienced homelessness after age 50. The primary cause of homelessness, although difficult to pinpoint, is largely due to money issues. Over half of survey respondents cited money issues as their reason. The number of individuals experiencing homelessness exceeds the capacity of the current system of care. With growing levels of displacement, and more and more people being unable to afford housing, we are seeing high levels of homelessness, tent encampments and associated deterioration of health, mental health and social outcomes.
Details: The UC Berkeley Center for Community Innovation (CCI) developed the above gentrification index adapting the methodologies of various researchers (e.g., Freeman 2005; Bates 2013; Maciag 2015) to characterize places that historically housed vulnerable Populations, but have since experienced significant demographic shifts as well as real estate investment. The methodology for evaluating gentrification and displacement risk involved analyzing over 50 variables for the years 1990, 2000, and 2013 from various datasets including data on demographics, transportation, housing, land use, and policies. The above research shows that most of greater downtown Oakland is experiencing ongoing gentrification and displacement.

Why it matters: Oakland’s booming real estate market necessitates a careful look at the causes and consequences of neighborhood change to protect residents that are most vulnerable to potentially being displaced. Wages of low-income residents have not kept pace with the sky-rocketing housing prices resulting in massive demographic shifts, including displacement of individual households as well as the changing character and loss of cultural resources that many residents have raised concerns about during the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP) process.

Figure 12. Greater Downtown Oakland SRO Inventory

Source: City of Oakland.

Details: According to the 2015 report, “Downtown Oakland’s Residential Hotels”, there are currently 18 Single-Room Occupancy facilities (SROs) commonly referred to as residential hotels in downtown Oakland, containing a total of 1,311 units. Most of Oakland’s SROs are clustered in the downtown.

Why it matters: Residential hotels do not typically require a security deposit, credit references, proof of income, or long-term lease agreement. For these reasons, residential hotels can provide housing for vulnerable populations with unstable finances and little access to credit. They are often the housing of last resort that provides a stopgap from homelessness. The 2015 report on Downtown’s Residential Hotels (SROs) detailed demographic data for 240 units, or 22% of all SRO residents. The residents of these units were 71% male and 28% female. Residents of these units identified as 66% black, 27% white, and 4.5% Asian. Most residents reported social security and/or disability benefits as their sole source of income, with a smaller group receiving pension payments or general assistance.
SROs face risks both from disinvestment and from investment. Two of Oakland’s SROs have recently been placed in receivership due to mismanagement leading to crime and health violations. At the same time, rising real estate prices provide an incentive to property owners to sell SROs, displace their current residents, and either convert the units to a more profitable activity or facility type or rehabilitate them to reach a higher-end market. This is occurring at the same time as more Oakland residents, particularly low-income and residents of color, are priced out of their homes and are looking for affordable housing in increasingly limited supply.
B. Jobs and Economic Opportunity

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

The Downtown Specific Plan will align with the recently completed *City of Oakland Economic Development Strategy 2018-2020* and its goal of making Oakland: “...an easy, efficient, and prosperous place to do business, and reducing racial disparities and helping all Oaklanders achieve economic security so that everyone has an opportunity to thrive.” To this end, the Specific Plan could include a range of policies around local business retention and expansion, support for development of industrial, office and retail space, and encouragement for affordable commercial space to nurture a diverse set of local businesses that employ residents with all levels of education and training. The Plan could also include recommendations for expanding youth development-serving programs.

Table 2. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Jobs, Training and Economic Opportunity in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs and Economic Opportunity</th>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disconnected youth (percent of 16 to 24 year-olds not working or in school by race/ethnicity 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unemployment rate by race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Job Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational attainment requirements for jobs in greater downtown Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent of workers with an associate degree or higher by race, ethnicity and immigrant status, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Median hourly wage by race/ethnicity, 1980-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Financial Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent working poor by race/ethnicity, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Median household income, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oakland’s downtown has a vibrant economy that is inclusive and racially equitable. Prosperity is shared and the economic gains that are experienced downtown reverberate throughout all of Oakland with longstanding residents and their children securing quality jobs downtown, accumulating wealth and easily accessing services offered downtown.
Figure 13. Disconnected Youth, City of Oakland (2014)


Details: Are youth ready and able to enter the workforce? Citywide in 2014, the white population had the lowest share not working or in school among 16-24 year-olds at 9.88% and the black population had the highest share at 20.56%.

Why it matters: Ensuring that youth are educated, healthy, and ready to thrive in the workforce is essential for economic prosperity, but too many youth— particularly youth of color— are disconnected from educational or employment opportunities. Not accessing education and job experience early in life can have long-lasting impacts including lower earnings, higher public expenditures, lower tax revenues, and lost human potential.
**Figure 14. Unemployment Rate by Race (2015)**


**Details:** In 2015, the average unemployment rate in downtown for the black population was 14.1%, 14.1% for Hispanic and 10.3% for Asian, while the average unemployment rate for the white population was much lower at 5.7%. These figures do not take into account the underemployed, who are working part time and would rather be employed full time.

**Why it matters:** In an equitable city, all workers would have similar success in finding work, regardless of race (or gender). Racial differences in employment result from differences in education, training, and experience, as well as barriers to employment for workers of color such as English language ability, immigration status, criminal records, lack of transportation access, and racial discrimination and bias among employers and institutions. Policy and systems changes that remove these barriers and increase education and job training opportunities will lead to greater labor force participation and a stronger Oakland economy.

**Figure 15. Educational Attainment Requirements for Jobs in Greater Downtown (2015)**


Note: based on educational attainment of downtown workers.
Details: At least 26% of the jobs in the greater downtown require some college or an AA degree and 36% require a Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree.

Why it matters: Overall, more than 62% of downtown jobs require an associate degree or higher level of education. This reflects the education requirements of many jobs in professional services, finance and insurance, information, management, and other knowledge-based industries that are concentrated downtown.

Figure 16. Percent of Workers with an Associate Degree or Higher by Race, Ethnicity and Immigrant Status, City of Oakland (2014)

Details: Do Oakland workers have the education needed to meet the requirements for the jobs in the greater downtown? The educational requirements place most Downtown jobs out of reach of many Oakland residents, especially people of color. Approximately 25% of all Oakland residents aged 25 years and over have completed some college or an Associate degree.

Why it matters: There are significant racial and ethnic disparities in educational attainment among Oakland residents. More than 70% of U.S. born, white and Asian residents have completed an Associate degree or higher, a much higher rate than for Oakland’s black, Latino, or immigrant communities.
Details: The median hourly wage of the white population has out-paced people of color for over 30 years. Since 1990, hourly wages for people of color declined and since 2000 haven’t increased.

Why it matters: In an equitable job market, wages would reflect differences in education, training, experience, and pay scales by occupation and industry, but would not vary systematically by race or gender. Racial gaps in wages between those with similar levels of education suggests discrimination and bias among employers. Policy and systems changes that ensure fair hiring and rising wages for low-wage workers will boost incomes, resulting in more of the consumer spending that drives economic growth and job creation.
Figure 18. Percent of Working Poor by Race and Ethnicity, City of Oakland (2014)


Details: Is job opportunity in downtown being broadly shared? In 2014, 17.3% of Latino adults were working full-time, and yet earning below 200% of the poverty level, while 8.3% of black and 8.7% of Asian adults were doing the same. This is contrasted to 3.0% of white adults.

Why it matters: As the low-wage sector has grown, the share of adults who are working full-time jobs but still cannot make ends meet has increased, particularly among Latinos and other workers of color. The failure of even full-time work to pay family-supporting wages dampens the potential of many of Oakland’s workers.
Figure 19. Median Household Income by Race, City of Oakland (2000-2014)


Details: Median household income in 2014 for the white population in downtown was nearly twice that of Latino and Asian households. The household income for the white population was nearly $50,000 higher than the black population.

Why it matters: Wage and employment gaps by race (as well as gender) are not only harmful for people of color—they hold back the entire Oakland economy. Closing these gaps by eliminating discrimination in pay and hiring, boosting educational attainment, and ensuring strong and rising wages for low-wage workers is good for families, good for communities, and good for the economy. Rising wages and incomes, particularly for low-income households, leads to more consumer spending, which is a key driver of economic growth and job creation.
BUILT ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY
C. Sustainability, Health and Safety

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

The Downtown Specific Plan’s policies addressing climate change will align with the City’s Energy and Climate Action Plan. Potential ideas could include those that help insulate residents from adverse environmental impacts, and help to improve walking conditions and other options to improve health conditions. Also, principles of “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” (CPTED) can be used to address safety within the downtown, among other strategies to enhance safety.

Table 3. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Sustainability, Health and Safety in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability, Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oakland’s residents enjoy clean air, protection from climate change risks and access to a livable, supportive and nurturing community that fulfills the daily needs for a healthy lifestyle for all ages and ability levels. Residents can access services and activities at all times of day, secure in their surroundings with a sense of safety. | • Obesity by race  
• Age adjusted asthma hospitalization rate  
• Vehicle pedestrian motor vehicle accidents  
Emergency Dept. visits rate by race  
• Black carbon air pollution and communities of concern |
| | **Crime** |
| | • Crime by victim and arrestee race  
• Crime reports by type  
• Crime density/heat map |
**Figure 20. Obesity Rate by Race (2014)**


Note: Percentage of adult respondents ages 18+ who had a body mass index (BMI) of 30.0 or above based on self-reported height & weight.

**Details:** The obesity rate for adults in downtown mirrors that for the City as a whole, with the black and Latino populations exhibiting the highest levels of obesity.

**Why it matters:** Healthy neighborhoods provide residents with access to parks, healthy food, clean air, safe streets and health care and social services. In communities where these basic needs are not met, people are more likely to suffer from chronic diseases such as obesity.
Figure 21. Age Adjusted Asthma Hospitalization Rate (2013-3Q2015)

Source: Office Statewide Health Planning and Development, 2013-3Q2015; Alameda Co. Dept. of Public Health; City of Oakland
Note: Due to small numbers, the asthma hospitalization rate for whites is unstable.
Note: Hospitalization data combines Asian and Pacific Islander, so the asthma hospitalization rate is for Asians/Pacific Islanders.

Details: The black population had the highest asthma hospitalization rate, at almost twice the rate of all other races in zip codes downtown.

Why it matters: Neighborhoods with people of color and low-income communities are more likely to be exposed to environmental hazards, putting them at higher risk for chronic diseases and premature death.
**Figure 22. Vehicle-Pedestrian Motor Vehicle Accidents ED Visit Rate (2013-3Q2015)**

- **Source:** Office Statewide Health Planning and Development, 2013-3Q2015; Alameda Co. Dept. of Public Health; City of Oakland.
- **Note:** Motor vehicle accident as primary diagnosis for ED visit.
- **Note:** Due to small numbers, the vehicle-ped motor vehicle accident ED visit rate for Hispanics/Latinos may be unstable.

**Details:** The black population had the highest rate of vehicle-pedestrian accidents in downtown zip codes, followed by the white population.

**Why it matters:** As noted in the 2017 Pedestrian Master Plan update, pedestrian collisions tend to overlap with transit- and walking-dependent populations, and populations that are especially vulnerable to poor walking conditions, such as senior citizens, children and people with disabilities.
Figure 23. Black Carbon and Communities of Concern

Details: Downtown Oakland, along with most of Oakland’s flatland neighborhoods are considered “Communities of Concern” by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which created the Communities of Concern index to identify Bay Area neighborhoods with concentrations of residents who face potential disadvantages and barriers to mobility. The above figure shows that the majority of downtown Oakland is in the medium- to high-disadvantage category, indicating that the populations in these areas are most vulnerable. Many of these Communities of Concern are adjacent to high-pollution corridors. The concentration of black carbon is highest near the freeways and heavily used motorist corridors throughout downtown.

Why it matters: Earthjustice.org reports that black carbon – microscopic airborne particles commonly known as soot – comes from diesel engines, is the leading cause of respiratory illness and death and is a

---

23 The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) created the “Communities of Concern” index to identify areas with concentrations of residents who face potential disadvantages and barriers to mobility. The darker green the area, the more disadvantaged the area (for example a person who is low income and over 75 years of age).
big factor in global warming. The portions of downtown near higher concentrations of black carbon could contribute to higher rates of respiratory illness for the vulnerable communities that live in these areas.

Figure 24. Crime by Victim Race in Downtown Oakland (9/1/2016-9/30/2017)

[Pie chart showing crime by victim race in Downtown Oakland (9/1/2016-9/30/2017)]

Details: White, black and Asian residents had the highest rates of victimization out of the police beats analyzed, with whites having a slightly higher rate of victimization.

Why it matters: Personal safety is essential to livability. Chronic stress caused by criminal activity affects all aspects of personal and community wellness.

Table 4. Arrest Rate by Arrestee Race (9/1/2016-9/30/2017) and Other Disparity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Population (Downtown, 2013)</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (Downtown, 2015)</th>
<th>Poverty Rate (Oakland, 2015)</th>
<th>Arrest Rate Downtown 9/1/16 to 9/30/17 (322 total arrests)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census; IPUMS; City of Oakland.

Details: African Americans are significantly over-represented in arrest rates.
Why it matters: Possessing a criminal record can keep someone unemployable, as demonstrated in the African American unemployment rate, which is double that for the white population rate downtown. This condition undermines the building of economic security and contributes to lives lived in poverty in communities of color at rates much higher than those for white residents. It blocks access to federally-funded housing, increases housing instability and the likelihood of homelessness.

Figure 25. Crime Reports by Type of Crime and Crime Density Heat Map

Details: Larceny (personal property) theft and motor vehicle theft accounted for the majority of crime reports. Crime “hot spots” occurred near 7th Street between Broadway and Washington St., Franklin St. and Webster St. between 12th St. and 8th St., near Broadway and 14th St., near San Pablo and 17th St., and Broadway between Grand Ave. and 25th St.

Why it matters: The physical environment greatly influences crime, fear of crime, and quality of life. For a crime prevention strategy to be effective, it must be comprehensive. “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” (CPTED) is a crime prevention approach based on the theory that the proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to reduction in crime as well as improvement in the quality of life. CPTED works by decreasing a criminal’s ability to commit crime and increasing the chances that the crime will be seen and prevented by the presence of bystanders.
D. Outdoor Space and Recreation

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

In conjunction with the City’s Parks and Recreation and Public Works Departments, the Downtown Specific Plan will contain policies related to protecting and enhancing natural resources (including Lake Merritt and the estuary), linking green spaces (including streets, paths and linear parks), and highlight a network of civic spaces welcoming to all residents.

Table 5. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Open Space and Recreation in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Recreation Opportunities abound in the downtown to play, relax, exercise, attend events and connect with nature. Outdoor spaces are unique, welcoming and safe.</td>
<td>Access to outdoor space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor space conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26. Access to Outdoor Space

Source: Oakland Planning Dept.

**Details:** Most of the Downtown Specific Plan study is within walking distance (0.25 mi) of a park or an open space. The greater downtown area has around 2.1 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. The City of Oakland Open Space Conservation and Recreation element of the Oakland General Plan sets the desired standard for local-serving park acreage at 4 acres per 1,000 residents.

**Why it matters:** The American Society of Landscape Architects cites the health benefits of time spent in nature including parks and gardens.24 Studies document positive impacts from living in close proximity to greenspace, positive impact on children’s health and educational outcomes to reduced symptoms of depression in adults. The obesity rate for black and Latino downtown residents is 30.9% and 25.4%, respectively. Studies have shown a significant relationship between walkability and obesity – getting

24 Web: https://www.asla.org/healthbenefitsofnature.aspx
outside encourages us to move. Walking to a park or for other reasons can help residents get their exercise and improve their health.

**Figure 27: Outdoor Space Conditions**

Inviting outdoor spaces: variety of recreation facilities; street trees; illumination; cleanliness; active recreational

Neglected outdoor spaces: no active recreational use; play area next to a homeless encampment; lack of trash removal.

Upgraded outdoor spaces: ample seating; street trees; upgraded sidewalk materials; decorative lamp posts.

Divested outdoor spaces: lack of seating, street trees, and illumination; lack of trash removal.

**Details:** The photos above are a few examples of the noticeable lack of investment in the open spaces in different neighborhoods throughout downtown, particularly on the edges traveling to West Oakland and in historic Chinatown.

**Why it matters:** In the photo examples above, with the exception of Lincoln Park, a stark contrast can be seen in the areas that have received investment (i.e., seating, lamp posts, cleaning service) and those without similar levels of investment in less affluent areas (historically) inhabited by black and Chinese
Figure 28. Street Trees

Details: Most of downtown Oakland consists of impervious surfaces due to the presence of large parking lots. These tracts, along with dense, commercial areas like Chinatown lack street trees. Areas close to I-980 and I-880 also lack sufficient street trees.

Why it matters: Urban forests help capture particulate matter, moderate temperature, retain rainwater, reduce street speed (canopies visually reduce street width prompting drivers to slow down) and provide shade for pedestrians. Downtown Oakland residents are flanked by 2 highways, which produce pollutants. A higher concentration of street trees could provide better air quality for downtown Oakland residents.
E. Built Environment

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

The Downtown Oakland Specific Plan will establish the framework for how downtown Oakland will grow and change over the next 20 to 25 years. The plan will introduce new zoning regulations, design guidelines and other development-related policies to shape growth that is focused, promotes transit ridership, builds demand to support businesses, and creates a downtown that is active at all times of the day. The plan will include clear plans for connecting downtown Oakland’s distinct neighborhoods and waterfront areas, and help guide the city’s future public investment decisions. The Specific Plan is projected to improve downtown’s role as the economic engine of the City, and thereby support the delivery of services to residents throughout the whole city. Policies and initiatives will be included that address social equity.

Table 6. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to the Built Environment in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>(Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality architecture provides the backdrop for people from diverse cultural backgrounds, incomes, ages and ability levels to fulfill their daily activities. Oakland’s history and diverse cultures are easily identified outdoors through inclusive cultural markers, gateway features, signs, murals and coordinated motifs. Street infrastructure and furniture supports a variety of accessibility types from wheelchair accessible sidewalks to closely spaced benches for seniors. Public art abounds and reflects the diversity of people who have called Oakland home for generations.</td>
<td>New Development Public Realm Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 29. New Development Projects Downtown (2017)

Details: The majority of new development is mixed-use residential and commercial projects.

Why it matters: Is there sufficient land dedicated to job-generating land uses? Relatedly, is new housing being evenly distributed, along with investment in infrastructure and transportation, throughout downtown Oakland?
Figure 30: Public Realm Conditions

Inviting street area: street trees; upgraded sidewalk materials; decorative lamp posts (in historic Old Oakland)

Exiting downtown towards West Oakland at Castro St. reveals the end of a painted bike lane and the last pedestrian island

Exiting downtown toward West Oakland near 27th Street reveals diminished bicycle facilities and no pedestrian amenities

Details: The photos above are a few examples of the noticeable lack of investment in the public realm in different neighborhoods throughout downtown, particularly on the edges traveling to West Oakland and in historic Chinatown.

Why it matters: Race and place are interconnected. In the photo examples above, a stark contrast can be seen in the areas that have received investment (i.e., bike lanes and pedestrian amenities) and those without similar levels of investment leading to historically less affluent areas inhabited (historically) by black and Chinese residents. Racialized place creates demarcations providing advantage, privilege and an “edge” for whites, while generally offering less opportunities for non-white racial groups.  

Streets, Connectivity and Mobility

Range of Specific Plan Policies, Programs or Actions

The design guidelines and street design concepts included in the Downtown Plan will help enrich the public realm, and improve the pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks downtown (building off of the recently completed Pedestrian Master Plan and the Bicycle Master Plan update that is underway). Policies will be put in place that make each street comfortable, safe and visually unique and interesting. Emphasis will be placed on Broadway as the commercial and transit spine of the city. Recommendations will be made for improving connections to adjacent and outlying neighborhoods, such as West Oakland and East Oakland, so that residents throughout the city have efficient transportation access to downtown’s jobs, services and opportunity.

Table 7. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Streets, Connectivity and Mobility in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Disparity Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets &amp; Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Oakland will be a place where vibrant, safe and attractive streets give everyone the opportunity to walk, bike and take transit to their destinations. Access throughout Oakland to jobs, education, training and needed services downtown will be seamless and efficient.</td>
<td>Transportation mode to and from downtown Households without a car Race/ethnicity of AC Transit bus riders and BART riders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details: For non-commute trips, a little over 50% of trips to and from Downtown are by car, and a quarter of trips are made on foot and 12% by rail; bus and bike are less commonly used. For commute trips, half are made by rail (48%) to Downtown Oakland. Driving is the second most common mode of travel (40%). Only 1% of commute trips are currently made on foot and 6% by bike.

Why it matters: As reported in Advancing Equity in Transportation in Oakland, CA, (a UC Berkeley Masters report), Oakland is served by to main transit systems: the urban rail services operated by the Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART), and surface bus services, including a new Bus Rapid Transit system, operated by AC Transit. While Oakland has a relatively dense transit network compared to many other cities in the Bay Area, connectivity is low due to poor service levels in some areas. There are also significant transportation gaps in low-income communities and communities of color. Academic literature documents transit policy’s bias toward the expansion of suburban bus, express bus and fixed rail systems which are primarily used by higher income “choice riders”, while putting fewer resources toward transit service in low-income communities and communities of color who are more likely to be “transit dependent.” The Specific Plan policy objectives and transportation investment decisions could address the deeply racialized and segregated framework that shaped many of these decisions in the past.
Figure 32. Percent of Households Without a Vehicle by Race (2014)


Details: In 2014, only 10.4% of white households did not have access to a car, while 26.0% of black households did not have access to a car.

Why it matters: As illustrated in Figure 32, 40% of commute trips and 55% of non-commute trips to downtown were made by car, indicating the importance of the personal automobile as a means of transportation today. Reliable and affordable transportation is critical for meeting daily needs and accessing educational and employment opportunities located throughout the region. Access to a car can be critical and people of color are more likely to be carless.
Figure 33. Race and Ethnicity of AC Transit Riders vs BART Riders (Systemwide)


Details: Systemwide, a greater percentage of AC Transit riders are black, while BART has higher percentages of both white and Asian riders.

Why it matters: Transportation planning and investment decisions can bring fundamental improvements in communities that support their development and growth, or they can exclude them from access, isolating them from opportunities. Indeed, many communities in Oakland have borne the brunt of infrastructure disinvestments in the past and are still underserved today. In studying the 2005 case of Darenburg et al. v. Metropolitan Transportation Commission, a case of Title VI complaint, Golub (2013) found that regional transportation planning processes in the Bay Area disproportionately benefit a higher income, mostly white population, while overlooking bus riders who tend to be low income people of color.
F. Arts and Culture

Brief Description of the Range of Specific Plan Policy, Program or Action

The Downtown Oakland Specific Plan could include policies, actions and programs that bolster the work of the Oakland Cultural Plan. The plan may include a regulatory system and/or program for incentives to encourage development related to arts and culture (including arts and cultural districts), such as provisions related to maker space, custom manufacturing, performance spaces, art studios and galleries (including enhancements to existing facilities/organizations). The plan could also include a plan for gathering spaces, wayfinding, gateways, etc. to tie existing arts districts together.

Table 8. Desired Future Condition and Disparity Indicators Related to Arts and Culture in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Condition</th>
<th>Community Indicators (Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland’s downtown will be a vibrant center for intellectual and artistic innovation. Racially diverse artists, many with generational ties to Oakland, will craft, design and showcase their work in affordable spaces. A strong network of grassroots organizations will have affordable space to carry out their mission. Downtown’s art and culture districts will incubate both established and traditional cultures, as well as new and emerging cultural forms.</td>
<td>Map of arts, culture, &amp; entertainment districts&lt;br&gt;Artist displacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Details:** Downtown has one formally designated cultural district in Oakland, the “Black Arts Movement and Business District” in and around 14th Street, and another proposed district, the “Art + Garage District” in the Uptown area.

**Why it matters:** Downtown’s concentration of cultural and entertainment resources is an asset and bring both direct and indirect economic returns and provide diverse cultures with entertainment options.
Details: Half of artists surveyed (49%) reported being displaced from both their works space as well as their living space with large rent increases being cited as the main reason for displacement.

Why it matters: Affordable art working spaces are essential to keeping artistic innovation in downtown. Art and culture enriches the city in numerous ways, including uplifting youth, and has helped attract some of the new investment in downtown.
Conclusion

The analysis in this report has identified a range of racial disparities within downtown Oakland among indicators related to each of the major Specific Plan topic areas, including (1) housing, jobs and economic opportunity, (2) built environment, health and sustainability, (3) streets, connectivity and mobility and (4) arts & culture. Future components of the equity impact assessment for the Specific Plan will help to identify supportive Specific Plan policies for closing these disparity gaps.