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Introduction

Change is a constant in urban neighborhoods. New buildings are constructed, older buildings are renovated or reused, structures are sometimes demolished and replaced, and businesses can change as often as the seasons. People also come and go—new ethnic groups move in, established groups disperse to other areas, types of employment change, as do residents’ economic well-being, and some residents grow old while younger people ebb and flow with the times. How can we see and study this dynamic process?

Urban Solutions has prepared this *South of Market Neighborhood Profile* in the research and planning tradition of its predecessor, the South of Market Foundation. The Profile provides basic information for assessing both the assets and needs of the community. It also provides a comparison between South of Market and citywide conditions for a variety of demographic variables. The timing of this report is intended to coincide with a planning process currently underway for the western portion of SoMa and more broadly with an ongoing city planning effort for many of San Francisco’s “eastern neighborhoods.”

Using demographic data from the 2000 Census and land use and business data collected intensive lot-by-lot field surveying in Spring 2004, the report provides illustrative snapshots of existing conditions in this important central-city neighborhood. Records from the city Treasurer’s Office and the Planning Department were also “ground-truthed” through this field survey, making this report an accurate current record. The data is presented in several series of annotated vibrant color maps that show patterns of various characteristics across the geography of the neighborhood. There are also several graphs that compare demographic data for the neighborhood to conditions for San Francisco as a whole, in some cases showing dramatic differences for residents in SoMa relative to the rest of the city. Two sets of boundaries were used for this profile of South of Market—the demographics analysis covers census areas from Market Street to Townsend Street on the south, and the Embarcadero to South Van Ness Avenue on the west, and the field survey for land use and economics mapping covers West SoMa from Mission Street to Townsend Street and roughly from 5th Street to Division Street. These study areas are shown on the Key Map on the next page.

There is little detailed information about the characteristics of San Francisco’s many neighborhoods and what little information is available is in a tabular, statistical format that does not allow one to really “see” the neighborhood. The Planning Department prepared a report of ‘San Francisco Neighborhood Profiles’ in 1997, however the information has not been updated and the data does not give a sense of the geographic characteristics of the neighborhoods. As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process, the Planning Department issued a report titled ‘Profiles of Community Planning Areas’ in 2002, which provided a more robust summary of key characteristics of several neighborhoods including SoMa. Yet, some in the community still expressed a need for a detailed and comprehensive...
neighborhood-specific geographic analysis. This *South of Market Neighborhood Profile* rich with maps of demographic, land use and business characteristics, therefore, provides a new approach to conveying details about the city’s neighborhoods.

Urban Solutions anticipates producing a series of Neighborhood Profile reports for key San Francisco neighborhoods. The South of Market Profile, a similar Tenderloin Profile, and smaller profiles of the Southeastern Neighborhoods prepared in partnership with the community organizing group POWER, are the first reports in the series.

The *South of Market Neighborhood Profile* provides a comprehensive look at who and what is in the neighborhood today. Of course, this report is not exhaustive of all possible types of information about the characteristics of SoMa, and in fact Urban Solutions intends to update these profile reports annually with follow-up field surveys and additional data layers to paint an ever-richer and more accurate picture. Nor is *profiling* a neighborhood just a matter of accumulating a volume of data—the neighborhood, any place, can also be described and understood through the “lived experience” of those folks who live there and work there and daily meander through its many intricate landscapes. Nevertheless, a profile such as this report can provide a fairly comprehensive portrait of the overall neighborhood for broader study and reflection, and as a living document it can be continuously updated to reflect changing conditions in the neighborhood and provide a record of changes over time.

Besides its value in assessing assets and needs of the South of Market, this report can be a resource in crafting community-based plans and programs to guide future development activity and to enhance the physical environment and economic vitality of the neighborhood, as was done in creating the current zoning for SoMa and a comprehensive neighborhood plan adopted in 1990. The easily understandable information not only provides a baseline for community planning efforts, but it can also be linked with commercial leasing data for business attraction strategies, used to analyze specific development projects, and for a variety of other community development efforts.

Urban Solutions encourages the use of the *South of Market Neighborhood Profile*, and our profiles for other neighborhoods, by many different organizations and interested parties, including community development organizations and community organizers, resident and merchant associations, commercial leasing brokers and housing developers, and various city agencies responsible for the health, safety and welfare of the South of Market community.

We hope you find this report interesting and useful, and we welcome your comments.
This map is provided as a reference for more detail than is shown on each of the individual maps in the body of the report. Note that the study area for the demographics analysis is broader than the “West SoMa” field survey area for the land use and economics mapping. The neighborhood is displayed within the context of surrounding districts, and it is important to consider that the “boundaries” of South of Market in reality are not as clearly defined as the boundary lines on these neighborhood maps. This key map also shows the street names throughout the neighborhood as geographic reference points. And finally, this map provides the Census “block group” reference numbers as well as the City Assessor’s block numbers.
Methodology and Census Definitions

Data sources
Field data was collected between April and July 2004 by Urban Solutions staff, interns and volunteers. A customized survey instrument was used that called out 15 separate fields of information to organize surveyor observations. A follow-up sample survey was conducted in September 2004 to confirm data for “PDR” land uses, which is a unique use type not always easily distinguishable on the ground. The parcel-level information from these surveys was organized in a Microsoft Access database which was then linked to a GIS data table and mapped in ESRI Arcview 3.2.

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 clusterings 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.

1970 population values for both the individual neighborhood and San Francisco as a whole were equaled to 100%. Any deviation from that value is noted as a percentage of the 1970 value—less than 100 for population decreases and more than 100 for population increases.

Mapping techniques
Data as depicted on the maps in the Demographics section of 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 chora (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 theses 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 Neighborhoods’ 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 Demographics section represent data values as percentages, which measure the relative magnitudes, or intensities of the data across the geographic area of the neighborhood. Some maps represent data values with real numbers, which measure absolute magnitudes.

Note that the study area boundaries for the demographics analysis differ slightly at the western end of South of Market between maps that are based on data at the Census block level (eg, race population data) and maps that are based on blockgroup data. Unfortunately the blockgroup boundaries in this area extend far to the south into the adjacent Mission neighborhood and thus could skew the data results. Thus it was decided to clip the geographic area for these maps to data that is just relevant to SoMa.

Data depicted on the maps in the Land Use and Economics sections of the report is qualitative information about the characteristics of each particular geographic unit area on the map (typically an individual parcel of property) based on information from the Urban Solutions field surveys. This is not quantitative data measuring a “value.” Classifications for these characteristics and a color palette are used to distinguish different types of data on these maps—for instance, residential land uses distinguished from commercial uses—that are based on conventional classification systems used in planning and economic development analytical methodology. The technique is called a “chorochromatic map” from the Greek words choros (place) and chroma (color), assigning unique colors to differentiate characteristics between places.

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, different from the term “not in workforce,” which refers to an adult 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.

**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.

**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></td>
<td>None</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>


Industry Employment: The Census uses a number of categories for sectors of employment in population surveys. For purposes of simplified tabulation in this report, the categories were combined as follows:

- Agriculture/Mining - Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, and Mining
- Construction
- Manufacturing
- Wholesale
- Retail - Retail trade, Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation, and Food Service
- Transportation/Utilities - Transportation, Warehousing, Utilities
- Professional/Information/Other Services - Information, Professional, Scientific, Management, Administration, Waste Management, and Other Services
- Education/Health/Social Services
- Finance/Insurance/Real Estate
- Public Administration
**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 (ie, 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.
The following maps show a variety of demographic characteristics for the neighborhood using data from the 2000 US Census. The maps show gradations of color representing relative magnitudes of the information being mapped—such as the relative percentages of residents in the neighborhood who are renters. On all these maps, the darker shade of a color is more intense or more dominant, while the lightest shade of the color is the least intense. Note that the first several maps are based on data at the Census block scale, but most of the maps rely on blockgroup data and thus have a slightly different boundary at the western end of the SoMa study area.
Population densities are based on the total number of residents for each Census block. Natural breaks in the data were used to create the five color gradations on the map. The map shows a gradual increasing concentration of people from the southern end to the northwest portion of the neighborhood. The southeast corner of SoMa around South Beach is also a dense residential cluster. Note the very low density of population in the northeast quadrant of the neighborhood in the areas near the financial district and around the Transbay Terminal.

This table shows that the South of Market neighborhood’s population decreased dramatically in the 1970s while San Francisco’s total population declined only slightly. However, through the 1980s the population trend in SoMa reversed and the number of residents rose back to its 1970s level. Finally, the table shows that in the 1990s the residential population of the neighborhood climbed even more sharply, far exceeding the relatively modest pace of population growth for the city as a whole.
The following series of four maps shows the geographic patterns of the data from the above table of population change in SoMa from the 1960s (recorded by the 1970 Census) through the 1990s (2000 Census). Note that this data is mapped at the Census “tract” level, a much larger reporting area than the blocks and blockgroups used for other maps. This first map shows that in 1970 the densest part of the neighborhood was in the northwest area along Market Street, with more modest residential densities in the center and southeast areas of SoMa.

This map of 1980 population density shows that there was a decrease in residents in the southeast portion of SoMa during the 1970s. Keep in mind that the population change data in the previous table showed a 30% drop in the number of SoMa residents during this time period. The explanations for this precipitous decline would likely need to be studied in the context of major urban renewal projects and other development policies of the time.
The previous table of population change data showed a reverse trend from 1980 to 1990, with a rapid increase in SoMa residents back to the 1970s level of population in the neighborhood. This map suggests that the growth during this period of the 1980s occurred predominantly in the southeast portion of SoMa. This is likely greatly explained by the development of the South Beach redevelopment area. An interesting change shown here is the decrease in population in the densest northwest part of the neighborhood in the 1980s.

This map of the 2000 South of Market population shows increases across all of the neighborhood except the northeast corner near the downtown. Data in the previous table indicates a dramatic 77% growth in the number of SoMa residents during the 1990s. Note that for the first time in this historic sequence the central and southern portions of the neighborhood experienced population increases, presumably reflecting the loft (“live-work”) development boom during that time.
In the following series of race population maps the five color gradations correspond to equal breaks in the data for easy comparison between the maps. For Asian and Pacific Islander populations, the greatest concentration is around the Yerba Buena redevelopment area at the center of the map, and generally in the northwestern quadrant of neighborhood This roughly coincides with the areas of overall highest population densities in the neighborhood shown on the previous map.

This map shows that the African American population in SoMa is somewhat concentrated along the broad Market Street axis at the northern edge of the neighborhood, though there are also pockets of concentration throughout SoMa. Note that African Americans make up a larger percentage of SoMa residents than the city’s overall percentage of African American population.
There is not a high percentage of Latinos living in South of Market compared with the other race categories shown on these maps. This map shows a concentration of the neighborhood’s Latino population generally in the southwest portion of SoMa. There are a few pockets of concentration in the northeast corner, though the earlier map showed there is very little overall resident population on these Census blocks.

This map shows a pattern of concentration for South of Market’s white population in the southern half of the neighborhood. Note that many of these Census blocks have relatively low overall population densities, as can be seen on the earlier map. The exception to this is the high density area around South Beach in the southeast corner of the neighborhood. Several of the blocks in the northwest portion of the map have percentages of white population close to SoMa’s overall average of 44%.
This table shows a fairly stable demographic mix in the South of Market over the last 30 years. The largest percentage of residents in SoMa are white, but the Census data indicates that percentage remained the same through the rapid population growth period for the neighborhood during the 1980s and 1990s. The data also shows that the Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander populations in SoMa have not been growing at the same pace as for the city as a whole. Of note in this table is that while the percentage of African Americans in the city has been steadily decreasing, in the South of Market it has remained relatively stable since the 1970s, and African Americans now comprise almost twice as much percentage of SoMa’s population as they do of the city population as a whole.

The primary race/ethnicity categories used by the Census that are shown on the maps in this report 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 within the broad categories of API and Latino for residents of the South of Market. Most notable is the predominance of Filipinos within SoMa’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander population.
Foreign Born - Not U.S. Citizen 2000

The color gradations on this map use representative breaks based on the San Francisco average of 16% foreign born non-citizens as a mid point for the range of data, to allow a comparison of SoMa with the city as a whole. The map shows that in much of the neighborhood the percentage of non-citizen resident population is at or above the citywide average. The highest concentrations are in the northwest corner along Market Street, which previous maps show is an area of overall high population density, and in the southern central portion of the map.

Foreign Born - Naturalized U.S. Citizen 2000

The San Francisco average of 21% naturalized citizens is used as the mid break point on this map. Again there is a concentration in the denser northwest portion of the neighborhood, but it is also notable that the highest concentration of naturalized citizens in SoMa is around the Yerba Buena redevelopment area. For much of the rest of the neighborhood the percentage is lower than the citywide average.
This table shows the percentage of both native-born and foreign-born SoMa residents in comparison to San Francisco as a whole. The neighborhood is very similar to overall citywide demographics in this regard, with about 35 percent of the total local population that is foreign-born. Note that the categories of Naturalized and Not U.S. Citizen are sub-sets of the Foreign-Born column in this table. The chart also indicates that immigrants living in South of Market have become U.S. citizens at only slightly less the pace as the average for San Francisco. Consider that it often takes many years to gain citizenship status.

This table shows households in the South of Market which do not have at least one adult or teenager who speaks English and those households where English is spoken along with Spanish or an Asian or Pacific Islander language. It is clear that there is a higher percentage of “linguistically isolated” Asian/Pacific Islander households, where English is not spoken, in SoMa than for the rest of San Francisco. Note also that the data shows a slightly higher percentage of API households in SoMa which are bilingual as compared with San Francisco on the whole.
A linguistically isolated Asian/Pacific Islander household is one where no one over the age of 14 speaks English “very well.” The representative data breaks used to create the color gradations for this map center on the Southeastern Neighborhoods average of 11.2%, because the overall San Francisco average was too low to make for a useful point of reference (suggesting that the issue of language isolation is much more relevant to the immigrant and lower-income neighborhoods in this quadrant of the city). This map pattern roughly reflects the earlier API race population map.

The low break for the color gradations on this map is keyed to the Southeastern Neighborhoods average of 4.9%. By comparison, the overall San Francisco average for linguistically isolated Spanish-speaking households is 2.3%. The map pattern here roughly corresponds to the map of concentrations of Latino residents shown previously.
The Census defines youth as under 18 years of age, adults as those who are 18 to 64, and seniors as 65 and older. This table shows that the adult population in SoMa has been steadily growing over the last several decades, but the percentage of senior residents has been declining since the 1970s and is now roughly the same as for the city as a whole. Also notable is that the neighborhood’s youth population has declined dramatically since the 1960s, now almost a third of the SoMa population percentage that it was at the time of the 1970 Census. The table shows a general citywide trend of a shrinking population of young people.

The city average age of 38.8 years old was used as a mid break point to create the color gradations on this map. Note the concentration of an older population around the Yerba Buena redevelopment area. The average age for residents was calculated by multiplying the population for each age category — youth, adults, seniors — by the average age for that age category, summing those numbers, then dividing by total population within each Census blockgroup.
The Census defines youth as under 18 years of age. The San Francisco average of 14.5% youth among the city's total population is used as the mid point for the data. The map shows an overall low percentage of youth across most of SoMa, reflecting the previous statistics about the neighborhood's declining youth population. Notable on this map, though, is the relatively higher percentage of young people in the Census blockgroup encompassing the 6th Street corridor.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)                                                                               Fig. 15

The Census defines adults as those who are ages 18 to 64. The San Francisco average of 71.8% adults was used as the mid break point to create the color gradations on this map. In marked contrast to the previous map of youth in the South of Market, this map shows the predominance of an adult population across the entire neighborhood. Note, however, how clearly the three anomalies on this map are mirrored in the other maps of youth and senior population concentrations in SoMa.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)                                                                               Fig. 16
The Census defines seniors as those people age 65 and older. The San Francisco average of 13.6% seniors in the total population was again used as the mid point for this map. This map shows high percentages of seniors in the Yerba Buena redevelopment area and along the 6th Street corridor where there are a large number of residential hotels.

The table shows that South of Market generally resembles the overall city trend of a declining percentage of older residents and a growing percentage of younger and middle aged adult residents. The data shows a particularly sharp increase in the population of 35-54 year old adults in SoMa over the past two decades. Considering also the small youth population, as shown previously, a total of 73% of SoMa’s population is adults between the ages of 18 and 54. Note that the percentages for each age category are of the total population, not just the adult population.
The average per capita (per person) income for the city’s Southeastern Neighborhoods of $24,999 was used as the mid point for creating the color breaks on this map, as the city’s overall average of roughly $35,000 from the 2000 Census was too high to be a useful gauge for data from SoMa. The map clearly shows that residents with higher per capita income are more concentrated in the southeastern portion of the neighborhood. Note comparisons with maps of other demographic characteristics.

Household income is the total income received by all household members age 15 and over, including those not related to the primary “householder.” Median (the middle point) household income is shown for each Census blockgroup. Again a more local average was used for the data breaks rather than the much higher citywide median for San Francisco. This map shows a pattern of higher household incomes in the southern and eastern portions of SoMa.
The first table strikingly shows that a higher proportion of the neighborhood’s adult population is below poverty, compared with San Francisco as a whole. The table on the right compares the neighborhood’s median household income and per capita (per person) income with citywide conditions. It is notable that while SoMa has a high percentage of adults in poverty it also has an overall per capita income slightly higher than for the entire city, suggesting there is a segment of the neighborhood population with very high incomes that offset the many residents with lower incomes.
Education Attainment for Adults (25 years of age or older)

This table shows the highest level of education attained for adults age 25 and over. Someone who has a high school diploma and an undergraduate degree is counted in this Census data under the ‘Bachelors/Graduate’ column but not under the ‘H.S. diploma’ category since the college degree is the person’s highest educational attainment. The table shows that much of the city’s overall adult population, almost half, has at least an undergraduate college degree. A slightly lower percentage of South of Market residents have college degrees. Educational attainment for SoMa’s adult residents overall seems roughly similar to citywide conditions. Note, however, the column to the far right in the table which is specifically for those residents aged 16-19 who were neither in high school nor had their diploma at the time of the 2000 Census. An astounding five times the percentage of the neighborhood’s population of this age, compared to the city, falls in this category of education attainment. The separate data chart below the main table is just for SoMa residents aged 25 and over and is broken out by the four main Census population races, highlighting some notable differences in education among the neighborhood’s residents.
This map uses the San Francisco city average of about 65% renters as the middle point for the range of five color gradations. The South of Market has an 83% renter population. This map clearly shows a pattern of a significant concentration of renter households in the central and northwest areas of the neighborhood, as well as in the southeast corner, all of which are areas of highest population density in SoMa. Note that in general the intensity progressively decreases from north to south on the map.

This map shows the average percent of their monthly incomes that residents are paying for rent in the neighborhood. The conventional standard of 1/3 of income towards housing costs (rent + utilities) is used as the mid break point. This data indicates that for the most part SoMa residents are similar to the broader population relative to this conventional housing cost standard.
Family Households

The Census defines a family as a primary “householder” and at least one other person living in the same household who is related by birth, adoption, or marriage (though not including domestic partners). Therefore a married couple is defined as a “family.” The Southeastern Neighborhoods average of 68.7% family households (using the Census definition) is used as the middle break point. The data shows clearly that the SoMa neighborhood has a lower percentage of family households than this region as a whole.

Length of Residency

This map is showing the average number of years residents have lived in their current housing unit. It is important to note that this is not necessarily the same as a person’s total length of residency in the neighborhood if they have moved from one housing location to another. The map is thus somewhat of a proxy for housing stability for residents — whether the population is more transient or more settled. The Southeastern Neighborhoods average of 4 years is used as the middle point for the color gradations.
The table here shows that the South of Market has long been a neighborhood of a largely renter population, but there is a clear trend of a decreasing percentage of renters and an increasing number of owners, most dramatically during the 1990s. Note the overall major increases in total numbers of both renters and owners in SoMa during this 1990s period as well. The shift in housing tenure for South of Market far outpaces the trend for the city as a whole of a slight, but continuous, decline in renter population—from 66.3% in 1980 to 65% by the year 2000.

The chart on the right shows the percentage of SoMa renters by the year moved in, and on the left is homeowners. The very notable pattern here is that the vast majority of owners in the neighborhood had been in their housing units only since 1995 (at the time of the Census), and generally the owners in SoMa are relative newcomers. Note, by comparison, the significantly higher percentage of residents citywide who had owned their housing more than 10 years. The table also shows the sudden jump in renter population at the very end of the 1990s in SoMa compared to citywide data.
This table shows the number of South of Market residents who work within San Francisco, work within the San Francisco ‘Metropolitan Statistical Area’ (MSA) but outside of the city itself, or work in other parts of the Bay Area or even farther away, respectively. SoMa residents are very similar to the citywide population in this regard.

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

### Location of Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents Who Work in SF</th>
<th>Work in Marin or San Mateo Co.</th>
<th>Work Elsewhere in Bay Area (or farther)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322,009</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This map looks at the geographic patterns of the data from the above table. The San Francisco average of 76.9% local workers is used as a lower end break. There are two notable patterns on this map relative to the areas of highest population density in SoMa—the northwest portion of the neighborhood, near Market Street and the downtown and Civic Center areas, has a higher than average percentage of residents who work in the city. The southeast portion of the neighborhood around South Beach has a comparatively higher percentage of residents who are commuters.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, SF1 (short form)
The Southeastern Neighborhoods average of 0.94 vehicles owned per household is used as the middle point for the range on this map, since the citywide average is too high to be a useful measure. The total number of vehicles owned is displayed in each Census blockgroup on the map as well. The fairly clear pattern here is that the higher density areas of SoMa closer to Market Street have low levels of vehicle ownership. Note the large number of vehicles owned in the southeast areas around South Beach and Rincon Hill.

This table compares vehicle ownership for the South of Market and the city as a whole. Note that 50% of all the neighborhood’s households are renters who do not have a car. This compares with slightly over ¼ of San Francisco households overall that are car-free. Conversely, a small number of owner households in SoMa are without a vehicle. Note, however, that for both renters and owners in SoMa, there are much smaller percentages that own two cars compared to citywide statistics.
Average commute times for residents are shown on this map, regardless of the “mode” (e.g., transit, walk, car, etc) used to get to work. The San Francisco average time to work of 31 minutes is used as the middle point for the range of color gradations. The map shows an interesting pattern with residents in a central swath of the neighborhood generally having longer commute times to work than other SoMa residents.

This table supplements the above map by breaking out the neighborhood data into various commute time categories. The data patterns for both San Francisco and the South of Market have a somewhat similar ‘bell curve’ shape peaking in the 15 to 30 minute range. However, it is also clear that a much larger percentage of SoMa residents commute to work in less than 15 minutes compared to San Francisco residents overall. This should not come as a surprise considering the neighborhood’s proximity to downtown and the Civic Center as well as to key transportation connections.
This and the following two maps show patterns for commuting to work by different “modes” of transportation—walking, bicycling, transit, driving. For this map of residents who walk or bicycle to work, natural breaks in the data were used for the color gradations because the statistics on commuting are too varied throughout the city to create a single comparative standard. Consider the nearly flat topography throughout the South of Market in looking at this map of walk or bike commuting.

The average for the Southeastern Neighborhoods of 32.3% transit use for work commuting is used as the middle break point on this map. There is a very clear pattern here with a higher percentage of residents using transit who live near the Market Street metro lines and BART along the northern edge of the neighborhood, while relatively few residents in the southern and southeastern portions of SoMa rely on transit for commuting to work.
Natural breaks in the data were used on this map because the data is highly variable throughout the city. The notable pattern here is the relatively high percentage and total numbers of SoMa residents in the southeastern portion of the neighborhood around South Beach and Rincon Hill who drive to work. Compare this map to the numbers of vehicles per household in those Census blockgroups as shown on the earlier map.

This table supplements the previous three maps of patterns of transportation use. The data shows that SoMa residents overall are less likely to use a vehicle to get to work than other modes of travel, even though previous maps show a wide variation on patterns of transportation across the neighborhood. Most notable is the very high percentage of South of Market residents who walk or bike to work compared to citywide statistics. It is also notable that even though SoMa is a central-city neighborhood, transit use for work is lower than the average for San Francisco residents overall.
The maps in the next two sections of this report are based on 2004 field data. This data is provided for each property, or “parcel” rather than just at the Census block or blockgroup level, which allows for a much more “fine-grained” picture of existing conditions in the neighborhood. The following maps of land use characteristics are also presented in a larger format since there are more colors to decipher than in the previous demographics section. Note that the boundaries for the field survey and these maps encompass the “West SoMa” area, not the entire South of Market neighborhood that was shown on previous demographics maps.
This map shows the predominant land use type on each parcel in the neighborhood. There are a couple of noticeable patterns on this map—the upper part of the West SoMa neighborhood, north of Folsom Street, is a fairly concentrated residential area, while the southeast portion of the study area has a cluster of industrial uses. Yet it is also clear that West SoMa is a very mixed landscape of uses, with most use types represented throughout the neighborhood. Note that there are also a significant number of parcels with buildings of mixed commercial and housing or other mixed uses.
Perhaps even more relevant to the everyday experience for residents and visitors in any neighborhood is the types of activities on the ground floor of buildings—here is where we most directly interact with the built forms and functional uses of the urban landscape. This map shows that housing and industrial activities are the predominant land uses at the ground floor level in West SoMa. The patterns of pink color help identify somewhat cohesive commercial corridors, such as along north-south 9th Street and 4th Street between Bryant and Townsend, and along east-west Folsom Street. The yellow sites on this map compared to the previous map of land uses indicates that there are many buildings with residential use all the way down to street-level, while in some other neighborhoods it may be common to find more retail/commercial uses on the ground floor with housing above.
This single-theme map makes the patterns of commercial land uses in the West SoMa neighborhood even more evident. Retail, mixed commercial, hotels, light industrial and office activities are separated out from residential and institutional uses. Here the strong presence of light industrial and retail uses is clearly noticeable. Note also the significant number of buildings with multiple types of commercial uses, for example the building at 11th and Market streets that has retail on the ground floor with offices on the upper floors.
Rather than a single category of “housing” as a land use, this map breaks out different types of residential uses into subcategories such as apartments, SRO hotels and lofts. While condos and lofts are present throughout the West SoMa neighborhood, the southeast section of the study area between 7th, 4th, Bryant, and Townsend Streets is more predominantly ownership housing than apartment units compared to the rest of the neighborhood.
It is clear from this map that West SoMa is a neighborhood of overwhelmingly one- and two-story buildings. This is reflective of SoMa’s high concentration of warehouse and manufacturing structures owing to the neighborhood’s historic function as an industrial district since the 1800s, with a peak of industrial development into the 1940s Word War II years. You can also see several buildings of three and four stories, and a scattering of even taller buildings towards the Market Street corridor.
In 1992 after the Loma Prieta earthquake, the City of San Francisco prepared an inventory of all the “unreinforced masonry buildings” (UMBs) that proved to be most vulnerable to damage and safety risks from seismic shaking. The inventory identified over 2,000 buildings citywide, a number of which are in the West SoMa neighborhood, as shown on this map by the small grey dots. The map also shows based on field observations which buildings in the neighborhood have evidence of recent rehabilitation work and where new buildings have been constructed. While this was not a precise engineering or architectural survey by any means, it is notable how many UMBs in the neighborhood appear on surface level to still not have had significant capital investments in structural or aesthetic improvements.

Source: Department of Building Inspection 1992, Urban Solutions Field Data 2004
This section provides data on the economic characteristics of the neighborhood. The initial maps show the employment profile for residents, using data from the Census. The subsequent sequence of eight maps based on field data show the patterns of distribution for different types of ground floor businesses in the neighborhood. Note that nearly 20 different business categories were used in the field survey, so these maps were made by combining various business types into more generalized categories. Also note that larger buildings often have more than one business occupant on the ground floor, but the limitations of mapping allows only one use at a time to be shown on the entire parcel.
This table of general employment types for neighborhood residents (both as wage-earners and as business owners) indicates that the largest portion of SoMa workers are in various professional and information-based job sectors, including scientific, management, administrative, and business services. Also notable are retail, manufacturing and “FIRE” sectors which comprise slightly higher percentages of the SoMa workforce than for the overall city population.

This is a map of employed SoMa residents between the ages of 16 and 64, both as wage-earners and as business owners. The San Francisco overall employment rate of 95.4% at the time of the 2000 Census is used as the upper end for the range of color gradations on this map. The notable pattern here is the decreasing levels of employed residents from the southern and southeast portions of the neighborhood towards the northern areas closer to Market Street, which is also generally the densest part of SoMa.
Unemployed adults are defined by the Census as those people between the ages 16 and 64 who at the time of the 2000 Census were without a job and who were looking for work during the previous 4 weeks and available to start a job. San Francisco’s overall unemployment rate of 4.6% in 2000 was used as the lower end for the range of color gradations (note that the city’s unemployment rate has risen to 5.2% in 2004). The cluster of blockgroups along Market Street in the northwest part of SoMa had an average unemployment rate of 11% or more.

The Census defines “not in labor force” as those residents between the ages of 16 and 64 who are unemployed and not seeking work or not in the labor force for various other reasons including students, retirees, homemakers/caregivers, or institutionalized people. Note that this category of the workforce accounts for a large number of people—the San Francisco overall average is 22.4%, which is used as the mid break point for this map. The map shows that the SoMa population is generally at or below the city average in this case.
General Retail and Personal Services

This map, based on field survey data, shows general retail shops, food and beverage stores, and personal services scattered throughout West SoMa. While retail shops are quite ubiquitous, this map suggests some distinct retail “corridors.” Food and beverage markets are generally located fairly centrally in the study area, which makes sense considering the greater residential densities in this northwest portion of South of Market.

Eating and Drinking Places

While eating and drinking places exist throughout SoMa, this map clearly shows some clusters including the “late night” entertainment zone around 11th and Folsom streets, and along segments of Folsom Street, Bryant Street, 9th Street and 4th Street.
This particular map shows businesses where art is produced and/or showcased such as galleries or theatres. The map shows a sprinkling of such uses throughout the West SoMa area, however, it should be noted that the data represents uses at the ground floor level only and does not necessarily account for many arts-related uses in the neighborhood that share space with other uses (including housing) or are housed on the 2nd floor level or higher.

This map shows the locations of various professional and technology-based job sectors, including scientific, management, administrative, and business services. Most notable is a concentration of financial/real estate services clustered on Bryant Street between 6th and 7th Streets. Technology/internet businesses are found throughout West SoMa, though the map shows a few general clusters.
South of Market supports many light industrial and repair uses, including general production, apparel manufacturing, publishing/printing, and furniture production/repair. With the exception of apparel manufacturing, the map shows these types of uses broadly distributed throughout the West SoMa neighborhood. Apparel production appears to be concentrated in the areas north of Folsom Street. Also note the corridor along 9th Street for furniture manufacturing and repair.

This map shows automotive services including production/repair and rental, and parking lots. West SoMa clearly has an abundance of auto service businesses, and the map shows them broadly distributed throughout the study area. There is a somewhat higher concentration of auto services towards the far western portion of the neighborhood.
In addition to manufacturing, West SoMa also has a large number of wholesale businesses and trade contractors. Wholesale businesses are particularly concentrated south of Bryant Street, though they are found throughout the study area, while West SoMa boasts a concentration of trade contractors clustered in the central portion of the neighborhood between Howard and Harrison streets. Note the cluster of storage uses in the northwest corner of the map.

While social services are scattered throughout much of West SoMa, they are clearly more concentrated north of Folsom Street, which is also within the denser residential area of the South of Market neighborhood. Government services are clustered in two areas of West SoMa near Mission and 7th streets where a new federal GSA building is under construction and near 7th and Bryant streets where the city’s courthouse and jail are located.
The field survey of West SoMa revealed a total of 1,084 businesses and institutions, primarily occupying space on the ground floor of buildings. While the previous series of maps showed the locational patterns for various groupings, the table above provides a tally of the more specific establishment types used in the survey itself. The table shows that the most ubiquitous activities in the neighborhood are automotive repair/sales/services, as well as a significant number of wholesale and general production/repair businesses. The long tradition of industrial activities in South of Market and the attendant typical building stock support these types of businesses as does the neighborhood’s close proximity to transportation access. The table also shows there are many retail businesses and eating and drinking establishments, which attests to the neighborhood’s evolution as increasingly a place of residence and entertainment as well as a place of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wholesale Goods</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Retail Food Stores</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Trade Contractors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Eating Places</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Production</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drinking Places</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Production</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>General Retail</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Production/Repair/Sales</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing/Printing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tourist Hotel</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Production/Repair</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Production</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated Parking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Automotive Repair/Sales/Service</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Internet</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Government Services</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Solutions Field Data 2004
Reader’s Notes