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Introduction

Yerba Buena. Barbary Coast. Baghdad by the Bay. San Francisco. This unique Northern Californian city is a city of neighborhoods. From Chinatown to the Mission to Bayview Hunter’s Point, San Francisco’s strength grows out of the diversity of its many neighborhoods. But the specter of change is looming over many San Francisco’s neighborhoods.

Spend any time walking the streets of San Francisco, and you’ll feel it— the City by the Bay is in the midst of some dramatic changes. SRO hotels are being leveled to make way for upscale condominiums. Chic grocery stores are replacing neighborhood bodegas. Tax breaks are being offered to establish new industries in historically-working class neighborhoods. Changes that are re-shaping the face of San Francisco. The question is: what will become of San Francisco’s neighborhoods, especially the Eastern neighborhoods?

Since our founding in 1997, People Organized to Win Employment Rights (POWER) has been committed to fighting racial, gender and economic injustice. Like many other community-based organizations, POWER is rooted in a belief in the power of the people to make change. In the past seven years, low-income people have mobilized to raise the local minimum wage, to establish a moratorium on the construction of live-work lofts and to block local efforts to privatize the distribution of Food Stamps, among many important victories.

In spite of these advances, many low-income people— especially in the African-American, Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander communities in San Francisco’s Eastern neighborhoods— have said that they are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet. Many working class people of color have already left San Francisco as economic refugees, and the people moving into those neighborhoods have been changing the face of those neighborhoods.

To better understand the changes that the City has undergone, POWER partnered with Urban Solutions to get a handle on exactly who lives in the neighborhoods that have historically been home to San Francisco’s working class people of color. Neighborhoods like the Tenderloin, Chinatown, the Mission, Bayview Hunter’s Point, and Visitation Valley; neighborhoods that we are referring to as the Eastern neighborhoods of San Francisco.

Each of these neighborhoods has played an important role in the development of San Francisco as a world-class city, and at the same time each of these neighborhoods has been home to particular groupings of people. There Goes the Neighborhood was developed to offer us a statistical view of these neighborhoods today and how they have changed over the past thirty years. This study, coupled with our anecdotal experiences of these neighborhoods, should give us a better idea of how to move forward as we look to build vibrant community organizations fighting for economic, racial and gender justice in our communities, and in all of San Francisco.

This question of how to move forward is a particularly critical one at this point because the City is laying the groundwork to launch several major development projects in the coming years. More than any other collection of efforts, these economic development and land use projects will likely define the face of San Francisco into the next century.

Development in San Francisco has always posed unique challenges because of the urban geography. San Francisco sits on a plot of land measuring seven square miles surrounded on
either side by the Pacific Ocean and the San Francisco Bay. Because of this, development cannot go out. There are many restrictions on going up as well. All of this means that to develop something new in San Francisco means that something else has to be torn down.

Throughout its history, San Francisco has proven that it is ready and willing to tear something down in order to build something new. From the demolition of the Yerba Buena low-income housing buildings to make way for the Moscone Convention Center. To the tearing down of the Downtown Produce Market in the 1950s which was replaced by luxury housing. To the destruction of the Fillmore neighborhood for urban renewal. San Francisco has repeatedly torn down to build up something new. But what does this mean for the people who live, work and raise their families in these neighborhoods?

As you will see, San Francisco does not have a laudable track-record of protecting and maintaining African American, Asian, Latino, Native American and Pacific Islander communities. The Eastern neighborhoods have changed considerably since 1970. In all of the neighborhoods, it is low-income and working class people of color that are being pushed out. Occasionally, the displaced community has been replaced by another community. But over the span of just thirty years, San Francisco’s population has become more white, more professional and more exclusive. San Francisco is indeed losing much of its diversity. 

There seem to have been two main forces impacting the character of San Francisco’s development. The first is the attempt to make San Francisco the Manhattan of the West. As a result, the interests of finance, tourism and retail centers have had a disproportionate impact on the character of the City’s development.

Secondly, San Francisco’s development has often displaced working class communities of color. Although working class people of color have played important roles in making San Francisco what it is today, the City has a long and troubling history of displacing communities. In the 1940s, the Japanese-American community was almost completely ripped from San Francisco in alleged attempts to protect national security. The African-American community in the Fillmore was ravaged by “urban removal” in the 1950s and 1960s. More recently, the Latino community in the Mission was almost destroyed by a second wave of urban renewal and gentrification. And let us not forget, this city rests on land once inhabited by the Ohlone people who were virtually wiped out by the Spanish.

We believe that changing our current reality means that we must first understand the complexities of our situations. There Goes the Neighborhood represents POWER’s attempt to develop a concrete understanding of who lives in the Eastern neighborhoods now and how that has changed over the last thirty years. We hope that this information will strengthen the work of POWER and of our allies as we work together to build a San Francisco which develops an economy and communities that sustain and nurture all of us who call this place home.

As a document, There Goes the Neighborhood is broken into three main sections. The report is prefaced by a key map which provides a framing view of the Eastern neighborhoods relative to the rest of San Francisco. The second section provides an examination of the current make-up of each of the twelve targeted neighborhoods. Next, the document examines how each of these neighborhoods has changed over the past thirty years in several key areas. The document finally concludes by identifying up-coming development projects that could impact the character and diversity of the Eastern neighborhoods and all of San Francisco.
This map is provided as a reference for the larger Eastern Neighborhoods area that encompasses the eight individual neighborhoods profiled in the body of this report. The area is displayed within the context of the broader San Francisco landscape. Each of the eight neighborhoods is outlined, though it is important to consider that the “boundaries” of these neighborhoods in reality are not as clearly defined as the boundary lines on this map. This key map also shows some of the major street names throughout the area as geographic reference points.
Methodology and Census Definitions

**Data sources**
Census Bureau data was taken from the US Census 2000 and processed for mapping in Arcview 3.2. Census SF 1 data is representative of the entire population of a region. Maps are either at the Census “block” level, which is the finest-grain scale of data reporting that the Census offers, or at the “blockgroup” level which is an aggregate of several Census blocks. Note that Census blocks are not necessarily the same as an Assessor block or a city block as we may think of one empirically.

SF 2 and SF 3 data are generated from a sample of approximately one in six or seven households that is weighted by the Census Bureau to represent the area population. All SF 3 maps are at the blockgroup level, while SF 2 data is reported only at the Census “tract” level, which is the largest sized geographic unit for measuring Census data.

SF 2 data used in this report is for nationalities of the resident population. However this data is only provided for Census tracts where the reporting population is over 100. For example, if only 50 individuals in a Census tract self-identified under the category “Mexican,” then the Census would not report any data for that tract. Therefore, it should be used as an indicator of the general clustering of nationalities in broader areas, not precise counts of population.

All data from 1970, 1980 and 1990 used in the report tables were culled from Geolytics’ Neighborhood Change Database (NCDB), data originally collected by the US Census Bureau. The 1970-90 data sets were normalized by Geolytics to correspond to 2000 boundaries. Because the U.S. was completely covered by both Census tracts and blocks in both 1990 and 2000, the 1990 data was weighted to use as the basis for normalizing the boundaries. (In 1980, Census tracts only covered urban areas, as well as a few rural areas in certain states. In 1970, tracts covered most urban areas only.) Once the tract weights were computed, they were used to normalize all 1970, 1980, and 1990 NCDB counts to 2000 tract boundaries.

**Mapping techniques**
Data as depicted on the maps in this report is stratified in a variety of ways to create the ranges of color gradations. This gradation or shading technique is called a “choropleth map” in formal cartographic terminology. Its name is derived from the Greek words *choros* (place) and *pleth* (value). The advantage of this technique is that the map shows different intensities of a color in proportion to the magnitudes, or values, of the data for each particular geographic unit area on the map (typically a Census block or blockgroup).

The data is stratified to create these ranges of color gradations using a few different methods: In some cases “natural breaks” in a data set are used to create three levels of value with three corresponding shades of color (for some maps the data is parsed out into five gradations of color rather than just three). On other maps “equal breaks” are used to divide up a data set in accordance with a range of evenly incremental levels of value. For ease to readers, the break points in the ranges of values were also typically rounded to create more logical break points.

In many cases the data set for a map was parsed out relative to “representative” breaks that are benchmark values for gauging the implications of the data, for example in setting a middle break in the range of color gradations based on an average for San Francisco citywide statistics (such as the percentage of renters in the city’s overall population). When citywide statistics are too dramatically different to be a useful measure for neighborhood characteristics, these representative breaks are based on averages for the ‘Southeastern Neighbors’ quadrant of San Francisco—encompassing the neighborhoods of the Tenderloin, Chinatown, South of Market, the Fillmore, Mission, Potrero Hill and Central Waterfront, Bernal Heights, Bayview and Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, and Portola and the Excelsior. These neighborhoods have generally comparable demographics characteristics.

Most of the maps in the report represent data values as percentages, which measure the *relative* magnitudes
or intensities of the data across the geographic area of the neighborhood. Maps can also represent data values with real numbers, which measure absolute magnitudes.

**Census Definitions**

Throughout the “Demographics” section of this report there are descriptions and terms used that are unique to the vocabulary of the U.S. Census. The way these terms are precisely defined is important in understanding the type of data that was collected and what it is telling us about certain demographic characteristics. For example, the term “unemployed” in the Census survey refers to a person who was actively looking for work at the time of the Census survey and able to begin working. As might be expected, such a narrow definition captures a relatively small portion of those people who we intuitively understand to be not working. For this latter status the Census uses the term “not in workforce,” which refers to anyone between the ages of 18 and 65 who, for a variety of possible reasons, is not working.

Given the complexities of some of these definitions which can not be completely explained in the brief annotations accompanying the maps themselves within the main body of this report, the following elaborations are provided for further explanation.

**Population Density:** the number of residents relative to the geographic size of the area. In this case the map of Census data shows the relative magnitude of residents in each Census “block” of the neighborhood. On an overall neighborhood level, this population density data shows the general concentration of residents—the neighborhood population is concentrated in certain areas where there is a higher density of residents.

**Latino:** For the 2000 Census, residents who identified with the terms “Hispanic” or “Latino” were those who classified themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census surveys—“Mexican,” “Puerto Rican,” or “Cuban”—as well as those who indicated that they are “other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino.” Origin is viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race. Thus this term is not mutually exclusive from any of the other three primary ethnicities/races mapped; Census survey respondents may have been counted as African American and Latino, Asian and Latino, White and Latino, or Latino only. For example, a person whose ancestry is from Spain may self-identify as “White” or they might choose to identify themselves as “Latino.” In the previous 1990 Census, the term “Latino” was a self-designated classification for people whose origins are from Spain, the Spanish-speaking countries of Central or South America, the Caribbean, or those identifying themselves generally as Spanish, Spanish-American, etc.

**Linguistically isolated household:** A household is classified as “linguistically isolated” if no household members age 14 years or over speaks only English, and no household members age 14 years or over who speak a language other than English speaks English “very well”. All the members of a linguistically isolated household are tabulated by the Census as linguistically isolated, including members under 14 years old who may speak only English.”

**Per capita income:** Calculated as the mean income computed for every man, woman, and child in a geographic area. It is derived by dividing the total income of all people 15 years old and over in a geographic area by the total population in that area. Note that income is not collected for people under 15 years old even though those people are included in the denominator of per capita income. This measure is rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The per capita income for a Census blockgroup shows the total income earned by every person 15 years of age and older divided by the total population of that blockgroup, including those under the age of 15.

**Household income:** Defined by the Census as the sum of money income received in the calendar year 1999 by all household members 15 years old and over, including household members not related to the householder, people living alone, and other non-family household members. Included in the total are amounts reported separately for wage or salary income; net self-employment income; interest, dividends, or net rental or royalty income or income from estates and trusts; Social Security or Railroad Retirement
income; Supplemental Security Income (SSI); public assistance or welfare payments; retirement, survivor, or disability pensions; and all other income.

**Below poverty**: The Census Bureau uses the federal government’s official poverty definition. A person is below poverty if their individual income or total family income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of related children under 18 (see table below for poverty level thresholds). The poverty thresholds are updated every year to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country — they are not adjusted for regional, state or local variations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of 1999 income in the 2000 census are shown below.

Poverty Thresholds in 1999, by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of family unit</th>
<th>Weighted average threshold</th>
<th>Related children under 18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person (unrelated individual).</td>
<td>8,501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years.................</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>8,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over..............</td>
<td>7,990</td>
<td>7,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people......................</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder under 65 years......</td>
<td>11,214</td>
<td>11,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over...</td>
<td>10,075</td>
<td>10,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people...................</td>
<td>13,290</td>
<td>13,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people....................</td>
<td>17,029</td>
<td>17,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people.....................</td>
<td>20,127</td>
<td>20,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people.....................</td>
<td>22,727</td>
<td>23,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people...................</td>
<td>25,912</td>
<td>27,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight people...................</td>
<td>28,967</td>
<td>30,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine people or more............</td>
<td>34,417</td>
<td>36,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Employed**: Defined by the Census as all civilians 16 years old and over who were either (1) “at work” — those who did any work at all during the reference week as paid employees, worked in their own business or profession, worked on their own farm, or worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers on a family farm or in a family business; or (2) were “with a job but not at work” — those who did not work during the reference week, but who had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent because of illness, bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, or other personal reasons. Excluded from the employed are people whose only activity consisted of work around their own house (painting, repairing, or own home housework) or unpaid volunteer work for religious, charitable, and similar organizations. Also excluded are all institutionalized people and people on active duty in the United States Armed Forces.

**Unemployed**: All civilians 16 years old and over were classified by the Census as unemployed if they were neither “at work” nor “with a job but not at work” during the reference week, were looking for work during the last 4 weeks, and were available to start a job. Also included as unemployed were civilians 16 years old and over who: did not work at all during the reference week, were on temporary layoff from a job, had been informed that they would be recalled to work within the next 6 months or had been given a date to return to work, and were available to return to work during the reference week, except for temporary illness.

Employment and unemployment estimates from Census 2000 will, in general, differ from the official labor force data collected in the Current Population Survey (CPS) and released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, because the design and collection methodology of the census and the CPS meet different purposes. Census 2000 was designed to collect general information about the labor force for very small geographic areas on a one-time basis. It was primarily a mail-out/mail-back data collection that asked fewer and less precise questions than the CPS on employment and unemployment. The CPS is specifically designed to produce
the official estimates of employment and unemployment for the United States each month. Specifically, at the national level, Census 2000 estimates of employment were considerably below, and estimates of unemployment above, the corresponding CPS estimates. Subnational estimates from the two sources may exhibit even wider relative differences.

**Not in labor force:** Defined by the Census as all people 16 years old and over who are not classified as members of the labor force. This category consists mainly of students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers enumerated in an off-season who were not looking for work, institutionalized people (all institutionalized people are placed in this category regardless of any work activities they may have done in the reference week), and people doing only incidental unpaid family work (fewer than 15 hours during the reference week).

**Gross Rent:** The data on gross rent were obtained from answers to Census long-form questionnaire Items 45a-d, which were asked on a sample basis. Gross rent is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, water and sewer) and fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these are paid by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else). Gross rent as a percentage of household income in 1999 is a computed ratio of monthly gross rent to monthly household income (total household income in 1999 divided by 12). The ratio is computed separately for each unit and is rounded to the nearest tenth. Units for which no cash rent is paid and units occupied by households that reported no income or a net loss in 1999 comprise the category “Not computed.”

**Family Households:** A family according to the Census includes a householder and one or more other people living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. This includes common-law marriages but does not include an unmarried-partner (i.e., domestic partners) household. An “unmarried partner” can be of the same or of the opposite sex of the householder. An unmarried-partner household may also be a family household, depending on the presence or absence of another person in the household who is related to the householder, such as a child. A family household may contain people not related to the householder, but those people are not included as part of the householder’s family in census tabulations. A household can contain only one family for purposes of census tabulations.

**Female-headed household:** This category of the Census is for a Female “householder” with no husband present as well as a family with a female maintaining the household with no husband of the householder present.

**Social security income:** Social security income includes social security pensions and survivors benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration prior to deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance checks from the U.S. government. Medicare reimbursements are not included.

**Public assistance income:** Public assistance income includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). Separate payments received for hospital or other medical care (vendor payments) are excluded. This does not include Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

**Supplemental Security Income (SSI):** Supplemental Security Income (SSI) is a nationwide U.S. assistance program administered by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.
In the world of planning and redevelopment, the Eastern Neighborhoods are often talked about as the five redevelopment areas that the City has identified for re-zoning in this area: South of Market, the Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero/Central Waterfront, South Bayshore, and Visitacion Valley. When we talk about the Eastern Neighborhoods, we are talking about the neighborhoods as they are popularly understood: Chinatown, the Fillmore, the Tenderloin, SOMA, the Mission, Excelsior, Bayview Hunter’s Point, and Visitation Valley. While there has been an increasing interest in the land and the resources in this area, the historic identity and composition of the communities who make up this area has been largely unexamined. Who are the people who live here and work here and who make this community their home?

In this section we are focusing on this question of neighborhood composition and have chosen ten categories to examine. Each section starts with a neighborhood description, then looks at racial composition, language diversity, family households, age, the length of residence, concentration of renters, the percentage of income spent on rent, levels of employment and unemployment, income, and poverty levels.

The demographic survey in these maps is based on the information gathered in the 2000 U.S. Census. While this information provides a helpful snapshot of some of the trends within the neighborhood, we also recognize that the Census is incomplete based on people’s lack of trust and willingness to participate in the government survey.

Throughout this section we have included five oral histories of people who have lived all or most of their lives in San Francisco, and whose life stories in many ways tell the history of the neighborhoods they lived in.
San Francisco’s Chinatown is the largest Chinese community on the West Coast, and it is one of the oldest, largest, and most visually recognizable urban Chinese American enclaves in the world.

The neighborhood began as the home to the early waves of Chinese railroad workers who often gave their lives to lay the infrastructure that allowed San Francisco to become trading hub for the West Coast.

In spite of their critical role in the building of San Francisco’s economy, these workers faced tremendous racial discrimination and xenophobia. Anti-Chinese racism in the gold-rush era culminated in a Congressional law, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which barred Chinese laborers from entering the country, and created in Chinatown a world of men separated from their families overseas. San Francisco’s Chinatown provided for itself what the outside world would not.

By the 1930’s Chinatown had developed a vast self-sufficient infrastructure comprised of businesses, restaurants, groceries, benevolent associations, entertainment, newspapers, schools, churches and temples.

Today’s Chinatown still functions as a gateway to many Chinese immigrants. It is the most densely populated area of San Francisco and is home to many seniors, families, and young children. While Chinatown has higher employment rates than other areas of San Francisco, Chinese workers also represent a high concentration of the lowest paid workers in the city. Chinese workers have played a leading role in advancing a movement in San Francisco to raise wages and enforce worker protection laws. Strong community organizations in Chinatown have protected the area from some of the more recent waves of gentrification, although pressure continually looms from its southern edge, which borders San Francisco’s Financial District, and its northern edge bordering North Beach.
Lisa has been an active member of the Chinese Progressive Association’s Worker Organizing Center Core Group and the Housing Justice Core Group since 1999. She is currently a part-time outreach worker for the SRO Families United Program of CPA.

When did your family come to San Francisco? What were the reasons for coming?
My name is Lisa Chen.* I immigrated to San Francisco from China in 1997 to reunite with my parents and to fulfill my American dream of a better life for me and my family. Coming to San Francisco was very hard for me because I had to leave my husband and young daughter behind in China. My husband and daughter eventually joined me here six years later. I originally lived with my sister in Visitacion Valley, but soon moved to a residential hotel in Chinatown. Although I was happy to be able to settle into a vibrant Chinese community, the reality of life in America was quite different from the fantasies I had imagined in China.

Where did you work? What is it like working in San Francisco?
In my 8 years in San Francisco, I have struggled to find decent stable employment and have pretty much moved from low paying job to low paying job, when I can find work at all. Right after I arrived, I went to work in the Wins Garment Factory as a seamstress. In the factory, I worked for more than 10 hours a day and got paid only around forty dollars or what amounted to less than $4 an hour. The exploitation of workers was severe, and the bosses paid us at a piece rate and being owed over a month of back wages, I quit. Since then over the past 5 years, I have worked at other low paying jobs including in a restaurant as a bus person, in another garment factory and as an electronic assembly worker where I got a decent wage of $7.50 an hour. But one day the supervisor told us workers that the factory would be closed and that everyone would be fired without severance. I was then recommended by a friend to be a food-packer in a food preparation factory for airline companies. The workplace was always kept at a very low temperature. I could not stand the coldness and had to leave because I got very bad headaches and as a result I have a permanent ear ache.

How is life in San Francisco Chinatown?
Living in Chinatown is like living in my own country, China. Everyone speaks Chinese and markets, restaurants, grocery stores and community groups like CPA are all nearby. Most people in Chinatown live in Single Room Occupancy hotels. They are densely populated; tenants have to line up to use the common kitchens and bathrooms. The environment is not suitable for children to grow there. I live with my husband and my daughter in an SRO hotel room which is about 80 square feet, just large enough to put a bunk-bed and a desk. The air quality is bad and there are many problems in the building. We live here because we cannot afford to live anywhere else, but the rent is not cheap for what we are actually provided.

What problems and issues people face in your community?
In recent years, jobs have been hard to find, especially since 9-11. The main concerns of the residents here are jobs, housing and environmental health issues. Residents, especially families long to move to decent housing but poverty and the lack of affordable housing prevents them from doing so.

The Chinese Progressive Association is a grassroots membership-based organization that empowers the Chinese community in the San Francisco Bay Area promoting justice and equality for all people. CPA’s campaigns and programs improve the living and working conditions of low-income immigrants and give ordinary community members a stronger voice in the decision-making processes that affect them. CPA supports other disenfranchised communities fighting for human rights and self-determination. CPA works for world peace and sustainability and promotes U.S. China people’s friendship. This interview was translated from Cantonese to English by CPA Staff.
This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 1

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 2
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.
White Population

This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>Percent of Chinatown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>12551</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data) Table 1

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
Linguistically Isolated API-Speaking Households

This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 6

Linguistically Isolated Spanish-Speaking Households

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 7
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)                             Fig. 8

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)                             Fig. 9
Seniors

This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of are seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Youth

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

![Length of Residency Map](Fig. 12)

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

Rent as a Percentage of Income

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used as the mid break point.
Rent as a Percentage of Income

This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
Employment Status

This map shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

Median Household Income

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form) Table 4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form) Fig. 18
This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
Households with Social Security Income

This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 21

Households with Supplemental Income or Public Assistance

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 22
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
The story of the Fillmore cuts across some of the most significant and painful historical moments that have shaped San Francisco as a whole. Having escaped most of the damage of the 1906 earthquake, the Fillmore had a brief period where it became the commercial center of the city. In the early 1900’s the Fillmore was San Francisco’s Japantown, or Nihonmachi, home to hundreds of Japanese families, businesses, and cultural and religious centers. With the rise of anti-Japanese racism in World War II, San Francisco city officials actively enforced Executive Order 9066 by rounding up thousands of Japanese Americans and forcing them into concentration camps across the state. At the same time that Japanese American were being forced out of the neighborhood, African American workers were being ushered in as they arrived in San Francisco to work in the new war economy. In this period, The Fillmore developed as the “Harlem of the West,” with strong Black churches, theaters, grocery stores, restaurants, nightclubs, and newspapers. Throughout the 1940’s and the rise of Jazz, the Fillmore was able to attract to it’s clubs such big names as Ella Fitzgerald, Louis Armstrong and Billie Holiday.

In 1960s, the Fillmore went through yet another major process of racist displacement, when it became a target for the federal Urban Renewal Program under the local leadership of Justin Herman. Coming less than 20 years after the neighborhood’s Japanese residents were forcibly removed, the first Urban Renewal Program displaced 6000 African American residents to build a Japan Trade Center. As the program continued and displaced more than 20,000 residents, the community renamed urban renewal as “negro removal” and launched a major battle against Justin Herman and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

Today the Fillmore is still symbolic of the fight against this repeating model in San Francisco of destroying a community in order to save it. The Fillmore still has the second largest African American community in San Francisco, but the heart of the community was largely crushed by the impact of the Redevelopment Agency. The construction of a Japanese Trade Center after the Japanese community was dispersed, or the construction of a Jazz Preservation District after the Black community was systematically displaced may create a tourist attraction, but does little to meet the real needs of the communities they are meant to represent.
Stories of San Francisco - Don Mark

Don Mark has been a member of POWER for 2 years. He has been active in the Bay Area community throughout his life, involved with: Renaissance, the Black Panther Party, Swords to Plowshares, and was a Community Organizer with the Equal Opportunities Commission in the Tenderloin and South Park. At POWER, Don is a regular at Fantastic Fridays, anti-war marches and membership meetings. Don’s insights have been instrumental in piecing together a “people’s” version of San Francisco’s history.

How long have you lived in San Francisco? What were the reasons for moving?
I’ve been living in San Francisco since 1944, came from Texas. My mother had come out to reunite with my stepfather who was in the military. She worked at the shipyard, at the defense plants and built ships, repaired them. In Hunter’s Point (HP) lots of folks worked at the shipyard.

Describe this San Francisco to me.
In the 1950’s, in Bay View Hunter’s Point it was more heavily concentrated with ethnic minorities, Blacks. In HP, we lived on Navy Road, in the temporary emergency housing projects. Housing comprised of WWII quantion huts, reminiscent of shotgun houses in the old South. Reason they’re called shotgun houses is if you went in the front door and fire at someone going out the back door you’d hit ‘em. Three rooms, exact same dimension, nothing fancy, cheap. Later we moved to the Fillmore where I spent the majority of my youth.

Fillmore...you talk about Harlem, it was Harlem West. There was a great social life in the neighborhood. Older women would go and shop, plenty of good produce. You’d go out there and run into your friends. And, this might be the most significant thing, Fillmore nightlife was where all the major jazz greats could be seen. There was a spot called Bop City, as youngsters we would peep and sometimes we might sneak in and hide in the corner and listen to greats like Charlotte Parker, Miles Davis, Billie Holiday, Lester Young, Vin Webster, Dinah Washington...that was the kind of community Fillmore was, nothing tacky, second or third rate and it attracted the best from everywhere.

How did the Fillmore start to change?
The community had become too independent and powerful. For them, we seemed out of control because we didn’t need them anymore. I returned from living in L.A. for a short time, in 1958 and found people were selling their businesses like mad, things were shutting down. Instead of expanding, the community economy was disappearing. People were losing jobs, rents were getting raised. They’d also started urban renewal programs, a good excuse to get things back to the way it was, we used to call it Negro removal.

What issues did the Black community face?
It faced discrimination, racism. It took a while for the community to get over the fascination with California. Especially after the war that had created jobs, we had to get used to the fact that what was seen as paradise west with gold on the streets wasn’t true at all. On the contrary, SF had not even one Black police or fireman and you don’t need to be a rocket scientist to figure out what it must’ve meant in terms of respect for the community. Unions were extremely racist. My mother, as a wartime wife, never got anything back from the government. When she applied for benefits, she was harassed and humiliated.
Population Density

This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Asian/Pacific Islander Population

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

African American Population

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

### Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Fillmore</th>
<th>Percent of Fillmore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>16065</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8442</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data) Table 6

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of are seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 32

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 33
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood between 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used use as the mid break point.
Rent as a Percentage of Income

This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.
Per Capita Income

This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Residents Below Poverty Level

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
**Tenderloin**

Within San Francisco, the Tenderloin is in some ways the neighborhood of refugees - the landing point for many people seeking a safe home: immigrant workers, queer youth, transgender women, homeless people.

Working poor families in the neighborhood sustain themselves working in restaurants, laundries, and other small businesses, Seniors and single adults build community in the many SRO hotels. The Tenderloin is almost more of a constellation of several smaller worlds, where distinct Vietnamese, Cambodian, Russian, African American, and Mexicano communities all find a way to co-exist.

The Tenderloin (also known as the TL) takes its name from the days when crooked police were controlling and benefiting from the underground economy in the neighborhood and where taking in enough money to buy high quality cuts of meat. The tough reputation of the Tenderloin is in many ways rooted in the higher concentrations of poverty throughout the neighborhood.

The level of struggle that the community faced has also led to a high level of community organization and resistance. Historically, the Tenderloin became known for the gay and transgender activism in the 1960s and 70s. Even before Stonewall, the Tenderloin was home to the Compton Cafeteria Riot* of 1966 when transgender women and queer street-youth rebelled against the police for harassing the community. In response to the demands of the community, the Central City Anti-Poverty Program was created in 1967.

Today, the TL continues to house a vast infrastructure of social service and community health agencies, and a number of social justice organizations. While almost every mayor in recent years has based their campaign on attacking homeless people in the city, the many social service organizations in Tenderloin have maintained a small opening for the poorest residents of the city, including homeless families and adults.

Because of its close proximity to downtown, Union Square, and the San Francisco Shopping Center, the TL is the place where the city’s tourism industry butts up against the more underground tourism services: the sex industry, massage parlors, and other underground economies. Recently there has been a big push by the City to “clean up” the neighborhood, which has largely taken the form of increased police harassment coupled with new redevelopment projects that expand the tourism district and encroach on the current neighborhood.

*For more information on the Compton Cafeteria Riot see the work of Susan Striker and the SF Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Historical Society.*
Garth has been an activist and organizer in San Francisco for over 20 years. He was a founding member of Hospitality House/Tenderloin Self-Help Center, the Coalition on Homelessness and GARU (General Assistance Rights Union), which was the predecessor organization to POWER.

**How long have you lived in SF?**

48 years, born here in 1946. I was raised the Height Ashbury. In the 60’s my parents left that area because the hippies came – and I stayed. That’s when I started taking notice of the city – I was about 18 years old. Then I started coming downtown, to the Tenderloin, it attracted me because it was the gay community and the drug community.

*Your early experiences as an organizer involved anti-gentrification fights in SOMA, tell me about that.*

I’ve seen the housing crisis for poor people appear and keep growing, a good example of how it came to be was when the city wanted to build the Yerba Buena Center. I don’t know exactly how many units there was, but all that area used to be housing and local grocers. And one of the things that has always pissed me off is when a developer comes and they promise people the same amount of housing and to this day we don’t have the replacement housing let alone the rest that followed. For me this made me really understand that corporate America doesn’t want you in the playground but they want you close enough so that you can do the work for cheap. To me it was a double educator because I learned how capitalists get their way and how racism really fit into planning because it was basically a Filipino community. Almost everybody affected was poor, Filipino families. Another thing I really learned about the city was how it makes promises to people about relocation and never comes up with it.

*What do you remember of Justin Herman, head of the City’s Redevelopment Agency?*

He represented big business. He was good at conning people into thinking that big business was the only way to save the community and an artist at pitting poor against poor. He was very aware of what organizing can do, so they made it very difficult.

*How has the city changed? What caused it to change?*

I really think that in SF with George Moscone and Harvey Milk and all those, the electorate was expressing progressive thoughts but what happened here during that assassination, I see it as a right wing political revolution. I don’t think people knew what it was, but when Feinstein became mayor the focus of progressiveness stopped, big business stepped in and the mayor’s office became more big business oriented. I think that’s the biggest problem with SF politically is that it believes its own reputation. I’ve lived in Texas, New Orleans and SF is one of the most closeted right wing governments. They run as progressives and don’t follow through, I’ve learned that they ain’t gonna do shit for us.
This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)

Fig. 47

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)

Fig. 48
White Population

This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form) Fig. 49

Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Tenderloin</th>
<th>Percent of Tenderloin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>12899</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data) Table 11

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 52

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 53
Seniors

This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Youth

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the midpoint in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used as the mid break point.
This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.
Per Capita Income

This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Residents Below Poverty Level

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Social Security Income

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 65

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Supplemental Income or Public Assistance

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 66
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
South of Market

The SOMA neighborhood, which stands for “South of Market,” was once an industrial district of factories and Gold Rush immigrant workers. SOMA was also home to many of the dockworkers and developed into a very multiracial working class neighborhood.

The development of San Francisco’s Downtown has had a great impact on the SOMA neighborhood, whose eastern edge overlaps with the Financial district. In this struggle between the interests of finance versus the interests of families rooted in SOMA, one of the most defining moments was the battle to preserve dozens of residential hotels and apartment buildings threatened with demolition by the Redevelopment Agency.

For over 17 years, a multi-racial coalition including many Filipino families, seniors, and working poor tenants successfully fought off the Redevelopment Agency by refusing to be removed from their homes. In 1971, the City finally did demolish the low-income housing buildings to replace them with an art museum, a garden, and a convention hall. Through their struggle, the residents had legally forced the Redevelopment Agency to provide four housing sites in Yerba Buena Center to replace the lost residences, but the City never followed through with this agreement.

One of the key victories from the long tradition of anti-displacement organizing in SOMA was the low-income protective zoning for 6th Street, where many of the displaced Yerba Buena residents had relocated. Surrounded by a boom in luxury housing development, the zoning of 6th Street has preserved a small pocket of affordable housing for seniors, single adults and working-class families. Additionally, Sixth Street has managed to maintain a Filipino community, with Filipino businesses and services. It is also home to Bindlestiff Studio, the only Filipino theater in the country, which continues to face the possibility of displacement by the Redevelopment Agency.

In the mid-nineties Dot-Com boom, SOMA once again became a focal point of gentrification. More market-rate live-work lofts were built in this neighborhood than in any other part of San Francisco. This dynamic continues with SOMA now containing more than six different redevelopment areas, including the new Trans-bay Terminal, and the Mid-Market Redevelopment Zone, which are radically increasing the amount of market-rate housing in the area. Folsom Street, which has historically been the heart of the gay-male leather community, is now being re-imagined by City developers as a “pedestrian promenade” for tourists cruising SOMA.

In addition to the long-standing pressure from its eastern edge, SOMA now also faces pressure from its southern edge, with both the new baseball stadium and the Mission Bay bio-tech complex.
This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 67

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 68
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

![Latino Population Map](source)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 69

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.

![African American Population Map](source)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 70
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary "householder" whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
Seniors

This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Youth

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used use as the mid break point.
Rent as a Percentage of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Renters</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>SOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>17,688</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14%</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19%</td>
<td>32,695</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24%</td>
<td>27,729</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29%</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34%</td>
<td>16,221</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39%</td>
<td>11,339</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49%</td>
<td>13,982</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+%</td>
<td>35,058</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)

Table 18

This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)

Fig. 81
Adults Unemployed

This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

Not in Labor Force

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as mid break in this map.
Employment Status

This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

Median Household Income

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.
This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Social Security Income

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 87

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Supplemental Income or Public Assistance

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 88
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared to the percentages for the city as a whole.
The Mission neighborhood takes its name from Mission Dolores, one of the Missions that were established by the Franciscan Friars in the 1770s during the Spanish colonization of the Ohlone lands. Soon after the Missions were established, Mexico won control of the area from Spain and Mexican settlers established ranches here. In the 1840’s when California was incorporated into the United States, the Mission became more residential as Gold Rush workers migrated to the state. The Mission was one of the least devastated parts of the city after the 1906 earthquake and people from all over the city poured in. As a result of this influx, the Mission developed into a more densely-populated, working class, predominantly Irish community. During the economic boom of World War II, the Irish community moved out to more affluent neighborhoods in the Sunset and Twin Peaks, and immigrants from across Latin America moved in. By the 1960s, the Mission had taken on a new identity as a Mexicano, Chicano, and Central American neighborhood.

Today the Mission is still the center of Latino community in San Francisco, with over 50% of the neighborhood comprised of Mexicano, Chicano, Salvadoran and Nicaraguan residents. A network of Latino community organizations and businesses extends through the area from 14th Street through Cesar Chavez. The Mission is also the hub of Chicano/Latino arts and culture in San Francisco including art galleries, performance spaces, and local community arts groups such as Loco Bloco dance and drum troupe. The neighborhood is known for its progressive politics, and hosts many of the protests and marches for a broad range of social justice struggles from immigrants rights protests, to anti-war rallies, the annual Dyke March, and housing and tenants rights activism.

Like SOMA, the Mission was heavily impacted by the Dot-Com boom of the 1990s which led to unprecedented rent increases and massive evictions. Landlords capitalized on legal loop-holes, including underhanded schemes such as the owner “move-in” pretense and other falsified eviction efforts in order to clear out their previous tenants and make room for the higher-income Dot-Comers who would often pay double and triple the rent. In response to this gentrification crisis, neighborhood leaders built the Mission Anti-Displacement Coalition (MAC) and gave rise to a powerful tenants rights movement. This struggle over housing and land-use continues, but through this neighborhood activism the residents have won a moratorium on Live-Work Loft construction, and have been negotiating community control of the City’s planning and zoning process.
Jazmín has been a counselor/organizer at St. Peter’s Housing Committee since April, 2004. She has been a member of PODER [People Organized to Defend Environmental Rights] since the fall of 2001.

**When did your family come to San Francisco?**
My mother came in 1973 from El Salvador. She left her country for several reasons, but primarily to find work. My sister was about nine years old at the time and my mother wanted to work so she could support her parents and my sister. I was born and raised en La Mision. I lived on 23rd and Mission for 25 years.

**Describe this San Francisco to me.**
La Mision I remember growing up in was very lively. Every Sunday folks would be cruising up and down Mission Street. It was like a block party every weekend (especially when the 49ers would win a game). It was always crowded, especially in front of my house. There used to be 4 theatres where you could watch 2 movies. Two of them showed movies only in Spanish (Tower and Latino) and the other 2 (New Mission and Grand) showed movies in English. I also remember the Taquerias being open until 4am and the food was better too. The neighborhood was more fun to be in, but at the same time folks lived in poverty. We were happy but poor. It was never really an issue. We had no choice but to live there. When the neighborhood started being gentrified it was difficult to understand why anyone else would want to purposely live in the Mission because the apartments and houses that were rented to Raza were so messed up. Almost everyone lived in a place that was infested with either mice or roaches if not both. Or places had mold and had paint that was peeling. The room I grew up in had a leak that was there all of my life and each time it rained water would come in. I also had a window that never opened. The point is that no matter how poor we were La Mision had something to offer. The parades used to be amazing. They were a lot longer and more family oriented. Folks would get together and kick back watching people go on about there business. My grandmother once noticed from our window all of the pretty colors of the umbrellas people had standing at the bus stop across the street from our house.

The entire neighborhood was made up of working class Raza who immigrated from Latin America or whose parents or grandparents immigrated. Everyone spoke Spanish, even the Chinese merchants. Most folks worked in the service industry. My mom and my aunt worked in hotels as housekeepers.

The main problems folks faced were INS related and of course, poverty. As for my generation, we had to struggle with the usual issues that arise from being children of immigrant parents, primarily learning the language. There were also a lot of immigrants from Central America who were dealing with the trauma of living through civil wars. With that came problems of alcohol and drug abuse and lots of violence. But the upside to these issues being present in La Mision is that there was always a protest of some sort going on. So, I grew up in a community constantly fighting against injustice and demanding change, because the voice of La Mision was always present and heard.

St. Peter’s Housing Committee is a membership organization that works to help low and moderate income tenants, primarily immigrant, working class, Latino/a tenants, build tenant power, preserve and expand affordable housing, and improve living conditions through counseling, organizing, and the development of leadership within the communities we serve.
This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 89

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 90
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 94

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 95
Family Households

This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Female Headed Households

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  Fig. 98

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  Fig. 99
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used use as the mid break point.
Rent as a Percentage of Income

This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.
This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
Households with Social Security Income

This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Supplemental Income or Public Assistance

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
Bayview Hunter’s Point is San Francisco’s oldest and largest African American neighborhood. The neighborhood developed during World War II, when African American workers came to the area seeking jobs in the Naval Shipyard.

The Bayview boasts one of the highest percentage of homeowners in the City, as well as the highest number of youth who reside in the neighborhood.

Over the last fifty years, Bayview Hunter’s Point has supported several strong Black churches, community businesses and organizations, and one of the most widely-read neighborhood newspapers in the city: *The Bayview*.

Even as the neighborhood exploded into a large residential community, the Bayview has remained largely disconnected from the rest of the city and has historically been severely under-resourced by the City Government. Community demands around the economic and environmental crisis in the neighborhood have largely fallen on deaf ears.

Over time, toxic pollution from both the military and shipping industry and the PG&E power plant have turned Bayview into one of the most severe cancer clusters in the country. According to the film “Straight Outta Hunter’s Point”, Bayview/Hunter’s Point houses one-third of San Francisco’s hazardous waste sites, and the area has four times as many toxins released as all other neighborhoods in the city, as well as four times the state rate of hospitalization for chronic diseases.

For decades Bayview residents have waged campaigns to clean up the naval shipyard and to close the PG&E power plant, but the City has failed to follow through on most of the agreements they have made in response to the community’s demands.

Community members have also led several major campaigns against repeated incidents of police harassment and violence targeted at the Black community. These problems have only been exasperated in recent years with the shift in San Francisco’s political economy from a manufacturing base to a high-tech and service sector economy. These changes have had a particularly devastating impact on African American workers in the Bayview where estimates of unemployment and permanent displacement from the labor market range as high as 50 to 65%.

More recently, the Bayview is being targeted as the next major front of redevelopment. Several new development projects are underway, such as the Eastern Neighborhoods Redevelopment Area, plans to convert industrial space into new housing, and an effort to turn Candlestick Park into a major retail mall. City officials have finally moved to connect the Bayview to Downtown with the new 3rd Street Lightrail and to clean up the toxins from the neighborhood. The question many people are asking is why now, and for whom is this work being done?
Population Density

This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form) Fig. 111

Asian/Pacific Islander Population

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form) Fig. 112
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

![Map of Latino Population](source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form))

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.

![Map of African American Population](source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form))
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

### Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Bayview HP</th>
<th>Percent of Bayview HP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16054</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>6518</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data)  Table 26

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%. 

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary "householder" whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 121

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 121
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used as the mid break point.
This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

### Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
Adults Unemployed

This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 126

Not in Labor Force

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Fig. 127
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

### Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Not in Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GeoLytics, Inc, CensusCD Neighborhood Change Database 1970-2000 Tract Data

### Median Household Income

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)
Per Capita Income

This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Residents Below Poverty Level

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
Over the last 30 years, the Excelsior has grown into a very diverse family neighborhood with large Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and Samoan communities. The Excelsior has long been a working class largely immigrant neighborhood. In the late 1800s the area was mostly known as a community of Italian and Irish immigrant families, and had more land devoted to farms and dairies. In the early 1900s, the farmland was converted into one of the largest enclaves of residential family housing in the City.

In San Francisco political history, the Excelsior is most known for being the neighborhood that elected reactionary Supervisor Dan White in the 1970s whose campaign was based largely on a white mainstream backlash against civil rights and the gay liberation movement. Since that time, the Excelsior has changed dramatically and most notably it has become much more racially and ethnically diverse, and consequently more socially and politically progressive.

In recent years the Excelsior has been on the forefront of the struggle for progressive public education and public services for children and families. As development pressures have pushed working class families out of SOMA, the Mission, and central city, the Excelsior has been one of last accessible neighborhoods where families have looked to relocate. In this process, the Excelsior has also replaced SOMA as the largest Filipino neighborhood in the City. The businesses along Mission and Geneva reflect the pan-Asian and Latino diversity that has come to represent the Excelsior.
Jordan initially joined POWER in the fight against Care not Cash and has been a member for a year and a half. In the organization she has actively participated in POWER University, the Organizing Working Group and the Women’s Caucus.

*When did your family come to San Francisco?*
We came when I was 16 months old, we lived on Geary. It used to be a poor area. Eventually we had to move from there because the city pulled the ‘eminent domain’, I think that’s what they called it – they said our property was needed for the good of all. They force you to take their money, which isn’t much, and move on.

*Where did you all move? What was your neighborhood like?*
From there we stayed at someone’s house, we all slept on the floor. Five of us kids and my parents. Around 1956 we moved to Ingleside on Shields Street, at the time that area had been all white but they were leaving because of the people of color who were moving in. They started vacating San Francisco in droves. Most people in my neighborhood were poor, blue-collar workers. They drove buses, worked at factories, were janitors, street cleaners, and most everyone was African-American. My mom was a nurse, dad worked at Hill Brothers Coffee Company.

*Describe the queer women’s community?*
I came out when I was 17; most of the women’s community was in the Mission and the Haight. Everyone would socialize and hang out. There were a lot more women’s bars compared to now. There was Maud’s Study, The 20 Club, one on Potrero Hill off of 16th, Emilia’s on Geary, two or three in the Mission – there was a lot in the East Bay. We used to play intramural soccer games, bar against bar. It was there that I got more of a sense of the injustice happening for so many people, I started going to demonstrations, talks, groups would meet. Lots of women were getting together to see what they could do to make things better for lesbians. I got to meet and learn from lots of profound women. I didn’t really appreciate it at the time, I was into it and enjoyed learning all the different things but I didn’t realize until years later how lucky I was to meet them and hear what they had to say.

*What were the main problems and issues that women faced?*
Homophobic anti-gay kinda thing, real heavy. You could get beaten up if you walked around by yourself. Police wouldn’t do anything, they did some of the beating themselves. It was a hard road to hold in those days. Violence – it could happen to you most anytime. Outside of that there was racism amongst the women. In racially mixed spaces there was a power struggle going on where whites wanted to do somethin’ and only saw women of color as helpers. And when called on their racism, it was total denial. In the bars, women of color would speak to owners and they were all white so they swung towards white folks. Besides, they had more money to spend. There was that and sexism in the form of butch and femme kinda thing. It was really kinda sad and twisted because the butch women would emulate the worst kind of men and they’d be dogging their feminine girlfriends. Class divided the gay and lesbian community. The gay community was mostly white gay males who had good jobs and came from families with money. It was as if they had lesbians around to be gophers. There was a lot of class stuff going on in both groups.

*What factors caused the face of San Francisco to change?*
Folks started coming back to the city, buying houses. There were fewer places to rent because of that. You got the sense that they wanted San Francisco to be white again. Rents skyrocketed overnight. Lots of people started moving out of San Francisco. And it turned into the place it is now, where you don’t see as many people of color, working class people.
Population Density

This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 133

Asian/Pacific Islander Population

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 134
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

### Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Excelsior</th>
<th>Percent of Excelsior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>15505</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5959</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>12819</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>9354</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data)  Table 31

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
Linguistically Isolated API-Speaking Households

This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Linguistically Isolated Spanish-Speaking Households

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of are seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used use as the mid break point.
This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

### Adults Employed

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We were unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)

Table 34

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)

Fig. 150
Per Capita Income

This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Residents Below Poverty Level

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

Households with Social Security Income

Households with Supplemental Income or Public Assistance

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
In early San Francisco history, Visitacion Valley was one of the most prominent places in the newly forming city, and a main attraction for wealthy investors.

Even the first Governor of the State of California, Peter H. Burnett built his large home on Sunnydale Avenue. The neighborhood had two street cars that connected Bayshore to downtown and developed a social district with restaurants, saloons, and a Nickelodeon theater to attract visitors.

Beyond this initial infrastructure, it was really Industry that played the biggest role in shaping the development of Visitacion Valley. In 1905, the Southern Pacific railroad built tracks along Bayshore Boulevard. The same year a gas plant was built, which was later run by PG&E. Soon after, two major machinist shops opened in the area, the Bodinson Manufacturing Company and the Schlage Lock Company.

While these industries created lots of employment for the neighborhood, they had a devastating impact on the land as well as the health of the workers and the community. In the 1990’s the Schlage Lock plant was closed by it’s multinational parent company, but left behind a Brownfield Site that was condemned by the Department of Toxic Substance Control due to the extremely high concentration of toxins left in the soil. PG&E also created another large toxic Brownfield Site along Geneva Avenue where the Midway Village housing complex was built.

Facing similar isolation from Downtown as the Bayview, Visitacion Valley has suffered systematic under-development by City officials over the last 40 years. While the neighborhood is one of the main areas for affordable family housing, including the large Sunnydale projects, it doesn’t have a single large grocery store, and lacks other family support infrastructures such as medical and dental facilities.

In the late 1990s, many low-income residents were scattered from the area when the two 20-story Geneva Towers were torn down. Five years later, the Heritage Homes opened to replace the lost housing but many of the residents were not able to return to the area.

This neighborhood remains one of the most diverse working class areas of San Francisco and is still fighting for a community infrastructure and true economic development that will serve the needs and interests of the community.
This map shows the general population density in the neighborhood based on the U.S. Census data from the year 2000. The data is collected by census blocks and is shown here in different color shades representing various levels of intensity of the population density across the neighborhood.

![Population Density](image1.jpg)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  Fig. 155

---

**Asian/Pacific Islander Population**

This map shows the concentration of Asian/Pacific Islanders in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps in this book that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of the area is Asian/Pacific Islander, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Asian/Pacific Islander.

![Asian/Pacific Islander Population](image2.jpg)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  Fig. 156
This map shows the concentration of Latinos in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is Latino, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% Latino.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 157

This map shows the concentration of African Americans in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue is where 81-100% of the population of that area is African American, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% African American.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 158
This map shows the concentration of White people in this neighborhood. The percentage levels and the color-coding in this map are consistent with all of the maps that show population concentration based on ethnicity. In this map, the darker blue section is where 81-100% of the population of that area is White, whereas the lightest blue is 0-20% White.

### Population by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Percent of SF</th>
<th>Vis Valley</th>
<th>Percent of Vis Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385728</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60515</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3611</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>45451</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>19574</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>152653</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>5738</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8994</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9744</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>35410</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF2 (long form, Tract Level Data)  Table 36

The primary race categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this book are Asian/Pacific Islander (API), Hispanic (Latino), Black (African American), and White. This table shows more detailed data from the Census for the particular places of origin for the broad categories of API and Latino.
This map shows the concentration of households where an Asian Pacific Islander language is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where an Asian or Pacific Islander language is the dominant language is 11.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of households where Spanish is the dominant language spoken with little or no ability among teenagers or adults in the home to speak English. The average percentage of households in the Eastern Neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language is 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%.
This map shows the concentration of families living in the neighborhood. A family is defined by the Census as at least two people related by birth, marriage, or adoption (therefore a married couple would be classified as a family by the Census, but not a domestic partnership). The average percentage of families in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 68.7%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of female-headed households living in the neighborhood. These are family households where a woman is reported to be the primary “householder” whether or not she is living with a spouse. The average concentration of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 6.4%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of seniors 65 years and older living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percent of seniors in the city is 13.6%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of youth under 18 years old living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco, the average percentage of youth in the city is 14.5%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the percentage of youth, adults, and seniors in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

### Length of Residency

This map shows the concentration of longer-term residents in the neighborhood. The average length of residency for people living in the Eastern Neighborhoods is 4 years, which is used as the mid break in the map.
Renter Households

This map shows the concentration of renters living in the neighborhood. In San Francisco approximately 65% of all households are rented, which is used as the mid point in this map. In this map the darker blue shows where 86% or more of the households are rented.

Rent as a Percentage of Income

This map shows the average percent of their income that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. In this map the conventional standard, that on average 1/3 of a person’s income is spent on rent, is used as the mid break point.
This table shows the average amount of their income that residents in the neighborhood are paying in rent compared with the average percentage of income people spend on rent in San Francisco as a whole. On the far left of the table is people who pay less than 10% of their income on rent, and the table ranges up to the category on the far right of people who spend more than 50% of their income on rent.

This map shows the concentration of employed adults in the neighborhood. In the San Francisco the average employment rate is 95.4%, which is used as the high-end break in this map.
This map shows the concentration of unemployed adults in the neighborhood. Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the Census were with a job but not at work, or without a job and looking for work during the last 4 weeks and were available to start a job. In San Francisco the average unemployment rate is 4.6%, which is used as the low-end break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of adults in the neighborhood who are considered not in the labor force by the Census. This category includes students, individuals taking care of home or family, retired workers, seasonal workers surveyed in an off-season, incarcerated people, and people doing incidental or unpaid family work. In San Francisco the average percentage of people not in the labor force is 22.4%, which is used as mid break in this map.
This table shows the changes in the employment status in the neighborhood from 1970 to 2000. We have also compared the changes in the neighborhood with the changes taking place across the city as a whole.

This map shows the median (the statistical middle) income levels in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average median household income is $44,171 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map. We where unable to use the median income levels for San Francisco as a whole because on average the income in the Eastern Neighborhoods is so far below the averages for the wealthier parts of the city.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form)  
Table 39

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)  
Fig. 172
This map shows the average income levels per resident in the neighborhood. In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average per capita income is $24,999 per year, which is used as the mid break in this map.

![Per Capita Income Map](source)

This map shows the poverty levels in the neighborhood. The official U.S. poverty level for a single adult under the age of 65 was $8,667 at the time of the Census. (see Methodology for a complete list). In the Eastern Neighborhoods the average percentage of the population living below the poverty line is 16.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

![Residents Below Poverty Level Map](source)
This map shows the concentration of people living on social security income in the neighborhood. In San Francisco the average number of people living on social security income is 21%, which is used as the mid break in this map.

This map shows the concentration of people living on supplemental security income or public assistance in the neighborhood. In the Eastern neighborhoods the average number of people living on public assistance or supplemental security income is 17.2%, which is used as the mid break in this map.
This table shows the percentage of people in the neighborhood living on social security income, supplemental security income, and public assistance compared the percentages for the city as a whole.
While Section 1 is an overview of the composition of each of the neighborhoods in the year 2000, Section II is a survey of the Eastern Neighborhoods as a whole over the last 30 to 40 years. We have chosen four lenses through which to examine the trends in the Eastern Neighborhoods: ethnicity, female-headed households, unemployment, and poverty levels.

Across the 30 to 40 years, we see that the identity of the Eastern Neighborhoods is that of diverse working class communities of color. While there have been some shifts, these neighborhoods have maintained strong Asian Pacific Islander, Latino, and African American communities. The Eastern Neighborhoods are also home to high concentrations of low-wage workers, displaced workers, and low-income tenants. From 1980 to 2000, we see that the African American community in San Francisco declined by 30%. From 1990 to 2000, the maps also show that the concentration of poverty and unemployment drop throughout the area, especially in the Bayview. Our experience shows us that the shift is not a reflection of increasing prosperity, but rather the result of the massive displacement of low-income people.
This map is provided as a reference for the larger Eastern Neighborhoods area that encompasses the eight individual neighborhoods profiled in the body of this report. The area is displayed within the context of the broader San Francisco landscape. Each of the eight neighborhoods is outlined, though it is important to consider that the “boundaries” of these neighborhoods in reality are not as clearly defined as the boundary lines on this map. This key map also shows some of the major street names throughout the area as geographic reference points.
In examining the racial demographics of the Eastern Neighborhoods as a whole, it is clear that these neighborhoods are many of the core African American, Latino, and Asia/Pacific Islander communities in San Francisco. There are higher concentrations of Black and Latino communities here than in the rest of the city, and a steadily increasing representation of Asian/Pacific Islander communities. The most notable shift in this graph is the drastic decline of African American residents in the Eastern Neighborhoods. *Note:* the census data on racial demographics is only available from 1980 forward. Until that time the census only identified people as "black" or "white."
In 1980, the greatest concentrations of Asian/Pacific Islander communities are clearly reflected in Chinatown, Excelsior, Visitation Valley, and SOMA. There are also smaller Asian Pacific Islander communities in the Fillmore, the Tenderloin and the western edge of Bayview Hunters Point.
In 1990, we see Asian Pacific Islander communities really expanding through the Eastern neighborhoods. This is most notable through the Tenderloin and SOMA, as well as the Southern edge of Bayview and Visitation Valley. There is also an Asian Pacific Islander community developing in the Mission.
By 2000, the significance of the emergent Asian/Pacific Islander community throughout the Excelsior, Visitation Valley, and the western edge of Bayview is evident.
In 1980, the Latino communities of San Francisco are most heavily represented along the western edge of the Eastern Neighborhoods. Clearly the Mission is the heart of the Latino community, which extends out through Bernal Heights, the Excelsior, and Visitation Valley. There is also a sizable Latino community reflected in Potrero Hill.
During the 1980s there is only minimal change in the Latino Community in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The presence of latinos on Potrero Hill has diminished, while an increase in the percentage can be seen in and around the Mission.
In the year 2000, the Latino communities through the Eastern Neighborhoods become much more significant throughout the area. Some of the biggest changes seem to be the increased Latino presence in the northern areas of Bayview and in Visitation Valley.
In 1980, the clear centers of African American community in the Eastern Neighborhoods are Bayview Hunters Point and the Fillmore neighborhoods. There are also sizable African American communities in Visitation Valley, Potrero Hill, and SOMA.
From 1980 to 1990 we see a substantial decline in the African American communities in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The displacement of African Americans from the Eastern Neighborhoods is especially reflected in the Bayview, Potrero Hill, and in the Fillmore.
The drastic drop in African American community in San Francisco is even more apparent from 1990 to 2000. While the Bayview remains the core African American community in San Francisco, the community has clearly lost the density of representation in the area. A similar dynamic is reflected in the Fillmore.
In 1980, there is a fairly sizable density of white people along the western edge of the Eastern Neighborhoods, from Central City down through Visitation Valley.
From 1980 to 1990, though declining in some areas and increasing in others, the demographic representation of white people in the Eastern Neighborhoods remains fairly similar.
In the year 2000, we see that the representation of white people in the Eastern Neighborhoods is declining overall and is most heavily concentrated around the financial district, SOMA, Potrero Hill and Bernal Heights. Given the emphasis on market rate housing development in SOMA and Potrero Hill with Rincon Hill, the Transbay Terminal, the new “mission bay” neighborhood, and Showplace square, we can expect more dramatic increases of white people in these areas to be reflected in the future census studies.
We chose to look more closely at female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods because of the changing nature of the economy and increasing feminization of the lowest wage sectors of the workforce. This is particularly true in San Francisco’s largely unorganized, low-wage service sector. While more women tend to be the primary wage-earners for their families, the infrastructure, such as childcare and after-school programs, that supports women in the workforce has been steadily eroding.
In 1970 and 1980, we see that a large concentration of female headed households is seen through much of the Eastern Neighborhoods, especially in Bayview and the Fillmore. The number of Female Headed Households is also increasing in this period.
In 1990, the concentration of female-headed households is still high through most of the area, with increasing concentrations in Potrero Hill and SOMA.
In the year 2000, the map reflects a significant drop in the number of female-headed households in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Our experience in the neighborhood tells us that this drop is not a reflection of increasing prosperity or family stability in the area, but more accurately it is a reflection of the displacement of low-income communities of color throughout the late 1990s.
As the core working class communities of color in San Francisco, the Eastern Neighborhoods have far higher concentrations of people living below the poverty level. Statistics relating to the poverty level are particularly useful to identify general trends, but they also tend to deflate the actual scale of poverty that a community is facing because the level is set at such a low-income particularly relative to the cost of living in this city. Still we see that while the general numbers rise and fall in relation to the economic conditions of the city as a whole, the Eastern Neighborhoods consistently have a much higher population living in poverty than the rest of San Francisco.
In 1970, we can see that there are many large pockets where over 30% of the community is living below the poverty line. The concentration of people living in poverty is fairly high through most of the Eastern neighborhoods, but especially concentrated in the Bayview, Potrero Hill, SOMA, and the Fillmore, as well as generally high levels of poverty in the Mission.
From 1970 to 1980 this high concentration of poverty remain relatively consistent throughout the Eastern Neighborhoods.
From 1980 to 1990 the high number of people living below the poverty line remains a problem throughout the Eastern Neighborhoods. The main shifts in this period are a drop in the number of people living below the poverty line in the Fillmore, and an increase of people living in poverty in the eastern edge of Visitation Valley.
In 2000, we see the most dramatic drop in the concentration of people living below the poverty line in the eastern neighborhoods. Again our experience tells us that this map is not reflecting increasing prosperity in the area, but rather it is a reflection of large numbers of working class people of color who have been displaced out of the city through the 1990s.
Unemployment and underemployment are core issues affecting the Eastern Neighborhoods. This table clearly illustrates the significantly higher concentration of unemployment in the Eastern Neighborhoods, relative to the San Francisco as a whole. In the following maps, we chose to combine the concentrations of “unemployment” and of people “not in the labor force.” We felt that given the long-term displacement of workers many parts of the Eastern Neighborhoods, the official record of “unemployment” alone does not accurately represent the conditions in the community.
As this table reflects, the main industries in San Francisco’s current economic base are retail, professional and information services, social services, and finance. In relation to the rest of San Francisco, the Eastern Neighborhoods have a higher proportion of the lower-wage sectors of retail, manufacturing, construction, and transportation/utility work. Many of these sectors will be impacted by the current development pressures to convert Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) zones into residential zones.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF3 (long form) Table 44
This map illustrates that even by 1970, there are several large areas in the Bayview, SOMA, and Fillmore where over 50% of adults in the area have been displaced from the labor market. In Chinatown, the Tenderloin, the Mission, Potrero Hill, and Visitation Valley we see that through most of the neighborhood the combined level of unemployment and adults otherwise not in the labor force is above 40%. Note that this sequence of maps includes people who were unemployed and people not in the labor force for various reasons. See methodology section for complete definitions of these terms.
Between 1970 and 1980 we see a significant increase in the number of areas where unemployment and those not in labor force reached above 50%.
From 1980 to 1990 the unemployment is leveling off. While we see a higher level of employment throughout the Eastern Neighborhoods in this period, the levels of adults unemployed and not in the labor force in the Bayview, SOMA, and Fillmore are still well above 40 and 50% of the neighborhood.
By 2000 we again see a dramatic level of unemployment and adults not in the labor force in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Chinatown, SOMA, Bayview, the Tenderloin, and Fillmore all show very high concentrations of these people.
This last section is one large map of the Eastern Neighborhoods, identifying a number of major projects that are likely to have a significant impact on the community. We are not classifying any of these developments as wholly positive or negative for the interests of the communities affected. The main purpose of this map is to illustrate that there are a lot of development and planning pressures that are currently impacting the neighborhood – many of which the community is not even aware of.

We chose to use a radiating circle as the visual symbol for each of these projects and pressures because every major development has an impact not only within its boundaries, but on the surrounding area as well. Some of these projects, especially the redevelopment zones, will have a much bigger impact than others, but all of these have raised community debate and will likely have a significant impact on the neighborhood. Following the map is a Key with a brief description for each of the points on the map.
Chinatown
1. The Central Subway is the northern extension of the new Third Street Light Rail. The Central Subway extends from 3rd Street and King, crosses beneath Market Street and runs under Geary and Stockton Streets to Stockton and Clay Streets. Underground subway stations will be located at Moscone Center, Market Street, Union Square and Clay Street in Chinatown.

2. Downtown Neighborhoods Initiative is a plan for the central-city neighborhoods including Chinatown, the Tenderloin, SOMA, and Mission Bay.

Tenderloin
3. SRO Hotel Master Leasing is a program that identifies under-utilized, privately owned buildings and master leases them under City control for the purpose of providing stable housing for people living on the street and in the emergency shelters in the city. This increased access to housing for people in City public assistance programs, but decreases housing options for undocumented people and others who are not participating in the City’s public assistance programs.

4. Lower Polk Business Improvement Project is a Community Benefit District (CBD). A CBD is a non-profit special assessment district that is created to provide neighborhood improvements by self-assessed fees from property owners. Owners with commercial tenants also can pass these costs onto to their tenants.

5. Glide Pavilion Project is a $200 million development will provide 400 units of mixed market-rate and affordable rental housing, and 100,000 square feet of exhibition, meeting and ballroom space. A conference center will be located across the street from the church to expand the church’s visibility as a tourist attraction.

6. Hastings/YMCA Project was a plan to convert an former student residential building into a 800 car parking garage. The project was very contested by Tenderloin residents and has been stalled. The community organizing against the project led to the formation of the Tenderloin Futures Collaborative as a longer-term space for community visioning of how the Tenderloin should be developed.

7. Van Ness Plan began as an area plan in 1983 to increase and re-zone development along the Van Ness Corridor, with an emphasis on increasing high-density housing development and developing the street as an attractive tourist corridor. For every square foot of commercial or office space, developers must provide three square feet of residential space.

8. Mid-Market Redevelopment Plan runs generally from Fifth Street to Tenth Street along the Market and Mission Streets corridor. San Francisco’s Redevelopment Agency is trying to turn the meeting point of the Tenderloin and SOMA into 6 million square feet of new housing, offices, hotels, retail and theaters over the next 30 years.

SOMA
9. The South Financial District is San Francisco’s high-rise growth zone south of the downtown office core. Plans for this area encourage market rate high-rise housing adjacent to downtown including: Rincon Hill, the Transbay Terminal area, and Yerba Buena Center.
10. Rincon Hill is a new development of two 35-story and two 40-story high-rise condominium towers that will alter the city’s skyline and bring more than 1,600 units of housing. The city Planning Department has estimated that the zoning changes, most notably doubling the height limit in the area, will mean more than $98 million in profits for the developers. The developers are also asking to build their affordable housing requirement “off-site,” so that the market-rate housing will be on water front SOMA property and the affordable housing will be located in Bayview Hunter’s Point.

11. The Transbay Terminal is a $2 billion project to rebuild the city’s Caltrain terminal, incorporating eight different transit systems, including several bus lines, Caltrain, and an envisioned high-speed rail to Los Angeles. This 40 acre redevelopment project will stretch over four city blocks include six towers of retail, office space, and at least 3400 units of residential housing.

12. South Beach/Ball Park, the former “South End” red-brick warehouse district that, like Rincon on the other side of the Bay Bridge approach, is becoming a new condo colony. South Beach is also a rapidly expanding retail district.

13. East SOMA Rezoning Plan is the SOMA piece of the Eastern Neighborhoods re-zoning process that is being led by the Planning Department.

14. West SOMA Rezoning Plan is being developed through a community based planning process. West SOMA residents organized to not be included in the Eastern Neighborhoods re-zoning process.

15. China Basin is a planning area that includes San Francisco’s Garment District, the SBC Park baseball stadium and the north end of the new Mission Bay district. This area is designated as a mixed-use residential and commercial district that is expanding through the new light rail construction and other open space developments.

16. Showplace Square Rezoning Plan is a plan to develop a collection of retail, wholesale, and office buildings in the meeting place of SOMA, the Mission, and Potrero Hill.

17. Folsom Street is the nightlife corridor lined with gay leather bars and straight nightclubs. Developers have plans to turn this into the main pedestrian boulevard for SOMA, a tourist promenade.

18. Bloomingdale’s Shopping Center is a $380 million project reconstructing the old Emporium store. This new high-end retail department store was heavily subsidized with over $55 million of public re-development money.

19. Sixth Street Improvement Plan. 6th Street is one of the more secure pockets of affordable housing in SOMA. Community organizations have been able to win zoning protections that have withstood many of the development pressures surrounding 6th Street. This area remains highly contested and the Redevelopment Agency is still a very active player in shaping “anti-blight” projects along this corridor.

20. Mission Bay UCSF Biotech Complex is being developed as San Francisco’s “new neighborhood.” Over the next decade, it will have 6,000 apartments and condominiums, 850,000 square feet of retail shops, 49 acres of parks and open space and a 500-room conference hotel. At the center of it all is a 43-acre University of California, San Francisco satellite campus to serve as the magnet that will attract corporate tenants to 5 million square feet of general office and biotech lab space.

**Fillmore**

21. Fillmore Jazz Preservation District Plan is to create a strip of museums, shops and clubs that would commemorate the Fillmore’s former glory as a jazz mecca in the strip of Fillmore Street between
Golden Gate Avenue and Post Street.

**Mission**

22. The Market and Octavia Better Neighborhood Plan is for the general area surrounding Market Street between the Van Ness Avenue and Church Street Muni stations and along the planned new Octavia Boulevard on the former Central Freeway off-ramp. Generally the better neighborhoods plans focus on creating more retail, pedestrian walkways, city services, and housing development.

23. Central Freeway/Octavia Boulevard project will expand Octavia Boulevard to carry the traffic that used to travel on an over-head structure. The boulevard will be widened to a four lane two-way roadway separated by a central median, and flanked on either side by a one-way street with on-street parallel parking.

24. The Armory Building has long been a contested resource, with many struggles over what use of the five-story former barracks would best serve the interests of the Mission neighborhood. Bar-K Inc., a lender that took possession of 1800 Mission St. from its previous owner last year, is moving forward with plans to convert the 200,000-square-foot building into 200 units of primarily market-rate housing.

25. 16th Street Light Rail would run from the Mission Bay connection of the Third Street Light Rail to the 16th Street BART Station. This is in a very preliminary planning stage, but the Transportation Authority has done a strategic analysis report on the possible project.

26. Northeast Mission Rezoning Plan is the Mission Neighborhood component of the Eastern Neighborhoods re-zoning process that is being led by the Planning Department.

27. 30th Street BART New Station Plan is a proposal for San Francisco’s first new BART station in more than 25 years at the corner of Mission and 30th Street. The project would cost up to $526 million and would likely take seven years to complete.

**Excelsior**

28. Balboa Park Better Neighborhoods Plan focuses on the area surrounding the Balboa Park Bart Station. Generally the better neighborhoods plans focus on creating more retail, pedestrian walkways, city services, and housing development.

**Visitacion Valley**

29. Schlage Lock Site Development is a project to clean up and convert this polluted brown field into a mixed-use residential and retail facility. From 1926 to 1999, the Schlage Lock Company manufactured door hardware and lock parts in a plant in Visitacion Valley and when they closed they left the neighborhood with serious carcinogenic contamination.

30. Brisbane Baylands Development is another development project on the toxic brown field located adjacent to the Schlage Lock Site. Between the toxins from Universal Paragon, Schlage Lock, the Southern Pacific refueling station that used to operate in the area, and an old San Francisco municipal landfill that was used from 1932 to 1967, this area of Visitacion Valley in is desperate need for real corporate accountability and environmental clean-up.

31. Federal Redevelopment – Sunnydale Housing Projects. Federal HOPE VI funding started a process of demolition and reconstruction of housing projects across the country. While this funding has been uncertain, the Housing Authority released a Request for Proposals in early 2004 for several large renovation projects of the older housing authority complexes. Sunnydale was the largest project on this list, but there is currently no funding for renovation.
Bayview Hunters Point

32. The Third Street Light Rail is the development project that has had the greatest impact on re-shaping the future of Bayview Hunters Point, which has historically been largely isolated from the rest of San Francisco. This new train line will run from Visitation Valley to Third Street and running through the main corridor of Bayview and through Mission Bay where it connects to the new Central Subway.

33. Central Waterfront Better Neighborhoods Plan runs from Mariposa Street south to Islais Creek and from the I-280 east to the Bay. Generally the better neighborhoods plans focus on creating more retail, pedestrian walkways, city services, and housing development.

34. PG&E Power Plant. The PG&E Hunters Point plant spews almost 600 tons of nitrous oxides, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, ammonia, volatile organic compounds, and sulfur dioxide into the air above Bayview Hunters Point each year. This power plant in Bayview has long been condemned a major source of carcinogens in the already severely polluted African American community of Bayview. After years of community outcry, the City finally promised to close the facility in the 1998, but never followed through on this agreement. Under Mayor Newsom’s administration, the power plant was again given an extension until 2007.

35. Bayview Redevelopment Plan is the Bayview piece of the Eastern Neighborhoods re-zoning process that is being led by the Planning Department

36. Hunter’s Point Naval Shipyard. The Redevelopment Agency and Lennar Corporation are planning to convert the highly polluted former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard into a new mixed-use community including 1600 new homes as well as commercial, educational, cultural and open space uses. From World War II until it was shut down in 1974, the 500-acre Shipyard created one of the most serious environmental crises in San Francisco and had a devastating impact on the health of people of Bayview. The shipyard remains a superfund site.

37. Candlestick Stadium and Mall. Is a $500 million project to reconstruct the 49ers football stadium, demolish Candlestick Park and replace it with a major mall and retail tourist attraction. The project began in 1994 under then-owner DeBartolo and Mayor Willie Brown. Newsom has reinvigorate the project with the current owners, the Yorks. The project has been contested because of the public subsidizing of shopping malls on public land, and the lack of clear community benefits in the project.

38. Federal Redevelopment – Middlepoint Housing Projects. The Housing Authority submitted a request for HOPE VI funding for the reconstruction and possible demolition of Middlepoint (Hunters View) Projects. If funded, the reconstruction is estimated to be a five-year process.

39. Federal Redevelopment – Doublerock Housing Projects. Similar to Sunnydale Projects, Doblerock (Alice Griffith) was one of the projects on the Housing Authority Request for Proposals, but there is currently no funding for renovation.

40. New Home Depot. Originally proposed for the Schlage Lock site, Home Depot faced community opposition to the “big box” retail outlet which often has a large impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The location was moved to Bayshore Boulevard and to secure approval for the project, Home Depot signed a First Source Horing Agreement, promising to hire 100 workers from Bayview/Hunters Point, an addition 100 workers from the Potrero Hill, Visitacion Valley, Bernal Heights, Excelsior and Mission neighborhoods.

41. Production Distribution and Repair (PDR) Conversion. Light, medium, and heavy industrial areas of San Francisco are more concentrated in the Eastern Neighborhoods than in other parts of the city. PDR zoning has become a central issue in the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process as developers seek to convert these areas for new retail, office, and residential developments.
In the preceding sections of map and demographic data we see a snapshot of San Francisco in motion. For those of us who call this city our home, San Francisco today stands at a crossroads. Will San Francisco prioritize consumption at the expense of its communities? Will the Eastern communities that have provided much of the labor that built this city and keep it running every day receive the respect and resources they deserve, or will they be paved over and forced out by today’s Justin Hermans? And lastly, if these trends continue, what kind of San Francisco will be left standing?

Many of the current plans for economic development and land use are an extension of the policies of past decades. In the Eastern Neighborhoods these plans center around the creation of white-collar jobs, market-rate housing, and a large low-wage service sector economy. In particular, as we saw in the last few pages, the overwhelming majority of development projects in the city center around the conversion of existing housing, commercial, and industrial areas in the Eastern Neighborhoods into tourist-centered retail attractions and luxury housing. Market interests, not community interests, drive most of these projects. Without community leadership they are likely to radically re-define the neighborhoods that have been the center of ethnic communities in San Francisco.

The conversion of industrial land into market-rate housing, combined with environmental clean-up and new transportation connecting Hunters Point and Visitation Valley to Downtown, set the stage for these areas to be reabsorbed back into the city as newly gentrified residential areas. We have already seen a 30% population decrease of African-Americans in San Francisco over the past two decades. The City’s current plans are likely to accelerate this trend.

The central-city neighborhoods at the other end of the Third Street Lightrail are also under pressure from the ever-expanding downtown Financial District. Chinatown, SOMA, and the Tenderloin are littered with cranes and massive construction projects. SOMA alone is carved in several tiny re-development zones where thousands of City dollars are subsidizing the conversion of the neighborhood to serve a growing upscale professional population. The demographics and character of the Mission are rapidly changing with the development of new trendy restaurants, condos and live-work lofts. Each of these communities will be affected by San Francisco’s “new neighborhood”, Mission Bay, made up of luxury housing and retail to support the new biotech industry.
The future of San Francisco, however, is not a finished story. No matter how many 30-year plans city politicians and big business leaders develop, we know plans don’t make history – people do. Will San Francisco’s future be determined in board rooms or in the community? Surely, it will take historic efforts on our part, on the part of everyday people to come together and shape and direct the course of the city. Ultimately, the history of San Francisco is unfinished, the outcome is undetermined, but the future is in our hands, everyday.

This book is a resource and it is also a call—to our allies, our friends, the leading anti-displacement groups and the progressive anti-racist forces in this city. We want to work together with you toward a tenant and worker vision for the future of the neighborhoods where we work, live and make our homes.

For more info on how to get involved contact POWER at (415) 864-8372 or visit our website at www.unite-to-fight.org
Reader’s Notes