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INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Key Findings
To map regional opportunity, variables were used that are indicative of high and low opportunity. High opportunity indicators include high-performing schools, the availability of sustainable employment, stable neighborhoods, and a safe environment. These multiple indicators of opportunity are assessed at the same geographic scale, thus enabling the production of a comprehensive opportunity map for the region. We then overlay demographic data to see potential patterns of demographic segregation.

Because the Bay Area is so large and complex, we split the mapping presentation in this report into three areas for easier readability and analysis: San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. In this summary report, composite maps reflecting overall opportunity for each geographic area are featured. Bay Area stakeholders requested an analysis of the shifting patterns of race, poverty, and comprehensive opportunity as well. Local stakeholders also articulated keen interest in housing affordability, gentrification and displacement, and consumer credit outlets. This report highlights these topics of interest as well.

There is great variability in opportunity in the Bay Area region. The seven largest cities (Richmond, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Hayward, Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco) all have neighborhoods that range from very low to very high opportunity. However, the distribution is not even; cities tend to be dominated by both very high and high opportunity or by low and very low opportunity neighborhoods. High and very high opportunity dominated municipalities include such San Mateo, with 83% of its census tracts in high or very high opportunity areas; Berkeley and Fremont City with two-thirds of their census tracts in these categories; and San Francisco, with 59% of its census tracts exhibiting high and very high opportunity. More troubling, however, is that many cities are dominated by low and very low opportunity tracts. For example, 89% of the census tracts in Richmond are low or very low opportunity, and 93% of Vallejo and Hayward census tracts are low or very low opportunity. Only ten percent of Concord city’s neighborhoods are high or very high opportunity. Such a heavy concentration of low opportunity can be a severe roadblock to healthier and more sustainable families and communities, and an impediment to a healthy region itself. Food deserts, poor job prospects, unsafe outdoor play areas, struggling schools, and residential and commercial asset depreciation can be the result of low opportunity clusters. Sustainability advocates should work to strengthen the opportunity webs in these neighborhoods, and to open up neighborhoods ripe with community assets and private investment to more families.
By overlaying racial population data on the opportunity maps, one can better understand the racial contours of opportunity access in the region. As shown in Figure 3, Asian Americans and Whites are more likely than the general population to live in high and very high opportunity areas; African Americans, American Indian and Alaska Natives, and Hispanics are more likely than the general population to live in low and very low opportunity areas. The differences can be stark: Asian Americans are almost three times as likely to inhabit a high or very high opportunity neighborhood as African Americans are, Hispanics are three times more likely to live in low opportunity neighborhoods than they are to live in high opportunity neighborhoods, and African Americans are four times as likely to live in low opportunity neighborhoods than they are to live in high opportunity ones. Whites and Asian Americans are the only racial groups to be more likely to live in a very high or high opportunity neighborhood than they are to live in a low or very low opportunity one, across the region.

Subsidized housing can be a key public mechanism to help disadvantaged families access high opportunities that they otherwise could not necessarily reach, such as high performing schools and grocery stores with fresh, affordable produce. Unfortunately, slightly over half of all public housing vouchers in the region are utilized in low and very low opportunity neighborhoods. Given that a recent study showed that living in a neighborhood of concentrated disadvantage is the equivalent of losing a year of school (Sampson, R.J., Sharkey, P., Raudenbush, S.W., 2008), the current distribution of public housing opportunity may not be providing the best hope for the future of already disadvantaged children.

The geography of deferred deposit lenders is less opportunity-segregated than might be expected. Slightly less than half are in low and very low opportunity areas; about one-third are in moderate opportunity areas, and just under one quarter are in high and very high opportunity areas. It could be more useful to know if lenders were disproportionately serving low-income people or people of color in these neighborhoods, were this data to be made available.

Analyzing how neighborhood demographics have changed since 1990 and 2000 was quite revealing. The population has grown overall, and more absolute numbers of people are in poverty in 2010 than they were in 2000 or 1990. But the biggest increase of people in poverty occurred in low and very low opportunity neighborhoods (on the order of magnitude of five times the increase of people in poverty in higher opportunity neighborhoods). Although both low and very low opportunity neighborhoods saw a startling increase of people in poverty, the biggest increase occurred in the very low opportunity neighborhoods.

Another striking finding from the analysis is just how many people are cost-burdened in 2010 compared to 2000. The number rises significantly within in each opportunity quintile; it nearly doubles in very low opportunity areas (from 83,658 in 2000 to 159,694 in 2010). Combining this finding with the findings regarding the geographic contiguity of low and very low opportunity areas and the rise in the absolute number of people in poverty, and the picture shapes up to be a grim one: more people across the region are in poverty, more of those people are in low and very low opportunity areas where it is harder to transition out of poverty, and more people are further constrained by their housing costs, which leaves less money for medical care, child care, and food.
The racialized contours of the shifts in opportunity are revealing. While the total population of the region has grown, this is due to Asian and Hispanic population growth offsetting White and African American population losses (see Figure 8). Whites largely dropped out of high and very high opportunity areas, which is largely where Asian families increased. The second highest drops for Whites occurred in low and very low areas; neighborhoods filled in by Hispanic and Asian populations. Unlike any other racial group, Asian population growth is quite bifurcated, being high in both high and low opportunity areas. African American population losses occurred in all opportunity quintiles fairly evenly. Although the total African American population across the region fell over the last two decades, African American families that remain are disproportionately in very low and low opportunity areas (see Figure 9). The majority of Hispanics has been and continues to locate in low and very low opportunity areas. The White and Asian population representation in low and very low opportunity areas has stayed constant over the last two decades, at about 36% White and about 32% Asian. Conversely, African Americans have been dropping out of high and very high neighborhoods, as have Hispanics, whereas White and Asian representation in high and very high opportunity areas has stayed relatively constant (see Figure 10).

Of special note are Maps 4, 5, and 6, which suggest a potential trajectory of future gentrification. Maps of areas with high or very high growth were overlaid on map of vulnerable populations for the years 2000 through 2010. High growth indicators include such factors as a low housing cost burden for the household, adult education attainment, and low commute time. Vulnerable population factors include a high housing burden, high poverty rate, and low household income.

Though the housing market has cooled some since the mid-2000s, local policymakers, advocates, organizers, and community development officials must continue to collaborate to develop equitable solutions to the problem of housing affordability and access to opportunity. Establishing and maintaining participation and engaged leadership among residents is one key to this work, as well as policy initiatives like housing vouchers, community land trusts and shared equity ownership options, and other rental assistance programs.
What is Opportunity Mapping? Why Map Opportunity?

The Kirwan Institute is a national leader in utilizing community-based mapping or GIS (Geographic Information Systems) to diagnose structural conditions impacting inequity, and identify strategic intervention points for advocacy and policy. The Institute has regularly worked as a GIS consultant to social justice organizations and community groups across the nation. The Kirwan Institute has a number of significant projects, research and collaborations to promote community development, fair housing and social justice through our “Opportunity Communities” model. The opportunity mapping approach has been further modified and developed by a variety of groups, including the Opportunity Agenda, the Institute on Race & Poverty, DiversityData.org, and a number of private companies. Opportunity maps have been utilized in policy advocacy, litigation, applied research, community organizing, coalition building, and to inform service delivery.

The “Communities of Opportunity” framework is a model of opportunity that considers factors such as housing, education, jobs, transportation, health, and engagement in one’s life and community. This approach is based on the premises that everyone should have fair access to the critical opportunity structures and the necessary social infrastructure to succeed in life; and that affirmatively connecting people to opportunity creates positive, transformative change in communities. The Communities of Opportunity model advocates for a fair investment in all of a region’s people and neighborhoods; to improve the life outcomes of all citizens, and to improve the health of entire regions. The Institute utilizes mapping and our Community of Opportunity model to address racial and social equity challenges, to promote community development for marginalized communities, and to affirmatively connect marginalized communities to critical opportunity structures, such as successful schools, safe neighborhoods and sustainable employment.

Decades of social science research have demonstrated that neighborhood conditions and access to opportunity play a significant role in life outcomes. The challenges facing marginalized communities are long-term, multi-faceted, and interrelated (such as housing, education, health, employment, safety, incarceration, assets and wealth), and the disparities facing marginalized communities have been widening. These inequalities are further exacerbated by the economic downturn and the fallout from the housing and economic crisis. Sustainable growth that is sensitive to the needs of marginalized populations requires multi-faceted solutions. Many advocates are coalescing around the understanding that no single factor is negatively impacting marginalized communities. Rather, a range of factors – from high rates of incarceration, neighborhood disinvestment, housing barrier, educational and early childhood challenges, to labor market discrimination—act in combination, restricting marginalized groups from access to opportunities and restricting the individual and collective ability to build assets.

More often than not, these multiple factors which negatively impact marginalized populations work together in particular places. These patterns of racial and spatial isolation are often the result of historic policies and practices—some of which were overtly racist. The policies that created much of the landscape we live in today, such as mortgage redlining or suburban infrastructure and highway investment, often created an inequitable and segregated landscape. These uneven opportunities and burdens can be perpetuated today by the status quo. The Kirwan Institute’s “Opportunity Mapping” initiatives analyze and communicate the cumulative structural disinvestment and segregation of people
of color into declining and distressed neighborhoods. These maps are a powerful tool to help guide coalition building, service delivery and investment around issues faced by marginalized and isolated communities.

Given the extensive networks of social, racial and regional equity advocates and initiatives in the State of California, and the ongoing use of sophisticated mapping approaches to democratize data and encourage greater equity, the Bay Area is well-poised to implement and take advantage of the opportunity mapping framework.

Bay Area Opportunity Mapping: Research Overview and Areas of Focus
To map regional opportunity, we use variables that are indicative of high and low opportunity. High opportunity indicators include high-performing schools, the availability of sustainable employment, stable neighborhoods and a safe environment. A central requirement of indicator selection is a clear connection between the indicator and opportunity. Opportunity is defined as environmental conditions or resources that contribute to healthier, vibrant communities and are conducive to helping individuals and families succeed. Indicators could either be impediments to opportunity (which are analyzed as negative neighborhood factors, e.g., high neighborhood poverty) or conduits to opportunity (which are analyzed as positive factors, e.g., an abundance of jobs). These multiple indicators of opportunity are assessed at the same geographic scale, thus enabling the production of a comprehensive opportunity map for the region. We then overlay demographic data to see potential patterns of segregation by age, class, gender, race, ethnicity, language, nativity; etc.

The Bay Area Opportunity Maps are composites of three neighborhood assessments: Educational Opportunity, Economics and Mobility, and Neighborhood and Housing Quality. The eighteen data indicators used in the Bay Area mapping project are listed in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economics and Mobility</th>
<th>Neighborhood and Housing Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>Proximity to Jobs w/in 5 miles</td>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Math Proficiency</td>
<td>Public Assistance Rate</td>
<td>Residential Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student / Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Neighborhood Poverty Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free &amp; Reduced Lunch Rate</td>
<td>Mean Commute Time</td>
<td>Median Gross Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Educational Attainment</td>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td>Crime Risk Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Toxic Waste Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Toxic Waste Releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Parks and Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Indicators used in the Bay Area opportunity mapping analysis.
Because the Bay Area is so large and complex, we split the mapping presentation in this report into three areas for easier readability and analysis: San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. In this summary report, the composite maps reflecting overall opportunity for each geographic area are featured. Bay Area stakeholders requested analysis of the shifting patterns of race, poverty, and comprehensive opportunity as well. Local stakeholders also articulated keen interest in housing affordability, gentrification and displacement, and consumer credit outlets. This report highlights these topics of interest as well.
SNAPSHOTS OF OPPORTUNITY

The Current Landscape of Opportunity: Bay Area

Map 1: Comprehensive opportunity, Bay Area with San Francisco inset.
Map 2: Comprehensive opportunity, Oakland.
Map 3: Comprehensive opportunity, San Jose.
The Opportunity Makeup of the Bay Area

Percent of Census Tracts by Opportunity Index Classification (Very Low/Low; Moderate or High/Very High) for Larger Incorporated Areas or Jurisdictions in the Bay Area

As the maps and data show, there is great variability in opportunity in the Bay Area region. The seven largest cities (Richmond, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Hayward, Berkeley, Oakland & San Francisco) all have neighborhoods that range from very low to very high opportunity. However, the distribution is not even—cities tend to be dominated by either very high and high opportunity neighborhoods, such as San Mateo, with 83% of its census tracts in high or very high opportunity areas, Berkeley and Fremont with two-thirds of their census tracts in these categories, or San Francisco, with 59% of its census tracts exhibiting high and very high opportunity. More troubling, however, is that many cities are dominated by low and very low opportunity tracts. For example, 89% of the census tracts in Richmond city are low or very low opportunity; 93% of Vallejo and Hayward census tracts are low or very low opportunity. Only
ten percent of Concord city’s neighborhoods are high or very high opportunity. Such a heavy concentration of low opportunity can be a severe roadblock to healthier and more sustainable individuals, families, and communities, and an impediment to a healthy region itself. Food deserts, poor job prospects, unsafe outdoor play areas, struggling schools, and residential and commercial asset depreciation can be the result of low opportunity clusters. Sustainability advocates should work to strengthen the opportunity webs in these neighborhoods, and to open up neighborhoods ripe with community assets and private investment to more families.

**Race and Opportunity**

![Figure 3: Racial populations and neighborhood opportunity.](image)

By overlaying racial population data on the opportunity maps, one can better understand the racial contours of opportunity access in the region. As shown in Figure 3, Asian Americans and Whites are more likely than the general population to live in high and very high opportunity areas; African Americans, American Indian and Alaska Natives, and Hispanics are more likely than the general
population to live in low and very low opportunity areas. The differences can be stark: for example, Asian Americans are almost three times as likely to inhabit a high or very high opportunity neighborhood as African Americans are. Hispanics are three times more likely to live in low opportunity neighborhoods than they are to live in high opportunity neighborhoods; African Americans are four times as likely to live in low opportunity neighborhoods than they are to live in high opportunity ones. Whites and Asian Americans are the only racial groups to be more likely to live in a very high or high opportunity neighborhood than they are to live in a low or very low opportunity one, across the region.

**Housing Opportunity**

![Percent of Regional Housing Vouchers Found Within Neighborhood Opportunity Areas](source)

Subsidized housing can be a key public mechanism to help disadvantaged families access high opportunities that they otherwise could not necessarily reach, such as high performing schools and grocery stores with fresh, affordable produce. Unfortunately, slightly over half of public housing vouchers in the region are utilized in low and very low opportunity neighborhoods. Given that a recent study showed that living in a neighborhood of concentrated disadvantage is the equivalent of losing a year of school (Sampson, R.J., Sharkey, P., Raudenbush, S.W., 2008), this distribution of public housing opportunity may not be providing the best hope for the future of already disadvantaged children.
Deferred-Deposit Lending

Percent of the Region’s Deferred Deposit Lenders Found Within Neighborhood Opportunity Areas

- Low & Very Low: 48.5%
- Moderate: 27.6%
- High & Very High: 23.9%

Figure 5: Deferred deposit lenders and opportunity.

The geography of deferred deposit lenders is less opportunity segregated than might be expected. Slightly less than half are in low and very low opportunity areas; about one-third are in moderate opportunity areas, and just under one quarter are in high and very high opportunity areas. It could be more useful to know if lenders were disproportionately serving low-income people or people of color in these neighborhoods. Unfortunately, that data is not available to date.
TRENDS IN OPPORTUNITY ACCESS, RACE, AND POVERTY

Poverty and Opportunity Trends

Figure 6: People in poverty and opportunity quintiles.

Another interesting perspective on the data and mapping regarding opportunity is to look at how neighborhood demographics have changed since 1990 and 2000. As one can see, the population has grown overall, and more absolute numbers of people are in poverty in 2010 than they were in 2000 or 1990. But the biggest increase of people in poverty occurred in low and very low opportunity neighborhoods (on the order of magnitude of five times the increase of people in poverty in higher opportunity neighborhoods). The increase of people in poverty was relatively slim in neighborhoods of very high opportunity. The uptick of people in poverty was slightly greater in high opportunity neighborhoods than it was in very high opportunity neighborhoods, with a sharper increase from 2000-2010 than from 1990-2000. A very sharp increase occurred in moderate opportunity neighborhoods in 2000-2010 as well, following a less sharp increase (though significant nonetheless) from 1990-2000. This could perhaps indicate that some moderate opportunity neighborhoods are in danger of slowly
transitioning into lower opportunity neighborhoods. Lastly, one can see from the chart that in 1990, there were more people in poverty residing in low opportunity neighborhoods than in very low opportunity neighborhoods; this was reversed in 2000. Although both low and very low opportunity neighborhoods saw a startling increase of people in poverty, the biggest increase occurred in the very low opportunity neighborhoods. When one compares large jurisdictions’ opportunity makeup in the earlier charts, the data showed that areas of low and very low opportunity were often clustered together. The combination of these findings suggest that not only are lower opportunity areas clustered geographically, the number of residents in poverty in them is growing at a significant rate.

**Housing Cost Burden and Opportunity Trends**

![Trends in Opportunity Areas: Change in the Number of Housing Cost Burdened Households in each Census Tract from 2000 to 2010 for Current Neighborhood Opportunity Areas](image)

Figure 7: Housing cost burden rises from 2000 to 2010.

Another striking finding from the analysis is just how many people are cost-burdened in 2010 compared to 2000. The number rises significantly in each opportunity quintile; it nearly doubles in very low opportunity areas (from 83,658 in 2000 to 159,694 in 2010). Combining this finding with earlier findings regarding the geographic contiguity of low and very low opportunity areas and the rise in the absolute number of people in poverty, the picture is shaping up to be a grim one: more people are in poverty; more of those people are in low opportunity areas, where it is harder to transition out of poverty, and more people are further constrained by their housing costs, which leaves less for health prevention and food.
While the total population of the region has grown, one can see from the chart that this is due to Asian and Hispanic population growth, which offset White and African American population losses (see Figure 8). By organizing the information into opportunity quintiles, one can see further nuances in the data. Whites, for example, largely dropped out of high and very high opportunity areas, which is largely where Asian families increased. The second highest drops for Whites occurred in low and very low areas, neighborhoods filled in by Hispanic and Asian populations. Asian population growth seems largely bifurcated, being high in both high and low opportunity areas. African American population losses occurred in all quintiles, fairly evenly.
Another way to view the data is to look at how the low opportunity quintiles are inhabited by racial populations (i.e. in percent), and how that changes over time. Here one can see that although the total African American population fell over the last two decades, African American families that remain are disproportionately in very low and low opportunity areas (see Figure 9). The majority of Hispanics, keeping population gains in mind, have been and continue to locate in low and very low opportunity areas. The White and Asian population representation in low and very low opportunity areas has stayed constant over the last two decades, at about 36% White and about 32% Asian. Conversely, African Americans have been dropping out of high and very high neighborhoods, as have Hispanics, whereas White and Asian representation in high and very high opportunity areas has stayed relatively constant (see Figure 10). Another way of visualizing these trends together is shown in Figure 11.
Figure 10: Regional populations in high and very high opportunity quintiles, 1900-2010.
Figure 11: Racial population changes in opportunity tracts, 1990-2010.
Neighborhood Growth and Vulnerable Populations in the Bay Area

Gentrification and displacement have long been critical concerns in the Bay Area. Gentrification is defined as a process where middle to high income individuals move into lower-income neighborhoods and displace existing residents. This phenomenon is closely tied to housing affordability. Displacement caused by gentrification can be quite uneven in terms of race and geography. Many rapidly gentrifying areas have sizeable minority populations, such as the Latino community in San Francisco’s Mission District and the African-American community in the city’s Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood. The African-American population has been particularly susceptible to displacement. For example, an article in *High Country News* stated that the black population in Bayview-Hunters Point decreased from 65 percent in 1990 to 48 percent in 2000 (Walholz, R., 2011). Many African American families have moved to more affordable areas in outlying counties, such as Contra Costa. However, the African-American population in the region as a whole has declined, as many displaced residents leave the Bay Area for cities in the southern U.S.

Gentrification can be difficult to measure and to predict. In 2009, the Center for Community Innovation at UC-Berkeley sought to do this by creating “toolkit,” which was published in the report *Mapping Susceptibility to Gentrification: The Early Warning Toolkit* (Chapple, 2009). This toolkit used indicators such as the percentage of workers using public transit and income diversity to determine an area’s susceptibility to gentrification. The Kirwan team modeled its approach after two studies, including the UC-Berkeley report, and the methods employed in *The Extent and Nature of Gentrification in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000* (Sanchez-Geraci, D. A., 2009), using the statistical median rather than the mean in the index calculations.

The Kirwan Institute measured and mapped gentrification susceptibility across the region, in terms of neighborhoods and in terms of populations. This work identifies gentrifying neighborhoods as areas of “higher growth,” based upon the following variables: median household income, median gross rent, median house value, adult education attainment, and the proportion of adults working in “high status” occupations (Ann, 2009). To identify vulnerable populations, we took account of housing cost burden, poverty rate, low income households (< $30,000/annual income), and public assistance rate. The following maps are the result of a series of analyses that overlaid two key identifications: the neighborhoods with the highest rates in factors such as rates of adult education attainment, growth of White population from 2000 to 2010, and proximity to neighborhoods of high housing opportunity (access to parks, low crime, etc) overlaid with the most vulnerable populations. In other words, these maps identify the areas of most significant change occurring in neighborhoods with the most vulnerable residents.

Bay Area and San Francisco (Map 4)

Several areas in San Francisco have a moderate to very high susceptibility to gentrification (see Map 4). These include tracts containing the Mission District and Bayview-Hunters Point, which are often highlighted in literature on Bay Area gentrification. In Bayview, the area containing the former Hunter’s
Point Naval Shipyard is shown as having high susceptibility to gentrification. This is possibly due to the redevelopment of the former Hunters Point Shipyard. The African-American population also increased in Hunters Point, which is not usually associated with gentrification. This could be because Hunters Point went from having little to no population, as a shipyard, to gaining more people in general (due to the newly built housing).

The neighborhoods immediately surrounding Hunters Point show very low susceptibility. Since this map shows change between 2000 and 2010, it could be because gentrification in Bayview-Hunters point is a more recent phenomenon than in other portions of the city. However, the African-American population is decreasing in these nearby neighborhoods, which demonstrates that gentrification is starting to occur.

The Mission District shows areas if moderate to very high susceptibility to gentrification. Unlike Bayview, gentrification has been occurring in this area for a while (mainly the 1990s “Dot Com” boom). The Mission District is a traditionally Latino area and the Latino population has declined between 2000 and 2010.

**Neighborhood growth and vulnerable populations: Oakland (Map 5)**

East Bay contains one of the largest concentrations of susceptible and vulnerable communities in the region. This map clearly shows the relationship between susceptibility and vulnerability, particularly in the neighborhoods between I-880 and I-580.

**Neighborhood growth and vulnerable populations: San Jose (Map 6)**

According to the overlay maps, Sunnyvale is highly susceptible to gentrification, as are the areas on the San Jose map near the bay, areas currently occupied by Moffett Field and in close proximity to wildlife refuges and parks. Sunnyvale is part of Silicon Valley, along with nearby Mountain View and Cupertino, and since the mid twentieth century been an area that supports high-tech and technologically advanced industries.

An important aspect of the planning for these challenges is understanding the landscape of high profile sites and the proximity thereto. This means that residents, organizers, and community development leaders need to engage major employers and organizations whose presence in the community can either be a resource and bridge to opportunity, or a catalyst for inequity and displacement.
Map 4. Neighborhood growth and vulnerable populations: Bay Area & San Francisco
CONCLUSION

That inequities and disparities exist within the Bay Area and its greater metro is not a new finding. The purpose of this analysis is to shed further light on where they exist, to more helpfully describe community access to opportunity, and to identify areas with some specificity that face challenges to equitable development.

Although a slow-down in the housing market has provided a moment of reflection, challenges to our communities persist, and we must be prepared to make wiser, more informed decisions about how to engage our neighborhoods and about how to invest scarce resources in a competitive economic environment. Forming partnerships that bring communities together in this cause is an essential part of the process. Developing policies and practices that make sense for the Bay Area is another integral component to sustainable affordability and equity in the region. The maps and findings from this work are intended to provide tools with which to further the discussion and collaboration around building communities of opportunity that are inclusive and accessible to all.
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